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## FOREWORD

It is a well recognized fact that the level of agricultural production in India is one of the ly irest in the world and it is only by the exploitation of scientific methods of agriculture that. we can hope to increase our agricultural production to the level necessary for providing a reasonable standard of living to the country's population. Properly planned and conducted field experiments provide a reliable basis for propagating improved agricultural techniques among farmers. A number of research institutes and other experimental centres are functioning under the Central Ministry of Agriculture, the Commodity Committees and the State Governments, in which research on agricultural problems is going on. The need for an integrated account of the researches done in these organisations and institutions in the cotntry has been felt for a long time, particularly in the context of planning. The absence of such a unified account has often led to duplication of work and delay in the utilisation of the results for practical farming. The Institute of Agricultural Research Statistics of the Indian Council of Agricultural Research has, therefore, rendered a most timely service by preparing a compendium of all agricultural field experiments conducted in India upto 1953 and similar compendia are under preparation by the Institute for subsequent years.

The present compendium contains critical summaries of results of experiments bearing on important agronomic factors such as the responses of crops to fertilizers and manures, inter-relationship of fertilizers, varieties and cultivation practices and other information of value for giving sound advice to farmers in different regions. I am sure that these results will be fully utilised by agricultural institutions, research workers,. planners and extension organisations. The chief merit of the present publication is that it brings together in one place the results of experimentation carried out under diverse soil, climatic and agricultural conditions obtaining in India. Workers in one State can thus supplement data for their own area by results from other regions where conditions may be similar and thereby re-inforce their own conclusions. For the same reason I hope that this publication will be of use to workers in other countries also.

A Standing Committee consisting of the Agricultural Commissioner with the Govern- . ment of India, the Director, Indian Agricultural Research Institute and the Statistical Adviser, Indian Council of Agricultural Research, has been set up to provide general guidance to the work under this scheme. I congratulate the members of this Committee and in particular the Statistical Adviser and his associates at the Institute of Agricultural Research Statistics for bringing out this compendium. The preparation of this compendium has been made possible only by the whole hearted co-operation of the States and other organisations in making available the results of their experimental researches for this purpose. My thanks are due to the officers of the State Departments of Agriculture and other institutions for participating in this work. I hope that the present series will be followed by periodical publication of similar compendia for later years, in order that the availability, in a consolidated form, of results of scientific experiments in-agriculture in India may be maintained up-to-date.

New Delhi,<br>August 20, 1962.

> A.D. Pandit
> Vice-President,
> Indian Council of Agricultural Research.

## PREFACE

A large number of agricultural field experiments on different problems is being conducted in the country by Central and State Governments, Research Institutes, Commodity Committees and other organisations engagedsin agricultural research. In addition, a number of schemes involving field experimentation is sponsored by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research in different States. The absence of a unified record of the results of these various experiments has considerably handicapped planning of further research and development and has often led to duplication of efforts.

Vaidyanathan brought out in 1933 a useful catalogue of manurial experiments conducted in India till then. Considering that Vaidyanathan's work was confined to manurial experiments and the fact that an enormous increase has taken place in the number and scope of agronomic experiments in recent years in India, the Indian Council of Agricultural Research launched the scheme of National Index of Field Experiments in 1954. The object of the scheme was two-fold :
(i) the preparation of compendium of all the field experiments for the period 1935-53 and
(ii) the preparation of index cards for individual experiments from 1954 onwards.

Under the scheme, results of all agricultural field experiments other than purely varietal trials were to be consolidated. Subsequently at the time of the extension of the scheme in 1959 it was decided that the compendium would be prepared in the first instance for the period 1948-53 and a similar compendium would be prepared for the period 195459. The present series for the period $1948-53$ has been prepared in pursuance of this decision.

The compendium is divided into 15 volumes one each for (1) Andhra Pradesh (2) Assam, Manipur and Tripura (3) Bihar (4) Gujarat (5) Kerala (6) Madhya Pradesh (7) Madras (8) Maharashtra (9) Mysore (10) Orissa (11) Punjab, Jammu \& Kashmir and Himachal Pradesh (12) Rajasthan (13) Uttar Pradesh (14) West Bengal and (15) all Central Institutes. In each volume back-ground information of the respective State regarding its physical features, soils, rainfall and climate, agricultural production and area under different crops is given. A map showing different regions of the State, soils and agricultural research farms is also included. The experiments reported in each volume have been arranged cropwise for each State. All the experiments belonging to a particular crop at various research stations are grouped together. For a particular crop, experiments are arranged according to the following classification :

Manurial (M), Cultural (C), Irrigational (I), Diseases, Pests and Chemicals other than fertilisers (D), Rotational (R), Mixed Cropping (X) and combinations of these wherever they occur (e.g., CMI as Cultural-cum-Manurial). Experiments in which crop varieties also form a factor are denoted by adding V to their symbol and are given together ie.g., MV as Manurial-cum-Varietal). The results of an experiment are given along with other basic information such as rotation of crops followed, cultural practices adopted, etc.

For making maximum use of the experimental data all the important tables giving the average yields of various treatments along with the appropriate standard errors have been presented. No atternpt has, however, been made to summarise the data of groups of experiments on any particular item and to draw any general conclusions. This will be done for the period 1948-59 while publishing the compendium for the period 1954-59.

This publication is the result of the co-operative endeavour of a large number of persons both at the Centre and in the States. I should particularly mention in this connection, guidance and help rendered in the formulation of the scheme by Dr. D.J. Finney F.R.S. of Aberdeen University, Scotland, during his stay at the Institute of Agricultural Research Statistics as an F.A.O. Statistical Expert in 1952-53.

At the Institute of Agricultural Research Statistics, the work under the scheme was carried out under the supervision and guidance of Shri T.P. Abraham, Assistant Statistical Adviser. Shri G.A. Kulkarni, Statistician, løoked after the detailed working of the scheme. These officers have been largely responsible for the preparation of the manuscript of the compendium and it is a pleasure to thank them for the hard work they have put in for getting this compendium ready. Messrs O.P. Kathuria, B.V. Srikantiah, M.L. Sahni, B.P. Dyundi, S.D. Bal and P.K. Jain of the statistical staff of the Institute deserve special mention for their careful scrutiny of the data and preparation of the material for the cqmpendium. Thanks are also due to Dr. Uttam Chand, Professor of Statistics, now with the Central Statistical Orgainsation, Shri K.S. Avadhany, Assistant Statistician, also now with the Central Statistical Organisation, and Shri K.C. Raut, Statistician in this office who were associated with the scheme in its initial stages.

The burden of collecting data from original records by visiting different research stations and the analysis of a large number of experiments, only the primary data for which had been recorded in the files, fell on the regional staff appointed by the Indian Council of Agricultural Research in different States. They deserve to be congratulated for the patient work they have put in. The State Departments of Agriculture, Central Institutes and Commodity Committees made data for the experiments conducted within their jurisdiction readily available. The Indian Council of Agricultural Research acknowledges this willing co-operation without which the consolidation of the results would not have been possible. Various State officers who helped the project by making the data accessible to the satistical staff of the project and worked as the regional supervisors for the scheme also deserve thanks by the Council for their active help. The list of names of the regional supervisors is given on the following page.

|  | V.G. Panse |
| :---: | :---: |
| New Delhi, | Statistical Adviser |
| August 16, 1962. | Institute of Agricultural Research Statistics |
|  | (I.C.A.R.) |



Owing to transfers and other chages more than one Regional Supervisor have been shown against several states as thes officers have acted as Regional Supervisor Curing different pcricds frcm 1955 to 1962.

## (iv)

8. Mysore
(Banoalore)
9. Orissa
(Bhubanbshwar)
10. Punjab, Jammu \& Kashmir and Himachal Pradest(Chandigarh)
11. Rajasthan
(Jaipur)
12. Uttar Pradesh
(Lucknow)
13. West Bengal
(Galcutta)

Shri A. Anant Padmanabha Rau. State Statistican, Mysore State.

Dr. U.N. Mohanty.
Dy. Director of Agriculture (H.Q.), Orissa.
Shri P.S. Sahota, -
Satistician, Department of Agriculture, Punjab

Shri. H.C. Kothari,
Satistician, Department of Agriculture, Rajastan.
Dr. K. Kishen,
Chief Statistician to Govt. of U.P.
Department of Agriculture, U.P.
Shri S.N. Mukherjee,
Statistical Officer,
Directorate of Agriculture,
West Bengal.
Dr. S. Basu,
Statistical Officer,
Directorate of Agriculture,
West Bengal.

## ABBREVIATIONS COMMON TO EXPERIMENTS ON ANNUAL AND PERENNIAL CROPS AND EXPERIMENTS ON CULTIVATORS' FIELDS

Crop :- In the top left corner is given the name of the crop on which the experiment is conducted. Within brackets along side the crop is mentioned the season wherever the information is available.

Ref :- Against the sub-title 'reference' is mentioned the name of the State, the year in which the experiment is conducted and the serial number of the experiment for that year given in brackets.

Abbreviations adopted for States are as follows :-

| A.P. | Andhra Pradesh | Mn. | Manipur |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| As. | Assam | Mh. | Maharashtra |
| Bh. | Bihar | Ms. | Mysore |
| DI. | Delhi | M.P. | Madhya Pradesh |
| Gj. | Gujarat | Or. | Orissa |
| H.P. | Himachal Pradesh | Pb. | Punjab |
| J.K. | Jammu \& Kashmir | Rj. | Rajasthan |
| K. | Kerala | Tr. | Tripura - |
| M. | Madras | U.P. | Uttar Pradesh |
|  |  | W.B. | West Bengal |

Repetition of the experiment in other years is indicated in the same line against 'reference' by stating the year and serial number for each repetition side by side e.g. U.P. 53(19)/52(42)/51(20) etc.

Site :- Name of the Research Station is mentioned along with the place where it is located, e.g. Agri. Res. Stn. for Agricultural Research Station.

For Central Institutes, the corresponding standard abbreviations have been adopted e.g. I.A.R.I. for Indian Agricultural Research Institute.

Type : Abbreviations used against this item are one or more than one of the following : -

C-Cultural ; D-Control of Diseases and Pests ; I-Irrigational ; M-Manurial; R-Rotational ; V-Varietal and X-Mixed cropping e.g. CM is to be read as Cultural-cum-Manurial.

Results :- Information under this heading should be read against the following items:-
(i) General mean. (ii) S.E. per plot. (iii) Result of test of significance. (iv) Summary table (s) with S.E. of comparison (s).

## Abbreviations used in the text of the experiments :-

ac.-acre.
Ammo. Phos.-Ammonium Phosphate.
A/N-Ammonium Nitrate.
A/S-Ammonium'Sulphate.
B.D.-Basal Dressing.
B.M.-Bone Meal.
C.L.-Cart load.
C.M.-Cattle Manure.

C/N-Chilean Nitrate.
C/S—Copper Sulphate.
F.M.-Fish Meal or Fish Manure.
F.W.C.-Farm Waste Compost.
F.Y.M.-Farm Yard Manure.
G.M.-Green Manure.
G.N.C.-Groundnut cake.

K-Potash.
lb. - Pounds.
M.C.-Municipal Compost.

Mur. Pot.-Muriate of Potash.

N -Nitrogen.
Nitro phos-Nitro phosphate.
P-Phosphate.
Pot. Sul.-Potassium Sulphate.
Super-Super Phosphate.
T:C.-Town compost.
Zn. Sul.-Zinc.Sulphate.

## BȦSAL CONDITIONS

Information under the above heading to be read against the following items:

## A. For annual crops :

(i) (a) Crop rotation if any. (b) Previous crop. (c) Manuring of previous crop. (State amount and kind). (ii) (a) Soil type. (b) Soil analysis. (iii) Date of sowing/ planting. (iv) Cultural practices. (a) Preparatory cultivation. (b) Method of sowing/planting. (c) Seed-rate. (d) Spacing. (e) No. of seedlings -per hole. (v) Basal manuring with time and method of application. (vi) Variety. (vii) Irrigated or Unirrigated, (viii) Post-sowing/planting cultural operations. (ix) Rainfall during crop season (State name of the season along with the month). (x) Date of harvest.

## B. For perennial crops :

(i) History of site including manuring and other operations. (ii) (a) Soil type. (b) Soil analysis. (iii) Method of propagation of plants. (iv) Variety. (v) Date and method of sowing/planting. (vi) Age of seedling at the time of planting. (vii) Basal dressing with time and method of application. (viii) Cultural operations during the year. (ix) Inter cropping if any. (x) Irrigated or Unirrigated. (xi) Rainfall during crop season. (xii) Date of harvest,
C. For experiments on cultivator's fields:
(i) (a) Crop rotation if any- (b) Previous crop. (c) Manuring of previous crop. (ii) Soil type in general. (iii) Basal manuring with time and method of application. (iv) Variety. (v) Cultural practices. (a) Preparatory cultivation. (b) Method of sowing. (c) Seed-rate. (d) Spacing. (e) No. of seedings per hole. (vi) Period of sowing/planting per hold. (vii) Irrigated or Unirrigated. (viii) Post-sowing/planting cultural operations. (ix) Rainfall during crop season. (x) Peroid of harvesting.

## DESIGN

Information under this heading to be read against the following items :
A. For annual crops:
(i) Abbreviations for designs : C.R.D.-Completely Randomised Design; R.B.D.Randomised Block Design ; L. Sq.-Latin Square ; Confd.-Confounded ; Fact.-Factorial. (other designs and modifications of the above to be indicated in full). (ii) (a) No. of plots per block. (b) Block dimensions (iii) No. of replications. (iv) Plot size. (a) Gross. (b) Net. (v) Border or guard rows kept. (vi) Whether treatments are randomised (separately in each block).

## B. For perennial crops:

(i) Abbreviations for designs : C.R.D.-Completely Randomised Design ; R.B.DRandomised Block Design ; L. Sq.-Latin Square ; Confd.-Confounded. (other designs and modifications of the above indicated in full). (ii) (a) No. of plots per block. (b) Block dimensions. (iii) No. of replications. (iv) No. of trees/plot. (v) Border or guard rows kept. (vi) Are treatments randomised.
C. For experiments on cultivators' fields :
(i) Method of selection of experimental sites, (ii) No. and distribution of experiments
(iii) Plot size. (a) Gross. (b) Net. (iv) Whether treatments are randomised.

## (vii)

## GENERAL

Information under this heading to be read against the following items :- . $\quad$ :
A. For annual crops :
(i) Crop conditions during growth with date of lodging, if any: (ii) Incidence of pests and diseases with control measures taken. (iii) Quantitative observations táken (iv) In case of repetition in successive years-(a) from what year to what year, (b) whether treatments were assigned to the same plots in the same manner every year, (c) reference to combined analysis, if any. (v) In case of repetition in other places, (a) names of the places along with reference, (b) reference to combined analysis, if any. (vi) Abnormal occurrences like heavy rains, frost, storm etc., if any. (vii) Any other important information.
B. For perennial crops :
(i) Crop condition during the year. (ii) Incidence of pests and diseases with control measures taken. (iii) Quantitative observations taken. (iv) In case of repetition in successive years-(a) from what year to what year, (b) reference to combined analysis, if any. (v) Abnormal occurrences like heavy rains, frost, storm etc., if any (vi) Any other important information.

## C. For experiments on cultivators' fields :

(i) Crop condition during growth. :(ii) lncidence of pests and diseases with control measures taken. (iii) Quantitative observations taken. (iv) In case of repetition in successive years, (a) from what year to what year, (b) whether treatments were assigned to the same plots in the same manner every year, (c) reference to combined analysis, if any. (v) In case of repetition in other places names of places along with reference. (vi) Abnormal occurrences, like heavy rains, rost, storm etc., if any. (vii) Any other important information.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS USED FOR OFFICERS ASSOCIATED WITH EXPERIMENTS IN UTTAR PRADESH

| Serial Number | Name and address of the Research officer | Abbreviation used in the proforma |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 1. | The Agricultural Chemist to Government, U.P., Kanpur. | A.C. |
| 2. | The Crop Physiologist to Government; U.P., Lucknow. | C.P. and C.P. (R) |
| 3. | The Plant Pathologist to Government, U.P., Kanpur. | P.P. and P.P. (K). |
| $t$. | The Economic Botanist (Rabi) Cereals and Potatoes to Government, U.P., Kanpur. | E.B. (R) |
| 5. | The Economic Botanist, (Oilseed) to Government, U.P., Kanpur. | E.B. (0) |
| 6. | The Principal, Agricultural College, Kanpur. | P.A.C. |
| 7. | The Horticulturist Incharge, Vegetable Research Station, Kalianpur, Kanpur. | V.R.S. and V.R. (H) |
| 8. | The Entomologist to Government, U.P., Kanpur. | Ento. (K) |
| 9. | The Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Government, U.P., Nagina, District Bijnor. | A.E.B. (P), A.E.B. (P) P, A.E.B. <br> (P) T and A,E,B. (P) G |
| 10. | The Economic Botanist (Cotton) to Government, U.P., Bulandshahr. | E.B. (C) |
| 11. | The Director, Sugarcane Research, Shahjahanpur. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { D.S.R;' D.S.R. (S), D.S.R. (M) } \\ & \text { and D.S.R. (G) } \end{aligned}$ |
| 12. | The Director, Irrigation Research Institute, Roorkee, Saharanpur. | I.R.I. |
| 13. | The Director, Vivekanand Laboratory, Almora. | V.L. |
| 14. | Head of the Agronomy Department, Allahabad Agricultural Institute, P.O. Agricultural Institute, Allahabad. | H.A.D., A.A.I. |
| 15. | Prof. and Head of the Horticulture Department, B.R. College, P.O. Bichpuri, Agra. | H.H.D., B.R.C. |
| 16. | Prof. and Head of the Agronomy Department, B.R. College, P.O. Bichpuri, Agra. | H.A.D., B.R.C. |
| 17. | Principal, College of Agriculture, Banaras Hindu University, Varansi. | - B.H.U., Varansi |
| 18. | Mycologist, Goverenment Hill Fruit Research Station, Chaubattia (Almora). | Myco (C). |
| 19. | Entomologist, Government Hill Fruit Research Station. Chaubattia (Almora) | Ento. (C). |
| 20. | Horticultrist, Government Hill Fruit Research Station, Chaubattia (Almora). | Horti. (C). |
| 21. | Soil Chemist, Government Hill Fruit Research Station, Chaubattia (Almora). | S.C. (C), |
| 22. | 3t. Director, Soil Conservation Research Training and Demonstration Centre, Rehmankhera, Dhakauni, Rahimabad and katiyar. | J.D.A, (S) D. |
| 23. | Jute Development Officer, Lucknow. | J.D.O. |

glossary or vernacular names of crops

| SI. No. | Name of Crop | Botanical name | Assamese | Bengali | Oriya | Telugu | Tamil | Malayalam | Kannada | Marathi | Gujarati | Hindi | Punjabi \& Kashmiri |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | Paddy | Oryza sativa L. | Dhan | Dhan | Dhano | Vadlu, Biyyamu | Nel | Nellu | Bhatta | Bhat | Dangar | Dhan; <br> Chawal | Chaul; <br> Dhan |
| 2. | Wheat | Triticum Sativum Lamk ; Triticum aestivum $\mathbf{L}$. | Gaum ; <br> Ghehu | Gam | Gaham | Godumalu | Kothumai | Gothambu | Godhi | Gahu | Ghahu | Gehon | Kanak |
| 3. | Jowar | Andropogon sorghum <br> Brot; Sorghum vulgare Pers. | $\cdots$ | Jowar | Juara | Jonna | Cholam | Cholam | Jola | Jowari : <br> Jondhla | Jowari ; <br> Juar | Jowar ; <br> Jaur | Jowar |
| 4. | Dajra | Pennisetum typhoides stapf Ex Hubbard | - | Bajra | Bajra | Sajja | Kambu | Kambu | Sajie | Bajri | Bajri. | Bajra | Bajra |
| 5. | Barley | Hordeum vulgare L. | Ja'dhan | Joba | Jaba, Barlhi | Barley | $\underset{\text { arisi }}{\text { Baarli }}$ | Barley | Barley akki. | Satu ; | Jav | Jau | Jaun |
| 6. | Maize | Zea mays L. | Gomdhan | Bhutta | Macca | Mokkajonna | Makka cholam | Cholam | Musukina jola | Makka | Makkai | Makka | Makki ; <br> Makayee |
| 7. | Lobia, Cowpea | Vigna catiang Walp; Vigna sineasis Savi. | - | Barbati | -- | - | Thatapay- | Mambayar | Alasande | Chavli | Chola ; <br> Choli | - | Lobia- Kara. |
| 8. | Moong | Phaseolus aureus Roxb | Magu- <br> mah | Sonamug | Mung | Pachapesalu | Pachaipayru; Pasipayaru | Cerupayaru ; <br> Payaru | Hesaru | Mug ; <br> Chinamug | Mag | Moong | Moong |
| 9. | Gram | Cicer arietinum L. | Butmah | Chola | Boot | Sanagalu | Kadalai ; <br> Sundal <br> Kadalai | Kadala 1 | Kadale | Harbara | Chana | Chana | Chhole ; <br> Chana |
| 10. | Pea | Pisum arvense L. | Motor | Chota : Pyaramatar | Bada chana | Desavalı Batani | Pattaani | $\cdots$ | Holada bataani | Vatana ; <br> Matar | Vatana | Muttar | Mattri |
| 11. | Masoor (Lentil) | Lens esculenta Moench | Masurmah | Masuri | Masur | Chirusenaga | Masur paruppu | - | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Masooru } \\ & \text { bele } \end{aligned}$ | Masur | Masur | Masur | Massar |
| 12. | Potato | Solanum tuberosum L. | Alooguti | Alu | Bilati <br> Alu | Bangladumpa | Uruzhai kilangu | Urala kizangu | Alu gedde | Batata | Aloo, Batata | Aaloo | Alu |
| 13. | Onion | Allium Cepa L. | Piyaz | - Piaj | Peas Ulli | Ulli | Vengayam | Ulii | Eerulli | Kanda | Dungli ; <br> Kando | Piaz | Ganda : Payaz |
| 14. | Bhindi <br> (Lady's finger) | Hibiscus esculentus ; Abelmoschus esculentus Moench. | Bhendi | Dhenrosh | Vendi | Benda $\mathbf{k a i}$ | Bendai kai | Venda | Bende Kayi | Bhendi | Bhida; <br> Bhinda | Bhindi | Bhindi ; <br> Tori |

GLOSSARY OF VERNACULAR NAMES OF CROPS

| S. No. | Name of Crop | Botanical name | Assamese | Bengall | Oriya | - Telugu | Tamil | Malayam | Kannada | Marathi | Gujarati | Hindi | Punjabi \& Kashmiri |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15. | Brinjal | Solanum melongera $L$. | Bengena | Begun | Baigan | Vankaya | Katharikai | Vazhuthana | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Badane } \\ & \text { kayi } \end{aligned}$ | Vange | Vangan | Baingan | Bengan ; Bataun |
| 16. | Cabbage | Brassica oleracea $L$. Var. capitata L. | Bandha kabi | Bandha kapi | Bandha kobi | L. Akugobi | Muttaikose | Muttakose | Yele kosu | Kobi | Kobij | Patgobhy | Band gobhi |
| 17. | Carrot | Daucus carota L. | Gajor | Gajar | Gajar | Gajaragadda: | Karrat | Carrot | Kempu mulangi | Gajar | Gajar | Gajar | Gajjar |
| 18. | Cauli Flower | Brassica olreacea L. var. borrytis L. | Phool <br> .Kabi | Fulkapi | Fula kobi | Poogobi | Gospoovu | Caulifiower | Hukosu | Phul kobi | Fulkobi | Phool <br> Gobhy | Phul gobhi |
| 19. | Calocasia | Colocosia antiquorum Sehott. | - | Kachu | Saru | Chemadumpalu: | Sambu <br> Sapan' <br> Kizhangae | Chambu | Kesavina gedde | Alu | Alvi | Arbi | Arvi |
| 20 | Garlic | Allium sativum L. | Nohoyu | Rashun | Rasun | Vellulli | Poodui Vella poodu | Veluthulli | Bellulli | Lasun | Lasan | Lehsoon | Thom; <br> Lassan |
| 21. | Pumpkin' | Cucurbila pepo; Cucurbita moschata Duch | Kumura | Kumra | Bilati Kakharu (Scas) | Allugadd Seemagummadi | Poosani | Mathanga | Kumbala kayi | Kashi Bhopla | Kohla | Sitaphal | Halwa kadu' Petha |
| 22. | Radish | Raphanurs sativus L | Mula | Mula | Mula | Mullangi | Mullangi | Mullanki | Mullangi | Mula | Mulo | Mooli | Muli - |
| 23. | Spinach | Spinacia oleracea L. | Palang sak | Palang | Mitha Palanga (Saga) | Teegabatchali | Vusavyeley . keral | -- | Spinak soppu | Palak | Palak | Paalak | Palak |
| 24. | Tomato | Lycopersicm escnleutum Mill: | Belahi | Belati begun | Bilati baigan | Tomato | Thakkali | Thakkali | Tomato | Welwangi ; Tambati | Vilaiti wagan Tometa | Tamatter | Tamatar |
| 25. | Torai (Ridge gourd) | Luffa acurangula Roxb. | Jika | Jhinga | Janhi | Beera | Peerkankai | Peechanga | Heere kayi | Dodka | Turia | Tori | kali Tori |
| 26. | Turnip | Brassica Campestris var. rapa L. | Salgom | Shlagan | Salgum | Turnip' | - | Seema mulanki | Turnip | Salgam | Salgham | Saljam | Gonglu ; <br> Shalgam; |
| 27. | Sugarcane | Saccharum officinarum $L$. | Kuhiar | Akh | - | Cheruku | Karumbu | Karimbu | Kabbu | Oos | Sherdi | Ganna <br> Kamad | Kamad; <br> Ganna; |
| 28. | Cotton | Cassypium spp: | Kapah | Karpas ; Tula | Kapa | Pratti | Paruthi | Paruthi | Hatti | Kapus | Kapas | Naishakar | Eakh:? <br> Kapah |

glossary or vernacular names of crops

| S. No. | Name of crops | Botanical name | Assam ese | 11111 | Oriya | Telugu | Tamil | Malayalam | Kannada | Marathi | Gujarati | Hindi | Punjabl |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 29. | Tobacco | Nicortlana tabacum $L$. | Dhopat | Tamak | Uanpatra | Pogaku | Pugayilai | Pukayila | Hoge soppa | Tambaku | Tamaku | Tambaku | Tamaku: <br> Tambaku |
| 30. | Jute | Corchorus spp. | Marapat | Shada pat Tosha pat | Jhota | Janumu | Chanapai | Chanambu | Sanabu | Joot | Moti Cbhunchh | Jute | Patsan |
| 31. | Groundnut | Arachis hypogaea L. | China Badam | Cheenabadam | ChinaBadam | Nelashanga | Nilkadalai | Nilakkadala | $\underset{\text { Kayi }}{\text { Kadale }}$ | Bhuimug | Magafali | Mungphali | Mungfali |
| 32. | Castor | Ricinas commun is L. | Eri | Rehri | Jada | Amudalu | Amanakku | Avanakku | Haralu | Erandi | Diveli; <br> Erondo | Rehri | Arind <br> Harind ; <br> Rind |
| 33. | Lineseed | Linum usitatissimum $\mathbf{L}$. | Tisi | Tishi | Peshi | Avise | Alivithai | Cheruchana | Agase | Javas ; <br> Alsi | Alsi | Alsi | Alsi |
| 34. | TU (Sesamum) | Sesamum orienrale $L$. Sesamum indicum $L$. | Til | Til | Rasi | Nuvvulu | Ellu | Ellu | Yellu | Til, Tili | Til | Til | Til |
| 35. | Mustard | Prassica Juncea Coss. | Sariah | Rai sarisha | Rai | Avalu | Kadugu | Kaduku | Kempu sasive | Mobri | Rai | Rai | Rai |
| 36. | Rape | Brassica compestris var. toria Duthie | Sariah | Tori sarisha | - | Ava | Kadugu | - | - | Saras | Sarsav | Toria | Toria |
| 37. | Berseam | Trifulium alexanrinum L. | -- | Berseem | Gini ghasa | -- | - - | - | -- | Bersim gavat | Barsim | Berseem | Berseem |
| 38. | Apple | Pyrus malus L. | - | Apel | Sco | Apple ; Sabe | Apple | Apple | Sebụ | Apple | Safarjan | Seb | Seo ; Seb |
| 39. | Lemon | Citrus limon Burm. F.; Citrus limionia ozback | Namu Tenga | Pati ;Gora lebu | Lembu | Peddanimma | - | Naranga | Herale | Limboo | Limbu | Bara Nemboo | Walaiti nimbu |
| 40. | Cirrus <br> Grape fruit | Citrus sarddisi Macf. | Grape Fruit | - | - - | Pamparapanasa | China bombili mas | - | -- | Grape fruit | - | Grape friut | Grape phal |
| 41. | Malta; Mosambi | Citrus sinensis Osbeck | Malta; Mozambique | Mosambi | Mitha kamala | Batlayi | Sathugudi ; Cheeni | Madura naranga | Sathkudi | Mosambi | Mosami | Malta Mausmee | Malta |
| 42. | Guava | Psidium guajava L. | Madhuri | Peyara | Pijuli | Jama | Koyya | Pera | Sebe | Peru | Jamphal | Amrud | Amrud |

glossary of vernacular names of crops

| S. No. | Name of Crop | Botonical name | Assamese | Bengall | Oriya | Telugu | Tamill | Malayalam | Kanuada | Marath | Gujarati | Hindi | Punjab |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 43. | Kharbooz <br> (musk meion) | Cucuemis melo L. | Chiral | Kharmuj | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Khar } \\ & \text { bhuja } \end{aligned}$ | Karbuja | Kakkirikaai | $\begin{gathered} \text { Thai } \\ \text { kumbalom } \end{gathered}$ | Kekkarike | Kharbuj | Sakkar teti | Kharbooja | Kharbuza |
| 44. | Lokat | Erlobotrya japonica lind. | Lataku | Loket phal | Lokat | Lokota | Lakkotta palam | - | Lakkote hannu | -- | - | Lokat | Lokat |
| 45. | Mango | Mangifera indica L. | Am | Am | Amba | Mamidi | Mangai | Mavu | Maru | Amba | Keri | Aam | Amb |
| 46. | Peach | Prunus persica Batsch. | Narabog- <br> ori | Pich | - | Peach | - | - | Pichis hannu | Pich | -- | Aaroo | Aru |
| 47. | Pomegranate | Punica granatum L. | Dalim | Dalim | Dalimba | Danimma | Maathuzham pazham | Mathalam | Dalimbre | Dalimb | Dadam | Anas | Anar |
| 48. | Strawberry | Fragaria vesca L. | Garukhis |  | --. | Strawberry | - | - | Strawberry hannu | - | - | Strawberry | Strawberri |
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# UTTAR PRADESH 

## 1. GENERAL

This territory, formerly known as United Provinces of Agra and Avadh, was renamed as the State of Uttar Pradesh in January, 1950, on the inauguration of the New Constitution of the Indian Republic. The erstwhile princely States of Banaras, Rampur and Tehri, which were associated with the United Provinces for the purposes of census, were integrated in 1949-50 with Uttar Pradesh. Some other minor changes have also occurred as a result of transfer of enclaves. Uttar Pradesh lies between north latitudes $23^{\circ} 52^{\prime}$ and $31^{\circ} 18^{\prime}$ and east longitudes $77^{\circ} 3^{\prime}$ and $84^{\circ} 39^{\prime}$. On the north, its boundary runs along Tibet and Nepal ; on the east lies the State of Bihar and on the south the State of Madhya Pradesh and on the west and south-west lie the States of Himachal Pradesh, Punjab and Rajasthan.

The State is divided into 54 districts which are grouped into following 11 revenue divisions:

1. Meerut, 2. Agra, 3. Rohilkhand, 4. Allahabad, 5. Jhansi, 6. Varanasi, 7. Gorakhpur, 8. Lucknow, 9. Faizabad, 10. Kumaion and 11. Uttarakhand, the last having been created in 1960 prior to which the areas of this division constituted part of Kumaon division.

The total geographical area of the State according to the Surveyor General of India is $1,13,452$ square miles. According to the village papers the area of the State during the year 1960-61 comes to $7,28,82,803$ acres. Between these two figures there is a little discrepancy which is due to the recording of area under forests. Regular partuls are not carried out in the hilly regions of Kumaon and Uttarakhand divisions and so no reliable figures are available for these regions.

TABLE I
Statistics of Land Utilization for the plains of U.P. for 1960-61.


The natural divisions of the territory of Uttar Pradesh are Himalayas in the North, Gangetic plain in the centre and Plateau on the South of the river Yamuna. Geologically, Himalayas form a region of their own, the central plain and the Plateau form a large alluvium of the Gangetic valley. This is the central part of the Indo-Gangetic plain which stretches from east to west of the country in the north. A part of

Mirzapur and the trans-Ganges part of the old state of Banaras are different both from the Himalayas in the north and large alluvial tract in the centre. East Satpura hills touch the south-east of the state and form a small separate tract.

The largest part of the land lying between Yamuna-Ganges in the South and the Himalayas in the north, is a large stretch of even land sloping very gently along the course of the Ganges. The plateau in the south slopes along the course of the Yamuna before its confluence with the Ganges at Allahabad or Prayag.

## 2. DIFFERENT SOIL-CLIMATIC REGIONS OF THE STATE

The State has been divided into 11 soil-climatic regions each of which has a particular combination of soil and climate that makes it somewhat different from others. However, it cannot strictly be said that the soils and climate within a region are throughout uniform, for there are local differences and that in passing from one region to another there is always a gradual rather than an abrupt change in these conditions. The various soil-climatic regions are described below :-

1. Hilly Region :-The hilly region includes the areas of Kumaon and Uttarakhand divisions and portions of Dehra Dun district of Meerut Division, the soils of which form a part of the southern outer spurs of the Himalayas, comprising of the eight hill districts vuz., Almora, Garhwal, Tehri, Naini Tal (excluding Kichha and Kashipur Tahsils), Dehra Dun (Mussoorie and Chakrata), Chamoli, Uttarkashi and Pithoragarh.

Native vegetation consists of forests of Oak and Pine with grasses and weeds as undergrowth.
2. Tarai Region :-This region extends along the foot hills of Himalayas from east to west and consists of Kichha and Kashipur tahsils of Naini Tal district, the whole of district Pilibhit excluding Bilaspur tahsil, entire area in Dehra Dun below 3000 ft . hight northern part of Rampur district, Kheri district except Mohammadi Tahsil, district Bahraich except Kaiserganj tahsil, district Gonda except Gonda and Tarabganj tahsils, Basti district except Harraiya, Basti and Khalilabad tehsils, district Deoria except Deoria tahsil and district Gorakhpur except Gorakhpur and Bansagaon tahsils.

The vegetation consists of grasses, natural weeds and wild shrubby plants specially in the west tarai.
3. Western Region:-This region comprises of the districts of Saharanpur, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut and Bulandshahr which are located in the upper half of the Ganga-Yamuna doab of U.P. The region is separated from the States of Punjab and Delhi by the river Yamuna, which flows southwards down the Himalayas, forming the western boundaries of the region.

The vegetation mostly consists of forests and hill shrubs and weeds in the north ; grasses and halophytic plants in the South.
4. Mid-Western Region :-The area south of the Tarai region covering the districts of Bijnor, Moradabad, Badaun, Rampur, Bareilly, Shahjahanpur and Pilibhit is called Mid-Western region. River Ganges forms the western boundary of this tract and river Sharda forms the eastern boundary.

Native vegetation is the same as in the western region, but the area abounds in natural vegetative growth also.
5. South-Western Region :-This region consists of the districts of Aligarh, Etah, Mainpuri and a major portion of Agra and Mathura districts. The region constitutes a very important tract of Ganga-Yamuna doab and extends both in the upper and mid region of this productive alluvial plain. River Ganges forms the eastern boundary and river Yamuna flows through the centre of Mathura and Agra districts touching the western and south-eastern borders of Mainpuri district.

Native vegetation consists of short shrubs, bushes, low grasses, a number of wild dry land weeds and halophytic plants.
6. Central Region :-Central region is an area comprising of the districts of Kanpur, Fatehpur, Unnao, Lucknow, Sitapur, Hardoi, Farrukhabad and Etawah and forming a composite block of land in the middle and lower portions of Ganga-Yamuna doab. Besides the doab areas considerable portion of this region also occurs on the other side of the Ganges. River Yamuna forms the western boundary and flows in south-eastern direction. River Ganges also flows southward through the middle of this region.
7. Mid-Eastern Region :-The districts of Barabanki, Rae Bareḷ, Faizabad, Sultanpar, Pratapgarh and Allahabad are included in this. region; with the exception of last named district, the area is situated between the river courses of the Ganges and the Ghagra. The latter river flows at a greater velocity.
8. North-Eastern Region :-This region comprising of the non-tarai areas of the districts of Bahraich, Gonda, Basti, Gorakhpur and Deoria is bounded on the south by river Ghagra, northern boundary being the tarai belt. Great Gandak river separates the eastern most districts of Gorakhpur and Deoria from the State of Bihar.
9. Eastern Region :-Areas of this region are distributed in the districts of:Jaunpur, Azamgarh, Varanasi, Ghazipur and Ballia which are situated in south-eastern extremity of U.P. Ghazipur and Ballia districts adjoin the State of Bihar which is separated from these districts by the river Ganges. A number of important rivers viz., the Ganges, Sai, Gomati, Karmnasa and the Ghagra flow in this soil region. River Ghagra forms the nothern boundary while the Ganges forms the southern boundary of this region.
10. Bundelkhand Region :-Jhansi, Jalaun, Hamirpur and Banda districts lying south-west of river Yarnuna constitute this region.

Native vegetation consists of shrubs and grasses.
11. Vindhya Region:-The Vindhya Region extends on the south of the river Ganges in Mirzapur and southern portions of Varanasi (Chakia tahsil) and Allahabad. districts (Meja and Karchhana tahsils).

Native vegetation consists of a wide range of forest trees and shrubs.

## 3. SOILS

The soils in the eleven regions already described above are as follows :-

1. Hilly Region :-The soils have developed over biotite schists and phyllites. The soil classifications recognized so far are (i) Brown Forest Soils (ii) Podsolic soils and (iii) Wiesenboden or meadow soils. Brown forest soils are most productive. High acidity and deeper alluviation of nutrients are the main characteristics of Podsolic Soils. Wiesenbodens have developed under water-logged conditions in valleys. Considerable correlation is found between soil condition and incidence of diseases and pests.
2. Tarai Region :-The soils have developed over finer fractions of material of considerable thickness transported by innumerable streams and rivulets from the outer Himalayan and Siwalik ranges resulting from wide torrential rains during monsoon months. Parent gravelly material are often found in lower depths specially in the foothills. The thickness of the soil layers increases with distance from the base of the hills with simultaneous decline in the thickness of underlying pebble bed.

All grades of texturally varying soils of alluvial nature are found in this region. Soil types recognized in one of the Tarai Region in Naini Tal. district are (1) Matkota clay loam (2) Matkota loam-highly calcareous (3) Matkota loam-slightly calcareous (4) Matkota loam-non-calcareous and (5) Matkota sandy loam.

Soils of Tarai region are productive, possessing initial reserve of nitrogenous plant food which deplete within few years of intensive cultivation. These soils have been found to be extremely responsive to phosphatic fertilizers. Being younger in formation these soils respond favourably to the application of both macro and micro-elements. Major portion of the tract due to their light texture, necessitates occasional green manuring. Short term crops do well in these areas.

The two Tarai tracts though developed under the influence of similar soil forming processes differ widely from one another in the fact that the soils in the north western group are located in close proximity to the Himalayas and are less calcareous than the soils in the north-eastern Tarai tracts, where the alluviums have to traverse larger distances. The latter thus are more calcareous and of much finer texture.
3. Western Region :-The alluviums are to a great depth and except for certain tracts of Saharanpur, parent rocks are found no where. These alluviums are very varied and are essentially basic in character and have been developed from mild calcareous parent material.

Like all alluvial regions, this tract contains all the four grades of the soil classes belonging to both the Ganges and the Yamuna river system. The four categories of soils pertaining to each of the two river systems are (i) Riverine soils (ii) Soils developed on flats (iii) Soils developed on uplands and (iv) Soils developed on low lands. Soils on recent alluviums are of recent origin and generally calcareous and light textured and are found in the vicinities of the river courses. At certain distances from the rivers, soils of the flatter areas are found. These soils are partially mature and of considerably older origin. These soils are medium textured, generally belonging to loam or clay loam categories with a heavy strata of soil in the lower regions of the soil profile. They are neutral to slightly alkaline on the top but slightly to moderately alkaline at lower depths. Free calcium carbonate is occasionally found at lower depths. Soils of the upland class are generally found in the mid-interior of the region on the highest elevations and are the product of the oldest alluviums. They are lighter on the surface, the finer fractions having been alluviated to lower depths. These soils are brown to reddish brown in colour and are neutral to slightly alkaline in reaction. Free calcium is not commonly found in these soil types. Soils of low land are found extensively within the elevated regions. The soils are formed from the washings of the adjoining areas and on this account are generally fine textured. Considerable soil salinization is found in these areas which give rise to various categories of usar formations. These soils are highly alkaline and usually contain a hard pan either of clay or of Kankar nodules. Where salinity does not prevail these soils form very productive areas specially in respect of paddy crop.

The alluvial soils found in this region are productive and respond very well to fertilizer applications and other management practices. The water requirement of this region is generally high.
4. Mid-Western Region :--Alluviums deposited by the river Ganges and its tributaries after the disintegration of Himalayan ranges in the north through which the rivers flow in southward direction, formed the soils. Those parent rocks are basic in character and calcareous in nature.

Soils of this region are closely related to the alluvial soils of the neighbouring western region and formed of similar parent material. Many of the characteristic features of those soils are also present in the soils of this region. All grades of soils viz., riverine, flat lands, up lands, and low lands distributed on topographical sequences are also found in this region. These soils, however, differ from doab soils in their degree of development, the factors influencing the soil development in the two cases being slightly different. These soils are generally finer in texture and have no impedence in drainage and on this account are, in general, comparatively free from hazards of soil salinity. They are generally calcareous except for the upland soils which have practically no lime.

The soils are freely drained and have a good moisture content. The water requirement of these soils is not as great as that of the soils of the adjoining western region. They are more productive and respond very well to improved management practices.
5. South-Western Region :-The soils of this region greately resemble the soils of theWestern Region and all grades of soils pertaining to the two river systems obtained in that region are also present in this soil region. These soils, however, differ from the soils of the former region in their extent of soil salinization, this region having greatest concentration of saline and alkali lands. The drainage of this tract is extremely defective, resulting in formation of extensive tracts of usar. The soils of the Agra and Mathura districts, more so of their western and south western tahsils lying on the other side of Yamuna, are markedly different from the soils of the doab area, the former being more closely related to the desert soils of Rajasthan.

The soils are generally dry and have accordingly a high water requirement. Irrigation facilities in this area have brought spectacular responses and give record yields of rabi cereal crops. These soils, however, should be watched with caution for hazards of soil salinization and a well laid out drainage system seems to be a pre-requisite for any agricultural development programme of this area.
6. Central Region :-Soils of this region also resemble closely the alluvial soils of the adjoining regions, more so of the doab areas. These soils, due to slightly better climate, however, give rise to fully mature soils. Riverine, flat, upland and lowland soils of both the river systems as found in the doab area are also found in this region. Greater extent of soil salinization is noticeable in these soils.

These soils afford good crop yields under controlled management practices and constitute an important part of the well known wheat belt of U.P. Due to the insufficient drainage, a considerable area of this region suffers from soil salinity. Extra caution should be taken to check further spread of salinity, more so in areas where irrigation canals are being introduced by providing adequate drainage facilities.
7. Mid-Eastern Region :-Practically all grades of soils, including recent alluviums, flats, uplands, and lowlands are found in this soil region. The region, however, differers from the other regions in the conspicuous absence of influence of Yamuna river which deposited alluviums primarily transported from more basic central Indian rock systems. The black, grey and the reddish brown soils found in the watersheds of the Yamuna river in doab areas are nowhere to be seen in this soil region. The districts adjoining Ganges river suffer from inadequate drainage facilities and on this account are subject to greater hazards of soil salinity. The districts worst affected from this hazard are, thus, Lucknow, Rae Bareli, Pratapgarh, Sultanpur and to certain extent that of Barabanki. The area on the left bank of Gomati comparising of greater portion of Barabanki and Faizabad are comparatively less saline than the soils of the remaining districts in this soil region.

The soils of the region stand in need of more controlled management practices specially in respect of saline and alkali soil areas. Provision of adequate drainage and affording other soil conservation practices are very important for the improvement of these soils.
8. North-Eastern Region :-The soils of this region have been rightly termed as calcimophic soils due to the vast reserve of calcium present in them. Various stages of soil development found in other alluvial regions are also present in these areas even though they are inherently different in physical and chemical characteristics. The soils of the recent alluviums are highly calcareous, calcium carbonates at times being as high as 50 to 55 per cent. Soils are slightly to moderately alkaline in reaction, and possess an excellent moisture regime. Good crops are grown even without any irrigation. The water table in these areas is usually very high which maintains moisture supply to the plants during the entire period of their growth. Soils of the plains in this regionare also calcareous though not to the same extent as the youngest member of the soil family. Soil
development which consists mainly of decalcification has considerably advanced in these areas and the surface soils have lost most of the calcium present in the recent alluviums. The lower regions are still fairly rich in free calcium carbonate and usually a zone of alluviated calcium carbonate in the form of Kankar nodules is found in these soil profiles. Soil salinity is not very common in these areas. Upland soils of this region are intensely leached, from which calcium carbonate has been completely washed out so much so that there is considerable depletion of exchangeable calcium. These soils thius are slightly acidic in reaction. There is excellent drainage and soil salinity is completely absent in these areas.

The soils of this region are fairly productive and afford bumper crops. Very intensive cultivation is practised in these areas and the field are rarely left fallow. Thre area have vast agricultural potential and given adequate plant foods, good crop yields can be maintained year after year. The upland soils due to the excessive rate of water percolation and their chemical and physical characteristics, hardly retain moisture for long period, and on this account stand in need of frequent irrigations. They respond remarkably well to fertilizer applications.
9. Eastern Region:-The alluviums deposited in this region though related to other alluvial formations of the State are some what different than the soils of the upper areas. In general they are finer in texture than the soils of the upper regions. The soils of this region are more weathered and they distinctly exhibit the influences of various soil forming factors. The soils have been subjected to greater hydromorphic influences and have resulted in formation of a number of hydromorphic soil varieties more important of which are Dhankar and Karail, the former constituting extremely productive paddy soils of this State. In regions where Ganges flows in circuitous courses a group of very fine textured and black coloured soils, resembling in many aspects the black cotton soils of Central India plains, are found deposited in the interior depressed lands. They are calcareous and retain moisture for long periods. During dry months they crack and form deep fissures. They grow good crops of gram alone or mixed with barley and wheat even without much irrigation.

The soils of this region have a better moisture regime and are comparatively free from salt. They respond remarkably well to fertilizer application and more so to nitrogenous fertilizer. The soils are productive and given adequate irrigation facilities and suitable management, are liable to maintain high yields.
10. Bundelkhand Region :-The soils have developed over granite and gneiss of the Deccan trap with highly ferruginous beds. Lime stones are occasionally found. Four broad soil types have been recognised. Type I-A is a reddish brown coarse grained soil, very shallow and underlaid with the parent material locally known as rakar. Type II is found near the plains. It is deeper having a layer of calciumcarbonate in lower depths. This is locally known as parwa. Type III and IV are clayey, black coloured and calcareous. These are the kabar aud mar types.

The soils in general are devoid of moisture and afford only early crops needing less water. Type I soils are most suited for inferior crops. Type II are better suited for cultivation under irrigated conditions. Type III \& IV soils are very fertile and grow wheat, linseed and gram. Methods of dry farming are practised throughout Bundelkhand region.
11. Vindhya Region :-A wide variety of rocks consisting of Vindhya sandstones and shales, mixed conglomerates, calcareous shales, haematitic slates and schists, gneiss, granites, quartzite, trappezian- and Archean Gneiss. Carboniferrous rocks and lime stones give rise to different soils.

The topograpaic already recognized have developed on (i) Vindhya upland (ii) Vindhya flats. (iii) Vindhya lowlands and categorized in five soil classifications viz., Vindhya type 1 to 5 .

Vindhyan type 1 soils are dark brown in colour and sandy loam in texture and are found on uplands. Type 2 soils are loam textured and of brown colour underlain by reddish yellow mottled clay. Type 3 soils are yellowish gray in colour and comprise of heavy loams. They are developed on resricted drainage. Type 4 and 5 are associated with low lands. Type 4 soils have a compact surface of olive brown clay loam soil of strong acidic reaction Type 5 soils have developed on extremely restricted drainage conditions with a high water table. These soils are gray coloured at the surface with a general fine texture and characterized by an underlying layer of Kankar nodules. Signs of water logging are clearly marked in lower depths of the profile of this type.

Cultivated areas are found sparsely interspersed within hilly areas with a system of rocks all round. Such areas are only adjacent to villages which are a few in number and are very sparsely populated. With the exception of soils developed on low lands the area supports only inferior crops whose water requirements are necessarily low due to the general scarcity of water prevailing in that country. They are excessively drained, Soils found in the Belan Valley belonging to Vindhyan lowland tracts respond remarkably well to phosphate and potash applications.

## 4. CLIMATE AND RAINFALL

The climate and rainfall of the eleven regions are described below :

1. Hilly Region :-The climate is good with temperature being cool and moist. Rainfall is over 60 inches. Summer is short and cool. Winter is long and cold with frost and snow in the higher altitudes.
2. Tarai Region :-The climate is sub-humid and cool specially during winter months. Rainfall ranges between 40 and 50 inches, maximum being from July to September. Summer is not excessively hot, the temperature rarely crossing $108^{\circ} \mathrm{F}$. Generally damp and excessive cold is experienced in the winter months.
3. Western Region :-The climate is sub-humid to semi-arid as one moves from north to south. Rainfall ranges between 30 and 50 inches, maximum being in the months of June to September. In north, the temperature is moderate all along the year.
4. Mid-west Region :-The climate is sub-humid in the north getting drier as one proceeds southward. The annual rainfall varies from 30 to 50 inches. The temperature is moderate with considerable fluctuations at different times of the year. Winters are very cold and summers are very hot. Almost the entire rain comes during the monsoon.
5. South-west Region:-The climate is arid to desert-like with rainfall ranging from 20 to 25 inches. Summer is quite severe, the western most districts showing desert like conditions.
6. Central Region:-The climate is semi-arid to sub-humid with slightly greater monthly and annual rainfall than the preceeding doab soil regions. Winters are very cold. Almost the entire rainfall is received during the monsoon months. Summers are very hot ranging only next to the adjoining south west region.
7. Mid-Eastern Region :-The climate of this region is sub-humid resembling their western and northern counterparts. They are slightly less humid than the districts of mid-west region but slightly more humid than the west or south western region. The rainfall ranges from 30 to 40 inches, nine tenth of the precspitations occur during the monsoon months. Summers and winters are extremes.
8. North-Eastern Region :-The climate is sub-humid to humid. Rainfall is more than in the districts of plains and the northern tarai. The area due, to its geographical situation and its scooplike shape is swampy and on this account is prone to numerous drainage and flood problems.
9. Eastern Region :-The climate is sub-tropic humid with annual rainfall ranging betweeen 40 to 45 inches. The area due to the swampy nature maintains humidity almost throughout the year. The temperatures are moderate and fluctuations during summer and winter are very marked.
10. Bundelkhand Region:-The climate is dry with hot summers and cool winters. Rainfall varies from 30 to 35 inches.
11. Vindhya Region :-The climate is sub-tropical with an annual rainfall of 40 to 45 inches. Months of July, August and September have the highest rainfall accounting for nine-tenths of the total rainfall. Temperatures are very high during summers and very low during winters. Marked difference between night and day temperatures is found.

## 5. IRRIGATION

The net irrigated area in the plains of the State was 124.6 lakh acres during the year 1960-61. It represents about 30.5 per cent of the net cultivated area. Irrigated area is concentrated in the western and north western districts.

The sources of irrigation in order of importance are canals, wells, tube-wells and tanks. The distribution of irrigation from different sources is given below :-

TABLE II
The table shows the source-wise distribution of the Net Irrigated Area for the plains

## Source

 portion of the State for the year 1960-1961| Goverrment |  | Irrigated Area in acres $49,19,717$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Private |  | 4,4,016 |
| Total |  | 49,23,773 |
| Government |  | 12,24,278 |
| Private |  | 1,18,193 |
| Total |  | 13,42,471 |
| Government <br> Private <br> Total |  | 24,915 |
|  |  | 45,31,321 |
|  | ' | 45,56,236 |
|  |  | 6,327 |
|  |  | 10,35,543 |
|  |  | 5,99,834 |
|  |  | 1,24,64,184 |

## 6. NORMAL CROPPING PATTERN AND AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION

Cropping Pattern :-The net cultivated area of the State, excluding the hills, in 1960-61 was about 409.2 lakh acres. Of this, about one fourth is Do fasli area. The total cropped area of each season is as follows :

| Kharif | 272.8 lakh acres |
| :--- | ---: |
| Rabi | 244.6 lakh acres |
| Zaid, | 3.1 lakh acres |

(i) Kharif Crops :-The main Kharif crops are Paddy and Millets which occupy 36.4 per cent and 27.5 percent respectively of the total Kharif cropped area. The heaviest concentration of these crops is in the eastern U.P. Among millets, Jowar, Bajra and Maize are the most important crops.

Sugarcane is included in Kharif crops. It occcupies only 12.0 per cent of the Kharifarea but from the monetary point of view, it is the most important cash crop of the State. The highest concentration of this crop is in the western districts of the Meerut and Rohilkhand Divisions but it is an important crop throughout the northern districts of the plain.

Cotton, Jute, Groundnut and Til are the other important cash crops of Kharif season. The cultivation of cotton increases from east to west due to the comparative aridity of the western portion of the upper Gangetic plains.

Jute cultivation found encouragement after the partition of the country and although its cultivation was not known before, it is extensively grown in the Tarai belt in low lying areas near river beds where water is in plenty.
(ii) Rabi Crops :-Among the Rabi crops, Wheat is the most important crop, which is grown in $37.9 \%$ of Rabi area. Cultivation of wheat increases from eastern to western U.P. Western districts of Meerut and Rohilkhand Divisions and northern districts of Faizabad and Lucknow Divisions constitute the most important wheat.growing tract. Gram and Barley come next in importance with an area of 25.8 percent and 17.8 percent respectively of the total Rabi cropped area. Bundelkhand is the most important gram producing area of the State. Barley which is next in importance to Gram, has its largest con-centration in the eastern districts.

Rapeseed, Mustard, Linseed, Tobacco and Potato are the other important crops of Rabi season.
(iii) Zaid crops :-Rice and Tobacco are the important zaid crops of the State.

Crop rotations:-The crop rotations followed locally by the cultivators in the different soil-climatic regions of the State, already described above, are given below :-

1. Hill Region:-

| (1) Maize-Wheat | (1 year) |
| :--- | ---: |
| (2) Rice-Peas+Mandua-Wheat | (2 years) |
| (3) Fallow-Wheat | (1 year) |
| (4) Rice-Wheat | (1 year) |
| (5) Maize-Potato | (1 year) |
| (6) Mandua or Soyabean-Wheat | (1 year) |

2. Tarai Region :
(1) Fallow-Lahi-Sugarcane (2 years)
(2) Cowpea-Wheat
(l year)
(3) Paddy-Peas +Green Manure-Wheat
(2 years)
(1) Green Manure-Lahi-Sugarcane
(2 years)
3. Western Region :
(1) Paddy-Berseem or Peas
(l year)
(2) Maize-Berseem-Sugarcane
(2 years)
(3) Maize-Peas-Sugarcane
(2 years)
(4) Maize-Wheat
(l year)
(5) Fallow-Wheat alone or mixed with Gram
(1 year)
(6) Maize-Methi-Sugarcane
(2 years)
(7) Maize-Potato-Sugarcane
(2 years)
(8) Green Manure-Wheat-Sugarcane-Ratoon
(3 years)
(9) Green Manure-Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane
(3 years)
4. Mid-Western Region :-
(1) Jowar, Bajra or Arahar-Fallow—Wheat (2 years)
(2) Paddy-Gram or Peas (1 year)
(3) Maize-Wheat
(4) Groundnut-Sugarcane-Ratoon
(I year)
(3 years)
(5) Groundnut-Sugarcane (2 years)
(6) Chari-Gram (1 year)
(7) Paddy-Peas-Fallow-Wheat
(2 years)
(S) Groundnut-Sugarcane-Fallow-Wheat
(3 years)
5. South Western Region:-
(1) Bajra alone or mixed with Arahar-Fallow-Wheat (2 years)
(2) Jowar alone or mixed with Arahar-Fallow-Wheat (2 years)
(3) Cotton-Peas-Fallow-Wheat (2 years)
(4) Paddy-Peas-Sugarcane (2 years)
(5) Maize-Porato-Sugarcane
(2 years)
(6) Fallow-Wheat
(l year)
(7) Green Manure-Mustard-Sugarcane-Ratoon
(3 years)
6. Central Region:-
(1) Jowar mixed with Arhar-Fallow-Wheat
(2 years)
(2) Maize - Potato-'Cobacco
(1 year)
(3) Paddy-Peas-Sugarcane
(2 years)
(4) Groundnut-Sugarcane--Fallow-Wheat
(3 years)
(l year)
(5) Cotton-Barley
(2 years)
(l year)
(7) Paddy-Gram
7. Mid-Eastern Region :-
(1) Maize-Sugarcane-Fallow-Wheat . . . (3 years)
(2) Paddy—Peas or Gram . (I year)
(3) Paddy-Fallow (1 year)
(4) Sugarcane-Ratoon-Maize - (3 years)
(5) Paddy-Gram-Fallow • Sugarcane (3 years)
(6) Sanai Seed-Barley
(l year)
(7) Sanai (fibrej-Wheat
(l year)
8. North Eastern Region :-
(1) Paddy-Fallow or Chatrimatri $\quad$ (l year)
(2) Paddy-Peas or Gram . (1 year)
(3) Sugarcane-Ratoon-Fallow-Wheat : (3 years)
(4) Sugarcane-Maize-Reas (2 years)
(5) Paddy-Wheat
(1 year)
(6) Fallow-Wheat
(1 year)
(7) Paddy-Barley . (1 year)
9. Eastern Region :-
(1) Paddy-Peas
(2) Paddy-Fallow
(1 year)
(8) Maize-Peas
(4) Arhar+Bajra-Fallow-Sugarcane
(l, year)
(1 year)
(5) Jowar + Arhar-Fallow-Barley
(6) Sugarcane-Fallow-Wheat-Paddy
10. Bundelkhand Region:-
(1) Jowar-Gram-Fallow-Wheat
(2 years)
(2) Jowar and Arhar-Fallow-Wheat (2 years)
(3) Early Paddy-Wheat
(1 year)
(4) Fallow-Wheat and Gram mixed
(1 year)
(5) Jowar or Bajra-Fallow-Fallow-Linseed
(6) Jowar with Til-Fallow-Wheat
(2 years)
(7) Til-Fallow-Fallow-Wheat
(2 years)
(2 years)
11. Vindhya Region :-
(1) Early Paddy—Gram or Peas (l year)
(2) Paddy-Khesari . (1 year)
(3) Paddy-Fallow (1 year)
(4) Jowar and Bajra-Fallow-Fallow-Wheat or Barley (2 years)
(5) Maize-Linseed
(l year)
( $\left.{ }^{( }\right)$Sawan or Kodon-Barley
(7) Fallow - Wheat or Barley mixed with Gram

## Agric ultural Area and Production :-

TABLE III
The table below gives the area, production average yield of principal crops for the year 1960-61:

| Crop | Area in acres | Production in tons | Av. yield in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rise | 1,03,40,080 | 31,01,148 | 653* |
| Wheat | 97,32,933 | 38,82,298* | 900** |
| Barley | 45,62,294 | 16,60,517* | 824** |
| Jawar | 22,09,962 | 4,86,861* | 494* |
| Bajra | 26,92,328 | 4,22.345* | 351* |
| Maize | 26,04,702 | 6,15,361* | 531* |
| Gram | 63,07,398 | 18,02,375* | 640** |
| Peas. | 23,84,424 | 9,44,980* | 888* |
| Arhar | 16,11,553 | 8,71,712* | 1,211* |
| Til (pure) | 1,25,127 | 6,674* | 113* |
| Groundnut | 5,21,367 | 1,72,669* | 742* |
| Rapeseed and Mustard (pure) | 3,09,851 | 5,98,98* | 445* |
| Linsed (pure) | 1,70,642 | 1,43,20* | - 187* |
| Castor | 5,645 | 2,241. | 492 |
| Total Oilseed (pure) | - 11,32,632 | 2,54,802 |  |
| Til (mixed) | 14,86,895 | 74,832 | 113 |
| Rapeseed and Mustard (mixed) | 42,67,099 | 8,47,250 | - 445 |
| Linseed (mixed) | 12,93,590 | 1,08,037 | 187 |
| Total Oilseeds (mixed) | 70,47,584 | 10,30,119 |  |
| Sugarcane | 32,83,988 | 5,36,54,564* | 36,597* |
| Potato | 2,80,825 | 7,87,102* | 6,417 |
| Cotton | 1,57,681 | 39,680* bales | 99* |
| Jute | 32,315 | 92,137* bales | 1,140* |
| Sannhemp (for fibre) | 1,48,697 | 23,267* | 351 |
| Tobacco | 48,075 | 15,796 | 777 |

Note: 1. *enotes that the estimates are based on the results of crop-cutting Experiments.
2. The production and average yield of Sugarcane are in terms of cane.
3. Production and average yield of rice are in terms of cleaned rice.
4. Figures of area and production are inclusive of the conventionally estimated figures for the hilly districts of Kumaon and Uttarakhand Divisions.
5. Figures of average yield are for the plains portion of the State only.
6. The figures of area under Til, Rapeseed (Mustard) and Linseed crops sowd mixed are included in the crops with which these are sown mixed and have not been eliminated from the latter.
7. The production of Rice in Kharif is $30,97,011$ tons and is based on the results of the crop-cutting experiments.
8. The production of Cotton is in bales of 392 lts . and Jute in bales of 400 lbs .

## 7. AGR1CULTURAL RESEARCH AND EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS

A large number of field experiments have been conducted for evolving better varieties through selection, acclimatisation and hybridisation. Varietal trials in various stages ranging from observational plots, preliminary trials, semifinal trials and field scale trials have been, and are being, conducted each season mostly at the Research Farms and Regional Research Stations. Besides these varietal trials, a number of other types of experiments on different problems have been conducted.

For the period 1948-1953, experiments conducted at 58 research and agricultural farms of the State were collected. A brief description of the number of experiments conducted is given below separately for each of the important crops.
(i) Wheat : It is the most important Rabi crop of U.P., occupying nearly 10 million acres. The number of experiments conducted on wheat are the highest. Nearly 100 experiments on wheat were conducted at the Government Research Farm, Kanpur and Government Agricultural Research Farm, Kalayanpur (Kanpur). In almost all the research farms and many of the seed multiplication farms of the State, experiments on wheat were conducted.
(ii) Paddy :-This is the most important kharif crop of the State, occupying as much as nearly 10 million acres. The research activities on Paddy were concentrated at the Rice Research Station, Nagina (Bijnor district), 38 experiments out of 40 laid at this station were on Paddy. The Central Rice Research Station has recently been established at Masodha, Faizabad district. The research work on early maturing varieties for the eastern districts of the State is being conducted at the Rice Research Sub-station, Kunraghat (Gorakhpur). Thirty three experiments on paddy were available at this Station. For research work on late paddy crop, which is mainly grown in eastern districts, two new sub-stations were started in 1949, one in Pachperwa (District Gonda) for the north eastern region and the other at Tissubi (District Mirzapur) for the south eastern region. About 50 experiments were available at these two stations on Paddy. In order to intensify the research work on this crop, 3 more sub-stations have recently been established. These are located at Majhera (Naini Tal), Bansdih (Ballia) and Balchandpur (Bhraich). Research work is also being conducted at the 5 regional research stations situated at Meerut, Nawabganj, Hardoi, Amrukh and Varanasi.
(iii) Barley:-Although Barley occupies 4.6 million acres, only about 40 experiments were conducted on this crop. The attention is mostly being paid to evolve better varieties of this crop. Experiments on this crop were conducted mostly at Government Research Farm, Kanpur.
(iv) Jowar, Bajra and Maize :--These crops occupy 2.21, 2.69 and 2.60 million acres in area respectively. The research work on these crops is mainly conducted at Kanpur to evolve high yielding and disease-free varieties.
(v) Potato :-It is one of the most important vegetable crops that brings large economic returns and is widely grown in the State. Research work on Potato crop was started at Kanpur in the year 1944. Since most of the varieties do not flourish in the plains, attempts are being made at the Kausani Hill Sub-station. A number of experiments were conducted on nitrogen, phospate and potash requirements of the potato crop. Potato crop is very widly grown in Farrukhabad district where a research station was established in 1948. Thirty one experiments on potato were conducted at this farm during the period under report.
(vi) Sugarcane: U.P. is the most important sugarcane growing State. A full fledged Sugarcane Research Station at Shahjahanpur has been functioning for a very long time. All the 86 experiments laid-out at this station were on Sugarcane. The two other subdstations for conducting research on Sugarcane are situated at Muzaffarnagar in west U.P. and Gorakhpur in the east. Muzaffarnagar station has been catering to the special needs of western tracts of U,P., while Gorkhpur station caters to the needs of eastern tracts of U.P. which markedly differ in agricultural conditions. The main activities of these stations consists of evolution of new sugarcane varieties out of the materialreceived from Coimbatore and Shahjahanpur in the form of the canes and out of the seedlings raised locally. Attention is also being paid by these research sub-stations for finding out improved agronomic practices suited to the tracts. Nearly 70 experiments were available at these two stations. A large number of experiments was conducted on cultivator's fields on this crop. Soil Survey work is also being conducted by these Stations. Eastern U.P. is more or less a permanent home for red rot and constant efforts are being made to wipe out this disease,
(vii) Cotton : - It is an important cash crop of western U. P. Experiments on this crop are being conducted at Bulandshahr with a sub-station at Raya (Mathura). The main research work is being carried out on the problem of finding out high yielding cotton varieties. Improved agronomical practices for increasing Cotton yield in the State are also being tried. Experiments on cotion are also being conducted at Regional Research Station, Meerut and several others Farms.
(vii) Oilseeds :-U.P. is one of the largest oilseed producing states of the countary. Research work, mostly varietal, is being done on the five important oilseed crops viz. Til, Groundnut and Mustard, Linseed and Castor at Kalayanpur (Kanpur) Keserwa (Badaun) and Belatal (Hamirpur) for determining high yielding varieties.
(ix) Fruit:-The fruits grown in U.P. are of two types, Hill fruits and Plain fruits Hill fruits like apple, peach and citrus are grown in the hilly districts of the State. Research work on these crops is concentrated at Chaubatia (Almora). Experiments are also being conducted at Jeolikote and Ramgarh in Nainital district. A large number of experiments are conducted to control pests and diseases. Experiments on plain fruits like mango, papaya, litchi are conducted at Govt. Horticultural Research Institute, Saharanpur. Recently, Govt. Fruit Research Station has been established at Basti to cater to the needs of eastern U.P.
(x) Vegetables :-The vegetable research station was established at Lucknow but was shifted to Kalayanpur (Kanpur) in 1953. Research work on seasonal vegetables is being conducted. Most of the experiments are laid out to control common diseases of vegetables. Varietal trials to improve the quality and yield of vegetables are also being conducted at regional research stations situated in different parts of the State.

## 8. EXPERIMENTS

The Table on page 14 shows the distribution of experiments according to the type of treatments tried and type of crops. Out of 1293 experiments reported for the period 19481953 in the state approximately, $44.6 \%$ were manurial and $20.0 \%$ cultural. Experiments in which manures or fertilizers forms a factor account for nearly $57.2 \%$ of the total number of experiments. The manurial experiments were largely on the principal crops like wheat, paddy and sugarcane. Nearly all manurial rum irrigational experiments were on wheat. Experiments in which irrigation was one of the factors accounted for nearly $10.5 \%$. The experiments on vegetables were generally of manurial and cultural types. $80 \%$ of the experiments conduted on fruit trees were to control diseases and pests. Nearly $23 \%$ of the experiments were on wheat crop alone. Experiments on other cereal crops accounted for the same order. Among cash crops sugarcane received more attention. Nearly $25.3 \%$ experiments were conducted on this crop. About 100 experiments were rejected for the reasons that they were either having no results or were not conducted according to the statistically laid out designs.

The treatments commonly tried were the factorial combinations of 3 levels of nitrogen and 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on cereals and other food crops. The levels of both nitrogen and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ besides control, varied from $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. to $60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. The usual source of nitrogen was Ammonium Sulphate, and in a few cases it was Chiliean Nitrate. In some experiments the organic manures were also included to study their effects as compared to artificial fertilizers. The organic manures used were Farm Yard Manure, Compost, Castorcake, Coconut cake etc. The green manures tried in some experiments were Sanai, Guar, Senji, Berseem etc. The other type of treatment usually tried along with the nitrogenous fertilizers was irrigation in about 6 to $7 \%$ of cases. The cultural treatments usually included in the experiments were dates of sowing and seedrates etc.

On sugarcane crop, the levels of nitrogen varied from $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. te $200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. and those of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ from 100 lb ./ac. to 150 lb ./ac. The source of nitrogen was usually Ammonium Sulphate, Ammonium Nitrate and mixture of Ammonium Sulphate and Groundnut cake. In cultivator's field experiments the treatments were usually manurial or cultural. In cultural experiments the treatments usually were harvesting time, times of planting etc.

The design mostly adopted was Randomised Blocks. In most of the experiments with R.B.D. layout the treatments were in factorial arrangements. The number of plots per replication varied from 3 to 16 although in a few experiments it was as much as 27. The next most used design was split-plot. In these designs the main plot treatments were usually irrigations, seedrates, dates of sowing etc. and sub-plot treatments were manures.

The number of main-plots per replication varied from 3 to 5 and number of subplots per main-plot varied from 3 to 6 . The number of replications varied from 4 to 6. The net-plot size varied from 1/100th of an acre to $1 / 20$ th of an acre.

TABLE 4

| Crop | M | MV | C | CV | CM | CMV | I+IV | IM+IMV | IC+ICV | D+DV | $\mathrm{DM}+\mathrm{CD}+\mathrm{CDV}$ | DI + Div | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Paddy | 114 | - | 57 | 5 | 13 | 3 | 9 | - | - | 9 | - | - | 210 |
| Wheat | 122 | 8 | 44 | 24 | 23 | - | 3 | 125 | - | 12 | - | 1 | 362 |
| Jowar | 35 | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | , - | - | 11 | 2 | - | 50 |
| Bajra | 1 | - | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | 6 |
| Barley | 18 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 5 | - | - | - | - | 4 | - | - | 37 |
| Maize | 14 | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | 20 |
| Pulses | 11 | 1 | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 | - | - | 17 |
| Potato | 40 | 8 | 58 | 8 | 1 | - | - | 1 | - | 7 | - | - | 123 |
| Onion | 2 | - | 10 | - | - | - | 2 | 1 | - | - | - | - | 15 |
| Other vegetables | 9 | - | 12 | 1 | 2 | - | 1 | - | - | 12 | - | - | 37 |
| Sugarcane* | 204 | 53 | 83 | 44 | 13 | - | 11 | 12 | 5 | 22 | 2 | 2 | 451 |
| Cotton | 15 | 2 | 2 | - | 5 | 3 | - | - | - | 7 | - | - | 34 |
| Tobacco | 1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 1 |
| Jute | - | - | 3 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 3 |
| Oilseeds | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | - | 2 | - | - | - | 2 | - | - | 12 |
| Fodder crops | 9 | - | - | 2 | - | - | - | - | - | 1 | - | - | 12 |
| Mixed cropping | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | 84 |
| Fruit crops | 11 | - | 7 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 92 | - | - | 110 |
|  | 607 | 77 | 286 | 94 | 62. | 8 | 26 | 139 | 5 | 189 | 4 | 3 | 1584 |

* Includes zonal trails aiso.


## STATEMENT SHOWING DESAILS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS

UTTAR PRADASH

| SI. | Name of the Station, Location, year of establishment | Major crops and tract it represents | Soil type and soil analysis | Normal rainfall in, inches (month wise) | Irrigation facilities | No. of experiments | General description of the topography of experimet tal area |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1. | Agra, Castle Grant Orchard B. R. College, Year of Establishment N.A. | It represents the southwest U.P. tract. Major crops : Orchard and Vegetables. | (a) Depth-6' <br> Colour-Brown. <br> Structure-Crumb. <br> (b) $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N}-0.057 \% . \\ & \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}-0.1225 \% . \end{aligned}$ <br> Ignition loss-2.715\%. <br> (c) Mechanical Analysis-N.A. | N. ${ }^{\text {. }}$ | Canal and Well Irrigation. | Turnip -2 <br> Potato -3 <br> Garlic -1 <br> Cabbage -2 <br> Tomato -2 <br> Peas -1 <br> Mosambi-1 <br> Totat -12 | $\begin{array}{lr} \text { Levelled land. No } \\ \text { proper } \\ \text { system. } \end{array}$ |
| 2. | Agra, Institutional Research Farm, B. R. College, Bichpuri. Year of Establishment 1943. | It represents the western U.P. tract. Major crops : Jowar, Bajra, Wheat, Potato and Sugarcane. | (a) Alluvial Soil Brownish, Structurless. <br> (b) Nitrogen-0 045\% <br> Phosphorus-0.084\% <br> Potash-1.213\% <br> (c) Coarse sand - $0.445 \%$ <br> Pure sand -58.925\% <br> Silt - $\mathbf{- 2 2 . 8 2 1 \%}$ <br> Clay - $16.66 \%$ | Junc. Nil <br> July. 0.85 <br> Aug. 0.85 <br> Sept. 0.59 <br> Oct. $\mathbf{0 . 3 2}$ <br> Nov. Nil <br> Dec. 0.24 <br> Jan. Nil <br> Feb. Nil <br> March. $\mathbf{0 . 3 2}$ <br> April. Nil <br> May. Nil <br> Periog-1960-61  | Canal-Since long. Tubewell from 1953. Sewage tank from 1957. | Wheat -7 <br> Cotton -2 <br> Sanai -2 <br> Moong -2 <br> Bajra -1 <br> Maize -1 <br> Gardea Peas -1 <br> Carrot -1 <br> Turnip -1 <br> Potato -1 <br> Mixed cropping-1  <br> Total -20 | Well levelled land. No proper drainage system. |

STATEMENT SHOWING DETALLS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS
UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | - 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3. | Agra, Khandari Farm, B.R. College. Year of establishment 1940. | It represents the western U.P. (Agri. tract). Major crops: Rabi: Wheat, Barley, Gram, Oats, Berseem and Potato. Kharif: Jowar, Bajra Maize and Lobia. | (a) Broad soil type : Alluvial soil. <br> Depth-16". <br> Colour-Brownish. <br> Structure-Structureless. <br> (b) Chemical analysis :-N-0.047\%, Phosphorous - 0.c853\% Potash (K)-1.217\%. <br> (c) Mechanical analysis:Coarse sand $0.445 \%$. Pure sand 58.925\%. Silt $\quad 22.821 \%$. <br> Clay $\quad 16.56 \%$. | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { June } & - \\ \text { July } & 8.5 \\ \text { Aug. } & 8.5 \end{array}$ | Canal irrigation available from 1952. Tube well irrigation available from 1954. | Wheat-1 | Well levelled land. No proper drainage system. |
|  |  |  |  | Sept. $\quad 5.9$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Oct. 3.2 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Nov. - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dec. 2.4 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Jan. . - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Feb. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | March, 1.2 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | April - |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | May |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | -- |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Total 29.0 (The figures are based on the data for the year 1960 only.) |  |  |  |
| 4. | Aligarh : Central Dairy Farm. | Wheat and Barley. | Soil type : Low lying clay (Aligarh T.3.) | N.A. | N.A. | Barley-2 <br> Wheat-1 | N.A. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total-3 |  |

Statement showing details of experimental stations
UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)


CHEMICAL ANALYSIS OF FIELD SOILS
Table 1 (a) Agricultural Institute Farm, Allahabad.

| $\begin{gathered} \text { Soil } \\ \text { Sample } \\ \text { So. } \end{gathered}$ | B. Ex. Capacity | Available P 2 (Modified Bray's lbs./A.) | Absorbed Prays PI. modified | Available K lbs./ac. | pH | Organic carbon percen- tage | Sticky <br> Point piper percentage | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ratio } \\ & \text { of of } \\ & \text { Sonkar } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\cdot 1$ | 15.15 | 33 | 13 | 264 | 8.85 | . 35 | 23.9 |  |
| 2 | 19.04 | 32 | 17 | 208 | 8.8 | . 48 | 23.25 |  |
| 3 | 14.45 | 71 | 10 | 632 | 9.1 | . 41 | 22.55 |  |
| 4 | 15.3 | 80 | 11 | 240 | 8.9 | . 47 | 22.55 |  |
| 5 | 11.35 | 86 | 38 | 632 | 9.1 | . 55 | 19.4 |  |
| 6 | 9.7 | 84 | 44 | 424 | 9.1 | . 52 | 23.45 |  |
| 7A | 15.0 | 352 | 18 | 328 | 8.45 | . 72 | 23.55 |  |
| 7B | 10.9 | 536 | 32 | 232 | 8.52 | . 48 | 20.45 |  |
| 7 C | 11.84 | 448 | 80 | 216 | 8.45 | . 63 | 22.05 |  |
| 7D | 25.2 | 536 | 64 | 420 | 8.75 | . 52 | 25.4 |  |
| 8 | 14.85 | 164 | 14 | 264 | 8.45 | . 44 | 23.5 |  |
| 9A | 29.3 | 656 | 55 | 216 | 8.25 | . 99 | 23.75 |  |
| 9 B | 19.1 | 320 | 37 | 384 | 7.8 | . 62 | 23.9 |  |
| 9 C | . 14.75 | 164 | 30 | $18+$ | 8.57 | . 51 | 21.55 |  |
| 9D | 10.55 | 568 | 56 | 304 | 8.3 | . 52 | 20.95 |  |
| 10A | 9.85 | 656 | 78 | 240 | 8.25 | . 62 | 21.53 |  |
| 10B | 9.9 | 656 | 60 | 240 | 8.42 | . 41 | 17.55 |  |
| 10 C | 18.9 | 134 | 27 | 232 | 8.4 | . 52 | 24.2 |  |
| 10D | 18.85 | 320 | 34 | 352 | 8.67 | . 75 | 23.35 |  |
| 10E | 19.2 | 162 | 8 | 184 | 8.55 | . 47 | 22.7 |  |
| 11 | 8.85 | 512 | 61 | 200 | 8.25 | . 41 | 28.35 |  |
| 12 | 10.2 | 656 | 52 | 304 | 7.77 | . 58 | 17.55 |  |
| 13 | . 11 | 528 | 87 | 232 | 8.1 | . 61 | 17.95 |  |
| 14A | 22.55 | 164 | 28 | 240 | 8.22 | . 61 | 23.85 |  |
| 14B | 21.25 | 384 | 43 | 368 | 8.6 | . 72 | 21.95 |  |
| 14 C | 20.2 | 320 | 20 | 208 | 8.65 | . 61 | 22.3 |  |
| 14 D | 17 | 496 | 74 | 288 | 8.65 | . 68 | 22.8 |  |
| 14 E | 5.55 | 488 | 36 | 424 | 8.9 | . 46 | 18. |  |
| 14F | 17.85 | 230 | 16 | 272 | 8.07 | . 55 | 20.45 |  |
| 15A | 17.85 | 104 | 16 | 216 | 8.75 | . 48 | 20.5 |  |
| 1SB | 11.65 | 112 | 16 | 240 | 8.42 | . 69 | 21.65 |  |
| 15 C | 16.65 | 66 | 13 | 134 | 8.15 | . 33 | 19.95 |  |
| 15D | 9.35 | 336 | 31 | 424 | 9 | . 37 | 21.05 |  |
| 15E | 8.85 | 162 | 6 | 220 | 8.9 | . 41 | 23.5 | 7: 84 |
| 16A | 11.55 | 360 | 32 | 190 | 8.7 | . 92 | 20.35 |  |
| 16B | 10.75 | 164 | 234 | 160 | 8.4 | . 50 | 14.6 |  |
| 16 C | 7 | 106 | 8 | 390 | 8.85 | . 43 | 22.95 |  |
| 16 D | 9.15 | 424 | 19.5 | 270 | 8.9 | . 41 |  |  |
| 17A | 9.3 | 84 | 8 | 190 | 8.75 | . 51 |  | 1:15 |
| 17B | 8.9 | 72 | 16 | 230 | 8.8 | . 41 | 20.4 |  |
| 17 C | 8.2 | 352 | 14 | 180 | 8.7 | . 30 | 23.55 |  |
| 18A | 6.0 | 88 | 12.5 | 160 | 8.95 | . 41 | 20.7 | 4:237 |
| 18B | 7.4 | 80 | 4 | 170 | 8.5 | . 41 | 19.15 |  |
| 18 C | 8.35 | 96 | 0 | 160 | 8.57 | . 55 | 23.6 |  |
| 18D | 23.05 | 256 | 12 | 190 | 8.9 | . 41 | 23.6 19.95 |  |
| 18 E | 8.1 | 86 | 8 | 160 | 9.25 | . 36 | 19.95 17.75 | 18:246 |
| 18 F | 9.3 | 32 | 16 | 190 | 8.72 | . 51 | 17.75 24.9 | 14:246 |
| 19A | 10.55 | 52 | - 11 | 150 | 8.8 | . 32 | 24.9 20.6 | 20: 236 5 |
| 19B | 9.45 | 56 | 8 | 130 | 8.55 | . 30 | 22.05 | 5:232 |
| 19 C | 7.55 | 74 | 13 | 150 | 8.2 | . 33 | 22.05 | 12:148 |
| 20A | 7.85 10.9 | 86 | 9 | 130 | 8.9 | . 58 | 19.8 22.2 |  |
| 20 B 20 C | 10.9 | 544 | 38 | 300 | 8.82 | . 75 | 22.2 24.35 | 10:137 |
| 20 C 20 D | 7.55 | 56 | 5 | 120 | 9 | . 54 | 25.35 |  |
| ${ }_{21}^{20 \mathrm{D}}$ | 12.25 | 44 | 4 | 120 | 8.6 | . 35 | 19.9 | 7:248 |
| $\stackrel{21}{\text { Hort. Nur- }}$ | 9.1 | 88 | 4 | 120 | 9 | . 33 | 19.9 15.6 | 7:142 |
| sery LOD (A) | 12.6 | 656 | 115 | 240 | 8.27 | . 69 | ${ }_{22.05}$ | $7: 148$ $7: 148$ |
| Near Farm Office | 20.65 | 164 | 22 | 272 | 8.6 | . 52 | 23.65 |  |

## STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS <br> UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)
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## STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS

UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)
Analytical data of soils of Bahraich Farm

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Field No. 7 Pit No. 1

| Depth | $0^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime 2} 2^{\prime \prime}$ |  | $1^{\prime \prime} 2^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ |  | 2'5"-4'9" | $4^{\prime \prime} 9^{\circ} \cdot 6^{\prime \prime}$ | 0-8" | 8"-3/3" | 3'3"-5' $10^{\prime \prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water hclding capacity\% | 41.12 |  | 33.18 |  | 35.33 | 37.79 | 36.25 | 3496 | 35.44 |
| pHI | 7.3 |  | 7.00 |  | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.7 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6} \%$ | 0.1230 |  | 0.1065 |  | 0.0915 | 0.0985 | 0.0945 | 0.1005 | 0.0810 |
| Cao\% | 3.9480 |  | 3.8360 |  | 2.7580 | 3.0240 | 3.0240 | 3.4020 | 2.7720 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O} \%$ | 0.7341 |  | 0.5371 |  | 0.4313 | 0.6978 | 1.4466 | 0.3909 | 0.3546 |
| Total Nitrogen\% | 0.0320 |  | 0.0154 |  | 0.0126 | 0.0196 | 0.0126 | 0.0056 | 0.0168 |
| Total Organic Carbon\% | 0.4430 |  | 0.1767 |  | 0.0665 | 0.0608 | 0.1680 | 0.0190 | 0.0361 |
| Total water soluble solids\% | 0.0680 |  | 0.0620 |  | 0.0600 | 0.0560 | 0.0600 | 0.0700 | 0.0980 |
| Total exchangeatle bases m.e.\% | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | / |
| Exchangeable calcium me.\% | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| Coarse sand\% | 11.18 |  | 44.64 |  | 75.06 | 71.04 | 46.78 | 66.51 | 62.47 |
| Fine sand\% | 44.65 |  | 30.34 |  | 18.36 | 22.02 | 42.82 | 26.46 | 31.15 |
| Silt\% | 30.35 |  | 11.25 |  | - 2.40 | 2.55 | 2.70 | 0.65 | 0.90 |
| Clay\% | 8.65 |  | 5.00 |  | 0.50 | 0.55 | 2.6 | 0.80 | 0.85 |


| Depth | $0^{\prime \prime}=1^{\prime 2} 2^{\prime \prime}$ |  | $1^{\prime \prime} 2^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ |  | 2'5"-4'9" | $4^{\prime \prime} 9^{\circ} \cdot 6^{\prime \prime}$ | 0-8" | 8"-3/3" | 3'3"-5' $10^{\prime \prime}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Water hclding capacity\% | 41.12 |  | 33.18 |  | 35.33 | 37.79 | 36.25 | 3496 | 35.44 |
| pHI | 7.3 |  | 7.00 |  | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.3 | 7.3 | 7.7 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6} \%$ | 0.1230 |  | 0.1065 |  | 0.0915 | 0.0985 | 0.0945 | 0.1005 | 0.0810 |
| Cao\% | 3.9480 |  | 3.8360 |  | 2.7580 | 3.0240 | 3.0240 | 3.4020 | 2.7720 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O} \%$ | 0.7341 |  | 0.5371 |  | 0.4313 | 0.6978 | 1.4466 | 0.3909 | 0.3546 |
| Total Nitrogen\% | 0.0320 |  | 0.0154 |  | 0.0126 | 0.0196 | 0.0126 | 0.0056 | 0.0168 |
| Total Organic Carbon\% | 0.4430 |  | 0.1767 |  | 0.0665 | 0.0608 | 0.1680 | 0.0190 | 0.0361 |
| Total water soluble solids\% | 0.0680 |  | 0.0620 |  | 0.0600 | 0.0560 | 0.0600 | 0.0700 | 0.0980 |
| Total exchangeatle bases m.e.\% | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | / |
| Exchangeable calcium me.\% | - |  | - |  | - | - | - | - | - |
| Coarse sand\% | 11.18 |  | 44.64 |  | 75.06 | 71.04 | 46.78 | 66.51 | 62.47 |
| Fine sand\% | 44.65 |  | 30.34 |  | 18.36 | 22.02 | 42.82 | 26.46 | 31.15 |
| Silt\% | 30.35 |  | 11.25 |  | - 2.40 | 2.55 | 2.70 | 0.65 | 0.90 |
| Clay\% | 8.65 |  | 5.00 |  | 0.50 | 0.55 | 2.6 | 0.80 | 0.85 |

Field No. I B Pit No. 2

STATEMENT SHOWING DETARS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS
UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)
Analytical data of soils of Bahraich Farm (Contd.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | $\delta$ | 9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | F.eld No. 19 A Pit No. 3 |  |  |  |  | Pit No. 4 |  |  |
| Depth | C. $1^{\prime}$ | $1^{\prime}-2^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}$ | $2^{\prime} 10^{\prime \prime}-3^{\prime} 8^{\prime \prime}$ | 3/8"-5'10" | 0-6" | $6^{\prime \prime} \cdot 2^{\prime \prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ | $2^{\prime} 5^{\prime \prime} 3^{\prime \prime} 5^{\prime \prime}$ | 35"'-5' |
| Water holding capacity\% | 48.98 | 47.22 | 43.80 | 42.96 | 47.29 | 47.13 | 55.03 | 48.83 |
| pH | 7.3 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 7.6 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \%$ | 0.1605 | 0.1140 | 0.1110 | 0.1075 | 0.1545 . | 0.1215 | 0.1110 | 0.1290 |
| Cao\% | 5.238 | 5.460 | 7.224 | 4.270 | 5.29 | 6.48 | 6.98 | 4.62 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O} \%$ | 0.8036 | 0.6844 | 1.7049 | 0.4635 | 0.74 | 0.83 | 1.08 | 0.71 |
| Total Nitrogen\% | 0.0462 | 0.0448 | 0.0560 | 0.0148 | 0.0406 | 0.0490 | . 0630 | 0.0518 |
| Total Organic Carbon\% | 0.4503 | 0.1786 | 0.2204 | 0.0194 | 0.3553 | 0.2389 | 0.2367 | 0.0988 |
| Total water Soluble Solids\% | 0.088 | 0.084 | 0.078 | 0.050 | 0.130 | 0.084 | 0.070 | 0.086 |
| Total exchangeable bases m.e.\% | - | - | . | - | . | 0. | . | - |
| Exchangeable calcium me.\% | - | - . | - | - | -, | - | - | ; - |
| Coarse sand\% | 2.311 | 3.925 | 1.296 | 47.17 | 7.53 | 2.62 | 0.88 | 5.40 |
| Fine sand\% | 62.04 | 72.31 | 68.52 | 42.85 | 56.51 | 62.51 | 42.95 | 76.49 |
| Silt\% | 19.30 | 9.60 | 21.05 | 1.73 | 18.85 | 21.45 | 39.10 | 4.20 |
| Clay\% | 8.30 | 4.25 | 5.50 | 0.900 | 7.40 | 6.85 | 9.00 | 2.60 |

STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OR EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS
UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 11. | Barabanki: Goit. Agri. Farm, Distt. Barabanki Year of establishment. 1933. | It represents central range Rotations:- <br> (l) Paddy-Pea or gram (2) Paddy - Pea or Sugarcane, mung-G.M. Wheat. | 1. Soll type: Loam <br> 2. Depth-2' <br> 3. Colcur: Light blackish <br> 4. Structure-Compact $26 \%$ poor space. <br> 5. Soil analysis : Not available | June 3.73 <br> July 4.06 <br> Aug. 14.93 <br> Sept. 5.64 <br> Oct. 10.00 <br> Nov. 0.30 <br> Dec to  <br> Apr:1 Nil <br> May 2.51 <br> Total 41.11 <br> (Figures for  | Irrigation by canal and tube well siace inception. No drainge system. | Wheat-2 <br> Paddy-4 <br> Total-6 | N.A. |
| 12. | Belatal : Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Distt. Hamirpur. mile from Belatal Rly Stn. Year of establishment 1922-23 | It reprrsents the Bundel- <br> Khand tract. <br> Major crops: Oilseeds, <br> Wheat, Jowar | 1. Soll type: Hard kabar contains Kans. <br> 2. Depth: $3^{\prime}$. <br> 3. Colour-Black. <br> 4. Struclurè - N.A, <br> 5. Soil analysis : Not available. |   <br> June 2.93 <br> July 12.78 <br> Aug. 16.93 <br> Sept. 3.31. <br> Oct. 3.59 <br> Nov. 0.49 <br> Dec. 0.56 <br> Jan. 0.66 <br> Feb. - <br> March 0.78 <br> Apil - <br> May - | Irrigation by tank and canal, facilities available since beginning of the farm. No proper drainage system. | Paddy-1 <br> Cotton-1 <br> Mixed-2 <br> Total-4 | Total area 58.48 Area for cultivation 54.27 acres. |
|  |  |  |  | Total 42.03 <br> Figures for 1956-57 |  |  |  |

Statement showing details of experimental stations
UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | - 5 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13. | Bhararl : State Mech. Farm (1928). Distt. Jhansi. | Typical Bundelkhand Tract of Rakar, Kabar and Parwa Soils. <br> Major crops : Paddy, Wheat, Barley. | Three types of solls, Rakar, Kabar, and Parwa. Other details N.A. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { June } \\ & \text { July } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 0.27 \\ 14.96 \end{array}$ | Pahai Canal | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Jowar } & -4 \\ \text { Malze } & -1 \end{array}$ | Uneven land. |
|  |  |  |  | Aug. | 13.74 |  | Wheat -17 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sept. | 11.19 |  | Paddy -8 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Oct.Nov. | 4.82 |  | Mixed -2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dec. | 0.11 |  | Total -32 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Jan. | 0.02 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Feb. | 0.19 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | March | 0.14 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | April | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | May | Nil |  |  |  |
| 14. | Bulandshahr: Govt. Agri. <br> School Farm (1921). | Light loam and sandy loam | Soil type : Light and sandy loam <br> Depth-10' (approximately) <br> Colour-Yellow <br> Structure-Fine and coarse <br> Chemical and Mechanical Analysis : N.A. | June | 0:55 | Lift irrigation from canal | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Sugarcane } & -1 \\ \text { Wheat } & -3 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Gangetic plain ; more or less flat. |
|  |  |  |  | Joly Aug. | $\begin{array}{r} 2.32 \\ 11.83 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sept. | 2.22 |  | Total -4 |  |
|  |  |  |  | Oct. | 1.18 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Nov. | 1.12 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dec, | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Jan. | 1.80 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Feb. | 0.30 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | March | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | April | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | May | 0.88 |  |  |  |

# STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OR EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS 

UTTAR PARDESH (Contd.)

|  |  | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | June | 0.78 |  |  |  |
| 19. | Bulandshahr: Govt. Cotton Research Station (1944) 2 miles from Bulandshabr Railway Station. | Wheat and Cotton. <br> It represents the alluvial trast of western U.P. | Soil type: Loam <br> Depth : Deep <br> Colour : Typical Gangetic alluvium <br> Structure : Loam <br> Other Details: N.A. | July | 8.54 | Irrigation by tube- | Cotton -7 | N.A. |
|  |  |  |  | Aug. | 8.89 | uell and also by the |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sept. | 6.39 | Ganges canal. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Oct. | 3.44 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Nov. | 0.15 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Dec. | 0.07 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Jan. | 0.99 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Feb. | 0.26 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | March | 0.63 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | April | 0.18 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | May | 0.22 | 1 - |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | - Averago | 2.545 |  |  |  |
| 16. | Chlrgaon: (Distt. Jhansi) Govt. Agri. Farm (1947). | Sugarcane, Jowar, Wheat, Cotton and Barley. It represents Bundelkhand tract. | Soil type: Kabar and Parwa <br> Depth: $\mathbf{1 5}^{\circ}$. <br> Colour : Light black and brown - <br> Structurc : Sticky nature, hard when dry and cracks in dry weather. Other Details : N.A. | June | 10.5 | Pumping plant fxed | Jowar -1 | N.A. |
|  |  |  |  | July | 8.0 | in a well. |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Aug. | 11.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Sept. | 8.0 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Oct. | 0.5 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Nov. | , Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | .Dec. | 0.5 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Jan. | 1.5 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Feb. | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | March | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | April | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | May | Nil |  |  |  |

# STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS 

UTTAR PARDESH (Contd.)


STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OR EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS
UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)

| 1 | 2 |  | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23. | Palzabad: Govt. Farm (1918). | Agril. | PadJy, Sugarcan 3, Wheat and Darley. | Soll typs : Loam. <br> Coluur : White brown. <br> Depth : $6^{\circ}$ (brown colour sub soil after. $6 \%$. <br> The soil becomes bard when dried and very loose wilh moisture. Other details N.A: | June | 2.91 | Tubewell irrigation | Sugarcane - 5 | N.A. |
|  |  |  |  |  | July | 11.46 |  | Wheat -8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Aug. | 13.40 |  | Paddy -5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Sept. | 7.04 |  | Mixed -2 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Oct. | 1.85 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Nov. | Na |  | Total - $\mathbf{- 2 0}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Dec. | 0.21 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Jan, | 1.35 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Feb. | 0.05 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | March | 0.64 ; |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | April | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | May | 1.11 |  |  |  |
| 21. | Farakhabad: Govt. Potato Research Farm (1925). |  | Wheat, Potato, Maizo Alluvial soils. | Soil type : Loam to sandy loam, <br> Depth. NA. <br> Colour : Light brown. <br> Structure: Granular. <br> Other details : N.N.A. | Jure | Nil | Tutewelljirrigation | Kharbooz-1 | Experimental area is |
|  |  |  |  |  | July | 7.56 |  | Potato -31 | levelled. |
|  |  |  |  |  | Aug. | 11.05 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Sept. | 5.52 |  | Tola -32 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Oct. | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Nov. | Nil |  |  |  |
|  | $\cdot$ |  |  |  | Dec. | 0.50 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Jan. | 1.61 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Feb. | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | March | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | April. | Nil |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | May | 1.67 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total | 2831 |  |  |  |

statement showing details of experimental stations
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# STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS 

UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 36. | Lucknow : Crop physiological Research Station (1948) | Paddy, Maize, Jowar Wheat, Barley. Gangetic Alluvial. | Sandy loam, light brown. Other details-N.A. | June 4.46 <br> July 12.00 <br> Aug. 11.50 <br> Sept. 7.40 <br> Oct. 1.28 <br> Nov. 0.22 <br> Dec. 0.32 <br> Jan. 0.76 <br> Feb. 0.72 <br> March 0.34 <br> April 0.25 <br> May 0.77 | Well | Wheat -20 <br> Moong -4 <br> Lobia -3 <br> Jowar -1 <br> Barley -2 <br> Gram -1 <br> Maizo -1 <br> Potato -11 <br> Paddy -12 <br> Mixed -14 <br> Total -69 | Formerly the experimental area was uneven having rolling topography with slopy land, with the levelling up of the farm, the fields are now even and uniform though the experimental area is in different tiers. |
| 37. | Lucknow : Govt. Vegetable Research Station Alambagh Year of Establishment 1943. | Vegetable with legumes for Green manuring and Paddy in the low lying fields. It represents the tract known as the Gangetic Plain (Duab). | Depth : Normal. <br> Colour: Brown. <br> Structure : Clayey <br> Other details : N.A. | N.A. | There were three tubewells. (Only two of which were in working order). The facilities were available from 1949. | Onion -13 <br> Cauliflower -3 <br> Torai -1 <br> Tomato -2 <br> Colocasia -1 <br> Garlic -4 <br> Pumpkin -3 <br> Bhindi -3 <br> Peas -1 <br> Brinjal -4 | Well drained and levelled farm. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Total $\quad \mathbf{3 5}$ |  |

statement showing detalis or experimental stations
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$$
37
$$

## SUGARCANE RESEARCH SUB STATION MUZAFFAR NAGAR

## TYPE IV LOAM SOIL

Depth $0-99^{\circ} \quad 9^{\prime \prime}-18^{\prime \prime} \quad 18^{\prime \prime}-42^{\prime \prime} 42^{\prime \prime}-60^{\prime \prime} 60^{\circ}-66^{\circ} 66^{\prime \prime}-75^{\circ}$

A-MECHANICAL COMPOSITION (AIR DRY BASIS)

| Coarse sand percent | 12.76 | 13.70 | 9.54 | 9.41 | 4.46 | 6.79 |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fine sand percent | 59.38 | 48.02 | 49.64 | 48.41 | 57.75 | 54.48 |  |
| -Silt percent | 14.37 | 16.27 | 18.22 | 20.63 | 16.95 | 19.46 |  |
| Clay percent | 11.21 | 19.43 | 20.03 | 18.30 | 18.00 | 15.38 |  |
| . |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

C.-CHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS (AIR DRY BASIS)

| Moisture percent | 0.41 | 0.84 | 0.88 | 0.90 | 0.69 | 0.62 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loss on ignition percent | 1.35 | 2.98 | 3.60 | 2.78 | 3.19 | 3.11 |
| $\mathbf{H C l}$ in solubles percent | 88.65 | 82.46 | 80.22 | 79.74 | 80.25 | 80.94 |
| HCl solubles silica percent | 1.05 | 1.23 | 1.28 | 1.24 | 1.22 | 1.27 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ percent | 6.67 | 11.46 | 12.39 | 13.44 | 12.76 | 11.58 |
| $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ percent | 3.87 | 7.38 | 7.99 | 8.60 | 7.96 | 6.86 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ percent | 2.80 | 4.08 | 4.40 | 4.64 | 4.80 | 4.72 |
| CaO percent | 0.84 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.48 | 0.50 | 0.50 |
| MgO | 0.87 | 1.09 | 0.87 | 0.75 | 1.21 | 0.62 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ percent | 0.33 | 0.40 | 0.42 | 0.49 | 0.45 | . 0.39 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ percent | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 | 0.10 | 0.08 | 0.05 |
| Nitrogen percent | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.02 | 0.03 |
| Carbon percent | 0.34 | 0.29 | 0.25 | 0.16 | 0.17 | 0.15 |
| TYPE IV CLAY LOAM SOIL |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Depth | $0 \times \sim 71$ | $7 \frac{1}{8}$ | $20^{\prime \prime}$ | $28^{\circ}$ | $32^{\prime \prime}$ | $51^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}$ |

A.-MECHANICAL COMPOSITION (AIR DRY BASIS)

| Coarse sand percent | 3.02 | 3.83 | 2.98 | 8.55 | 3.34 | 2.47 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Fine sand percent | 47.59 | 26.14 | 31.83 | 28.28 | 35.44 | - |
| Silt percent | 32.40 | 36.52 | 33.75 | 22.44 | 26.89 | 20.63 |
| Clay percent | 16.20 | 33.15 | 35.70 | 31.91 | 31.69 | 29.48 |

C.-CHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS (AIR DRY BASIS)

| Moisture percent | 0.72 | 1.06 | 1.04 | 1.46 | 1.52 | 1.34 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Loss on ignition percent | 3.23 | 4.24 | 4.04 | 4.41 | 4.49 | 4.21 |
| HCl in solubles percent | 82.57 | 74.79 | 75.97 | 72.70 | 71.26 | 73.96 |
| HCl soluble silica percent | 0.91 | 1.06 | 0.90 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 0.89 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{3}}$ percent | 11.88 | 18.14 | 16.09 | 18.65 | 21.23 | 15.92 |
| $\mathrm{Al}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{2}}$ percent | 8.04 | 12.70 | 11.29 | 11.93 | 14.03 | 10.48 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ percent | 3.84 | 5.44 | 4.80 | 6.72 | 7.20 | 5.44 |
| CaO percent | 0.73 | 0.64 | 0.56 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.45 |
| $\mathrm{MgO}^{2}$ percent | 0.40 | 0.64 | 0.68 | 0.60 | 0.52 | 0.48 |
| $\mathrm{~K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}$ percent | 0.66 | 0.68 | 0.65 | 0.87 | 0.33 | 0.32 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ persent | 0.12 | 0.09 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 0.14 | 0.09 |
| Nitrogen percent | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| Carbon percent | 0.74 | 0.38 | 0.33 | 0.24 | $\mathbf{0 2 2}$ | 0.21 |

# statement showing detain of experimental stations 
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43. Namabgunj: (Distt. Bareilly) Paddy, Sugarcance. Govt. Agri. Farm. Sub-Tarai region of Rohelkhand division.

Locally known as Matijar. It is classjfied as Bareilly Tyce III. Profile development : mature.
Texture-Clay loam with high clay percent.
Structure : Cloddy
Concretions-Small Iron nodules.
$\mathrm{pH}-6.8$ to 6.6 .
The water holding capacity ranges from 35 to $50 \%$ having higbest capacity in between $18^{\circ}$ to $30^{\circ}$ depth. Other details (i.e. Chemical and Mechanical Analysis)-N.A

| June. | 4.23 |
| :---: | ---: |
| July. | 3.31 |
| -Aug. | 12.11 |
| Sept. | 7.72 |
| Oct. | 1.83 |
| Nov. | 0.09 |
| Dec. | 0.39 |
| Jan. | 1.17 |
| Feb. | 1.29 |
| March | 0.46 |
| April | 0.22 |
| May | 0.88 |

Lift Irrigation from Wheat -2 the river, [also canal Sugarcane -2 is low lying and gets irrigation.
water logged during monsoon.

STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS
UTTAR PRADESH (Contd.)

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44. | Neoll, (Distt. Etab) Sugarcane Resa rch Sub-station. Year of establishmeat 1951-52. | Sugarcane, Wheat. Sandy Soul. | Sandy soil. <br> Depth: $6^{\circ}$ to $9^{\circ " .}$ <br> Colour : Greyish brown. <br> Structure : 2 J to $30 \%$ clay soil. <br> Chemical a:alysis: N.A. <br> Mechanical aualysis : <br> $50 \%$ coarse sand, $30 \%$ fine sand, and $\mathbf{2 0 \%}$ Sut. |  | 2.53 8.33 6.64 2.92 5.71 Nil 0.06 0.73 0.68 0.44 Nil 0.15 | Tubewell irrigation is available from the establishmeut of the Research Sub-station. | Sugarcane-6 | 25 acre area of land was set apart for experimental purposes. This land is situated in the Khadar tract of river Ganga which flows just on the north eastern boundary of the Neoli Farm. |
| 45. | Pachperva. (Distt. Gonda) Late Paddy Research SubStation. Year of establishment: 1949. | N.A. It represents late paddy growing tract. | Light loam to loam. Other details N.A. | N.A. |  | Canal Irrigation | Paddy - 22 | N.A. |
| 46. | Partapgarh. Govt. Agril. Farm. (1906). | Sugarcane, Wheat, Barley Pacdy. Eastern U.P. tract. | Sandy loam. Grey colour. <br> Other details : N.A. | N.A. | , | Tubewell Irrigation. | Wheat - 12 <br> Jowar - 3 <br> Maizo - 1 <br> Mixed - 7 | N.A. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total - 23 |  |
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| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |  | 6 |  |  | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 53. | Tissuhl : (Distt. Mirzapur) Govt. Agril. Farm (1935). | South-east of U.P. billy tract. Paddy and Barley | Soil type: Hard clay <br> Depth: $10^{\prime}$ to $\mathbf{2 0}^{\circ}$ <br> Colour : Grey <br> Structure : Hard clay with small kankars. Other details-N.A. | June <br> July <br> Aug. <br> Sept. <br> Oct. <br> Nov. <br> Dec. <br> Jan. <br> Feb. <br> March <br> April <br> May | $\begin{gathered} 1.33 \\ 10.50 \\ 22.90 \\ 12.60 \\ 5.90 \\ \mathrm{Nil} \\ \mathrm{Nil} \\ 3.00 \\ \mathrm{Nil} \\ \mathrm{Nil} \\ \mathrm{Nil} \\ \mathrm{Nil} \end{gathered}$ | Canal from rainfed Dam. | Wheat <br> Paddy <br> Total | $\begin{aligned} & -3 \\ & -6 \\ & \hline-9 \end{aligned}$ | N.A. |
| 54. | Tissubl : (Distt. Mirzapur) <br> Late Paddy Research SubStation. Year of Establishment 1949. | It represents late paddy growing tract. Normal cropping pattern-N.A. | Soil type : Loam to "clayey loam. Other details N.A. | N.A. |  | Canal Irrigation | Paddy | -33 | N.A. |

STATEMENT SHOWING DETAILS OF EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS
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| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 55. | Unnao : Govt. Seed Farm. Year of Establishment 1953. | It represents the Usar tract. Major crops : Berseem, Pea and Barley. | Depth-9* <br> Colour-Clayey Usar <br> Structure-Fine <br> Chemical \& Mechanical analysis-N.A. | June. 3.50 <br> July. 14.05 <br> Aug. 10.01 <br> Sept. 1.71 <br> Oct. 11.91 <br> Nov. Nil <br> Dec. 0.17 <br> Jan. 0.72 <br> Feb. 0.71 <br> March Nil <br> April 0.01 <br> May 10.22 <br> Average 43.01 <br> The period $1960-61$ | Canal and tubewell irrigation. Canal from 1953 and tubewel! from 1961-62. | $\text { Paddy } \quad-2$ | The farm is in low lying area and there is water logging in most of the farm land. Mostly paddy crop is successful in this farm. There is proper drainage system. |
| 56. | Varanasi : Agri. Farm, Agri. College. Banaras Hindu University. Year of Establishment 1923. | It represents "the Gangetic Alluvium tract. Major crops-N.A. | Medium alluvium soil suited for cultivation of almost all crops : <br> Depth-Korizonns not distinctly formed. <br> Colour-Light brownish yellow. <br> Structure-Structureless to compact. <br> Chemical Analysis: $\mathrm{N}-0.05 \%$ <br> $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}-0.05 \%$, Org. C-0.5\%, $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}-0.5 \%$ and $\mathrm{CaO}-0.8 \%$. <br> Mechanical Analysis: Clay-20.0\% Silt-25.0\%, Fine sand-35.0\% and Coarse sand-15.0\%. | June 2.78 <br> July 13.60 <br> Aug. 9.68 <br> Sept. 7.62 <br> Oct. 5.20 <br> Nov. Nil <br> Dec. Nil <br> Jan. 2.90 <br> Feb. Nil <br> March 0.22 <br> April 0.22 <br> May 0.27 <br> Average 42.63 <br> The period on which $t$ is based is 1958-1959 and 1960. | Tubewell irrigation available from 1935. | Wheat -6 <br> Spinach -1 <br> Paddy -1 <br> Onion -1 <br> Tobacco -1 <br> Mustard -4 <br> Potato -9 <br> Total -23 | Uniformly level except certain portions of the farm which are low lying and suitable for paddy cultivation. Natural drainage except in certain areas of the farm where deep ditches are provided for removing surplus and standing water. |
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## SUGARCANE RESEARCH FARM, SHAHJAHANPUR

Plot No: $\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{2}}$

Lab. : No.
Depth
(a) Mechanical (air dry basis)
Coarse sand percent
Fine sand percent
fin sand percent
Silt percent
Clay percent
(b) Physical (air dry basis)

| Water holding capacity percent | 42.66 | 58.30 | 54.96 | 55.79 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Moisture equivalent percent | 22.49 | 27.13 | 24.92 | 25.39 |
| Sticky point moisture percent | 18.38 | 26.55 | 24.09 | 22.31 |

(c) Physico-chemical (air dry basis)

|  |  | 13.80 | 18.20 | 17.50 | 16.50 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Base exchange capacity percent | $\cdot$ | 8.01 | 9.00 | 6.00 | 7.00 |
| Exachangeable Ca+m.e percent |  | .11 .00 | 14.00 | 15.00 | 14.00 |
| Total exchangeable bases m.c. percent |  | 6.60 | 6.20 | 6.00 | 6.00 |

(d) Chemical (air dry basis)

| Moisture percent | 0.67 | 1.79 | 2.24 | 1.25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Loss on ignition percent | 2.07 | 3.01 | 2.40 | 2.59 |
| HCl insoluble percent | 82.18 | 72.95 | 71.42 | 75.99 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ percent |  |  |  |  |
| .....................) | 13.33 | 18.39 | 20.98 | 16.44 |
| $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ percent | 8.09 | 12.67 | 8.22 | 9.92 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ percent | 5.24 | 5.72 | 12.76 | 6.52 |
| CaO percent | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.50 | 0.34 |
| MgO percent | 0.99 | - | 1.15 | 1.43 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ percent | 0.10 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.64 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ percent | 0.09 | 0.22 | 0.22 | 0.16 |
| Nitrogen percent | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.04 |
| Organic Carbon percent | 0.34 | 0.21 | 0.21 | 0.03 |
| C/N...... . ............ | 12.44 | 4.95 | 12.41 | 7.02 |
| C/P................... | 3.73 | 0.94 | 0.95 | 0.17 |

SOIL ANALYSIS FROM ONE REPRESENTATIVE PROFILE OF REGIONAL RESEARCH STATION, VARANASI

| Profile | 0-9* | 90-22" | 22*-33* | 33"-72* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Moisture | 1.46 | 1.06 | 1.28 | 1.07 |
| Loss | 2.12 | 2.56 | 2.62 | 2.62 |
| HCl. Insoluble | 84.67 | 80.27 | 75.46 | 74.70 |
| $\mathrm{R}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \%$ | 8.05 | 12.29 | 16.99 | 16.65 |
| CaO\% | 0.28 | 0.34 | 0.45 | 0.395 |
| MgO\% | 1.29 | 0.93 | 1.13 | 1.03 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O} \%$ | 1.03 | 0.99 | 1.06 | 1.12 |
| $\mathrm{Fe}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \%$ | 2.52 | 1.60 | 3.68 | 3.76 |
| $\mathrm{Al}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3} \%$ | 5.47 | 10.65 | 13.26 | 13.84 |
| Org. C | 0.589 | 0.226 | 0.215 | 0.203 |
| Total N | 0.054 | 0.025 | 0.020 | 0.022 |
| pH. | 6.80 | 6.60 | 6.20 | 6.500 |
| Total Water Soluble Salts | 0.064 | 0.069 | 0.039 | 0.0570 |
| Coarse Sand | 0.90 | 3.21 | 2.81 | 1.20 |
| Fine Sand | 42.21 | 25.45 | 25.07 | 25.26 |
| Silt | 34.75 | 34.80 | 32.46 | 40.60 |
| Clay | 17.33 | 33.15 | 35.90 | 29.53 |

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :-Allahabad Agri. Institute, Allahabad.

Ref:~ U.P. 53(363).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To ascertain the effect of two different Nitrogenous fertilizers on the yield of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Deep loam soil. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 8.\%.1ys3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Broadcast. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-22, (vii) N.A. (vini) Weeding on 21 and 29.7.1953. (ix) 48.44'. (x) 26.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

1. A/S @ $40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
2. Sodium Nitrate @ 40 lb ./ac. of $\mathbf{N}$.
3. Control.

Fertilizers were top dressed on 28.8.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) $41^{\prime} \times 69^{\prime}$. (iii) 7. (iv) (a) $41^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (b) $39^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ ring alround the net plot, (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Dusting with gam maxene cn 5.9.1953. (iii) Yield of grain and bhusa. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) There was a gradual slope in the fiel: from east to west. The plots in the south-es stern end of the laycut matured earlier and yielded less than the plots in the northwestern end. Experiment conducted by the Head of Agronomy Department, Allahatad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1537 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $287.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are si gnificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $1 b_{j} / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 1790 |
| 2. | 1524 |
| 3. | 1297 |
| S.E./mean | $=108.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Ref :-U.P. 53(343).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.
Type:-'M'.
Object :-To study the residual effect of a pplication of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ to Paddy crop, having already studied the residual effect on previous crop Moong.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS ;
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong $\mathrm{T}_{3}$. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.7.1953. (iv) (a) After turning Moong, 2 ploughings with Watts plough. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Green manucing of Moong. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirr igated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 28.10". (x) 29, 30 and 31.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super.
The treatments were applied in Rabl 1952-1253 to wheat crop. Then the residual effect was studied on Moong $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ crop and then the present experiment on Paddy crop.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $20^{\circ} \times 54.5^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Agril. Chemist.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $2368 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $117.20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are highly significant. Interaction $N \times P$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of paddy in lb./ac.


Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

## Ref:- U.P. 53(344).

Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.

Object :-To study the effezt of N and P applied alone and in combination on the yield and quality of Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (lii) 11 to 13.8.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with watts plough, including hot weather cultivation and 2 ploughings with watts plough. at the time of transplanting. (b) Transplanted in lines. (c) - (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 24.07". (x) 25,26 and 27.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied on 14.8.1953 and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super applied on 8.7.1953. A/S broadcasted and placed in $4^{\prime \prime}$ deep bunds (furrow opened by either a victory or U.P. plough or even two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow).
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $33^{\prime} \times 33^{\circ}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor growth was observed in some plots which were on higher level and irrigation water could not reach propsrly. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Agril. Chamist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2201 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $230.83 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and P are highly significant, interastion $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ is not significa nt.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 1837 | 1997 | 2143 | 1992 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 2090 | 2300 | 2383 | 2258 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | 2160 | 2320 | 2583 | 2354 |
| Mean | 2029 | 2206 | 2370 | 2201 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean <br> S.E. of body of table | $=54.41 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |  |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :- U.P. 50(194).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To find the response of Paddy to application of nitrogen, phosphate and calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Barley. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.6.1950/14.8.1950. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with Watts plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T. 36 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) $58.16^{\circ}$. (x) 26 to 28.11.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30 \mathrm{and} \mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super aod Ca as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3^{3}$ partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block and 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\circ} \times 42^{\circ}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of Paddy. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Tisuhi (Mirzapur), Bharari (Jhansi), Pachperwa (Gonda), Nawabgunj (Bareilly) and Nagina (Bijnore). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $2405 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $110.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $N$ and interation $P \times C$ are highly significant. Y component of NPC interaction is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 3 | Mean | $C_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | C3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | . 1258 | . 1400 | 1599 | 1 | 1419: | 1395 | 1387 | 1473 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 2260 | 2696 | 2441 | 1 | 2466; | 2355 | 2519 | 2523 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{8}$ | 3353 | 3215 | 3420 |  | 3329 | 3329 | 3349 | 3310 |
| Mean | 2290 | 2437 | 2486 |  | 2405 | 2360 | 2418 | 2435 |
| C. | , 2247 | 2333 | 2499 |  |  | -- |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 2268 | 2519 | 2467 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 2355 | 2458 | 2493 | $!$ |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =26.03 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =45.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{array}
$$

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

> Ref :-U.P. 51(279).
> Type :-‘M’.

Object :-To find the response of Paddy to application of nitrogen, phosphate and calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) $28.6 .1951 / 12.8 .1951$. (iv) (a) N.A (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T. 36 . (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2 TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3^{3}$ Corfounded Fact. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block and 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$ (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging, good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-53. (b) ani (c) No. (v) (a) Nagina, Tisuhi (Mirzapur), Bharari (Jhar si), Pachperwa (Gonda), Farzabad and Nawatganj (Barcilly). (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted ty C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $2357 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $178.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $N, P$ and $X$ component of NPC interaction are highly signifcant. W component of NPC interaction is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.


$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Paddy (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 52(322). } \\
\text { Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra. } & \text { Type:-'M’. }
\end{array}
$$

Object :-To find the response of Paddy to application of nitrogen, phosphate and calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Pac'dy-Pea. (b) Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light Kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) $23.6 .1952 / 25.7 .1952$. (iv) (a) N A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T. 36 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $49.18^{\circ}$. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=6 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Cnnfounded Fact. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block and 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\circ}$. (b) $12 \times 36^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) No. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 19:0-53. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Fachperwa (Gonda), Banalas, Nagina, (Bijrore), Nawakganj (Bareilly); Faizabad, Tissuhi (Mirzarur) and Bharari (Jhansi). (b) Mil. (vi) Mil. (vii) The expt. was conducted ty C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(1) 2937 lb./ac.
(ii) $158.81 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) All main eflects, all Ist order interactions and $Y$ and $Z$ components of NPC interaction ars highly significant ; $W$ and $X$ component of NPC interaction are not significant.
(iv) Av. yie.d of grain in lo./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{8}$ | Mean | $C_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 2975 | 3630 | 3474 | 3360 | 2750 | 3803 | 3526 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 3023 | 3407 | 2906 | 3112 | 2943 | 3710 | 2684 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | - 2286 | 2854 | 1875 | 2338 | 2614 | 2042 | 2359 |
| Mean | 2761 | 3297 | 2752 | 2937 | 2769 | 3185 | 2856 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 2189 ${ }^{\circ}$ | 3146 | 2973 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 3165 | 3399 | 2990 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 2930 | 3347 | 2292 |  |  |  |  |

S.E of any marginal mean $\quad=37.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
S.E. of body of table $=64.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
Crop :- Paddy
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.
Ref :- U.P. 53(48).
Type :- ' $M$ '.

Object:-To find out the response of late Paddy to application of nitrogen, phophate and calcium.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Paddy followed by pea. (b) Pza. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Pırwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.8.1953. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings during July and August 19j3. (b) Transplanting: (c) - (d) Plant spacing $9^{\prime \prime}$ and row spacing 12". (e) 1. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36 (laiej. (vii) Irrigated. .(viii) Weeding and hoeing performed 3-4 times. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.11.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$,
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{E}}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum.
3. DESTGN:
(i) $3^{3}$ confounded Fact. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block; 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\circ} \times 42^{\prime \prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Bbarari, Bacaras, Faizabad and Nawabganj. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2.67 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $12.43 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) All main effe:ts, all first order interactions and $\mathbf{W}, \mathbf{Z}$ and $X$ components of NPC irteracticn are bighly significant. Y component of NPC interaction is sigaificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{P r}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{Pa}_{3}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | C ${ }^{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1919 | 1925 | 1953 | 1932 | 1916 | 1934 | 1947 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1921 | 2098 | 2167 | 2062 | 1983 | 2096 | 2107 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 2081 | 2232 | 2310 | 2208 | 2085 | 2245 | 2292 |
| Mean, | 1973 | 2085 | 2144 | 2067 | 1995 | 2091 | 2116 |
| c | 1929 | 2016 | 2040 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1979 | 2104 | 2191 |  |  |  |  |
| $C_{2}$ | 2012 | 2135 | 2200 |  |  |  |  |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =2.93 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =5.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Crop :-Paddy.<br>Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

. Ref :-U.P. 52(156).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To find out the effect of minor elements on growth and yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat-Paddy. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.6.1952/7 and 8.8.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $49.18^{\circ}$. ( x ) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Control.
4. Molybdenum (Mo) as molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
5. Copper ( Cu ) as copper su'phate at $6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Cu .
6. Boron (B) as commercial borax at $1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathbf{B}$.
7. Sulphur S ) as commercial sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of S .
8. Zine ( Zn ) as zine sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .

A basal dose of $A / S$ at $30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Super at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+$ Pot. Sul. at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}$ applied to all plots. Trace elements mixed with soil before sowing; date of manuring 23.7.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $35^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (b) $31^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) All plots except control lodged in the 1st week of December. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No.
(b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Nawarganj (Bareilly), Faizabad, Banaras, Bharari (Jhansi), Belatal and Bahraich. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $4580 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $209.68 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. | 4268 |
| 2. | 4624 |
| 3. | 4513 |
| 4. | 4817 |
| 5. | 4451 |
| 6. | 4705 |
| S. E./mean | $=85.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

```
Crop:-Paddy.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.
Ref :-U.P. 53(47),
Type :-'M'.
```

Object :-To find the effect of trace elements on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Wheat followed by Paddy. (b) Fallow. (c) NiI. (ii) (a) Light kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.8 .1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings during July and August. (b) Transplanting. (c) 12 srs./ac. in nursery bed. (d) Plant spacing $4^{\circ}$ and row spacing $12^{\prime \prime}$. (e) single seedlings. (v) G.M. $+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at $30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super +15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ as Pot. sulphate +15 lb ./ac. of Ca as Gypsum. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) Irr:gated. (viii Interculturing between rows $3-4$ times with hand hoe. Weedings also performed. 1st weeding after 10-15 days of transplanting. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.11.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments:
3 trace elements: $\mathbf{C u}=\dot{C}$ opper, $B=$ Boron and $Z \mathbf{n}=Z i n c$.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 levels of trace elements: $L_{0}, L_{1}, L_{2}$, and $L_{3}$.
[levels of copper: $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=3, L_{2}=6$ and $L_{3}=12 \mathrm{lb}$.jac. of Cu .
levels of Boron: $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=1, L_{2}=2$ and $L_{3}=4 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $B$.
.
levels of $\mathrm{Zinc}: \mathrm{L}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~L}_{1}=1, \mathrm{~L}_{2}=4$ and $\mathrm{L}_{3}=10 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of Za .]
Copper as copper sulphate, Boron as borax and zinc as zinc sulphate applied as surface dressing mixed with dry earth or sand 2 days after transplanting so as to secure uniform distribution within the plots.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Sub-plot $28^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}$ main-plot $56^{\prime} \times 77^{\circ}$. (b) $25^{\circ} \times 34^{\prime}$. (v) Plot bund $1.5^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Gcod. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bharari (Jhansi), Baharaich, Nawabganj, Faizabad and Banaras. (vi) Nil, (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2674 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $21.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $8.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main-plot treatments are not significantly different, sub-plot treatments within main-plots are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.


| Crop :- Paddy | Ref :- U.P. 52(170) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich. | Type :- ‘M’: |

Object :-To study the effect trace elements in presence of adequate quantities of $N, P$ and $K$ on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pea+Marsur. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 7.6 1952/9,2t-10.195 : (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -., (d) and (e) N.A. v) $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ to be applied $6^{\circ}$ deep in furrows while preparing the fie'd. A/S and Pot. sulphate as top dressing one week before traosplanting. (vi) T-8 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control.
2. Molybdenum $\left(\mathrm{M}_{0}\right)$ as molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper (Cu) as copper sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as commercial borax at 1 lb ./ac, of $\mathbf{B}$.
5. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial sulphur at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of S .
6. Zinc ( Za ) as zine sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .

A basal dose of $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at 30 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Super at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\mathrm{Pot}$. Sulphate at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{3} \mathrm{O}$ is applied to all plots. Elements applied mixed with fine earth as surface dressing 5-6 days before soil. Date of manuring 12.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Latin square. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $35^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (b) $31^{\circ} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. Good. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of Paddy. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra, Nawabganj (Bareilly), Faizabad, Banaras, Bharari (Jhansi), Belatal and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Condice ted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $2799 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $364.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 2801 |
| 2. | 2791 |
| 3. | 2953 |
| 4. | 2728 |
| 5. | 2906 |
| 6. | 2613 |
| S.E./mean | $=149.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

## Crop:- Paddy.

Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref:- U.P. 53(49).
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To find the effect of trace elements (Copper, Boron, Zinc) in presence of adequate quantities of $\mathbf{N}$ P, K and Calcium on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Masoor. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 28 to 30.8.1953. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c) 12 srs./ac. in nursery bed. (d) Plant spacing $9^{\circ}$ and row spacing $12^{\circ}$. (e) 1. (v) Green manuring, $A / S$ at 30 lb ./ac. of N , Super at 30 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$; Sulphate of Potash at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. and Gypsum at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. (vi) $\mathrm{T}-15$ (late) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing on 15 and 16.9.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.11.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 trace elements :- $\mathbf{C u}=$ Copper, $\mathrm{B}=$ Boron and $\mathrm{Z} \mathbf{n}=\mathbf{Z i n c}$.

## Sub-plot treatments

4 levels of trace elements : $-L_{0}, L_{1}, L_{2}$ and $L_{3}$.
[levels of copper :- $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=3, L_{3}=6$ and $L_{3}=12 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of Cu.
levels of Boron : $-L_{0}=0, L_{1}=1, L_{2}=2$ and $L_{2}=4 \mathrm{lb}$. $/ \mathrm{ac}$, of $B$.
levels of Zinc :- $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=1, L_{2}=4$ and $L_{3}=10 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of Zn .]
Copper as copper sulphate, Boron as borax and Zinc as zinc sulphate applied as surface dressing mixed with dry earth or sand 2 days before transplanting so as to"secure uniform distribution within the plot. :
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) $28^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}$.
(b) $25^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}$
(v) Plot bund $1.5^{\circ} \times 1^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Pair. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. .(b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Paizabad, Bharari (Jhansi), Banda and Nawabganj (Barcilly). (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $541.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $119.46 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $132.78 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main-plot treatments and sub-plot treatments within main-plot treatment are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib,/ac.

|  | $L_{0}$ | $L_{1}$ | $\cdots L_{2}$ | $L_{\mathbf{3}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{C u}$ | 542.5 | 590.8 | 507.4 | 529.3 | 542.5 |
| B | 546.9 | 529.3 | 560.1 | 621.6 | 564.5 |
| Zn | 456.9 | 571.1 | 542.5 | 498.6 | 517.3 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. main-plot treatment marginal means $\quad=48.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. means in the same row $\quad=108.41 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Barabanki.
Ref:- U.P. 49(96).
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the best time of application of $N$ to Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A: (iii) $16.5 .1949 / 2,3.7 .1949$. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 40 lb ./ac. of N in the form of compost. (vi) T-22. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding. (ix) Nil. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control.
(1) 2 sources of $N$ at 60 lb ./ac. of $N: S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / N$.
(2) 6 times of application of $N: T_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $T_{2}=$ Full dose at 30 days after transplanting, $T_{8}=$ Full dose at 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=1$ at transplanting and $\frac{1}{2}$ at 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and 1 at 50 days after transplanting and $T_{6}=\frac{1}{1}$ at 30 days after and $\frac{1}{2}$ at 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $17^{\circ} \times 39^{\circ}$. (b) $11^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and Bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1732 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $323.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control = $1480 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| $S_{1}$ | 1686 | 1624 | 1624 | 1994 | 1953 | 1953 | 1806 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | 1552 | 1573 | 1696 | 1850 | 1871 | 1665 | 1701 |
| Mean | 1619 | 1599 | 1660 | 1922 | 1912 | 1809 | 1753 |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } S & =76.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } T & =132.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =187.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
$$

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Barabanki.

Ref :- U.P. 50(124).
Type:- ' M '.

Object:-To study the optimum time of application of $\mathbf{N}$ to Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Gram. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.5.1950/28.6. to 1.7.1950. (iv) (a) Palwa 29.4.1950 and 5, 6.5.1950; 1si ploughing by victory plough, 2nd ploughing by deshi plough on 13.5.1950, 3rd and 4th ploughing by cultivator, grass picking on $18,21.6 .1950$. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 140 md./ac. of compost. (vi) W-22(early). (vii) N.A. (viii) Weeding between 27.7.19j0 and 2.8.1950. (ix) 19.68". (x) 23 to 24.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control.
(1) 2 sources of $N$ at 60 lb ./ac. of $N: S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / N$.
(2) 6 times of application of $N: T_{1}=F u l l$ dose at transplanting, $T_{2}=$ Pull dose at 30 days after transplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose at 50 days after transplanting, $r T_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and $\frac{1}{1}$ at 30 days after transplanting, $T_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting ard $\frac{1}{2}$ at 50 days after transplanting and $T_{6}=\frac{1}{2}$ at 30 days after and $\frac{1}{1}$ at 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $17^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}$. (b) $11^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Due to scarcity of rains, the growth and yield was poor. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Tissubi (Mirzapur) and Hawalbagh (Almora). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $2176 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $574.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control $=1881 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | Ts | T | T5 | $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S_{1}$ | 2185 | 2143 | 2251 | 2442 | 1933 | 2431 | 2231 |
| $S_{2}$ | 1922 | 2272 | 2447 | 2385 | 2097 | 1877 | 2170 |
| Mean | 2054 | 2208 | 2349 | 2414 | 2015 | 2164 | 2201 |
|  | S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ <br> S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =1354 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =234.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =331.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Crop :-Paddy.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Barabanki.

Ref. :-U.P. 49(95).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the optimum time of application of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ to Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.5.1949/2, 3.7.1949. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c) (d) \& (e) N.A. (v) $40 \mathrm{lb} . / a c$. of $N$ in the form cf ccrapost. (vi) T-22. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 15.7.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control.
(1) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ (at 40 lb ./ac.) : $\mathrm{S}_{1}=$ Super and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ Ammo. Phos.
(2) 6 times of application of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Full dose at 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{a}}=$ Full dose at $\leq 0$ days after transplanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}$ at transplanting and $\frac{1}{2}$ at 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{5}=\frac{1}{8}$ at transplanting and $\frac{1}{2}$ at 50 days after transplanting
and $\mathrm{T}_{6}=\frac{1}{2}$ at 30 days after and $\frac{1}{2}$ at50 days after transplanting. .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $17^{\circ} \times 39^{\prime}$. (b) $11^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-50. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.

## 3. RESULTS:

(i) $2074 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $348.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

$$
\text { Control }=1480 \mathrm{lb} \cdot / \mathrm{ac}
$$

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | T 2 | $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | T | $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | T ${ }_{6}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S 1 | 1809 | 2251 | 2241 | 2138 | 2241 | 2092 | 2129 |
| $S_{3}$ | 2128 | 2220 | 1912 | 1994 | 2406 | 2056 | 2119 |
| Mean | 1968 | 2235 | 2077 | 2066 | 2324 | 2074 | 2124 |
|  |  | S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ <br> S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ <br> S.E. of body of table |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =82.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =142.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =201.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |


| Crop :-Paddy. | Ref :-U.P. 50(125). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Barabanki. | Type:=‘M’. |

Otject :-To study the oplimum time of application of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ to Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Gram. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) $15.5 .15 \leq 0 / 28.6 .19: 0$ to 1.7.1950. (iv) (a) Palwa 29.4.15s0, 1st ploughing by Victory plough, 2nd ploughirg ty deshi plough, 3rd and 4th ploughing by cultivator; grass picking on 18 to 21.6.19j0. (b) Tracsplarting. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) $140 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}$. of compost. (vi) W. 22 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) Wcedirg 27.7.1950 and 2.8.1950. (ix) 19.68\%. (x) 23 and 24.9.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) + a control
(l) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ (at $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. ): $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ Super and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ Ammo. phos.
(2) 6 times of application of $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ : $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Full dose at 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{3}}=$ Full dose at 50 days after transplantiog, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and $\frac{1}{2}$ at 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and $\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}} 50$ days after transplanting and $T_{5}=\frac{1}{1}$ at 30 days after and $\frac{1}{2}$ at 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $17^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}$. (b) $11^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Due to scarcity of rains the growth was poor. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow and Tissuhi (Mirzapur). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $1968 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(ii) $434.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | Control ${ }^{\text { }}$ |  |  | $=1963 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | T1 | T8 | Ts | T | T5 | T |  |
| $S_{2}$ | 1856 | 1907 | 2066 | 1876 | 1856 | 1850 | 1902 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ | 1902 | 2071 | 1671 | 2262 | 2231 | 2077 | 2036 |
| Mean | 1879 | 1989 | 1868 | 2069 | 2044 | 1964 | 1969 |


| S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ | $=102.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$, |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ | $=177.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$, |
| S.E. of body of table | $=250.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :~ Paddy.<br>Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Belatal.

Ref :- U.P. 52(172).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of Boron, Molybdenum, Copper, Sulphur and zinc in presence of adequate quantities of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and K on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) $12.6 .1952 / 25.7 .1952$. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (c) N.A. ${ }^{i}$ (v) $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ to be applied $6^{\circ}$ deep in furrows while preparing field. A/S and Pot. sulphate as top dressing one week before transplanting. (vi) T. 9 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $48.23^{\circ}$. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as molybdic acid at $6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Mo.
3. Copper ( Cu ) as copper sulphate at $6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as commercial borax at 1 lb ./ac. of $B$.
5. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of S .
6. Zinc ( Zn ) as zinc sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Za .

A basal dose of $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at 30 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Super at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+$ Pot. Sulphate at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}$ is applied to all treatments. Elements applied mixed with fine earth as 引surface dressing 5-6 days before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L.Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $35^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (b) $31^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra, Bahraich, Nawabganj (Bareilly), Faizabad, Banaras, Bharari (Jhansi) and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $335.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $108.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | $\ddots$ | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 327.9 |  |
| 2. | 324.0 |  |
| 3. | 244.7 |  |
| 4. | 335.1 |  |
| 5. | 415.0 |  |
| 6. | 367.2 |  |
| S.E./mean | $=44.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |

Crop:- Paddy.
Site:- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref :- U.P. 52(174).
Site : - State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of Boron, Molybdenam, Ccpper, Sulphur and Zinc in preserce of acequate quantities of $N, P$ and $K$ on the growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy_ Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) No. (ii) (a) Kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ to be applied $6^{\circ}$ deep in furrows while preparing field. A/S and Pot. sul. as top dressing one week before transplanting. (vi) T-43 (medi um). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Control.
4. Molybdenum (Mo)'as molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
5. Copper $(\mathrm{Cu})$ as copper sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
6. Boron (B) as commercial borax at 1 lb ./ac. of B .
7. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of S .
8. Zinc ( Zn ) as zinc sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .

A basal dose of $A / S$ at 30 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Super at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}+$ Pot. Sulphate at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ is applied to all treatments. Trace elements mised with fire earth as surface dressirg $5 \mathbf{5} \mathbf{6}$ days tefore sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $35^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}$. (b) $31^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes, :
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953, (b) ard (c) No. (v) (al Atarra, Belatal, Bahraich, Nawabganj (Bareilly), Faizabad, Luckncw and Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1557 Ib./ac.
(ii) $338.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ 1
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 1385 |
| 2. | 1657 |
| 3. | 1581 |
| 4. | 1563 |
| S. | 1524 |
| 6. | 1634 |
| S.E./mean | $=138.30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref:- U.P. 53(46).
Type:- ' M '.

Object:-To study the effect of varying doses of trace elements (Copper, Boron, Zinc) in presence of adequate quantities of $N, \mathbf{P}$ and Calcium on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Sanai-Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.8.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing on 30.7.1953. (b) Transplanting. (c) 12 srs/ac. in nursery bed. (d) Plant spaci $g 9^{\prime \prime}$ and row spacing $12^{\circ}$ (improved method). (c) 1. (v) Green manuring-Sanai turned in on 30.7 .1953 , A/S at $30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N , Super at 30 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$, Sulphate of potash at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{9} \mathrm{O}$ and Gypsum at 15 lb ./ac. of Ca. (vi) T-43 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculturing tetween rows 3 -4 times with hand hoe. Weeding is also performed. Ist weeding after 10-15 days of transplanting (ix) N.A. (x) 8,11.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 trace elements : $\mathbf{C u}=$ Cepper, $\mathbf{B}=$ Boron and $\mathbf{Z n}=\mathbf{Z i n c}$.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 levels of tuace elements : $L_{0}, L_{1}, L_{2}$ and $L_{3}$
[levels of Copper: $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=3, L_{2}=6$ and $L_{3}=12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Cu .
levels of Boron: $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=1, L_{2}=2$ and $L_{3}=4 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $B$.
le els of Zinc: $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=1, L_{2}=4$ and $L_{3}=10 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\left.Z n.\right]$
Copper as copper sulphate, boron as borax and zinc as zinc sulphate applied as surface dressing mixed with fine sand or dry earth, 2 days before transplanting so as to secure uniform distribution within plots.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii, (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $25^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}$. (b) $22^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}$. (v) Plot bund $1.5^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}$ alround, block partition of irrigation channel $3^{\prime}$. Field border 2' alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL : •
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of gundhibug at milky stage. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-contd. (b) and (c; No. (v) (a) Banaras, Nawabganj, Bahataich, Banda and Faizabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $1944 \quad$ lb./ac.
(ii) (a) $262.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $210.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main-plot treatments and sub-plot treatments within main-plot treatments are not significant.
(i.) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{L}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | Mean |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{C u}$ | 1937 | 1907 | 2017 | 2042 | 1976 |
| $\mathbf{Z a}$ | 1959 | 2007 | 1717 | 2037 | 1930. |
| 2 | 2017 | 2004 | 1817 | 1864 | 1926 |

S.E. of difference of two main-plot treatment means $=107.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. means in the same row $\quad=171.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref :- U.P. 49(240).
Type:- ' M '.

Object :-To study the response of Paddy to three levels of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) N:A. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.5.1949/23.7.1949. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation and subsequent 3 barrowings, transplanting after puddling. (b) Transplanting. (c) (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-136. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## : . TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2). 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{g}}=40 \mathrm{lb}$. /ac.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Calcium as gypsum containing $\mathbf{3 \%} \mathbf{C a}$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Confounded Factorial. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication, 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18 \times 42^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\circ} \times 36^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Height of paddy plants. No. of tillers per plant. No. of green leaves per plant. No. of dry leaves per plant. Length of leaf in cms. Breadth of leaf. Fresh weight of shoot per plant. Fresh weight of root per plant. Total weight of straw and grain. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Nawabgunj (Bareilly), Nagina (Bijoore) and Banaras. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P. This experiment was wrongly laid out. In one replication the treatment combination $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{P}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{8}}$ should have been tried in a block in place of treatmeat combination $N_{1} P_{2} C_{1}$ and vice versa in the other block. Hence yield of combinations $\mathrm{N}_{3} \mathrm{P}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{2} \& \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ have been taken as missing.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1309 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 2509 lb./ac.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ is highly significant. Main effect of $\mathbf{P}$ and interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ are significant. Other effect and all the interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1046 | 1160 | 1018 | 1075 | 994 | 1115 | 1115 |
| N | 1381 | 1227 | 1685 | 1431 | 1497 | 1305 | 1491 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1201 | 1383 | 1679 | 1421 | 1478 | 1411 | 1374 |
| Mean | 1209 | 1257 | 1461 | 1309 | 1323 | 1277 | 1327 |
| C0 | 1223 | 1262 | 1484 | . |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1199 | 1266 | 1366 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 1206 | 1242 | 1532 |  |  |  |  |

$S$ E. of difference between $N_{1}$ and $N_{0}$ means or $N_{1}$ and $N_{2}$ means $\quad=87.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$,
S.E. of $d$ fference between $N_{0}$ and $N_{2}$ means $=83.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of difference between $P_{1}$ and $P_{0}$ or $P_{2}$ and $P_{0}$ means . $\quad=85.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$S$ E. of $d$ fference tetween $P_{2}$ and $P_{1}$ means
S.E. of difference between $C_{0}$ and $C_{1}$ or $C_{2}$ and $C_{0}$ rreans $\quad=85.51 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$
S.E of difference tetween $C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$ means $\quad=87.35 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of boby of any table excluding $N_{1} P_{2}, N_{1} P_{1}, N_{1} C_{1}, N_{1} C_{2}, C_{1} P_{2}$ and $P_{1} C_{2}$ means $=102.44 \mathrm{lb}$ /ac. S.E. of $N_{1} P_{1}, N_{1} P_{2}, N_{2} C_{1}, N_{1} C_{2}, C_{1} P_{2}$ and $P_{2} C_{2}$ means $\quad=118.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref:-U.P 50(212). Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Paddy to three levels of $N, P$ and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 13.6.1950/12.8.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing by dest ploughing, 2 harrowings, 2 ploughings by desi plough, mixing manures by cultivator 3 times. . (b) Transplanting (c) -. (d) \& (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T. 136 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=N_{1} N_{1}=30$ and $N_{8}=60$ Ir.lac. cf $N$.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{4}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$.lac of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$
(2) 3 levels of Cakium: $C_{0}=0, C_{2}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{Ca}_{4}$

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{s}}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. $\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{~S}$ afplied on 11.8.1950, Super on 9.8.1950 and Gypsum on 10.8.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Partially Confounded. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication, 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) ;a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\circ}$.
(b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime} \quad$ (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-53. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bınaras, Atarra (Banda), Tisuhi ( lirzapur), Pachpurwa (Goad3), Nawabjanj (B řilly, and Nagina. (b) Nil. (vi) Layout plan in replication I was wrong. The treatment com sination $N_{1} P_{1} C_{2}$ should be in thrd bluck while the treament combination $N_{1} P_{2} C_{1}$ should be i.l first blusk. Hznce the yield of plots containing wrong treatmene combinations has been rejected aad aaalysis has been done by applying missing plot technique. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $345.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $166.61 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii None of the main effects and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P a}_{2}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | C2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 380.3 | 253.6 | 216.0 | 282.3 | 319.8 | 224.7 | 3025 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 328.4 | 321.9 | 382.4 | 344.3 | 302.5 | 347.9 | 382.4 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 509.9 | 380.3 | 345.7 | 412.0 | 363.0 | 466.7 | 406.2 |
| Mean | 406.2 | 317.6 | 314.7 | 346.2 | 328.4 | 346.4 | 3537 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 432.1 | 302.5 | 250.6 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 43!.1 | 285.2 | 321.9 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | - 354.3 | 355.1 | 371.6 |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of marginal means of $\mathrm{N}_{0}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}, \mathrm{P}_{0}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{0}$
$S$ E. of marginal mean of $N_{1}$
$=39.27 \mathrm{lh} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E of marginal mean of $P_{1}, P_{2}, C_{1}$ and $C_{2}$
$=43.02 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of any mean excluding ( $N_{1} P_{1}, N_{1} C_{2}, P_{1} C_{2}, N_{1} P_{2}, P_{2} C_{1}$ and $\left.N_{1} C_{1}\right)$ in the body of any table $=68.02 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. S.E. of means of $N_{1} P_{14}, N_{1} C_{2}, P_{1} C_{2}, N_{1} P_{2} P_{2} C_{1}$ and $N_{1} C_{1}$
$=75.54 \mathrm{lo} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site:-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref : U.P. 51(281). Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and Calcium.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Berseem. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Kabar and Rankar mixed. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.s.1951/3.8.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplantiog. (c) - (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T. 136. (vii) N.A. (viii) N A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N$ : $N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Ca : $\mathrm{C}_{0}=0, C_{2}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{,} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Manuring of $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ on 23.7.1951, Ca on 27.7.1951 and
Super on 21.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Confounded Fact. (ii) (a) 3 blosks/replication; 9 plsts/blo.k. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\circ}$. (b)
$12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) No lodging, good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Nagina (Bijnor), Tissuhi (Miszapur), Ne uatganj (Bareilly), Atarra (Banda), Pachperwa (Gonda) and Faizatad. (b.) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The, expt. was wrongly laid out. In ore replication the treatment combination $N_{1} P_{1} C_{2}$ should have ten ried in a ticck in place of treatrent cembination $N_{1} P_{2} C_{1}$ ard sice versa in the ctier blcck. Hence yield of treatment combinations $\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ have teen taken as missing ard they have tecn cstimated. The expt, was corducted by C.P.
3. RESULTS:
(i) $1187 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $28305 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii Main effect of N is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv). Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| - | $P_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 985 | 1003 | 1128 | 1039 | 994 | 1024 | 1098 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1201 | 1119 | 1117 | 1146 ~ | 1270 | 1044 | 1124 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1309 | 1312 | 1499 | 1377 | 1569 | 1301 | 1262 |
| Mean | 1165 | 1148 | 1248 | 1187 | 1278 | 1123 | 1161 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 1266 | 1219 | 1348 |  |  |  |  |
| $C_{1}$ | 1059 | 1067 | 1242 | . |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 1171 | 1158 | 1154 |  |  |  |  |


|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| S.E. of difference between $P_{1}$ and $P_{0}$ or $P_{2}$ and $P_{0}$ means | $79.42 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}$ |
| S.E. of differerce tetween $P_{2}$ and $P_{1}$ means |  |
| S.E of difference tetueen $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ or $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ means |  |
| S.E. of differerce tetween $\mathbf{C}_{1}$ and $\mathbf{C}_{2}$ rreans |  |
| S.E. of tody of any tatle excluding $\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{1}, N_{1} \mathrm{C}_{2}, \mathrm{P}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{2}, N_{1} \mathrm{P}_{2}, P_{2} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ means |  |
| S.E. of $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{1}, \mathrm{~N}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{2}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{2}, \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{1}$ means | $=109.85 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |


| Crop :-Paddy (Kharif). | Ref :-U.P. 52(244). |
| :---: | :---: |
| Site :-State Mecharised Farm, Bharari. | .Type :- 'M'. |

Object:-To study the resperse of late Pacdy to 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and Ca .

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Cersee m. (t) Eerscem. (c' N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi; T-43 (med). (vii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All comtinatiors of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ ind $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 iere's of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40: \mathrm{b}$./ac.
(2) 3 leve's of Calcium : $\mathrm{C}_{0}=\mathrm{C}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{1}=: 0$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 3 \times 3$ Partally Confounded. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication, 9 flcts/tlcck, (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $18^{\circ} \times 42$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL:

(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1553. (b) No. (c) No. (v) Pachperna (Gonda), Banaras. Nagina, Nawatgarj (Eareilly), Faizatad, Allara (l ar Ca) ard Tisschi (Mirzaplr). (vi) Mif. (vii) Lay-

treatment combination $N_{1} P_{8} C_{1}$ should be in first block. Hence ths yield of plots containing wrong treatment combinations has been rejected and analysis has been done by applying missing plot technique as suggested by chief statistician to Govt. of U.P. Coaduated by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $3191 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $368.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ is highly significant ; interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{C}$ is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $P_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P r}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ | Mean ; | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 2599 | 3001 | 2662 | 2754 | 2815 | 2681 | 2766 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 3364 | 3368 | 3299 | 3344 | 3312 | 3684 | 3036 |
| $\mathbf{N a}_{2}$ | 3492 | 3498 | 3431 | 3474 " | 3280 | 3438 | 3703 |
| Mean | 3152 | 3289 | 3131 | 3191 | 3136 | 3268 | 3168 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 3163 | 3059 | 3185 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 3215 | 3541 | 3046 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 3077 | 3267 | 3161 |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of marginal means of $N_{0}, N_{2}, P_{0}$ and $C_{0}$
S.E. of marginal mean of $N_{1}$
$=86.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
S.E. of marginal mean $P_{1}, P_{2}, C_{1}$ and $C_{3}$
$=95.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$S B_{0}=90.65 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
S.E. of any mean excluding $N_{1} P_{1}, N_{1} C_{9}, P_{1} C_{2}, N_{1} P_{2}, P_{2} C_{1}$ and $N_{1} C_{1}$ in the body of any table $=150.33 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. S.E. of means of $N_{1} P_{1}, N_{1} C_{2}, P_{1} C_{3}, N_{1} P_{2}$ and $P_{2} C_{1}$

- $-17359 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.


## Crop :-Paddy (Kharif). <br> Site : State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

> Ref :-U.P. 53(45).
> Type :-‘M'.

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to three levels of $N, P$ and Calcium (Ca).

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) Sanal-Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.8.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing on 1.8. 1953. (b) Transplasted. (c) " 12 srs in nursery bed. (d) Plant spacing 9" and row spacing $12^{\circ}$. (e) 1. (v) Nil. (vi) T-43 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.11.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{\mathbf{3}}=30$ and $N_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} \mathrm{jac}$
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{9}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as super and Ca as Gypsum.
Super applied $3^{\prime \prime}-\mathbf{- 4}^{\prime \prime}$ deep in soil behind plough 3 days before sjwing. Gypsum applied as surface dressing a day before sowing. A/S applied as top dressing 2 weeks after germination.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3 \times 3$ Confounded Fact. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication and 9 . plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL:

(i) Good. (ii) Negligible attack of gundibug. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) Atti ra (Banda), Nawabganj, Banaras and Faizabad. (b) N.A., (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2506 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $595.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is signaificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | P | $\mathbf{P r}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | $C_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 2627 | 2504 | 2411 | 2514 | 2746 | 2208 | 2588 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 2308 | 2390 | 2653 | 2450 | 2390 | 2619 | 2342 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 2859 | 2580 | 2221 | 2553 | 2513 | 2865 | 2282 |
| Mean | 2598 | 2491 | 2429 | 2506 | 2550 | 2564 | 2404 |
| $C_{0}$ | 2591 | 2638 | 2420 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 2558 | 2364 | 2770 |  |  |  |  |
| C | 2645 | 2472 | 2096 |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =140.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =243.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
$$

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.

## Ref:- U.P. 51(155).

Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to three levels of $N, P$ and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Berseem. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.5.1951/29.7.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-136 (late). (vii) [N.A. (viii) N.A.' (ix) 30.71". (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Date of manuring 26.7.1951 and 27.5.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Confounded Factorial. (ii) (a) 3 blocks'replication and 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2 . (iv) (a) $20^{\circ} \times 36^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}$
(b) $15^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}$. (v) $21^{\prime} \times 2^{\circ}$. Irrigation channel $-2^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging. The condition of the crop was poor due to late transplanting. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield.(iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $103.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $23.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =5.53 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } . & =9.58 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
$$

## Crop :- Paddy. <br> Site :- Gọvt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad,

Ref :- U.P. 52(217).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to three levels of N, P and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) N.A. (ii) (a)Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.5.1952/20 to 22.7.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T. 136 (early variety). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 25.57". (x) N.A

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{9}}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium: $\mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{9}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Manures applied 3 days before transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Partially Confounded. (ii) (a) 3 blocksjreplication and 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $20^{\circ} \times 36^{\circ}$.
(b) $15^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. (ii) Attacked by gundi $25 \%$ on ear heads. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Pachperwa (Gonda), Tisuhi (Mirzapur), Nagina (Bijnore), Nawabganj (Bareilly), Banaras, Atarra (Banda) and Bharari (Jhansi). (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $452.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $86.12 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 408.6 | 472.9 | - 464.7 | 448.7 | 419.0 | 470.9 | 456.3 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 396.2 | 460.5 | 448.0 | 434.9 | 452.2 | 394.1 | 458.4 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 522.7 | 435.6 | 462.6 | 473.6 | 514.4 | 445.9 | 460.3 |
| Mean | 442.5 | 456.3 | 458.4 | 452.4 | 461.9 | 437.0 | 458.4 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 475.0 | 402.4 | 458.4 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 425.2 | 452.2 | 433.5 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 427.3 | 514.4 | 433.5 |  |  |  |  |


| S.E. of any marginal mean | $=20.29 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of body of table | $=35.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |


| Crop :- Paddy. | Ref :m U.P.53(32). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad. | Type :- 'M. |

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to three levels of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and Calcium (Ca).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy followed by Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6-12.7.1953.
(iv) (a) Ploughing with desi plough on 6,7 and 11.7.1953. (b) Transplanting. (c) 12 srs./ac. in nursery bed.
(d) Plant spacing $9^{\circ}$ and row spacing $12^{\circ}$. (e) 1. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix)
N.A. (x) 3-5.10.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium: $C_{0}=0, C_{2}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S} . \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Super placed $3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}$ deep in soil between the plough 3 days before sowing. Gypsum applied as surface dressing a day before sowing. A/S applied as top dressing 2 weeks before germination.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3^{3}$ Confounded Factorial. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication and 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2 . (iv) (a) $21^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (b) $15^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$. (v) Plot bund $3^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Severe attack of gundhibug badly damaged the crop. (iii) Grain and istraw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Nawabganj, Banaras, Bharari (Jhansi) and Atarra (Banda). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $375 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $59.96 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{C}$ is highly significant ; that of $\mathbf{N}$ is significant. Interactions $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{C}$ are highly signtivant, interaction $N \times C$ is sigoificant $Y$ and $W$ components of NPC interaction are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | Mean | C. | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | $c_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 330 | 359 | 326 | 338 | 313 | 321 | 380 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 382 | 421 | 411 | 405 | 330 | 375 | 508 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 465 | 305 | 373 | 381 | 409 | 324 | 411 |
| Mean | 392 | 362 | 370 | 375 | 350 | 340 | 433 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 419 | 284 | 348 | $\begin{aligned} & =14.13 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =24.47 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 340 | 326 | 355 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 417 | 475 | 307 |  |  |  |  |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Crop :- Paddy.

Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.

> Ref :- U.P. $52(175)$.
> Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of Boron, Molybdenum, Copper, Sulphur and Zinc in presence of adequate quantities of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{P}$ and K on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. : (b) Berseem. (c) No. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b Transplanted. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ to be applied $6^{\prime \prime}$ deep in furrows while preparing the) field; A/S and Pot. sulphate as top dressing one week before transplanting. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 25.57". (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as molybdic acid at $6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of Mo.
3. Copper ( Cu ) as copper sulphate at 6 lb ./ac of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as commercial borax at 1 lb ./ac. of $B$
5. Sulphur $(\mathrm{S})$ as commercial sulphur at 50 lb /ac. of S .
6. Zinc ( Zn ) as zinc sulphate at 4 lb . /ac. of $\mathbf{Z n}$.

A basal dose of A/S at 30 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Super at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{5}+$ Pot. Sulphate at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}$ is applied to all treatments. Elements will be applied mixed with fine earth as surface dressing 5-6 days before sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $48^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}$. (b) $44^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. Satisfactory. (ii) Attacked by gundy-25\% on ears. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1955. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra, Banaras, Bharari (Jhansi), Belatal, Bahraich, Nawabganj (Bareilly) and
Lucknow. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $792.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $127.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 720.2 |
| 2. | 814.2 |
| 3. | 796.3 |
| 4. | 813.1 |
| 5. | 741.4 |
| 6. | 868.0 |
| S.E./meam | $=52.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :-Paddy.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.

Ref :-U.P. 53(36).
Type:-‘M'.

Object:-To study the effect of varying doses of trace elements (Copper, Boron, Zinc) in presence of adequate quantities of $N, P, K$ and Calcium on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy followed by Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16, 18.7.1953. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by praja desi on 26.6.1953 and 12.7.1953., ploughing with desi plough on 16 and 18.7.1953. (b) Transplanting. (c) 12 srs./ac. in nursery bed. (d) Plant spacing;" and row spacing $12^{\prime \prime}$. (e) Single seedling. (v) G.M. $+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $i \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super $+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ as Pot. Sulphate +15 lb ./ac. of CaO as Gypsum. (vi) $\mathrm{T}-136$ (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculturing between rows $3-4$ times with hand hoes. Weeding also performed. lst weeding after 10-15 days of transplanting. (ix) N.A. (x) 6 and 7.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 trace elements: $\mathbf{C u}=$ Copper as Copper Sulphate, $\mathrm{B}=$ Boron as Borax and $\mathrm{Zn}=$ Zinc as Zinc Sulphate. Sub-plot treatments:

4 levels of trace elements: $L_{0}, L_{1}, L_{2}$ and $L_{3}$
Levels of $\mathrm{Cu}: \mathrm{L}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~L}_{1}=3, \mathrm{~L}_{2}=6$ and $\mathrm{L}_{3}=12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
Levels of Boron: $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=1, L_{2}=2$ and $L_{3}=4 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
Levels of Zinc : $L_{0}=0, L_{1}=1, L_{2}=4$ and $L_{3}=4 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) $28^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}$
(b) $25^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}$. (v) Plot bund $1.5^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}$ (high) alround. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) Good, (ii) Attack of Gundhi bug (35.0\%). (iii) Grain and straw yield, (iv) '(a) 1952-1955, (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Nawabganj, Bahariach, Banda, and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1479 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $35.86 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

$$
\text { (b) } 55.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \text {. }
$$

(iii) Main treatments and sub-treatments are both highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{C u}$ | $\mathbf{B}$ | $\mathbf{Z n}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{L}_{0}$ | 1450 | 1531 | 1485 |
| $L_{1}$ | 1395 | 1671 | 1349 |
| $L_{8}$ | 1518 | 1388 | 1654 |
| $L_{8}$ | 1215 | 1483 | 1610 |
| Mean | 1394 | 1518 | 1524 |

S.E. of difference of two
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. main-plot treatment means: } & =14.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 2. means in the same column } & \end{array}$

Crop :-Paddy.
Site :-Govt. Agri. School Farm, Hawalbagh.

Ref :-U.P. 50(114).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of time of application of $\mathbf{N}$ on growth and yield of late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 9.6.1950, 24 and 25.7.1950. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) $\rightarrow$ (d) and (c) ${ }_{\Delta}$ N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Thapachini (lat ${ }_{\sim}$ (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 12.11.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) + a control.
(1) 2 sources of N at $60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / N$.
(2) 6 times of application of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Full dose 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 30 days after transplanting, $T_{8}=\frac{1}{8}$ at transplanting and half 50 days after transplanting, and $\mathrm{T}_{8}=$ Half 30 days after and Half 50 days after traosplanting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $14^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}$. (b) $10^{\circ} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not satisfactory due to lack of irrigation. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) 1950-1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Tisuhi (Mirzapur), Lucknow and Barabanki. (vi) Nil. (vii) The S.E. is greater than the G.M. on account of the fact that there is great variation between the yield in different plots. . Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $286.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $310.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the treatments and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control mean $=280.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.


| S.E. of marginal mean of N | $=89.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | ---: |
| S.E. of marginal mean of T | $=155.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| S.E. of body of table | $=219.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Govt. Agri. School Farm, Hawalbagh.

Ref:- U.P. 51(136).
Type:- ' M '.

Object :-To study the effect of time of application of N on growth and yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A, (iii) 4.5 .1951 to 4.7.1951. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) Transplanted. (c) - (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Thapachini (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control.
(1) 2 sources of $N$ at $60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. : $S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / N$.
(2) 6 times of application of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Full dose 30 days after transplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{8}$ at transplanting and half 30 days after transplanting, $T_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 50 days after transplanting and $T_{6}=$ Half 30 days after and Half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $14^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$. (b) $10^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Ni.. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) [and (c) No. (v) (a) Tisuhi and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $886.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $483.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects and their interaction is significast.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control $=728.1 \mathrm{Ib}$./ac.

|  | T1 | T2 | Ts | T4 | T | $\mathrm{T}_{8}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | 576.4 | 879.8 | 1152.8 | 273.0 | 394.4 | 1577.5 | 809.0 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | 879.8 | 455.0 | 1152.8 | 1152.8 | 1395.5 | 910.1 | 991.0 |
| Mean | 728.1 | 667.4 | 1152.8 | 712.9 | 895.0 | 1243.8 | 900.0 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ <br> S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{T}$ <br> S.E. of body of table |  |  |  | $=139.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $=241.8 \mathrm{ib} / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |  |


| Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). | Ref :- U.P. 48(122). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. | Type :- 'M'. . |

Object:-To find out the best manure amongst A/S. Neem cake, Castor cake, T.C. and F.Y.M. for carly broadcast Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kunraghat. (iii) 21.6.1948. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory plough and 3 ploughings with desi plough. (b) By broadcast. (c) 37 seers/ac. (d) No. (e) - (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weedings on 31.7.1948 and 23.8.1948. (ix) $43.59^{\circ}$. (x) 17 and 22.10.1948.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. A/S at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
2. Neem cake at 50 lb ./ac. of N .
3. Castor cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
4. T.C. at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$, of N .
5. F.Y.M. at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
6. Control.

A/S and Casior cake top dressed on 28.7.1948, Neem cake on 1.8.1948, T.C. and F.Y.M. broadcast as basal dressing on 15.6.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) $79^{\prime} \times 66^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}$. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $37^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}-3^{\circ}$. (b) $35^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime} \cdot 3^{\prime \prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Treatments 1, 2 and 5 completely lodged in replication II and treatment 1 completely lodged in replication IV. Partial lodging of other treatments. (ii) There had been a slight attack of white-ants in the central plots of replication 1 i.e., having treatments 1 and 3. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) 1946-1949. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) N.A. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $907 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $206.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1492 |
| 2. | 980 |
| 3. | 1132 |
| 4. | 610 |
| 5. | 688 |
| 6. | 538 |
| S.e./mean | $=103.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :-Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref :-U.P. 49(230).
Type : ${ }^{6} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}$.
Object:-To find out the best manure amongst A/S, Neem cake, Castor cake, T.C. and F.Y.M. for early broadcast Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram. (c) Nil, (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kunraghat. (iii) 12.6.1949. (iv) (a) One ploughing with victory plough and 3 with desi plough. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N. 22 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding on 17.7.1949 and 12.8.1949 and two hoeings. (ix) 47.37*. (x) 5,10.1949.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. A/S at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
2. Neem cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. Castor cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
4. T.C. at 50 lb ./ac. of N .
5. F.Y.M. at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$, of N .
6. Control.
F.Y.M. and T.C. broadcasted as B.D. on 10.6.1949, Neem cake top dressed on 24.7.1949, A/S and Castor cake top dressed on 21.7.1949.
7. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6; (b) $79^{\circ} \times 66^{\circ}-9^{\circ}$. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $37^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$. (b) $35^{\prime} \times 19^{\circ}-3^{\prime \prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes..
8. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. (ii) A few sandy plots of replication I and III were attacked by white-ants. This affected the germination adversely. About $50 \%$ of the plants were destreyed by the white-ants in some plots. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) 1946-1949. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii)Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $408.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $147.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{Ib}_{\mathbf{o}} / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 654.4 |
| 2. | 425.9 |
| 3. | 509.1 |
| 4. | 315.9 |
| 5. | 292.9 |
| 6. | 253.4 |
| S.E./mean | $=73.8 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. |

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :-Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:-U.P. 48(123).
Type:-‘M’.

Object :-To test the qualitative merit of $A / N$ as compared to $A / S$.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Kesari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kuoraghat. (iii) 14.7.1948. (iv) (a) One ploughing by victory plough and 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T. 88 (late). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Two hoeings by kassl and weeding on 129.1948 . ( Ix ) 44.24*. ( x ) 27 and 30.11.1948.
2. TREATMENTS: .

All combinations of (1) and (2) +one control
(1) 2 sources of $N: S_{1}=A / N$ and $S_{9}=A / S$.
(2) 2 levels of $N: N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Manures top dressed on 27.7.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}$. (b) $16^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 31^{\prime}-6^{\circ}$. (v) $9^{\prime \prime}$ all round the net plot. (v) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Uniform growth. (ii) A few gundhl bugs were found on two plants only at the flowering time, (iii) Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) 1947-1949. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1785 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 454.6 lb ./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Control $=1528 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$, |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | Mean |
| $S_{1}$ | 1722 | 1934 | 1828 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | 1817 | 1923 | 1870 |
| Mean | 1770 | 1928 | 1849 |
| S.E. of marginal means of S or N |  |  | lb./ac. |

## Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).

Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :- U.P. 49(231).
Type:- ' $\mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.

Object :-To test the qualitative meris of $A / N$ as compared to $A / S$.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam, (b) Refer soil analysis, Kunraghat. (iii) 16.7.1949. (iv) (a) One ploughing by victory plough and 3 by desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) N.A. (d) N,A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-88 (late). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings with kassi, weedings on 11.8.1949 and 3.9.1949. (ix) 47.53'. (x) 2.12.1949.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of ( 1 ) and ( 2 ) +a control.
(1) 2 sources of $N: S_{1}=A / N$ and $S_{2}=A / S$ :
(2) 2 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$\mathbf{N}$ top dressed on 25.8.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $18^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}$. (b) $16^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 31^{\prime}-6^{\circ}$. (v) $9^{\prime \prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good growth. (ii) Nil (iii) Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) 1947-1949. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1183 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $207.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Ooly control vs others is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grainin lb./ac.

Control $=930 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S_{1}$ | 1129 | 1293 | 1211 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | 1271 | 1320 | 1296 |
| Mean | 1200 | 1306 | 1253 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{S}$ or $\mathbf{N}$ S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =59.88 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.} \\ & =84.69 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac.} \end{aligned}$ |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :- U.P. 49(224).
Type:- ' $M$ '.

Object:- To determine the optimum time of application of manure.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Peas. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kunraghat. (iii) 27 to $\mathbf{3 1 . 5 . 1 9 4 9 /}$ 2.7.1949. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 with desi plough. (b) Transplanting. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 19.8.1949. (ix) 43.58". (x) 16.9.1949.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)+one control (no manure).
(1) 2 sources of $N: S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=$ Castor cake.
(2) 2 levels of $N: N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 2 methods of application: $\mathrm{M}_{1}=$ Castor cake at transplanting zod $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ one week after transplanting and $\mathbf{M}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 3 weeks after transplanting.
Manuring on 2, 9 and 23.7.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $2^{3}$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $28^{\prime}-6^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $27^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$. (v) $9^{\prime \prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Not good. (ii) There was a very severe attack of gundhi bugs on the whole field. The attack occurred in the 3rd week of August. Heavy manuring resulted in gappy growth in certain plots and such plots were seriously attacked by kharif grass hoppers and bugs. (iii) Height, tillers and yield of paddy grain, (iv) 1949-1951. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) The plot got flooded two days after first manuring. (•ii) Expt. conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $971.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $250.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant, interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{S}$ is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{rol}=880 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{M}_{1}$ | M2 |
| $S_{1}$ | 773 | 1240 | 1006 | 953 | 1059. |
| $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{9}}$ | 919 | 1001 | 960 | 853 | 1067 |
| Mean | 846 | 1120 | 983 | 903 | 1063 |
| $\mathrm{M}_{1}$ | 765 | 1041 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{M}_{3}$ | 927 | 1199 |  |  |  |

SE. of any marginal mean
S.E. of tody of any table

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =62.65 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =88.61 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
$$

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :~Rice Res. SubwStn., Kunraghat.

Ref :- U.P. 50(286).
Type: © "M'.

Object:-To determine the optimum time of application of manures to Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Barley and Peas. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kunraghat. (iii) 28, 29.6.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing by victory plough and 3 by desi plough. (b) Transplanting. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding on 6.8.1950. (ix) 39.92". (x) 21 to 23.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) +4 controls.
(1) 2 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N .
(2) 2 sources of $N: S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=$ Castor cake.
(3) 2 methods of application: $M_{1}=$ Castor cake at transplanting and A/S one week after transplanting and $\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 3 weeks after transplanting.

## 3. DESIGN:

(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $42^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $40^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 16^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$. (v) $9^{\prime \prime}$ alround the ret plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. (ii) No disease nas observed. Gundhi tugs and grass hoppers toth were fourd in small numbers and hence the damage was also not very serious. (iii) Height, tillring and yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) 1950-195I. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) No. - (vi) Nil. ( (vii) Experiment corducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $1271 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $240.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of N and M alone are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Jb./ac.

$$
\text { Control }=877 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
$$



## Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).

Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:- U.P. 51 (261).
Type :- 'M'.

Otject :-To determine the optimum time of application of manures to Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Barley. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil aralysis, Kurraghat. (iii) 3.7.1951. (iv) (a) One ploughing ty victory and 2 ty desi plocgh. (b) Trarsplanting. (c) N.A. (d) NA. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weedirg on 12.8.1Ss1. (ix) 26.27.\% (x) 25 to 27.9.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) +4 controls.
(1) 2 levels of $N: N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$.
(2) 2 sources of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ Castor cake.
(3) 2 methods of application of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=$ Castor cake at transplanting and A/S one week after trans planting and $M_{2}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half weeks after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) $42^{\prime \prime} \times 18^{\circ}$. (b) $40^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 10^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$. (v) $9^{\prime \prime}$ left alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL
(i) Good growth. No lodging. (ii) Grass hoppers and Gundhi bugs were found in abundance in weedy plots due to huge growth of weeds. All the pests were soon controlled by taking out weeds. The damage was very nominal. Borer attacked plants were also removed from some of the manured plots. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.

## 5. RESULTS

(i) $943 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(ii) $212.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ is highly significant. Main effect of $M$ is significant ; others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

Control $=668 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{2}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{M}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{M}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S_{1}$ | 940 | 1219 | 1080 | 966 | 1193 |
| $S_{2}$ | 928 | 1232 | 1080 | 1031 | 1129 |
| Mean | 934 | 1226 | 1080 | 998 | 1161 |
| $M_{1}$ | 853 | 1144 |  |  |  |
| M ${ }_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1015 | 1307 |  |  |  |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of any table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =53.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =75.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).<br>Site :- Rice Res. Sub.Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :- U.P. 50(282).
Type:- ' $M$ '
Object:-To study the cumulative effect of applying A/S over a number of years to the same field with or without F.Y.M. on the yield of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Peas. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kunraghat. (iii) 23.6.1950. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by Punjab plough and 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 seers/ac. (d) and (c) Nil. (v) As per treatments. (vi) $\mathbf{N}-22$ (early). (vii) Unirrigated, (viii) Weeding on 14.7.1950 and 14.8.1950. (ix) 39.92". ( ( 30.9.1950 and 1. 0.1950 .

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of F.Y.M. : $\mathrm{F}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~F}_{1}=50$ and $\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N .
(2) 4 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, h_{2}=40$ and $N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$.
F.Y.M. broadcast on 1.6.1950 as basal dressing.' A/S top dressed on 7.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 4$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 (b) N.A. (iii) A. (iv) (a) $42^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $40^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}$ (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. (ii) There was no disease incidence. Nymphs of grass hoppers were observed in the first week of August but soon they were controlled with the help of Hexiclene dust. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) $1950-1952$. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) N.A. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botainst (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P, Nagina,

## .5. RESULTS:

(i) $969 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 102.3 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graia in lb./ac.


Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref:-UP. 51(265).
Type:- ' M ':
Object :-To study the comulative effect of applying A/S over a number of years to the same field with or without F.Y.M. on the yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium black. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kunraghat. (iii) 16.6.1951. (iv) 1 ploughing with gujar and two ploughiogs with desi plough. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 seeris/ac. (d) Nil. (e) -. (v) As per treatments. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 3 weedings. (ix) $26.27^{\prime \prime}$. (x) 30.9.1951 and 4.10.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of F.Y.M. : $F_{0}=0, F_{1}=50$ and $F_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
(2) 4 levels of $N$ as A/S: $N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{2}=40$ and $N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
F.Y.M. broadcast on 2.4.5.1951 as basal dressing. A/S top dressed on 12.7.1951.

## 3. DESIGN :

(i) $3 \times 5$ Fact. in R.B D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) $42^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}$. (b) $40^{\circ} \times 16^{\circ}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ left alround the . net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. Some of the heavily manured plots were lodged due to rains. Grass hopper and Gundhi tugs were noticed in the heavily manured plots. Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) 19501952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) N.A. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botainst (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
3. RESULTS:
(i) $892 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $150.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Main effect of F and interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{F}$ are not significant.
(iv, Av. yield of graia in lb./ac,


Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :-Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:- U.P. 52(311).
Type :- ${ }^{\mathbf{c}}{ }^{\mathbf{M}}$.

Object:-To study the cumulative effect of applying A/S over a number of years to the same field with or without F.Y.M. on the yield of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) Nil. (b) Barley. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kunraghat. (iii) 28.7.1952. (iv) (a) 2 pluughings by Punjab plough and 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Broadcast. (c) $37 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}$. (d) - (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 19.8.19j2. (ix) 22.78". (x) 10 and 11.10.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of F.Y.M. : $F_{0}=0_{2} F_{1}=50$ and $F_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N.
(2) 4 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{2}=40$ and $N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
F.Y.M. broadcast on 6 and 7.6.1952. as basal dressing. A/S top dressed on 9.8.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 4$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) $42^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}$. (b) $40^{\prime} \times 16^{\circ}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good growth; no lodging. (ii) Spotting of leaves in the later stage was noticed. There has been a serious attack of gundhi bug. Dusting with gammaxeae was done twice as control męasure but with no result. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain (iv) (a) 19:0-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) No. (vi) Low yields due to less rains during the crop pariod and very limited supply of tubewell water and that too not proper time. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Batanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $45.47 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $5.05 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{N}$ are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 21.70 | 30.80 | 47.60 | 67.90 |  |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{1}$ | 28.70 | 30.80 | 49.70 | 72.10 | 45.32 |
| $\mathrm{~F}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 37.10 | 30.80 | 52.15 | 76.30 | 49.09 |
| Mean | 29.17 | 30.83 | 49.82 | 72.10 | 45.47 |

S.E. of marginal mean of $N$ S.E. of marginal mean of $F$ S.E. of body of table
$=1.26 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=1.46 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=2.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 49(65).
Type: ${ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ '.

Objeci :-To study the effect of application of N on growth, performance and yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.6 .1949 and 12 and 14.7 .1949 . (iv) (a) 4 ploughings by dest plough and planking. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22. (early) (vï) N.A. (viii) Weeding twice. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.10.1949.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) +Control
(I) 2 sources of N at 60 lb ./ac. : $\mathrm{S}_{1}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N}$.
(2) 6 time of application of $N: T_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $T_{2}=$ Full dose 30 days after tranplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 30 days after tranplanting, $T_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 50 days after 'transplanting, $T_{6}=$ half 30 days after and the other half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) $8^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}$. (b) $5^{\prime} \times 8^{\circ}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$ all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Av. height of plants, av. length of ear, av. no. of tillers per plant, grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Barabanki, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $624.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $87.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $T$ and control vs others are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

$$
\text { Control = } 303.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
$$


S.E. of marginal mean of $S$
S.E. of morginal mean of $\mathbf{T}$
S.E. of body of table
$=20.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
$=35.78 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=50.59 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
Crop :-Paddy. Ref:-U.P. 50(91).

Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Object :-To study the effect of time of application of N on growth, performance and yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.6.1950/22 and 23.7.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing by mould board and two by desi plough, one by cultivator and panking etc. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) T.C. as basal dressing on 1.6.1950. (vi) N. 22 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculture on 21.7.19j0. (ix) N.A. (x) 9 10.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control.
(1) 2 sources of N at $60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.: $S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / N$.
(2) 6 time of application of $\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Full dose 30 days after transplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{3}$ at transplanting and half 30 days after transplanting, $T_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplating and half 50 days after transplanting and $T_{6}=$ Half 30 days after and the other half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $34^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}$. (b) $30^{\circ} \times 6^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Ordinary. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949—1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Hawalbagh, Tisuhi and Barabanki. (b) N.A. (vi) Nıl. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $380.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $61.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Control ys. Others and $T$ are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | Control |  |  |  | $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | T ${ }_{6}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{T}_{1}$ | T 2 | Ts | $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ |  |  |  |
| $S_{1}$ | 622.3 | 497.8 | 311.1 | 404:5 | 388.9 | 311.1 | 422.6 |
| $S_{8}$ | 544.5 | 451.2 | 264.5 | 357.8 | 342.3 | 248.9 | 368.2 |
| Mean | 583.4 | 474.5 | 287.8 | 381.2 | 365.6 | 280.0 | 395.4 |
|  | S.E of marginal mean of $S$ |  |  |  | $=17.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |
|  | S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ |  |  |  | $=30.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |
|  | S.E. of body of table |  |  |  | $=43.44 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |

## Crop :-Paddy.

Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

## Ref:-U.P. 51(121).

Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To investigate the effect of time of application of N on the growth, performance and yield of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.6.1951/31.7.1951. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation. One ploughing by victory plough. Two by cultivator, one by kudali and planking etc. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T. 136 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculturing on 17.8.1951, 31.8.1951 and 23.9.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.10.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control
(1) 2 sources of $N$ at $60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ : $S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / N$.
(2) 6 time of application of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Full dose 30 days after transplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 30 days after transplanting, $T_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 50 days after transplanting and $\mathrm{T}_{8}=$ Half 30 days after and the other half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13 . (b) N.A. (iii) 2 . (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}$. (b) $16^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop was very poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yjeld. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Tisuhi and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $477.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $62.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}^{\circ}$
(iii) Control vs. others and main effect of $T$ are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

$$
\text { Control } \quad=233.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
$$

|  | T ${ }_{1}$ | $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | T8. | T | Ts | $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{S}_{1}$ | 641.7 | 816.7 | 641.7 | 379.2 | 291.7 | 262.5 | 505,6 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | 758.4 | 729.2 | 583.4 | 350.0 | 262.5 | 262.5 | 491.0. |
| Mean | 700.0 | 773.0 | 612.6 | 364.6 | 277.1 | 262.5 | 498.3 |


| S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ | $=17.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ | $=31.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$, |
| S.E. of body of table | $=43.85 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :- U.P. 49(66).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of time of application of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on growth, performance and yield of Paddy.

1. BAŞAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Nil. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.6.1949/12, 14.7.1949. (iv) (a) Fouv ploughings by desi plough and planking. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N. 22 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.10.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2)+a control
(1) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ (at 40 lb . ac .) : $\mathrm{S}_{1}=$ Super and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ Ammo. Phos.
(2) 6 times of application of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Full dose $30^{\circ}$ days after transplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{3}$ at transplan and half 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{5}=\frac{1}{3}$ at transplanting and half 50 days after transplanting, $T_{6}=$ Half 30 days after and the other half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $8^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}$. (b) $5^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$, all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) No. (c) No:- (v) (a) Barabanki. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $540.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $124.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effect of $T$ and control $v s$ others are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

|  | Control |  |  | $=280.0 \mathrm{lb}$ /ac. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | T | Ta | T3 | $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | T5 | T ${ }_{0}$ | Mean |
| S 1 | 653.4 | 630.1 | 443.4 | 513.4 | S13.4 | 373.6 | 521.2 |
| Ss. | 770.1 | 676.7 | 536.7 | 583.4 | 583.4. | 467.7 | 602.8 : |
| Mean | 7118 | 653.4 | 490.0 | 548.4 | 548.4 | 420.0 | 562.0 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ S.E of marginal mean of $T$ S.E of body of table |  |  |  |  |  | $=29.37 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $=50.88$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | $=71.93$ |  |

```
Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
```

Ref :- U.P. 50(92).
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To' study the effect of time of application of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ on growth, performance and yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Potato. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.6.1950/24.7.1950. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by mould board plough and two by desi plough. (b) Transplanting. (c) - (d) NA. (c) N.A. (v) T.C. as basal dressing on 23.7.1950. (vi) N. 22 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculuring on 9.8.1950 and 1.9.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control
(1) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ at 40 lb ./ac. : $\mathrm{S}_{1}=$ Super and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ Ammo. Phos.
(2) 6 times of application of $N: T_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $T_{2}=$ Full dose 30 days after transplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 30 days efter transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{b}}=\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}$ at transplanting and half 50 days after transplanting and $T_{6}=$ Half 30 days after and half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $20^{\circ} \times 11^{\prime}$. (b) $16^{\circ} \times 7^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 19491951 . (b) No. ) No. (v) (a) Tisuhi and Barabanki. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $830.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $106.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Control $\nu s$ others and main effects of $S$ and $T$ are highly signtifcant. Interaction $S \times T$ is not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control $\quad=450.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

S.E. of marginal mean of $S$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =30.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =53.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =75.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
$$

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :- U.P. 51(122).
Type :- ${ }^{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{M}$ '.

Object :- To study the effect of time of application of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ on growth, performance and yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b)N.A. (iii) 12.6.1951/31.7.1951. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation. One ploughing by victory plough ; two by cultivator; one by kudali and planking etc. (b) N.A. (c) 12 sr /ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculturings on 17, 31.8.1951 and 23.9.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.10.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control
(1) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ at 40 lb ./ac. : $\mathrm{S}_{1}=$ Super and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ Ammo. Phos.
(2) 6 times of application of $N: T_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $T_{2}=$ Full dose 30 days after transplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=1$ at transplanting and half 30 days after transplanting, $T_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 50 days after transplanting and $T_{8}=$ Half 30 days after and half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 2.
(iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}$
(b) $12^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Tisuhi. (b) N.A. (v) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $173.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $65.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(iii) Main effects of $S$ and $T$ are significant. Control vs others and interaction $S \times T$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathbf{I b}$./ac.

|  | Control $=116.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | T 2 | T3 | $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | T ${ }_{5}$ | $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | Mean |
| $\mathbf{S}_{1}$ | 233.4 | 155.6 | 155.6 | 116.7 | 116.7 | 77.8 | 142.6 |
| $S_{1}$ | 350.0 | 311.1 | 233.4 | 155.6 | 116.7 | 116.7 | 213.9 |
| Mean | 291.7 | 233.4 | 194.5 | 136.2 | 116.7 | 97.2 | 178.3 |
|  | S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ <br> S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =19.32 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =33.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =47.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S.E. of body of table. |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Crop :- Paddy.<br>Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.<br>\section*{Ref :- U.P. 53(34).}

Object:-To study the effect of varying doses of N in presence of adequate quantities of $\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{6}}$, Calcium, Copper, Zinc and Borcn on growth and yield of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Nil. (c) Potato. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12, 13.7.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. ( () 一. (d) Plant spacing $9^{\circ}$ and row spacing $12^{\prime \prime}$. (e) One. (v) Green manuring with sanai and F.Y.M. at 80 mds./ac. Super at $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$, Sulphate of Potash at $48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. Gypsum at $32.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .$, Copper Sulphate at $25.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ and Zinc Sulphate at $1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. (vi) T-136. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing on 27.7.1953, 9 and 23.8.1953. (ix) 49.36\% (x) 4.10.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. Control.
2. $250 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ of N .
$250 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}$ of N .
3. $300 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ of N
4. $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ of N .
5. $35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{lac}$ of N .
6. $150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
7. $4 C 0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
8. 200 lb -/ac. of N .
9. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $20^{\prime} \times 11.5^{\prime}$. (b) $19^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}$. (v) I $^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
10. GENERAL:
(i) Lodging occured in plots receiving more than 100 tb ./ac. of N . (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) ia) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C,P.
11. RESULTS:
(i) $860 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $253.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly aignificant.
(Iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatmènt | Av. yield | Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | ${ }^{1} 842$ | 6. | 779 |
| 2. | 1628 | 7. | 716 |
| 3. | 997 | 8. | 695 |
| 4. | 730 | 9. | 597 |
| 5. | 758 |  |  |
| E./mean $\quad=126.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |  |

Crop:- Paddy.
Ref :- U.P. 53(211).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. Type :- 'M'.
Object:-To study the effect of different doses of Calcium in presence of adequate quantities of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$, Copper, Zinc and Boron on growth and yield of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) No. (b) Potato. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1953/18.7.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) $10-$ (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring by sanai with $40 \mathrm{lb} /$ ac. $\quad\left(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\right)$ P.Y.M. at 80 maunds/ac. A/S at 40 lb . $/ \mathrm{ac}$ of N , Super at 40 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ and Pot. Sulphate at $20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}$ and trace elements-dose N.A. (vi) T-136 (medium-early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A, (x) 5.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control. 6. $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of CaO .
2. $20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of CaO .
3. $120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of CaO .
4. $40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}$, of CaO .
5. $140 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of CaO .
6. $60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of CaO .
7. $160 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of CaO .
8. 80 lb ./ac. of CaO .

CaO applied as Gypsum on 18.8.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $20^{\circ} \times 11 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}$. (b) $16 \times 7.5^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1379 Ib./ac.
(ii) $112.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield | Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1275 | 6. | 1368 |
| 2. | 1399 | 7. | 1368 |
| 3. | 1462 | 8. | 1337 |
| 4. | 1555 | 9. | 1244 |
| 5. | 1399 |  |  |
|  | S.E./mean | $=64.75 \mathrm{lb} . / a c$. |  |

```
Crop :-Paddy.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
```

Ref:- U.P. 50(126).
Type :- ' $M$ '.

Object:-To study the response of Paddy to application 'of Sulphur and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.6.1950/9.7.1950. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by mould board, 2 ploughings by desi and planking. (b) Transplanting. (c) (d) and (c) N.A. (v) 50 lb ./ac. of N on 4.7.1950. (vi) T-136 (medium early). (viii) Unirrigated. (viii) Interculturings on 13.7.1950, 19.8.1950 and 24.9.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.10.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS,

All combibations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : $\mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of Sulphur : $S_{0}=0, S_{1}=10$ and $S_{2}=20 \mathrm{lb}$. $/ \mathrm{ac}$.

Manures applied on 24.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 2 . (iv) (a) $10^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}$. (b) $9^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}$. (v) Half foot round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Length of shoot, length of leaf etc. and grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $2240 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $271.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{C}$ and S are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.

|  | $C_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $C_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S_{0}$ | 1451 | 1503 | 1814 | 1589 |
| $S_{1}$ | 2177 | 3265 | 3524 | 2989 |
| $S_{8}$ | 1451 | 2280 | 2695 | 2142 |
| Mean | 1693 | 2349 | 2678 | 2240 |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { - S.E. of any marginal mean } & =110.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =191.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\end{array}$

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Ref :- U.P. 52(183).
Type: © 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of Boron, Molybdenum, Copper, Su!phur and Zinc in presence of adequate quantities of $N, P$ and $K$ on yield and quality of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nit. (b) Potato. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 18.7.1952/9.8.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) Line to line $6^{\circ}$; plant to plant $3^{\circ}$. (c) N.A. (v) Super at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ to be applied $6^{\circ}$ deep in furrows while preparing the field. A/S at $30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N and Pot. Sulphate at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}$ as top dressing at least one week before transplanting. (vi) T. 136 (Medium early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weedings and hoeings on 2, 9.8.1952 and 11, 20.8.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.10.1952.

## 2. TREATMENTS

1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as Molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper ( Cu ) as Copper sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as Commercial Borax at $1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathbf{B}$.
5. Sulphur (S) as Commercial Sulphur at 50 lb .1 ac . of S .
6. Zinc (Zn) as Zinc Sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of $\mathbf{Z n}$.

A basal dose of $A / S$ at $30 \mathrm{lb} . / a c$. of $N+$ Super at $15 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\mathrm{Pot}$. Sulphate at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}$ is surplied to all treatments. Trace elements mixed with fine earth and applied as top dressing 5-6 days tefore transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq.
(ii) (a) 6.
(b) N.A. (iii)
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra, Faizabad, Banaras, Bharari Belatal, Bahraich and Nawabganj. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $610.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $215.3 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 515.3 |
| 2. | 622.3 |
| 3. | 568.8 |
| 4. | 763.3 |
| S. | 612.6 |
| 6. | 578.5 |
| S.E./mean | $=87.90 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. |

Crop:- Paddy.
Ref:- U.P. 51(88).
Site : $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ Tarai State Farm (Western Block), Matkota. Type :^"M".

Object :- To study the effect of $\mathbf{N}$ and $P$ applied alone and in combination on the yield and quality of Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Matkota. (iii) 27.6.1951. (iv) (a) The field was pl ughed and hirrowed by tractor. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Two weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) End of Nov., 1951

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25$ and $N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
$N$ as $A / S$ and $P_{2} O_{5}$ as Super. $N$ applied by broadcast and $P$ placed $3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}$ deep in furrows behind desi plough and pata applied. Manuring on 26.6.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $46^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}-7^{\circ}$. (v) A distance of one to three feet from plot to plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not good, beiow normal due to heavy infection of weeds and late rains. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Nawabganj. (b) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS
(i) $579.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $176.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ is highly significant, main effect of $\mathbf{P}$ and interaction $N \times P$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ | $\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 381.5 | 508.6 | 428.3 | 439.5 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 609.0 | 575.5 | 642.5 | 609.0 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 615.7 | 609.0 | 843.2 | 689.3 |
| Mean | 535.4 | 564.4 | 638.0 | 579.5 |
| S.E. of m arginal mean of $P$ or $\mathbf{N}$ S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =41.56 \\ & =71.98 \end{aligned}$ |  |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). . Ref :- U.P. 52(1).
Site :- Tarai State Farm (Western Block), Matkota. Type :- 'M'.
Object : - To study the effect of $N$ and $P$ applied alone and in combination on the yield and quality of Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Matkota. (iii) 246.1952 . (iv)
(a) Field prepared by tractor ploughing and disc harrowing. (b) Seedlings were sown in rows according to local practices. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.10 .1952.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=25$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super. $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied by broadcast as surface dressing and Super drilled in furrows $4^{*}$ deep tehind the plough. Date of application 22, 23.6.2952 and 11, 14.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $22^{\prime} \times 49.5^{\circ}$. (b) $22^{\prime} \times 49.5^{\circ}$. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Effected by excessive weeds. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Banaras, Partapgarh, Nawabganj, Bharari and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1156 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $229.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb,/ac.


Crop :~ Paddy.
Ref:- U.P. 49(40).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the cumulative effect of applying A/S over a number of jears to the same field with or without F.Y.M. on the yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Fallow. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1949/8.7.1949. (iv)
(a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil.. (vi) Anjana Pilibhit. (vii) N.A. (viii) Two weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.10.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of F.Y.M. : $F_{0}=0, F_{1}=50$ and $F_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N
(2) 4 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{2}=40$ and $N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
F.Y.M. applied on 7.7.1949 and A/S on 16.7.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 4$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $41^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}$. (b) $1 / 87.43 \mathrm{ac}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1〔49-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A. E. B. (P).
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2337 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $241.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{F}$ are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb}, \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{3}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{F}_{0}$ | 1716 | 2113 | 2332 | 2451 | 2153 |
| $\mathbf{F}_{1}$ | 2054 | 2225 | 2678 | 2726 | 2421 |
| $\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1873 | 2442 | 2813 | 2623 | 2438 |
| Mean | 1881 | 2260 | 2608 | 2600 | 2337 |

S.E. of marginal mean of $P$
$=60.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E of marginal mean of $N$
$=69.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of body of table
$=120.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Ştn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 50(44)/49(40).
Type :- ' $M$ '.

Object:-To study the cumulative effect of applying A/S over a numbers of years to the same field with or without P.Y.M. on the yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy followed by fallow. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1950/30.6 1950, (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (c) NA. (v) Nil. (vi) Anjana Pilibhit. (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of F.Y.M. : $\mathrm{F}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~F}_{1}=50$ and $\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ of N .
(2) 4 levels of $N$ as A/S: $N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{2}=40$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
F.Y.M. applied on 28.6.1950 and A/S on 7.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 4$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $41^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$. (v) $1 / 81.68 \mathrm{ac}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P) ${ }^{\text {. }}$
5. RESULTS:
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { (i) } 1610 & \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\end{array}$
(ii) $314.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Main effect of F and interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{F}$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Crop :~ Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref :- U.P. 51(47)/50(44)/49(40).
Type: ' M '.

Object :-To study the cumulative effect of application of A/S over a number of years to the same field with and without F.Y.M. on the yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Fallow. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.7.1951. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-138(early). (vii) N.A. (viii) Two weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.10.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of F.Y.M. : $\mathrm{F}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~F}_{1}=50$ and $\mathrm{F}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N
(2) 4 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{2}=40$ and $N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$.
F.Y.M, applied on 30.6.1951 and $A / S$ on 4.8.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 4$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $41^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}$. (b) $39.5^{\circ} \times 13.5^{\circ}$. (v) One row at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil, (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A.' (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 664.4 lb /ac.
(ii) $165.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of F and N are bighly significant. Interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{F}$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{3}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $F_{0}$ | 399.8 | 387.5 | 651.8 | 722.4 | 540.4 |
| $F_{1}$ | 402.1 | 687.7 | 545.4 | 912.8 | 637.0 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ | 679.8 | 749.3 | 984.5 | 850.1 | 815.9 |
| Mean | 493.9 | 608.2 | 727.2 | 828.4 | 664.4 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{F}$ $=41.45$ <br> S.E. of marginal mean of N  <br> S.E. of body of table $=87.86$ <br>   |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Crop :-Paddy.
Site :- Rice Rès. Stn., Nagin a.

Ref:- U.P. 52(141)/51(47)/50(44)/49(40).
Type:- 'M'.

Object:-To study the cumulative effect of application of $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ over a number of years to the same field $i$ with and without F.Y.M. on the yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Fallow-Paddy-Fallow-Paddy-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.6.1952. (iv) (a) 1 deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-1 38 (early). ivii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.10.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $F . Y . M: F_{0}=0, F_{1}=50$ and $F_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N .
(2) 4 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{2}=40$ and $N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N .
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 4$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) $122^{\circ}$ (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) $41^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}$. (b) $39 \frac{1}{}^{\prime} \times 131^{\prime}$. (v) $0.75^{\prime}$ border alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1985 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $352.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effest of $F$ is highly signifisant. Main effect of $N$ and interaction $N \times F$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{3}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{F}_{0}$ | 1466 | 1761 | 1732 | 1699 | 1664 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{1}$ | 1738 | 2148 | 1999 | 2214 | 2025 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ | 2275 | 2120 | 2356 | 2318 | 2267 |
| Mean | 1826. | 2010 | 2029 | 2077 | 1985 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{F}$ S.E. of marginal mean of N S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =88.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =101.8 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =176.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 53(165)/52(141)/51(47)/50(44)/49(40). Type := ' $M$ '.

Object :-To study the cumulative effect of application of $A / S$ over a number of years to the same field with and without F.Y.M. on the yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.7.1953. (iv) (a) 1 deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-138 (medium). (vii) Irrigated, (vii) 2 weedings. (ix) $46.28^{\prime \prime}$. (x) 19.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of F.Y.M. : $\mathrm{F}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~F}_{1}=50$ and $\mathrm{F}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
(2) 4 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{8}=40$ and $N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $N$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 4$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) i2. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) $41^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}$. (b) $39.5^{\prime} \times 13.5^{\circ}$. (v) $.75^{\prime}$ border around each experimental plot (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) 50 to $75 \%$ lodging was noted. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $2213 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $334.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only the interaction $N \times F$ is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{3}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $F_{0}$ | 1760 | 1916 | 2226 | 2377 | 2070 |
| $F_{1}$ | 2112 | 2712 | 2132 | 2230 | 2296 |
| $\mathrm{F}_{2}$ | 2367 | 2308 | 2279 | 2138 | 2273 |
| Mean | 2080 | 2312 | 2212 | 2248 | 2213 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of N S E. of marginal mean of $F$ |  |  | $=96.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |
|  |  |  | $=83.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |
|  |  |  | $=167.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Paddy. } & \text { Ref:- U.P. 50(39). } \\
\text { Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina. . } & \text { Type :- ‘M’. }
\end{array}
$$

Object:-To find out the effect of application of Phosphate to a legume Rerseem in Rabi, on" subsequent Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1950/ 30.6.1950. (iv) (a) 1 deep ploughing and 2 shallew ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Arjana Pilibhit. (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. No. $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$.
4. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
5. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
6. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) $41^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}$. (b) $1 / 87,43$ ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
7. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $1484 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $327.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. | 1512 |
| 2. | 1519 |
| 3. | 1421 |
| S.E./mean | $=115.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy.<br>Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 51(48)/50(39).
Type : $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ ' M '.
Object:-To find out the effect of application of Super to a legume Berseem in Rabi on subsequent Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.7.1951/N.A. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-138 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings by band. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.10.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. $\mathrm{No}_{8} \mathrm{P}_{5}$.
4. Super at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$
5. Super at 100 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$

Super was applied $4^{\prime \prime}$ deep behind the plough.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3
(b) N.A.
(iii) 8. (iv) (a) $41^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$.
(b) $1 / 87.43 \mathrm{ac}$.
(v) One row at each end of the
plot. (vi Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory, (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS:
(i) $819.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $269.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 842.2 |
| 2. | 733.6 |
| 3. | 881.4 |
| S.E./mean | $=95.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

## Crop : Paddy.

Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref :- U.P. 52(142)/51(48)/50(39).
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.

Object:-To find out the effect of application of Super to a legume Berseem in Rabi on subsequent Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. : (b) Paddy followed by Berseem. (c) As per treatments. (iii) 1.7.1952. (iv) (a)

One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-138 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Two weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.10.1952.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. $\mathrm{No}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$.
2. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ at 100 Jb ./ac.
$\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super was applied $4^{\prime \prime}$ deep behind the plough.
4. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) $1 / 70.8$ ac. (b) $1 / 70.8$ ac. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
5. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield, (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil, (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
6. RESULTS:
(i) $1584: \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 182.56 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1b./ac.

Treatment Av. yield

| 1. | 1537 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. | 1523 |
| 3. | 1692 |

3. 1692
S.E./mean $=64.54 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref :m U.P. 49(108).
Type:- ' $M$ '.

Object :--To study the response of Paddy to the application of N, P and calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1949/14.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (i) Nil. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.9.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $\mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ confounded factorial. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication, 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\circ}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Height of plants, length of leaf, breadth of leaf, no. of tillers, no. of green leaves and grain yield. (v) (a) 1949-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bharari (Jhansi), Nawabganj (Bareilly) and Baoaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1602 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 196.59 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of N alone is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}$ | Mean | C | $C_{1}$ | C1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1194 | 1485 | 1364 | 1348 | 1349 | 1399 | 1294 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 1595 | 1585 | 1600 | 1593 | 1490 | 1655 | 1635 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1941 | 1926 | 1730 | 1866 | 1856 | 1821 | 1921 |
| Mean | 1577 | 1665 | 1565 | 1602 | 1565 | 1625 | 1617 |
| C. | 1615 | 1635 | 1444 | - |  |  |  |
| $C_{1}$ | 1600 | 1665 | 1610 |  |  |  |  |
| $C^{2}$ | 1515 | 1695 | 1640 |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table
$=46.33 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=80.27 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 50(158).
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.

Object :-To study the response of Paddy to application of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{P}$ and calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Oats. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) $1.6 .1950 / 12.7 .1950$. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. . (vi) Paddy T-36 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding on 7.8.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium: $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Manures applied on $\mathrm{S}, 6$ and 26.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ confd. Fact. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication, 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2 . (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield.' (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1392 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $331.05 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ alone is highly significant. others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

S.E. of any marginal mean $\quad=78.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of body of table $\quad=135.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

## Crop:- Paddy.

Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref :- U.P. 51(I64).
Type:- ' $M$ '.

- Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to three levels of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Oats. (b) Oats. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) First week of June/last week of Junc. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) 一. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii)
N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{6}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 leevels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$. ac .

N as A/S. $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Manures applied 3 days before transplanting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3^{3}$ partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block, 3 blocks/repliçation. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 31^{\circ}$. (v) 3' alround. (vi) Yes.

## 4 GENERAL :

(i) No lodging; moderate. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield (iv)(a) 1949-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Nawabganj (Bareilly), Tissuhi (Mirzapur). Bharari (Jhansi), Atarra (Banda), Pachperwa (Gonda) and Faizabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1019 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $248.85 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of N is bighly significant. All other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | C | C2 | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 644 | 724 | 796 | 721 | 730 | 780 | 653 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 886 | 1046 | 1085 | 1005 | 878 | 1110 | 1028 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1499 | 1203 | 1290 | 1330 | 1325 | 1201 | 1466 |
| Mean | 1009 | 991 | 1057 | 1019 | 977 | - 1030 | 1049 |
| C0 | 921 | 950 | 1061 | ' |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1136 | 912 | 1044 | * |  |  |  |
| C | 972 | 1110 | 1056 |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =58.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =101.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
$$

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res, Stn., Nagina.

Ref :- U.P.52(215).
Type in ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.

Otject :-To study the response of late Paddy to 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and calcium.
BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Oats. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.5.1952/10.7.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) 一. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$.fac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. N applicd on 15.7.1952, Gypsum on 9.7.1952 and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on 7.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Partially Confd. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block and 3 blecks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 37$. (b) $12^{\circ} \times 31^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL:

(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1952, (b) and (c). No. (v) (a) Nawabganj (Bareilly), Bharaci, Faizabad, Tissuhi and Pachperwa (Gonda): (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $2679 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$,
(ii) $486.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ alone is highly significant. Others are not significant. (iv).Av. yield of graia in lb,/ac.

|  | $P_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | C ${ }^{\text {c }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N o}^{\prime}$ | 1701 | 2194 | 2434 | 2110 | 2203 | 2063 | 2063 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 2645 | 2437 | 2745 | 2609 | 2093 | 2750 | 2984 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 3202 | 3458 | 3297 | 3319 | 3403 | 3011 | 3543 |
| Mean | 2516 | 2696 | 2825 | 2679 | 2566 | 2608 | 2863 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 2269 | 2564 | 2865 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 2439 | 2555 | 2830 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 2841 | 2968 | 2780 |  |  |  |  |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =114.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =198.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Paddy. } & \text { Ref:- U.P. 48(28). } \\
\text { Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
$$

Object:-To determine the residual effect of differeat doses of T.C. as manure applied in previous years on the yield of Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) $1.6 .1948 / 5.7 .1948$. (iv) (a) 1 deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c)-. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-21. (vii) N A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.10.1948.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Control.
4. T.C. at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
5. T.C. at $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
6. T.C. at 150 lb ./ac. of N .

Manures applied last year. No manure was applied this year.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $41^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $1 / 76.81$ ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i), Normal. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945-1948, (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1566 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $243.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1 b ./ac.

| Treatment | $A v$, yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1472 |
| 2. | 1723 |
| 3. | 1534 |
| 4. | 1533 |
| S.E./mean | $=99.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 53(166).
Type :- ' $M$ '.

Object :-To find out the most economic dose of N in the form of $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$.

## 1. BÁSAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Paddy. (b) Berseem. (c) No. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N,A. (iii) 6.7.1953. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing, 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-138 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) $46.28^{\circ}$. (x) 13.10.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. No manure.
2. A/S at $30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$, of $\mathbf{N}$.
3. A/S at $60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
4. A/S at 90 lb ./ac. of N .
5. A/S at $120 \mathrm{lb} . / a c$. of N .
6. $A / S$ at $150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .

Ist dose applied on 29.7.1953 and 2nd dose applied on 29.8.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a). $41^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}$. (b) $1 / 81.35$ th ac. (v) $1^{\prime}$ border around each experimental plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor; 50 to $75 \%$ crop lodged in different plots. (ii) Not recorded. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Treatment no. 5 (A/S at $120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.) was missing in all the four replicates and so it was totally eliminated while analysis was done. (vii) Conducted by A.E,B.(P).

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $2433 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $367.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 2028 |
| 2. | 2169 |
| 3. | 2595 |
| 4. | 2678 |
| 5. | - |
| 6. | 2694 |
| S.E./meas | $=183.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref :- U.P. 52(143).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the effect of $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}$ in comparison with $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ or the yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Oats. (c) No. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Transplanting on 1.7.1952. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) \& (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-138. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (X) 6.10.1952.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a Control.
(1) 2 sources of $N: S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / S / N$.
(2) 3 levels of $N: N_{1}=30_{1} N_{2}=60$ and $N_{3}=90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$N_{1}$ applied one week after transplantation; $N_{2}$ applied one to three weeks after transplating and $N_{8}$ applied one, three and 5 weeks after transplantation.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $55^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$. (b) $1 / 58.34$ th ac. (v) No. of lines/plot $=23$; no. of lines/plot $=21$ at harvest, (vi) Yes.

4 GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $2214 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 274.40 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of N and control $v$ s. others are highly significant. Main effect of S is significant. Interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{S}$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain ia lb./ac.

|  | Control | $=1488$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | S | Mean |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1829 | 1775 | 1802 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 2342 | 2201 | 2272 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{3}$ | 3127 | 2734 | 2930 |
| Mean | 2433 | 2237 | 2335 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{N}$ |  |  | 9.21 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ |  |  | 4.68 lb |
| S.E. of body of table |  |  | 2.02 lb |

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:r U.P. 51(49).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}$ in comparison with $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ on the yield of Paddy crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Berseem and fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.5.1951/14.7.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) - (d) \& (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-137. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.10.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control.
(1) 2 sources of $N: S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=C / N$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=20, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=40$ and $\mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

C/N and A/S applied on 4.8.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $55^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}$. (b) $53^{\circ} \times 13^{\circ} \cdot$ (v) One row at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS:
(i) $990 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $152.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Control $v s$. others andimaineffect of $N$ are highly significant. Main effect of $S$ and interaction $S \times N$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.fac.

|  | Control=670 lb./ac. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $S_{1}$ | $S_{8}$ | Mean |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 766 | 880 | 823 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1024 | 1091 | 1057 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{3}$ | 1271 | 1228 | 1249 |
| Mean | 1020 | 1066 | 1043 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{N}$ |  | $=43.97 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}$. |  |
| S.E. of marginal mean of S |  | $=35.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |
| S.E. of body of table |  | $=62.18 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |

Crop:- Paddy.
Ref:- U.P. 48(30).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.
Type:- ‘M’.
Object :-To test efficacy of different sources of compost and its manurial value on Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N A. (iii) 1.6.1948/9.7.1948. . (iv) (a) One deep plough and 2 shallow ploughing. (b) Transplacting. (c) -. (d) \& (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T- 21 (mediumearly). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.10.1948.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control.
4. Maya Das compost at 50 lb ./ac. of N. .
5. Indore compost at 50 lb ./ac of N .
6. A.charya's compost at 50 lb ./ac. of N.
7. T.C. at $50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
8. A/S at 50 lb jac. of N .

Manuring of treatments 2, 3, 4 and 5 on 9.7.1948 and treatment 6 on 19.7.1948.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) $33^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}$. (b) $1 / 92.64$ th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. Norral. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2160 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $455.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 1645 |
| 2. | 2477 |
| 3. | 2206 |
| 4. | 2388 |
| 5. | 2418 |
| 6. | 1827 |
| S.E_/mean | $=203.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site : $\boldsymbol{\sim}$. Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 48(27).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To test the comparative merits of $A / S$ and $A / N$ on the yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1948/5.7.1948. (iv) (a) I deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c) -- (d) \& (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Anjana Pilibhit. (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.10,1948.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control.
(1) 2 sources of $N: S_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / N$.
(2) 2 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

Manuring on 9.8.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $33^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $1 / 92.63$ th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) 1978 lb./ac.
(ii) $306.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only control vs. others is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control $=\mathbf{1 3 4 2} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 2177 | 1961 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 2257 | 2152 |
| Mean | 2217 | 2056 |
| 22069 |  |  |
| 2137 |  |  |

S.E. of marginal mean of N.or $S \quad=88.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of body of table $\quad=124.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Crop :- Paddy. | Ref :- U.P. 49(43). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina. | Type :- 'M'. |

Object :-To study the manurial value of coconut cake on Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Oats. (b) Oats. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.6.1949/2.8.1949. (iv) (a) 1 deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) \& (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-17 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.12.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. No manure.
4. Coconut cake at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
5. Coconut cake at 50 lb ./ac. of N .
6. Coconut cake at $75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
7. Coconut cake at 100 lb ./ac. of N.

Manuring on 15.7.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) 1/73.3th ac. (t) $1 / 59.0$ th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nid. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1721 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(ii) $144.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1548 |
| 2. | 1723 |
| 3. | 1747 |
| 4. | 1856 |
| 5. | 1729 |
| S.E./mean | $=58.98 \mathrm{Ib}, / \mathrm{ac}$ |

```
Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn, Nagina.
```


## Ref :- U.P. 50(41)/49(43)., Type :- ' $M$ '.

Object :-To study the manurial value of coconut cake on Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Oats. (b) Paddy followed by oats. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) $10.6 .1953 /$ 15.7.1950. (iv) (a One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) \& (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-17 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.12.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. No marure.
2. Coconut cake at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. Coconut cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
4. Coconut cake at 75 lb ./ac. of N .
5. Coconut cake at $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .

Manuring on 15, 16.6.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $33^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $1 / 92.64$ th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL ;
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949—1950. (b) Yes, (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1984 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $233.0 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{/ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 1435 |
| 2. | 1836 |
| 3. | 2019 |
| 4. | 2438 |
| S. | 2194 |
| S.E./meaa | $=95.1 \quad$ Ib./ac. |

## Crop :- Paddy.

Ref:- U.P. 51(45).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

$$
\text { Type :- ' } M \text { '. }
$$

Object :-To find out the response of Paddy to application of super singly or in combination with compost and A/S.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil., (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.5.1951/14, 15.7.1951. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughiog. (b) Transplanting. (c) - (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-138 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.10.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of ( 1 ) and ( 2 ) +a selective treatment.
(1) 3 sources of $N: S_{0}=$ No manure, $S_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}$,/ac, of N as compost.
(2) 2 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0$ and $\mathrm{P}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}$. $/ \mathrm{ac}$ of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super.

Selective treatment $=A / S$ at 25 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+$ compost at 25 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Super at $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$. Compost applied on 2.7.1951, Super on 14.7.1951 and A/S on 6.8.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $55^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$. (b) $1 / 58.34$ th ac. (v) One row at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) $1951-1953$. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).

5, RESULTS :
(i) $653.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $146.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $S$ is highly significant ; interaction $S \times P$ is significant. Main effect of $P$ and selective treatment vs others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb}_{0} / a c$.

Selective treatment $=\mathbf{6 8 2 . 6} \mathbf{1 b}$./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 490.1 | 400.6 | 445.4 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | 912.0 | 763.3 | 837.6 |
| $\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 588.3 | 739.9 | 664.1 |
| Mean | 663.5 | 634.6 | 649.0 |

S.E. of marginal mean of $S$
S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{P}$
S.E. of body of table
S.E. of selective treatment

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =42.41 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =34.63 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =59.97 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =59.97 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
$$

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn. Nagina.

Ref. :- U.P. 52(145)/51(45)
Type:- 'M'

Object:-To find out the response of Paddy to application of super singly or in combination with compost and A/S.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem-Paddy-Oats. (b) Oats. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Transplanting on 2.7.1952. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) Transplanting (c)-. (d) \& (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T. 138. (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 meedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.10.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a selective treatment.
(1) 3 sources of $N: S_{0}=$ No manure, $S_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $S_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as compost.
(2) 2 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0$ and $\mathrm{P}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ as Super.

Selective treatment $=A / S$ at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Compost at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Super at $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{s}}$ -
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $1 / 52.8$ th ac. (b) $1 / 58.34$ th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E. B(P).
5. RESUL̇TS:
(i) 2039 lb./ac.
(ii) 276.7 lb /ac.
(iii) Main effect of $S$ is highly significant, others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb/ac.

Selective treatment $=\mathbf{2 2 1 8} \mathbf{l b} . / a c$.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{a}}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{S}_{0}$ | 1798 | 1808 | 1893 |
| $\mathbf{S}_{1}$ | 2259 | 2309 | 2284 |
| $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1987 | 1893 | 1940 |
| Mean | 2015 | 2003 | 2009 |

S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathrm{S}=79.87 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
S.E. of marginal mean of $P \quad \because=65.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E of body of table $\quad \because=112.95 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of selective treatment $\quad=112.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina

Ref. :- U.P. 53(167)/52(145)/51(45)
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '

Object :- To find out the response of Paddy to application of super singly or in combination with compost and A/S.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.7.1953. (iv)
(a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-138 (medium).
(vii) Irrigated (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) $46.28^{\circ}$. (x) 23.10 .1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a selective treatment.
(1) 3 sourees of $N: S_{0}=$ no manure, $S_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $S_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as compost.
(2) 2 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0$ and $\mathrm{P}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as super.

Selective treatment $=A / S$ at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N}+$ compost at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N}+$ super at $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $55^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}$. (b) $1 / 58.34$ th ac. (v) $1^{\circ}$ border around each experimental plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good; no lodging. (ii) Not recorded. (iii) Nil. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a), (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B.(P).
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1314 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $2770 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}$
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

Selective treatment $=1152 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

|  | $P_{\text {P }}$ | $\mathbf{P r}_{1}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S_{0}$ | 1384 | 1294 | 1339 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | 1155 | 1547 | 1351 |
| $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | . 1331 | 1332 | 1332 |
| Mean | 1290 | 1391 | 1341 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ <br> S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{P}$ <br> S.E. of body of table <br> S.E. of selective treatment |  | $=79.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .$ |  |
|  |  | $=65.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .$ |  |
|  |  | $=113.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ |  |
|  |  | $=113.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |

## Crop :- Paddy.

Ref:- U.P. 49(116).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj.
Type :- ' $M$ ';
Object:-To study the response of Paddy to three levels of $\mathrm{N}, \mathbf{P}$ and calcium (Ca).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram. (c) NA. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) $\mathbf{1 2 5} \cdot 1949 / 16,17.6 .1949$. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings. (b) Transplanting. (c) - (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) 1 weeding on 5.8.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 8.9.1949.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$. ac
(3) 3 levels of Calcium: $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. N applied on 23.6.1949, $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ on 14.6.1949 and 25.7.1949 and Ca on 14.6.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Confounded Fact. (ij) (a) 3 blocks/replication, 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Ht. of plants, no. of tillers, no. of green leaves, grain yield and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. . (v) (a) Bharari (Jhansi), Nagina (Bijnor) and Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1118 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}, \cdot$
(ii) $254.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) A.v. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | ${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | Mean | C0 | $\mathrm{Ci}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1078 | 1032 | 1058 | 1056 | 1082 | 1032 | 1054 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1153 | 1039 | 1158 | 1117 | 1125 | 1082 | 1142 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | - 1168 | 1108 | 1268 | 1181 | 1216 | 1214 | 1114 |
| Mean | 1133 | 1060 | 1161 | 1118 | 1141 | 1109 | 1103 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 1062 | 1097 | 1263 |  |  |  |  |
| $C_{1}$ | 1188 | 952 | 1188 |  |  |  |  |
| $C_{1}$ | 1149 | 1129 | 1032 |  |  |  |  |
| S.E. of any marginal mean $=60.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. <br> S.E. of body of table $=104.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

```
Crop :- Paddy.
Site:- Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj.
Ref:- U.P. 50(167).
Type:- 'M'.
```

Object :-To study the response of Paddy to three levels of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and calcium (Ca).

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.5.1950/18.6.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughing, turn-wrest plough on 23,24.5.1950 and Meston plough on 29 and 30.5.1950 (b) Transplanting. (c) 一. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CH-4 (early). (vii). Irrigated. (viii) Interculture on 19.8.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.9.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium: $\mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. N applied on 15.6.1950, Super on 15.6.1950 and Ca on 17.6.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Partially confd. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication, 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime \prime}$ (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bharari, Nagina and Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted ty C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2617 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $505.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{8}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 2437 | 2532 | 2688 | 2552 | 2835 | 2515 | 2308 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 2792 | 2671 | 2334 | 2599 | 2619 | 2861 | 2316 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 2740 | 2671 | 2692 | 2701 | 2766 | 2800 | 2537 |
| Mean | 2656 | 2625 | 2571 | 2617 | 2740 | 2725 | 2387 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 2843 | 2619 | - 2757 | - |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 2774 | 2826 | 2576 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 2351 | 2429 | 2381 |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =119.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =206.2 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{array}
$$

## Crop:- Paddy.

Site:- Regional Res. Stn., Nawabgunj.

Ref:- U.P. 51(163).
Type :- ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{M}$ '.

Object :-To study the response of Paddy to three levels of $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{P}$ and calcium (Ca).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) No. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2nd week of May/last week of June (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) - (d) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CH. 4 (early.) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) $J(2)$ and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Manures applied 3 days before transplanting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3^{3}$ partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block, 3 blocks/replication. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime \prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ on all sides of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Nagina, Tisuhi (Mirzapur), Atarra (Banda), Pachperwa (Gonda) and Faizabad, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1519 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 263.1 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of $C$ is significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb,/ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{Pa}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | Co | $\mathbf{C l}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 1487 | 1642 | 1798 | 1642 | 1487 | 1659 | $1780{ }^{\circ}$ |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1452 | 1547 | 1392 | 1464 | 1340 | 1383 | 1668 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1521 | 1403 | 1435 | 1452 | 1348 | 1435 | 1573 |
| Mean | 1487 | 1530 | 1541 | 1519 | 1391 | 1492 | 1674 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 1400 | 1322 | 1452 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1383 | 1435 | 1659 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 1677 | 1832 | 1512 |  |  |  |  |


| S.E. of any marginal mean | $=62.0 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{lac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of body of table | $=107.4 \cdot \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

> Crop :- Paddy.
> Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj.

Ref:- U.P. 52(216).
Type:- 'M'.
Object :-To study the response of Paddy to three levels of $N, \mathbf{P}$ and calcium (Ca).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem-Fallow, (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam . (b) N.A. (iii) 9.6.1952/27.7.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) - (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CH-4 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(l) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3. 3 levels of Calcium: $C_{6}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Date of manuring 13, 14.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{2}$ partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block, 3 blockg/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\circ} \times 42^{\circ}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) Nil. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain y ield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Pachperwa (Gonda), Tisuhi, Nagina (Bijnor), Badaras, Faizabad, Attara (Banda) and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1306 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 309.0 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{z}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1350 | 1134 | 1214 | 1233 | - 1234 | 1415 | 1050 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 1344 | 1281 | 1314 | 1313 | 1214 | 1329 | 1396 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1370 | 1301 | 1448 | 1373 | 1359 | 1350 | 1409 |
| Mean | 1355 | 1239 | 1325 | 1306 | 1269 | 1365 | 1285 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 1240 | 1199 | 1368 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{Cl}_{1}$ | 1506 | 1309 | 1279 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 1318 | 1208 | 1329 |  |  |  |  |


| S.E. of any marginal mean | $=72.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| ---: | :--- |
| , S.E. of body of table | $=126.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

## Crop :- Paddy. <br> Ref:- U.P. 53(43). <br> Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj. <br> Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to three levels of N, P and calcium (Ca).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy followed by gram or Berseem. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. ' (iii) 4.8.1953. (iv) (a) Two ploughings and pata on 25, 26, 30.7.1953 and 1.8.1953. (b) Transplanting. (c) (d) Plant spacing $9^{\circ}$ and row spacing $\mathbf{1 2}^{\prime \prime}$. (e) Single. (v) Nil. (vi) CH-4 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) NA. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum, N applied on 20.8.1953, $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on 2.8.8953 and Ca on 3.8.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Confounded Fact. (ii) (a) 9 plots/blcck, 3 tlccks/replicatiod. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$ (b) $12 \times 36^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra, (Banda), Bharari (Jhansi), Bana ras and Faizabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $2030 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$
(ii) $601.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1884 | 1607 | 1781 | 1757 | 1677 | 1400 | 2195 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 2454 | 2160 | 1746 | 2120 | 1832 | 2126 | 2402 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 2195 | 2195 | 2247 | 2212 | 2507 | 1935 | 2195 |
| Mean | 2178 | 1988 | 1924 | 2030 | 2005 | 1821 | 2264 |
| $C_{0}$ | 1832 | 1902 | 2281 | $\begin{aligned} & =141.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =347.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1832 | 1728 | 1902 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{8}$ | 2869 | 2333 | 1590 |  |  |  |  |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :~ Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj.

Ref:- U.P. 51(95).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of $N$ and $P$ applied alone and in combination. with each other, on the yield and quality of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Domat (Bareilly Type 3). (b) N.A. (iii) 23, 24.7.195t. (iv) (a) The field was prepared by ploughing with de si plough. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil, (vi, N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.11.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=25$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super. $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied broadcast and Super placed $3^{\text {ne}}-1^{\circ}$ deep in furrows bebind the plough, manuring of N on 27th August 1951 and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on 23.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $62^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}-7^{\prime}$. (b) A distance of one to three feet from plot to plot and three to four feet from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(j) Monsoon was abnormally delayed and canal Irrigation could not be obtained in time. The crop in general, was unsatis'actory. (ii) No. (i i Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Matkota and Nainital. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $748 \quad \mathrm{bb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $202.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ is highly significant. Main effect of $\mathbf{P}$ is significant. Interaction is not significant. (iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.


```
Crop :- Paddy.
Site:- Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj.
Ref: U.P. 52(5).
Type:- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '
```

Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied alone and in combination with each other, on yield and quality of Kharif crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam (Brreilly type-3 E). (b) NA. (iii) 6 to 8.7.1952. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with desi plough. (b) Seedlings planted in rows accordirg to local practices. (c) (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21 to 23.10.1952.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super. A/S applied as surface dressing by broadcast and Super drilled in furrows $4^{*}$ deep behind plough. Date of manuring 5, 6 and 9.7.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $22^{\circ} \times 49.5^{\circ}$. (b) $22^{\prime} \times 49.5^{\prime}$. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, crop lodged during formation of seeds and was severely damaged specially in those plots which had bumper crop. (ii) Attacked by rats. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952 (b) Yes (c) N.A. (v) (a) Partapgarh, Banaras, Atarra (Banda), Matkota (Nainital), Kalyanpur (Kanpur) and Bharari (Jhansi). (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESUCLTS:
(i) $1668 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $254.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ is highly significant. Main effect of $\mathbf{P}$ is significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1352 | 1407 | 1600 | 1453 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1633 | 1793 | 1766 | 1731 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{8}$ | 1760 | 1667 | 2033 | $1820^{\circ}$ |
| Mean | 1582 | 1622 | 1800: | 1668 : |
| S.E. of marginal mean of N or $\mathbf{P}$ |  |  | $=60.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |
| S.E. of body of table |  |  | $=104.0 \mathrm{l}$ l $\mathrm{b} / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj,

Ref:- U.P. 52(171).
Type:- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.

Object:-To study the effect of boron, molybdenum, corper, sulphur and zinc in preserce of adequate quantities of $N, P$ and $K$ on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clayey lo $m$. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.6.1952/23.7.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ to ke applied $6^{\circ}$ deep in furrows while preparing field, A/S as top dressing and Pot sulphate as top dressing at least one week tefore transplanting (applied on 13.7.1952). (vi) CH-4 (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 26.95". (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as molybdic acid at 5 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper $(\mathrm{Cu})$ as copper sulphate at $6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as commercial borax fit 1 lb ./ac. of $\mathbf{B}$.
5. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial sulphur at $50 \mathrm{Ib} . / a c$. of S .
6. Zinc ( Za ) as zinc sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zo .

A basal dose of $A / S$ at 30 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+$ Super at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+$ Pot. sulphate at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ is applied to all plots. Trace elements mixed with soil and applied as sarface dressings 5-6 days before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $35^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (b) $31^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging. Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra, Faizabad, Banaras, Bharari (Jhansi), Belatal, Bahraich and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Cooducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1341 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $201.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not sigaificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1407 |
| 2. | 1370 |
| 3. | 1207 |
| 4. | 1378 |
| 5. | 1312 |
| 6. | 1372 |
| S.E./mean | $=82.30$ lb./ac. |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.
Ref:- U.P. 50(213).
Type:- ' $M$ ' '
Object:-To study the response of late Paddy to three levels of $N, P$ and calcium (Ca).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil (b) Gram. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.7.1950/ 22 to 24.8.1953. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) Single plant $9^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}$ distance. (e) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) T-88 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) 41.43*. (x) 4.12.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), ( $2^{\prime}$ and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{cc}$.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum . Manuring on 19.8.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{8}$ partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block, 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $19.5^{\circ} \times 34.5^{\prime}$. (b) $13.5^{\circ} \times 28.5^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\circ}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop suffered due to no irrigation arrangement and failure of monsoon. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a Attara (Banda), Tisuhi (Mirz apur), Bhar יri (Jhacsi), Banaras, Nawabgunj (Bareilly) and Nagina (Bijnor). (b) N.A. (vi) Mil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $4536 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $128.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | C ${ }_{\text {e }}$ | $C_{1}$ | C2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 354.3 | 378.6 | 463.6 | 398.8 | 349.5 | 429.6 | 417.4 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 439.3 | 550.9 | 475.7 | 488.6 | 463.6 | 524.2 | 478.1 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 364.0 | 531.5 | 524.2 | 473.6 | 439.3 | 502.4 | 478.1 |
| Mean | 385.9 | 487.0 | 487.8 | 453.6 | 417.5 | 485.4 | 457.9 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 371.3 | 429.6 | 451.4 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 402.9 | 526.7 | 526.7 |  |  |  |  |
| $C_{2}$ | 383.5 | 504.8 | 485.4 |  |  |  |  |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P} \text { or } \mathrm{C} & =30.32 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =52.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\end{array}$

| Crop :- Paddy. | Ref:- U.P. 51(280). |
| :--- | ---: |
| Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa. | Type :- ‘M’. |

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to three levels of N, P and calcium (Ca).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Heavy soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.7.1951/27, 28.8.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) - (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-88 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{2}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Calcium (Ca) as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3^{3}$ confounded Factorial. (ii) (a) 9 plots/tlock, 3 blocks/replicaticn. (b) N.A. (iii) 2 (iv) (a) $19.5^{\circ} \times 34.5^{\circ}$.
(b) $13.5^{\prime} \times 38.5^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) No lodging, crop very poor, failed due to nen availability of water and late transplanting. (ii) Thero was attack of borer and the damage was about $15 \%$. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) $1950-1952$. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Nagina, Tisuhi (Mirzapur), Bharari (Jhansi), Atarra (Banda), Nawabgunj (Bareilly) and Faizabad. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $1644 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $421.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of N and interaction PXC is sigrifcan. All otter effects ord interacticas are no significant.

| (iv) A | $\underset{\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}}{\text { of grai }}$ | $\underset{\mathbf{P}_{1}}{\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | Mean | $C_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $C_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1361 | 1463 | 1298 | 1374 | 1419 | 1300 | 1402 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1698 | 1938 | 1747 | 1794 | 1754 | 1892 | 1737 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{8}$ | 1941 | 1630 | 1720 | 1764 | 1676 | 1681 | 1934 |
| , Mean | 1667 | 1677 | 1588 | 1644 | 1617 | 1625 | 1691 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 2006 | 1502 | 1342 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1436 | 1827 | 1611 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 1558 | 1703 | 1812 |  | - |  |  |
| S E. of marginal mean of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ or $\mathbf{C}$ S.E. of body of table |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =99.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =172.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.

Ref:- U.P. 52(196).
Type:- ' $\mathrm{M}^{\prime}$.

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to 3 levels of nitrogen, phosphate and calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Fallow. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hzavy ?clay. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.7.1952/14.8.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) \& (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-58 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2 TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $P_{2}=10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium: $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as super and Ca as Gypsum. Date of manuring 9,11.8.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Confd. Fact: (ii) (a) 3 Hocks'replication, 9 plots/block.
(b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $19.5^{\circ} \times 34.5^{\circ}$. (b)
' $13.5^{\prime} \times 28.5^{\prime}$. (v) $\mathbf{3}^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 19j3-19;2. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Cunducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1726 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $286.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only the main effect of N is signiflcant. All other effects and interactions are not significant. (iv) Av. yie'd of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{g}}$ | Mean | C0 | $C_{1}$ | C8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 1520 | 1603 | 1525 | 1549 | 1695 | 1336 * | 1617 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1683 | 1896 | 1894 | 18.4 | 1695 | 1554 | 1823 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1781 | 1838 | 1800 | 1836 | 1703 | 1849 | 1867 |
| Mean | 1661 | 1779 | 1739 | 1726 | 1698 | 1713 | 1769 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 1500 | 1724 | 1826 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1658 | 1823 | 1785 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 1826 | 1652 | 1697 |  |  |  |  |
| S.E. of any marginal mean $=67.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}$. <br> S.E. of body of table $\quad=116.8 \mathrm{lb} . j \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.
Ref:- U.P. 50(288).
Type :- 'M'. .

Object :-To find out best manure amongst A/S, green manure and F.Y.M: for late Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $41.43^{\prime \prime}$ (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. A/S at 50 lb /ac. of N .
2. Castor cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. F.Y.M. at 50 Jb /ac. of N.
4. Dhaincha at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
5. Control (no manure).
6. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) 1/92.52th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
7. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.E.B. (P).

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) 877 lb ./ac.
(ii) $185.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 882 |
| 2. | 1280 |
| 3. | 949 |
| 4. | 617 |
| 5. | 656 |
| S.E./mean | $=82.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

$$
\text { Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). Ref :- U.P. } 52(315) .
$$

Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.
Object :-To find out the best manure among A/S, green manure and F.Y.M.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.6.1952/13.8.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-88 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.11.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. A/S at 50 lb ./ac. of N .

2 Castor cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. F.Y.M. at 50 lb . Jac. of N .
4. Dhanicha at 50 lb ./ac. of N .
5. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $1 / 56$ ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.E.B. (P) to Govt. of U.P. Experiment failed in 1951.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1324 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $211.0 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences ara highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{Jb}_{\mathrm{A}} / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1374 |
| 2. | 1495 |
| 3. | 1357 |
| 4. | 1399 |
| S. | 997 |
| S.E./mean | $=86.14 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |


| Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). | Ref:- U.P. 49(235). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa. | Type :- 'M'. |

Object:-To find out the best manure among A/S, F.Y.M. and Castcr cake for late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hea vy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. A/S at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
4. Castor cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
5. F.Y.M. at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
6. Control (no manure).

Date and method of application-N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $1 / 90.5$ ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) Nil. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.E.B. (P) to Govt. of U.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1487 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $267.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yi:ld of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1818 |
| 2. | 1585 |
| 3. | 1381 |
| 4. | 1165 |
| S.E/mean | $=109.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa

Ref: U.P. 53(319)
Type : ‘ ${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{M}$ '.

Object : - To find out the best manure among A/S, green manure and compost for late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS.

1. $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at $50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
2. G N.C. at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. Compost at 5 J lb ./ac. of N .
4. Dhaincha (Green manuring).
5. Control.

Date and method of application-N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $32^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}$. (b) $30^{\circ} \times 25^{\circ}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL:
(i) N:A. (ii) Slight attack of stem borer. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by AEB (P) to Govt. of U.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1914 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $342.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.lac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 2148 |
| 2. | 2513 |
| 3. | 1783 |
| 4. | 1629 |
| 5. | 1498 |
| S.E./mean | $=139.7 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. |

```
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif)
Ref.:- U.P. 53(320)
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub.Stn., Pachperwa
Type : © \({ }^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\)
```

Objest :-To find out the efficacy of Japanese method of paddy cultivation.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy Loan. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.6.1953/28.7.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Local method of Paddy cultivation as followed at sub-station.
4. Japanese method as recomended by the state Department of Agriculture.

Compost applied at 20 C.L./ac. and A/S applied at 1.25 mds . per acre under the Japanese method.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $25^{\prime} \times 85^{\prime}$. (b) $23^{\circ} \times 83^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) NA. (ii) Slisht attack of stem borer, (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) Nil. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt, was conducted by AEB (P) to Govt. of U.P.
3. RESULTS :
(i) 1981 'b./ac.
(ii) $2 \times 4.3 \mathrm{lh}$.;าс.
(iii) Treatment difference is not sigaificant.
(iv) Av. yie'd of grain ia lb,/ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1931. |
| 2 | 2031. |
| S.E./mead | $=127.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). } & \text { Ref:- U.P. 53(357). } \\ \text { Site :- Govt. A gri. Farm, Pura. } & \text { Type :- ‘M'. }\end{array}$

Object :-To study the residual effect of N and P applied to previous crop on the yield of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Kanpur Type 2 soil. (b) Refer soil analysis, Pura. (iii) 12.5.1953. (iv) (a) Polewa given in the first week of May and then it was ploughed twice with Gujar plough and pata was given. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nit. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) $38.9^{\prime \prime}$. (x) $27,28.9 .1953$.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$, and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60$, and $\mathrm{P}_{8}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super. Manures applied to wheat in 1952-1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $53^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}$ (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination was good; growth good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa. yield (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Tissuhi. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1442 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $251.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effect of $\mathbf{P}$ is highly significant. Effect of N and interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $P_{0}$ | $P_{1}$ | $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 1101 | 1520 | 1680 | 1434 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 1443 | 1361 | 1461 | 1422 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1388 | 1365 | 1657 | 1470 |
| Mean | 1311 | 1415 | 1599 | 1442 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $N$ or $P$ | $=59.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |  |
| S.E. of body of table |  |  |  |  |

Crop :m Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Tissuhi.

$$
\text { Ref :- U.P. } 53(353) .
$$

Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.

Object :-To study the residual effect of $N$ and $P$ applied to previous crop on the yield of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Karail clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.6.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings on $14.6 .1953,22.6 .1953,29.6 .1953$ and 2.7 .1953 . (b) Sown in lines. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) The experiment was given a uniform manuring at 20 lb ./ac. of N on 17.8.1953. (vi) $\mathrm{N}-22$ (vii) Nil. (viii) Nij. (ix) $35.61^{\circ}$. (x) 8 to 12.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 leve's of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$, and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60$, and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ as Super. Manures applied to previous crop wheat in 1952-53.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) $26^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$, (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) to (b) Pura. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $412.7 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $83.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effects of N and P are bighly significant. Interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ is significant. (iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $P_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 266.9 | 315.8 | 388.6 | 323.8 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 295.2 | 377.3 | 505.9 | 392.8 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 351.7 | 490.0 | 723.0 | 521.6 |
| Mean | 304.6 | 394.4 | 539.2 | 412.7 |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{N}$ or $\mathbf{P}$ |  |  | $=19.60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |
| S.E. of body of table |  |  | $=33.951 \mathrm{l}_{\text {d/ac. }}$ |  |


| Crop :- Paddy. | Ref :- U.P. 50(127). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Tissuhi. | Type :- 'M'. |

Object:-To study the effect of varying doses of Sulphur and Boron in combination with $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ on late Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard clay. (b) N.A. (iii) $25.6 .1950 / 24$ to 27.8.1950. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) $9^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}$. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 fertilizers: $\mathrm{O}=$ No manure, $\mathrm{N}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N and $\mathrm{P}=20 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}$.
(2) 3 levels of Boron: $\mathrm{B}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~B}_{1}=5$ and $\mathrm{B}_{2}=10 \mathrm{lb}$./ac..
(3) 3 levels of Sulphur: $S_{0}=0, S_{1}=5$ and $S_{2}=10 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of Sulphur.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{8} \mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Boron as Borax applied on 21,22.8.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) $58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $52^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) $1950-1951$. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vi) Conduited by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $2925 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $319.3 \mathrm{ib} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | 0 | N | P | - Mean | $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{B}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ | 2063 | 2210 | 2379 | 2384 | 2120 | 2520 | 2452 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | 1827 | 1752 | 2583 | 2054 | 2392 | 1911 | 1860 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | 1836 | 2625 | 2066 | 2176 | 2030 | 2219 | 2278 |
| Mean | 1909 | 2196 | 2510 | 2205 | 2201 | 2217 | 2197 |
| $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ | 1674 | 2219 | 2709 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | 1950 | 2120 | 2580 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ | 2102 | 2249 | 2240 |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of any marginal mean $\quad=61.45 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of body of table $\quad=106.43 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Tissuhi.

Ref:- U.P. 51(137).
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.

Object :-To study the effect of varaying doses of Sulphur and Boron in combination with $\mathbf{N}$ and P on late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard clay. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.6.1951/24,25.8.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting (c) -. (d) $9^{\circ} \times 9^{4}$. (e] N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) $29.80^{\circ}$. (x) N.A.

## 2, TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 fertilizers : $\mathrm{O}=$ No manure, $\mathrm{N}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N and $\mathrm{P}=20 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{8}}$.
(2) 3 levels of Boron: $B_{3}=0, B_{1}=5$ and $B_{2}=10 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Sulphur: $S_{0}=0, S_{1}=5$ and $S_{2}=101 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $A / S, \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ as Super, Sulphur as commercial Sulphur and Boron as commercial Borax. Manuring on 19,20.8.1951.

## 3. DESIGN :

(i) $3^{3}$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $66^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}$. (b) $52^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}$. (v) Plot bund- 1'. field border-4' and irrigation channel-4'. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging, there was no water in the canal and the crop suffered very much for want of water. (ii) Nil. (iij) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2387 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $440.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the main effects and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | 0 | N | P | Mean | $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{S}_{0}$ | 1967 | 2138 | 2748 | 2284 | 1821 | 2547 | 2482 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | 1701 | 2604 | 2320 | 2208 | 2212 | 2320 | 2093 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | 2129 | 3606 | 2269 | 2373 | 2927. | 2532 | 2544 |
| Mean | 1932 | 2783 | 2446 | 2387 | 2321 | 2467 | 2373 |
| $\mathrm{B}_{0}$ | 1782 | 2676 | 2505 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{B}_{1}$ | 1994 | 2984 | 2422 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{B}_{2}$ | 2021 | 2688 | 2410 |  |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =84.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of any table } & =146.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
$$

## Crop :- Paddy.

Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref :- U.P. 50(93).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of time of application of $\mathbf{N}$ on growth, performance and yield of late Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Kesari. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard clayey with Usar patches at places. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.6.1950/ 31.8.195) to 3.9.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughing 3 times by desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) 一. (d) $9^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}$. (c) Single plant. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings (ix) $35.67^{\circ}$ : (x) 2nd week of December.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control.
(1) 2 sources at 6) lb./ac. of $\mathrm{N}: \mathbf{S}_{1}=A / S$ and $S_{2}=A / N$.
(2) 6 times of application of $N: T_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $T_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Full}$ dose 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{8}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and balf 30 days after transplanting. $T_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 50 days after transplanting and $\mathrm{T}_{6}=$ Half 30 days after transplanting and the other half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $28^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}$. (b) $22^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The crop was severely damaged due to the total failure of rains at the right moment. Late transplanting due to late rains further derressed the yielj. (ii) Slight artack of poricularia oryzac and Stem-borer. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-19;1. (b, and (c) No. (v) (a) Hawalbagh, Luvknow and Barabanki. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $128.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $92.96 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Nore of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control=122.1 Ib./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | T 2 | $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | T | $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | T ${ }_{6}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $S_{1}$ | 87.4 | 163.5 | 87.4 | 100.8 | 137.8 | 80.6 | 109.6 |
| $S_{1}$ | 218.4 | 107.5 | 168.0 | 172.5 | 48.2 | 179.2 | 148.9 |
| Mean | 152.9 | 135.5 | 127.7 | 136.6 | 93.0 | 129.9 | 129.3 |
|  | S.E of marginal mean of $S$ $S E_{+}$of marginal mean of $T$ |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =21.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =37.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =53.67 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :m Late Paddy Res. Submin., Tissuhi.

Ref.. U.P. 51(124).
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of time of application of $\mathbf{N}$ on the growth, performances and yield of late Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard c'ayey. (b) N.A. (iii) Middle of June/3rd week of July. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (vi) T. 36 (late). Nil. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2)+one control.
(1) 2 sources at 60 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N}$.
(2) 6 times of application of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=\mathbf{F u l l}$ dose $30^{\circ}$ days after transplanting, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 30 days after transplanting, $T_{5}=1$ at transplanting and half 50 days after transplanting, and $\mathrm{T}_{6}=\mathrm{Haf} 30$ days after transplanting and the other half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $28^{\prime} \times 29^{\circ}$. (b) $22^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very poor growth and yield of Paddy. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow and Hawalbagh (Almora). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $338.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $106.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $S$ and $T$ are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control $=210.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{a}}$ | $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{6}}$ | $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{6}}$ | $\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{6}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 380.0 | 262.0 | 394.8 | 276.7 | 483.3 | 313.6 | 351.7 |
| $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{a}}$ | 158.7 | 464.9 | 461.2 | 453.8 | 180.8 | 365.3 | 347.4 |
| Mean | 269.4 | 363.4 | 428.0 | 365.2 | 332.0 | 339.4 | 349.6 |


| S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ | $=25.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ | $=43.46 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| S.E. of body of table | $=61.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop:-Paddy. ' Ref :- U.P. 50(94).
Site:- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi. Type :- 'M'.
Object:-To study the effect of time of application of $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ on growth, performance and yield of late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Resari. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard clayey with Usar patches at places. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.6 .1950 / 31.8.1950 to 3.9.1950. (iv (a) Ploughings 3 times with desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) 一. (d) $9^{\circ \prime} \times 9^{\circ}$. (e) 1. (v) Nil (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) 35.67". (x) 2nd week of December

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + one control.
(1) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ (at 40 lb ./ac.) : $\mathrm{S}_{1}=$ Euper and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=A \mathrm{mmo}$. Phos.
(2) 6 times of applicatian of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Full dose 30 days after transplantirg, $T_{3}=$ Full dose 50 days after transplanting, $T=\frac{1}{3}$ at transplanting and half 30 days after transplanting, $T_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 50 days afier transplanting and $T_{6}=$ Half 30 days after transplanting and the other half 50 days after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $28^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}$. (b) $22^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The crop was severely damaged due to the total failure of rains at the right moment. Late transplanting due to late rains further depressed the yield. (iii) Attack of pori cularia oryzac and stem borer. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow and Barabanki. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $68.41 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $30.24 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control=57.12 lb./ac.

|  | T 1 | T2 | T3 | Ts | T | T6 | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{S}_{1}$ | 61.60 | 91.84 | 50.40 | 63.54 | 67.20 | 57.12 | 65.33 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | 50.40 | 57.12 | 54.88 | 122.08 | 59.36 | 96.32 | 73.36 |
| Mean | 56.00 | 74.48 | 52.63 | 92.96 | 63.28 | 76.72 | 69.34 |
|  | S.E. of marginnl mean of $S$ <br> S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ <br> S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =7.13 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =12.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =17.46 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

Crop:- Paddy.
Ref:- U.P. 51(123).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the effect of time of application of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on the growth, performance and yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard clayey. (b) N.A. (iii) Middle of June/3rd week of July. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) $\rightarrow$ (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of ( 1 ) and (2) + a control
(1) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ (at $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.) : $\mathrm{S}_{1}=$ Super and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ Ammo. Phos.
(2) 6 times of application of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}=$ Full dose at transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=$ Full dose 30 days after transplanting, $T_{2}=$ Full dose 50 days after transflanting, $T_{4}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 30 days after transplanting, $\mathrm{T}_{5}=\frac{1}{2}$ at transplanting and half 50 dass alter transplantirg and $T_{5}=$ Half 30 days after transplanting and the other half $\mathbf{5 0}$ days after transplantiog.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $28^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}$. (b) $22^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL:
(i) Very poor growth and yield of Paddy. (ii) Nil. (iii' Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) Conducied by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $436.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(ii) $2 \div 4.16 \mathrm{lb}$./ac
(iii) Main effect of $S$ is highly significant, control $v s$, treated is significant and main effect of $T$ and interaction $\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{T}$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | TI | $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | T8 | T4 | T5 | T ${ }_{6}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{S}_{1}$ | 402.2 | 199.2 | 199.2 | 287.8 | 468.6 | 446.4 | 333.9 |
| $\mathrm{S}_{8}$ | 778.5 | 660.4 | 339.4 | 733.5 | 619.8 | 420.6 | 591.5 |
| Mean | 590.4 | 429.8 | $269.3{ }^{\text {' }}$ | 509.2 | 544.2 | 433.5 | 462.7 |
|  | S.E. of marginal mean of $S$ <br> S.E. of marginal mean of $T$ <br> S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =57.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =99.69 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =140.97 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref :- U.P. 51(138).
Type :- 'M'.

Objezt:-To study the effect of varying doses of trace elsmants in com bination with $N, P$ and $K$ on the growth and yield of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard clay. (b) N.A. (iii) $30.6 .1951 / 24,25.8 .1951$ (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) $\rightarrow$ (d) $9^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}$. (e, N.A. (v) $33 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, 15 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super (single) and 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ as Sulphate of potash. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $34.31^{\circ}$. ( x ) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control.
2. Molybdic acid ( $41.1 \% \mathrm{MO}$ ) at I lb./ac. of Mo.
3. Molybdic acid $(41.1 \%$ Mo $)$ at $3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Mo.
4. Molybdic acid ( $41.1 \% \mathrm{Mo}$ ) at $6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Mo.
5. Copper Sulphate $(25.46 \% \mathrm{Cu})$ at $3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Cu .
6. Copper Sulphate $(25.46 \% \mathrm{Cu})$ at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .

7. Commercial Borax $(9.4 \% B)$ at $1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of B.
8. Commercial Borax $(94 \% \mathrm{~B})$ at $2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of B.
9. Commercial Borax $(9.4 \% \mathrm{~B})$ at $4 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}$. of B.
10. Commercial Sulphur ( $85 \% \mathrm{~S}$ ) at 15 lb . ac . of S .
11. Commercial Sulphur ( $55 \% \mathrm{~S}$ ) at 30 lb .jac. of S .
12. Commercial Sulphur $(85 \% \mathrm{~S})$ at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of S .
13. Zinc Sulphate $(\mathbf{2 2 . 7 4} \% \mathrm{Zn})$ at I lb./ac. of Zn
14. Zinc Sulphate $\left(22 \cdot 74 \% Z_{1}\right)$ at $4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Zn .
15. Zinc Sulphate ( $\mathbf{2 2 . 7 4} \% \mathrm{Za}$ ) at $10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Za .

## 3. DESIGN :

(i) R,B D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) $58^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}$. (b) $52^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951—1952. (b), (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1302 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $343.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in it.jac.

| Av. yield of grain in it.jac. <br> Treatment | Av. yield | Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1321 | 9. | 1177 |
| 2. | 1041 | 10. | 1552 |
| 3. | 946 | 11. | 1207 |
| 4. | 1047 | 12. | 1303 |
| 5. | 1429 | 13. | 1370 |
| 6. | 1494 | 14. | $1: 08$ |
| 7. | 1597 | 15. | 1171 |
| 8. | 1115 | 16. | 1655 |
|  | S.E./mean | $=171.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Crop :- Paddy. $\quad$ Ref:- U.P. 52(162).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Sın., Tissuhi.

Object :-To study the effect of $v$ arying doses of trace elements in com.tiration wilh $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ P.ard K cn growth and yield of late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy clay. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v As per treatment. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 30.02*. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Control ( 5 plots/block).
4. Molybder um (MO) as Moly bdic acid at 1 lb ./ac. of Mo.
5. Molybdenum (Mo) as Molybdic acid at 3 lb ./ac of Mo.
6. Molybdenum (Mo) as Moly bdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
7. Copper $(\mathrm{Cu})$ as Copper Sulphate at $3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathbf{C u}$.
8. Copper $(\mathrm{Cu})$ as Copper Sulphate at $6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. $\mathrm{cf} \mathbf{C u}$.
9. Copper ( Cu ) as Copper Sulphate at $12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Cu .
10. Boron (B) as cummercial Borax at 1 lb ./ac. of $B$.
11. Boron ( $B$ as commercial Borax at 2 lb ./ac. of $B$.
12. Boron B) as commercial Borax at 4 lb ./ac of $\mathbf{B}$.
13. Zinc ( Zn ) as Zinc Sulphate at $1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Zn ,
14. Zinc $(Z \mathrm{Z})$ as Zinc Sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Za .
15. Zinc (Zn) as Zinc Splphateat $\mathbf{1 0} \mathbf{1 b}$./ac. of $\mathbf{Z n}$
16. Sulphur ( $S$ ) as commercial Sulphur at 15 lb ./ac. of $S$.
17. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial Sulphur at 30 lb ./ac. of $S$.
18. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial Sulphur at $50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ of S .

A basal dressing of 30 lb ./ac. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+15 \mathrm{lb}$. ac . of $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super +15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ as Pot. Sulphate was applied to all treatments including control plots
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 20. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $52^{\prime} \times 12^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1306 lb./ac.
(ii) $363.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii Treatment diferences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield | Treatment | Av. yie'd |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1321 | 9. | 1178 |
| 2. | 1041 | 10. | 1553 |
| 3. | 947 | 11. | 1207 |
| 4. | 1048 | 12. | 1304 |
| 5. | 1429 | 13. | 1371 |
| 6. | 1494 | 14. | 1409 |
| 7. | 1598 | 15. | 1171 |
| 8. | 1115 | 16. | 16:6 |
|  | S.E./mean (excluding control mean) S.E. for control mean |  | lb./ac. |

```
Crop :- Paddy.
Ref:- U.P. 50(195).
```

Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Paddy to $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and Calcium ( CaO ).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Kesari. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard clay. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.6.1950/16 and 17.8.1950. (iv) (a) 3 ploughing with desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. N applied on 14.8.50, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on 13.8.1950 and Ca on 12.8.1950.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3^{\mathbf{a}}$ partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block, 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $21^{\prime} \times 36^{\circ}$.
(b) $15^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield, (iv) (a) $1950-1952$. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra (Banda) Banaras, Bharari (Jhansi) Pachperwa (Gonda), Nawabganj (Bareilly) and Nagina (Bijnor). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $454.9 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $323.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only the main effect of N is siznificant.
(iv) Av. yjeld of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $P_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P a}_{2}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 178.3 | 396.2 | 385.8 | 320.1 | 302.8 | 278.0 | 379.6 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 253.1 | 555.9 | 657.5 | 488.8 | 512.3 | 535.2 | 419.0 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 383.7 | 522.7 | 761.3 | 555.9 | 659.6 | 550.0 | 458.4 |
| Mean | 271.7 | 491.6 | C01. 5 | 454.9 | 491.6 | 454.4 | 419.0 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 396.2 | 460.5 | 618.1 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 157.6 | 526.9 | 678.3 |  |  |  |  |
| $c_{2}$ | 261.4 | 487.5 | 508.2 |  |  |  |  |
|  | S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ or C S.E. of body of table |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =76.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =132.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

$$
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { Crop :- Paddy. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 51(162). } \\
\text { Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
$$

Object : - To study the response of late Paddy to N, P and Calcium (CaO).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Hard clay. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.6.1951/30.7.1951 and 31.7.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) $35.29^{\circ}$. (x) 18th, 19th, and 20 th November 1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$, and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40$
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Ca applied $\mathfrak{i}$ on 28.7.1951, $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on 29.7.1951 and N on 30.7.1951.

## 3. DESIGN :

(i) $3^{3}$ Partially Confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/blcck, 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $21^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (b) $15^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Nagina (Bijnor), Nawabgunj (Bareilly), Bharari (Jhansi), Atarra (Banda), Pachperwa (Gonda) and Faizabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Crop was transplanted very late. : (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $952 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $594.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P} \text { or } C^{:} & =140.1 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac} \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =242.7 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}
\end{array}
$$

## Crop:- Paddy.

Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref :- U.P. 52(213).
Type :- ' $M$ '.

Object:-To study the response of Paddy to N, P and Calcium (CaO).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (s) Nit. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Heavy clay. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.6.1952/12 and 13.8.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36 (late). (vii) N.A. (viji) NA. (ix) 30.02'. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium: $\mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. N applied on 12.8.1952, $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ on 10.8 .1952 and Ca on 9.8.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3^{3}$ Partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/blcck, 3 blccks/replication (iii) 2 (iv) (a) $21^{\prime} \times 36^{\circ}$. (b) $15^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) Pachperwa (Gonda), Banaras, Nagina (Bijoor), Nawabgunj (Bareilly) Faizabad, Atarra (Banda), Bharari (Jhansi). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1103 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 586.0 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | C | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1026 | 660 | 1021 | 902 | 975 | 560 | 1172 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1215 | 701 | 1311 | 1076 | 1344 | 1170 | 1. 714 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{8}$ | 1545 | 1444 | 1006 | 1332 | 1776 | 1095 | 1124 |
| Mean | 1263 | 935 | 1113 | 1103 | 1365 | 942 | 1003 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{6}$ | 1143 | 1278 | 1674 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1243 | - 776 | 807 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | 1402 | 751 | 857 |  |  |  |  |

$\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.R of marginal mean of } \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P} \text { or C } & =138.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =239.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}$

## Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). <br> Ref :- U.P. 50(292). <br> Site :- Rate Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi. <br> Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.

Object :-To find out the best manure for late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.(vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $45.43^{\circ}$. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Castor cake.
4. Compost.
5. Dhaincha.
6. A/S.
7. Cor trol.

Rate of application-N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $1 / 86.71$ ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. i
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) $1950-1953$. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Raw data N.A. The experiment was conducted by A.E.B. (P) T.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 738.0 lb ./ac.
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1016.6 |
| 2. | 924.5 |
| 3. | 647.7 |
| 4. | 566.3 |
| S. | 535.1 |
| S.E $/$ mean | $=$ N.A. |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
. Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref:- U.P. 51(276),
Type :a 'M'.

Object:-To select the lest manure for late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $48.12^{\circ}$. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Castor cake.
4. Compost.
5. $A / S$.
6. Dhaincha.
7. Control.

Rate of application-N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $1 / 86.71$ ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) $1550-1953$. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Raw data N.A. The experiment was conducted by A.E.B. (P) T.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1135 lb . ac .
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1661 |
| 2. | 1122 |
| 3. | 995 |
| 4. | 978 |
| 5. | 917 |
| S.E./mean | $=$ N.A. |

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. SubwStn., Tissuhi.

Ref:- U.P.52(318). Type: $\boldsymbol{-}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.

Object : -To select best manure for late Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to bard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (v) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Castor cake.
4. Compost.
5. Dhaincha green manure.
6. A/S.
7. Control.

Rate of application - N.A.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $1 / 86.7$ as. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) 19 ;0—1953. (b) N.A. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Raw data N.A. The experiment was conducted by A.E.B. (P) T.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1125 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) N.A.
(iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}$.

| Av. yield of grain |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Treatment | AN. yield |
| 1. | 2016 |
| 2. | 1099 |
| 3. | 939 |
| 4. | 893 |
| 5. | 677 |
| S.E./mean | $=$ N.A. |


| Crop :- Paddy. | Ref :- U.P. 53(324). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub- Stn., Tissuhi. | Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}^{\prime}$. |

Object :-To select the best among different manures.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish . black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) 19.7.1953.' (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Traniplanted. (c) - . (d) $9^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}$. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. A/S at 50 lb ./ac. of N .
4. Castor cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
5. Compost at $50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
6. Dhaincha green manuring.
7. Control.
8. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $35^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime} \times 14^{\circ}-3^{\circ}$. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
9. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) $1950-1953$. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.E.B (PT.).
10. RESULTS :
(i) $1052 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $506.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatmẹt differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

| Treatmrnt | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 854 |
| 2. | 1869 |
| 3. | 935 |
| 4. | 622 |
| 5. | 979 |
| S.E. $/$ mean | -226.6 |
|  | lb.lac. |

Ref :- U.P. 49(107).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.
Object : - To study the response of Paddy to N, P and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Peas and Barley. (c) Sanal grean manured. (ii) (a) Medinm alluvium. (b) Refer soll analysis, Varanasi. (iii) $5.5 .1949 / 26,27.6 .1949$. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation by tractor, Palewa on 19.6.1949. Ploughings on 20.6.1949, 21, 22.6.1949. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 43.16". (x) 23 and 24.9.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and 60 lb ./ac. of Ca.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ Partially confounded. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication, 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) D.D.T. spray on 26.8 .1949 . (iii) Height of paddy plants in cm. No. of tillers/plant, green leaves, dry leaves, length of green leaves and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bharari (Jhansi), Nawabgunj (Bareilly) and Nagina (Bijnor). (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1779 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 272.6 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ alone is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1 lb ./ac.


| S.E. of any marginal mean | $=64.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of body of any table | $=111.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

## Crop :- Paddy.

Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Rēf :- U.P: 50(193).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the response of Paddy to N, P and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Peas and gram. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi, (iii) 19.5.1950/29 and 30.6.1950. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings on 13.5.1950, 19.6.1950, 22.6.1950 and 23.6.1950. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil, (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) Nil. (ix) $39.30^{\circ}$. (x) 26.9.1950 and 27.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium : $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=6010$./ac. of Ca .

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Manuring on 24.6.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ partially coiffounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block 3 block/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2 . (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\circ}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Slightly affected by gundhl bug, yield reduced by 20\%. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra (Banda), Tissuhi (Mirzapur), Bharari (Jhansi) Pachperwa (Gonda) Nawabganj (Bareilly) and Nagina (Bijnor). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $237.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $120.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $N, P, C$ and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | . $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $P_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 246.3 | 220.4 | 198.8 | 221.8 | 177.2 | 276.6 | 211.7 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 207.4 | 330.6 | 341.4 | 293.1 | 309.0 | 287.4 | 283.0 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{3}$ | 181.4 | 168.5 | 242.0 | 197.3 | 237.7 | 194.5 | 159.9 |
| Mean | 211.7 | 239.8 | 260.7 | 237.4 | 241.3 | 252.8 | 218.2 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 203.1 | 231.2 | 289.5 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 218.2 | 259.3 | 280.9 |  |  |  |  |
| $\therefore C_{2}$ | 213.9 | 229.0 | 211.7 |  |  |  |  |


| S.E. of any marginal mean | $=28.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of body of any table | $=49.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 52(214).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of late Paddy to $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{P}$ and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Bariey. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) N.A. 20.7.1952. (iv) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

2 TREATMENTS:
All combinations (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium: $C_{0}=0 . C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum. Date of manuring 12.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{3}$ partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block, 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\circ} \times 42^{\circ}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Pachperwa (Gonda) Tissuhi (Mirzapur), Nagina (Bijnor), Nawabganj (Bareilly), Faizabad, Atarra (Banda), and Bharari (Jhansi). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) 709.4 lb . Jac.
(ii) $279.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects and their interactions is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | C2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 747.6 | 600.7 | 697.9 | 682.1 | 764.9 | 615.8 | 665.5 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 764.9 | 676.3 | 795.1 | 745.4 | 730.3 | 803.8 | 702.2 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 747.6 | 734.6 | 620.1 | 700.8 | 741.1 | 743.3 | 617.9 |
| Mean | 753.4 | 670.5 | 704.4 | 709.4 | 745.4 | 721.0 | 661.9 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 907.5 | 605.0 | 723.8 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 665.5 | 855.6 | 641.7 |  |  |  |  |
| $C_{4}$ | 687.1 | 551.0 | 747.6 |  |  |  |  |


| S.E. of any marginal mean | $=65.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of body of any table | $=114.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Regional Res. Stn. Varanasi.
Ref:- U.P. 53(39)
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.
Object :-To study the response of Paddy to N, P and Calcium.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay Loam. (b) Refer sail analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 23,24.7.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 21 and 23.7.1953. (b) Transplanting. (c) - . (d) Row spacing $12^{\circ}$ and plan spacing $9^{\circ}$. (e) Single seedling. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii). Intercultural operation such as boeing and weeding are common in practico. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.10.53.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{N}_{0}=0 . \quad \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}:-\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{8}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 levels of Calcium :- $C_{0}=0, C_{1}=30$ and $C_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super and Ca as Gypsum . Super placed $3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in soil behind the plough 3 days before sowing. Gypsum applied as surface dressing a day before sowing. A/S applied as top dressing 2 weeks after germination.
3. DEIIG.N :
(i) $3^{3}$ confounded factorial. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block, 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$ (b) $12^{\prime} \times 36^{\circ}$. (v) Plot bound $3^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}$ (high) alround. Irrigation channel $4^{\prime}$ and field border $4^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of Gundhi bug. (iii) Grain yield and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Attara, Bharari (Jhansi), Faizabad and Nawabgang (Bareilly). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $2174 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $233.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effec:s of $N, P$, and $C$ are highly significant. Interaction NXP is significant. Interactions $N \times C$ and $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{C}$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | Mean | C0 | $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | C3 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 1478 | 1694 | 1932 | 1701 | 1357 | 1776 | 1971 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | 1990 | 2474 | 2331 | 2265 | 1843 | 2411 | 2541 |
| $\mathbf{P a}_{9}$ | 2286 | 2446 | 2934 | 2555 | 2124 | 2573 | 2969 |
| Mean | 1918 | 2205 | 2399 | 2174 | 1775 | 2253 | 2494 |
| $\mathrm{C}_{0}$ | 1445 | 1763 | 2115 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{1}$ | 1988 | 2416 | 2357 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{C}_{2}$ | $2321{ }^{\circ}$ | 2435 | 2725 |  |  |  |  |
| S.E. of marginal mean of N, P or C S.E. of body of any table |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =55.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =95.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

> Crop :- Paddy.
> Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 52(173).

Sit Regional Res. Sti, Varana
Type :- ' M '.
Object:-To study the effect of varying doses of trace elements in presence of adequate quantities of $N, P$ and $K$ on growth, yield and quality of Paddy.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d), (e) N.A. (v) $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ to be applied $6^{\circ}$ deep, in furrows while preparing the field. A/S and Potassium Sulphate as top dressing one week before transplanting. (vi) $\mathbf{N} \mathbf{- 2 2}$ (Early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as Molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper (Cu) as Copper Sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as commercial Borax at 1 lb ./ac. of $\mathbf{B}$.
5. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial Sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of $S$.
6. Zinc (Zn) as Zinc Sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .

A basal dose of $A / S$ at 30 lb ./ac. of $N+$ Super at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+$ Pot. Sul. at 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. is applied to all treatments. Trace elements mixed with fine earth and applied as surface dressing 5-6 days before sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $35^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (b) $31^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging. Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) \& (c) No, (v) (a) Atarra, Faizabad, Bharari (Jhansi), Belatal, Bharaich. Nawabganj (Bareilly) and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1696 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $295.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yieid |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1990 |
| 2. | 1670 |
| 3. | 1817 |
| 4. | 1435 |
| 5. | 1793 |
| 6. | 1471 |
| S.E./mean |  |
|  | $=120.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P: 53(37)
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of varying doses of trace elements in the presence of adequate $N, P$, Potassium and Calcium on growth yield and quality of Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Leguminuous crop. (b) 'Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasio
(iii) 17.7.1953. (iv) Ploughing on 14, 15 and 17.7.1953. (b) Transplanting of single seedling, (c) 12 ars./acom in nursery bed. (d) Plant spacing $9^{\prime \prime}$ and row spacing $\mathbf{1 2}^{\prime \prime}$. (Improved method). (e) - . (v) (1) Green manuring, (2) A/S at $30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ of N . (3) Super at $30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$, of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$, (4) Sulphate of potash at $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \mathrm{c}_{4}$ of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ and (5) Gypsum at 15 lb ./ac. of CaO . (vi) $\mathrm{N}-22$ (late). (vii) Irrigated: (viii) Interculturing between rows 3-4 times with hand hoes. Weeding is also performed. 1st weeding after $10-15$ days of transplanting. (ix) Not recorded. (x) 14.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 trace elements: $\mathbf{C u}=$ Copper as Copper Sulphate, $B=$ Boron as Borax and $\mathbf{Z n}=$ Zinc as Zinc Sulphate. Sub-plot treatments:

Levels of trace elements: $L_{0}, L_{1}, L_{2}$ and $L_{3}$ :
Levels of $\mathrm{Cu}: \mathrm{L}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~L}_{1}=3, \mathrm{~L}_{2}=6$ and $\mathrm{L}_{3}=12 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
Levels of $B: L_{0}=0, L_{1}=1, L_{2}=2$ and $L_{8}=4 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
Levels of $\mathrm{Zn}: \mathrm{L}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~L}_{1}=1, \mathrm{~L}_{2}=4$ and $\mathrm{L}_{3}=10 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $28^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}$, sub-plot size $56^{\prime} \times 77^{\prime}$ main-plot size. (b) $25^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}$. (v) Plot bund $1.5^{\circ} \times 1^{\prime}$ (high) bund alround, block partition and irrigation channel $3^{\prime}$ and field border $2^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Attacked by rice gundhi bug. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a)Faizabad, Nawabgunj, Baharaich, Banda; Bharari and Jhansi. (b) N.A: (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1017 \quad \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $189.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $178.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Sub-plot treatments within main-plot are significant. Others iare not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Nawabgunj (Bareilly).
Ref:- U.P. 51(239).
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Bareilly type 3 E and 3F. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practiced locally. No details are available. After application of manure the field is levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Sceds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of $1^{\prime \prime}$ to $2^{\prime \prime}$ away from th ${ }^{\circ}$ fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2 TREATMENTS:

1. Control.
2. $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
3. $25 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N}+50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$.

Method of Application : $N$ as $A / S$ broadcast at the time of sowing and Phospheric acid in the form of Super is applied to one of the plots over the $\mathbf{N}$ dose. Super is placed at a depth of $3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep at the sole of the furrow and in the sides of the furrow mado by either an iron plough or two desi plough, ono behind the other in the same furrow,
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) One village selected in the district and expt. with the above 3 treatments laid out in 10 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Uniform growth; satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of paddy grain and straw. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. ।
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1080 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $85.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $1 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 894 |
| 2. | 1106 |
| 3. | 1241 |
| S.E./mean | $=26.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Nawabganj (Bareilly).

Ref :- U.P. 50(236).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Bareilly type 3 E and 3 F. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Generally irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
3. Control.
4. 15 lb ./ac. of N
5. 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. in which villages have been taken as replications (No. of villages=4) Fields selected randomly in randomly selected villages in the district. (iii) (a). N.A. (b) N.A. (but generally $1 / 40$ th of an ac.). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1827 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $85.30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1669 |
| 2. | 1786 |
| 3. | 2025 |
| S.E./mean | $=42.65 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. |

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Robertsganj and Dubhi (Mirzapur).

Ref:- U.P. 51(225).
Type : ' ${ }^{\prime} M$ '.

Object :-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Dhaunsar, Domat and Karail. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control.
2. $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. . f N .
3. $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N}+50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$.
4. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B D. in which villages have been taken as replications (No of villages $=\mathbf{2 1}$ ). Field selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the District. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
5. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
6. RESULTS :
(i) 1797 lb./ac.
(ii) $175.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain of in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1431 |
| 2. | 1856 |
| 3. | 2104 |
| S.E./mean | $=38.4 \mathrm{lb} . / a c$. |


| Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). | Ref :- U.P. 51(235). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- Kichha (Nanital). | Type $: \sim^{〔}$ M'. |

Object :-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (1) Domat. (2) Clayey loam. (3) Light loam. (4) Matiyar.' (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practised locally No details are available. After application of manures the field is levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of $1^{\circ}$ to $2^{\circ \prime}$ away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control.
4. $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
5. 25 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+5 \mathrm{llb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$.
$\mathrm{N}_{\text {as }}$ A/S broadcast at the time of sowing $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super applied to one of the plots over the N dose, Super is placed at a depth of $3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}$ at the sole of the furrow and the sides of the furrow made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs, one tehind the other in the same furrow.
6. DESIGN:
(i) and ;ii) Villages selected in the district and experiments with the above three treatments laid out with 8 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
7. GENERAL :
(i) Ore trial has excellert stand and four trials have good stand. One trial was infested with kans. One trial damazed by asimals. (ii) One trial damaged by borer. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v, N.A. (ii) Nu. (vi) The experiment was conducted by A.C.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $1318 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $119.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment difference are highly aignificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1155 |
| 2. | 1360 |
| 3. | 1440 |
| S.E./mean | $=\mathbf{4 2 . 4}$ |
| b./ac. |  |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Bilaspur and Kichha (Nanital.)

Ref:- U.P. 52(283).

$$
\text { Type : ‘‘ ' } \mathrm{M} \text { ’. }
$$

Object:-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule fcr this agriculturally important soil type.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Terai soil. (iii) Clayey loam to loam. (iv) Improved, (v) (a) After application of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ the field was levelled by drawing a pata and seeds sown. (b) Sown by broadcast. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control.
2. $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. 25 lb ./ac. of $\mathrm{N}+50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$.

N applied as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super. Nitrogen applied to surface at sowing time. Super is placed at a depth of about $3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep at the sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and the experiment laid out with 8 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor growth for 4 trials, good for two trials and normal for 2 trials. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1828 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $307.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1603 |
| 2. | 1887 |
| 3. | 1989 |
| S.E./mean | $=108.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- State Usar Reclamation Farm, Dhakauni. Type :- 'C'.
Object :- To study whether leaching with water alone helps in reclaiming saline alkali soils.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Saline alkali. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.7.1951/1.8.1951. (iv) (a) One ploughing and one harrowing by tractor. (b) Transplanted and broadcast. (c) $5 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}$. (d) Irregular (e) One seedling per hole. (v) Nil. (vi) No. 22 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 21.07". (x) 18.10.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Two cultural operations : $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{0}}=$ No leaching and $\mathrm{L}_{\mathbf{1}}=$ leaching with water.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired-plot. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) and (b) $L_{0}=0.48 \mathrm{ac}$., $L_{1}=0.59 \mathrm{ac}$; $\mathrm{L}_{0}=0.37 \mathrm{ac}$., $\mathrm{L}_{1}=0.59$ ac. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Nil. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1955. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by J.D.A.S.(D).
5. RESULTS:
(i) $291.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $72.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{L}_{0}$ | 59.0 |
| $\mathbf{L}_{2}$ | 524.5 |
| S.E./mean | $=51.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 52(344)/51(300).
Site :- State Usar Reclamation Farm, Dhakauni. Type :- ' C '。
Object:-To study whether leaching with water alone helps in reclaiming saline alkali soils.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Saline alkali. (b) $\mathbf{p H}$ value varies from 7.9 to 9.6 at different depths. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) One ploughing with gujar plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) Irregular: (e) One seedling/hole. (v) No. (vi) Type 100 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) No. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.11.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

Two Cultural operations : $\mathbf{I}_{0}=$ No leaching and $L_{1}=$ leaching with water.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired-plot. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) and (b) $L_{0}=0.48 \mathrm{ac}, \mathrm{L}_{1}=0.59 \mathrm{ac}$; $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{o}}=0.37$ ac., $L_{1}=$ 0.59 ac . (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL ;
(i) No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1955. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil (vii) The expt. was conducted by J.D.A.S. (D).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $739.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $302.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | ---: |
| $\mathbf{L}_{0}$ | $246.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $1231.9 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$. |
| S.E./mean | $=213.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Paddy. (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 5?(401)/52(344)/51(300)
Site :- State Usar Reclamation Farm, Dhakauni. Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To study whether leaching with water alone helps in reclaiming salive alkali soils.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Padjy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Saline alkali. (b) pH value varies from 7.8 to 9.5 at different depths. (iii) 7 and 8.8.1953. (iv) (a) One ploughing by gujar plough. (b) Transplanting. (c) - (d) Irregular. (c) One seedling per hole. (v) Nil. (vi) Type 100 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 15.19". (x) 15 and 29.11.1953.

## 2. TREATMENIS :

Two cultural operations: $L_{0}=$ No leaching and $L_{1}=$ leaching with water.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired-plot. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) and (b) $L_{0}=0.48$ ac., $L_{1}=0.59$ ac., $1 L_{0}=0.37$ ac., $L_{1}=0.59$ ac (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1955. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by J.D.A.S. (D).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $469.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $134.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{u}}$ | 253.0 |
| $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 685.1 |
| S.E./mean | $=95.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Paddy-(Kharif). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(343). } \\
\text { Site :- State Usar Reclamation Farm, Dhakauni } & \text { Type : - 'C'. }
\end{array}
$$

Object :-To study whether leaching by water alone helps in reclaiming saline at alkali soils.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) No. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Saline alkali. (b) pH valne varies from 10.60 to 11.90 at different depths. (iii) 23 to 31.7.52. (iv) (a) One ploughing by gujar plough. (b) Transplanted. (c)- (d) Irregular (e) I seedling per hole. (v) Nil. (vi) Type 100 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 21.56". (x) 22 to 24.11.52.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Two cultural operations : $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{0}}=$ No leaching and $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}=$ Leaching with water.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired-plot. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) 0.50 acre. (b) 0.50 acre. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil. (viil The expt. was conducted by J.D.A.S. (D).
3. RESULTS:
, (i) $299.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $13.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{L}_{0}$ | 253.7 |
| $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 345.3 |
| S.E /mean | $=43.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 53(400)/52(343). } \\
\text { Site :- State Usar Reclamation Farm, Dhakauni. } & \text { Type :- 'C'. }
\end{array}
$$

Object:-To study whether leaching by water alone belps in reclaiming saline alkali soils.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Saline alkali. (b) pH value varies from 10.0 to 11.20 at diferent depths. (iii) 5 to 288.1953 . (iv) (a) One ploughing by gujar plough. (b) Transplanted (c)-. (d) Irregular. (e) 1 seedling/hole, (v) Nil. (vi) Type 100 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) 15.19". (x) 13 to 17.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Two cultural operations: $\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{0}}=$ No leaching and $\mathrm{L}_{\mathbf{2}}=$ Leaching with water.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired-plot. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) 0.50 ac . (b) 0.50 ac . (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) Nil. (vi) Nj!. (vii) The expt. was conducted by J.D.A.S. (D).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $232.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $82.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatments differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{L}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 182.6 |
| $\mathrm{~L}_{1}$ | 282.1 |
| S.E./mean | $=29.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

> Crop :- Paddy.
> Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

## Ref:- U.P. 51(268).

Type :- 'C'.
Object :-Rotational trial for early Paddy. (For final rotation).

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) As per treatments. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.7.1952.
(iv) (a) One ploughing by Punjab and two by desi plough. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 srs./ac. (d)-. (e)一. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early paddy). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding' on 30.8.1951. (ix) $20.20^{\circ}$.
(x) 7 and 8.101951.
2. TREATMENTS :
A. Paddy-Pea-Paddy-Pea-Paddy.
B. Paddy-Pea-Maize-Berseem-Paddy.
C. Paddy-Pea-Sugarcane-Paddy.
D. Paddy-Berseem-Sawan-Pea-Paddy.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) $172^{\prime} \times 173^{\prime}$. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $42^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}$, (b) $40^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround the net plot left as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of paddy grain: (iv) (a) 1949-195f. (b) As p3r rotations. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., of U.P., Nagina Analysis is done ol ly for the final year rotation. For the first two years of rotation only mean yields of different crops are given.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $736.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 9668 lb /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yiel I of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| A | 764.8 |
| B | $6+2.8$ |
| C | 754.2 |
| D | 782.6 |
| S.E./mean | $=39.47 \mathrm{lb} /$ ac. |

[Note: - The results given above are for the yield of paddy grain in the year 1951].


Object :- To find out the most suitable and economical long rotation of early Paddy under broadcast condition.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Paddy-Pea and then the rotation as given under treatments. (b) As per treatments. (c) T.C.-giving about 40 lb ./ac. of N. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.7.1953. (iv) (a) Three desi ploughings and one victory ploughing. (b) Broa Jcast. (c) $37 \frac{1}{2}$ seers/ac. (d) -. (e) 一. (v) Village compost $10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of C.L. giving about $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N and $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ @ 20 sr ./ac. as top dressing. (vi) $\mathrm{N}-22$ (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weedings on 16.7.1953 and 8.8.1953. (ix) 37.38". (x) 11 and 13.10.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

A. Paddy-Pea - Paddy-Pea-Paddy.
B. Paddy-P،a-Paddy-Berseem-Paddy.
C. Paddy-Pea-Sugarcane-Paddy.
D. Paddy-Berseem-Sawan-Pea-Paddy.

## 3. DESIGN:

(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a). $42^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 39^{\prime}$. (b) $40^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 3^{\prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ left on all sides of the net plot as non-experimental area. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL:

(i) Growth is very good and uniform in all the plots. Full lodging in all the plots on 26.9.1950. (ii) Only slight attack of leaf-spot disease was observed in the last stage of the crop. Attack of grass hoppers and gundhi bug. Control measure :-One dusting with gammaxene was done. (iii) Height, tillering, yield of paddy grain. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) As per rotation. (c) -. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina. As this is a rotational expt., all the information and yield etc. are given in the two enclosed proformas. Analysis was done for the final year rotation crop. For the first two years only mean yields given. Analysis : was not done for. 2 years.

5: RESULTS :
(i) $1293 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $210.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of paddy in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| A: | 1382 |
| B. | 1235 |
| C. | 1299 |
| D. | 1257 |
| S.B./mean | $=85.8$ |

Note:-The results given are for the Paddy of 1953 only.

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

> Ref:- U.P. 48(117). Type : ${ }^{6} \mathrm{C}$ '.

Object:-To find out the best time of broadcasting early Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Pea. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) 35 srs./ac. (d) -. (c) -. (v) Village compost at $10 \mathrm{C} . L . / a c$. giving about 40 lb ./ac. of N. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Lrrigated. (viii) 3 weedings. (ix) $43.59^{\circ}$. (x) 4 to 30.9 .1948 and 10.10.1948.
2. TREATMENTS:

5 dates of broadcasting : $D_{1}=1.6 .1948, D_{2}=10.6 .1948, D_{9}=20.6 .1948, D_{4}=30.6 .1948$ and $D_{5}=10.7 .1948$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $33^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $31^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 16^{\prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes-
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good and vigorous growth in $D_{1}, D_{2}$ and $D_{3}$ plots and stunted in $D_{4}$ and $D_{5}$ plots. (ii) Nil. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1594 lb./ac.
(ii) $240.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.Jac. Treatment Av. yield

| $D_{1}$ | 2240 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $D_{2}$ | 1844 |
| $D_{3}$ | 1616 |
| $D_{4}$ | 1151 |
| $D_{5}$ | 1118 |
| S.E./mean | $=98.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ |

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:- U.P. 49(229).
Type:- 'M'.

Object:-To find out the best time of broadcasting early Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Pea. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) 35 seers/ac. (d) -. (e) -. (v) Village compost at $10 \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{L}$ /ac. giving about $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 weedings. (ix) 47,37. (x) 30.8.1949, 10 and 21.9.1949; 3 and 13.10.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

5 dates of broadcasting: $D_{1}=1.6 .1949, D_{2}=10.6 .1949, D_{8}=20.6 .1949, D_{4}=30.6 .1949$ and $D_{5}=10.7 .1949$.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $33^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 18^{\prime}$ 。(b) $31^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 16^{\circ}$. (v) $1^{1}$ alrourd the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good growth. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Econ.omic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :

| (i) 496.7 lb -/ac. <br> (ii) $269.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| (iii) Treatment differences are highly significant. (iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. |  |
|  |  |
| Treatment | Av. yield |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}$ | 681.0 |
| $\mathrm{Da}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 512.7 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | 631.2 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{4}$ | 569.8 |
| $\mathrm{D}_{5}$ | 88.6 |
| S.E./mean | $=109.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

```
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
```

Ref :- U.P. 50(279).
Type :- 'M'.
Object:-To find out the best time of broadcasting carly Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Pea. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) One punjab plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) 35 seers/ac. (d) -. (e) -. (vi Village compost at 10 C.L./ac. giving about $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 3 weedings, (ix) 39.97". (x) 12, 22.9.1950; 6 and 8.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

5 dates of broadcasting : $D_{2}=1.6 .1950, D_{2}=10.6 .1950, D_{3}=20.6 .1950, D_{4}=30.6 .1950$ and $D_{5}=10.7 .1950$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $33^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $31^{\prime}-6^{\circ} \times 16^{\circ}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround the net. plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Germination and growth good in $D_{1}, D_{\mathbf{2}}$ and $D_{3}$ plots and not good in $D_{5}$ and $D_{5}$ plots. (ii) Attack of grass hoppers Dusting of Hexiclean. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $711.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $127.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 988.6 |
| $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 883.1 |
| $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | 851.7 |
| $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 477.4 |
| $\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{s}}$ | 357.7 |
| S.E./mean | $=52.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |


| Crop :-Paddy (Kharif). | Ref :-U.P. 48(118). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :-Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. | Type :^‘'C'. |

Object:-To find out the best time of transplanting early Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Pea. (b) Pea. (c) Nit. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (ii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) Ono victory plough and 3 desi plough. (b) Transplanting. (c)- (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) 10 C.L./ac of village compost giving about 40 lb ./ac. of N . (vi) T-1 36 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) $43.59^{\circ}$. (x) 1,14 and 25.9.1948 and 1, 6.10.1948.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

5 dates of transplanting: $D_{1}=10.6 .1948, D_{2}=20.6 .1948, D_{3}=30.6 .1948, D_{4}=10.7 .1948$ and $D_{6}=20.7 .1948$.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) $37^{\prime}-6^{\circ} \times 86^{\circ}-6^{\circ}$. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $37^{\prime}-6^{\circ} \times 16-6^{\circ}$ (b) $36^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}$. (v) $9^{\circ}$ alround the net plot. (vi)Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) Good growth. (ii) Slight attack of gundhi bug in August. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botar ist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $941 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $151.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{D}_{1}$ | 1448 |
| $D_{2}$ | 791 |
| $\mathbf{D}_{3}$ | 1070 |
| $\mathbf{D}_{4}$ | 1099 |
| $\mathbf{D}_{5}$ | 299 |
| S.E./mean | $=61.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ |

Crop :-Paddy. (Kharif).
Site :-Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :- U.P. 49(226).
Type :-‘C'.

Object:-To find out the best time of transplanting early Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Pea. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) Onc victory plough and 3 desi plcughs. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) 10 C.L. of village compost giving about 40 lb /ac. of N. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) 47.37" (x) 30.8.1949, 9, 23 and 29.9.1949 and 13.10.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

5 dates of transplanting : $D_{1}=10.6 .1949, D_{2}=20.6 .1949, D_{3}=30.6 .1949, D_{4}=10.7 .1949$ and $D_{5}=20.7 .1949$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iij) 6. (iv) (a) $37^{\prime}-6^{\circ} \times 16^{\circ}-6^{\circ}$. (b) $36^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}$. (v) $9^{\prime \prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Vigorous growth. (ii) Nil. (iii) Height, tiller and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment condueted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., of U.P. Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $694.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $158.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| $D_{1}$ | 770.6 |
| $D_{2}$ | 869.6 |
| $D_{3}$ | 943.7 |
| $D_{4}$ | 675.7 |
| $D_{5}$ | 212.7 |
| S.E/mean | $=64.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

## Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). <br> Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

## Ref:- U.P. 50(283).

 Type :- 'C'.Object :- To find out the best time of transplanting early Paddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Ni. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings (ix) 39.97". (x) 29.8.1950, 10,29.9.1950 and 6.10.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

5 dates of transplanting : $D_{1}=10.6 .1950, D_{4}=20.6 .1950, D_{3}=30.6 .1950, D_{1}=10.7 .1950$ and $D_{5}=20.7 .1950$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $37^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime} \times 16^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}$. (b) $36^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}$. (v) $9^{\prime \prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Height, tillering and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (al and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1070 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $203.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| $D_{1 .}$ | 1731 |
| $D_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1583 |
| $D_{3}$ | 644 |
| $D_{6}$ | 803 |
| $D_{5}$ | 587 |
| S.E./mean | $=83.1 \mathrm{lb} . / a c$. |

```
Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref:- U.P. 48(120).
Type:m 'C'.
```

Object :- To find out the best method of sowing earlyPaddy.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy—gram. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.6.1948, 3.7.1948. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 seers/ac. (d)一. (e)-. (v) 10 C.L./ac. of village compost giving about 40 lb ./ac. of N . A/S at 50 lb ./ac. of N as top dressing. (vi) N .22 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) 43.59". (x) 20, 21.10.1948.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

4 methods of sowing :

1. Dry Sowing.
2. Sowing in moisture.
3. Sowing in puddled field with germinated seed.
4. Sowing in puddled field with ungerminated seed.
5. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $37^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$ (b) $35^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
6. GENERAL:
(i) Good growth. (ii) Nil. (iii) Height, tillering and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-195i. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to U.P. Nagina.
7. RESULTS :
(i) $1172 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $122.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. | 1085 |
| 2. | 1413 |
| 3. | 1167 |
| 4. | 1023 |
| S.E./mean (except treatment 4) | $=49.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

```
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref :- U.P. 49(225).

Object :-To find out the best method of sowing early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Gram. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.6.1949. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 srs./ac. (d)-. (e)-. (v) Village compost at \(10 \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{L} . / \mathrm{ac}\). giving 4 J lb ./ac. of N. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings, (ix) \(47.37^{\circ}\). (x) 12.10.1949:
2. TREATMENTS :

4 methods of sowing :
1. Dry sowing.
2. Sowing in moisture.
3. Sowing in puddled field with germinated seed.
4. Sowing in puddled field with ungerminated seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}=6^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. (ii) Slight attack of white ants. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1951. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) The expariment has been spoiled due to the excessive mud in the field. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(217.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(103.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 180.3 \\
2. & 285.8 \\
3. & 217.5 \\
4. & 187.3 \\
S.E./mean & \(=42.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). \\ Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
}

> Ref :- U.P. \(50(284)\).
> Type : \(:\) ' \(C\) '

Object:-To find out the best method of sowing early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.6.1950. (iv) (a) One vicrory plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 srs./ac. (d)—. (c)—. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) \(39.92^{\circ}\). (x) 18.9.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

4 methods of sowing :
1. Dry sowing
2. Sowing in moisture.
3. Sowing in puddled field with germinated seed.
4. Sowing in puddled field with ungerminated seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(29^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\), (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) A disease similar to root rot was observed. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1951. (b) No. (c -. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Butanist (Paddy) to Govt., of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(458.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(54.31 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 380.2 \\
2. & 474.6 \\
3. & 527.6 \\
4. & 450.6 \\
S.E./mean & \(=22.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). \\ Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
}

Ref :- U.P. 51(263).
Type :- 'C'.

Object: - To find out the best method of sowing early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS .
(i) (a) Paddy-gram. (b) Gram and then Sanai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy. (b) N.A. (iii) 18.6.1951. (iv) (a) One Punjab plough and 2 desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 seers/ac. (d) 一. (e) 一. (v) Sanal as G.M. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Unirrigated.' (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) 26.27". (x) 1.10.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

4 methods of sowing:
1. Dry sowing.
2. Sowing in moisture.
3. Sowing in puddled field with germinated seed.
4. Sowing in puddled field with ungerminated seed.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 22\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1951. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Lower yield due to the shortage of water and less rains during the crop period (vii) Expt. conducted by Asst. Econmic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(459.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(159.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathbf{l b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 355.9 \\
2. & 506.2 \\
3. & 514.6 \\
4. & 461.9 \\
S.E/mean & \(=64.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
> Site :- Rice Res. SubwStn., Kunraghat.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. 48(119). } \\
& \text { Type :- ‘C’. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object:- To find out the best seed rate for broadcasting Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :
(iv) (a) Paddy-gram, (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.6.1948. (iv) (a) One victory plough and three Desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) As per treatments, (d) -. (e) -. (v) Village compost as \(10 \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{L} . / \mathrm{ac}\). giving about \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N . and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at the rate of 50 lb ./ac. (vi) \(\mathrm{N}-22\) (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) 43.59". (x) 19.10.1948.
2. TREATMENTS:

4 seed rates: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{2 0}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{3 0}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}=\mathbf{4 0}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}=50\) seer/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}-3^{\circ}\). (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}-3^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack of white ants. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1948. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economlc Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1052 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(243.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{8 7 5}\) \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 989 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 1296 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1048 \\
S.E/mean & \(=99.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop : Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub.Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref :- U.P. 49(227). -
Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To study the benefits of double cropping of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As under treatments, (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early), T-88 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) 49.63". (x) 26.7.1949, 14.10.1949 and 5.121949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Early variety N-22 broadcast in April (12.4.1949) and manured. Late variety T-88 transplanted in August (28.3.1949) and manured. Berseem sown in standing late crop.
2. Early variety N -22 broadcast in normal time (13.6.1949) and manured. Berseem in Rabi.
3. Late variety T-88 transplanted in normal time (22.7.1949) and manured and Berseem in standing in late crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime}-9^{\circ} \times 13^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(41^{\circ} \times 11^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}-9^{\prime}\) along the length and \(2^{\prime}\) along the breadth. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. Late sown plots poor in growth. (ii) Nil. (iii) Height, tillers, grain yield of paddy and yield of Berseem green fodder. (iv) (a) \(1949-1951\). (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P. Nagina.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(646.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(121.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly sigoificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(1 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{Jc}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 918.2 \\
2. & 124.5 \\
3. & 896.7 \\
S.E.fmean & \(=49.5 \mathrm{lb}\)-/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:- U.P. 50(281).
Type:- 'C'.

Object:-To study the benefits of double cropping of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Dhanicha for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As under treatments. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 desi ploughs. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) NA. (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring dhanicha. (vi) N-22 (early), T-88 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 weedings. (ix) \(42.53^{\circ}\). (x) 9.8.1950 and 22.9.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Early variety ( \(\mathrm{N}-22\) ) broadcast in April (12.4.1950) and manured. Late variety transplanted in August (12.8.1950) and manured. Berseem sown in standing late crop.
2. Early variety broadcast in normal time (17.4.1950) and manured. Berseem in Rabi.
3. Late variety transplanted in normal time (18.7.1950) and manured and Bersesm in standing late crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a)
(b) N.A.
(iii) 8. (iv)
(a) \(42^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime} \times 16^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\)
(b) \(41^{\prime}-3^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) \(9^{\prime \prime}\) left alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack of root rot and stem borer was observed. (iii) Height, tillering and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vil Nil. (vii) The yield of Berseem is not available in the records and hence it is not possible to find out the eccnomics of this experiment. In treatment the yield of early and late Paddy has been added up and the data of Paddy grain only has been analysed. Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P. Nagina.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1178 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(276.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2170 \\
2. & 371 \\
3. & 993 \\
S.E./mean & \(=97.8 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy. (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 51(266)
- Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Type :- ‘C'.

Object :-To study the benefits of double cropping.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Berseem. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light Loam. N.A. (iii) As under treatments. (iv) (a) One hoeing with kudali and two ploughings by desj plongh. (b) As per treatments, (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early), T-88 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 weedings. (ix) 26.69*. (x) 21.8.1951.. 21,11.1951, 2.10.1951 and 19.11.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Early variety N-22 broadcast in April (14.4.1951) and manured. Late variety transplanted in August (27.8.1951) and manured. Berseem sown in standing late crop.
2. Early variety broadcast in normal time (16.6.1951) and manured. Berseem sown in Rabi.
3. Late variety transplante 1 in normal time (17.7.1951) and manured and Berseem in standing late crop.

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) \(42^{\prime \prime}-9^{\prime \prime} \times 16^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(41^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) \(9^{\prime \prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good growth. (ii) Nil. :(iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) \(194^{n}-1951\). (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) N.A. (vi) Lowor yields due to less rains. (vii) The yield of Berseem is not avilable in the records and bence it is not possible to find out the economics of this experiment. In treatment 1 , the yields of early and late Paddy has been added up and the data of Paddy grain only has been analysed. Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(638 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(128.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1186 \\
2. & 403 \\
3. & 324 \\
S.e./mean & \(=45.5 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). & Ref :- U.P. 50(285). \\
Site :- Rice Res. Sub \({ }^{\text {Stn., Kunraghat. }}\) & Type :- 'C'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To determine the effect of summer ploughing on the yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Pea. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.6.1953. (iv) (a) As per treatments. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 seers/ac. (d) 一. (e) 一. (v) N.A. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Uniirrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) \(38.92^{\circ}\). (x) 28.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Two desi ploughings in summer, puddling and ganning (control).
2. Thorough ploughing in summer (one deep ploughing and 5 desi); puddling and ganning.
3. No ploughing in summer, puddling and ganning.
4. Ploughing just before puddling and ganning.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 16^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nib. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) To (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P.g Nagina.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1041 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 161.7 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1053 \\
2. & 1190 \\
3. & 907 \\
4. & 1015 \\
S.E./mean & \(-66.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). \\ Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.}

Ref :- U.P. 51(262).
Type:- 'C'.

Objost:-To detarmine the effect of summer ploughing on the yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIOVS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Gram. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.6.1951. (iv) (a) As per treatments. (b) Broadsast. (c) 37 srs./ac. (d)-. (e)—. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) \(26.27^{\circ}\). (x) 2.10 .1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. 2 desi ploughings in summer, puddling and ganning (control).
2. Thorough ploughing in summer (one deep ploughing and 5 desi) puddling and ganning.
3. No ploughing in summer, puddling and ganning.
4. Ploughing just before puddling and ganning.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(50^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(48^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 31^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good growth except in treat. no. 3 where tho growth is poor and weeds are too many. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tillering and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Lower yields due to the shortage of water and rains. (vii) Experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(209.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(93.21 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 208.5 \\
\hline 2. & 270.0 \\
\hline 3. & 191.8 \\
\hline 4. & 167.5 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=38.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(309). } \\
\text { Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. } & \text { Type :- 'C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To determine the effect of summer ploughing on the yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium black. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.6.1952. (iv) (a) As per treatmonts. (b) Broadcast. (c) \(39 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d)-. (e)-. (v) T.C. at 160 mds./ac. giving about \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 3 weedings. (ix) 28.36". (x) 29, 30.9.1952 and 1.10.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. 2 desi ploughings in summer, puddling and ganning (control).
2. Thorough ploughing in summer (one deep ploughing and 5 desi), puddling and ganning.
3. No ploughing in summer, puddling and ganning.
4. Ploughing just before puddling and ganning.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). (b) \(40^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL ;
(i) Good growth. Lodging on 20.9.1952. (ii) Grass hoppers and gundhi bug were observed. Dusting by gammaxene. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1952\). (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(830.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(124.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 882.2 \\
2. & 958.0 \\
3. & 757.3 \\
4. & 785.41 \\
S.E./mean & \(=50.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
'Site :- Rice Res. SubuStn., Kunraghat.

Ref:- U.P. 51(264).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To find out the best time of sowing germinated seed for early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram and, Arhar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 22.6.1951. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 2 desi ploughs. (b) Broadcast. (c) 38 seers/ac. (d) -. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 3 weedings. (ix) 26.27". (x) 28 and 29.9.1951.
2. TREATMENIS:
1. Ungerminated seed.
2. Germinated seed sown immediately.
3. Germinated seed dried for two days and stored for 15 days before sowing.
4. Germinated seed dried for two days and stored for \(\mathbf{3 0}\) days before sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime}-6^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vl) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good growth. Half lodging. (ii) Nil, (iii) Height tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) No.; (c) Nil. (v) (a N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) All sowings were to be done on 15.6 .1951 but due to scarcity of water it was done on 22.6.1951 The seed for germination was soaked for 24 hours in water. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P. Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(668.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 183.4 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Ib}_{0} / \mathrm{ac}\).
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 645.5 \\
2. & 696.9 \\
3. & 552.0 \\
4. & 778.8 \\
S.E./mean & \(=74.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 52(312).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Type:- 'C'.

```

Object : - To find out the best time of sowing germinated seed for early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pea. (c) No. (ii) (a) medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.6.1952. (iv) (a) One victory and two desi ploughings. (b) Broadcast. (c) 38 seers/ac. (d) -. (c) -. (v) N.A. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) 3 weedings. (ix) 28.36". (x) 15 and 16.9.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Ungerminated seed.
2. Germinated :eed sown immediately.
3. Germinated seed dried for two days and stored for 15 days before sowing.
4. Germinated seed dried for two days and stored for 30 days before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(29^{\prime} \times 28^{\circ}-2^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good and uniform growth. (ii) Grass hoppers and gundhl bug controlled by dasting gammaxene. (iii) Height, tillering and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U. P.Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1215 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(194.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Trearment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1212 \\
2. & 1229 \\
3. & 1234 \\
4. & 1186 \\
S.E./mean & \(=79.4 \mathrm{lb} /\) /ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref. :- U.P. 53(212).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of cutting roots and shoots of Paddy seedling on its growth and yield.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS:
(i) (a) Nîl. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(1.6 .1953 / 15.7 .1953\). (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c)-. (d) Line to line \(9^{\circ}\) apart; plant to plant \(8^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) Nil. (v) C/N at 2 srs. applied on 18.8.1953. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.10.53.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Roots-1 cut.
3. Roots 1 cut.
4. Roots-full cut. (leaving a very small portion).
5. Shoots - full cut.
3. DESIGN
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(11^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\) (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 5^{\prime}\) (v) \(1^{\prime}\) plot bund and \(11^{\prime}\) irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield, (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Crop Physiologist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1075 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 378 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av yield of grain in Ib ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 896 \\
2. & 1484 \\
3. & 1092 \\
4. & 896 \\
5. & 1008 \\
S.E./mean & \(=189.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop: Paddy.
Ref :=U.P. 49(41).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.
Type :~‘c’.

Object :-To determine the effect of summer ploughings on the yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS.
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt (loam). (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1949/16.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Ajana, Pilibhit. (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 hand weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.10.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Two or three desi ploughings in summer, puddling and ganning (control).
2. Thorough ploughings in summer (one deep ploughing and 6 or 7 desi ploughings puddling and ganning.
3. No ploughing in summer.
4. Ploughing just before puddling and ganning.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(1 / 59\) ac. (b) \(1 / 72.23\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Asstt. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1028 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(181.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1030 \\
2. & 1104 \\
3. & 848 \\
4. & 1130 \\
S.E./mean & \(\Rightarrow 74.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :~ Rice Res. Stn., Nagina. (Bijnor.)
Site :~Rice Res. Stn., Nagina. (Bijnor.)

```

Ref. :m U.P. 50(42)
Type ' C '.
Object :-To determine the effect of summer ploughing on the yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Silt Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.6.1950. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nal. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) N.A. . (viii) 2 hand weedings, (ix) N.A. (x) 22.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Three desi ploughings in summer and ganning.
2. Thorough ploughings in summer (one deep ploughing and E-7 desi ploughings).
3. No ploughings in summer and ganning.
4. Ploughing in water and no ganning.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(61^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(1 / 28.40\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952 . (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted. by Asstt. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt of U.P. Nagina.
S. RESULTS:
(i) \(1220 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(75.04 \mathrm{lb} /\) /ac.
(iii) Treatments differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1187 \\
2. & 1306 \\
3. & 1103 \\
4. & 1285 \\
S.E/mean & \(=30.63 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Rice. Res. Stn., Nagnia.
Ref :- U.P. 51(46).
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To determine the effect of summer ploughings on the yield of Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Oats. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt (loam). (b) N.A. (iii) 11.7.1951. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.22. (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 hand weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.9.1951 and 5.10.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS}
1. Two desi ploughings in summer.
2. Thorough ploughing in summer (1 deep ploughing and 4 or 5 desi ploughings) and ganning.
3. One ploughing immediately befor puddling and ganning.
4. Ploughing in water and no ganning.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(171^{\prime} \times 85 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 84^{\prime}\). (v) One row at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Asstt. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(409.4 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{jac}\).
(ii) \(94.08 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av- yield \\
1. & 489.4 \\
2. & 769.4 \\
3. & 190.4 \\
4. & 188.2 \\
S.E/mean & \(=38.41 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :~ Paddy.
Site :- Rice. Res. Stn., Nagina.

```
```

Ref :- U.P. 52(140).

```
Ref :- U.P. 52(140).
Type:= 'C'.
```

Type:= 'C'.

```

Object :-To determine the effects of summer ploughings on the yield of paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Silt (loam). (b) N.A. (iii) 22.6.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.22 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 hand weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.9.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Two desi ploughings in summer and ganning (control).
2. Thorough ploughing in summer (deep ploughing and 4 to 5 desi ploughings) and ganning.
3. One ploughing immedialely before puddling and ganning.
4. Ploughing in water and no ganning.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(85.5^{\circ} \times 17.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(84^{\circ} \times 16^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(927.1 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{lac}\).
(li) \(190.40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 873.6 \\
2. & 965.4 \\
3. & 984.8 \\
4. & 884.8 \\
S.E/mean & \\
& \(=77.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Rice. Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref :- U.P. 52(144).
Type :- 'C'.
Object:-To determine the three year rotation for early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) As per Treatment. (b) As per treatment. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Silt (loam). (b) N.A. (iii) 2.7.1932, (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings, (b) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Early. variety (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings by hand. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.9.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{llll} 
& \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Ist year } & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ 2nd year } & 3rd year. \\
A. & Paddy-Gram & Paddy-Gram & Paddy. \\
B. & Paddy-Gram & Jowar-Berseem & Paddy. \\
C. & Paddy-Pea & Sugarcane & Paddy. \\
D. Paddy-Berseem & Cotton-Pea & Paddy.
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(59^{\circ} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(1 / 32.65\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi). Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.E.B. (P).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1980 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(327.0 \mathrm{lb} /\) ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
A. & 1869 \\
B. & 2025 \\
C. & 1948 \\
D. & 2078 \\
S.E./mean & \(=133.51 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). & Ref :- U.P. 49(233). \\
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa. & Type :m 'C',
\end{tabular}

Object :-To determine the proper age of seedling for late Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Trange planted. (c)-. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

4 different ages of seedling : \(A_{1}=20, A_{2}=30, A_{2}=40\) and \(A_{4}=50\) days.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 99.0\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) NiL (vii) The expt. was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research work in U.P." for the year 1949 was consulted. No original record or plotwise yield data, available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1835 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1873 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1883 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 1891 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1695 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 50(187).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.
Type :- 'C'.

```

Object :-To find out the best age of seedlings for late Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c)一. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(41.43^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

5 different ages of seedlings : \(A_{2}=20, A_{2}=30, A_{2}=40, A_{4}=50\) and \(A_{5}=60\) days.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 130.15\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A..
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain. (iv) (a) No. (b)-. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research work in U.P." for the year 1950 was consulted. No original records or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1213 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(ii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Ar. yield \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{2}\) & 1077 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{8}\) & 1254 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{8}\) & 1318 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{4}\) & 1190 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{8}\) & 1224 \\
S.E.jmean \(^{2}\) & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). & Ref :- U.P. 49(234), \\
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa. & Type:- 'C'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To determine the best time of transplanting.
1. BAṠAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) \(\rightarrow\) (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

6 dates of transplanting : \(D_{1}=10.7 .1949, D_{2}=20.7 .1949, D_{3}=30.7 .1949, D_{4}=10.8 .1949, D_{5}=20.8 .1949\) and \(D_{6}=30.8 .1949\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) Nil., (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expcriment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., of U.P. Nagina, Only the annual report "Rice Research work in U.P. for the year 1949" was consulted. No original record or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1054 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) The treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yeld of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & 1643 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{2}\) & 1384 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 999 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{4}\) & 745 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 801 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & 810 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa. Type :- 'C'.
Ref:- U.P. 50(289).

```

Object :-To determine the best time of transplanting.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Tranga planted. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(41.43^{\prime \prime}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

8 dates of transplanting : \(D_{1}=20.6 .1950, D_{2}=30.6 .1950, D_{3}=10.7 .1950, \quad D_{4}=20.7 .1950, D_{6}=30.7 .1950, D_{6}=\) 10.8.1950, \(D_{7}=20.8 .1950\), and \(D_{8}=30.8 .1950\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 73.54\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) -. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research work in U.P." for the year 1950 was consulted. No original record or plotwise yieid data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(506.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(188.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 452.3 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 529.1 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 655.7 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 627.3 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & 722.6 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & 570.4 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{7}\) & 412.5 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 81.1 \\
S.E./mean & \(=94.06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :~ Paddy (Kharif).}

Ref :- U.P. 49(237).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To find out the best spacing for transplanting late Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplantiag. (c) 一. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

3 spacings: \(S_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{3}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work' in U.P." for the year 1949 was consulted. No original record or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1047 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(201.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1228 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1074 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 838 \\
\(\mathbf{S . E} /\) mean & \(=71.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 50(290).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. SubmStn., Pachperwa.
Type :- ‘C’.

```

Object:-To find out the best spacing for transplanting late Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c)一. (d) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(41.43^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

3 spacings: \(S_{1}=6^{\prime}, S_{2}=9^{\circ}\) and \(S_{3}=12^{\prime \prime}\) apart.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 104.5 \mathrm{ac}\). (v) and (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddyl to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annull report "Rice Research Work in U.P." for the year 1950 was consulted. No original plotwise yield data ol original records were available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 896.1 lb /ac.
(ii) \(167.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graia in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1175.3 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 904.1 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 708.9 \\
S.E./mean & \(=59.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :~ Paddy. (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa. Type :- 'C'.
Ref :- U.P. 49(236)."

```

Object :- To find out the optimum number of seedlings for transplanting late Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a), (b), and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting (c) (d) N.A. (e) As per treatments. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
- No. of seedlings/hole : \(S_{1}=1, S_{2}=3\) to 4 and \(S_{s}=8\) to 12 seedlings.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 105.6\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Asstt. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the Annual report "Rice Research Work in U.P." for the year 1949 was consulted. No original records or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1161 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(215.16 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{aç}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Treatment - Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & 1042.40 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1127.28
\end{tabular}
\(\mathrm{S}_{3} \quad 1312.21\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=76.03 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Paddy. (Kharif). & Ref:- U.P. 50(291) \\
Site :- Late Paddy Res. SubwStn., Pachperwa. & Type :-C'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To find out the optimum number of seedlings for transplanting late Paddy. . .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a), (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c)(d) N.A. (e) As per treatments. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(41.43^{4}\) (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

No. of seedlings/hole: \(S_{1}=1, S_{2}=3\) to 4 and \(S_{3}=8\) to 12 seedlings.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 150.95\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) N.A. (c) Nil, (v) (a); (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Asstt. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in U.P." for the year 1950 was consulted. No original plotwise yield data or original records were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1570 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(236.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1354 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1667 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1690 \\
S.E. \(^{2}\) mean & \(=83.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Paddy :- (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 51(270).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of mixed sowing of early and late Paddy on its yield, and hence to avoid total crop failure.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) -. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N-22 (early) and T-88 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(31.33^{\prime \prime}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Pure late broadcast
2. Pure late transplant
3. Pure early broadcast
4. Pure early transplant
5. Early and late broadcast
6. Early and late transplant
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 6 .
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(1 / 87.72 \mathrm{ac}\).
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1951-1952\). (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (,ii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in U.P." for the year 1951 was consulted. No original record or plot wise yield data are available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 108.4 lb ./ac.
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant,
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & hv. yield \\
1. & 110.3 \\
2. & 183.9 \\
3. & 67.9 \\
4. & 96.2 \\
5. & 62.2 \\
6. & 130.1 \\
S.E./mean & EN.A.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.

Ref:- U.P. 52(316).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of mixed sowing of early and late Paddy on its yield, and hence to avoid total crop failure.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Date of transplanting 19.7.1950, Broadcast 26.6.1952 ; Nursery sowing 24.6.1952 (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-88 (late) and N-22 (early) (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Early 26.9 .1952 ; Late 1.12.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{T}-88, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{N}-22\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{8}=\mathrm{T}-88+\mathrm{N}-22\).
(2) 2 methods of sowing: \(M_{1}=\) Broadcast and \(M_{2}=\) Transplant.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D
(ii) (a) 6.
(b) N.A. (iii)
(v) (a) N.A.
(b) \(1 / 37.03 \mathrm{ac}\). (v) N.A.
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) N A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1220 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(494.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of V alone differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 1896 & 1843 & 1870 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 544 & 248 & 396 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 1299 & 1491 & 1395 \\
\hline Mean & 1246 & 1194 & 1220 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { S.E. } \\
& \text { S.E. } \\
& \text { S.E. }
\end{aligned}
\] & \begin{tabular}{l}
means \\
means
\end{tabular} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =142.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =174.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =247.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa. Type:- \({ }^{6} \mathbf{C}\).

Object :-To compare different cultural practices.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Broadcast. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) As per treatments. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control
2. Ploughing 3 weeks after sowing
3. Ploughing 5 weeks after sowing
4. Harrowing 3 weeks after sowing
5. Harrowing 5 weeks after sowing
6. Transplanting
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 93.33\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield (iv) (a) \(1951-\) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the anoual report "Rice Research Work in U.P." for the year 1951 was consulted. Original records and the plotwise vield data are not available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(116.27 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graio in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 94.63 \\
2. & 77.79 \\
3. & 94.63 \\
4. & 109.67 \\
5. & 113.66 \\
6. & 207.26 \\
S.E/mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site:- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pach perwa.

```
Ref :- U.P. 52(317).
Type : ' 'C'.

Object :-To compare different cultural practices.
1.- BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Nursery-24.6.1952, broadcasto 26.6.1952 and transplant-6.8.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Broadcast and transplant. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-88 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.12.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control
2. Ploughing 3 weeks after sowing
3. Ploughing 5 weeks after sowing
4. Harrowing 3 weeks after sowing
5. Harrowing 5 weeks after sowing
6. Transplantivg
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 73.03\). ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1645 lb ./ac.
(ii). \(\quad 338.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cl} 
Treatment & \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Av. yield } \\
1. & 1534 \\
2. & 1715 \\
3. & 1803 \\
\hline 4. & 1809 \\
\hline 5. & 1519 \\
\hline 6. & 1488 \\
S.E./mean & \(=138.3 \mathrm{lb}\).ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy. (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy. Res. SubwStn., Pachperwa. Type:~ 'C’.

Object:-To compare different cultural practices.
1. , BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Broadcast-29.6.1953 ; Transplant - 19.7.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Broadcast and transplant. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control
2. Ploughing 3 weeks after sowing
3. Ploughing 5 weeks after sowing
4. Harrowing 3 weeks after sowing
5. Harrowing 5 weeks after sowing
6. Transplanting
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) \(1951-\) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nit. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2466 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 220.9 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatments & Av. yield \\
1. & 1956 \\
2. & 2598 \\
3. & 2723 \\
4. & 2351 \\
5. & 2338 \\
6. & 2828 \\
S.E/mean & \(=82.83 \mathrm{Ib} /\) /ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif). \(\quad\) Ref:- U.P. 53(322).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. SubwStn., Tissuhi. \(\quad\) Type :- 'C'.

Object:-To select out which rotation suits best after late Paddy with crops sown after harvesting late Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay and hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.8.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Late Paddy T-9. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Late Paddy followed by Phillipine Pea.
2. Late Paddy followed by Local Pea.
3. Late Paddy fallowed by Gram T.87.
4. Late Paddy followed by Tangier Pea.
5. Lats Paddy foilowed ty Lathyrus Salivas.
6. Late Paddy followed by Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 26^{\prime}-6^{\circ}\). (v) (a) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.E.B(P).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1695 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(252.24 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(r\) eatment dififereaces are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1591 \\
2. & 1756 \\
3. & 1522 \\
4. & 1556 \\
S. & 1994 \\
6. & 1750 \\
S.E.Jmean & \(=196.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{Jc}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn , Tissuhi.
Ref:- U.P. 53(323).
Type:- 'C'.

```

Object:-To find out the best rotation for late Paddy (with crop that can be broadcast on standing late Paddy fields).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.7.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) \(\Gamma\)-9 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Late paddy followed by fallow.
2. Late paddy followed by gram T-87 at 1 md./ac.
3. Late paddy followed by Aksa at 25 seers/ac.
4. Late paddy followed by Masoor at 15 seers/ac.
5. Late paddy followed by Pea local at \(1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. Late paddy followed by Hubam clover at 10 seers/ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(34^{\prime}-6^{\circ} \times 19^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) \& (b) N.A. (vj) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.E.B. (P) Nagina

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
. . (i) \(1258 \quad 1 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(377.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1199 \\
2. & 1336 \\
3. & 1122 \\
4. & 1566 \\
5. & 1211 \\
6. & 1113 \\
S.E./mean & \(=188.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :※ U.P. 51(274). } \\
\text { Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub_Stn., Tissuhi. } & \text { Type :- 'C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To find out the best rotation for late Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 48.12". (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Gram-Paddy.
2. Aksa-Paddy.
3. Pea-Paddy.
4. Fallow-Paddy.
5. Linseed-Paddy.
6. Masoor-Paddy.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 100.57 \mathrm{ac}\). (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951. (b) N.A. (c) NiJ. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.E.B. (P) Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in Uttar Pradesh" for the year 1951 was consulted. No origisal record or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(512.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cr} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 617.1 \\
2. & 579.3 \\
3. & 485.5 \\
4. & 477.3 \\
5. & 466.6 \\
6. & 449.3 \\
S.E./mean & \(-\mathbf{N}_{0} \mathbf{A}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Paddy. & Ref :- U.P. 49(42). \\
\hline Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina. & Type :-‘CV'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find out the residual effects of previous crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Paddy followed by Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A! (iii) 1.6.1949/ 17.7.1949. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and two shallow ploughings, (b), (c), (d), and (c) N.A. (v) Nil (vi) Anjana Pilibhit. (vii) N.A. (viii) Two hand weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.10.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

Paddy Anjana Pilibhit is sown in all the fields having 3 treatments in the previous year as follows:
1. Very early broadcast and harvested in early August, late variety transplanted in August.
2. Early variety broadcast at normal time.
3. Late variety transplanted at normal time.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) \(1 / 54.7 \mathrm{ac}\). (b) \(1 / 55.9 \mathrm{ac}\). (v่) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Asstt. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1500 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(258.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of graio in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1548 \\
2. & 1527 \\
3. & 1425 \\
S.e./mern & \(=91.5 \mathrm{lb}\).fac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :-Paddy .
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

```
Ref :- U.P. 50(40).
Type :-'CV'.

Object :-To find out the residual effects of previous crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Faddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1950/1.7.1950. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and two shallow ploughings. (b), (c), (d), and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi)Anjana Pilibhit. (vii) N.A. (vili) Two hand weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.10.1950.

\section*{8. TREATMENTS:}

Paddy Anjana Pilibhit is sown in all the fields having 3 treatments in the previous year as follows :
1. Very early broadcast and harvested in early August, late variety transplanted in August.
2. Early variety broadcast at normal time.
3. Late variety transplanted at normal time.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) \(1 / 51.8\) ac. (b) \(1 / 67.87\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) Yes. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil.
(vii) Conducted by Asst. Economic Botanist_(Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2108 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(274.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb . /ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2307 \\
2. & 1905 \\
3. & 2111 \\
S.En/mean & \(=97.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Paddy.
Ref: : U.P. 52(160).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi. Type :- 'CV'.

```

Object:-To find out the effect of spacing along with time of transplanting on the growth and yield of different varieties of Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy clay. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.6.1952/3.8.1952 and 18.8.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) \(30.02^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 4.12 .1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 times of transplanting : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Last week of July and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=15\) days after 1st transplanting.
Sab-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=T-36, V_{8}=T-88\) and \(\cdot V_{8}=T-100\).
(2) 4 spacings : \(S_{1}=3^{\circ}, S_{2}=6^{\circ}, S_{8}=9^{\circ}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block; 12 sub-plots/main-plots. (iv) (a) \(28^{\circ} \times 29^{\prime}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 23^{\circ}\). (v) \(6^{\prime}\) alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. to Govt. U.P., Lucknow.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1271 lb .ac.
(ii) (a) \(173.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(501.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(S\) and \(V\) effects are highly significant. None of the interactions is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & \(S_{3}\) & S & Mean & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}\) & \(\mathbf{V}\) \\
\hline T1 & 1988 & 1698 & 1152 & 977 & 1454 & 1034 & 1896 & \(1430{ }^{\circ}\) \\
\hline T 2 & 1953 & 1025 & 759 & 617 & 1089 & 920 & 1360 & 986 \\
\hline Mean & 1970 & 1362 & 955 & 797 & 1271 & 977 & 1628 & 1208 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 1525 & 1142 & 553 & 687 & & & & \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 2454 & 1618 & 1394 & 1046 & & & & \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 1932 & 1325 & 918 & 659 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1. T marginal means & \(=40.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 2. \(S\) marginal means & \(=167.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 3. V marginal means & \(=144.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}\). \\
\hline 4. \(S\) means at a level of \(\mathbf{T}\) & \(=236.5 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\). \\
\hline 5. T means ata level of \(S\) & \(=208.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 6. V means at a level of \(T\) & \(=204.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 7. T means at a level of \(\mathbf{V}\) & \(=172.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{S \times V}\) table & \(=204.8\) lb. \(/ \mathrm{ac}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.
Ref:- U.P. 51(278).

Site Late Paddy Res Thist
Type :- 'CV'.
Object :-To study the effect of growing together early and late Paddy on its yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplant and broadcast. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N-22 (early), T-88 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(48.12^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

2 TREATMENTS:
1. Late variety broadcast
2. Late variety transplanted
3. Late and early variety broadcast
4. Late and early varieties transplanted
3. Early variety broadcast
6. Early variety transplanted
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 61.16\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Padjy, to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in Uttar Pradesh" for the year 1951 was consulted. No original record or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(521.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
t. & 626.2 \\
2. & 516.8 \\
3. & 566.1 \\
4. & 544.6 \\
5. & 474.0 \\
6. & 393.3 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. SubwStn., Tissuhi. \(\quad\) Ref :-U.P. 52(320).

Object:-To study the effect of growing together early and late Paddy on its yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplant and Broadcast. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N-22 (early), T-88 (late) (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Late variety broadcast
2. Late variety transplanted
3. Late and early varieties broadcast
4. Late and early varieties transplanted
5. Early variety broadcast
6. Early variety transplanted
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 61.16\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) N.A. (c) NiL. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Report was consulted. No original record or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 766.8 lb ./ac.
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cr} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1163.5 \\
2. & 1166.8 \\
3. & 714.2 \\
4. & 1091.1 \\
S. & 195.8 \\
6. & 269.1 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 50(297).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To determine the best age for transplanting late Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting, (c) - (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 45.43. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

5 different ages of seedlings : \(A_{1}=20, A_{8}=30_{2} A_{8}=40, A_{4}=50\) and \(A_{5}=60\) days,
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 72.2\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in Uttar Pradesh" for the year 1950 was consulted, No original record or plot wise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(403.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cr} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{1}\) & 250.3 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{2}\) & 304.9 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{3}\) & 555.2 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{4}\) & 618.0 \\
\(\mathbf{A}_{5}\) & 291.3 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Lat e Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.
Ref :- U.P. 50(296).
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To find an optimum date for transplanting Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatment. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -- (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi, N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45.43^{\circ}\) (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

8 dates of transplanting : \(D_{1}=20.6 .1950, D_{2}=30.6 .1950, D_{3}=10.7 .1950, D_{4}=20.7 .1950, D_{6}=30.7 .1950, D_{8}=\) 10.8.1950, \(D_{7}=20.8 .1950\) and \(D_{8}=30.8 .1950\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8.
(b) N.A. (iii) 4.
(iv)
(a) N.A.
(b) \(1 / 102.46\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iij) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) II. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A, (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Asssitant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in Uttar Fredesh" the year 1950 was consulted. No original record or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(488.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,'ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatments & Av. yield \\
\(D_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 653.8 \\
\(D_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 787.6 \\
\(D_{3}\) & 711.2 \\
\(D_{8}\) & 690.2 \\
\(D_{8}\) & 341.5 \\
\(D_{8}\) & 323.0 \\
\(D_{7}\) & 260.8 \\
\(D_{8}\) & 137.0 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Site:~ Late Paddy Res, SubrStn., Tissuhi.
Ref:~ U.P. 49(238).
Type:m 'C'.

```

Object:-To find out the best spacing for transplanting late Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey to hard clay, with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(39.18^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

3 spacings: \(-S_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{2}=12^{\prime \prime}\) apart.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 72.2\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in U.P." for the year 1949 was consulted. No orginal record or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(366_{z} 12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatments differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(S_{1}\) & 506.64 \\
\(S_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 346.48 \\
\(S_{3}\) & 245.25 \\
S.E/reean & N.A.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
> Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref:- U.P. 50(294).

Object :-To find out the best spacing for transplanting late Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting (c) -. (d) As per treatments. (o) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45.43^{\circ}\) ( \((x)\) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

3 spacings: \(S_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{8}=12^{\prime \prime}\) apart.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 72.2\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b)and (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Asst. Economic Botanist (Paddy) 10 Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in U.P." for the year 1950 was consulted. No original records or plotwise yield data were quailable.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(833.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatments differ significantly.
\begin{tabular}{cr} 
(iv) & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. } \\
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(S_{1}\) & 1083.3 \\
\(S_{2}\) & 764.0 \\
\(S_{3}\) & 652.1 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
> Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref:- U.P. 49(239).
Type: ' C '.
Object :- To find out the optimum numter of seedlings required for transplanted Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay to hard clay with gres ish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii)N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) As per treatments. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 39.18". (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

No. of seedlings/hole : \(S_{1}=1, S_{2}=3\) to 4 and \(S_{3}=8\) to 12 seedlings.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 72.2\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Asst. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in Uttar Pradesh" for the year 1949 was consulted. No original records or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(417.86 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not sinificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). Treatment Av. yield
\(S_{1} \quad 261.8\)
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 388,9
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{lr}\mathrm{S}_{8} & 602.9 \\ \text { S.E./mean } & =\text { N.A. }\end{array}\)

\section*{Crop :-Paddy (Kharif). \\ Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.}

> Ref :-U.P. 50(295).
ype :-C.
Object :-To find out the optimum number of seedlings required for transplanted Paddy,
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (jii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) As per treatrents, (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45.43^{\circ}\), (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

No. of seedlingsihole: \(S_{1}=1, S_{2}=3\) to 4 and \(S_{3}=8\) to 12 seedlings.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 72.2 \mathrm{ac}\) (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-19j0. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P.0 Nagina. Oaly the annual report "Rice Research Wurk in Uitar Pradesh" for the year \(195 J\) was consulted. No original plotwise yield data or records were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(687.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant. (iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cr} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & 409.2 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 649.7 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1002.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. SuboStn., Tissuhi.

Ref :-U.P. 50(293).
Type :~‘‘’.

Object:-To compare different cultural practices.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Broadcast. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) As per treatments. (ix) \(45.43^{\prime \prime}\). (x) NoA.
2. TREATMENTS :

6 cultural operations :
1. Control
2. Ploughing 3 weeks after sowing
3. Ploughing 5 weeks after sowing
4. Harrowing 3 weeks after sowing
5. Harrowing 5 weeks after sowing
6. Transplanting
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) N.A.
(b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(1 / 99.62\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Graia yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1952\). (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the annual raport "Rice Research Work in Uttar Pradesh" for the year 1950 was consulted. No original record or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(210.5 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 284.4 \\
2. & 254.1 \\
3. & 103,4 \\
4. & 299.8, \\
5. & 83.3 \\
6. & 237.7 \\
S.E \(/\) mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

Crop :~ Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref :- U.P. 51 (275).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To compare different cultural practices.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colour. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Broadcasting and transplantıng. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(48.12^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control
2. Ploughing 3 weeks after sowing
3. Ploughing 5 weeks after sowing
4. Harrowing 3 weeks after sowing
5. Harrowing 5 weeks after sowing
6. Transplanting
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 99.72\) ac. (v) and (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. UP., Nagina. Only the annual report "Rice Research Work in Uttar Pradesh" for the year 1951 was consulted. No original records or plotwise yield data were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(661.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 570.2 \\
2. & 907.6 \\
3. & 479.7 \\
4. & 801.5 \\
5. & 639.4 \\
6. & 568.6 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).}

Ref:- 52(321).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To compare different cultural practices.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with greyish black colcur. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a' NA. (b) Broadcasting and transplanting. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) As per treatments. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control
2. Ploughing 3 weeks after sowing
3. Plougbing 5 weeks after sowing
4. Harrowing 3 weeks after sowing
5. Harrowing 5 weeks after sowing
6. Transplanting

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 58.57 \mathrm{ac}\) (v) and (vi) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1952\). (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Économic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina. Only the Annual report "Rice Research Work in Uttar Pradesh" for the year 1952 was consulted. No plote wise yield data or original records were available.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1141 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1270 \\
2. & 1054 \\
3. & 986 \\
4. & 1337 \\
5. & 1131 \\
6. & 1066 \\
S E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- Late Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Ref:-U.P. 53(42).

Object:-To study the effect of spacing and manuring on growth and yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sanai-Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.8.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing and Palewa with cultivators, desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c)-. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Sanai ploughed in as G.M. and F.Y.M. appplied at \(50 \mathrm{md} . / a c\). (vi) T-43. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculturing between rows 3-4 times with hand how and weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.10.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 spacings : \(S_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=6^{\circ}, S_{3}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
Sub-plot treatments:
4 manurings: \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{CaO}, \quad \mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \quad\) of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) \(15 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{CaO} . \quad \mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{4}=90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}+45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO .
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super, CaO as Gypsum, N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate .
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-72 \(\times 3^{\prime}\); Sub-18 \(\times 39^{\circ}\). (b) Sub- \(15^{\circ} \times 36^{\circ}\). (v) Plot bund \(1.5^{\circ} \times 1^{\prime \prime}\) (higb) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of Gundhi bug in milky stage, (iii) Grain ans straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Nawabganj, Banaras and Luck now. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Crop Physiologist to Govt. of U.P., Lueknow.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1967 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(342.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(376.2 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1988 & 1902 & 1832 & 1936 & 1914 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1798 & 2102 & 1874 & 1839 & 1903 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1805 & 1898 & 2061 & 2396 & 2040 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1898 & 1725 & 2265 & 2147 & 2009 \\
\hline Mean & 1872 & 1907 & 2008 & 2080 & 1967
\end{tabular}

S E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(S\) & \(=139.9 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\), \\
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\) & \(=153.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at a level of \(\mathbf{S}\) & \(=307.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(\mathbf{N}\) & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 53(40).
Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of spacing and manuring on the growth and yield of Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) ia) Nil. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30 and 31.7.1953. (iv) (a) One ploughing. (b) Transplanted. (c).-. (d) As per treatments. (e) One seedling/hole. (v) Mung and Lobia ploughed in as G.M. and F.Y.M. at 50 md./ac. at puddling. (vi) T-9 (late). (vii) Irrigated, (viii) Interculturing 3-4 times. (ix) N.A. (x) 9 and 10.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments:
4 spacings : \(S_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{8}=9^{\prime}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
Sab-plot treatments:
4 manurings : \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{CaO}, \mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .0\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}+\) \(15 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac, of \(\mathrm{CaO}, \quad \mathrm{N}_{5}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{4}=90 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{4}}+45 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac, of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\) 40 lb ./ac of CaO .
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super, CaO as Gypsum. N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
Time of application : \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) on 26.7.1953, Gypsum 29.7.1953. Potash and A/S 2 weeks after transplanting.
Method of application: \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) by placement ( \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep) in soil behind the plough, Gypsum as surface dressing, and \(A / S\) and Potash as top dressing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block ; 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) main \(72^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). Sub-18' \(\times 42^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Nawabganj, Bharari, Varanasi and Lucknow. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Crop Physiologist to Govt. U.P., Lucknow.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(3513 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(58.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(81.45 \mathrm{lb} \cdot \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{N}\) and interaction \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{S}\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \begin{tabular}{l} 
Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\)
\end{tabular} \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{2 9 4 5}\) & \(\mathbf{3 0 5 1}\) & 3284 & 3341 & 3155 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 3600 & 3466 & 3647 & 3663 & 3521 \\
\hline Mean & 3242 & 3759 & 3839 & 3791 & 3747 \\
& 3274 & 3473 & 3928 & 3724 & 3628 \\
\hline & & & 3674 & 3630 & 3513
\end{tabular}
S.E of difference between two
1. \(S\) marginal means
\(=23.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(\mathbf{N}\) marginal means
\(=33.25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)
\(=66.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(N\)
\(=62.32 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 53(315).
Site :~Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Type :- 'CM'.

Object:-To test the efficacy of Japanese method of Paddy cultivation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Paddy-Pea. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(46.1953 / 12\) and 13.7.1953 (Tr. 1) and 10.7 .1953 (Tr. 2). (iv) (a) 5 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Transplanting. (c)-(d) \(10^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\) (in Trt. 1) : \(9^{\circ}\) in rows (Trt. 2). (e) 3 seedlings hole (Trt. 1) and 4 scediags/hole (Trt. 2). (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) Nıl. (viii) 4 weedıngs. (ix) \(46.14^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 1 and 3.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Japanese method of cultivation.
2. Local method of cultivation.

Manturg of treatment 1 : Oire C L./plot of village compost +5 lb . A/S +5 lb. Super at transplanting (15.7.1953 and the 2nd dos: on 218 ,953).
Manuring of treatment 2 : No village compost, 61 lo . A/S on 10.7.1953 and again 6 flb , of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 10.8.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired-plot. (ii) 2 (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(121^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\), (b) \(119^{\prime}-6^{\circ} \times 16^{\prime}-6^{\circ}\). (v) \(9^{n}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good and uniform growth, lodging oa 26.9.1953. (ii) Slight attack of leaf spot disease and gundhis. Control measures-dusting with gammaxene. (iii) Height, tillering, and grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nit. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1524 \quad \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(46.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yicld of grain in lb.jac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1658 \\
2. & 1389 \\
S.E./mean & \(=23.94 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 48 (121).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Type:-'CM'.
Object:-To find out the effect of manuring nursery and the field along with different seed rates on yield of Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.7.1943. (iv) (a) One victory plough and 3 desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early).? (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) \(43.59^{\circ}\). ( \(x\) ) 1 to 3.10.1948.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 doses of N applied to the field: \(\mathrm{F}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~F}_{1}=25 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{F}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 3 doses of \(N\) applied to nursery: \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) and \(N_{z}=2.20\) lo./ac. of \(N\).
(3) 2 seed rates: \(S_{1}=20\) and \(S_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as Castor cake.
Date of application :-In nursery beds on 25.5 .1948 as basal by broaucast. In field on 30.7.1948 as top dressing by broadcast.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 18 . (b) \(175^{\prime} \times 60^{\circ}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Vigorous growth. (ii) Slight attack of gundhi bugs and stem borer. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1949. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.Po, Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1174 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(182.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{F}\) and \(\mathbf{N}\) are highly significant. No other effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{a}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{0}\) & 905 & 631 & 759 & 765 & 755 & 775 \\
\hline \(F_{1}\) & 1323 & 1151 & 1211 & 1228. & 1292 & 1164 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{2}\) & 1667 & 1382 & 1534 & 1528, & 1547 & 1509 \\
\hline Mean & 1298 & 1055 & 1168 & 1174 & 1198 & 1149 \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 1366 & 1083 & 1145 & & & \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 1230 & 1026 & 1191 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal means of \(N\) or \(F\)
S.E. of marginal means of \(S\) S.E of body of \(N \times F\) table S.E. of body of \(\mathrm{F} \times \mathrm{S}\) or \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{S}\) table
\[
=37.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]
\(=30.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=64.38 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\), \(=52.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).}

Sitc :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :- U.P. 49(228).
Type :- ‘CM'.

Object:-To find out the effect of manuring nursery and the field along with different seed rates on yield of Paddy.
1. BASAC CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) NiL. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 andj7.7.1949. (iv) (a) Ono victory plough and 3 desi plough. (b) sTransplanted. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136 (early). (viii) Unirtigated. (viii) 3 hoeings by kassi and 2 weedings. (ix) 43.58.. (x) 27.9.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 doses of \(N\) applied to the field: \(F_{0}=0, F_{1}=25 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{F}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 3 dates of \(N\) applied to nursery: \(N_{8}=0, N_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N
(3) 2 seed rates: \(S_{1}=20\) and \(S_{8}=40 \mathrm{Jb}\)./ac.

N as Castor cake.
Date of of application ; In nursery beds on 28.5 .1949 as basal by broadcast. In field on 25.7.1949 as top dressing by broadcast.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3 \times 2\) Fact in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 18. (b) \(175^{\prime} \times 60^{\circ}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) One foot alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good growth. (ii) Slight attack of gundhi bugs. (iii) Height, tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1919 (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 828 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(252.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(F\) is highly significant. Effect of \(S\) and interaction \(N \times S\) are significant. No other effects are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb//ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{0}\) & 634 & 715 & 672 & 674 & 726 & 621 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{1}\) & 752 & 882 & 880 & 838 & 976 & 700 \\
\hline \(F_{2}\) & 865 & 939 & 1110 & 971 & 997 & 946 \\
\hline Mean & 750 & 845 & 887 & 828 & 899 & 756 \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & . 859 & 995 & 845 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 641 & 695 & 930 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(N\) or \(F\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\)
S.E. of body of \(N \times F\) table
S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{F} \times \mathbf{S}\) and \(N \times S\) table
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =57.37 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =42.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =89.20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =72.75 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Object :-To study the effect of spacing and manuring on growth and yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.7.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplant d. (c) - (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-136. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 spacings : \(S_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=6^{\circ}, S_{8}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures : \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=\) No manure, \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=A / S\) at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. Sulphato at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+G y p s u m\) at 20 lb ./ac. af \(\mathrm{CaO}, \mathrm{N}_{2}=A / \mathrm{S}\) at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 60 \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. sulphate at 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\mathrm{G}\) ypsum at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO .
Super by placement \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in soil befcre sowing and Gypsum as surface dressing. A/S and Pot. Sulphate applied two weeks after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) \(20^{\circ} \times 11.5^{\circ}\). (b) \(16 \times 9.5^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii), Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Nawabgunj, Bharari and Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Condusted by crop Physiologist to Govt. of U.P., Lucknow.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1984 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(552.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) 277.4 lb ./ac.
(iii) Nose of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1774 & 1945 & 2256 & 1898 & 1968 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1649 & 2022 & 2069 & 1836 & 1894 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1540 & 2147 & 2038 & 2629 & 2089 \\
\hline Mean & 1654 & 2038 & 2121 & 2121 & 1984
\end{tabular}.
S.E. of difference between two
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1. S marginal means & \(=260.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 2. N marginal means & \(=113.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 3. S means at a level of N & \(=319.6 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 4. N means at a level of S & \(=226.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 48(31).
Type:- 'CM'.

Object:-To find out the effect of manuring nursery and the field along with different seed rates on yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.6.1948/25.7.1948. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-22-A (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.11.1948.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 doses of \(N\) applied to the field: \(\mathrm{F}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~F}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N
(2) 3 doses of \(N\) applied to nursery: \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N
(3) 2 seed rates : \(S_{1}=20\) and \(S_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as castor calce on 7.6.1948 to nursery and on 26.8.1948 to the field.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3 \times 2\) Fact. in R B.D. (ii) (a) 18. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(41^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (b) \(1 / 93.88\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1404 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(184.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of \(F\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mea & \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) \\
\hline \(F_{0}\) & 1183 & 1200 & 1102 & 1162 & 1145 & 1179 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{1}\) & 1428 & 1427 & 1416 & 1424 & 1389 & 1458 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{2}\) & 1717 & 1476 & 1687 & 1626 & 1682 & 1570 \\
\hline Mean & 1443 & 1368 & 1402 & 1404 & 1405 & 1403 \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 1467 & 1343 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & - 1418 & 1393 & 1397 & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of N or F \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) \\
S.E. of tody of \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathrm{F}\) table \\
S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{F} \times \mathbf{S}\) or \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{S}\) table
\end{tabular}} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =42.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =30.80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =65.34 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} \\
& =53.29 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 53(136). Type :- 'CM'.

Object:-To test ihe merits of Japanese method of Paddy cultivation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Birseem. (b) Berseem. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 9,10.7.1953. (iv) (a) 1 deep ploughing, 2 shallow plougbings and 1 harrowing (b) to (c) As per treatments.' (v) F.YM. at 80 mds /ac. and compost at 80 mds./ac. applied on 21.6 .1953 and 22.6 .1953 respectively. (vi) CH-4 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hand weedings and 2 weedings by Japanese cultivator. (ix) 46.28". (x) 20,21.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (A), (B), (C). (D), (E) and (F)
\((A)=\) Seed rate, \((B)=\) Preparation of beds, \((C)=\) No. of seedlings/hole, \((D)=\) Method of planting \((E)=\) Manuring and \((F)=\) Weeding.
Each of the above treatments tried under Local and Japanese method of Paddy cultivation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{6}\) confounded. (ii) (a) 8 blocks/replication; 8 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) (a) \(59^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (b) \(57^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime \prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of rice fly and gundhi, 3-4 dustings with gammaxene. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-cortinued, (b) No. (cl No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2463 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(350.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effects of \(\mathbf{C}\) and \(\mathbf{E}\) are highly significant.
(iv) Mean and differential response of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Factors & Mean & A & B & C & D & E & F \\
\hline & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { res- } \\
\text { ponse }
\end{gathered}
\] & + & \(-\quad+\) & \(+\) & \(-\quad+\) & \(-\quad+\) & \(\pm\) \\
\hline A & -152.9 & & -110.4-195.3 & -128-293.0 & -169.8-135.9 & -106.1-199.6 & -51.0-254.8 \\
\hline B & 48.9 & 89.285 &  & \(\begin{array}{lll}-12.7 & 110.4\end{array}\) & 135.9-38.2 & 195.3-97.6 & 110.4-12.7 \\
\hline C & 2505 & 390.61104 & \(186.8 \quad 314.2\) & - - & 106.1 394.9 & \begin{tabular}{|ll}
339.7 & 161.3
\end{tabular} & \(276.0 \quad 225.0\) \\
\hline D & - 80.7 & -97.7-63.7 & 8.5-169.8 & \begin{tabular}{|cc|}
\hline 225.0 & 63.6
\end{tabular} & - - & - 63.7 -97.6 & \(-29.7-131.6\) \\
\hline E & 643.3 & 687.8598 .7 & 794.0 & 730.3 556.2 & 662.4624 .2 & - - & \(811.0 \quad 475.5\) \\
\hline F & - 67.9 & 34.0-169.8 & -8.5-127.4 & \(\mid-42.5-93.4\) & \(|-17.0-118.9|\) & 97.6-233.5 & - - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj.

```

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 53(41).}

Type :m 'CM'.
Object:- To study the effect of manuring along with spacing on yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.7 .1953 and 1.8 .1953 . (iv) (a) Ploughing and pata. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring dhaincha. Compost at \(5 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). at the time of puddling when the green manure crop has been buried. (vi) CH-4. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Iaterzulturing betwaen ruws \(3-4\) tim3s and waeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 späcings : \(S_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{3}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime}\)
Sub-plot trealments :
4 manures: \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{Ca} ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+15\) lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{Ca} ; \mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Ca ; and \(\mathrm{N}_{4}=90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+40\) lb./ac. Ca.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super, Ca as Gypsum, N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Spilt-Plot (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) main- \(72^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\); sub \(18^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). (v) Flot bund \(1.5^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\) (high) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL
(i) Good. (ii) Nil (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953 -continued (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bharari, Varanasi, Kanpur and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Crop Physiologist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2415 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(404.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(322.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Mean } \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & 2068 & 2566 & 2604 & 2553 & 2418 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 2591 & 2591 & 2374 & 2566 & 2530 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{9}\) & 2400 & 2476 & 2374 & 2438 & 2422 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 2285 & 2272 & 2042 & 2438 & 2259 \\
\hline Mean & 2336 & 2476 & 2348 & 2499 & 2415
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference between two.
1. S marginal means \(=165.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means \(\quad=131.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)
\(=263.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. S means at a level of N
\(=281.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Paddy.
Site :-Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref:- U.P. 52(161).
Type : ' 'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of spacing and manuring on the yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c). N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy clay. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N A. (b) Transplanted. (c) - (d) and (c) N.A. (v) NiL (vi) T-36 (late) (vii) N.A (vii) N.A. (ix) \(30.02^{\circ}\) (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :-
3 manures : \(N_{1}=A / S\) at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at \(15 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{s}}+\) Pot. Sulphate \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\); \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 45 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 22.5 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. Sulphate at 22.5 lt ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) : \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}}=A / \mathrm{S}\) at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. Sulphate at 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\).
Sub-plot treatments :-
4 spacings: \(S_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{3}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-Plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/biock ; 4 sub-plots/majn-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(35^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\) (b) \(31^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a), (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Crop Physiologist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(784 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{jac}\).
(ii) (a) \(310.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(359.8 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\)
(iii) Only \(S\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{c|cccc|c} 
& \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(S_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(S_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1282 & 775 & 440 & 796 & 823 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1665 & 765 & 440 & 370 & 810 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1215 & 843 & 482 & 330 & 718 \\
\hline Mean & 1387 & 794 & 454 & 499 & 784
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference between two
1. \(\mathbf{N}\) maryinal mean
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =126.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =188.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =326.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =309.8 \mathrm{lo} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]
2. \(S\) marginal means
3. S means at a level of N
4. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)

Crop:-Paddy.
Site :-Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Tissuhi.

Ref:-U.P. 53(321).
Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To judge the merits of Japanese method of Paddy cultivation.
1. BASAL CO DITIIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light clay to hard clay with grayish black colour. (iii) 14.6.1953/23.7.1953. (iv) (a) As per treatments. (b) Transplanting. (c) 一. (d) As pertreatments. (e) As per treatments. (v) N.A. (vi) T-88 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
(1) Local method: One \(1 / 16\) acre plot of nursery bed, in which 25 mds . of compost and 25 lb . mixture of A/S in equal proportion was applied, was filled with water, ploughed with desi plough 4 times and was thoroughly puddled and sprouted seeds at the rate of \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{bed}\). was sown, half an hour after puddling the fields (no raised beds were made in this case). No weeding in the nursery was required. Transplanted seedlings \(7^{5} \times 8\) apart, not in a row, with 3 to 4 seedlings/hole.
(2) Japanese method :-Made \(4 \times 25\) bed raised 3 inches above the level of the ground and with 1 foot space, between adjacent beds The raised beds were prepared after 6 ploughings of the fields with desi plough after palewa. Each raised seed bed was manured with 1 md . compost and levelled and then a thin layer of compost followed ty a thin layer of asbes which in itself was followed by one lb. of mixture of super and"A/S in equal parts. One lb. seed which was thoroughly winnowed was sown in each bed on 14.6.1953 and the seed was covered with \(1 / 8\) inches layer of fine earth and was highly pressed and the beds were irrigated. No weeding in nursery was required. Transplanted \(10^{\circ}\) apart from row to row and plant to plant with 3 to 4 seedlings/hole.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired-plot. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(88.5^{\prime} \times 22.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1953-\) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Asst. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Tissubi.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1400 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(378.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lbo/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1609 \\
2. & 1191 \\
S.E./mean & \(169.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). & Ref :- U.P. 53(398). \\
Site :- Agri. College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi. & Type :- 'CM'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of multiple transplantation with 'increasing doses of \(\mathbf{N}\) on growth and yield of Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane Ratoon. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Agri. College Farm, Varaoasi. (iii) September 1953. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by meston plough and 5 by desi plough. (b) Transplanted. (c)- (d) \(9^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) 2 seedlings/hole. (v) F.Y.M. at \(100 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\) and Super at \(82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). applied before transplanting. (vi) T-2 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 weedings and one hand hoeing. (ix) Nil. (x) 20.11.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=20, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=40\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 types of seedlings: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) From nursery (1), \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) From nursery (2) and \(\mathrm{T}_{8}=\) From nursery (3).

N as A/S applied 12 days after transplanting of seedlings. Light irrigation after application of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
[Nursery (1): Bed size-1/50 ac. 3 ploughings were given and F.Y.M. applied at 100 md /ac. io lb . of seed dipped in \(15 \%\) brine solution. Heavier seeds were taken from the bottom and soaked in water for \(\mathbf{2 4}\) hours prior to sowing. Soaked seed dried for 1 hour and broadcast.
Nursery (2) : \(2 / 3\) of the seedlings from nursery (1) removed and the gap is immediately covered with hand implements. The removed seedlings were transplanted in nursery (2) in bunches of 15 to 20 seedlings with \(3^{\prime \prime} \times 3^{\prime \prime}\) spacing.
Nursery (3) : \(50 \%\) of the seedlings from nursery (2) uprooted after 15 days and again transplanted in bunches of 10 to 15. After 15 days, the seedlings were transplanted in the main field from these three nurseries as under (2)].
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(4 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(560 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft}\). (b) \(416 \mathrm{sq}, \mathrm{ft}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield along with growth measurements. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(2157 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(146.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effects of N and T differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :~ Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Ref:- U.P. 53(38).
Type :- 'CM'.

Object:-To study the effect of manuring and spacing on yield and growth of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 20.7.1953. (iv)
(a) 4 ploughings. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 50 mds/ac and G.M. at the time of puddling when green manure crop has been turned in. (vi) N-22. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 to 4 interculturings and weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.10.19j3.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 spacings : \(S_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, S_{8}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{3}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
Sub-plot treatments :
4 manures : \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{Ca}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+15\) \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{Ca}, \mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) +30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{Ca}, \mathrm{N}_{4}=90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Ca.
N applied as A/S, Ca as Gypsum, \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Suiphate.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) main-72' \(\times 42^{\prime}\). sub-18' \(\times 42^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (iv) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Attack by gundhi bug. (iij) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-contd. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Nawabganj, Bharari and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Crop Physiologist to Govt. U.P., Lucknow.

\section*{, 5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1223 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(361.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(171.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(S\) effect differs significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1468 & 1564 & 1647 & 1545 & 1556 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 1264 & 1213 & 1462 & 1066 & 1251 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 970 & 1111 & 919 & 1098 & 1024 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 996 & 1136 & 970 & 1136 & 1060 \\
\hline Mean & 1174 & 1256 & 1250 & 1211 & 1223
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal means
2. \(\mathbf{N}\) marginal means
\(=147.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(N\) means at the same level of \(S\)
\(=70.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(S\) means at the same level of \(N\)
\(=140.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=191.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
```

Crop :-Paddy.
Site :-Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

```
Ref:-U.P. 48(26).
Type: ‘‘CMV'.

Object :-To determine the effect of double cropping on the total Paddy yield and its residual effect on the subsequent rice crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Tr. \(1: 15.4 .1948\), Tr. 1 (double): 1.7.1948 and Tr. 2 and Tr. 3 : 15.6.1948, Berseem : 11.11.1948. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early) and T-100 (late). (vii) N A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) Tr. \(1: 9.8 .1948\), Tr. \(2: 18.9 .1948\), Tr. \(3: 2.12 .1948\), Tr. I (double) 9.12.1948.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Early variety broadcast in April and manured, late variety transplanted in August and manured, Berseem sown in standing late crop.
2. Early variety broadcasted normal time and manured. Berseem in Rabi.
3. Late variety transplanted in normal time, manüred and Berseem in standing late crop.

Date of manuring: Tr. 1 on 17.5.1948, Tr. 2 on 17.7.1948, Tr. 3 on 17.8.1948 and Tr. 1 double on 14.9.1948.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B D.
(ii) (a) 3.
(b) N A.
(iii) 8. (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 29.5^{\prime}\).
(b) \(1 / 54.7\) ac.
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1948 \rightarrow 1950\). (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1881 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(356.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2583 \\
2. & 1141 \\
3. & 1919 \\
S.E./mean & \(=125.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Paddy. & Ref:- U.P. 49(39). \\
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina. & Type:- ‘CMV’.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To determine the effect of double cropping on the total Paddy yield and its res'dual effect on the subsequent rice crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Fallow. (b) Fallow (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Tr. 1: 11.4.1949, Tr. 1 (double) : 27.6.1949/11.8.1949. Tr. \(2: 24.6 .1949\) and Tr. \(3: 8.6 .1949 / 18.7 .1949\). (iv) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) As per treatments. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-22 (early) and T. 17 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 hand weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) Tr. \(1: 2\) and 5.8.1949; Tr. \(2: 24.9 .1949\); Tr. 3 : 28.11.1949 and Tr. 1 (double): 3.12.1949.

2 TREATMENTS:
1. Early variety broadcast in April and manured, late variety transplanted in August and manured, Berscem sown in standing late crop.
2. Early variety broadcasted in normal time manured and Berseem in Rabi.
3. Late variety transplanted in normal time manured and Berseem in standing fate crop.

Castor cake applied on 25.1949, 23.7.1949, 26.8.1949 and A/N applied on 18 5.1949, 25.7.1949 and 22.8.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) \(29^{\circ} \times 29.5^{\circ}\). (b) \(1 / 58.34 \mathrm{ac}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948 -1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagain.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1678 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 190.4 ib ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1550 \\
2. & 1740 \\
3. & 1744 \\
S.E./mean & \(=67.32 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy.
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.
Ref :- U.P. \(50(38)\).
Type :- 'CMV'.
Object :-To determine the effect of double cropping on the total Paddy yield and its residual effect on the subsequent rice crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Paddy—Berseem. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Tr. 1 : 10.4.1950,

Tr. 2:22.6.1950 and Tr. 3:8.6.1950. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and two shallow ploughings.
(b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N-22 (early) and T-17 (late). (vii) N.A. (yiii) Two weedings by hand.
(ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Early variety broadcast in April and manured. Late variety transplanted in August and manured. Berseem sown in standing late crop.
2. Early variety troadcast in normal time manured and Berseem in Rabi.
3. Late variety transplanted in normal time, manured and Berseem in standing late crop.

Castor cake applied on 10.5.1950 and 8.8.1950 and A/S on 23.5.1950 and 11.8.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) \(29^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\). (b) \(1 / 61.25\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. : (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) an I (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2155 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(323.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb.Jac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 3074 \\
2. & 1680 \\
3. & 1710 \\
S.E./mean & \(=114.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 48(113). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Attara. } & \text { Type :- 'I'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of varying intervals and depths of irrigation on yield of Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N. A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa, (b) N.A. (iii) 7.7.1948/23.8.1948 to 27.8.1948. (iv) (a) Ploughing according to the local practice. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-36. (vii) As per treatments. (viii) Weeding was done in nursery plots. (ix) 76.04*. (x) 15.12.1948.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 depths of irrigation: \(L_{0}=0, L_{1}=3, L_{2}=4 \frac{1}{2}, L_{3}=6, L_{4}=7 \frac{1}{4}\) and \(L_{5}=9\) ioches.
(2) 4 intervals of irriga tions: \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=2, \mathrm{I}_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}, \mathrm{I}_{3}=3\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{4}=4\) weeks.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(6 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 24 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(25^{\circ} \times 11^{\prime}\). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Crop matured well. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1950. (b) In the same plots from 1948 to 1950. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Bahadrabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by I.R.I.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1961 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(307.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\[
\text { Control }=1849 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]
\begin{tabular}{l|cccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1934 & 1919 & 2006 & 1746 & 1894 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2077 & 1762 & 2037 & 1996 & 1968 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 2026 & 1863 & 2093 & 2036 & 1997 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 2057 & 2113 & 1940 & 1879 & 1997 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{5}\) & 2184 & 2057 & 2118 & 1879 & 2060 \\
\hline Mean & 2050 & 1943 & 2039 & 1901 & 1983
\end{tabular}
S.E. of \(L\) marginal means
S.E. of I marginal means
S.E. of tody of table
S.E. of the control mean
\(=76.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=68.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=153.81 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=76.91 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 49(221).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Attara.
Type:- 'I'.'
Object :-To study the effect of varying intervals and depths of irrigation on yield of Paddy.
BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A.. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.6.1949/3.8.1949 to 6.8.1949. (iv) (a) Ploughing according to the local practice. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36. (vii) Irrigated. (viij) Weeding was done in the nursery plots. (ix) \(39.58^{\circ}\). (x) 4.12.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 depths of irrigation: \(L_{0}=0, L_{3}=3, L_{2}=41, L_{8}=6, L_{4}=71\) and \(L_{5}=9\) inches.
(2) 4 intervals of irrigations: \(I_{2}=2, I_{2}=21_{1} I_{3}=3\) and \(I_{4}=4\) weeks.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(6 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 24. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1950. (b) In the same plots from 1948 to 1950. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Bahadrabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by LRI.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(736.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(1324 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) \(L\) effect is significant, interaction \(L \times I\) add control vs others are hilhly sienifcant. I effect is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Paddy (Kharif). & Ref :-U.P. 50(277). \\
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Attara. & Type :-'I'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of varying intervals and depths of irrigation on yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a), (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) \(30.6 .1950 / 10\) to 12.8.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughing according to local practice. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-36. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding was done in the nursery plots. (ix) \(56.28^{\prime \prime}\) ( x ) 8.12.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 deptis of irrigations : \(L_{0}=\dot{0}, L_{1}=3, L_{2}=4 \frac{1}{2}, L_{3}=6, L_{8}=7 \frac{1}{2}\) and \(L_{5}=9\) inches.
(2) 4 intervals of irrigations: \(I_{1}=2, I_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}, I_{2}=3\) and \(I_{4}=4\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(6 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B D. (ii) (a) 24. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(25^{\circ} \times 11^{\prime}\) inches. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not good. The crop was badly damaged for want of rains. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-195J. (b) In the same plots from 1948 to 1950. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Bahadarabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil.
(vii) The experiment was conducted by I.R.I.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1442 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(218.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Only I effect, interaction I \(\times \mathrm{L}\) and control \(\boldsymbol{v}\) others are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control =336 lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & \(I_{2}\) & Is & It & Mean \\
\hline \(L_{1}\) & 1782 & 1517 & 1477 & 1874 & 1662 \\
\hline \(L_{1}\) & 1431 & 2113 & 1716 & 1858 & 1780 \\
\hline \(L_{8}\) & 1314 & 1848 & 1690 & 1349 & 1550 \\
\hline \(L_{4}\) & 1701 & 1685 & 1609 & 1665 & 1665 \\
\hline \(L_{5}\) & 1599 & 1553 & 1354 & 2118 & 1656 \\
\hline Mean & 1565 & 1743 & 1569 & 1773. & 1663 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S E. L marginal means \\
S.E. I marginal means \\
S.E. of body of table \\
S.E. of control mean
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=54.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=48.86 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=169.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=54.60 \mathrm{lt} / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- Crop :- Paddy (Kharif)..

Site :- Field Res. Stn., Bahadrabad.

Ref :-U.P. 48(114)
Type :- 'I'.

Object :-To study the effect of varying frequet cies and depths of irrigation on yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a), (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey. (b) N.A. (iii) \(2.6 .1948 / 1 \mathrm{I}\) to 18.7 .1948 . (iv) (a) Palleva, ploughing and patala. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M, at \(120 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). to nursery and castor cake at \(10 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). to the feld. (vi) T-21 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding was done in nursery plots. (ix) \(44.2^{\circ}\). (x) 15 to 23.10.1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 depths of irrigations : \(L_{0}=0, L_{1}=3, L_{2}=4 \frac{1}{2}, L_{8}=\sigma_{8} L_{6}=7 \frac{1}{2}\) and \(L_{6}=9\) inches.
(2) 4 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{2}=2, I_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}, I_{3}=3\) and \(I_{4}=4\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(6 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 24. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(48^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(43^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) \(2 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Tillering and grow th were very gcod. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yjeld. (iv) (a) 1947-1949. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Attara. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii; The experiment was conducted by I.R.I.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1655 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 325.8 lb ./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control \(\rightarrow 1554 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 13 & If. & Mead \\
\hline \(L_{1}\) & 1862 & 1670 & 1803 & 1493 & 1707 \\
\hline \(L_{2}\) & 1562 & 1631 & 1709 & 1734 & 1659 \\
\hline Ls & 1704 & 1675 & 1572 & 1730 & 1670 \\
\hline \(L_{4}\) & 1442 & 1909 & 1654 & 1530 & 1634 \\
\hline \(L_{5}\) & 1667 & 1599 & 1714 & 1849 & 1707 \\
\hline Mean & 1647 & 1697 & 1690 & 1667 & 1675 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S E of L marginal means} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=8145 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E of I marginal means} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=72.85 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=162,90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of control mean} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=81.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Field Res. Stn., Bahadrabad.

Ref :- U.P. 49(222).
Type:- 'I'.

Object :-To study the effect of varying frequ retes ard defthe cf imigation on yield cf Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam and clayey. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.6.1949/1 to 7.8.1949. (iv) (a) Ploughing according to local practice. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) F Y.M. at \(12 \mathrm{Cmd} / \mathrm{ac}\). to the nursery ard the field on 4.6.1949. (vi) T-21 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii Wcecirg was dene after sowirg of nurstry. (ix) 37.5". (x) 29.10.1949 to 4.11.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 levels of irr'gation : \(L_{8}=0, L_{1}=?, L_{8}=4,, L_{8}=6, L_{4}=71\) and \(L_{5}=9\) inches.
(2) 4 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{2}=2, I_{2}=2 I_{1} I_{2}=3\) and \(I_{4}=4\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i, \(6 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 24. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(48^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(43^{\circ} \times 25\). (v) \(21^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1949. (b) Ye3. (c) No. (v) (a) Attara, (b) No. (vi) Nii. (vii) Conducted by I.R.I.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1275 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(257.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only I effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./a:.

Control mean \(=1326 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & I 1 & \(\mathbf{I}_{2}\) & Is & \(L_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(L_{1}\) & 1275 & 1321 & 1391 & 992 & 1245 \\
\hline \(L_{1}\) & 1080 & 1310 & 1481 & 1073 & 1236 \\
\hline \(L_{3}\) & 1494 & 1116 & 1417 & 1141 & 1292 \\
\hline \(L_{4}\) & 1381 & 1232 & 1579 & 1271 & 1366 \\
\hline \(L_{5}\) & 1107 & 1308 & 1159 & 1167 & 1185 \\
\hline Mean & 1267 & 1257 & 1406 & 1129 & 1265 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of L marginal means & \(=64.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of I marginal means & \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=57.67 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of control mean & \\
& \(=128.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
&
\end{tabular}

Crop :mPaddy.
Site :-Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:~ U.P. 50(43).
Type :-‘'I.

Object :-To test the effect of varying intervals and depths of irrigation on \(\mathbf{P a d d y}\) yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-fallow. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.6.1950/2.7.1950. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) Anjana Pilibhit. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 depths of irrigation: \(L_{0}=0, L_{1}=2, L_{2}=4\) and \(L_{3}=6\) inches.
(2) 3 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{1}=4, I_{2}=8\) and \(I_{2}=12\) days.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (b) \(1 / 233.77\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1948-1951\). (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment failed in 1948 and 1949. Conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist. (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2458 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(381.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only I effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Contro & & & \\
\hline & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & Iz & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{L}_{1}\) & 2612 & 2291 & 2192 & 2365 \\
\hline \(L_{2}\) & 2817 & 2273 ' & 2484 & 2525 \\
\hline Ls & 3004 & 2741 & 2174 & 2640 \\
\hline Mean & 2811 & 2435 & 2283 & 2510 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. any marginal mean S.E. of body of table S.E. of control mean} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =11019 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =140.85 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =110.19 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref :-U.P. 48(115).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Tissuhi.
Type :-'I'.
}

Object :-To study the effect of va rying frequencies and depths of irrigation on yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Black cotton soil. (b) N.A. (iii) June 1948/25.7.1948, (iv) (a) Ploughing according to the local practice. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-36. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding was done in \(n\) ursery plots. (ix) 66.5". (x) 24.11.1948.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of irrigation: \(L_{0}=0, L_{1}=3, L_{2}=6\) and \(L_{3}=9\) inches.
(2) 3 intervals of irrigation: \(\mathrm{I}_{1}=2, \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=3\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=4\) weeks.

3 DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv). (a) \(25^{\circ} \times 11^{\prime}\). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by the I.R.I. In the absence of net plot area which is not available the yields etc. given above are on gross plot size.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2104 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(488.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only I effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control=2199 lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{L}_{1}\) & 2530 & 1650 & 1741 & 1974 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2205 & 1914 & 1675 & 1931 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 2536 & 2184 & 2210 & 2310 \\
\hline Mean & 2424 & 1916 & 1875 & 2072
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=141.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=244.34 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{lac}\). \\
S.E. of control mean & \(=141.07 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{lac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Paddy (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Tissuhi.

Ref: U. \({ }^{\text {P. }}\) 49(223).
Type:-'I'.

Object:-To study the effect of varying frequensies and depths of irrigation on yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Black cotton soil. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Ploughing according to local practice. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-36. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding was done in the nursery plot. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of irrigation: \(L_{0}=0, L_{1}=3, L_{2}=6\) and \(L_{3}=9\) inches.
(2) 3 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{1}=2, I_{2}=3\) and \(I_{3}=4\) wess.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (i) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by I.R.I.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1546 \quad\) lb./ac.
(ii) \(272.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only control vs ohters effect is significant.
(iv) Ay. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\[
\text { Control }=1390 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & \(I_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{L}_{1}\) & 1701 & 1527 & 1487 & 1572 \\
\hline \(L_{2}\) & 1660 & 1604 & 1558 & 1607 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{L}_{2}\) & 1634 & 1665 & 1548 & 1616 \\
\hline Mean & 1665 & 1599 & 1531 & 1598 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table \\
.E. of conirol mean
\end{tabular}}} & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =78.57 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =136.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & \(\because\) & \(=78.57\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Tissuhi.

Ref :- U.P. 50(278).
Type :- 'I'.

Object :-To study the effect of varying frequencies and depths of irrigation on yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Black cotton soil. (b) N.A. (iii) June 1950/28.7.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughing etc. according to the local practice. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-36. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding was done in the nursery plots. (ix) \(38.7^{\circ}\). (x) \(20.11,1950\).
2. TREATMENTS :

All comb nation of (1) and (2)

(1) 3 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{2}=2, I_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}\) and \(I_{3}=3\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(5 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 15 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by I.R.I.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1496 lb-Jac.
(ii) \(398.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of I differs significantly. Control \(\nu \underset{\text { p̣ }}{ }\) others differs bighly significantly. Other effects dọ not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). & Ref :- U.P. 53(316). \\
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To compare the effect of mercurial, cuperous and organic seed dressings on germination, disease and yieid of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Barley. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy. (b) N.A. . (iii) 22.6.1953. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Broadcast. (c) 37 srs./ac. (d)-. (e)-. (v) 10 C.L./ac. of village compost.. A/S at \(20 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). (vi) N-22 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) \(46.14^{\circ}\). (x) 7 to 9.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Agrosan G.N.
2. Special Agrosan (of low vitality)
3. Fernosan \(\mathbf{A}\)
4. Copper seed dressing (Y.F. 2776)
5. Control (no dressing)

Rate of dressing \(0.25 \%\) by weight.
3. DESIGN:
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(21^{\prime} \times 51^{\prime}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 51^{\prime}\). (v) NiL. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory growth. Half lodging in all the plots on 23.9.1953. (ii) Nil. (iii) Height, tillering and grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(875.5 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(80.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 888.9 \\
2. & 936.0 \\
3. & 886.8 \\
4. & 809.4 \\
5. & 856.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=36.22 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:- U.P. 53(164).
Type:- 'D'.

Object:-To find out the effect of dressing seed with new fungicides on the leaf spot disease and yield of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Berseem. (b) Berseem. (c) No. (ii) (a) Silt loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.6.1953. (iv) (a) One deep ploughing and 2 shallow ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-88 (late) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings.- (ix) 46.28". (x) 23.10.1953.

\section*{2. TREATME VTS :}
1. Control
2. Special Agrosan
3. Agrosan G.N.
4. Fernosan
5. Copper seed dressing (Y.F, 2776)
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) S. (iv) (a) \(21^{\prime} \times 31.5^{\circ}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 31.5^{\circ}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging, (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by Asst. Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt. of U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(3186 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(260.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av, yietd of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 3124 \\
2. & 3240 \\
3. & 3148. \\
. 4. & 3260 \\
S. & 3158 \\
S.E./mean & -116.6 lb./ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 48(150). } \\
\text { Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina. } & \text { Type :- 'D'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To test the efficacy of D.D.T. and Gammaxene against Gundhi bugs of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Paddy (Anghani Pilibhit). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) DDT emulsion at 300 gallon per acre.
2. Dusting with gammaxene D. 025 (containing \(5 \%\) benzenchexachloride) at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. Dusting with gammaxene D .025 at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Control-no treatment.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(23^{\circ} \times 36^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of gundhi bug. (iii) Counts of living bugs before and after application of treatments. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) N A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into sin- \(1 \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) and then analysed. Transformed back mean percentages are given after correcting for bias. Expt. conducted by Ento. (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv) Reduction of gundhl bugs/ 100 sq. ft .

2- hrs. after application of ireatments. \(\quad 15\) days after the application of treatment.
Treatment Mean Angle. Transformed back-mean \% Mean Angle Transformed back-mean \%
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
1. & 83.36 & 99.17 & 80.33 & - \\
2. & 51.42 & 60.99 & 64.88 & 96.73 \\
3. & 65.26 & 82.16 & 82.80 & 81.68 \\
4. & 35.53 & 35.26 & 62.38 & 97.92 \\
G M. & 5914 & & 72.60 & 78.22 \\
S E /mean & 4.297 & & 7.877 & \\
Sig. & Highly significant & & N.S. & \\
& & &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Paddy (Kharif). \\ Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.
}

Ref :- U.P. 49(211).
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To study the effects of B.H.C. and sodium fiuosilicate against the Kharif Grass hoppers of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Several varieties. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Gammaxene D. 025 ( \(5 \%\) B.H.C) at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Poison baits (Sodium fluosilicate, bran, gur and water in the ratio \(1: 15: \mathbf{2 : 7}\).
3. Control (no treatments/.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 3.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 5.
(iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(28^{\circ} \times 28^{\prime}\)
. GE, ERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Grass hoppers-as per treatments. (iii) Population of grass hoppers before and after the application of treatments. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{\mathrm{p}}\) and then analysed. The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K).
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv) Reduction of grass hoppers at a distance of \(28^{\circ}\).
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back-mean\% \\
1. & 61.28 & 76.63 \\
2. & 51.12 & 60.50 \\
3. & 9.68 & 3.27 \\
G.M. & 40.69 & \\
S.E./mean & \(=4.812\) & \\
Sig. & Highly Signiflcant &
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 49(212).
Site :- Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To test the effizacy of D.D.T. and B.H.C. insecticides against gundhi bugs of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i (a) to (c) N.A. (ii (a) and (b) N.A. "(iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Paddy A-22 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Spraying \(025 \%\) D.D.T. suspensioa.

2 Spraying with 0 5\% Benzene hexachloride suspension at 100 gallon/ac.
3. Dusting with \(5 \%\) Binz=ne hera=h'oride dust at 33 lb .1 lac
4. Durtin' with \% D.D T. (Buggs 5\% D.D.T. dust) at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. Cuntrol-No treatment.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(63^{\circ} \times 17.5^{\circ}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Milk stage on 28.10.1949. (ii) Gundhi bugs-as per treatments. (iii) Population of gundhi bugs before and after the application of treatments. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-2} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{P}\) and then analysed. The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K).
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv) Reduction of gundhi bugs/ 100 sq. ft .24 hrs. after the application of treatments

```

Crop:- Paddy (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 53(310).
Site :- Late Paddy Res. Sub-Stn., Pachperwa.
Type:- 'D'.

```

Object :-To test the efficacy of different insecticides against stem borer of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 2.7.1953/31.7.1953 and 1.8.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-83 (late). (vii) Ircigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

1 Spraying with 0.2\% D.D.T.
2. Spraying with \(0.2 \%\) B.H.C.
3. Dusting with \(5 \%\) B.H.C.
4. Dusting with 5\% D.D.T.
5. Spraying with 0.2\% Parathione.
6. Control.

Rate of application of insecticides: Dusting at 20 lb ./ac. in both applications. Spraying at 40 and 60 gallons in Ist and 2nd applications respectively.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (il) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(23^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) \(5^{\prime}\) on all sides of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Stem borer-as per treatments. (iii) Count of total no. of plants effected, no, of adults larvae and eggs at 5 different places in each plot of size \(2^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\) and yield of grain. (iv) (a) Nil. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}}\) and then analysed where \(\boldsymbol{x}\) is the larvae count per plot. The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{x+1}\) & Larvae counts (Transformed back) & Av, yield of grain in lb./ac \\
1. & 2.424 & 5.38 & 2980 \\
2. & 2.422 & 5.37 & 2137 \\
3. & 2.546 & 5.98 & 2066 \\
4. & 2.248 & 4.55 & 2425 \\
5. & 2.162 & 4.17 & 2731 \\
6. & 2.838 & 7.55 & 2075 \\
G.M. & 2.440 & 5.50 & 2402 \\
S.E./mean & 0.0994 & & 121.61 \\
Significance & Highly significant & & Highly significant
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Pura.

Ref :- U.P. 53(311).
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-To test the effizacy of different insecticides against gundhi bugs of Paddy.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Pura. (iii) \(2.719 \times 3 / 1.7 .1953\). (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-2I (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Dusting with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Dusting with \(10 \%\) Toxaphene at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. Dusting with \(5 \%\) Cblorodain at 201 b ./ac.
4. Control.

Application on 8.9.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) \(4^{\prime}\) all around the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Gundhi bugs-as per treatments. (iii) Counts of adults and nymphs taken at 5 different places in plot of size \(2^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\) and grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1953-1954\). (b) No. (c) N.A. (v, (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \boldsymbol{V} \mathbf{p}\) and \(t . e n\) analysed where \(p\) is \(\%\) of survival of adults and nymphs. Transformed back means have been calculated after applying bias correction. The experiment was conducied by Ento. (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean value in
\[
\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p
\] & \% of survial of adults and nymphs (tuansformed back) & Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. \\
\hline 1. & 35.36 & 33.67 & 998.8 \\
\hline 2. & 38.74 & 39.28 & 1082.8 \\
\hline 3. & 37.75 & 37.61 & 1087.4 \\
\hline 4. & 59.59 & 74.14 & 849.4 \\
\hline G.M. & 42.86 & & 1104.6 \\
\hline S.E./mean & 1.5860 & & 232.61 \\
\hline Significance & ce Highly sign & cant & N.S. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Paddy (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Seed Farm, Unnao.

Ref :- U.P. 50(270).
Site :- Govt. Seed Farm, Unnao.
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To test the efficacy of D.D.T., B.H.C and allied insecticides against Gundhi bugs of Paddy.
f. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) No. 21. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. \(25 \%\) D.D.T. (Guesarol 550 ) suspension at 40 gallon/ac.
2. \(\mathbf{2 5 \%}\) B.H.C. suspension (Hexachloride) at \(\mathbf{4 0}\) gallon/ac.
3. Pyro dust 4000 at 201 ./ac.
4. \(5 \%\) Hexyclan dust at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. Control (no treatment).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 54.5^{\circ}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Gundhl bugs-as per treatments. (iii) Number of nymphs and adult bugs. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying tias correction. The dsta was converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv) Reduction of Gundhi bugs/ 100 sq. ft .72 hrs . after the application of treatment
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back mean\% \\
1. & 86.45 & 99.11 \\
2. & 78.75 & 95.74 \\
3. & 90.00 & 99.50 \\
4. & 87.50 & 99.31 \\
5. & 87.97 & 99.37 \\
G.M. & 86.13 & \\
S.E./mean & \(=5.321 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
Significance & N.S. & \\
& &
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Paddy (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :: U.P. 53(309). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Seed Farm, Unnao. } & \text { Type :- 'D'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To test the efficacy of different insecticides against gundht bugs of Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.6.1953/24.7.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-21 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Spraying with \(0.2 \%\) B.H.C. (a) 40 gallons/ac.
2. Dusting with \(5.0 \%\) B.H.C. at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
3. Spraying with \(0.02 \%\) Parathion emulsion at 40 gallons/ac.
4. Spraying with \(4 \%\) Fish oil Rosin Soap at 40 gallons/ac.
5. Spraying with \(10 \%\) Nicotine Sulphate at 40 gallons/ac.
6. Control (no treatment).

Application on 22.9.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(42^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}\) (v) \(8^{\prime}\) alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Gundhi bugs-as per treatment. (iii) Count of adult and nymphs in plots of size \(2^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\) and grain sield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Transformation back has been done after applying bias correction. The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) and then analysed where \(\mathrm{p}=\%\) reduction of aymphs and adults. The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K).
S. RESULTS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{(i) to (iv)} \\
\hline Treatment & Mean value in
\[
\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{p}
\] & \% reduction (transformed back) & Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. \\
\hline 1. & 79.70 & 96.33 & 1628 \\
\hline 2. & 79.27 & 96.06 & 1488 \\
\hline 3. & 76.94 & 94.44 & 1370 \\
\hline 4. & 76.62 & 94.20 & 1435 \\
\hline 5. & 78.07 & 95.27 & 1594 \\
\hline 6. & 42.68 & 45.99 & 1488 \\
\hline G.M. & 72.21 & & 1500 \\
\hline S.E/mean & 2.6978 & & 167.74 \\
\hline Significance & Highly sign & & N.S. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop : \(\boldsymbol{\sim}\) Paddy.
Site :-Azamgarh. (Tehsil) Dist. Azamgarh.

Ref :-U.P. 50(275).
Type : ‘D'.

Object :-To test the efficiency of Hexyclan and Toxaphene dusts and Sodium fluosilicate bait against kharif grass hoppers.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Paddy (Local). (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Dusting with \(5 \%\) Hexyclan dust at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Dusting with \(5 \%\) Hexyclan dust at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. Dusting with \(20 \%\) Toxaphene at 20 lb ./ac.
4. Sodium fluosilicate, bran, mollasses bait in the ratio of \(1: 15: 2\) at 40 lb ./ac.
5. No treatment (control).

Insecticides applied on 11.8.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) Number of replications-4. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40.5^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) Grass hoppers-as per treatments. (iii) Count of grass hoppers (nymphs and adults) per 10 strokes at hand net (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The cata were converted to \(\sin -1 \sqrt{ } p\) and thed analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K). on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv) Reduction in grass hopper population 72 hrs. after the application of treatments.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed tack-mean \% \\
1. & 70.25 & 88.22 \\
2. & 40.90 & 42.97 \\
3. & 60.20 & 75.05 \\
4. & 25.84 & 19.31 \\
5. & 19.89 & 11.98 \\
G.M. & 43.42 & \\
S.E./mean & 5.039 & \\
Sig. & Highly significant. & \\
& &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 49(246).
Site in B. R. College Farm, (Bichpuri), Agra. Type :r ' \(M\) '.
Object :-To study the effect of organic and inorganic nitrogenous manures on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam and medium in texture, quite porous. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College Farm, Bichpuri. (iii 3.11.1919. (iv) (a) 10 ploughings, 3 pata, 2 times stubble picking. (b) Behind the plough by drilling seeds with Nai. regular depth of \(5^{\circ}\). (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb-591 (late variety). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) Nil. (x) 13.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. No manure.
2. Farm compost at 60 lb ./ac. of N .
3. A/S at 60 lb .fac. of N and Super to give \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as containes in treatment 2 .

Compost spread about 25 days before sowing; A/S and Super applied I day before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) \(121^{\circ} \times 59^{\prime}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(57^{\prime} \times 38^{\prime}, 57^{\prime} \times 41^{\prime}\) and \(57^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) \(4^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}, 4^{\prime} \times 5^{\prime}\) and \(4^{\prime} \times 51^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Lodging occured in plots and treated with inorganic manures in the later stage. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield, etc. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Nil. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R. Coliege.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2024 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(438.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2021 \\
2. & 1949 \\
3. & 2101 \\
S.E \(/\) mean & \(=253.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 49(247). } \\
\text { Site :- B. R. College Farm, (Bichpuri) Agra. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study of the effect of different sources of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at varying depths on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Alluvial origin, It is a loam type of soil having more \(\%\) of sand than the clay. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College Farm, Bichpuri. (iii) 7.11.1949. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Behind the plough with the help of a Nai. (c) \(90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) -. (v) N.A. (vi) Pu-591 (late). (vii) lrrigated. (viii) One weeding on 14.12 .19 ,9. Roguing of extra plants removed from the feld tefore harvesting. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments : All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 sources of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{3}}: \mathrm{F}_{1}=\) Bonemeal and \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Super.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Sub-plot treatments :
4 depths of placement of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{D}_{1}=\) Surface, \(\mathrm{D}_{2}=3^{\prime \prime}, \mathrm{D}_{8}=6^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{4}=9^{\circ}\).
A/S additional dressing to \(\mathrm{F}_{2}\) plots to compensate for N in B.M. Super, finely powdered and sieved, placed at different depths on 5 to 7.11. 1949 .
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(20^{\circ} \times 26^{\circ}\). (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain, bhusa yield and other characters. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Nil. (b) Nil. (vi) Nile (vii) Experiment conducted by B.R. Collego. Raw data N.A.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1957 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(416.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(218.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{clcc} 
Main plot treatments & Av. yield & sub-Plot treatments & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1898 & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2020 \\
\(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2016 & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1942 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1955 & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1983 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1960 & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1883 \\
S.E./mean & \(=73.63 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & S.E./mean & \(=54.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- B. R. College Farm, (Bichpuri), Agra.
Ref:- U.P. 53(383).
Site :- B. R. College Farm, (Bichpuri), Agra.
Type:- 'M'.

```

Object :-To study the effect of green manure creps turied in different ways on soil fertility and Wheat yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) Cow pea-Wheat. (b) As per treatments. (c) Nil to green ranures. (ii) (a) Sandy loam of average fertility. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College Farm, Bichpuri. (iii) 4.11.1953. (iv) (a) Palewa applied, after burying the green manuring crops, the field was ploughed by tractor dise two times before wheat sowing. (b) By tractor driven seed drill. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e)-. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1454.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
Two methods of burying the green manuring crops: \(M_{2}=\) Burrying the whole plant and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Burying the under ground portion only (harvesting the complete a: ove ground portion).
Sub-plot treatments :
5 green manures: \(G_{1}=M o o n g\) at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}, \mathrm{G}_{2}=\) Sanai at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} ., G_{3}=G u a r\) at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} ., G_{4}=C o w\) pea at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(\mathrm{G}_{5}=\) Chinamug at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
G.M. on 19.7.1953 by troadcast followed by harrowing and pla, king off set disc. Harrow attached with pata driven by tractor to mix seeds. Burying of G.M. done on 1.9.1953.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border- \(\mathbf{2}^{\prime}\), block border-4' and channels-4'.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor in plots at a bit bigher level. Patchy germination. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and bhusa. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Nil. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R. College.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1051 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(74.21 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(179.49 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{M}\) and \(G\) effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant,
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\stackrel{\square}{\mathbf{G}}\) & G2 & Gs & \(G_{4}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{5}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & 708 & 1178 & 691 & 963 & 943 & 897 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1182 & 1687 & 874 & 1164 & 1123 & 1206 \\
\hline Mean & 945 & 1432 & 782 & 1064 & 1013 & 1051 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(M\) marginal means
\(=23.47 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. G marginal means
\(=89.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(G\) means at the same level of \(M\)
\(=126.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(M\) means at the same level of \(G \quad=115.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- B. R. College Farm, (Bichpuri), Agra.

Ref :- U.P. 50(312).
Type :- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) ':

Object :-To study the effect of N with and without bass 1 dressing of compost on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pea and then fallow. (c) Nit. (ii) (e) High loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College Farm Bichpuri. (iii) 8.11.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughings hy tractor with dise harrow on 9.5.1950. 6 desi ploughinga. Ploughing by fractor with disc harrow on 21.10.1951. (b) By Nai ploughnethod at \(3^{\circ}\) depth. (c) 40 srs/ac. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) Ni. (vi) Pb. 591 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings by khurpi. (ix) N,A. (x) 21.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 basal applicitions : \(\mathrm{B}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=\mathbf{2 0} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as compost.
Sub-plot treatments:
8 levels of \(N\) as A/S : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15, N_{2}=30, N_{3}=45, N_{4}=60, N_{5}=75, N_{6}=9 \mathrm{~J}, N_{7}=105\) and \(N_{8}=120\). Farm compost: Cattle duag including litter, sugareane trash and other farm refuse including straw of mustard, etc. applied on 5.10 .1952 followed by dest plough on 6.10 .1950 , A/S applied on 7.11 .1950 by spreading evenly.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split/plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plot/replication and 8 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4." (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\) and \(42^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(36^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) Block border \(-4^{\prime}\) and plot border \(-2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Lodging oscurred due to showers followed by wind at high velocity. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c)-. (v) (a) Nil. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R. College.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1679 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(212.03 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
(b) \(215.11 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) levels of N differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lclc} 
& Av. yield & & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 1674 & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1178 \\
\(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1683 & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1413 \\
S.E./mean & \(=37.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1575 \\
& & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1852 \\
& & \(\mathbf{N}_{4}\) & 1933 \\
& & \(\mathbf{N}_{5}\) & 1842 \\
& & \(\mathbf{N}_{6}\) & 1828 \\
& & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{7}}\) & 1814 \\
& & S.E./mean & \(=76.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Central Dairy Farm, Aligarh.

Ref:-U.P. 50(69).
Type :-‘'

Object:-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) fertilizers applied alone and in combination on Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.11.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levils of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) was broadcast while \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) plazed pre drilling it in bands near the root zone on 13, 14.11.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 43\) th acre. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Growth patchy in2 blocks. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur: Atarra (Banda), Kalai, Banaras, Partapgarh, Nawabganj, and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The field was uneven with alkaline patches. The patchy growth had, however considerably vitiated the accuracy of the experiment. Experiment was planned with 6 replications but 2 replications were omitted for analysis for patchy growth. The experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1479 \mathrm{lb}, \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(111.43 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1030 & 1350 & 1380 & 1253 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1550 & 1650 & 1720 & 1640 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1790 & 1220 & 1620 & 1543 \\
\hline Mean & 1457 & 1407 & 1573 &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=32.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=55.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).}

Ref:-U.P. 53(371).
Site :-Allahabad A gricultural Institute, Allahabad. Type :~'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of \(N, P\) ard \(K\) applied alone ard in combination on Wheat yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Fine sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allababad Agricultural Institute. (iii) 29.10 .1953 [missing strips If placted cn 10.11.15:3]. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (v) N.P. 720 (N.A.) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 1.00\% (x) 27.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinatious of (1), (2) and (3) \(+\mathrm{N}_{1}+\mathrm{Mg}\) at \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of Mg . (selective treatment.)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{K}: \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}=0\) ahd \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{1}}=41.5 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, K as Potassium chloride and Mg as Magnesium Sulphate. Fertilizer applied 20 to 27.10.1953. Cultivated the fertilizer on 28.10.1953. These were spread on ploughed land and mixed with the surface soil by cultivatio \(n\) just tefore the crop was planted on 20 to 27,10.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) torder tetween the plots. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of termite. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a)\&(b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Dr. George H. Dungan, I.C.A. (representative from the University of Illinois who worked in collaboration with the Agronomy Department). Plot wise yield data N.A.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1837 Jb./ac.
(ii) \(332.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effects of NP, NK and N are Significant.

While effect NPK is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\[
\text { Selective treatment }(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{Mg})=1827 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]

S.E. of any marginal mean S.E of body of table
\(-83.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(-117.61 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Site :- Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad. Type :- ' \(M\) '.
Object :-To ses the effect of four different legu ninous craps, when ploughed into the soil as green manures, on the following Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONCIIIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) As par treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Fine sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad Agricultural Institute. (iii) 11.1U.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b Sowa in rows. (c) 30 srs./ac. (d) 12 rows/plot. (e) 一. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13 (e.rly). (vii) Irrigare」. (viii) N.A. (ix) 1.78". (x) 30.3.1953.
2. TREATMENIS:
I. Sannhemp.
2. Cow Pea.
3. Mung.
4. Dhaincha.
5. No manure.

Green manuies sown on 7.6.1952 and ploughe 1 into the soil on 20.9.1952.
3. DESIGN ;
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5 . (b) \(73^{\circ} \times 60^{\circ}\). (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(73^{\circ} \times 12^{\circ}\). (b) \(71^{\prime} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The germination poor and patchy. (ii) N.A. (iii) Ear emergence, germination and yield of grain. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil (v) (a) and (b) No. vi) Nil. (vil) Seed received from Govt. seed store was bad. Experiment conducted by the Head, Agronom.y Department, (A.A.I.).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1636 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(210.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment cifferences are highly signifisant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2040 \\
2. & 1735 \\
3. & 1725 \\
4. & 1641 \\
5. & 1041 \\
S.E./mean & \(=85.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). & Ref:- U.P. 53 (369). \\
Site :- Allahabad Agri. Inst, Allahabad. & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To see the effect of four different leguminous crops when ploughed into the soil as green manure, on the following Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat-Bajra. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad Agri. Institute. (iii) 29.10.19i3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Drilling by Malabasa. (c) 30 srs./ac. (d) 12 rows/plot. (e) --. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 4, 5.12 1953. (ix) 1.00 . (x) 2.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Sannhemp.
2. Cow pea.
3. Mung.
4. Dhaincha.
5. Control (no madure).

Green manures sown on 7.6.1952 and ploughed into the soil on 20.9.1952. Their effe:ts studied on wheat (1952), residual effect studied on Bajra 1953 and again residual effect on wheat stusied now.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) \(13^{\prime} \times 60^{\circ}\). (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\), 'b) \(71^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and bhusa. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No, (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by the Head, Agr onomy Department (A.A.I.).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1020 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(113.31 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatments & Avo yield \\
1. & 1125 \\
2. & 1052 \\
3. & 1020 \\
4. & 1010 \\
& S. \\
S.E./mean & \(=46.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Wheat. } & \text { Ref :- Ù.P. 49(23). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) manures alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 29, 30.10.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)

Super placed \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows \(A / S\) was top dressed on 27, 28.9.1949.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(1 / 40\) th ac. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. Germination \(90 \%\). (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) N.A. (c) N A. (v) (a) Kanpur, Kalai, Banaras, Partapgarh, Bharari, Nawabganj. (b) N.A. (vi) During harvesting there was a hailstorm, bence it delayed threshing. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(\mathbf{6 : 0} \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(61.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All the effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 313 & 507 & 820 & 547 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 380 & 633 & 887 & 633 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 567 & 1060 & 1047 & 891 \\
\hline Mean & 420 & 733 & 918 & 690 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of the table} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Wheat. \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra. \\ \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. 50(70). } \\
& \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{aligned}
\]
}

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) fertilizers alons and in con'jin ation on Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fdllow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.12.1950. (iv) (a) Seed bed was prepared after cross ploughings. (b) In lines behind a desl plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A (ix) N.A. (x) 9 to 11.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 evels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 le.els of \(P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=10\) and \(P_{2}=12 \mathrm{Jlb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) was broajcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super through Pre-driling in bands ( \(4^{\circ}-5^{\prime \prime}\) deop) near the root zone on 6.12.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) th ac. (v) 1 ' plot to plot and \(3^{\prime}\) block to block. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Lodging on account of rains. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Ka ai, Aligarh, Banaras, Partapgarh, Nawabganj and Bharari: (b) N.A. (vi) Slight damage caused by rats. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1520 \quad \mathrm{It} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(91.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All effects ave highlv significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1067 & 1213 & 1413 & 1231 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1587 & 1407 & 1380 & 1458 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & \(178)\) & 1893 & 1940 & 1871 \\
\hline Mean & 1478 & 1504 & 1578 & 1520 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of talle} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =21.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =37.24 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :-State Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :-U.P. 51(102).
Type: = \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{M}\) '

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii (a) Light Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 27, 28.10.1951. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with watts plough. One ploughing with desi plough after Palewa. (b) Banda country seed drill. (c) to (e, N.A. (v) Nil. (ii) N.A. (vii) Irrignted. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29 to 31.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of ( 1 ) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{7} \mathrm{O}_{6} \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=61\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=12 \mathrm{l} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) was broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super was placed deep in bands near the root zone through fertilizer drill and then pata applied on 26.101951.
3. DESIGN .
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R B D. (ii) (a) 9 (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(38^{\circ} \times 28^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\). (v) 1 to 3 feet plot to plot and 3 to 4 feet between biocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953. (b) \& (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kalai (Aligarh), Raya, Tissuhi, Partapgarb, Bharari and Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1578 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(111.03 \mathrm{lb}, 1 \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N and P effects are highly signifcant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 1333 & 1473 & 1593 & 1466 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1533 & 15.3 & 1593 & 1546 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1666 & 1686 & 1813 & 1722 \\
\hline Mean & 1511 & 1557 & 1666 & 1578
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=26.17 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=45.33 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref:- U.P. 52(18)
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) aloce and in combination on Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N A. (b) Early paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa (un classified). (b) N.A. iiii 711.1952 . (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii; N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=1: 0 \mathrm{lb}\). /ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied as top dressing by broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super placed \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in tands near the root zone-applied on 5.11.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 54.5^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Pura, Kalai, Raya, Tissuhi, Matkota, Banaras, Bharari and Farrukhabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Coṇducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1405 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(66.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N and P effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1119 & 1279 & 1305 & 1234 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1332 & 1385 & 1539 & 1419 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1425 & 1592 & 1672 & 1563 \\
\hline Mean & 1292 & 1419 & 1505 & 1405 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any margical mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =15.65 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =27.10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]}} & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :- U.P. 53 (345).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Chari and Jowar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with watts plough and 1 ploughing with cultivator. (b) Line sowing by Banda-country seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 3.80 . (x) 11.4.1954 and 13.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as A/S : \(N_{0}=0_{2}, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands at \(9^{\circ}\) apart (Furrows opened by either a victory or U.P. plough or even two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrows) \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) is about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) below the seed. Manures applied on 30.10.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40.33^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime} . \quad\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and busha. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Phoolbagh, Matkota, Tissuhi, Gazipur, and Raya, (b) -. (vi) The lack of irrigation has resulted in the incomplete response of fertulizers. (vii) Expt. conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1012 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(56.86 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N, Peffects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{6}\) & 810 & 907 & 973 & Mean \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 927 & 1017 & 1130 & 897 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 973 & 1147 & 1227 & 1025 \\
\hline Mean & 903 & 1024 & 1110 & 116 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l} 
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular} & \(=13.40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). & Ref:- U.P. 53(193). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra. & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different fertilizers on growth and yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.11.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) Drilling. (c) 10 chks/plot (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 fertilizers: \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{1}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate and \(\mathrm{M}_{4}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO as Gypsum.
(2) 3 methods of application of fertilizers: \(A_{1}=B y\) broadcast, \(A_{2}=\) Placement behind plough in furrows and \(A_{2}=\) Drilled mixed with seed through improved seed drill.
Date of manuring 23.11.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad and Partapgarh. (b; N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(735 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(15.11 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(A_{1}\) & A8 & \(A_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 769 & 1018 & 1035 & 941 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 715 & 645 & 610 & 657 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M a}_{3}\) & 754 & 541 & 830 & 708 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{4}\) & 769 & 503 & 629 & 634 \\
\hline Mean & 752 & 677 & 776 & 735 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of \(M\) marginal mean S.E. of A marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =5.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =4.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =8.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Ref :- U.P. 49(30).
Type:- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa (Bundelkhand T2). (b) N.A. (iii) 15.11.1949. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as single Super applied \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep in soil and N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(1 / 40\) th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953 . (b) No. (c) N.A. (v)
(a) Atarra, Banaras, Kanpur, Nawabganj, Kalai and Partapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) and (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1188 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(253.33 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graio in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrr|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 893 & 833 & 860 & 862 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1253 & 1167 & 1167 & 1196 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1387 & 1500 & 1633 & 1507 \\
\hline Mean & 1178 & 1167 & 1220 & 1188
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E of any marginal mean & \(=59.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=103.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop:- Wheat.
Ref :- U.P. 50(68).
Site :- Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied alone and in combination on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maizo. (c) No. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11 .1950 . (iv) (a) Seed bed was propared after two ploughings and one harrowing by tractor. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

An combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=60\) and \(P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S was troadcast and Super applied on 11.11.1950 through predrilling it in bands near the root zone.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 4\) Cth ac. (v) 1 ' between plots and \(3^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop lodged due to heavy rains. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyaupur, Atarra, Kalai, Aligarh, Banaras, Partapgarh and Nawabganj. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2589 \quad\) lb./ac.
(ii) 332.07 lt ./ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


\section*{Crop :- Wheat.}

Site :- Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref :- U.P. 51(114).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITTONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.11 .1951 . (iv) (a) 3 tractor harrowings, and one palewa. (b) Drilled. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. ( x ) 5 to 7.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{6}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=60\) and \(P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) was broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super placed deep in bands near the root zone through a fertilizer drill and then pata applied on 24.11.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) to \(3^{\prime}\) between plots and \(3^{\prime}\) to \(4^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kalal, Raya, Tissuhi, Atarra, Partapgarh and Markota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Ccnducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i). 1347 lb./ac.
(ii) 208.46 lb ./ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and P effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathbf{l b}\)./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 880 & 1213 & 1260 & 1118 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1093 & 1380 & 1640 & 1371 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 1253 & 1647 & 1760 & 1553 \\
\hline Mean & 1075 & 1413 & 1553 & 1347 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table
\(=49.13 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \(=85.10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :- Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref:-U.P. 52(19)
Type:- \({ }^{\text {M }}\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) fertiliser, alone and in combinations on Wheat yield-
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) N.A (ii) (a) Parwa (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1952. (iv) (a) One tractor ploughe ing and 2 harrowings. (b) Drilling. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 26, 27.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied as top dressing by broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super placed \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in bands near the root zone on 5.11.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Pura, Kalai, Raya, Banaras, Tisuhi, Matkota, Atarra and Farrukhabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1930 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 221.12 lb ./ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graio in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 1527 & 1727 & 1693 & 1619 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1633 & 1947 & 2047 & 1876 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1960 & 2353 & 2480 & 2264 \\
\hline Mead & 1707 & 2009 & 2073 & 1930 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =52.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =90.27 . \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Ref:- U.P. 52(119).
Type :~ 'M'`

```

Object :-To study the effect of different trace elements on growth, yield and quality of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) NiI. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parna soil, clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1952. (iv) (a) One ploughing, 2 harrowings \& 2 Pata. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Molybdenum as Molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper as Copper sulphate at \(6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Cu .
4. Boron as commercial Borax at 1 lb ./ac. of B.
5. Ca as Gypsum at 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{C a}\).
6. Zinc as Zinc Sulphate at \(4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of Zn .

A basal dose of (A/S at 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 15 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{8}+\) Pot. Sulphate at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) ) was applied to all treatments. Treatments applied on 2.11.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (b) \(38^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Rust was traceable. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1856 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(153.15 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2102 \\
2. & 1787 \\
3. & 1907 \\
4. & 1787 \\
5. & 1697 \\
6. & 1858 \\
S.E./mean & \(=76.58 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref :_U.P. 53(51).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of different trace elements on growth, yield and quality of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Sanai-wheat. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.10.1953. (iv) (a) 1 Ploughing and 2 harrowings. (b) Improved seed drill. (c) \(20-25 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (c) N.A. (v) \(6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). N as A/S, 16 lb ./ac. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. applied on 16.11 .1953 and 30 lb ./ac. of Ca as gypsum applied on 19, 20.11.1953. Super placed \(3^{\circ}\) to- \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in soil behind the plough in furrows while preparing the field. Mixture of A/S and potash as surface dressing 4-5 days before sowing and application of gypsum as surface dressing to be done 2 days before sowing. (vi) \(\mathrm{Pb}, 591\) (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no trace eiement).
2. \(3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of Copper as Copper Sulphate.
3. \(6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Copper as Copper Sulphate.
4. \(12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Copper as Copper Sulphate.
5. 1 lb ./ac. of Boron as Borax.
6. \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Boron as Borax.
7. \(3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Boron as Borax.
8. \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Zinc as Zinc sulphate.
9. \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Zinc as Zinc sulphate.
10. 10 Jb ./ac. of Zinc as Zinc sulphate.

Trace elements mixed with fine dry earth as surface dressing a day before sowing so as to secure uniform distribution within the plot.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(35^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime} \cdot\) (b) \(32^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of . rust and frost. (iii) Straw ard grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur (Kanpur) Atarra (Banda), Meerut, Gorakhpur and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1229 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 387.4 lb.jac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1496 & 6. & 940 \\
2. & 1283 & 7. & 1138 \\
3. & 1619 & 8. & 912 \\
4. & 1181 & 9. & 1167 \\
5. & 1202 & & 10. \\
S.E./mean. & & \(=223.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{lac}\). & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(341).
Site :- Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Type :-'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of \(N, P\) and \(K\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.11.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with tractor, one barrowing with tractor. (b) By seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(2.76^{\circ}\). (x) 30.3.195 .

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All comtinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 ievels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{2}=60\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S broadcast, Super placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep tands at \(9^{\circ}\) apart ; P \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) below the seed. Potash applied as deep placement with phosphate. Manures applied on 13, 14.11.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fartially Balanced. (ii) (a) 2 blocks/replication; 6 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL
(i) Germination good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and Bhusa. (iv) (a) 1953 - N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Matkota, Banaras, Kalai, Pura. (b) N.A. (vi) Crop needed irrigation badly in the month of Jan. and Feb. ; but it could not be applied due to the caral water being not-available. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1320 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(218.03 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only Peffect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grainin \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1228 & 1310 & 1260 & 1266 & 1098 & 1433 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1375 & 1418 & 1328 & 1374 & 1117 & 1630 \\
\hline Mean & 1301 & 1364 & 1294 & 1320 & 1108 & 1531 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 1080 & 1195 & 1048 & 1108 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 1522 & 1532 & 1540 & 1531 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(N\) or \(P\) & \(=44.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(K\) & \\
S.E. of body of \(N \times P\) table & \(=64.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S..E of body of \(N \times K\) or \(P \times K\) table & \\
& \(=77.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat. (Rabi)
Site :- Govt. Agri. School Farm, Bulandshahar.
Ref:- U.P. 51(293).
Site :- Govt. Agri. School Farm, Bulandshahar. Type :- 'M'.
Object :--To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) applied by different methods.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Green manuriug-Wheat-Maize-Gram. (b) Sanal. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam of average fertility with free drainage. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1951. (iv) (a) One palewa, 6 ploughings by desi plough followed by planking. (b) Sowing with desi plough and Nal method. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e)N.A. (v) Green manuring with Sanai (ploughing on 13.8.1951. (vi) Pb. 591 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing on 22.4.1951. Roguing on 21.2.1952. (ix) 2.78. (x) 2.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(l) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0_{2} N_{1}=20\) and \(N_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=80\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=160 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 methods of placement of fertilizers : \(D_{0}=\) Broadcast, \(D_{1}=2 \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{2}=4 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}\).

Fertilizers thoroughly mized with equal quantity of earth taken for the same plot and evenly broadcast with hand and was immediately mixed with cultivator. Fertilizers applied on 26.10.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{8}\) partially confounded. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication; 9 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) \(56^{\circ} \times 13^{\circ}\). (b) \(53^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) Block \(4^{\prime}\) and replication \(5^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Lodging occurred in patches in March (stormy wind). Lodging occurred in NP treatment plots. (ii) A slight attack of white ants was observed after germination. To check this, 1st irrigation was applied on 11.11.1951. Rust attack when earing was complete. No pest attack. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) and (a) (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2465 \quad\) lb./ac.
(ii) 246.7 lb ./ac.
iii) Peffect is highly significant, N effect is significant. All other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).


Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.

Ref:- U.P. 53(63).
Type : ' ' M '.

Object :-To study the effect of placement of fertilizers on growth and yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with Praja and dest plough. (b) Sown behind plough. (c) \(20-25\) srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-52 (medium, early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1954,
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 fertilizers: \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Super at 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}, \mathrm{M}_{8}=\) Pot. Sulphate at 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) and \(\mathrm{M}_{4}=\) Gypsum at 60 lb ./ac. of Ca .
(2) 3 methods of application: \(A_{1}=\) By broadcast, \(A_{2}=\) Placement behind plough in furrows and \(A_{2}=\) Drilled mixed with seed through improved seed drill.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 ( 3 flanks of 4 plots each). (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (b) \(39^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}\). (v) \(1.5^{\circ} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) \(30 \%\) attack by rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) No (v) (a) Banda, Partapgarh, Hardoi and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C. \(P(R)\).
S. RESULTS :
(i) \(531.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(76.32 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only M effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(A_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{A}_{2}{ }^{\text {a }}\) & \(\mathrm{A}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 353.7 & 337.7 & 470.7 & 387.4 \\
\hline M & 499.9 & 515.9 & 616.9 & 544.2 \\
\hline M8 & 411.4 & 484.0 & 497.3 & 474.2 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{4}\) & 691,4 & 771.2 & 699.4 & 720.6 \\
\hline Mean & 496.6 & 527.2 & 571.1 & 531.6 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E of marginal mean of \(M\) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{A}\) S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =25.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =22.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =44,06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Regional Training Institute, Gazipur.
Ref:- U.P. 53 (329).
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M}$ '.

```

Object :-To study the effects of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1, 2.11.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings.
(b) Line sowing tehind the plough. (c) N.A. (d) - (e) 一. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Irrigated. (viii)

Nil. (ix) 2.31\%. (x) 18, 19.3.1354.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S broadcasted. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands at \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart ; about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) below the seed. Manures applied on 31.10.1953 and 1.11.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(25^{\circ} \times 42^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Germination satisfactory. Heavy rajns affected the plots of \(N_{2} P_{2}\) and \(N_{2} P_{1}\), which occurred in the third week of February 1954 and caused lodging in few plots. (ii) Rat damage in some plots. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Phoolbagh, Matkota, Tissuhi, Atarra and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1550 lb./ac.
(ii) \(205.65 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lbo/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1158 & 1120 & 1300 & 1193 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1583 & 1580 & 1708 & 1624 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1756 & 1895 & 1846 & 1832 \\
\hline Mean & 1499 & 1532 & 1618 & 1550 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =48.47 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =83.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 53(5). \\
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Hardoi. & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of fertilizer placement on growth and yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nit. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.10.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings. (b) Behind desi plough. (c) \(20-25\) seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C- 13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 fertilizers : \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Super at 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}, \mathrm{M}_{3}=\) Pot. sulphate at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) and \(\mathrm{M}_{4}=\) Gypsum at 60 lb ./ac. of CaO .
(2) 3 methods of application: \(A_{1}=\) By broadcast, \(A_{2}=\) Placement behind plough in furrows and \(A_{3}=\) Drilled mixed with seed through improved seed drill.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 ( 3 flanks of 4 plots each). (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\circ} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (ii) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued, (b) No. (c) No. (v) .(a) Banda, Partapgarh, Fuizabad and Luckncw. (vi) Crop failed due to untimely rains in winter. Grain shriveled due to Westerly winds in March. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(899 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(198.40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Ooly M effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(A_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(A_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 746 & 771 & 712 & 743 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 947 & 905 & 763 & 872 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & 1039 & 888 & 905 & 944 \\
\hline M \({ }_{4}\) & 1090 & 939 & 1081 & 1037 \\
\hline Mean & 955 & \(876{ }^{\circ}\) & 865 & 899 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of marginal mean of M} & /ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of marginal mean of A} & /ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & /ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Ralai.

Ref :-U.P. 49(21).
Type : \({ }^{〔} \mathbf{M}\) ’.

Object :-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS .
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light I oam (Aligarh Tg) (b) N.A. (iii) 18.10.1949. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Single Super : \(P_{0}=O_{3} P_{1}=60\) and \(P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

N top dressed, \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied \(3^{\circ}\) to \(4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows on 17.10.1949.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Atarra, Kanpur, Banaras, Partapgarh, Bharari and Nawabganj. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1732 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(337.36 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 1147 & 1393 & 1473 & 1338 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & -1493 & 1880 & 1920 & 1764 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N a}_{1}\) & 1767 & 2160 & 2353 & 2093 \\
\hline Mean & 1469 & 1811 & 1915 & 1732 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=79.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=137.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Ref :-U.P. 50(61). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm، Kalai. \\ Type : ' M '.
}

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Allgarh Type 3). (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1950. (iv) (a) Seed bed prepared after 5 ploughings followed by levelling. (b) In lines by seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{P}_{3}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S was broadcast, Super was applied through pre-drilling it in bands near the root zone ( \(4^{\circ}\) to \(5^{\circ}\) deep) on 25, 26,10.1950.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) acre. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) No. i(c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Atarra, Aligarh, Banaras, Partapgarh, Nawabganj and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(835 \quad\) 1b./ac.
(ii) \(85.32 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 240 & 267 & 260 & 256 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 633 & 1060 & 973 & 889 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & 893 & 1545 & 1640 & 1360 \\
\hline Mean & 589 & 958 & 938 & 835 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =20.11 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& -34.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :m Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref :~ U.P. 51(109).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effects of N and P fertilizers, alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Jonrar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.11 .1951 . (iv) (a) 5 initial ploughings with a desi plough, finally 1 harrowing. (b) Seed drill. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (med). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9, 10.4.1952.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}

All cominations of (1) and (2).
(1) - 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S was broadcast and Super placed deep in bands near the roct zone ty fertiliser drill and then pata applied on 15.11.1951.

DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(39.4^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes:
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Raya, Tishli, Partapgarh, Atarra, Bharari, and Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(744.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(129.81 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All the effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\), & \(P_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 163.8 & 204.7 & 197.9 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 511.8 & 948.6 & 955.4 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{8}\) & 750.7 & 1337.6 & 1631.1 \\
\hline Mean & 475.4 & 830.3 & 928.1 \\
\hline & & \begin{tabular}{c}
188.8 \\
805.3 \\
1239.8 \\
\hline
\end{tabular} &
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =30.59 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =52.99 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\end{array}\)
\(\begin{array}{lr}\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(15). } \\ \text { Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai. } & \text { Type :- 'M' }\end{array}\)
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
Type :~ 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) fertilzers alone and in combination on yield of crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Moong (failed). (c) Failure of these crops left tehind high fertility. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1952. (iv) (a) Palewa and 1 ploughing with soil turning plough and 6 ploughings with de.i plough. (b) Behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi)_N.A. (vii) lrrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3, 4.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{2}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)..
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as single super : \(P_{0}=0, P_{2}=60\) and \(P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\)

A/S was applied as surface dressing by broadcast. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) was placed in bands \(4^{4}\) deep near the root zone with the help of fertiliser drill attached to a plough on 22.10.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B,D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(40.33^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\) (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Para, Bharari, Banaras, Tissuhi, Matkota, Raya, Atarra and Farrukhabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1802 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(158.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All effects are highly signifizant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1387 & 1360 & 1433 & 1393 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1693 & 1847 & 2007 & 1849 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1840 & \(2187^{\circ}\) & 2460 & 2162 \\
\hline Mean & 1640 & 1798 & 1967 & 1802
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean \(=37.24 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=64.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref: : U.P. 53(352).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of Super and B.M. applied at deep placement with and without \(N\) on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Mixed fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Aligarh type 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) 6 ploughings, one additional \(\downarrow\) oughing for drilling of the fertilizers, \(t\) harrowing. (b) Drilling. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 4.57*. (x) 8.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments:
2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: \quad N_{0}=30\) and \(N_{\mathbf{1}}=30\) lb./ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
5 applicaitons of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as \(\mathrm{B}_{.} \mathrm{M}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}=120\) lb./ac, of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as super and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as B.M.
A/S broadcast \(P\) placed in \(4^{\circ}\) dsep bands at \(9^{\circ}\) apart on 1.11 .1953. \(P\) about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\circ}\) below the seed.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(72.7^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes .
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination-satisfactory. Crop normal. Some plots lodged due to adverse weather conditions during February, March. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and bhusa. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b NA. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Matkota and Banaras, (b) -. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by A.C. Data for 1952 N.A.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1417 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
(ii) (a) \(223.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(235.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(N\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yieldof grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{lac}\).


\author{
Crop: - Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm، Kalai.
}

Ref :- U.P. 53(350).
Type :- 'M'.
Orject :-To study the effect of \(N, P\) and \(K\), fertilizers alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Aligarh type 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1953. (iv) (a) 9 ploughings followed by Pata. 1 more ploughing for fertilizer drilling. (b) Drilling. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 4.57". (x) 8.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: \quad N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(K_{2} O\) as Pot.-Sul : \(K_{0}=0, K_{1}=60\) and \(K_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S broadcast. \(P\) placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands at \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. \(P\) is about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\circ}\) below the seed. Potash applied as deep placement with phosphate. Manures applied on 29.10.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) partially balanced. (ii) (a) 2 blocks/replication and 6 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 261^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop progressed well upto February and March 1954 and then was damaged due to abnormal weather conditions. Heavy showers and strong winds caused partial lodging. (ii) Attack of rust resulting in shrievling of the grain. (iii) Yield of grain and bhusa. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Bharari, Matkota, Banaras and Pura. (b) -. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
3. RESULTS :
(i) \(1506 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(57.96 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(N, P\) and \(K\) and interactions NK, PK are highly significant other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1253 & 1383 & 1285 & 1307 & 1269 & 1344 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1661 & 1634 & 1822 & 1706 & 1677 & 1734 \\
\hline Mean & 1457 & 1508 & 1554 & 1506 & 1473 & 1539 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 1413 & 1403 & 1604 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1501 & 1614 & 1503 & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal means of \(N\) or \(P\) \\
S.E. of marginal means of \(K\). \\
S.E. of body of \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}\) table \\
S.E. of body of \(N \times K\) or \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{K}\) table
\end{tabular}} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =11.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =14.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =16.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =20.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyan pur.

Ref:- U.P. 49(22).
Type: \(\boldsymbol{\sim}^{\text {' }} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Lorm (Kanour \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{y}}\) ). (b) N.A. (iii) 2 2.10.1949 Resown on 12.11.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7, 8.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=63 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{8} O_{5}\) as super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=6\) ) and \(P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac. .

A/S was top dressed, \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) was placed in deep ( \(3^{\prime \prime}-\mathbf{4}^{\prime \prime}\) ) furrows on 24.101949.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(57.5^{\circ} \times 19^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Severe hail storm resulted in heavy damage to the crop. (ii) Nil. (ii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1949-i951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) '(a) Atarta. Kılai, Binaras. Partapgarh, Bhar.ri and Nawabganj. (b) N.A. (vi) Juit after sowing there ware heavy rains-hence poor germination. So it was resown. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2059 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(167.9 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & Meau \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1980 & 2060 & 1987 & 2009 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 2014 & 2153 & 2166 & 2111 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 2146 & 1940 & 2080 & 2055 \\
\hline Mean & 2047 & 2051 & 2078 & 2059 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =39.57 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac} . \\
& =68.54 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{a} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
> Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 50(63).
Type:- 'M'.
'Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1950. (iv) (a) NA. (b) Sown in lines by seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (v.ii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18, 19.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=6 J\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) through predrilling it in bands near the root zone i.e. \(3^{*}\) to \(4^{\circ}\) deep on 25.10.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(37.5^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Graio yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Atarra, Kalai, (Aligarh) Banaras, Partapaarh. Nawabgaoj, and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
S. RESULTS:
(i) \(1176 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 269.4 lb ./ac.
(jii) Only N effct is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{fac}\).
\begin{tabular}{c|rcc|c} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 808 & 668 & 741 & Mean \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1208 & 1215 & 1308 & 739 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1535 & 1509 & 1589 & 1244 \\
\hline Mean & 1184 & 1131 & 1213 & 1544 \\
\hline & & & &
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table
\(=63.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=109.97 \mathrm{db} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 51(106).
Type:- 'M!

Object :-To study the effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) fertilizers, alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1951. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with Watt's plough followed by levelling each tire. Finally sown by lev elled. (b) seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One interculture. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.4.1952.

2 TREATMENTS:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) was broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) was placed deep in bands near the root zone through a fertiliser drill and pata applied on S, 6.11.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(\mathbf{3} \times \mathbf{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 9.
(b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A
(b) \(37.5^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Average. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai, Raya, Tissuhi, Partapgargh, Atarra, Bharari and Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(955 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(247.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Only N effect is higbly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.


Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res, Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(117).

Object :-To study the effect of rare elements on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) 1 victory plough, 1 watts plough, 1 palewa, 3 desi plough, 1 spring harrow, 6 times patta and one ploughing with cultivator plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(17.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super +15 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{4} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul, applied 3 days before sowing. (vi) \(\mathrm{C}-13\) (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Molybdic Acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper Sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
4. Commercial Borax at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of B .
5. Gypsum at 30 lb ./ac. of Ca.
6. Zinc Sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .

Treatments applied 1 day before sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 5
(iv) (a) \(47^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\).
(b) \(43^{\prime} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Jhansi and Lucknow.
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. 1 RESULTS:
(i) \(1306 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(115.69 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1489 \\
2. & 1291 \\
3. & 1279 \\
4. & 1141 \\
S. & 1282 \\
6. & 1357 \\
S.E./mean & \(=57.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(146).
Type :- © \({ }^{\prime}\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of doses of trace elements in presence of adequate \(N, P, K\) and Calcium on yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Legume and Cereal. (b) Lobia. (c) Nit. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1953. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings followed by paya. (b) Seed drill. (c. \(20-25 \mathrm{sts} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d: and (e) N.A. (v) \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super to be placed \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows behind the plough while preparing the field. A/S at 60 lb ./ac. of N as surface dressing \(4-5\) days before sowing and appl cation of gypsum at \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). as surface dressing to be done 2 days before sowing. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculturing with cultivator on 2.12.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control. 6. \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Boron.
2. \(3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Copper.
3. 6 lb ./ac. of Copper.
7. \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of Boron.
8. . 1 lb ./ac. of Zinc.
4. \(12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Copper
9. 4 lb /ac. of \(Z \mathrm{nc}\).
5. \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Boron.
10. 10 lb ./ac. of Zinc.

Copper as Copper Sulphate, Boron as Borax and Zinc as Zinc Sulphate mixed with fine dry earth as surface dressing a day before sowing and applied on 30.10.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii)
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Slightly damaged by rats. (iii) Germination/sq. yd., grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1956. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Borax plots appeared to be better when judged in 1st week of March and these plots have given better yield also. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1584 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(228.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 1674 & 6. & 1806 \\
\hline 2. & 1651 & 7. & 1699 \\
\hline 3. & 1593 & 8. & 1608 \\
\hline 4. & 1357 & 9. & 1551 \\
\hline 5. & 1346 & 10. & 1553 \\
\hline & S.e./meag & \(=132.2\) ¢ \({ }_{\text {d }} / \mathrm{/ac}\). & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(345).
Type :- \({ }^{〔} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of heavy applications of Phosphatic fertilizers in a rotation on the yield of crops.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Moong. (b) Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.10.1952. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring by Moong in 2nd week of September +30 lb 。/ac. of \(\mathbf{N}\) as A/S. (vi) N.A. ( \(\mathrm{y} \dot{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{i}\) ) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\multicolumn{5}{l}{ Application of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super in lb ./ac. to wheat during } \\
& \(1952-53\) & \(1953-54\) & \(1954-55\) & \(1955-56\) \\
1. & 120 & - & - & - \\
2. & 60 & - & 60 & - \\
3. & 30 & 30 & 30 & 30 \\
4. & 240 & - & - & - \\
5. & 120 & - & 120 & - \\
6. & 60 & 60 & 60 & 60 \\
7. Control & - & - & - & -
\end{tabular}
\(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) placed deep in furrows on 14.10 .1952 .
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) \(44^{\prime} \times 191.25^{\prime}\). (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(44^{\prime} \times 24.75^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1956. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) Nil. (vi) aod (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1262 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(202.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Dairy Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 48(40).
Type :- ' M '。

Object:-To study the effect of Super applied at different depths to Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.10.1948. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C 13-(early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+one Control (no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=125\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=250 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 methods of application of \(P_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) Applied on surface, \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Applied \(21^{6}\) deep and \(\mathrm{M}_{8}=\) Applied \(4 \mathbf{t}^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1620 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(176.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\[
\text { Control } \quad=1616 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & M \({ }_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) & M3 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1556 & 1655 & 1596 & 1602 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 1536 & 1655 & 1725 & 1639 \\
\hline Mean & 1546 & . 1655 & 1660 & 1620 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E of marginal mean of \(M\) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(=62.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(=50.97 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(=88.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Dairy Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 49(90)/48(40).
Type:-'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of Super applied at different depths to Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 18.10.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seersiac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C 13-(early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a Control (no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=125\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{9}=250 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 methods of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) Applied on surface, \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Applied \(21^{\prime \prime}\) deep and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Applied \(41^{\circ}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Much below average. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1947 to 1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 548.2 lb /ac.
(ii) \(92.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{Control} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=565.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)} \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & M & \(\mathbf{M a}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 482.7 & 491.6 & 550.5 & 508.3 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 523.6 & 578.4 & 645.2 & 582.4 \\
\hline Mean & 503.2 & 535.0 & 597.8 & 545.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(M\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\)
S.E. of body of table
\(=32.65 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=26.66 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=46.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Dairy Farm, Kanpür.

Ref:-U.P. 48(35).
Type :-‘M'.

Object :-To study the relative efficiency of different manures on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.10 .1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and '(c) N.A. '(v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
3. TREATMENIS:
1. Control.
2. \(50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.
3. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathbf{G} . \dot{N} . C\).
4. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
5. 50 lb ./ac, of N as cowdung manure.
6. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+25 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as castor cake.
7. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S+25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(G . N . C\).
8. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as cowdung manure.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\circ}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination was bad on account of less moisture in the field at the time of sowing. Growth normal except in Block No. 2. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1949 . (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(646.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 184.0 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 514.2 & 5. & 635.2 \\
\hline 2. & 736.1 & 6. & 705.8 \\
\hline 3. & 7865 & 7. & 4739 \\
\hline 4. & 645.3 & 8. & 675.6 \\
\hline & S.E./mean & 2.0 lb./ac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Dairy Farm, Kanpur.

Ref: U.P. 49(92)/48(35).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the relative efficiency of different N manures on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.10.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.4. 1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Conirol.
5. 50 lb ./ac. of N as cowdung manure.
2. \(50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.
6. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+25 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.
3. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{N}\) as \(G . \mathrm{N} . \mathrm{C}\).
7. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) - of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+25 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{G} . \mathrm{N} \mathbf{C}\).
4. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
8. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+25 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac. of N as cowdung manure.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N,A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A(vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(661.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(196.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 436.6 & 5. & 573.7 \\
2. & 665.5 & 6. & 668.5 \\
3. & 635.0 & 7. & 809.7 \\
4. & 704.8 & 8. & 830.9 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=98.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) &
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Dairy Farm, Kanpur.

```
Ref:- U.P. 48(34).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To find the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied to leguminous crops and its residual effect on the yield of Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 22.10.1948. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
2. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Ammo. Phos.
3. \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Bone Super.
4. 75 lb ./ac of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super +25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Ammo. Phos.
5. 75 Ib ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super +25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Bone Super.
6. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) and (b) \(1 / 40\) ac. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yicld. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1943. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experimeat was conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1549 \mathrm{lb} /\) ac.
(ii) \(360.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1. & 1560 \\
2. & 1712 \\
3. & 1432 \\
4. & 1776 \\
5. & 1472 \\
6. & 1344
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(=161.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 48(43).
Type : ' \({ }^{\prime} \mathbf{M}\) '.

Object:-To study the effects of ploughing stabbles of leguminous crops on the yield of Wheat as compared to fallow and green manuring with Sanai.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.10.1948. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Sanai for green manuring sown at 1 md./ac. and ploughed in on 7, 8.8.1948.
2. Guar cut for fodder, sown at 25 srs, ac.
3. Jowar cut for fodder, sown at \(25 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac} .+50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as F.Y.M. applied from 6 to 8.8.1948.
4. Fallow during Kharif +50 lb .Jac. of N as F.Y.M. applied from 6 to 8.8.1948.
3. DESIGN:
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(66^{\prime} \times 33^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1830 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(157.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1950 \\
2. & 1845 \\
3. & 1625 \\
4. & 1900 \\
S.E \(/\) mean & \(=78.8 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :- U.P. 48(21).
Type :- ' M '.
Object :-To study the manurial value of coconut oil cake for Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11.1948. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nid. (vi) NP-165 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.4.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 doses of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}=25, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=50\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{8}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
N applied as coconut oil cake containing \(3 \mathbf{1} \% \mathrm{~N}\) on \(\mathbf{3 0 . 1 2 . 1 9 4 8}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of grain and bhusa. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1183 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(104.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Treatment Av. yield
\(\mathrm{N}_{0} \quad 1129\)
\(\mathrm{N}_{1} \quad 1248\)
\(\mathrm{N}_{2} \quad 1178\)
\(\mathrm{N}_{3} \quad 1178\)
S.E./mean \(=42.80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 49(31). \\ Type:-‘'M'.}

Object :-To study the manurial value of coconut oil cake for Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11.1949. (iv; (a) Ploughing and harrowing-1 with victory plough, 1 with cultivator and 5 with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 100 lb ./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 5 mds. of G.N.C. (vi) NP-125 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 20, 21.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=25, \mathrm{~N}_{3}=50\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
N applied as coconut oil cake containing \(\mathbf{3 1} \% \mathrm{~N}\) on 1.12 .1949 .
3. DESIGN :

4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Moderate late infection of Orange rust. Postules reaching a little below the collar. Black rust in traces only. (iii) Yield of fresh and dry grain. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
S. RESULTS :
(i) \(2572 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(244.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 2504 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 2685 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2500 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 2601 \\
S.E./mean & \(=99.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\title{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :-U.P. 50(55).
Type: © "M'.
Object :-To study the effect of diferent methods of application of Super on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7, 8.11.1950, (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.4.1951 to 1.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combina tions of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 applications of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows by victory plough and \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied by seed drill.
(2) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(35^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime} .9^{\circ}\). (b) NoA. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nilo (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(j) \(2071 \cdot \mathrm{lb} \cdot / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(412.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\text {a }}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline No & 2075 & 1742 & 2017 & 1597 & 1858 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 2039 & 2385 & 2402 & 2309 & 2284 \\
\hline Mean & 2047 & 2064 & 2210 & 1953 & 2071 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{N}=92.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E of marginal mean of \(P \quad=130.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table
\[
=184.3 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ad}
\]

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 51(119).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of different methods of application of Super on Wheat.
1. BASAL CÓNDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat Jowar fodcer. (b) Jowar fcdder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C 13-(early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16 to 19.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 applications of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows ty victory plough and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{3}}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied by seed drill.
(2) 2 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied on 28.11.1951.
3. DESIGN
:(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ij) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) S. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(35^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}-9^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Poor. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1954\). (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(631.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(263.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 464.2 & 537.4 & 478.6 & 345.5 & 456.4 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 560.2 & 712.6 & 953.7 & 996.9 & 805.8 \\
\hline Mean & 512.2 & 625.0 & 716.2 & 671.2 & 631.1 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(N\) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =\$ 8.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =83.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 52(165).
Type :~ "M'.

Object :-To study the effect of different methods of application of Super on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 applications of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) breadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows by victory plough and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) by seed drill.
(2) 2 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Manures applied on 5.11 .1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) S. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(31^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\) 。 (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Tbe experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2168 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(535.9 \mathrm{1b} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1877 & 1758 & 2122 & 2067 & 1956 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 2489 & 2410 & 2200 & 2424 & 2381 \\
\hline Mean & 2183 & 2084 & 2161 & 2246 & 2168 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of marginal mean of \(N\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\)}} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=84.7 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline & & & & & /ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{m \(239.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt, Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref: ©U.P. 53(202).
Type :.' \({ }^{\prime}\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of different methods of application of Super on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.11.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). . (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 applications of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) : \(\quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied in furrows by victory plough and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{g}}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) by seed drill.
(2) 2 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Manures applied on 9.11 .1953 before sowing.
3. DESIGN
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(31^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1728 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 334.8 lb ./ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1255 & 1305 & 1315 & 1385 & 1315 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 2151 & 2193 & 2035 & 2184 & 2141 \\
\hline Mean & 1703 & 1749 & 1675 & 1784 & 1728 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S E. of marginal mean of \(N\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) S.E. of body of table} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =74.88 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =105.88 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =149.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 48(41).
Type :-'M'.

Object:-To test the effect of growing a leguminous crop and ploughing in as against a non leguminous crop and fallow during Kharif.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.10 .1948 . (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.4.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Sanai for green manuring (seed rate \(1 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). ) and ploughed in September 1948.
2. Guar for fodder (seed rate at 25 seers/ac.)
3. Jowar for fodder \(+50 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of N as F.Y.M. (seedrate 25 seers/ac.).
4. Fallow during Kharif +50 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
G.M. crops sown on 27.6.1948, harvested on 25.8.1948 and compost applied on 25.8.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(36 x^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1943 to 1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpup (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Agri. chemist. Not conducted during 1944.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1205 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(99.27 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & \\
1. Av. yield \\
2. & 1292 \\
3. & 1277 \\
4. & 1126 \\
S.E./mean & 1126 \\
& \(=49.64 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 49(93).
Type :~ 'M'.

Object:-To test the effect of growing a leguminous crop and ploughing in as against a non leguminuous crop and fallow during Kharif.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) As under treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.10.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10, 24, 25.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Sanai for green manuring, seed rate 4 srs./ac.
2. Guar for fodder, seed rate 25 srs./ac.
3. Jowar for fodder and seed rate 25 srs./ac. +50 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
4. Fallow \(+50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.

Date of sowing \(=17.6 .1949\), date of harvest \(=10.8 .1949\) and Sanai turned out \(=12.8 .1949\).
3. DESIGN :

4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1943 to 1949. (b) Yes (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(877.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(193.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 857.7 \\
2. & 833.7 \\
3. & 931.3 \\
4. & 887.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=96.7 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 48(39). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the optimum dose of F.Y.M. and compost on the yield of Wheat as compared with A/S.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.10.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. ( x ) 1.4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Cortrol.
5. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as compost.
2. 100 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
6. 150 lb ./ac. of N as compost.
3. \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as F.Y.M.
7. \(200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as compost.
4. \(200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(29^{\circ} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agri. Chemist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2356 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(209.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatme.ts are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Aveatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2208 & & S. & 2268 \\
2. & 2268 & & 6. & 2433 \\
3. & 2283 & & 7. & 2493 \\
4. & 2373 & & 8. & 2523 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=104.8 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. \\ > Ref :- U.P. 49(94).
> Site :-'M'.
}

Object :-To study the optimum doses of F.Y.M. and compost on the yield of Wheat as compared with \(A / S\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.10.1949. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 50 sr./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control. 5. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Compost.
2. 100 lb lac. of N as F.Y.M.
6. \(150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Compost.
3. 150 lb ./ac. of N as R.Y.M.
7. 200 lb ./ac. of N as Compost.
4. 200 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
8. 50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1943 to 1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2153 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(519.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1969 & 5. & 1915 \\
2. & 2163 & 6. & 2370 \\
3. & 1766 & 7. & 2354 \\
4. & 2142 & 8. & 2543 \\
& S.E./mean & \(-259.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 50(54).
Type:-'M'.

```

Object :-To determine a dose of F.Y.M. equivalent to optimum dose of A/S.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (X) 15, 16.4 .1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control. 5. \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M
2. \(\quad 50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
6. \(175 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
3. 100 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
7. \(200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
4. 125 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
8. \(225 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(29^{\circ} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ȧ.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2171 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(411.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). -
(iii) Treatment differeaces are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av, yield \\
1. & 1867 & 5. & 1891 \\
2. & 2508 & 6. & 2110 \\
3. & 2110 & & . & 2427 \\
4. & 2077 & 8. & 2378 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=205.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 51(117). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. } & \text { Type :~ 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To determine a dose of F.Y.M. equivalent to optimum dose of A/S.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.10.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.30.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
5. \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as F.Y.M.
2. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
6. \(175 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{F} . Y, \mathrm{M}\).
3. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{lac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
7. \(200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N asjF.Y.M.
4. 125 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
8. \(225 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
F.Y.M. applied on 20.10.1951 while A/S on 28.11.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8.
(b) N.A. (iii) 4.
(iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(29^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1955. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A. C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(739.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(240.41 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. & & \\
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 578.3 & 5. & 633.9 \\
2. & 1150.6 & 6. & 639.9 \\
3. & 629.4 & 7. & 857.7 \\
4. & 555.8 & 8. & 869.7 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=120.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :- Govt. Kes. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref:~ U.P. 52(167).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.
Object :-To determine a dose of F.Y.M. equivalent to the optimum dose of A/S.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodder. (b) Jowar fodJer. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.11.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
5. \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as F.Y.M.
2. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
6. \(175 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
3. 100 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
7. \(200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
4. \(125 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
8. \(225 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
F.Y.M. applied on 28.10.1952 and A/S on 15.11.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(36^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (v1) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No, (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A. C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1673 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 278.96 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differenzes are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1307 & . & 1691 \\
2. & 2134 & 6. & 1804 \\
3. & 1791 & 7. & 1541 \\
4. & 1653 & 8. & 1463 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=139.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(201).
Type:- 'M'.

Object:-To determine a dose of F.Y.M. equivalent to the optimum dose of A/S.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Jowar fodder-Wheat. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A (x) 14.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control. 5. 150 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
2. 50 lb . ac of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
6. 175 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
3. 100 lb /ac. of N as F.Y.M.
7. 200 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
4. \(125 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
8. \(225 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as F.Y.M.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Ordinary. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted ty A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1214 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(280.20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 845 & 5. & 1036 \\
2. & 1918 & 6. & 1237 \\
3. & 1087 & 7. & 1246 \\
4. & 1148 & 8. & 1195. \\
& S.E./mean & \(=140.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). & Ref \(:=\) U.P. \(51(35)\). \\
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. & Type \(: \sim\) ' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of \(N, P\) and \(K\) applied alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Chari for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Lcam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.10 .1951 . (iv) (a) \(2 \mathrm{dest}, 2\) victory ploughing and 1 spring harrow. (b) N.A.(c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}\). (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 125 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Two weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1} \xlongequal{=} 50\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3^{3}\) Fact in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27 in 3 flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) \(20^{\circ} \times 19^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 16^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fair, the plants of one blcck in treatment \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{~K}_{\mathrm{p}}\) were semi ledged. (iii) Attack of brown rust. (iii) Grain sicld. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1554. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(910.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(391.47 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N effect is highly significant, interaction NK is signifizant while other effects are not significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P i}_{\mathbf{i}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 657.6 & 478.5 & \(5+2.1\) & 559.4 & 584.6 & 671.8 & 421.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 985.3 & 997.1 & 792.0 & 924.8 & 1188.0 & 1015.9 & 570.4 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1086.6 & 12846 & 1367.1 & 1246.1 & 1272.9 & 1096.1 & 1369.5 \\
\hline Mean & 909.8 & 920 I & 900.4 & 910.1 & 1015.2 & 927.9 & 787.3 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & 1048.9 & ¢80.6 & 1015.9 & 1015.2 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 832.1 & 990.0 & 961.7 & 927.9 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 848.6 & 789.6 & 723.6 & 787.3 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =75.33 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =130.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 52(67)/51(35).}

Type:-'M'.

Object:-To study the effects of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}\) and K applied alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Charifor fodJer. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) 5 victory, 8 desi and 1 cultivator ploughing. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{9}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P-125 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weediag on 28.11.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of N as A/S: \(\mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=25\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 ievels of \(K_{2} O\) as Potash : \(K_{0}=0, K_{1}=50\) and \(K_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) dusted and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in rows before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27 in 3 flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}-5^{\prime}\). (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{3}^{\prime}\).
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not good. (ii) Orange rust or brown rust attack \(5 \%\). (iii) Graia yiold and germination. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1653 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(304.59 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N and K effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 905 & 1100 & 999 & 1001 & 1018 & 949 & 1037 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1729 & 1697 & 1622 & 1683 & 1898 & 1408 & 1741 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 2288 & 2351 & 2275 & 2305 & 2439 & 2143 & 2332 \\
\hline Mean & 1641 & 1716 & 1632 & 1663 & 1785 & 1500 & 1703 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & 1659 & 1936 & 1760 & 1785 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 1659 & 1421 & 1421 & 1500 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) & 1603 & 1791 & 1716 & 1703 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=58.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=101.53 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:wU.P. 53(95).
Type : \({ }^{\prime}\) M'.

Object :-To find the manurial requirement of \(\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{P}\) and K for Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.11.1953; (iv) (a) Palewa on 9.10.1953. Ploughing with victory plough and pata on 12, 13.9.1953; 16 and 19.10.1953.. Cultivator and pata on 1, 2 and 16.10.1953. Desi plough and pata on 25.10.1953, 1 and 10.11.1953. (b) Behind plough. (c) 80 lb./ac (d) \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 125 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding. (ix) Not recorded. (x) 13.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All possible combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: \quad N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K} O\) as Pot. Sul.: \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{\mathbf{1}}=50\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) were broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27 (3 flanks of 9 plots each). (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) 2' \(\times \mathbf{y}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Attack by rust. (iii) Germination, straw and dry grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1624 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(321.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of N alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1169 & 1377 & 1232 & 1259 & 1301 & 1157 & 1320 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1597 & 1653 & 1691 & 1647 & 1647 & 1565 & 1729 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1917 & 1955 & 2024 & 1965 & 1923 & 1949 & 2024 \\
\hline Mean & 1561 & 1662 & 1649 & 1624 & 1624 & 1557 & 1691 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & 1546 & 1741 & 1584 & 1624 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 1609 & 1465 & 1597 & 1557 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1527 & 1779 & 1766 & 1691 & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =61.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =107.32 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
> Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 50(140).
Type :- 'M':
Object :-To study the effect of time of application of different doses of A/S.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing by victory plough and two by desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows 9 apart. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-125 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 4, 5.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at the time of sowing.
2. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at the time of first irrigation.
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at the time of sowing +25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at first irrigation.
4. \(37 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at the time of sowing \(+12 \frac{\mathrm{l}}{\mathrm{lb}} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at first irrigation.
5. 25 lb ./ac. of N as Castor cake at the time of sowing +25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at first irrigation.
6. \(37 \frac{1}{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as Castor cake at the time of sowing \(+12 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} S\) at first irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) \(29^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(25^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}-3^{\circ} . \quad\) (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (y) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
S. RESULTS :
(i) 1886 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(201.25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1772 \\
2. & 2044 \\
3. & 1918 \\
4. & 1957 \\
5. & 1807 \\
6. & 1817 \\
S.E./mean & \(=100.62 \mathrm{lb} . /\) ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref: U.P. 50(139).
Type :- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c), N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing with victory plough and two by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (c) N.A (v) Nil. (vi) NP-125 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 4, 5.5.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25\) and \(N_{8}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N broadcast while \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{9}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 12 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times\) i \(^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nii. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1761 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(218.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1000 & 1978 & 2165 & 1714 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1169 & 2178 & 2178 & 1842 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1009 & 1991 & 2178 & 1726 \\
\hline Mean & 1059 & 2049 & 2174 & 1761 \\
& & & & \\
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=62.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & & &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(141).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the manurial value of coconut oil cake on Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11 .1950 . (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by victory plough and 3 plougbings with desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 12 ozs'plot. (d) Between rows- \(9^{\circ}\) (e) N.A. (v) 2 srs/plot of ASS. (vi) NP-125 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding with khurpt. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.11.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control.
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} ., \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 sources of \(N: S_{1}=\) Castor cake and \(S_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Coconut cake.

Manures broadcast before sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(38^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime} .6^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{i}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1739 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(145.27 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(ili) Only N and control \(v s\) other treatments effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Control \(=897 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1482 & 1954 & 2343 & 1926 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1437 & 1821 & 2242 & 1833 \\
\hline Mean & 1460 & 1888 & 2292 & 1880.
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of N
\(=51.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) \(=41.94 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(=72.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(137).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the comparative effect of green manuring on the yield of succeeding Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) Nir. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1950. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with victory plough and 4 with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 80 lb ./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) First week of May 1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow.
2. Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\)-pods picked and plants buried.
3. Sanal G.M.
4. Chari for fodder.
5. Fallow followed by 50 lb ./ac. of F.Y.M.
6. Fallow followed by 50 lb ./ac. of castor cake.
7. Chari followed by \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of F.Y.M.
8. Chari followed by 50 lb ./ac. of castor cake.

Sanat and Chart were broadcast. Samal ploughed in on 6.9.1950. Moong (with vegetable parts) ploughed in on 16.9.1950. F.Y.M. and castor cake applied on 5.11.1950.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(28^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}-9^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \frac{3}{\prime}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1651 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(184.23 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(i.i) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(1 \mathrm{~b}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1759 & 5. & 1912 \\
2. & 1558 & 6. & 2158 \\
3. & 1806 & 7. & 1143 \\
4. & 1135 & 8. & 1735 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=75.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 51(26).
Type :- 'M'.

```

Object :-To study the comparative effect of green manure crops on yield of succeeding Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.11.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughing with 4 desi, 1 victory, 1 watts and 1 cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow.
2. Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\)-pods picked and plants buried on 22.9.1951.
3. Sanai G.M.
4. Chari for fodder.
5. Fallow followed by F.Y.M. at 100 lb .4 oz ./plot.
6. Fallow followed by Castor cake at \(12 \mathrm{lb} .1 \mathrm{oz} . /\) plot.
7. Chari followed by F.Y.M. at 103 lb .4 oz ./plot.
8. Chari followed by Castor cake at \(12 \mathrm{lb} .10 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{oz}\)./plot.

Castor cake and F.Y.M. applied on 9.11.1951, Chari, harvested on 15, 16.11.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime \prime} 9^{\prime}\). (b) \(24^{\circ} \times 14^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \frac{3}{3}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(735 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(172.93 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 549 & 5. & 611 \\
2. & 778 & 6. & 1160 \\
3. & 802 & 7. & 587 \\
4. & 434 & 8. & 958 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=70.60\) lb./ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(66).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the comparative effect of green manure crops on the yield of succeeding Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A (b) As per treatments. (c) 50 lb ./ac. of N. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.10.1952. (iv) (a) 3 victory, 7 desi, 4 cultivator and 2 watts ploughing. ib) N.A. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding on 29.12.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow.
2. Moong at 5 seers/ac. (pods picked and plants buried in).
3. Sanai G.M. at \(1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Chari for fodder at 20 seers/ac.
5. Fallow followed by F.Y.M. at 101.25 lb ./plot.
6. Fallow followed by Castor cake at 12.66 lb ./plot.
7. Chari followed by F.Y.M. at 101.25 lb ./plot.
8. Chari followed by Castor cake at 12.66 lb ./plot.
F.Y.M. and Castor cake applied on 28.10.1952; Sanal, Chari and Moong sown on 8.7.1952 while turned in on 30.8.1952, 10.9.1952 and N.A. respectively.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8 in two flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime \prime} 9^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime} 3^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{l}^{\prime} \cdot(\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fair. (ii) Brown rust attack \(6 \%\). (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1049 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(164.87 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Avo yield \\
\hline 1. & 901 & 5. & 936 \\
\hline 2. & 1138 & 6. & 1613 \\
\hline 3. & 1329 & 7. & 639 \\
\hline 4. & 540 & 8. & 1296 \\
\hline & S.E./mean & ./ac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref:- U.P. 53(86).
Type :- ' M ’.

Object :-To study the comparative effect of green manure crops on the yield of succeeding Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1953. (iv) (a) Palewa on13.10.1953. Ploughing with victory plough on 5/6.9.1953, desi plough and pata on 10/10, \(26 / 10\), and 8.10 .1953 (b) Behind the plougb. (c) Mung \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) at 10.28 lb ./ac., Sanai \(82.285 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). Chari at 41.14 lb ./ac. Wheat at \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 22.1.1954 with khurpi. (ix) N.A. (x) 8.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow.
2. Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) at 10.28 lb ./ac. (Pod picked and plants turned id).
3. Sanal G.M. sown on 4.7.1953 and turned in on 5.9.1953.
4. Chari (Jowar for fodder) sown on 4.7.53 and harvested on 3.9.1953.
5. Fallow followed by F.Y.M. at 101.25 lb ./plot.
6. Fallow followed by castor cake at 12.66 Jb ./plot.
7. Chari followed by F.Y.M. at 101.25 lb ./plot.
8. Chari followed by castor cake at 12.66 Jb ./plot.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8 (in two flanks). (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 15.75^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 14.25^{\circ}\) (v)
\(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{B}^{\prime \prime}\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fair. (ii) Slight incidence of rust. . (iii) Germination, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(962 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(118.02 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
3. & 794 & 5. & 1425 \\
2. & 887 & 6. & 854 \\
3. & 1073 & 7. & 742 \\
4. & 614 & 8. & 1307 \\
& S.E.jmean & \(=48.18 .1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop: \(\boldsymbol{\sim}\) Wheat (Rabi) \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

> Ref :- U.P. 48(42).
> Type :- ‘M’.

Object :-To study the effects of sanai with different doses of Super on a subsequent crop of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Sanai. (b) Sanai. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26/27.10.1948. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control. (no manure).
2. Sanat for green manuring without \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time.
3. Sanal for green manuring with 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing of Sanai.
4. Sanai for green manuring with 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing of Sanat.
5. Sanal for green manuring with 75 lb . ac . of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing of Sanal.
6. Sanai for green manuring plus 25 lb ./ac of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burial of Sanai.
7. Sanai for green maduring plus 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burial of Sanai,
8. Sanai for green manuring plus 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burial of Sanai. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied on 2.7.1948. Sanai sown on 2.7.1948 and ploughed in on 1.9.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(37.5^{\prime} \times 28.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1954. (b) yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1542 lb./ac.
(ii) \(251.81 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 999 & 5. & 1752 \\
2. & 1396 & 6. & 1590 \\
3. & 1600 & 7. & 1671 \\
4. & 1579 & 8. & 1752 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=125.9\) lb./ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 49(91).
Type :- 'M'.

Object : - To study the effect of Sanai with different doses of Super on subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Sanai. (b) Sanai. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 19.10.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) No. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Sanai alone as green manure.
3. Sanait \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super at the time of Sanal sowing.
4. Samal +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super at the time of Sanai sowing.
5. Sanai +125 lb ./ac, of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super at the time of Sanal sowing.
6. Sanait 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super at the time of ploughing in of Sanal.
7. Sanai+ 100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super at the time of ploughing in of Samai.
8. Sanai \(+125 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super at the time of ploughing in of Sanat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28.5^{\circ} \times 37.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1954. (b) Yes, (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1094 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(336.69 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 486 & & 5. & 1203 \\
2. & 1140 & & 6. & 1303 \\
3. & 946 & & 7. & 1356 \\
4. & 1063 & & 8. & 1252
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. \\ Ref:- U.P. 50(53). \\ Type :- 'M'. \\ Object:-To study the effect of applying \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) while sowing and while ploughing in Sanai crop.
}
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Sanai. (b) Sanai. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1950. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 100 lb /ac. (d) and (c) N.A, (v) No. (vi) C-13 (carly). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. Sanai alone.
3. Sanai+ \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing of sanai.
4. Sanai \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing of sanai.
5. Sanai \(+125 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing of sanal.
6. Sanai +75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying of sanai.
7. Sanai +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying of sanai.
8. Sanai +125 lb . /ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying of sanal.
\(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Sanai sown on 8.7.1950 and turned in on 23.8.1950.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28.5^{\circ} \times 37.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi),Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1757 lb./ac.
(ii) \(310.91 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 909 & 5. & 2044 \\
\hline 2. & 1610 & 6. & 2182 \\
\hline 3. & 1773 & 7. & 2128 \\
\hline 4. & 1674 & 8. & 1733 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{S.E./mean \(\quad 155.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref : U.P. 51(118).
Type:-‘'M'.

Object:- To study the effect of applying \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) while sowing and while ploughing in Sanai crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Sanai. (b) Sanai. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b). N.A. (iii) 26.10.1951. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. Sanal alone.
3. Sanai \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time of sanai.
4. Sanai \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time of sanai.
5. Sanui \(+125 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time of sanal.
6. Sanai \(+7 \mathrm{j} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying time of sanai.
7. Sanai \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at bury ing time of sanai.
8. Sanai +125 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying time of sanai.

The crop of sanai was badly damaged by locust and the total produce of sanai was equalty distributed to all the 28 plots at \(2 \mathrm{mds} .18 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{plot}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28.5^{\prime} \times 37.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1021 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(251.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 571 & 5. & 1060 \\
2. & 835 & 6. & 1190 \\
3. & 927 & 7. & 1282 \\
4. & 1041 & 8. & 1269 \\
S.E./mean & \(=112.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).}

Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U P. 52(166).
Type:-‘M'.

Object :-To study the effect of applying \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) while sowing and while ploughing in Sanai crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Wheat-Sanai. (b) Sanal. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.10.1952. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 40 ars./ac. (d), (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) C- 13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. Sanai aloce.
3. Sanai \(+75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time of sanal.
4. Sanai +140 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time of sanal.
5. Sanai +125 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time of sanat.
6. Sanai +75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying time of sanal.
7. Sanai +1 JO lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying time of sanal.
8. Sanai +125 lb ./ac of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying time af sanai.

Sanai sown on 8.7.1952 and buried in on 5.9.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28.5^{\circ} \times 37.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil.
(vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { (i) } 12 s 4 & \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)
(ii) \(256.40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
I. & 627 & 5. & 1320 \\
2. & 1246 & 6. & 1526 \\
3. & 1325 & 7. & 1477 \\
4. & 1202 & 8. & 1550 \\
4. & S.E./mean & \(=128.2\) lb./ac. & \\
& & &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govi. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(200).
Type :-'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of applying \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) while sowing and while ploughing in Sanai crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Sanai. (b) San ai. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.11.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. Sanai alone.
3. Sanai+ \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) at sowing time of Sanai.
4. Sanai \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time of Sanai.
5. Sanai +125 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing time of Sanai.
6. Sanai+ 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying time of Sanai,
7. Sanai \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying time of Sanai
8. Sanai \(+150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at burying time of Sanai.

Sanai buried on 23.9.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28.5^{\circ} \times 37.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1250 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(2740 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 633 & 5. & 1321 \\
2. & 1221 & & 6. & 1465 \\
3. & 1220 & & 7. & 1499 \\
4. & 1287 & & 8. & 1358 \\
S.E./mean & \(=137.0 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). & &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref:-U.P. 51(24).
Type : \(=^{\prime} \mathrm{M}\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied to green manure crops on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) As per treatments. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) N.A. (iji) 26.10.1951. (iv)
(a) 3 desi ploughings, 1 victory ploughing and 1 cultivator ploughing. (b) N.A. (c. \(80 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\) apart.' (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) Trrigated. (vjii) One weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 previous Kharif crops: \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{C}_{1}=\) Fallow, \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=\) Moong. \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=\) Sanai green manure.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied to kharif crops : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Sanai broadcast, moong sown behind the plough on 23.7.1951, green manure ploughed in on 23.9.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact, in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{9^{\prime}}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) In the early stage, when the ears had not emerged there was a little attack of brown rust. After the emergence of ears in all the rlots at later stage, when the ears were just about to mature, the leaves were attacked by rust. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. wes conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1759 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(284.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) C effect and interaction CP are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(C_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{C}_{2}\) & C & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 1438 & 1849 & 2096 & 1794 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1772 & 1929 & - 1468 & 1723 \\
\hline Mean & 1605 & 1889 & 1782 & 1759 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(C\) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =100.75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =82.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =142.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kan pur.

```

Ref :- U.P: 52(45).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied to green manure crops on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) As per treatments. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam (medium). (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1952. (iv) (a) 8 ploughings-victory 2, watts 2, desi 3 and cultivator 1. (b) Behind the plough. (c) 80 lb./ac. (d) \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) Not recorded. ( x ) 7.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 previous kharif crops: \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=\) Fallow, \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=\) Moong and \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=\) Sanal green manuring.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied to kharif crops : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).

Sanai at 80 lb ./ac. broadcast and Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) sown behind the plough on 8.7.1952; sanai ploughed in on 30.8.1952 while Moong \(T_{1}\) on 2.9.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 13 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{B}^{\prime} \cdot\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Brown rust attack 20\%. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2220 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(193.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Ceffect and interaction CP are highly sigrificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) & C2 & \(C_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 1735 & 2377 & 2357 & 2156 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 2369 & 2166 & 2318 & 2284 \\
\hline Mean & 2052 & 2271 & 2337 & 2220 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{S.E. of marginal mean of \(C\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) S.E. of body of table}} & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =68.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =55.97 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =96.94 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 53(92). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied to green manure crops on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatment. (ii) (a) Loam, (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11.1953. (iv) (a) Light Palwa on 11.10.1953. Watt plough and pata on 5.10.1953, Spring harrowing and pata on 20.10.1953, desi plough and para on 30.10.1953. (b) Behind the plough. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (c) N.A. (v) Nil, (vi) Pb-591 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 18.1.1954 by khurpi. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 previous kharif crops: \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=\) Fallow, \(\mathrm{C}_{8}=\) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{8}=\) Sanai for green manuring.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied to kharif crops: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=50 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Sanai at \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . M u n g \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), pods removed, upper portion, leaves and stems turned in on 4.9.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 13.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{1}^{\prime \prime}\), (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Medium infection of brown and black rust was observed in every plot (treated or untreated). (iii) Germination \%, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1555 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(223.25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) C effect and interaction CP are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll} 
& \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{3}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 1025 & 1978 & 1723 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1257 & 1839 & 1508 \\
\hline Mean & 1141 & 1909 & 1616
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } \mathbf{C} & =78.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of marginal'mean of } P & =64.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =91.14 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :- U.P. 50(311).
Site :- Students' Instructional Farm, Govt. College, Kanpur.

Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the residual effect of \(N\) and \(P\) on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize, (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iji) 25.10.1950. (iv) (a) Punjab plough on 28.9.1950, 2 desi plough after palewa. Each ploughing was followed by pata. (b) Sown behind desi plough. (c) 50 srs /ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-125 (N.A.). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding with khurpi to remove weeds like rougeing. Ears of other varieties were picked before harvesting to maintain the purity of the variety. (ix) 5.54*. (x) 14 and 15.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) 2 rows on either side and 13' at each end of the plet. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) A very mild attack of black rust. (iii) Germination counts, shoot height, tillers, final shoot height, ear height, grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) NA. (vi) Nil. The experiment conducted by Govt. Agril. College, Kanpur.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1056 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(68.85 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only Peffect is highly sigrificant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \({ }^{1}\) & 1004 & 1016 & 1185 & 1068 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1010 & 1023 & 1154 & 1062 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 965 & 996 & 1148 & 1036 \\
\hline Mean & 993 & 1012 & 1162 & 1056 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =19.88 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =34.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :m Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Ref :- U.P. 49(70).
Type:- 'M'.

```

O'jest :-To study the effect of different formz of N on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iiii) 20.11.1949. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by mould board plough \({ }_{n i c}\) crosswise ploughing by tractor and two harrowings. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 45 srs /ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) T.C. applied on 21.10.1949. Amount N.A. (vi) Po. 591 (mid latel. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and 2 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 3 and 4.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

60 lb ./ac. of N applied on 19.11 .1949 in the form of
1. Sulphate of Ammonia.
2. Groundout cake.
3. Ammonium phosphate.
4. Kurdi cake.
5. Town compost.
6. Poultry manure.
7. F.Y.M.
8. Zoo excreta.
9. Castor cake.
10. Stable manure.
11. Neem cake.
12. Mohawa cake.
13. Mustard cake.
14. Ammonum Nitrate.
15. Linseed cake.
16. Control (no manure).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D: (ii) (a) 16.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (b)
(b) \(30^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\).
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield, height and length of ear/plant. (iv) (a), (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1130 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(115.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & \\
1. & 1724 & Treatment & Av. yield \\
2. & 1089 & & 9. \\
3. & 1307 & 10. & 1134 \\
4. & 1343 & 11. & 1016 \\
5. & 1062 & 12. & 907 \\
6. & 1243 & 13. & 1016 \\
7. & 1053 & 14. & 1016 \\
8. & 889 & 15. & 1125 \\
& S.E./mean & & \(16_{0}\) \\
& & \(=81.95 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). & 817 \\
& & &
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Wheat.
Ref :^ U.P. 50(117).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Type s- 'M'.

```

Object :-To study the efect of various forms of N on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.10.1950. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by mould board plough, 4 deshi and one by cultivator. (b) Sown tehind the deshi plough. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) T.C. applied on 1, 2.10.1950. (vi) C-13. (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 interculturings. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
\(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N applied on 22.10 .1950 as :
1. Control (no manure) 6. F.Y.M.
2. \(A / S\)
7. T.C.
3. Ammonium Nitrate
8. Castor cake.
4. Sodium Nitrate
9. Linseed cake.
5. Ammonium Phosphate
10. G.N.C.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 10.
(b) N.A. (iii) 3
3. (iv) (a) \(25^{\circ} \times 24^{\circ}\).
(b) \(22^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Below normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 837 lb./ac.
(ii) \(404.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Trearments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1260 & 6. & 670 \\
2. & 1066 & 7. & 1115 \\
3. & 1212 & 8. & 170 \\
4. & 824 & 9. & 489 \\
5. & 678 & 10. & 888 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=\mathbf{2 3 3 . 7} \mathbf{l b}\)./ac. & \\
& & &
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :~U.P. 53(139). } \\
\text { Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. } & \text { Type :m }{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{M} \text {. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of different trace elements on growth and yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Dhaincha. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sardy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.10.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings and 1 planking. (b) Behind the plough. (c) \(30-35\) srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Pea and (G.M.) dhaincha turned in on 12.8 .1953 and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 24.10 .1953 at \(2 \mathrm{il} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}, 30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, 30 \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul., and Gypsum at 30 lb ./ac. of Ca applied cn 20.10.1953. (vi) \(\mathrm{K}-13\) (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 5.78. (x) 10, 11.4.1954.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
6. Borax at \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Copper Sulphate at \(3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. Borax at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. Copper Sulphate at \(6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
8. Zinc Sulphate at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Copper Sulphate at 12 lb ./ac.
9. Zinc Sulphate at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. Borax at 1 lb ./ac.
10. Zinc Sulphate at \(10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Trace eiements applied mixed with fine earth as surface dressing a day before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 (b) N.A. (iii) 2 (iv) (a) \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 36^{\prime}\). (v) 2 alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) Nil. (iii) Physiological aspects of plants. Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Instead of 4 replications, only 2 have bzen used for analysis purpose, as the remaining 2 replications were shaded. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(706.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(124.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatinent & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 495.9 & 6. & 807.0 \\
\hline 2. & 661.2 & 7. & 773.0 \\
\hline 3. & 646.6 & 8. & 724.4 \\
\hline 4. & 690.3 & 9. & 870.2 \\
\hline 5. & 753.5 & 10. & 641.7 \\
\hline & & - \(87.69 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat. & Ref :-U.P. 52(188). \\
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Licknow . & Type:-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Licknow .
Type: \({ }^{-} \mathbf{~ M ' ~}\)
Object :-To study the effect of different trace elements (in presence of adequate quantities of \(\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{P}, \mathrm{K}\) and Ca) on the growth, yield and quality of wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDIITONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Guar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1952. (iv) (a) 10 ploughings.
(b) Seed drilled. (c) 40 srs ./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, 15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super,

15 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and 12 lb ./ac. of Ca applied during 19 to \(21.10 .195 \mathrm{O}+\) town compost. (vi)
C-13 (early). vi) Irrigated. (viii) Weediags and hoeings from 4 to 24.12.1952, (ix) N.A. (x) 2 to 5.5.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Manganese Sulphate at 5 lb ./ac.
3. Borax at \(1 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Copper Sulphate at 6 lb ./ac.
5. Molibidic acid at \(6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. Gypsum at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). -
7. Zinc Sulphate at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
8. Magnesium Sulphate at 5 lb ./ac.

Trace elements appliej on 4, 5, 6.11.1952.
3, DESIGN:
(i) R B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(41^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(38^{\circ} \times 23^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield and bhusa. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(383.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(154.7 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not siguificant.
(iv) Av yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 387.7 & 5. & 503.0 \\
2. & 400.5 & 6. & 342.8 \\
3. & 432.5 & 7. & 323.6 \\
4. & 400.5 & 8. & 291.6
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref:-U.P. 52(184).
Type :-‘M'.

Object : - study the effect of ploughing in moong, lobia and sanai at different times on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong, lobia and sanai. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.10.1952. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) \& (e) N.A. (v) Double Super at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\), Sulphate of Potash at \(\mathrm{Jlb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\), Gypsum at 10 lb ./ac. of Ca. Gypsum applied as. surface dressing, super phosptate applied behind the plough and Potash as surface dressing before planting on 22 10.1952. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) .N.A. (x) 24 to 26.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) + Control (fallow).
(1) 3 green manures: \(\mathrm{G}_{1}=\) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}, \mathrm{G}_{2}=\) Sanai and \(\mathrm{G}_{3}=\) Lobia.
(2) 5 times of application of G.M. : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=25, \mathrm{~T}_{2}=35, \mathrm{~T}_{3}=45, \mathrm{~T}_{6}=55\) and \(\mathrm{T}_{5}=65\) days after germination.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(18^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) Irrigation channel 2'. Plot border 13'. Block border \(2^{2}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. vi) Nii, (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(727.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(348.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) 'Control \(v s\) other treatments' effect alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\[
\text { Control = } 1742 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]
\begin{tabular}{l|ccccc|c} 
& \(T_{1}\) & \(T_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(T_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(T_{\mathbf{6}}\) & \(T_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 544.5 & 466.7 & 933.4 & 591.2 & 964.5 & 700.1 \\
\(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 544.5 & 466.7 & 575.6 & 373.4 & 886.8 & 569.4 \\
\(G_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 902.3 & 575.6 & 746.7 & 731.2 & 591.2 & 709.4 \\
\hline Mean & 663.8 & 503.0 & 751.9 & 565.3 & 814.2 & 659.6
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{G}\) & \(=90.01 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\), \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{T}\) & \(=116.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=201.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Ref :-U.P. 52(185).
Type:-‘M'.
Object :-To study the residual effect of different green manure crops in presence and absence of \(P\) on growth* and yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) G.M. as per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1952. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings. (b) Behind desi plough with sowing funnel. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of Ca as Gypsum and 5 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. applied on 2 .10.1952. (vi) \(\mathrm{C}-13\) (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 21 and 23.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1, 6 green manures: \(G_{0}=\) Fallow, \(G_{1}=\) Moon g \(T_{1}, G_{2}=\) Lobia, \(G_{3}=\) Udid, \(G_{4}=\) Dhaincha and \(\mathrm{G}_{5}=\) Sanai.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Fertilizers applied on 26.101952.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) \(2 \times 6\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 13^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\). (v) Irrigation channel \(2^{\prime}\), block border \(4^{\prime}\) and field border \(=4^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and \(]\) (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1105 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(456.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av . yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(G_{4}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 1120 & 1348 & 1056 & 817 & 1003 & 677 & 1004 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1546 & 986 & 998 & 1324 & 1318 & 1068 & 1207 \\
\hline Mean & 1333 & 1167 & 1027 & 1070 & 1160 & 873 & 1105 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of the marginal mean of \(G\) \\
S.E. of the marginal mean of \(P\). \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =161.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =93.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =228.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 51 (112).
Site :- Tarai State Farm (Western Block), Matkota. Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of N and P fertilizers, alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.11.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing with a tractor, ploughed with a victory plough at the time of drilling of Super. (b) Sown in lines behind desi plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) to (ix) N.A. (x) April, 1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as A/S broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super placed deep in bands near the root zone through a fertilizer drill and then pata applied; manured on 22.11.1951 aod 14.1.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) to \(3^{\prime}\) between plots and \(3^{\circ}\) to \(4^{\prime \prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good growth, completely lodged; due to rains. Very little grain could be recovered. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-Continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kalai, Raya, Tissuhi, Atarra. Partapgarh and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1280 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 228.66 lb ./ac.
(iij) Neffect and interaction NP are highly significant. Peffect is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1253 & 1713 & 1567 & 1511 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1433 & 1273 & 1173 & 1293 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1207 & 967 & 933 & 1036 \\
\hline Mean & 1298 & 1318 & 1224 & 1280
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =53.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =93.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.}
\end{array}
\]

Crop :~Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :=U.P. 52(20).
Site : \(\boldsymbol{\sim}\) Tarai State Farm (Western Block), Matkota. Type : ' 'M'.
Object:-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) fertiliser, alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Matkota loam). (b) N.A. (iii) 19.11.1952. (iv) (a) One tractom ploughing followed by harrowing and pata. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 9 to 11.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{6}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied as surface dressing by broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super drilled in furrows \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep near the root done by plough. \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied on 2.1.1953 and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) on 18.11.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii). 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(49.5^{\circ} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) Badly attacked by rats. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-Contd. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Pura, Kalai, Bharari, Raya, Tissuhi, Atarra, Banaras and Farrukhabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1828 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(408.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}_{3}\),
\begin{tabular}{l|lll} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 1280 & 2053 & 2160 \\
\(N_{1}\) & 1813 & 1813 & 2000 \\
\(N_{2}\) & 1680 & 1740 & 1913 \\
\hline Mean & 1591 & 1869 & 2024 \\
1875 \\
\hline & & 1878 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
S.E. of any marginal mean \(=96.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(=166.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
}

\section*{Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).}

Ref :- U.P. 53(339)
Site :- Tarai State Farm (Western Block), Matkota. Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effects of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Matkota clay loam, calcarious. (b) N.A. (iii) 18 to 20.11.1953. (iv) (a) Disc ploughing, harrowing-including one cultivator. (b) Behind the desi plough. (c) N.A.
(d) and (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(7.37^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S:-N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30, N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super :- \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S broadcast, Super placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands \(9^{\circ \prime}\) apart; \(P\) is about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) below the seed; manures applied on 15 to 17.11.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(49.5^{\circ} \times 22^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Heavy rains accompanied by strong winds caused severe lodging especially in N plots. Germination good. Growth normal. (ii) Artack of rust and smut. Damage due to rats was severe in lodged plots while light damage in all the plots. Attack of weeds. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1951continued. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Phoolbagh, Tissuhi, Gazipur, Atarra and Raya. (b) -. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1282 \mathrm{lbs} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(570.99 \mathrm{lbs} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathbf{l b} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1253 & 1293 & 1320 & 1289 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1167 & 1467 & 1500 & 1378 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1447 & 1033 & 1060 & 1180 \\
\hline Mean & 1289 & 1264 & 1293 & 1282
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean \(=134.58 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=233.11 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Tarai State Farm, Matkota.

Ref:- U.P. 53(337).
Type:- ' \(\mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Matkota loam, slightly calcareous. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 and 4.11.1953. (iv) (a) 1 tractor harrowing and 2 ploughing followed by fata. (b) Behind desi plough. (c) N.A. (d) -. (c) -. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) 8.55". (x) 17 and 19.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) : \(N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pol. Sul : \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}=\mathbf{0}, \mathrm{K}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S broadcast. Super placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands at \(9^{\circ}\) apart and about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) below the seed. Potash applied as deep placement with Phosphate. Manures applied on 2.12.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) partially balanced. (ii) (a) 2 blocks/replication; 6 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(49.5^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Heavy rains accompanied by hail storm in the last week of February caused lodging and also general damege of mmature ears. Lodging was more marked in N applied plots. Crop condition good. (ii) Outbreak of wheat rust and smut. Also attack of rats, controlled by frequent bait poisioning. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Bharari, Banaras, Kalai and Pura. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. One replication was rejected because it involved one missing plot and as such analysis became complex due to partialiy balanced design of the experiment.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1209 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 237.72 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{P}\) and K are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of the marginal mean of \(\mathbf{K}\) & \(=68.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of the marginal mean of \(\mathbf{N}\) or \(\mathbf{P}\) & \(=56.03 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of the body of the table \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}\) & \(=79.24 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of the body of the table \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{K}\) or \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K}\) & \(=97.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Tarai State Farm, Matkota.

Ref:- U.P. 53(340).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the effect of Super and B.M, applied at deep placement with and without \(\mathbf{N}\) on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17 and 18.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) 1 tractor ploughing and 1 harrowing. Ploughing by desi plough and victory plough followed by para. (b) Behind desi plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) Weeding and hoeing twice. (ix) 8.55'. (x) 19 and 20.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot trealments:
2 levels of \(N\) as A/S: \(\mathbf{N}_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Sub-plot treat ments:
 \(\mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as B.M.
NS broadcast. Super placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands \(9^{\circ}\) apart and about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\circ}\) below the seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block and 5 sub-plots main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(54.5^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Normal. (ii) Severe attack of wheat rust and smut. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai \& Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Heavy rains accompanied by hail storm in the last week of February 1954 and severe infection of weeds specially katerl which could not be eradicated even by weedings affected the experiment. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1168 \quad \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(346.76 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(162.43 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1049 & 989 & 1139 & 1129 & 1049 & 1071 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{L}}\) & 1099 & 1299 & 1269 & 1319 & 1339 & 1265 \\
\hline & 1074 & 1144 & 1204 & 1224 & 1194 & 1168
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of N & \\
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{P}\) & \(=109.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(P\) means at the same level of N & \\
4. N means ut the same level of \(P\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Wheat. \\ Site :-Regional Res. S tn., Nawabganj.
}

Ref:-U.P. 49(29).
Type :-‘M'.
Object:-To study the effect of N and P applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a), (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam (unclassified). (b) N.A. (iii) 13.11.1949. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(l) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{g}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}: P_{9}=0, P_{1}=60\) and \(P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as single Super applied in deep furrows en 13.11.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1950. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Bharari, Atarra, Banaras, Kanpur, Kalai and Partapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1124 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(121.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graid in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1008 & 1052 & 992 & 1017 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1108 & 1198 & 1132 & 1146 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1158 & 1255 & 1212 & 1208 \\
\hline Mean & 1091 & 1168 & 1112 & 1124 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=28.58 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} & \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=49.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat & Ref:-U.P. 50(67). \\
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj. & Type :-‘M \({ }^{\text {s }}\)
\end{tabular}

Object: - To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy Loam (Barielly Type 30). (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1949. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings after levelling. (b) Sown in lines behind the plough. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of ( 1 ) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=12\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=24 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{3}}\) as Super placed through pre-drilling on 5.11.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 45.4^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) from plot to plot and \(3^{\prime}\) from block to block was left out: (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1950. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Atarra, Kalai, Aligarh, Banaras, Pratapgarh and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1504 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(230.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1473 & 1712 & 1366 & 1517 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1506 & 1559 & 1439 & 1501 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1499 & 1379 & 1599 & 1492 \\
\hline Mean & 1493 & 1550 & 1468 & 1504 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=54.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=94.01 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agril. Farm, Pratapgarh.

Ref:- U.P. 49(28).

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Domat. (b) N.A. (iii) 12,11.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) NiL. (vi) to (viil) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.3 .1950 to 8.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and ( 2 )
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Single Super applied on 9.10.1949.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(45^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Atarra, Banaras, Bharari, Nawabgunj and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1537 lb./ac.
(ii) \(168.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N effect alone is bighly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\). & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1562 & 1650 & 1745 & 1652 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\), & 1532 & 1488 & 1592 & 1537 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1452 & 1445 & 1371 & 1423 \\
\hline Mean & 1515 & 1528 & 1569 & 1537 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =39.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =68.59 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agril. Farm, Pratapgarh.

Ref :- U.P. 50(66).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
2. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Moong type 1. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11.1950. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings and one harrowing. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) to (ix) N.A. (x) 3.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=12 \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied on 1, 2.11.1950 through pre-drilling.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Pact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(45^{\circ} \times 22^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) between plots and \(3^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Heavy lodging at the time of harvesting. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Atarra, Kalai, Aligarh, Banaras, Nawabgunj and Bharari. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
3. RESULTS:
(i) \(1598 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 321.4 lb /ac.
(iii) N efiect alone is highly significant. P effect and interaction ' \({ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}\) ' are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1350 & 1459 & 1173 & 1327 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1422 & 1621 & 1863 & 1635 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1488 & 1848 & 2164 & 1833 \\
\hline Mean & 1420 & 1643 & 1733 & 1598 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =75.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =131.23 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agril. Farm, Pratapgarh.

Ref :-U.P. 51(108).
Type \(\mu^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of N and P fertilizers, alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Green manuring. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam (unclassified). (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1951. (iv)
(a) Eight ploughings. (b) Sown in lines behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A.
(vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of V as A/S: \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(?) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
A/S broadcast and Super placed deep in bands through drill.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 46^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) to \(3^{\prime}\) between plots and \(3^{\prime}\) to \(4^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination good. Growth suffered due to leck of moisture. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyadpur, Kalai, Raya, Tissuhi, Atarra, Bharari and Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1152 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(174.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N effect is highly significant. \(\mathbf{P}\) effect is significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1040 & 976 & 1018 & 1011 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1148 & 1191 & 1348 & 1229 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 1127 & 1121 & 1399 & 1216 \\
\hline Mean & 1105 & 1096 & 1255 & 1152 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =41.18 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =71.33 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(53).
Site :-Govt. Agril. Farm, Pratapgarh.
Type :-‘'M’.

Object:-To study the effect of placement of fertilizers on growth and yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil (b) G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1953. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings and harrowing. (b) Drilling. (c) \(20-25\) seers/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 19-21.12.1953. (ix) N A. (x) 29.3.19:4.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 fertilizers: \(\quad M_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{M}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate and \(\mathrm{M}_{4}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO as Gypsum.
(2) 3 methods of application: \(A_{1}=B y\) broadcast, \(A_{2}=\) Placement behind plough in furrows and \(A_{3}=\) Mixed with seed and drilled through improved seed drill.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\circ} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes. .
4. GENER \(\wedge L\) :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Banda, Hardoi and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(512.8 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{lac}\).
(ii) \(44.17 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(M\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av.yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{4}\) & \multicolumn{1}{|c}{ Mean } \\
\hline \(\mathrm{A}_{1}\) & 645.1 & 542.1 & 474.9 & 405.4 & 516.9 \\
\(\mathrm{~A}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 675.4 & 575.7 & 441.3 & 347.2 & 509.9 \\
\(\mathrm{~A}_{3}\) & 672.0 & 563.4 & 436.8 & 374.1 & .511 .6 \\
\hline Mean & 664.2 & 560.4 & 451.0 & 375.6 & 512.8
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } M & =14.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } A & =12.75 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =25.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref : U.P. 53(338).
Site :-Tarai State Farm, (Central Block) Phoolbagh. Type :-'M'.
Object :-To study the effects of \(N\) and \(P\) fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Slightly calcarious. (b) N.A. (iii) 3, 4.11.1953. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by dise plough and 3 harrowings. (b) Sown behind the desi plough in lides. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viil) N.A. (ix) 7.37* . (x) May, 1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{9}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{8} O_{5}\) as Super : \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=60\) and \(P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Method of application : A/S broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands \(9^{\circ}\) apart and \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) below the seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(49.5 \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Practically good growth. (ii) Rust and smut attack, 'Rat attack in some treatments. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Matkota, Tissuhi, Gazipur, Atarra and Raya, (b) N.A. (vi) Heavy rains in the last week of February. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1317 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(182.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is bighly significant and interaction NP is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.


Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Pura (Kanpur).

Ref:.U.P. 52(8).
Type :- \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) N.A. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpur type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Pura. (iii) 25.10.1949. (iv) (a) I ploughing with victory plough and 3 ploughings with gurjar plough, one harrowing to remove weeds and stubbles on 26.9.1952. Ploughing again with desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 23 to 25.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as A/S: \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as surface dressing by broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled in furrows ( \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep) on 24, 25.10.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL:
(i) Gocd. Lodging due to rains and stcrmy winds. (ii) Lodged; crop attacked by rats. Anti rat measures taken. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai, Raya, Banaras, Tissuhi, Matkota, Bharari, Atarra and Farrukhatad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) Tte exptriment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1686 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(228.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Both the main effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1151 & 1333 & 1507 & 1330 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1479 & 1781 & 1963 & 1741 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{9}\) & 1799 & 1927 & 2237 & 1988 \\
\hline Mean & 1476 & 1680 & 1902 & 1686 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=53.92 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=93.39 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 53(358).
Site :- Govt. Agril. Farm, Pura (Kanpur).
Type:- 'M'.
Object:-To study the eifect of \(N, P\) and \(K\) fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Kanpur-type 2 soil. (b) Refer soil analysis, Pura. (iii) 2, 3.11.19s3. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by gurjar plough, 3 by desl plough and I disc harrowing. (b) Behind the plough in linis. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 4.1". (x) 5.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Surer: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=6 \mathrm{~J} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) placed in \(4^{\circ}\) deep bands \(9^{\circ}\) apart and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) applied as deep placement with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) on 1, 2.11.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) partially confd. (ii) (a) 2 blocks/replication; 6 plots/block. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(47^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime} \times 23^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Germination good. Growth poor in January. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1953N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Matkota, Banaras, Kalai and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(682.6 \mathrm{1b}\) //ac.
(ii) \(171.9 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N, P efects are highly significant. Interaction NP is signific ant, while other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 576.7 & 570.7 & 514.2 & 553.9 & 388.5 & 719.2 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 836.8 & 792.7 & 804.7 & 811.4 & 517.8 & 11050 \\
\hline Mean & 706.7 & 681.7 & 659.4 & 682.6 & 453.1 & 912.1 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 456.6 & 431.1 & 471.6 & 453.1 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 956.8 & 932.3 & 847.3 & 912.1 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

SE of marginal mean of \(N\) or \(P\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(K\)
S.E. of body of table \(N \times P\) S.E. of body of tabie \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathrm{K}\) or \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K}\)
\(=35.09 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=42.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=49.63 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=60.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref:- U.P. 51(111).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) applied, alone and in combination on Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Jowar as green fodder. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam (unclassified). (b) Refer soil adalysis, Raya. (iii) 22.11.1951. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings with desi plou,h and one ploughing with victory plough. (b) Sown in lines with drill bebind the desi plough. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (ii) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 harrowing. (ix) N.A. (x) 17 to 19.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(.) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(N\) as A/S broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super placed deep through fertilizer drill on 21.11.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(72^{\circ}-7^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) to \(3^{\prime}\) from plot to plot and \(3^{\prime}\) to \(4^{\prime}\) from block to block. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kalai, I issuhi, Pratapgarh, Atarra, Bharari and Matkota. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1658 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 108.6 lb ./ac.
(iii) N and P effects are highly significant, while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb /ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(N_{0}\) & 1167 & 1347 & 1541 & 1352 \\
\(N_{1}\) & 1467 & 1874 & 1907 & 1749 \\
\(N_{2}\) & 1754 & 1867 & 2000 & 1572 \\
\hline Mean & 1463 & 1696 & 1816 & 1658
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =25.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & \\ & =44.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)

Crop:- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :- U.P. 52(16).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the ef ect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A (ii) (a) Sandy loam (unclassified). (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 2.11.1952. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with desi plough, palewa followed by 2 more ploughings with desi plough ard pata. (b) Sown in lines behind desi plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irr gated (viii) 2 band weedings and 1 harrowing with level harrow. (ix) 1.8". (x) 3.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied as sulface dressing by broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as S uper placed \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep near the root zone. Date of manuring 25.10.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(60.5^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Gocd. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) No. (cl No. (v) (a) Pura, Kalai, Atarra, Tissuhi, Matkota, Bharari and Farrukhabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2193 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(236.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1827 & 2046 & 1960 & 1944 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 2206 & 2280 & 2294 & 2260 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2240 & 2453 & 2486 & 2393 \\
\hline Mean & 2091 & 2260 & 2246 & 2199 \\
\begin{tabular}{l} 
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of the table
\end{tabular} & & \(=55.72 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}\). \\
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Farm, Raya. \\ > Ref :- U.P. 53(346).
> Type :- 'M'.
}

Object :-To study the effect of N and P applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 13.11.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings followed by pata. Palewa one on 25.10 .1953 ; one more ploughing by way drilling of fertilizers. (b) Drilling. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings and weedings. (ix) 1.13". (x) 12.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S broadcasted \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) placed in \(4^{\circ}\) deep bands to \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) is about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) below the seed. Manures applied on 10.11.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(60.5^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination excellent. Crop condition good. Rains with strong winds during February 1954 caused lodging in plots with bumper growth. (ii) Affected with rust. (iii) Grain of and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1951-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Phoolbagh, Matkota, Tissuhi, and Gazipur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(2328 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 188.4 lb .ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) effectiand interaction \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}\) are highly significant while \(\mathbf{P}\) effect is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{I}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1900 & 2150 & 2327 & 2126 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 2537 & 2470 & 2413 & 2473 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 2350 & 2613 & 2193 & 2385 \\
\hline Mean & 2262 & 2411 & 2311 & 2328 \\
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of the table
\end{tabular} & & \(=44.41 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agril. Farm, Tissuhi.

\author{
Ref :mU.P. 51(113). \\ Type :-'M'.
}

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\dot{\mathbf{P}}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) No. (b) Early paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hard clay (Belan clay loam). (b) N.A. (iii) 27 and 28.11.1951. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4 and 5.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, deep placed through a fertilizer drill on 21.11.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) to \(3^{\prime}\) from plot to plot and 3 from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Below normal due to late sowing and inadequacy of moisture. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield: (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kalai, Raya, Pratapgarh, Atarra, and Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(571.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 9520 lb ./ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) effects alone are highly significant.
(iii) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 439.0 & 518.6 & 564.5 & 507.4 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 452.5 & 604.8 & 697.8 & 585.0 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 459.2 & 645.1 & 765.0 & 623.1 \\
\hline Mean & 450.2 & 589.5 & 675.8 & 571.8 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =22.44 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =38.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agril. Farm, Tissuhi.
Ref :-U.P. 52(10).
Type:-‘M'.
Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) applied alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Karail (Mirzapur-type 2 C) clayey. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.11.1952. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings with desi plough and light pre-sowing irrigation. (b) Sown in lines behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1 and 2.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{3}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{g}}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed by broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super drilled in furrows \(4^{4}\) deep near the root zone.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(42^{\circ} \times 26^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Bharari, Pura, Kalai, Raya, Banaras, Matkota, Atarra and Farrukhabad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(832.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(161.95 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All the effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 492.8 & 560.0 & 566.7 & 539.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 726.9 & 993.4 & 912.8 & 877.7 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 679.8 & 1260.0 & 1300.3 & 1080.8 \\
\hline Mean & 633.2 & 937.8 & 926.6 & 832.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table
\(=38.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=66.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Tissuhi.
Ref :-U.P. 53(354).
Type :-'M'.
Object:-To study the effects of N and P applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Wheat-Paddy-early Wheat-Fallow-Wheat. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Hard clayey (Kharif) soil.) (b) N.A. (iii) 2 ; \(26.11 .1: 53\). (iv) 3 palewa, 4 ploughings. (b) Line sowing behind desi plough. (c) to (e) N.A (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 1.61". (x) 11.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands at \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart is about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) below the seed. Manures applied on 23, 24.11.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(9 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Uniform germination. (ii) N.A. (iii) Graia and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Phoolbagh, Matkota, Gazipur, Atarra and Raya. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(386.5 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(63.91 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graia in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 187.8 & 322.4 & 455.4 & 321.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 227.3 & 442.1 & 563.4 & 410.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 197.9 & 530.2 & 551.8 & 426.6 \\
\hline Mean & 204.3 & 431.6 & 523.5 & 386.5 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =15.06 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =26.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :-U.P. 49(25).
Type:- \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of N and P applied alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Domat (Banaras-Type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 2.11.1949. (iv) (a) to (e),N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) to (ix) N.A. (x) 10 to 17.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep through furrows and N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed on 2.11.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 9. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(4 l^{\prime} \times 231^{\prime} \cdot\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Severe lodging due to winter rains. Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (c) (a) Atarra, Kanpur, Pratapgarh, Bharari, Nawabganj and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) and (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1102 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(193.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) effoct is highly significant, \(\mathbf{P}\) effect is significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & & 827 & 1025 & 812 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1017 & 1191 & 1176 & 888 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1290 & 1419 & 1161 & 1128 \\
\hline Mean & 1045 & 1212 & 1050 & 1290 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
\(=45.57 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=78.93 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 50(62). } \\
\text { Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Moong T1. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Domat (Banaras type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 26.10.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 6 to 10.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as A/S was broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super through pre-drilling in bands near the root zone.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27.5^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) from plot to plot and \(3^{\prime}\) from block to block was left out.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Atarra, Kalai, Aligarh, Pratapgarh, Nawabgunj and Bharari. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C. Plots damaged by rats.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1649 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 233.66 Ib ./ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant, \(P\) effect is significant. Interacion is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 52(9).
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) applied alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (li) (a) Loam (Banaras-type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 29.10.1952. (iv) (a) Slight palewa, 9 ploughings with desi plough and one harrowing. (b) Sown by Seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viij) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26/27.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{6}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied on surface dressing by broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super drilled in furrows \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep near the root zone
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(42^{\circ} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good, no lodging. (ii) Severely attacked by rats. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Pura, Bharari, Raya, Atarra, Tissuhi, Matkota, Kalai and Farrukhabad. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 894 lb.lac.
(ii) \(171.15 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant, interaction is significant, while P effect is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 477 & 622 & 553 & 551 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 933 & 899 & 1141 & 991 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1169 & 1217 & 1030 & 1139 \\
\hline Mean & 860 & 913 & 908 & 894 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =40.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =69.87 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop: Wheat (Rabi).
Site s- Reg. Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 53(335).
Type:- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of Super and B.M. applied at deep placement with and without N on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) Nil, (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 19.11.1953. (iv) (a) 1 palewa, 3 ploughings and 1 pata. (b) Seed drilled. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 1.75". (x) 3.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
5 application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as B.M., \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=120\) lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{P}_{6}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as B.M.
A/S broadcast on 20.11.1953 Super placed in \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep bands \(9^{\circ}\) apart on 14.11 .1953 about \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\circ}\) below the seed.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(23^{\prime} \times 47.25^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. '(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Germination uniform. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) \(1952-53-\) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Matkota and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. Data for 1952 N.A.
S. RESULTS:
(i) \(672.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(89.23 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(81.40 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of N
\(\begin{aligned} & =28.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =40.70 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}, \\ & =57.56 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =58.71 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{aligned}\)

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 53(333).
Site :- Reg. Kes. Stn., Varanasi.
Type :- ‘M'.

Object :- To study the effect of \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) applied alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 18.11.1953. (iv) (a) 3 ploughirgs during kharif, 2 palewa, 1 ploughing and 1 pata. (b) In lines with seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 1.75'. (x) 29.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S broadcast on \(5,6.11 .1953\). Super placed in \(4^{\circ}\) deep bands \(9^{\circ}\) apart about \(1^{\circ}\) to \(2^{\circ}\) below, the seed. Potash applied as deep as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) partially confd. (ii) (a) 2 blocks/replication; 6 plots/bleck. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(26^{\circ} \times 36^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Affected by rats. (iii) Grain ànd bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1953-54-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Matkota, Bharari, Kalai, and Pura. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1285 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(178.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal means of \(N\) or \(P\) & \(=36.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal means of \(K\) & \(=44.53 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{K}\) or \(\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{K}\) tables & \(=62.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}\) table & \(=51.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :~U.P. 48(129). } \\
\text { Site :-College of Agri. B.H.U., Varanasi. } & \text { Type :- ©M’. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the relative effect of organic and inorganic manures on the growth and morphological characters of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pusa 52 (N.A.). (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. No manure.
2. F.Y.M. at \(12000 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. Compost at \(7500 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Castor cake at \(1052 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. A/S at \(292 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. Pot. Nitrate at \(424 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) at \(393 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

All manures were applied on equal N basis before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(58^{\prime} \times 26^{\circ}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good and vigorous growth. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v), (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1063 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(146.68 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 969 \\
2. & 1033 \\
3. & 979 \\
.4. & 1215 \\
5. & 1133 \\
6. & 981 \\
7. & 1130 \\
S.E./mean & \(=73.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(391).
Site :-College of Agri., B.H.U., Varanasi.
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of different trace elements applied alone and in combination on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 9.11.1953. (iv) (a) Field thoroughly ploughed to a fine tilth. (b) Drilled. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super \(+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. (vi) C. 13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing at regular intervals. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of Boron as Borax: \(B_{0}=0\) and \(B_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 levels of Iron as Fe . Sulphate: \(\mathrm{I}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 2 levels of Zinc as Zinc Sulphate: \(Z_{0}=0\) and \(Z_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Treatments applied 15 days after sowing. A light irrigation was given afterwards to help incorporation of the elements into soil.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) \(103^{\circ} \times 74^{\circ}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(33^{\circ} \times 23^{\circ}\). (b) \(29^{\prime} \times 19^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) NaA. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield
(vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1160 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(347.23 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Z. & \(\mathbf{Z}_{1}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{B}_{0}\) & 1292 & 1198 & 1245 & 1167 & 1324 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{B}_{1}\) & 1050 & 1088 & 1069 & 1067 & 1070 \\
\hline Mean & 1171 & 1143 & 1557 & 1117 & 1197 \\
\hline \(I_{0}\) & 1120 & 1114 & 1117 & & \\
\hline \(I_{2}\) & 1222 & 1172 & 1197 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E of body of table
\(=50.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=70.88 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Collage of Agri. B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref :-U.P. 53(392).
Type :~'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of different trace elements applied alone and in combination on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U-, Varanasi. (iii) 9.11.1953. (iv) (a) Field ploughed several times to achieve good tilth. (b) Seeds drill. (c) 100 lb /ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac, of \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super +10 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. Uniformly distributed and incorporated into the soil. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing and other interculture operations at regular intervals. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of Borax: \(B_{0}=0\) and \(B_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
(2) 2 levels of Zinc oxide: \(Z_{0}=0\) and \(Z_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 2 levels of Ammonium Molybdate : \(A_{0}=0\) and \(A_{1}=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Treatments mixed with sand and applied as top dressing 15 days after germination.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) \(103^{\circ} \times 74^{\prime}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(33^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (b) \(29^{\circ} \times 19^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(813.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(168.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{B}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{B}_{1}\) & Mean & \(Z_{0}\) & \(Z_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{A}_{0}\) & 733.7 & 857.4 & 795.5 & 713.1 & 878.0 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{A}_{1}\) & 766.1 & 897.0 & 831.5 & 780.0 & 883.1 \\
\hline Mean & 749.9 & 877.2 & 813.5 & & \\
\hline \(Z_{0}\) & 691.0 & 802.1 & 746.5 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{Z}_{1}\) & 808.8 & 952.3 & 880.5 & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =48.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =68.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-College of Agri. B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref : - U.P. 53(393).
Type :-'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of different trace elements applied alone and in combinations on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Green manuring. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U. Varanasi. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Ploughing several times. (b) By drilling. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring, 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}, 40 \mathrm{ib} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\). incorporated in the soil. (vi) C-13. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 150 days after sowing.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of Borax : \(\mathrm{B}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{B}_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of Zinc oxide: \(Z_{0}=0\) and \(Z_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 2 levels of Manganese : \(M_{0}=0\) and \(M_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Treatments given 15 days after germination followed by irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) \(87^{\circ} \times 63^{\circ}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (b) \(26^{\circ} \times 17^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(910 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(210.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \(\mathbf{B}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{B}_{1}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{Z}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{Z}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{0}\) & & 955 & 868 & 912 & 944 & 879 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & & 807 & 1008 & 908 & 898 & 917 \\
\hline Mean & & 881 & 938 & 910 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{Z}_{0}\) & & 904 & 938 & 921 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{Z}_{1}\) & 1 & 858 & 938 & 898 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =60.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =85.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac},
\end{aligned}
\] & ; & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 52(397). \\
Site :- College of Agri. B.H.U., Varanasi. & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different trace elements applied alone and in combination on yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 9.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing several times. (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, 40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. uniformly spread over the feld. (vi) C-13. (vii) N.A. (viii) Hoeing was done at regular intervals. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of Borax : \(B_{0}=0\) and \(B_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 leveis of \(Z i n c\) oxide: \(Z_{0}=0\) and \(Z_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 2 leve's of Copper Sulphate: \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Treatments applied 15 days after the germination.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{4}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) \(90^{\circ} \times 59^{\prime}\). (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) \(21^{\prime} \times 28.51^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 24.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes .
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(908.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(102.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|cc|} 
& \(\mathbf{B}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{B}_{1}\) & Mean & \(Z_{0}\) \\
\hline\(C_{0}\) & 913.9 & 913.1 & \(Z_{1}\) \\
\(C_{1}\) & 919.9 & 886.9 & 913.5 & 978.5 \\
\hline Mean & 916.9 & 900.0 & 848.5 \\
\hline\(Z_{0}\) & 949.2 & 911.0 & 889.4 & 908.5 \\
\(Z_{1}\) & 884.6 & 889.0 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=29.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=41.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Koil, Sikandra Roa and Hathras, Aligarh.

Ref :- U.P. 49(190).
Type:- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '.

Object:-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Aligarh type 1 soils and type 2 soils. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Aftes application of manure, the field was levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (c) N.A. (vi) 23.10 .1949 to 3.11.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.3.1950 to 8.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure)
2. 30 lb . lac . of N .
3. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\dot{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\) as Super.

A/S added to surface at sowing time. Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in the bole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs, one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) villages selected in the district and unreplicated 35 trials laid out. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) ac.
(iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) 5 trials attacked and damaged by hail storm, general crop stand normal. (ii) Rust attack in one trial, one trial attacked by white ants. (iii) Yield of grain of wheat and straw of wheat. (iv) (a). 1949-1950. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. [Expt. conducted on cultivator's field.]
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1618 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 278.2 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1241 \\
2. & 1649 \\
3. & 1963 \\
S.E./mean & \(=47.03 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 50(247).
Site :-Sikandra Rao, Hathras, Koil, Khair, Atrauli and Gis, (Aligarh). Type :-'M'.
Object :-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) October-November. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) April.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{~S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Fields selected randomly from 26 villages; villages randomly selected in the district. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good to fair crop. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. [Expt. on cultivator's field]
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1806 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(252.65 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).

Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. & \(137 \dot{6}\) \\
2. & 1856 \\
3. & 2186 \\
S.E/mean & \(=49.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 50(238). } \\
\text { Site :-Nawabganj and Anola, (Bareilly). } & \text { Type:-'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To draw out a suitatle fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) November. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) March-A pril.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control ( \(n o\) madure).
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Fields selected randemly from 22 villages; villages rardomly selected in the district. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Generally good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv, (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. [Expt. on cultivator's field.]'

S, RESULTS :
(i) \(1415 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(147.63 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1692 \\
2. & 1443 \\
3. & 1711 \\
S.E./mean & \(-31.47 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Bareilly, Bahri and Meerganj (Bareilly).
Ref:-U.P. 51(237).
Type: © 'M'.

```

Object : - To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Bareilly soil type 1 ( \(A+B\) combined), typs 2 ( \(A+B\) combined), type \(3 C\) and type 3 D. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) After application of manures the field was levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertlizer. (c) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathbf{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S broadcast at the time of sowing and applied, to one of the plots over the \(\mathbf{N}\) dose. Super is placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep at the sole of the furrow and in the sides of the furrow made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) 33 villages selected jin the district and unreplicated experiments are laid. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) 1/40 ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) On the whole the trials had good growth. About 8 trials suffered due to drought, rats, cattle, weeds or frost. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. [Expt. on cultivator's field]

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1097 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(98.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatmerts are highly significantiy different .
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb -/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 912 \\
2. & 103 \\
3. & 1276 \\
S.E./mean & \(=17.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 51(227). } \\
\text { Site :- Etah and Jalesar (Etah). } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domat. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a): to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\) of N .
3. 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Villages have been taken as replications. Field selected randomiy \(\mathbf{3 0}\) in randomly selected villages in the district. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. [Expt, on cultivator's field].

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1527 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(150.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1328 \\
2. & 1569 \\
3. & 1684 \\
S.E./mean & \(=27.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Kasganj, Jalesar, Etah, Aliganj (Etah).
Ref :-U.P. 52(288).
Type:- \({ }^{\prime}\) '.'
Object :-Ti draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Etah type 2, Etah type 3, Etah type 4. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (x) (a) After application of manures \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\), the field \(p\) as levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
(1) Control (no manure)
(2) \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
(3) \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S} .+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S added to surface at sowing time; Super is placed at a depth of about \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep at the sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs-one behind the other in the same furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) 44 villages selected in \({ }_{3}\) the district and unreplicated experiments laid out. (iii) (a), (b) \(1 / 40\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good and uniform stand in 33 trials pcor srowth in 8 trials and average in the rest. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The exferiment was conducted by A.C. Expt. on cultivator's field].
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1106 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ae}\).
(ii) \(174.75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 937 \\
2. & 1096 \\
3. & 1286 \\
S.E./mean & \(=26.34 \mathrm{Jb} . \mathrm{Jac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Chibraman, Kan auj. (Farrukhabad).

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 51(229):}
Type :^'M’.

Object :-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schecule fer this agricultarally important soil type.

\section*{I. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) 10 (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy Loam, Bhoor, Eomat, Kapisa. (iii) N.A. (iv) Irproved. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
(1) Control (ao manure).
(2) \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N .
(3) \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+63 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) Villages have been taken as replications. Field selected randomly in 33 randomly selected villages. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. [Expt, on cultivator's field].
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(965 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(109.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 828 \\
2. & 970 \\
3. & 1097 \\
S.E./mean & \(=19.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi.)
Ref :- U.P. 52(287).
Site :- Karimganj,-Farrukhabad, Chibraman and Kanunj (Farrukhabad).

Type:- 'M'.
Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a), (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) Farrukkabad type 1 soil, type 2 soil type 3 soil and type 4 soil. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved: (v) (a) After application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\), the field was levelled by drawiog a pata. (b) Sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S added to surface at sowing time is placed at a depth of about \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep at the sole of furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi ploug \(h\)-one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \(\mathbf{4 6}\) villages selected in the district and unreplicated experiments laid out. (iii) N.A.; but roughly about 1/40th ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor for 7 expts. good for 20 expts, and average for the rest of the villages, (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a), (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. [Expt. on cultivator's fields].
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1530 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 93.83 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1284 \\
2. & 1575 \\
3. & 1732 \\
S.E./mean & \(=13.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Fatehpur (Fatehpur).
Ref:- U.P. 53(420).
Type:- 'M'.

```

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Juar for 10 trials, Paddy for 4 trials, (c) N.A. (ii) 12 trials in loam, 1 trial in sandy loam and 1 trial in clay loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 30.10.1953 to 13.11.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.4.1954 to 9.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. 25 lb ./ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S\).
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
\(A / S\) broadcast and super placed deep in furrows behind the plough before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 7 villages were selected in the tehsil. In each village two fields were selected, (iii) (a) N.A.
(b) Different sizes, Area \(=1 / 16\) th ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1491 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(103.81 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are bighly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1223 \\
2. & 1371 \\
3. & 1589 \\
4. & 1782 \\
S.E./mean & \(=27.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref:-U.P. 53(421).
Site :- Khaga (Fatehpur).
Type :- \({ }^{\mathbf{\prime}}{ }^{\prime}\) '.
Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedule for this agriculturaily important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar in 3 trials, Paddy in 3 trials. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) 9 to 16.11.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.3.1954 to 1.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. \(25 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S broadcast and Super applied deep in furrows behind the plough before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 3 villages were selected in the tehsil. In each village 2 fields were selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different plot sizes, Area \(=1 / 16\) th ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-54. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. . (vii) Interaction village \(\times\) treatment has been taken as Error, Lecause it comes out to be significant when tested with Interaction Treatment \(\times\) Fields within villages. [Expt, on cultivator's field].

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1433 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(71.19 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ AV. 933} \\
2. & & \\
3. & 1255 & \\
4. & 1625 & \(\therefore\) \\
S E./mean & & 1859 \\
& \(=29.06 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop : \(\boldsymbol{\text { Wheat }}\) (Rabi). \\ Site :-Khajuha (Fa tehpur).
}
Ref :-U.P. 53(422).
Type:-‘M'.

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow for 16 trials, paddy for 3 trials, maize for 1 trial. (c) N.A. (ii) 14 trials in loam, 5 trials in sandy loam and 1 trial in clayey loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) 27.10.1953 to 11.11.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1 to 18.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb ./ac of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. 25 lb ,/ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S broadcast and Super applied deep in furrows behind the plough before sowing.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) 10 villages were selected in the 1ahsil. In each tahs il two fields were selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different plot size, area \(=1 / 16\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N A. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Interaction village \(\times\) treatment has been taken as Error, because it comes out to be significant when tested with treatment \(\times\) fields within villages. Experiment conducted by A.C. in cultivators fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1423 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 14002 lb /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in It./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 940 \\
2. & 1313 \\
3. & 1592 \\
4. & 1849 \\
S.E./mean & \(=31.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Ghazipur.

Ref :.U.P. 52(413).
Type:- \({ }^{-} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).

Object:-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow for 15 trials, maize for 1 trial and late paddy for 2 trials. (c) N.A. (ii) 6 trials sandy loam, 4 trials in clayey loam to clayey 2 trials in loam and 6 trials in clayey loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) 7 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Behind the plough. (c) 30 to \(40 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(4^{4 \prime}\) to \(6^{\prime \prime}\) between rows. (e) N.A. (vi) 22.10.1953 to 20,11.1953. (vii) 16 trials Irrigated and 2 trials unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.3.1954 to 4.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manures).
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as super placed ceep in furrows bebind the plough, before sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \(\mathbf{1 0}\) villages were selected in the tahsil. In 8 villages 2 fields were selected and in 2 villages one field was selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different plot sizes, area \(1 / 16\) acre. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good in 13 trials, fair in 3 trials and very poor in 2 trials. (ii) Damage by rats in 7 trials. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Interaction village \(\times\) treatment has been taken as error, because it comes out to be highly significant when tested by the interaction treatment \(x\) fields within villages. Experiments conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1072 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(103.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 851 \\
2. & 1036 \\
3. & 1148 \\
4. & 1252 \\
S.E./mean & \(=24.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Saidpur and Ghazipur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(414).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To draw out suitable fertijizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow for 6 trials, Jowar fodder for 1 trial and early paddy for one trial. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam to loam in 2 trials, clayey loam to clayey in 2 trials. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) 7 to 8 ploughings by desi plough, (b) Sown tehind the plough. (ci) 35 to 40 srs./ac. (d) \(4^{\circ}\) to \(6^{\circ}\) between rows. (vi) 20.10.1953 to 3.11.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.3.1954 to 22.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manures).
2. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as super.
4. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as super.

A/S broadcasted, Super placed deep in furrows behind the plough before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) 6 villages were selected in the tahsil. In 2 villages two fields were selected and in the other 4 villages one field was selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different plot sizes. Area=1/40 ac. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good in 3 trials, fair in 4 trials and very peor in one trial. (ii) Damage by rats in two trials. (iii) Grain ard straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) In one trial there were alkaline patches. (vii) Interaction village \(\times\) treatment has been taken as Error, because it comes out to te highly significant when tested by the interaction treatment \(\times\) fields within viliages. Experiarents conducted by A.C. in cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1216 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(272.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. & \\
Treatment & Av. yield \\
I. & 806 \\
2. & 1120 \\
3. & 1442 \\
4. & 1495 \\
S.E./mean & \(=96.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :- Mohamadabad (Ghazipur).
}

> Ref :- U.P. 53(415).

Type : ' M '.
Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally im portant soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) In clayey loam 3 trials, in loam 2 trials and in sandy loam 1 trial. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) 7 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Sowa beh nd the plough. (c) 30 to 40 seers/ac. (d) \(4^{\circ}\) to \(6^{\circ}\) between rows. (vi) 28.10 .1953 to 7.11.1953. (vii) 4 trials irrigated, 2 trials unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3 to 24.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb}, \mathrm{jac}\) of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb . Jac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. \(25 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S broadcasted, Super placed deep in furrows behind the plough before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) 3 villages were selected 'in the tahsil. In each village 2 leelds were selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different plot sizes. Area \(=1 / 40 \mathrm{ac}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) 1 trial damaged by rats. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) As interaction village \(\times\) treatment is not significant it has been pooled with interaction treatment \(\times\) fields within villages to give the error. Experiment conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1399 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(106.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1. & 1133 \\
2. & 1420 \\
3. & 1503 \\
4. & 1540 \\
S.E.fmean & \(=43.61 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Orai and Kunch (Jalaun).

Ref:- U.P. 52(274).
Type:-'M'.

Object:-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Bundelkhand type 2 soils and type 3 soils. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) After application of manures, the field is levelled by drawing a pata. (b) sown in lines parrallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) Seeds sown \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (c) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S broadcasted at the time of sowing and super applied to one of the plots over \(\mathbf{N}\) dose. Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep in the furrow and on the side of the sole made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated experiments were laid out. 30 such trails were laid. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1265 \mathrm{jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(220.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
Treatment Av, yield
\begin{tabular}{lr}
1. & 815 \\
5 & 1427
\end{tabular}
5. 1427
3. 1553
S.E./mean \(=40.20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref : -U.P. 53(411). } \\
\text { Site :-Jalaun (Jalaun). } & \text { Type :-‘M’. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :- To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) NA. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Parwa soil in 10 trials, Mar soil in 8 trials and Kabar soil in 2 trials. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 15.10 .1953 to 14.11 .1953 . (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.3 .1954 to 10.4 .1954 .

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control ( no manure).
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S broadcast and Super applied deep in furrows on the day of sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i 9 villages were selected in the tahsil. In 7 villages 2 fields were selected and in two villages 3 fields were selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) There were light weeds in practically every field. Interaction village \(x\) treatment has been taken as Error tecause it comes out to be highly significant when tested by the interaction treatment \(\times\) fields within villages. Experiment conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.

\section*{S. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1521 \quad 16 . / 2 \mathrm{c}\).
(ii) \(329.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differeoces are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. \\
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 816 \\
2. & 1524 \\
3. & 1834 \\
4. & 1910 \\
S.E./mean & \(=73.58 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop : Wheat (Rabi). & Ref:-U.P. 53(412). \\
Site :-Kalpi (Jalaun). & Type :-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar for 13 trials, Fallow for 6 trials and Sawan for 1 trial. (c) N.A. (ii) In Parwa soil 11 trials, in Mar soil 6 trials and in Kabar soil 3 trials. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 21.10.1953 to 17.11.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.3.1954 to 8.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S applied by broadcast and Super placed deep in furrows one day before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 9 villages were selected in the sahsil. In 7 villages 2 fields were selected and in two villages 3 fields were selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) As interaction villages \(\times\) treatment is not significant, it has been pooled with treatment \(\times\) fields within villages to give Error. Experiment conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1698 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(145.72 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1338 \\
2. & 1760 \\
3. & 1810 \\
4. & 1885 \\
S.E./mean & \(=32.58 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat.
Site :~Jhansi, Lalitpur and Mahroni (Jhansi).

Ref:-U. P. 50(241).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Generally irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N as A/S.
3. \(30 \mathrm{Jb} /\) /ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i), (ii) R B.D. 24 villages ha ve been taken as replications. Field selected randomly in a randomly selected village. (iii) (a), (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL;
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield, (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1018 ib./ac.
(ii) \(141.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(lii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 875 \\
2. & 1042 \\
3. & 1138 \\
S.E./mean & \(=28.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).}

Ref :-U.P. 51(234).
Site :-Moth, Mau Ranipur and Gorotha (Jhansi). Type :-‘M’.
Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) (a), (b) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i). (ii) R.B.D. 35 villages bave been taken as replications. Field selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the district. (iii) (a), (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (y) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1116 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(160.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 840 \\
2. & 1195 \\
3. & 1314 \\
S.E./mean & \(=27.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 49(187).
Site :- Bilhaur, Ghatampur and Kanpur (Kanpur). Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Kanpur-Type 1 soils, Type 2 soils and Type 3 soils. (v) (a) After application of manure the field was levelled by pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer tand. (d) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\circ}-2^{\circ}\) from the fertlizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) 28.10.1949 to 15.11 .1950 . (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.2.1950 to 9.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

N added to surface at sowing time. Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\boldsymbol{\prime}}-\mathbf{4}^{\prime \prime}\) in the furrow and on the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two dest ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Villages selected in the district and 29 unreplicated trials were laid out. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) 1/40 ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1209 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(139.5 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 977 \\
2. & 1199 \\
3. & 1451 \\
S.E./mean & \\
& \(=25.90 \mathrm{lb}\) _ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- In 5 tahsils of Kanpur Distt.

```
    Ref :- U.P. 50(244).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) October-November 1950. (vii) Irrigared. (viji) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) April 1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B D., 32 villages have been taken as replications. Fields selected randomly in randomly selected villages. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Generally good growth except in few cases. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (iv) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. in cultivator's felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1308 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
(ii) \(175.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cl} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1132 \\
2. & 1335 \\
3. & 1457 \\
S.E./mean & \(=30.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 53(402).
Site :- Bhogaon (Mainpuri).
Type:m 'M'.

```

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow for 18 trials, maize for 2 trials. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) About 6 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Sown in lines by seed drill. (c) 35 to 40 seers/ac. (d) Rows \(6^{\prime \prime}\) to \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 27.10 .1953 to 1.11.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.5.1954. to 6.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
\(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcasted and super applied by drilling before sowing.
3. DESIGN
(i) and (ii) 9 villages were selected in the fahsil, in 7 villages 2 fields and in 2 villages 3 fields were selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different plot sizes, area \(1 / 16\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) 16 trials good, 3 trials average, 1 trial poor (lodging in 3 trials). (ii) 3 trials were damaged by rats and birds. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953 -continued. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vij) There were alkaline patches in one trial. As interaction village \(\times\) treatment is non significant, it has been pooled with treatments \(\times\) fields within villages to give the error. Experiment conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(1) \(1137 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(197.06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 863 \\
2. & 1077 \\
3. & 1260 \\
4. & 1349 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\mathbf{4 4 . 0 6} \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Jasrana (Mainpuri).

Ref :- U.P. 53(403)
Type:- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow for 3 trials, maize for 3 trials. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) About 6 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Sown in lines by seed drill. (c) 35 to 40 seers/ac. (d) Rows \(6^{\circ}\) to \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 31.10.1953 to 2.11.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.4.1954 to 7.4.1954
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S broadcasted and Super drilled before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 3 villages were selected. In each village 2 fields were selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different plot sizes, area \(=1 / 16\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good in the beginning. Continuous rains and high winds caused severe lodging. (ii) Slight attack of disease (Name-N.A.). (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953--continued. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) In one field, crop failed. Interaction village \(\times\) treatment has been taken as error because it comes out to be significant when tested by interactions treatment \(\times\) fields within villages. Experiments conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1168 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(368.5 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 749 \\
2. & 957 \\
3. & 1498 \\
4. & 1470 \\
S.E./mean & \(=164.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :~Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Sikohabad (Main puri).
Ref:- U.P. 53(404). Type : ${ }^{\prime}$ M'.

```

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important so.l types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. '(b) Fallow for 5 trials and maize for 1 trial. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) About 6 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Sown in lines by seed drill. (c) \(35-40\) seers/ac. (d) Rows \(6^{\prime \prime}\) to \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 28 to 30.10.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1954. to 5.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S and super applied by drilling before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 3 villages were selected in the tahsil. In each village 2 fields were selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different sizes, area \(=1 / 16\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good, continuous rains for 3 days and high winds caused lodging. (ii) Slight attack of disease. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Interaction village \(x\) treatment has bren taken as error, because it comes out to be highly significant when tested with interaction treatment \(\times\) fields within villages. Experiment conducted by A.C. in cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(986.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 306.1 ' lb./ac.
(iii) Treaiment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 868.0 \\
2. & 986.7 \\
3. & 985.3 \\
4. & 1106.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=125.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Mainpuri (Mainpuri).

Ref :-U.P. 53(405).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow for 5 trials, maize for 2 trials. (c) N.A. (ii) Clayey loam, (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) About 6 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Sown in lines by seed drill. (c) \(35-40\) seers/ac. (d) Rows \(6^{\circ}\) to \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (c) N.A. (vi) 3 to 5.11.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.3.1954 to 7.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
2. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. 25 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S broadcasted and Super drilled before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 3 villages were selected. In two villages 2 fields and in one village 3 fields were selected. (iii) (a)
N.A. (b) Different plot sizes ; area=1/16 ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Average in 4 trials, good in 1 trial, poor in 1 trial and 1 trial failed. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953 -continued. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) In one field crop failed. As interaction villages \(\times\) treatments is not significant, it has been pooled with treatment \(\times\) fields within village to give error. Experiment conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(745.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(61.65 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 613.3 \\
2. & 674.7 \\
3. & 808.0 \\
4. & 885.3 \\
S.E./mean & \(-25.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Robertsganj and Dudhi (Mirzapur).

Ref :-U.P. 51(223).
Type : \({ }^{〔} \mathbf{M}\).

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domar, Karail, Dhanusar. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+6 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B D, 21 villages have been taken as replications. Fields selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the district. (iii) (a), (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good to poor growth. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields,

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(681 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(87.88 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 553 \\
2. & 695 \\
3. & 996 \\
S.E./mean & \(=89.18 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 52(285). \\
Site :-Chunar, Mirzapur, Robertsganj (Mirzapur). & Type :-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Mirzapur soils-Type 1B (Southern Flats), Type 1C (Karail), Type 1E (Eastern Lowlands), Type 2A (Vindhyan Uplands), Type 2B (Vindhyan Flats), Type 2C (Vindhyan Lowlands), Type 3 (Belanseries). (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) After application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) the field was levelled by drawing pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as A/S.
3. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{2}\) as Super.

N added to surface at sowing time super is placed at a depth of about \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) in the furrow and on the sides of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi plough-one bthind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i). (ii) Villages selected in the district and 32 unreplicated experiments conducted. (iii) (a), (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1027 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(146.1 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 761 \\
2. & 969 \\
3. & 1351 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\mathbf{2 5 . 8 3} \mathbf{l b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop : Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. } 51(236) . \\
\text { Site : } \text { Kichha (Nainital). } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Tarai soils. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) After application of manures the feld is levelled by drawing a para. (b) Sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as Super.
\(A / S\) broadcasted at the time of sowing and super applied to one of the plots over the \(N\) dose. Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in the furrow and on the sides of the furrow made either by an iron plough or two desi ploughs one tehind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and 10 unreplicated experimerts are laid cut. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) The crop was sown late but the growth on the whole was satisfactory, ore trial damaged by hail storm and rats and one trial badly infested by weeds. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1189 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(59.58 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 999 \\
2. & 1162 \\
3. & 1406 \\
S.E./mean & \(=18.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(282). } \\
\text { Site :- Matkota (Nainital). } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object : - To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) 'a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Block wise (1) Clay loam'. (2) Loam (slightly calcarecus). (3) as in (2). (4) Loam (highly calcareous). (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Fiek was levelled by drawing pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

N-applied to surface at sowing time, super placed at a depith of atout \(3^{\circ}-4^{*}\) in the furiow and on the sides of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs one tehind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 3 treatments and 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Growth normal, a very serious rat attack caused heavy damage at the time of seed formation. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1160 \quad \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(103.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Areatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 974 \\
2. & 1120 \\
3. & 1386 \\
S E./mean & \(=54.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). Site :- Matkota (Nainital)

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) NA. (ii) 2 block on loam (slightly calcareous). 2 blocks on loam (highly calcareous) One block on clayey loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) The field was levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control
2. \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\)
3. \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)
4. \(N_{1} P_{1}\)
5. \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{2}\)
6. \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{1}\)
7. \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}\)

Doses of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}-N . A\).
N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. N added to the surfacs at sowing time, Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-\mathbf{4}^{\circ}\) in the furrow and on the sides of the seed row made either by the iron plough or two desi ploughs-one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a), (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Results erratic due to severe damage by rats. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. in cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1380 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\),
(ii) 262.10 lb ./ac.
(iii) \(P\) effect is significant. The interaction \(N \times P\) and control \(w s\) others are highly significant. N effect is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Control \(=1019 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1479 & 1666 & 1342 & 1496 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1160 & 1444 & 1552 & 1385 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Mean} & 1320 & 1555 & 1447 & 1441 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{S.E of P marginal mean S.E. of N marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =82.88 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =67.67 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.} \\
& =117.21 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Kichha (Nainital).

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 53(406).}

Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow in case of 3 trials, maize in case of 2, paddy in case cf 1, sanai for green manuring in case of 1 , and N.A. in case of 3 trials, (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy Loam in 6 trails, Loam (highly calcareous) in 2 trials and loam (slightly calcareous) in case of 2 trials. (iii) Nil. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) About 6 to 8 ploughings by desi plough, (b) Sown in lines ty seed drill, (c) 30 to 40 seers/ac. (d) rows \(6^{\circ \prime}\) to \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 23.10.1953 to 14.11.1953. (vii) 8 trials unirrigated. 2 trials irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) NoA. (x) 5.4.1954 to 24.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+25 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. 30 lb ./ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S+25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
4. \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Supet.
5. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
6. \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as A/S
7. \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\)

A/S troadcast before sowing, and Super applied \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows behind the victory plough.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 3 villages were selected in the lahsil. In one village 5 fields were selected, in another 4 fields, and in the third village one field was selected. (iii) (a) \(66^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor in some fields while good to very gcod in others. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C. in cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1059 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(142.14 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 920 \\
2. & 1074 \\
3. & 1014 \\
4. & 1129 \\
5. & 1211 \\
6. & 1007 \\
7. & 1057 \\
S.E./mead & \(=44.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Varanasi and Chandauli (Varanasi).
Ref:- U.P. 50(242).
Type:- 'M'.
Object :-To draw out suitable fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) NA. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) Octoter-Novemter 1950. (vii) Generally irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) March-April 1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) R B.D. in which 14 villages bave been taken as replicaticns. Field selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the district. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Average to good. (ii) N.A. (iii) yield (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) ! N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Tho expt. was conducted by A.C. in cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1564 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) :
(ii) \(122.46 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{sc}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of graio in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1218 \\
2. & 1583 \\
3. & 1890 \\
S.E./mean & \(=32.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat.
Ref:- Complex experiments (T.C.M.), 1953.
Centre :- Varanasi (U.P.) Type :-'M'.

```

Object : - I-To study the effect of types and levels of \(N\) and \(P\) on non-acidic soils.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) NA. (ii) (a) Loam in texture -brownish in colour. (b) Neutral in reaction. (iii) 14.11,53. (iv) N.A. v. N.A. (vi) P-S2. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 39.75". (x) 5.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20\) and \(N_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 suurces of \(N: S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=\) Urea.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Triple Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S and Ure broadeast efore sowing and Triple Supar placed in bands behind a plough with the help of fertilizer drill
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 15. (b. V.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1956. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Pura, Paliad. (b) N. .. (vi) Nil. (vii) NiL
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(743 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(180.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(N\) is highly significant and that of \(P\) is significant. Other effect and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yie,d of grain in lb.jac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N a}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 374 & 571 & 926 & 674 & 789 & 708 & 748 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 392 & 723 & 1075 & 798 & 934 & 864 & 899. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 448 & 709 & 960 & 757 & 869 & 801 & 835 \\
\hline Mean & 405 & 668 & 997 & 743 & 864 & 791 & 827 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & - & 666 & 1062 & 864 & & & \\
\hline 2 & - & 670 & 912 & 791 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

For table \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline S.E. of mean in body of table in \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) column & \(=74.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline \(S\) E. of mean in body of table in \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) column & \(=52.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) column & \(=42.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S. E. of marginal mean of \(\mathrm{N}_{1}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) column & \(=30.4 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. \\
\hline S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) & \(=32.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of body of table & \(=52.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) & \[
=30.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\] \\
\hline S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) & = \(37.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of body of table & \(=42.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=30.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat.
Centre :- Varanasi (U.P.).

Ref:m Complex experiments (T.C.M.), 1953. Type :- 'M'.

Object :- II-To study the best time of application of N.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture-brownish in colour. (b) Neutral in reaction. (iii) 18.11 .53 (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) P-52 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 39.75" (x) 7.4.54.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + one control (no manure).
(1) 2 source of N ( \(20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).) : \(S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=\) Urea
(2) 2 times of application: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) at scwing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) at first irrigation.

Manures broadeast as top dressing at sowing time and at first irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
- (i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield (iv) (a) 1953-56 (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kotah, Pura, Niphad, Satna and Paliad, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) Nil.
S. RESULTS:
(i) 534 lb /ac.
(ii) \(52.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{S}\) and control vs others are highly significant. Others are not significant. (iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


Crop :-Wheat
Ref : Complex experiments (T.C.M.), 1953
Centre :- Varanasi (U.P.). Type :-‘M'.

Object :- IV-To study the effect of types, levels and method of application of \(P\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture-brownish in colour. (b) Neutral in reaction. (iii) 27.11.1953. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) P-S2. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 39.75". (x) 7.4.1954;

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3) +2 extra treatments
(1) 3 sources of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{S}_{1}=\) Super, \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=\) Nitro. Phos. and \(\mathrm{S}_{3}=\) Ammo. Phos.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) : \(\quad \mathrm{P}_{1}=15\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{zc}\).
(3) 2 methods of application: \(M_{1}=\) Broadcast tefore final cultivation, \(M_{2}=21^{\prime \prime}\) telow seed.

Extra treatments : one control (no manure)/block, one plot receiving \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcast at sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 14. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-56. (b) No. (c) N.A, (v) (a) Kotah, Pura and Paliad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nî. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(952 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 137.2 lb ./ac.
(iii) Control vs N and (control +N ) vs other treatments are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graio in lb./ac.

Control=518 lb./ac.; N only=1075 lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & \(S_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{M 1}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 956 & 998 & 1025 & 993 & 974 & 1012 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 956 & 965 & 969 & 963 & 987 & 940 \\
\hline Mean & 956 & 982 & 997 & 978 & 981 & 977 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & 968 & 960 & 1013 & 981 & & - \\
\hline M & 945 & 1002 & 981 & 977 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(M\) or \(P\)
S.E. of any mean in the body of table \(S \times P\) or \(S \times M\)
S.E. of any mean in the body of table \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{M}\)
S.E of control or "N only" means
39.61. lb./ac.
\(=32.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=56.02 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=45.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=79.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Wheat. } & \text { Ref:-Compl } \\
\text { Centre :-Pura (Kanpur). } & \text { Type :-‘M’. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-I \(\mathbf{I}^{\prime}\) (a)-To study the effect of types and levels of \(N\) and \(P\) on non-acidic soils.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture-Grey in colour. (b) pH . 7.5. (iii) 1 and 2.11.1953. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Co. 13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 38.18'. (x) 10.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: \quad N_{6}=0, N_{2}=20\) and \(N_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=\) Urea.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Triple Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S and urea applied by broadcast before sowing and Triple Super placed deep in band behind a plough with the help of fertilizer drill.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 15. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(45.45^{\circ} \times 16^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal, lodging appeared in plots treated with \(\mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{3}\). (ii) Slight damage by rats and wheat rust. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1956. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Paliad and Varanasi. (b) N,A. (vi) and (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1436.
(ii) \(139.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}\) are highly significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline & 960 & 1299 & 1332 & 1245 & 1340 & 1291 & 1316 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 986 & 1579 & 1664 & 1494 & 1753 & 1489 & 1621 \\
\hline \(P_{2}\) & 1194 & 1638 & 1692 & 1571 & 1623 & 1707 & 1665 \\
\hline Mean & 1047 & 1505 & 1562 & 1436 & 1572 & 1496 & 1534 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & - & 1534 & 1610 & 1572 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) & - & 1477 & 1515 & 1496 & & & \\
\hline Mean & - & 1505 & 1562 & 1534 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{For table \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}\)} & & \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of No Column S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathrm{N}_{1}, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) Column S.E. of body of table ( \(\mathrm{N}_{1}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) Col.) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\)
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =69.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =49.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =85.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =53.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{For table \(\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{N}\)} & & \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of body of table \\
S.E. of any marginal mean
\end{tabular} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =69.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =49.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline \multirow[t]{6}{*}{For table S \(\times \mathbf{P}\)} & & \\
\hline & S.E. of body of table & \(=85.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline & S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) & \[
=60.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}
\] \\
\hline & & \[
=49.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\] \\
\hline & & \(\cdot\) \\
\hline & - & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{rop :-Wheat. Ref:-Complex experiments (T.C.M.), 1953.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Centre :-Pura (Kanpur).} & Type : \(\mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{M}}\) '. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Object :-II-To study the best time of application of N .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture-Grey in colour. (b) pH. 7.5. (iii) 30.10.1953. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 38.18". (x) 8.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

Ail combinations of (1) and (2)+One control
(1) 2 sources of \(N(20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}):. S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=\) Urea.
(2) 2 times of application: \(T_{2}=\) At sowing and \(T_{2}=\) At first irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(14.2^{\circ} \times 51^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1956. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kotah, Varanasi, Niphad, Satna and Paliad. (b) N.A. (vi) and (vii) Nil.
3. RESULTS :
(i) \(1035 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(141.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only control vs others is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain io lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) & T 2 & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & - 1123 & 1058 & 1090 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 1089 & 1117 & 1103 \\
\hline Mean & 1106 & 1088 & 1097 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =44.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =63.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Ref:-Complex experiments (T.C.M.) 1953.
Centre :-Pura (Kanpur). (U.P.) Type:-‘M’.
Object :-IV., To study the effect of types, levels and method of application of \(\mathbf{P}\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture-Grey in colour. (b) pH:7.5. (iii) 17.11.1953. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13. (vii, Irrigated (viii) N.A. (ix) 33.18". (x) 11.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3) +2 extra treatments.
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{1}=15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 methods of application : \(M_{1}=\) Broadcast before final cuitivation and \(M_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}\) below seed.
(3) 3 sources of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=\) Super, \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=\) Nitro. phos. and \(\mathrm{S}_{3}=\) Ammo. Phos.

One control (no manure)/block and one plot recieving 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcast at sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 14. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(44^{\circ} \times 16.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal; lodging was observed in plots treated with higher doses of manures. (ii) Appreciable damage by rats, controlled by rat poison baits. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1956. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kotah, Varanasi and Paliad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1414 Ib./ac.
(ii) 2200 lb ./ac.
(iii) (Control \(+N\) ) \(u s\) others effect is highly significant. Other effects are not sigaificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline S.E. of marginal mean of S & \(=63.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of marginal mean of P or M & \(=51.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E of any mean in the body of table S \(\times\) P or \(\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{M}\) & \(=89.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of bodr of S \(\times\) M table & - \(73.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of control mean & \(=127.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- B.R. College Farm, (Bichpuri) Agra.

Ref :-U.P. 48(124).
Type : \({ }^{\prime} \mathbf{M V}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N , P}\) and \(K\) on different varieties of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize-chari. (c) Nil. (ii) Typical Gangetic alluvial light loam moderate fertility and neutral in reaction with a free drainage and a good water holding capacity. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College, Bichpuri. (iii) 29.10 .48 . (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with soil turning plough, followed by pata., 4 ploughings with desi followed by pasa clearing, and 4 ploughing. (b) By means of the plough by Nai method ( \(25^{\prime \prime}\) to \(3^{\prime \prime}\) depth). (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) - (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) One Liver harrowing, one harrowing and roguing. (ix) N.A. (x) 6, 7.4.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) Local, \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{Cl} 3\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=P 591\) (late).
(2) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=8\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=16 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(4) 3 levels of \(K_{2} O\) as Pot. Sul. : \(K_{0}=0, K_{1}=15\) and \(K_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

All combinations of manures mixed seperately for each treatment and then mixed with the soil of the plot in which treatment has to be applied and evenly spread on 28,10.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{2}\) partially confounded in quasi L. sq. (ii) (a) 9 cols \(\times 9\) rows. (b) column \(395^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\) and row \(175^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (iii) 1. (iv) (a) \(18^{\prime} \times 42^{\circ}\). (b) \(13 \times 06^{\circ}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) White ant attack at all stages of the life cycle. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1653 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(347.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(V_{8}\) & V: & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & 1596 & 1428 & 1729 & 1481 & 1597 & 1674 & 1524 & 1553 & 1675 & 1584 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 1824 & 1593 & 1671 & 1364 & 1952 & 1772 & 1697 & 1763 & 1626 & 1696 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) & 1771 & 1545 & 1719 & 1546 & 1744 & 1744 & 1758 & 1567 & 1713 & 1678 \\
\hline Mean & 1730 & 1522 & 1706 & 1464 & 1764 & 1730 & 1660 & 1628 & 1671 & 1653 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{*}}\) & 1711 & 1556 & 1713 & \(1<86\) & 1703 & 1791 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1618 & 1495 & 1771 & 1442 & 1738 & 1703 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 1862 & 1515 & 1635 & 1464 & 1852 & 1696 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1620 & 1281 & 1490 & & & & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 2006 & 1597 & 1690 & & & & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1564 & 1688 & 1938 & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=66.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E of body of tabla & \(=115.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site:- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

> Ref :- U.P. 50(300).
Type :-'MV'.

Object:-To compare the effect of two varieties of Wheat under different levels of \(\mathbf{N}\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1950. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory plough 2 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Line sowing. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) rows \(9^{4}\) apart. (e)-. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) Weeding on 28.2.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C - 1 3}\), (early) \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{N}_{1}\) P. 125 (medium).
(2) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}-9^{\circ}\). (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 11^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\) (v) One row on either side and \(2^{\prime}\) at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v)
(a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by the Economist Botanist (Rabi cereals and Potato) to Govt. of U.P., Kanpur.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1086 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(141.6 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ae}\),
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll}
1 & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}^{\prime}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 597 & 1077 & 1581 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}^{\prime}\) & 622 & 1114 & 1525 \\
\hline Mean & .610 & 1096 & 1553
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } \mathrm{N} & =50.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } \mathbf{V} & =40.86 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of the body of table } & =70.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :~ Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :- U.P. 51(282).
Type :- 'MV'.
Object :-To compare the effect of two varieties of Wheat under different levels of N .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Charl. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11.1951. (iv) (a) One ploughing each by victory plough, desi plough and cultivator. (b) Line Sowing (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{-1}\) apart. (c) 一. (v) \(\mathrm{Ni}^{\prime}\). (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Two weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 1,2.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) N.P. 125 (medium).
(2) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) \(28^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}-9^{\circ}\). (b) \(19^{\circ} \times 11^{\circ} 3^{\prime \prime}\). (v) One row ob either side and 2' at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination ard grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by the Economic Botanist (Rabi cereals and Potato) to Govt. of U.P., Kanpur.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1655 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(315.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 1042 & 1749 & 2050 & 1614 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 1520 & 1657 & 1913 & 1697 \\
\hline - Mean & 1281 & 1703 & 1982 & 1655 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{S.E. of marginal mean of \(N\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) S,E. of body of table} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =111.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =74.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =157.70 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site:- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(323).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object :-To compare the effect of two Wheat varieties under different levels of N .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Charl. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughings and harrowing by victory plough on 10.8.1952, I by cultivator and 3 by desi plough. (b) Line sowing. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (medium).
(2) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{2}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(23^{\circ} \times 123^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 10.75^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(2^{\prime}\) at each of the plots; distance between plots \(2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) distance between blocks \(4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and yield of grain. (iv) (a) \(1950-1952\). (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) The object was to compare the yield of wheat and barley under similar conditions of manuring. In that experiment along with the 3 levels of manuring, two varieties each of wheat and barley were tested giving 12 treatments (in each replication!. This proforma is for wheat and another has been filled in for barley. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Economic Botanist to Govt. of U.P., Kanpur.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2256 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(242.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Ooly N effect is highly significant
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N o}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 1899 & 2365 & 2248 & 2171 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1851 & 2386 & 2790 & 2342 \\
\hline Mean & 1875 & 2375 & 2519 & 2256 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of margical mean of \(N\) \\
SE. of marginal mean of \(V\) \\
S.E of body of table
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =85.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =70.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.} \\
& =121.38 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kan pur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(93).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) application on carliness, disease resistance, stand, maturity and final yield of Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sanai-wheat. (b) Sanal for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11.1953. (iv) (a) Turning of sanal on 2.9 .1953 with victory plough, 2 desi ploughings and pata. (b) N.A. (c) 80 lb /ac. (d) \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) NiL. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 18.1 .1954 with khurpi. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (medium) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late).
(2) 5 applications of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\) No \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} \mathrm{P}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=50\) lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied broadcast, \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{4}}=100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied broadcast.

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) \(5 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(16^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 7.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{i}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Growth good in general. No lodging. (ii) Slight attack of rust. (iii) Germination, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-contd. (b) No. (c) N:A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1648 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(341.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1540 & 1571 & 1447 & 1929 & 1649 & 1627 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1447 & 1711 & 1540 & 1602 & 2038 & 1668 \\
\hline Mean & 1494 & 1641 & 1494 & 1766 & 1844 & 1648
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\)
S.E. of body of table \(\quad \therefore=170.9 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Crop:- Wheat.
Centre :- Varanasi (U.P.) Type :- 'MV'.

Object :- VII To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) on different varieties of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture, brownish in colour. (b) Neutral in reaction. (iii) 27.11.1953. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As under treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 39.75". (x) 7.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20\) and \(N_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Triple Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) Desi, \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{P}-52\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) NP-750.

A/S broadcast before sowing and Triple Super placed deep in bands behind plough with the help of fertilizer drill.
3. DESIGN: .
(i) \({ }^{3}\) Fact, in R.B.D. (confounded). (ii) (a) 9 plots/block, 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 1 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1956, (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kotah, Pura, Niphad and Paliad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(542 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(58.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of N and V are highly significant. Interaction VN is significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{V} \mathbf{z}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 260 & 285 & 260 & 268 & 147 & 363 & 294 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 574 & 648 & 603 & 608 & 392 & 667 & 765 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 746 & 760 & 746 & 751 & 422 & 878 & 952 \\
\hline Mean & 527 & 564 & 536 & 542 & 320 & 636 & 670 \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 270 & 343 & 348 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 662 & 652 & 594 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 648 & 697 & 667 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =19.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =33.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

Crop:- Wheat.

\section*{Ref. :- Complex experiments (T.C.M.), 1953.}

Centre :- Pura (Kanpur-U.P.). Type :- 'MV'.
Object :-VIII, To study the effeet of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) on different varieties of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture-Grey in colour. (b) pH.-7.5. (iii) 3.11.1953. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As under treatments. (vij) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 38.18". (x) 9.4.1954.

2 TREATMENTS:
All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20\) and \(N_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as triple Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 varieties: \(-V_{1}=\) Desi, \(V_{2}=N P-125\) and \(V_{3}=C-13\).

A/S applied by broadcast before sowing and Triple super placed deep in bands behind a plough with the help of fertilizer drill.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication; 9 plots/block.
(b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv)
(a)
N.A. (b) \(36.25^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. Slight lodging was observed in plots treated with higher doses of N and P along with \(\mathrm{C}-13\) and Desi (ii) Attack of wheat rust and slight damage by rats. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1956 (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kotah, Banaras, Niphad and Paliad. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1390 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 168.6 lb /ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly significant while that of \(P\) is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathbf{l b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{Na}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 1049 & 1255 & 1367 & 1224 & 905 & 1347 & 1419 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 1296 & 1476 & 1651 & 1474 & 1265 & 1573 & 1584 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1579 & 1425 & 1410 & 1471 & 1255 & 1461 & 1697 \\
\hline Mean & 1308 & 1385 & 1476 & 1390 & 1142 & 1460 & 1567 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 1198 & 1070 & 1158 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 1296 & 1466 & 1620 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 1430 & 1620 & 1651 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S E. any marginal mean } & =56.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =97.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{array}
\]

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(370).
Site :-Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad. Type :-‘C’.
Object :-To study the effect of seed rate and spacing between lines on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sunnhemp. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 13 and 14.10.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) and (d) As per treatments. (e) -. (v) Good green manure crop of Sunnhemp ploughed in. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(1.00^{\circ}\) ( (x) N.A. \(^{\prime}\)
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 spacings between rows : \(S_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{8}=9^{\circ}, S_{9}=12^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=15^{\circ}\).
Sab-plot treatments :
4 seed rates : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=20, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=30, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}=40\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}=50\) seers \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot (L. Sq.) (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/row or col. and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Main-plot : \(16 \frac{1}{1}^{\circ} \times 16 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\), Sub \(4 \frac{1^{\circ}}{}{ }^{\circ} \times 16 \frac{1}{1}^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield, height of plants etc. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nilo (v) (a) and (b; No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1 ., 12478 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(205.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(304.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Ooly \(S\) effect is highly significant.
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(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R 1}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 2635 & 2627 & 2880 & 2699 & 2710 \\
\hline \(S_{3}\) & 2781 & 2672 & 2399 & 2485 & 2584 \\
\hline \(S_{3}\) & 2551 & 2187 & 2748 & 2633 & 2530 \\
\hline S \({ }_{6}\) & 2337 & 2129 & 1981 & 1905 & 2088 \\
\hline Mean & 2576 & 2404 & 2502 & 2430 & 2478 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(S\) & \(=72.67 \mathrm{lb}, \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(R\) & \(=107.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
8. \(R\) means at the same level of \(S\) & \(=215.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
8. \(R\) means at the same level of \(S\)
\(=215.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(\mathbf{S}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{R}\)
\(=200.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

Ref:eU P. 51(68).
Type :-'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rates on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Green manured at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 1.10' (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

6 seed rates : \(R_{\mathbf{1}}=10, R_{2}=20, R_{3}=30, R_{4}=40, R_{5}=50\) and \(R_{6}=60\) srs./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 54^{\prime}\), (b) \(29^{\prime} \times 51^{\prime}\), (v) \(1.5^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1139 ib./ac.
(ii) \(268.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of graio in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1041 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1198 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 1005 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{t}}\) & 1093 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{t}}\) & 1053 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{d}}\) & 1441 \\
S.E/mean & \(=134.02 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site:-Regional Training Institute, Gazipur.
}

Ref:-U.P. 53(328).

Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume, green manure or a non-legume crop during kharif on the yield of the subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) As per treatments. (c) 20 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied to Maize. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30, 31.10.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings. (b) Line system-behind plough-east to west. (c) N.A. (d) -. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) \(1.93^{\circ}\). (x) 16, 17.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow-Wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize-Wheat.
4. Guar for fodder-wheat.
5. Sanai for green manuring-wheat.
6. Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\)-wheat.

Maize crop very poor due to water logging and it failed to bear cobs. It was harvested for fodder. After picking of moong, the green matter was turned in.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 48.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Kalai, Kalyanpur, Banaras and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Sanai failed in 3 plots. This had its consequent effect on the succeeding wheat crop. (vii) Experiment conducted ty A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1062 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 207.65 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1078 \\
2. & 1018 \\
3. & 915 \\
4. & 962 \\
5. & 1104 \\
6. & 1297 \\
S.E./mean & \(=73.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai (Aligarh).
Ref:-U.P. 49(26).
Type:-‘C'.
Object :-To study the effect of fallow as compared to having a legume, non legume or green manure crops in kharif on the yield of Wheat in rabi.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii)(a) !Light losm (Aligarh T-2). (b) N.A. (iii) [5.11.1949. (iv) (a) Sown in rectangular strips, ploughed and levelling done. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) One weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-fallow-wheat.
3. Bhadian sawan-wheat.
4. Juar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanai for G.M.-wheat.
6. Early Moong and early Udid-wheat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 30\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Lodging due to heavy rains ; crop satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to N.A. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Partapgarb and Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. Experiment not conducted during the year 1950.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(989 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(220.88 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant..
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
I. & 1042 \\
2. & 1084 \\
3. & 859 \\
4. & 1076 \\
S. & 892 \\
6. & 979 \\
S.E./mean & \(=78.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{lac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat. (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
Ref:-U.P. 51(100).
Type :- 'C'.
Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume for green manure or a non legume crop in kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S\) was broadcast to maize crop. (ii) (a) Loam (Aligarh Type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 24.10.1951. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings by desi plough. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (lx) N.A. (x) 2 and 3.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS
1. Fallow-wheat-
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanai for green manuring-wheat.
6. Early moong. wheat.

In hot wheather cultivation plots, 2 ploughings were given during pre-monsoon period. Kharif crop sown in 2od week of June with irrigation. Moong completely failed and was subsequently resown on July 19, hharif crops were poor due to late rainfall. 3 pickings of Moong peds were taken on Aug. 7, 20 and Sept.7, 1951. Sanai turned in on Aug. 12. Guar harvested frem 8 to 12 Aug. Moong plants turned in on Sep. 7 ; Maize harvested on Sept. 15, 1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1549 to N.A. (t) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kanpur, Partapgarb, Banaras and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment uas conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1418 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(196.05 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
-iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(.v) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1622 \\
2. & 1765 \\
3. & 969 \\
4. & 1329 \\
5. & 1818 \\
6. & 1006 \\
S.E./mean & \(=69.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
Ref :- U.P. 52(11).
Type:- ' C '.

Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume green manure or non legume crop during kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Aligarh type 3). (b) N.A. (iii) \(21 / 22.10 .1952\). (iv) (a) Ooly hot weather plots were ploughed, Palewa and plough thrice, once with Watts plough and twice with desi plough 5 ploughings with desi plough and 1 harrowing for wheat. (b) Sown behind the plough in lines, (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Only maize was top dressed with \(50 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 8.7.1952. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow (monsoon cultivated)-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize (harvested on 9/10.9.1952 and used as fodder)-wheat.
4. Guar (barvested on 3/4.9.1952 and used as fodder)-wheat.
5. Sanai (turned in as green manure)-wheat.
6. Early moong (poor growth, buried on 3.9. 1952)-wheat.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) and (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Persistant rains adversely effected kharif crops. Pallow plots infested with weeds. Growth of wheat is very poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-50. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Partapgarh, Banaras, Raya and Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(763 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(137.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
1. . 690
2. 746
3. 765
4.716
5. 848
6. \(\quad 754\)

S E./mean \(=48.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :- U.P. 53(351).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
Type:- 'C'.
Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume green manure or a non-legume crop during kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) As per treatments. (b) As per treatments. (c) A/S applied only to maize plots at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 30.7.1953. (ii) (a) Aligarh type 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1953. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings each followed by pata, 1 harrowing and 1 palwa. (b) Drilling. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 4.57'. (x) 7.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-fallow- wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanal for green manare-wheat:
6. Early moong \(T_{1}\)-wheat.

Guar and moong failed to develop because of continuous rains during the early part of the monsoon. Maize crop also failed and was harvested for fodder.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 6.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 8.
iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(50^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop progressed well but in the month of February and March 1954 heavy showers accompanied with strong winds caused partial lodging of the crop. (ii) Attack of fungus diseases like rust which caused shrievling of the grain. (iii) Grain and bhusa yjeld. (iv) (a) 1949-N.A. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Gazipur, Banaras and Raya. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS.
(i) \(940.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(167.92 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are bighly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb /ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 958 \\
2. & 873 \\
3. & 1038 \\
4. & 766 \\
5. & 1155 \\
6. & 851 \\
S.E./mean & \(=59.37 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 49(20).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of fallow as compared to having a legume, non legume or green manure crop in kharif on the yield of Wheat in rabi.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpur type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 18.10 .1949 and re-sown on 9.11 .1949 due to poor germination and due to rains. (iv) (a) Ploughing and levelling done on 29.9.1949. (b) Sown in rectangular strips. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-wheat
2. Hot weather cultivation-fallow -wheat.
3. Bhadian Sawan-wheat.
4. Jow ar fodder-wheal.
5. Sanai for G.M.-wheat.
6. Early moons and early Udid-wheat.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 10\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield, (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai and Pratapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi). A severe hail storm on 24.3 .1950 damaged the standing crop, but some of the fallen cars were picked up and added to the harvested crop. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1934 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(185.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2020 \\
2. & 1985 \\
3. & 1365 \\
4. & 1950 \\
5. & 2265 \\
6. & 2020 \\
S.E/mean & \(=65.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(64).
Type:-‘C’.

Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot wheather cultivation as compared to having a non legume, legume or green manure in kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop in rabi.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N to maize on 16.6.1950. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpur Type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1950. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation was commenced from \(9.6,1950\) in the field having this treatment. Final preparation on 19.6 .1950 with one ploughing by iron watts plough and cultivation by cultivator and finally levelled. Plots were ploughed with a victory plough after kharif and given one cultivation and finally prepared after rabi. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-fallow-wheat
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat. .
5. Sanai for green manuring -wheat.
6. Early moong-wheat.

Sowing in kharif was done on 19.6.1950. Sanai turned in after 6 weeks of sowing. Moong pods were picked up 4 times and the plants turned into the soil. Maize crop was poor and was harvested as fodder after removing the green cobs. Sanai and Moong were average.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}-4^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor germination. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1749 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Pratapgarh and Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt, was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1543 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(237.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are bighly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1280 \\
2. & 1465 \\
3. & 1375 \\
4. & 1175 \\
5. & 2310 \\
6. & 1650 \\
S.E./mean & \(=84.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). Ref :-U.P. 51(101). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. \\ Type:-‘C•.}

Object :-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume green manure or a non legume crop in Kharif on the yicld of subsequcnt crop of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) 50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) was t roadcast to maize crop. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpur type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1951. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings and harrowing. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 8 and 9.11.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanai for green manuring-wheat.
6. Early moong-wheat.

Hot weather cultivation was done on 19.4.1951. Crop sown on 13.7.1951. Moong pods were picked up 3 times before turning in on 18.9.1951. Sanai was turned in on 3.9.1951. Guar was harvested on 3.10.1951 and maize was harvested on 8.9.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Pratapgarh, Banaras, Kalai and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1271 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(192.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1190 \\
2. & 1455 \\
3. & 1185 \\
4. & 1295 \\
5. & 1290 \\
6. & 1210 \\
S.E./mean & \(=68.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
}

Ref: \(=\) U.P. 52(12).
Type : \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{C}^{\prime}\).
Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume green manure or noa-legume crop during kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpur-type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 24, 25.10.1952. (iv) (a) Only hot weather cultivated piots were tilled with victory plough. Irrigation followed by Punjab soil turning plough. Watts plough followed by cultivation on 3.7.1952. Kharif crops sown on 5.7.1952. 4 ploughings before sowing wheat. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Maize top dressed wilh 50 lb ./ac. of N on 3.8.1952. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding. (ix) N,A. (x) 28.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow (monsoon cultivated)-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-whest.
3. Maize (harvested and used as green fodder)-wheat,
4. Guar (harvested and used as fodder) - wheat.

5 Sanai (turned in as green manure on 2.9.1952) -wheat.
6. Early moong (harvested on 7.9. 1952 and then buried)-wheat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) and (b) \(27^{\circ} \times 40.4^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N A. (v) (a) Kalai, Raya, Matkota, Pratapgarh and Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1143 lb .ac.
(ii) \(217.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 580 \\
2. & 1860 \\
3.- & 850 \\
4. & 1510 \\
5. & 1685 \\
6. & 1175 \\
S E./mean & \(=76.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Got. Agri. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Ref:-U.P. 53(361).
Type :-‘'C’.
Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume green manure or a non-legume crop during kharif on the yield of the subsequent Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) to maize ooly. (ii) (a) Kanpur (Type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 23, 24.12.1953. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation fields ploughed on 207.1953 , 1 victory plough, and 1 watts plough. The field was cultivated and Pata done on 15th, 18th Sept. and 8th Oct. Two ploughings by dest. (b) Behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow followed by wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation followed by wheat.
3. Early maize followed \(t y\) wheat.
4. Guar for fodder followed by wheat.
5. Sanai for green manuring followed by wheat.
6. Moong T-1 followed by wheat.

Kharif sowing on 20.6.1953. Maize harvested on 5.9.1953 and Guer on 19.8.1953. Sanai turned in on 12 8.1953. Moong picked up and plants turned in for green manuring.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime} 4^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination was uniform. Growth good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Yes. (v) (a) Kalai, Gazipur, Banaras and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Rats damaged the wheat crop. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(581.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(93.10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 386.5 \\
2. & 410.0 \\
3. & 607.5 \\
4. & 502.0 \\
S. & 1036.5 \\
6. & 548.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=32.92 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat. (Rabi)
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 50(151).
Type:- ' C '.

Object :-To study the effect of spacing and seedlings per hill on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) ,N.A. (iii) 14 and 15.11.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing with victory plough and six with desi - plough. (b) Dibbling. (c) N.A. (d) and (e). As per treatments. (v) 4 cart loads of F.Y.M. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 8 and 9.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) Seedling/hill: \(H_{1}=1, \mathrm{H}_{2}=2\) and \(\mathrm{H}_{3}=3\) seedlings/hill.
(2) 4 spacings between plants : \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=3^{\circ}, \mathrm{S}_{2}=6^{\circ}, \mathrm{S}_{3}=9^{\circ}\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{4}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.R.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1977 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(314.25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Both H and S effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & \(S_{3}\) & \(S_{4}\) & -Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & 2152 & 1893 & 1322 & 1037 & 1601 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2645 & 2308 & 2048 & 1659 & 2165 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{3}\) & 2437 & 2152 & 2074 & 1997 & 2165 \\
\hline Mean & 2411 & 2118 & 1815 & 1564 & 1977 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of H \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =78.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =90.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =157.12 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}_{3}
\end{aligned}
\]}} & \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop : Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 51 (34).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effects of spacing and sesdlings per hill on yield of Wheat-
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanal (G.M.). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14 and 15.11.1951. (iv)
(a) 3 dest, 1 victory and \(I\) cultivator ploughing. (b) and (c) N.A. (d) and (e) As per treatments. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated, (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 19,4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) Seedings/hill : \(\mathrm{H}_{1}=1, \mathrm{H}_{3}=2\) and \(\mathrm{H}_{3}=3\).
(2) 4 spacings between plants : \(S_{4}=3^{\circ}, S_{2}=6^{\circ}, S_{3}=9^{\circ}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 in two flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(9^{\circ} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. (ii) At the later stage the leaves and stems of all the plots were attacked by orange rust. (iii) Germination and yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1673 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(433.53 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) S and H effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{8}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\because \quad \mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1698 & 1296 & 1089 & 1050 & 1283 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) & 2411 & 1634 & 1672 & 1361 & 1770 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{8}\) & 2774 & 1906 & 1724 & 1465 & 1967 \\
\hline Mean & 2294 & 1612 & 1495 & 1292 & 1673 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E of H marginal mean
\(=108.38 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of \(S\) marginal mean
S.E. of body of table.
\(=125.15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=216.76 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(51).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of spacing and seedlings per hill on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanal (G.M). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4,5.11.1952. (iv) (a) ploughings2 with victory plough, 3 with desi plough and 2 with cultivator. (b) Dibbling. (c) N.A. (d) and (e) As per treatments. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) Seedlings/hill: \(\mathrm{H}_{1}=1, \mathrm{H}_{2}=2\) and \(\mathrm{H}_{8}=3\) seedlings/hill.
(2) 4 spacings between plants: \(S_{1}=3^{\circ}, S_{2}=6^{\circ}, S_{3}=9^{\circ}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 in two flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and(b) \(9^{\circ} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Traces of brown rust. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2852 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(328.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) H and S effects are highly significant while their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll} 
& \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{4}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3189 & 2723 & 2126 & 1763 \\
\(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 3189 & 2852 & 2774 & 2800 \\
\(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 3474 & 3163 & 3267 & 2904 \\
\hline Mean & 3284 & 2913 & 2722 & 2489
\end{tabular}
S.E. of \(H\) marginal mean \(=82.00 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of \(S\) marginal mean \(=94.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of \(b \circ\) dy of table \(\quad=163.99 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 53(90). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. } & \text { Type :- 'C'. } \\
\text { Object :-To study the effect of spacing and seedlings per hill on yield of Wheat. }
\end{array}
\]
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sanai-wheat. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1953. (iv) (a) Light Palewa, 1 watts ploughing and pata, 3 desi ploughing and pata. (b) Dibbling. (c) N.A. (d) and (e) As per treatment. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) Seedlings/hill: \(\mathrm{H}_{1}=1, \mathrm{H}_{2}=2\) and \(\mathrm{H}_{3}=3\) seedlings/hill.
(2) 4 spacings between plants: \(S_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, S_{8}=6^{\prime \prime}, S_{3}=9^{\circ}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime}\) 。
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, flowering, tillering, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt, was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(3490 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(240.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) H and S effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & S8 & \(S_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & 3500 & 3397 & 3008 & 2930 & 3209 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) & 3708 & 3630 & 3397 & 3526 & 3565 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{3}\) & 3889 & \[
3630
\] & 3656 & 3604 & 3695 \\
\hline Mean & 3699 & 3552 & 3354 & 3353 & 3490 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of H marginal mean \\
S.E of \(S\) marginal mean S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). \(\quad\) Ref:- U.P. 48(19).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. \(\quad\) Type :- 'C’.

Object :-To study the effect of depth of sowing and seed rates on the yield of Wheat
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1948. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seeds drilled. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 22, 234.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 seed rates: \(R_{1}=38\) seers/ac. and \(R_{2}=60\) seers/ac.
(2) 2 depths to which the seed is sown : \(D_{1}=11^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{2}=21^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(33^{\circ} \times 22.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 22.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime}\) along both sides of breadth. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Attack of rust was not severe except that it was found in traces, but later on, it developed. (iii) Yield of fresh and dry grain. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1974 \quad \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(136.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 1948 & 2109 & 2028 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R 2}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1940 & 1900 & 1920 \\
\hline Mean & 1944 & 2004 & 1974 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
=48.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(=68.38 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

```

Ref :- U.P. 49(35).
Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of depth of sowing and seed rates on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1949. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory plough, 3 ploughing with cultivator and I ploughing with desi plough. (b) Drilling. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings with man power. (ix) N.A. (x) 5, 6.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 seed rates: \(R_{2}=34, R_{2}=27, R_{1}=17\) and \(R_{4}=11\) seers/ac.
(2) 2 depths to which the seed is sown: \(D_{1}=11^{\prime}\), and \(D_{2}=21^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(38^{\circ} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{1}^{\prime \prime} \cdot\) (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Negligible - only traces of orange rust (small postules) appeared late in the season i.e. during 1st. week of February. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1560 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 236.4 lb ./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cccc|l} 
& \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1681 & 1670 & 1517 & 1474 & 1586 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1594 & 1528 & 1594 & 1419 & 1534 \\
\hline Mean & 1638 & 1599 & 1556 & 1446 & 1560
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\)
\(=83.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\)
\(=59.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 50(136).
Type: \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{C}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of depth of sowing and seed rate on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10 .1950 . (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with victory plough and 5 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Behind the plough. (c) As per treatments. (d) Rows \(9^{\text {a }}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) 8 cart loads of F.Y.M. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil._(ix) N.A. (x) 25 and 26.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 seed rates: \(R_{1}=20, R_{\mathbf{3}}=40, R_{3}=60\) and \(R_{4}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 depths to which the seed is sown: \(D_{1}=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime \prime}\), and \(D_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(23^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}-5^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times{ }^{\frac{y^{\prime}}{}}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. (ii) No disease except brown rust in traces only. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950.
(b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1363 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(181.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(1 \mathrm{~b}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1408 & 1450 & 1268 & 1188 & 1328 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1385 & 1329 & 1469 & 1404 & 1397 \\
\hline 1396 & 1390 & 1368 & 1296 & 1363
\end{tabular}
\(S\) E. of marginal mean of \(D\) S.E of marginal mean of \(R\) S.E of body of table
\(=45.27 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=64.03 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=90.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P.52(46).
bject :-To study the effect of seed rate and spacing on the growth and yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanal (G.M.). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1952. (iv) (a) 2 victory, 3 desi and 1 cultivator ploughing. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) and (d) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 710. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.4.1953.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 row spacings : \(S_{1}=9^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=12^{\circ}\) and \(S_{8}=15^{\circ}\).
(2) 3 seedrates : \(R_{1}=40, R_{2}=60\) and \(R_{8}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9 in 3 flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) \(22^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ} \cdot\) (v) \(2^{\prime}\) at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2934 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(310.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{1}\) & 3194 & 2738 & 2676 & 2869 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{2}\) & 2925 & 3153 & 2551 & 2876 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{3}\) & 3174 & 2862 & 3132 & 3056 \\
\hline Mean & 3098 & 2918 & 2786 & 2934 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =126.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =219.3 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 53(88). } \\
\text { Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. } & \text { Type :-'C’. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of seed rates and spacings on growth and yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat rotation followed. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1953. (iv) (a) Light palewa on 12.10.1953. Turning in of Sanai on 31.8 .1953 with victory plough. Victory plough and pata on 28.9.1953. Desi plough and pata on 10,23 and 27.10.1953. Spring harrow and pata on 20.10.1953, (b) N.A. (c) and (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 710 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings with khurpi. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 spacings: \(S_{1}=9^{\prime \prime}, S_{8}=12^{\circ}\) and \(S_{8}=15^{\circ}\).
(2) 3 seed rates: \(R_{1}=40, R_{2}=60\) and \(R_{8}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(22^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\). (b) \(18^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) at each end of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. No lodging. (ii) Slight incidence of rust disease. (iii) Germination, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 19521953 (Rabl) continued with modification. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conđucted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1121 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 166.0 lb ./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1104 & 1151 & 1094 & 1116 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1099 & 1156 & 1099 & 1118 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 1120 & 1104 & 1162 & 1129 \\
\hline Mean & 1108 & 1137 & \(i 118\) & 1121 \\
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=47.93 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ae}\). \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :mU.P. 51(23).
Type :-'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of pruning and top dressing on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Chari for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.10.1951. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings and harrowings with desi plough and 1 with. victory plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apant. (e) N.A. (v) 24 seers _of A/S i.e. 1 sr./plot applied with first irrigation on 22.11.1951. (vi) N.P. 125. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Pruned and top dressed.
3. Unpruned and top dressed.

A/S at \(\frac{1}{2}\) srs./plot top dressed on 10.10.1952. Date of pruning on 29.12. 1951 at the height of \(9^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime} 9^{\circ}\). (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime} 3^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{3}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) At a later stage the leaves and stem of all the plants of every treatment were affected by orange rust. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) iNo. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1144 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(169.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1122 \\
2. & 1130 \\
3. & 1180 \\
S.E./mean & \(=59.93 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

```
Ref:- U.P. 48(16).
Type :-'C'.

Object :-To find out the best seed rate for Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

4 seed rates : \(R_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} ., R_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} ., R_{3}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(45^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil, (iii) Yield of fresh and dry grain. (iv) (a) 1947 to 1948. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1983 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(105.21 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc}
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1948 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1948 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1948 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 2088 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\mathbf{5 2 . 6 0} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

\author{
Ref :- U.P. 49(38). \\ Type :^‘'C’.
}

Object :-To study the effect of the dibbling on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15, 16.11.1949. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with victors plough, 2 with cultivator and 5 with dest plough. (b) to (e) As per treatments. (v) Sanai for G.M. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One hoeing with manpower. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 4 levels of seedlings: \(H_{1}=1, H_{2}=2, H_{8}=3\) seedlings/hill and \(H_{4}=A s\) usual behind the plough ( 80 lb ./ac. of seed).
(2) 2 depths at which the seeds are sown : \(D_{1}=11^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime \prime}\)

Method of sowing : For \(\mathrm{D}_{1} \mathrm{H}_{4}\)-with kudali; \(\mathrm{D}_{2} \mathrm{H}_{4}\)-sown behind the plough and rest with dibbling sticks.
3. DESIGN
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(35^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(32^{\prime} \times 101^{\prime}\) (v) \(11^{\prime} \times \mathbf{3}^{\prime}\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The field was watered on 8 th and 10th March with the result crop lodged. (ii) N.A. (iil) Yield of grain and bhusa. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1757 lb./ac.
(ii) \(163.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) H and D effects are highly significant but interaction is not signjficant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1387 & 1679 & 1770 & 1783 & 1655 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1637 & 1906 & 1938 & 1958 & 1860 \\
\hline Mean & 1512 & 1792 & 1854 & 1870 & 1757
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of H & \(=57.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of D & \(=41.00 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{cc}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=81.99 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref: : U.P. 50(143).
Type :- ‘C'.
Object :-To study the effect of dibbling on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14 and 15.11 .1950 . (iv) (a) One ploughing with victory plough and six with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) Between rows \(9^{9}\) (no. of rows 14) ; distance between seeds \(6^{\circ}\). (v) 4 C.L. of F.Y.M. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 8, 9.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of seedlings : \(H_{1}=1, H_{2}=2, H_{3}=3\) seddlings/hill and \(H_{4}=\) seed sown behind the plough (seed rate \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac})\).
(2) 2 depths at which the seed is sown: \(D_{1}=11^{\circ}\) and \(D_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(20^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}-6^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{x}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Nil. (iii) Graio yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950 to 1954-1955. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1393 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(215.14 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{H}\) effect is bighly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 1103 & 1303 & 1449 & 1556 & 1354 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1196 & 1478 & 1468 & 1585 & 1432 \\
\hline Mean & 1152 & 1390 & 1458 & 1570 & 1393
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(H\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\)
S.E. of body of table
\(=76.06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=53.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=107.57 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
```

Crop :~Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm Kanpur.

```
Ref:- U.P. 51(33).
    Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of dibbling on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanal (green manuring). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (jii) 15.11.1951. (iv) (a) Floughings by desi-3; victory-2; cultivator-1. (b) and (c) As per treatments. (d) \(9^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) As per treatments. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of seedlings : \(H_{1}=1, H_{8}=2, H_{8}=3\) and \(H_{4}=\) seed sown behind the plough at \(80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). as seed rate.
(2) 2 depths to which the seed is sown : \(D_{1}=11^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime \prime}\).

3, DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(21^{\prime} \times 10 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. Lodging in 3 plots. (ii) At a later stage the leaves and stem of every plant were affected by orange rust, ears were not affected (6.3.1952). (iii) , Germination and grain [yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1954.
(b) No.
(c) N.A.
(v) (a) No.
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1504 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(179.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(H\) and \(D\) effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1089 & 1382 & 1519 & 1620 \\
\hline Mean & 1364 & 1492 & 1647 & 1922 & 1402 \\
\hline 1626 & 1437 & 1583 & 1771 & 1504
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of H
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\).
S.E. of body of table
\(=63.30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \(=44.76 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \(=89.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site:-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 52(52).
Type :-'C'.

Object:-To study the effect of dibbling on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai (G.M.). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iij) 4 and 5.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughings-victory 2, desi 3 and cultivator 2. (b) and (c) As per treatments. (d) \(9^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) As per treatments. (v) Nil. (vi) C. 13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.4.1953.

2, TREATMENTS :
\(S_{1}=\) One seed/hole ( \(1 / 3 \mathrm{ch}\). per plot) by dibbling.
\(S_{2}=\) Two seeds/hole ( \(11 / 12\) ch. per plot) by dibbling.
\(\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{g}}=\) Three seeds/hole (7/6 ch. per plot) by dibbling.
\(S_{4}=\) Seed sown behind the plough ( 6 ozs . or 3 chh. per plot).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(21^{\prime} \times 10 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime} \cdot\) (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \frac{1}{3}^{\prime} \cdot\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERÁL:
(i) Good. (ii) On leaves and stem \(15 \%\) attack of brown rust. (jii) Grain yield and germination. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2294 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(199.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2159 & \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2422 & \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(2410^{\circ}\) & \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 2184 & \\
S.E./mean & \(=81.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
& & \\
& & \\
& & \\
& & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :-U.P. 53(89),
Type :-‘'C’:
Object : To study the effect of dibbling on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sanai-wheat. (b) Sanai green manure. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1953. (iv) (a) 1 light palewa, 1 watts plough and pata, 3 desi plough and pata. (b) and (c) As per treatments. (d) \(9^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) As per treatments. (v) Nil. (vi) C. 13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated, (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (х) 7.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\(\mathrm{S}_{1}=1\) seed/hole at 8.45 lb ./ac. as seedrate.
\(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}=2\) seeds/hole at 23.26 lb ./ac. as seedrate.
\(\mathrm{S}_{3}=3\) seeds/hole at 29.62 lb ./ac as seedrate.
\(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Sown behind plough at 82.28 lb ,/ac. as seedrate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(21^{\prime} \times 10.4^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\circ} \times\) T \(^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good, lodged on 21.2.1954. (ii) Rust incidence took place on 26.2.1954 after rains. Before rains rust was negligible, medium for \(S_{1}, S_{9}, S_{3}\) and heavy for \(S_{4}\). (iii) Germination\%; flowering, sheaf, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2250 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(214.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2361 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2276 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 2239 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 2123 \\
S.E./mean & \(=87.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 51(191).
Site :-Students, Instructional Farm, Kanpur.
Type :~‘'C’.
Object : - To study the effect of on the yield of Wheat different rotational and cultural practices.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (a) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Last week of October and first week of November. (iv) (a) Ploughing of moong after two pluckiogs. (b) N.A. (c) 40 seer./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13 (Early). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) As per treatments. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.:
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 previous crops : \(C_{6}=\) Fallow, \(C_{2}=\) Green manure, \(C_{2}=\) Guar and \(C_{3}=\) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 weedings: \(W_{0}=\) No weeding and \(W_{1}=W\) eeding.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround sub-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1955 (Modified in 1952-1953). (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.(K).
5. RESULTS :
(I) 1407 lb.Jac.
(ii) \(181.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{C}\) and \(\mathbf{W}\) effects are highly significant, while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(C_{0}\) & \(C_{1}\) & \(C_{2}\) & \(C_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \multirow{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Mean \\
\hline\(W_{0}\)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline 1445 & 1396 & 1055 & 1074 & 1242 \\
\hline & 1607 & 1787 & 1539 & 1353 & 1572 \\
\hline & 1526 & 1592 & 1297 & 1214 & 1407
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. Marginal means of \(\mathbf{C}\) & \(=73.93 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(W\) & \(=73.45 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. W means at the same level of \(C\) & \(=1275 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. C means at the same level of \(W\) & \(=146.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 52(245).
Type :-'C’.

Object :-To study the effect of different rotational and cultural practices on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sand loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) As per treatments.
(ix) N.A. (v) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
2 ploughings : \(S_{0}=\) No ploughing and \(S_{1}=\) Summer ploughing.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 previous crops : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Fallow, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) G.M. (Sanai), \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}=\) Guar and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}=\) Moong.
Sub-sub-plot treatments:
2 weedings: \(W_{0}=\) No weeding and \(W_{1}=\) Weeding.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block, 3 sub-plots/main-plot and 2 sub-sub-plots/sub-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(30^{\circ} \times 24^{\circ}\). (b) \(28^{\circ} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1955 (modified in 1952-1953). (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1647 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(148,2 \mathrm{Jb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(213.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{am}\)
(c) \(237.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) R effect is highly significant. W effect is significant others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 53(127). \\
Site :- Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur. & Type --'C.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different rotational and cultural practices on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) No manuring. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1953. (iv)
(a) The fallow plots were ploughed twice during rains. Moong was ploughed in the first week of September in the plots concerned. Four ploughings followed by patta. (b) Sowing tehind the plough. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated, (viii) Weeding on 3.1.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 4, 5.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatmen ts :
2 ploughings: \(S_{0}=\) No ploughing and \(S_{1}=\) Summer ploughing.
Sub-plot treatments:
4 previous crops : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Fallow, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) G.M. (sanal), \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Guar and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{d}}=\) Moong.
Sub-Sub-plot trealments :
2 weedings : \(\mathbf{W}_{0}=\) No weeding and \(W_{1}=\) Weeding.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot, (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block, 4 sub-plots/main-plot and 2 sub-sub plots/sub-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(30^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround sub-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Wheat grain and bhusa yield separately. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1955 . (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1264 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(603.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(176.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(c) \(150.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\),
(iii) \(R\) effect is highly significant, W effect is significant while other effects are not significante
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & R4 & Mean & \(\mathrm{w}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{W}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{0}\) & 1120. & 1583 & 1253 & 1450 & 1352 & 1432 & 1271 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 929 & 1224 & 1296 & 1255 & 1176 & 1193 & 1158 \\
\hline Mean & 1024 & 1404 & 1274 & 1353 & 1264 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{W}_{0}\) & 988 & 1473 & 1385 & 1405 & 1313 & & \\
\hline \(W_{1}\) & 1061 & 1335 & 1164 & 1300 & 1215 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal means
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =174.15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =72.09 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =43.57 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =101.95 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =195.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =61.61 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =179.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =87.13 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =94.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]
2. \(R\) marginal means
3. W marginal means
4. \(\mathbf{R}\) means at the same level of S
5. \(\mathbf{S}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{R}\)
6. W
6. W means at the same level of \(S\)
7. S means at the same level of \(W\)
8. \(W\) means at the same level of \(R\)
9. \(R\) means at the same level of \(W\)

Crop: Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :m U.P. 50(135).
Type : ' \(C\) ' .

Object :-To study the effect of short duration legume in the Fallow-Wheat rotation as judged by the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N. A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow wheat.
2. Moang with 80 lb ./ac, of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\)-wheat.
3. Moong without \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\)-wheat.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(130^{\circ} \times 19^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1955. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(819 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(115.2 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) The treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 992 \\
2. & .738 \\
3. & 728 \\
S.E.fmean & \(=\mathbf{= 4 7 . 0 5} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :- U.P. 51(140)/50(135).
Site :-Students' Instr uctional Farm, Kanpur. Type :-‘C'.
Object:-To study the effect of a short duration legume in the Fallow-Wheat rotation as judged by the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Moong with 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\)-wheat.
3. Moong without \(\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{5}\)-wheat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(130^{\circ} \times 19^{\circ}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1955. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(881 \quad \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(151.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 93 I \\
2. & 909 \\
3. & 802 \\
S.E /mean & \(=61.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). Ref :-U.P. 52(190)/51(140)/50(135).
Site :-Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur. Type :-'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of a short duration legume in the Fallow-Wheat rotation as judged by the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.9.1952 (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Moong with 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\)-wheat.
3. Moong without \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\)-wheat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B.D. (ij) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(130^{\circ} \times 19^{\circ}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 195s. (b) Yes (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1207 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(166.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(tii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lbo/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Av. yield of grain in & Ib./ac. \\
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1288 \\
2. & 1232 \\
3. & 1100 \\
S.E./mean & \(=68.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). Ref :- U.P. 53(126)/52(190)/51(140)/50(135).
Site :-Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur. Type : ${ }^{〔}$ ' $C$ ’.

```

Object:-To study the effect of a short duration legume in the Fallow-Wheat rotation as judged by the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1953. (iv) (a) 5 to 7 ploughings. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding and rogoing. (ix) N A. (x) 31.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Moong with 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\)-wheat.
3. Moong without \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\)-wheat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(132^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(130^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1955. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(890.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(58.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cr} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 852.0 \\
2. & 1024.8 \\
3. & 794.6 \\
S E./mean & \(=40.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat. & Ref:- U.P. 49(69). \\
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type:-‘C’.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of varying seed rates of Wheat on growth and yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Uncultivated land. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (iii) 8.11.1949. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by mould board plough, 1 crosswise ploughing by tractor. 2 ploughiags by desi plough and planking. (b). dibbling. (c) As per treatments. (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) 1. (v) \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as T.C. on 8.12 .1949 \(+20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\), of N of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed on 29.12 .1949 . (iv) Pb .591 (mid late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings and weedings. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 5.4. 1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

7 seed rates : \(R_{1}=5, R_{2}=7.5, R_{3}=10, R_{6}=12.5, R_{6}=15, R_{6}=17.5\) and \(R_{7}=20\) seers \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2322 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(265.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2042 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 2439 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 2609 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 2405 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 2359 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 2216 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{7}}\) & 2155 \\
\(\mathbf{S}\). E./mead & \(\Rightarrow 153.0 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat.
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. Type :-‘C’.

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rates on yield and growth of Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.10.1950. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by mould board plough and two by desi plough with cultivator and planking etc. (b) Dibbling.
(c) According to treatments. (d) Line to line \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) 40 mds. stable manure on 15.10 .1950 . (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 interculturings. (ix) N.A. (x) 12 and 16.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

6 seed rates: \(R_{1}=3, R_{2}=6, R_{3}=9, R_{4}=12, R_{5}=15\) and \(R_{8}=18 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(20^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Below normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
s. RESULTS :
(i) \(938 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(123.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 727 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & 809 \\
\hline Rs & 878 \\
\hline \(R_{1}\) & 933 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 1235 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{6}\) & 1043 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=71.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat.
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 50(121).
Type :^'C’.

Object :-To study the effect of varying seed rates of Wheat on its yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.11.1550. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by mould board plougb, ploughing by desi plough, planking. (b) Behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Stable manure oo 15.10 .1950 . (vi) Pb -591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 interculturing. (ix) N.A. (x) 12.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

12 seed rates : \(R_{1}=20, R_{8}=25, R_{3}=30, R_{4}=35, R_{5}=40, R_{8}=45, R_{7}=50, R_{8}=55, R_{9}=60, R_{10}=70, R_{11}=80\) and \(R_{12}=90\) seers/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(14^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Below normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain aad fod ler yiald. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(979 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(244.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 760 & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{7}}\) & 1278 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 795 & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 1071 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 864 & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 1037 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 933 & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1 0}}\) & 795 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 1140 & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1 1}}\) & 967 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 1175 & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1 2}}\) & 933 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=140.9 \mathrm{lb}\). ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref. :- U.P. 50(87)
Type :~ ' C '.

Object :-To study the effect of rotating Moong \(T_{1}\) with Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.10.1950. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by monld board plough and 3 by desi plough and planking. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-52 (medium early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 intercultures. (ix) N.A. (x) 14 to 16.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow.
2. Moong once.
3. Moong two times.

4, Moong three times.
5. Sanai-G.M.

One time :-Moong sown on 30.4.1950. Harvested from 30.5.1950 to 12.6.1950.
Two times:-As above + Maong sown on 8.6.1950. Harvested from 10.8.1950 to 18.8.1950.
Three times :-As above+sowing on 24.8.50, and harvested on 15.10.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(16^{\circ} \times 42^{\prime \prime}\) (b) \(12^{\circ} \times 38^{\prime}\) (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil, (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(633.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(128.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatments & Av. yield \\
1. & 564.5 \\
2. & 405.4 \\
3. & 516.3 \\
4. & 700.0 \\
5. & 982.2 \\
S.E./mean & \(=64.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat.
Site:- Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.

```
Ref. :-. U.P. 49(27).
Type:- ' \(C\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of fallow as compared to having a legume, a non-legume or green manure crop in kharif on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As under treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Domat (unclassified). (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11.1939. (iv) (a) Ploughed and levelling done, (b) Sown in rectangular strip. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) I weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 18, 23.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-Wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-fallow-wheat.
3. Bhadian Sawan-wheat.
4. Juar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanai for G.M.-wheat.
6. Early moong and Early Udid-wheat.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 29,50\) th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth in 3 replicates and poor in other 5. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai and Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(739.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(286.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatments & Av. yield. \\
1. & 785.4 \\
2. & 877.6 \\
3. & 800.2 \\
4. & 682.2 \\
5. & 674.8 \\
6. & 623.2 \\
S E./mean & \(=101.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat. & Ref:-U.P. 50(60). \\
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh. & Type :-‘C'.
\end{tabular}

Otject:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having a non-legume, a legume or green manure crop in kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) Maize plots at \(50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as compost top dressed. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.10.1950. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings and 2 harrowings, (b) to (e) N.A. (v) NO. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-fallow-wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanai for green manuring-wheat.
6. Early moong-wheat.

Sanai and guar were sown on 5.7.1950, moong on 7.7.1950 and maize on 8.7.1950. Sanal was turned in on 20.8.1950. Guar harvested as fodder on 23.8.1950; moong pods were picked and plants turned in 1st week of September. Maize completely failed due to excessive rains,
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6 . (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(31^{\prime} \times 48^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) betweed plots and \(3^{\prime}\) betweeu biocks. (vi) Yea.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur and Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(876.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}\).
(ii) \(298.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 662.4 \\
2. & 918.5 \\
3. & 655.0 \\
4. & 962.4 \\
5. & 1101.4 \\
6. & 958.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=105.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.

Kef :-U.P. 51(107).
Type :-‘C'.

Object :-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume, green manure in Kharif or a non-legume crop on the yield of subsequent crop of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) Maize plots at \(50 \mathrm{lb} /\) ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcast. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11.1951. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings and palewa. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 12.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. M-ize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanal for green manuring-wheat.
6. Early moong-wheat.

Hot weather cultivation was done on 26 and 27.5.1951. Sanai and guar seeds were sown as broadcast on 7.7.1951, while moong and maize were sown in lines on 8.7.1951. Sanal was ploughed in on 27.8.1951 and moong on 13.9.1951. Guar and maize harvested on 26.8 .1951 and 22.9.1951 respectively. Maize crop failed due to droughty condition.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 35.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Crop affected by white ants and in the late stage by rats also. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kanpur, Banaras, Kalai and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) The damage due to rats was maximum in the sanal and hot weather cultivated plots. (vii) Conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1121 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 345.6 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av, yjeld \\
1. & 1150 \\
2. & 1084 \\
3. & 976 \\
4. & 1063 \\
5. & 1391 \\
6. & 1063 \\
S.E /mean & \(=122.2\), lb./ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.
ject!:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation] as compared to having legume, green manure or a non-legume crop during kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.
1. \({ }^{-}\)BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (unclassified). (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1952. (iv) Only hot weather plots ploughed in summer, one ploughing before kharif crop was sown, seven ploughings for wheat. (v) A/S at 50 lb /ac. of N as top dressing to maize crop on 19.7.1952. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 27, 28.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow (monsoon cultivated)-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation (potato)-wheat.
3. Maize (barvested on \(10,11.9 .1952\) and used as green fodder)-wheat.
4. Guar (harvested and used as G.M. 10.9.1952)-wheat.
5. Sanai (turned in on 10.9.1952)-wheat.
6. Early moong (two pickings of pods on 25.8.1952 and 10.9.1952 and then buried after broadcasting)wheat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) and (b) \(43^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ} \cdot 3^{\circ}\). (v) Between plots \(1^{\prime}\) and between blocks 3'. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Cobs of maize damaged by birds before maturity. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai, Kalyanpur, Banaras, Raya and Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1172 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(166.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1032 \\
2. & 1111 \\
3. & 1149 \\
4. & 1186 \\
5. & 1204 \\
6. & 1349 \\
S.E/mean & \(=58.92 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site : Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.
site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

```

Refie U.P. 51(120).
Type:- 'C'.
Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume, green manure or a non-legume crop in kharif on the yield of subsequent crop of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) 50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) was broadcast to maize plots. (iii) (a) Sandy loam (not classified). (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 23.11.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughing, (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17 to 22.4.1952.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanaifor green manuring-wheat.
6. Early moong-wheat

Kiharif crops sown on August 2.3.1951, moong pods were picked 3 times and after the 3rd picking plants were buried into the soil on 4.10.1951. Sanai was turned into the soil on 17 and 18.9.1951, guar was harvested on 22 to 24.9.1951 and maize harvested on 16.10.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) tetween plots and \(3^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v)
(a) Kanpur, Pratapgarh, Banaras and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
-5. RESULTS :
(i) \(515.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(122.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly"different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yiéld \\
1. & 371.8 \\
2. & 860.2 \\
3. & 296.8 \\
4. & 281.1 \\
S. & 916.2 \\
6. & 364.0 \\
S.E.mean & \(=43.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :mheat.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Stn., Raya.

Ref:-U.P. 52(169)/51(120).
Type :m‘'.

Object :-To study the effect of fallow with or nithout hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume, green manure or a non-legume crop during kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) 50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied to maize. (ii) (a) Sandy loam (unclassified). (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Only hot weather cultivated plots ploughed twice in summer, palewa followed by two ploughings, Sanai and Guar by broadcast and moong and maize were sown in lines, palewa and ploughing twice, light irrigation and 4 ploughings for Wheat (Rabi). (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hand weedings and 1 harrowing with lever harrow before sowing wheat. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow (monsoon cultivated)-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize (harvested on 21.9.1952 and used as G.M.)-wheat.
4. Guar (harvested on 7 to 10.9.1952)-wheat.
5. Sanai (ploughed in on 5, 6.9.1952)-wheat.
6. Early moong (crop ploughed in on 9.9.1952)-wheat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kalai, Pratapgarh and Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1167.2 lb /ac.
(ii) \(181.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 938.6 \\
2. & 866.9 \\
3. & 1145.8 \\
4. & 976.6 \\
5. & 1678.9 \\
6. & 1396.6 \\
S.E./mean & \(=64.15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Farm, Raya
Ref: :U.P. 53(347).

Object :-To study the effect fof fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume, green manure or a non-legume crop during kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) \(\mathbf{N}\) applied to maize as top dressing. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) S.11.1953. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings and 2 palewa. (b) By drilling. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nit. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculture and one hoeing. (ix) 1.13". (x) 14.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-fallow-wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar for fodder-wheat.
5. Sanai for green manure-wheat.
6. Early moong T 1-wheat.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair crop. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Banaras, Gazipur, Kalai and Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Because of the continuance of the experiment in the same field for the last two years, general fertility of the field has gone down. On the whole the wheat crop was fair considering the low fertility of the field. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(720.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(97.43 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) The treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb, /ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 525.7 \\
2. & 475.0 \\
3. & .572 .7 \\
4. & 621.5 \\
5. & 1134.1 \\
6. & 993.2 \\
S.E./mean & \(=34.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Wheat.}

Site :-Regional Res. Str., Varanasi.

Ref :-U.P. 50(65).
Type :-‘C’.

Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having a non-legume or a legume or green mapure crop in kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop in Rabi.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M. to maize crop. (ii) (a) Clayey loam (Banaras Type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 1.11.1950. (iv) (a) Field was prepared for Rabi. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Middle of April, 1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-fallow-wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanai for green manuring-wheat.
6. Early Udid-wheat.

Kharif crop sown on July 7,1950, but due to heavy rains the crop completely failed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(29^{\prime} \times 46^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) between plots and \(3^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur and Pratapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1039 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(150.7 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av.yield \\
1. & 976 \\
2. & 1065 \\
3. & 1016 \\
4. & 1049 \\
5. & 996 \\
6. & 1135 \\
S.E./mean & \(=53.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Ref :- U.P. } 51(103) / 50(65) . \\
\text { Type :- 'C'. }
\end{array}
$$

```

Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legumes for grain, fodder or green manuring in kharif or a non-legume on the yield of subsequent crop of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) 50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcast to maize crop. (ii) (a) Clayey loam (Varanasi). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 28.10.1951. (iv) (a) 8 ploughiogs. (b) Sown in lines. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.3.1952.

TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar fodder-wheat.
5. Sanal for green manuring - wheat.
6. Early moong-wheat.

Hot weather cultivation was done on June 1, 1951. Sanai and guar were broadcast on July 4 and moong and maize sown in lines on July 5, 1951. Maize failed due to droughty condition, Sanal was turned in on Aug. 1951. Moong buried on Sept. 18, 19, Guar harvested on Sept. 9, and maize on Aug. 30, 1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(43^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}-3^{\prime \prime}\) (v) \(1^{\prime}\) between plots and \(8^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fair but the plants began to face mortality due to droughty conditions. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kanpur, Pratapgarh. Kalai and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vij) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(623 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(111.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatments & Av. yield \\
1. & 483 \\
2. & 553 \\
3. & 586 \\
4. & 469 \\
5. & 1041 \\
6. & 604 \\
S.E./mean & \(=39.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat.
Ref :- U.P. 52(14)/51(103)/50(65).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Object :-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume, green manure or a non-legume crop during kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam, Varanasi type (2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 28.10.1952. (iv) (a) Only hot weather plors were ploughed, field prepared in the last week of June and sowing of kharif crop on 4.7.1952. 3 subsequent ploughings for wheat and one palewa on 20.10.1952 (b) to (c) N.A. (v) Only maize was top dressed at 50 lb ./ac. of N. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow (monsoon cultivated)-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize (barvested on 22.8 .1952 and used as green fodder-wheat.
4. Guar (harvested on 22.8 .1952 and used as fodder) -wheat.
5. Sanai (turned in on 18-20 8.1952)-wheat.
6. Easly moong (two pickings, harvested and ploughed in on 9.9.1952)-wheat.

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(43^{\prime} \times 27.25^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) apart and blocks \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kalai, Pratapgarh, Matkota and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(556.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(106.2 \mathrm{Bb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 381.0 \\
2. & 450.7 \\
3. & 543.7 \\
4. & 474.0 \\
5. & 664.5 \\
6. & 822.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=37.54 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat. Ref :- U.P. 53(334)/52(14)/51(103)/50(65).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi. Type :- 'C'.
Object:-To study the effect of fallow with or without hot weather cultivation as compared to having legume, green manure or a non-legume crop during kharif on the yield of subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) \(\mathbf{N}\) as A/S top dressed to maize on 12.8.1953. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis. Varanasi. (iii) 18.11.1953. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation was given on 15.6.1953 after irrigating the 8 plots. Field ploughed on 2, 3.7.1953. 7 ploughings and palewa on 2.11.1953. (b) Seed drilled. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 1.75'. (c) 3, 4.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-wheat.
2. Hot weather cultivation-wheat.
3. Maize-wheat.
4. Guar for fodder-wheat.
5. Sanaf green manuring-wheat.
6. Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\)-wheat.

Moong after harvest turned in on 6.9.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(43^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}-3^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (ii) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Yield poor. The germination was uniform and good but maize and guar could not stand due to water lodging and they were almost completely wiped off. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Gazipur, Kalai, Kalyanpur and Raya. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(317.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(60.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) The treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 313.7 \\
2. & 259.1 \\
3. & 266.0 \\
4. & 268.4 \\
5. & 425.2 \\
6. & 371.1 \\
S.E./mean & \(=21.25 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref: 49(250).
Site :- B.R. College, Bichpuri.
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of harrowing and weeding on different Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loamy, (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College, Bichpuri. (iii) 29.10.1949. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings \(5^{4}\) deep by soil turning plough with no pata. Pata on 5.9.1949, 4 desi ploughings followed by pata, 3 ploughings and 1 harrowing. Last ploughing followed by para. (b) By help of Nai and plough. (c) 40 seers./ac. (d) Rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) As under treatments and 1 harrowing on 5th Dec. and cross harrowing on 6th Dec. (ix) N A. (x) 6, 7.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties :- \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) Local, \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{C} .13\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{Pb} 591\).
(2) 2 weedings: \(-W_{0}=\) No weeding and \(W_{1}=\) Weeding.
(3) 3 harrowings : \(-\mathrm{H}_{0}=\) No harrowing, \(\mathrm{H}_{1}=\) Harrowing and \(\mathrm{H}_{2}=\) Cross harrowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 18. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(19^{\prime} \times 53^{\prime}, 21^{\prime} \times 55^{\prime}, 21^{\prime} \times 53^{\prime}\) and \(19^{\circ} \times 55^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\circ} \times 45^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield etc. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.R. College.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1550 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(166.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only V effect is higbly significant. All other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{H}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) & Mean & \(W_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{W}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 1730 & 1778 & 1777 & 1762 & 1732 & 1454 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 1412 & 1198 & 1208 & 1273 & 1725 & 1347 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{8}\) & 1637 & 1632 & 1578 & 1616 & 1604 & 1438 \\
\hline Mean & 1593 & 1536 & 1521 & 1550 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{W}_{0}\) & 1937 & 1383 & 1741 & 1687 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{W}_{1}\) & 1587 & 1163 & 1490 & 1413 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of V or H \\
S.E of marginal mean of \(W\) \\
S E. of body of table \(\mathrm{V} \times \mathrm{H}\) \\
S.E. of body of table \(V \times W\) or \(H \times W\)
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =32.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =39.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =67.92 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =55.46 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 48(17).}

Type :- 'CV'.

Object:-To study the effect of shrivelled and plump seeds on the yield of Wheat varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G. M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5, 6.4.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{C - 1 3}\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (carly) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{Pb} 591\) (medium),
(2) 2 kinds of seeds: \(K_{1}=\) Plump and \(K_{2}=\) Shrivelled.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(32^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}-3^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times .75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Brown and black rust have attacked all types of varieties. Pb 591 is worst effecteddamage is considerable. Helminthosporium also present, (iii) Yield of fresh grain and bhusa and weight of dry grain. (iv) (a) 1947 to 1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1632 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(253.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1647 & 1480 & 1564 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1637 & 1706 & 1672 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1554 & 1761 & 1658 \\
\hline Mean & 1613 & 1649 & 1631
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(K\) S.E of the body of table
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =89.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =73.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =126.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.}
\end{aligned}
\]

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 49(37).
Type :-‘CV’.

Object :-To study the effect of shrivelled and plump seeds on the yield of Wheat varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.11.1949. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with victory plough, 2 ploughings with cultivator plough, 1 ploughing with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 80 lb./ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) 4 C.L. of F.Y.M. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigat=d. (viii) NiI. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of ( 1 ) and (2)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP} .125\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (medium).
(2) 2 kinds of seeds : \(K_{1}=\) Plump and \(K_{2}=\) Shrivelled.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(36^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}-9^{\circ}\). (b) \(32^{\circ} \times 14^{\circ}-3^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times .75^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Mild rust on stems and leaves. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2285 \quad\) lb./ac.
(ii) \(190.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Oaly V effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & Mea \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 2412 & 2223 & 2318 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 2395 & 2400 & 2398 \\
\hline \(V_{3}\) & 2185 & 2092 & 2138 \\
\hline Mean & 2331 & 2238 & 2285 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(K\)}} & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =67.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac.} \\
& =55.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.} \\
& =95.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 50(149).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of sbrivelled and plump seed on the yield of Wheat varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.An (iii) 29.10.1950. (iv) (a) Thorough ploughing with victory plough and 4 ploughings with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) Rows \(9{ }^{9}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Sanai as G.M. (vi) As fer treatments. (vii) As per treatments. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 25 and 26.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{C}-13\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{Pb}-591\) (medium).
(2) 2 kinds of seeds: \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Plump and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Shrivelled.
(3) 2 seed rates: \(R_{1}=80\) and \(R_{2}=105 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(23^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (vi) \(2^{\prime} \times .75^{\prime}\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal growth. C-13 lodged more than the other two varieties. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) The weather thìough out March has been abnormal. In the first half it was quite hot with winds blowing west ward. In the second half it was cloudy thioughout. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
3. RESULTS:
(i) \(2188 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
(ii) 214.1 lb /ac.
(iii) Only \(V\) effect is bighly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb, /ac.


\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :-U.P. 49(33).
Type:-‘CV’.
Object : -To stujy the effect of different varieties of Wheat sown on different dates.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with victory plough, i ploughing with cultivator plough, 2 ploughings with desi plough and 1 with spring harrow. (b) N.A. (c) \(2 \mathrm{ozs} . / \mathrm{plot}\). (d) \(18^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Sanai as G.M. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One hozing with hand hoe. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varietics: \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late).
(2) 8 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=17.10 .1949, D_{2}=24.10 .1949, D_{8}=17.11 .1949, D_{8}=24.11 .1949, D_{5}=27.11 .1949\). \(D_{6}=30.11 .1949, D_{7}=3.12 .1949\) and \(D_{8}=6.12 .1949\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(8 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(12^{\circ} \times 3^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Severe attack on leaves. Orange rust attacked the leaves and stem in general and to little extent the ears. Black rust symptoms in \(V_{3} D_{3}\) plot in one replieation. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A, (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by EB.(R).

5: RESULTS :
- (i) \(1527 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(278.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only D effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & D. & \(\mathrm{D}_{7}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 1756 & 1643 & 1934 & 1461 & 1692 & 1469 & 1035 & 1056 & 1506 \\
\hline \({ }^{\prime} \cdot \mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 1981 & 1635 & 1401 & \(15 \dot{47}\) & 1748 & 1450 & 1431 & 1192 & 1548 \\
\hline Mean & 1868 & 1639 & 1668 & 1504 & 1720 & 1460 & 1233 & 1124 & 1527 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\)
S.E. of body of table

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =50.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =101.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =139.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of different varieties of Wheat sown on different dates.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with victory plough and 4 with desi plough. (b) and (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Sanai as G.M. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS: :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(V_{1}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{8}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late).
(2) 8 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=10.10 .1950, D_{2}=17.10 .1950, D_{3}=25.10 .1950, D_{4}=31.10 .1950, D_{5}=7.11 .1950\), \(D_{8}=14.1 \mathrm{~J} .1950, D_{7}=21.11 .1950\) and \(D_{8}=28.11 .1950\).
3. DESIGV:
(i) \(8 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}-9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Rust incidence. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(2725 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(865.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(V\) and \(D\) effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\dot{V}_{1}{ }^{\text {a }}\) & 1991 & 1867 & 1784 & 2821 & 3319 & 2821 & 2780 & 2572 & 2494 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 2738 & 2240 & 2614 & 3443 & 3443 & 3402 & 2780 & 2987 & 2956 \\
\hline Mean & 2364 & 2054 & 2199 & 3132 & 3381 & 3112 & 2780 & 2780 & 2725 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) & \(=306.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) & \\
S.E. of body of table & \\
& \(=433.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site ;-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 51(31).
Type :-'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of different varieties of Wheat sown on different dates.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Charl. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with desi plough, 1 with watts, plough and 1 with cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) 80 lb ./ac. (d) Rows 9 apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late).
(2) 8 sowing dates : \(-D_{1}=12.10 .1951, D_{2}=19.10 .1951, D_{3}=2.11 .1951, D_{4}=9.11 .1951 ;, D_{5}=16.11 .1951\), \(D_{6}=23.11 .1951, D_{7}=30.11 .1951\) and \(D_{8}=7.12,1951\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(8 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 in two flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime} .9^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good; no lodging. (ii) The disease incidence was recorded at an advanced stage of plant growth (latet in the season). NP. 125 had heavy attack of orange rust on the leaves and stem, mostly on the lower portions of the plant. Pb. 591 had a mild attack of orange rust only on the leaves in the lower portion of the plants. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv, (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) ro. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B (R). The preparation of the field was absolutely neglected. After 2 sowings it was irrigated exactly on the date of 3rd sowing i.e. 26.10.1951 and so the sowing bad to be postponed to the next week and during irrigation no care was taken of either the lay out or the sown plots and ridges were formed hapazardly totally injuring the sown plots. The plan was relaid and the experimental area was got levelled with the khurpi. It will be better if the 2 sowings are considered to be lost and the plots are sown on appropriate dates following 7.12.1951 sowing. But actually it was not practiced.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(834 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(383.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) D and V effects are highly significant while interaction is not signsficant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & D1 & D1 & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & D 6 & \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{7}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 187 & 560 & 1307 & 1042 & 996 & 871 & 140 & 311 & \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 132 & 1322 & 1680 & 1385 & 1525 & 1011 & 459 & 412 & 991 \\
\hline Mean & 160 & 941 & 1494 & 1214 & 1260 & 941 & 3 CO & 362 & 834 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of V \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) \\
S E. of body of table
\end{tabular}} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =67.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =135.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =191.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 48(12). \\
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. . & Type :-'CV'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To find out optimum so wing date and seed rate for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sartai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18, 19.4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seed rates: \(R_{1}=80\) and \(R_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=15.10 .1948, D_{8}=22.10 .1948\) and \(D_{3}=29.10 .1948\).
(3) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\circ} \times 16.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(2 \times .75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Fresh and dry grain yield. (iv) (a) 1947 to 195t. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1678 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(294.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & D8 & Mean & \(\mathrm{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 1585 & 1640 & 1564 & 1596 & 1508 & 1684 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1925 & 1763 & 1588 & 1759 & 1762 & 1755 \\
\hline Mean & 1755 & 1702 & 1576 & 1678 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 1753 & 1581 & 1571 & 1635 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R g}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 1757 & 1822 & 1581 & 1720 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E of the marginal mean of \(R\) or \(V\) S.E. of the marginal mean of \(D\) S.E. of body of table \(R \times D\) or \(V \times D\) S.E. of body of table \(R \times V\)
\(=60.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=73.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=104.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(-85.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 49(34).
Type :- 'CV'.
Object :-To find out optimum sowing date and seed rate for Wheat varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 5 with victory plough 2 to 3 with cultivator plough, 3 with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Sanai as G.M. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 to 2 hoeings with hand hoe. (ix) N.A. (x) 6 to 8.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) \({ }^{-} 2\) seed rates: \(R_{1}=80 \mathrm{lb}\), /ac. and \(R_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 sowing dates: \(\mathrm{D}_{1}=17.10 .1949, \mathrm{D}_{2}=24.10 .1949\) and \(\mathrm{D}_{2}=9.11 .1949\).
(3) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{C}-13\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Pb}\). 591 (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 . (b)
(b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv)
(a) \(29^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime} \times 17^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\).
(b) \(25^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime} \times 15-9^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \frac{3^{\prime \prime}}{}{ }^{\prime}\)
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Postules of orange rust and black rust spols were observed in traces on few plants. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1947 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A, (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
, 5. RESULTS :
(i) 183 l lb./ac.
(ii) \(338.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(V\) effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 1683 & 1739 & 1697 & 1706 & 1610 & 1803 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 2035 & 2042 & 1788 & 1955 & 1934 & 1976 \\
\hline Mean & 1859 & 1890 & 1743 & 1831 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{1}\) & 1838 & 1824 & 1655 & 1772 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{2}\) & 1880 & 1957 & 1831 & 1889 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{4}{*}{\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) or \(V\) & \(=69.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) & \(=84.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table \(R \times D\) or \(V \times D\) & \(-119.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table \(R \times V\) & \(=97.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}}} \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 50(148).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To find out optimum sowing date and seed rate for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1950, 2.11 .1950 and 8.11.1950. . (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing-2 with victory plough and 6 with desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and 100 lb /ac. (d) Distance between rows \(9^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) 16 C.L. of P.Y.M. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seed rates: \(R_{1}=80\) and \(R_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=27.10 .1950, D_{2}=2.11 .1950\) and \(D_{8}=8.11 .1950\).
(3) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(34^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime} \cdot 9^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good, about \(10 \%\) lodging was observed in C-13. (ii) No smut was observed and the rust was al:o not very prominent. (iii) Yield of dry grain. (iv) (a) 1947-1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1745 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(270.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) or \(V\) & \(=55.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) & \\
S.E. of body of table \(R \times D\) or \(V \times D\) & \\
S.E. of body of table \(R \times V\) & \\
& \(=95.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{lac}\). \\
&
\end{tabular}
Crop : - Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. \(\quad . \quad\) Ref :-U.P. 51(32).
Type :-‘CV'.

Object :-To find out optimum sowing date and seed rate for Wheat varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) Moong. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 4 desi plough, 1 spring fine harrow and i victory plough. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) Not recorded. (x) 21.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All the combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seed rates: \(R_{1}=80\) and \(R_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=3.11 .1951, D_{2}=14.11 .1951\) and \(D_{3}=25.11 .1951\).
(3) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{C - 1 3}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Pb}\). 591 .
3. DESIGN :
(i) (a) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 in two flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(34^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}-9^{\circ}\). (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 11^{\circ}-3^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{3}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. No lodging except in Block IV, on \(R_{1} D_{2} V_{1}\) plots; only \(1 / 3\) plants lodged. (ii) In early stage of growth there was no disease but at the later stage the stem and leaves of each plant was nildly affected by orange rust. (iii) Germination and graio yield. (iv) a) 1947 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R). The \(12^{\prime}\) gap between blocks is to provide enough turning space for bullocks at different dates of sowing. After the last sowings are over, these gaps are to be sown with C-13 as commercial crop, leaving about \(3^{\prime \prime}\) on each side of the plot.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(779 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(360.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant. .
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{R}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 830 & 983 & 788 & 867 & 885 & 849 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 734 & 527 & 811 & 691 & 684 & 697 \\
\hline Mean & 782 & 755 & 800 & 779 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow{3}{*}{:}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 811 & 697 & 846 & 785 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R 2}_{2}\) & 753 & 813 & 753 & 773 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) or \(V\) & \(=73.67 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) & \(=90.23 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table \(R \times D\) or \(V \times D\) & \(=127.61 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table \(R \times V\) & \(=104.19 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

> Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
> Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(43).
Type :-‘CV'.

Object :-To find out the optimum sowing date for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai (G.M.) (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Furrows were made with kudali. (c) 80 lb ,/ac. (d) Row \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) One weeding on 18.12.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) 31.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{C}-13, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP}-125, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{NP}-710\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{4}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\).
(2) 4 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=23.10 .1952, D_{2}=30.10 .1952, D_{3}=6.11 .1952\) and \(D_{4}=13.11 .1952\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 in two flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes,

\section*{4CGENERAL :}
(i) Unsatisfactory. Lodging io some plots. (ii) Very little traces of smut disease, rust incidence also to the extent of 1 to \(20 \%\). (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952 -continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(2688 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(522.82 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & D \({ }_{\text {c }}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 3072 & 2359 & 2774 & 2748 & 2738 \\
\hline \(v_{1}\) & 2956 & 2489 & 2606 & 2619 & 2668 \\
\hline \(V_{3}\) & 2710 & 2787 & 3047 & 3021 & 2891 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{4} \cdot\) & 2463 & 2282 & 2437 & 2645 & 2457 \\
\hline Mean & 2800 & 2479 & 2716 & 2758 & 2688 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{S.E. of any marginal mead S.E of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =130.70 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =261.41 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :- U.P. 53(84).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object:-To find out optimum sowing dates for wheat varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Samai-wheat. (b) Sanai green manure. (c) Nil. (ii) (a)'Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory plough and 1 cultivator; 1 spring harrow and pata 2 desl plough and pata. (b) Behind the plough. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 12.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 varieties: \(V_{1}=\mathbf{C - 1 3}, V_{g}=N P-125, V_{8}=\) NP-710 and \(V_{4}=P b .591\).
(2) 4 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=26.10 .1953, D_{2}=2.11 .1953, D_{2}=9.11 .1953\) and \(D_{4}=16.11 .1953\).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 plots (in 2 flanks of 8 plots each). (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(18^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (b) 18' \(\times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair, no lodging was observed at all during the expt. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952 -continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt, was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1794, \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(418.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(D_{z}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & D4 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{I}}\) & 1996 & 1621 & 1802 & 1491 & 1728 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 1984 & 1815 & 1996 & 1958 & 1938 \\
\hline Vs & 1893 & 1569 & 1906 & 1556 & 1731 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{4}\) & 1854 & 2009 & 1802 & 1452 & 1779 \\
\hline Mean & 1932 & 1754 & 1876 & 1614 & 1794 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { S.E of any marginal mean } & =104.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =209.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 48(18).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate and spacing on the yield of Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1948. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) \& (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2 and 4. 4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) \& (3).
(1) 2 seed rates : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 spacings between rows : \(S_{1}=9^{\circ}\) and \(S_{2}=18^{\prime \prime}\).
(3) 2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13\), and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{Pb}\). 591 .
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2^{\prime}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(35^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(31^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}-3^{3^{\circ}}\) (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime \prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of fresh and dry grain. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1366 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(209.60 \mathrm{lb}-\mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only S effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1 b ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{2}\) & \(S_{9}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 1397 & 1233 & 1315 & 1370 & 1261 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1495 & 1339 & 1417 & 1374 & 1460 \\
\hline Mean & 1446 & 1286 & 1366 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{\(\cdots\)}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 1464 & 1280 & 1372 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1428 & 1292 & 1360 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad=52.40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of any table \(\quad=74.10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 49(36).
Type :m'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate and spacing on the yield of Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Maizo. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.11.1949. (iv) (a) Ploughings-2 with victory plougb, 4 with cultivator and 1 with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) land (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments, (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 12, 13.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of \({ }^{*}\) (1), (2) and (3)
(I) 2 seed rates : \(R_{1}=40\) and \(R_{8}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 spacings between rows: \(S_{1}=9^{\circ}\) and \(S_{2}=18^{\circ}\).
(3) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(35^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime} .9^{\circ}\). (b) \(31^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ} .6^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 131^{\prime \prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) A very few pustules of orange rust followed by black rust later on. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1664 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(298.26 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{8}\) & Mean & .\(_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{R}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 1785 & 1729 & 1757 & 1794 & 1721 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 1583 & 1557 & 1570 & 1462 & 1678 \\
\hline Mean & 1684 & 1643 & 1664 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{1}\) & 1596 & 1660 & 1628 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{2}\) & 1772 & 1626 & 1699 & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=74.56 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=105.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:wU.P. 50(150).
Type:-'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate, spacing and earth:ng on lodging and final yield of Wheat varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanat. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1950. (iv) (a) 3 plougbings wiih victory plough and 5 with desi ploughs. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) and (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring by Sanoi. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 27, 28.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seedrates: \(R_{1}=40\) and \(R_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 spacings and earthing up : \(S_{1}=9^{\prime \prime}\) between rows (unearthed), \(S_{2}=18^{\prime \prime}\) between rows (unearthed) and \(S_{3}=18^{\circ}\) between rows (earthed).
(3) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Pb}\). 591 (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(23^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime} .9^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\circ} \times 10^{\prime} .6^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 13 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2310 lb./ac.
(ii) \(200.90 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) or \(R \quad=41.00 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(S . E\), of marginal mean of \(S \quad=50.22 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
S.E. of body of table \(V \times S\) or \(R \times S\)
\(=71.03 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(V \times R\)
\(=57.99 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. SubmStn. Kunraghat.

Ref:- UP. 48(15).
Type:- 'CV'.

Object :-To find out the optimum sowing dates for wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sawan. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) Ploughings by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 6 C.L. of cowdung and 1 md./ac. of A/S. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.4.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) NP-125 (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) NP- 52 (early).
(2) 4 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=22.10 .1948, D_{2}=29.10 .1948, D_{3}=5.11 .1948\) and \(D_{4}=12.11 .1948\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(37^{\circ} \times 19.5^{\circ}\). (v) One row on either side and \(1.5^{\prime}\) at each end of the plot. \(2^{\prime}\) between varieties and \(5^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Attack of rust-abnormal. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1945-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Meerut, Nagina and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Feb. rainfall of \(1.86^{\circ}\) prolonged maturity and the western winds during the flowering time, all combined togather shrivelled the grains very much and hence the poor yield was obtained than expected. (vii) Conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(361.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(78.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{D}\) and V effects are highly significant and interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 427.3 & 270.7 & 206.6 & 200.9 & 276.4 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 517.0 & 475.4 & 477.3 & 319.8 & 447.4 \\
\hline Mean & 472.2 & 373.0 & 342.0 & 260.4 & 361.9
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of crarginal mean of } D & =27.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of marginal mean of } V & =19.73 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =39.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.
Ref:- U.P. 48(47).
Type :- 'CV'.
Object :-To find out the optimum sowing dates for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 9 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 80 lb ./ac. (d) Rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (c) N.A. (v) Sanai green manuring ploughed in by victory plough on 30.9.1948. (vil As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing and weeding on 27.12.1948 by iron tooth bar harrow. (ix) 2.65". (x) 27, 28.4.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combination of (1) and (2)
( 1 ) 2 varieties: \(\mathbf{V}_{1}=\mathrm{Pb}-591\) (late) and \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) NP-125 (medium).
(2) 5 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=20.10 .1948, D_{2}=27.10 .1948, D_{2}=5.11 .1948, D_{4}=12.11 .1948\) and \(D_{5}=19.11 .1948\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (i) (a) 10. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}-6^{\circ}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (v) One row on either sids and If' at each end of the plot. Blocks \(20^{\prime}\) apart and plots \(4^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Incidence of rust. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1950, (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Gorakbpur, Nagina and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) Conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2235 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 146.1 lb ./ac.
(iii) V effect is significant, D effect is highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}\).


Crop :-Wheat.
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.

Ref: U.P. 49(109).
Type :- 'CV'.
'Object:-To find out the optimum sowing dates for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai (G.M.). (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam (light). (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 9 times desi plough ; ridge making on 19.11.1949. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 80 lb ./ac. (d) Rows \(6^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Sanai green manuring turning with victory plough on 28.8.1949. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) No. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.4.1950 to 24.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (medium).
(2) 5 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=20.10 .1949, D_{2}=27.10 .1949, D_{3}=5.11 .1949, \quad D_{4}=12.11 .1949\) and \(\mathbf{D}_{5}=\) 19.11.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (v) One row on either side and \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) at each end of the plot. Blocks \(22^{\prime}\) and plots \(4^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of rust in all the plots except in both varieties sown on 5.11.1949 and 12.11.1949 where they were very much affected. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Raya and Kanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2359 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 173.99 Ib /ac.
(iii) Both V and D effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(D_{5}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 2393 & 2537 & 2489 & 2409 & 2385 & 2443. \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 2170 & 2533 & 2421 & 2114 & 2142 & 2276 \\
\hline Mean & 2282 & 2535 & 2455 & 2262 & 2263 & 2359 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\)
\end{tabular}}} & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =38.90 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =61.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=87.00 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop: : Wheat.
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.
Object :-To find out optimum sowing dates for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Cowpea guar. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough 6 by desi plough, (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding by khurpi on 3.1.1951, 7.1.1951. (ix) \(4.45^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 24, 25.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) \(\div 2\) varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (medium).
(2) 5 sowing dates : \(\quad D_{1}=20.10 .1950, \quad D_{2}=27.10 .1950, \quad D_{3}=5.11 .1950, \quad D_{4}=12.11 .1950\) and \(D_{5}=19.11 .1950\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\). (v) Distance between block 5 ; distance between plots 2'. One row on either side at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Rust in plots sown on 12.11 .1950 and 19.11.1950. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(2698 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(236.03 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av.gield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
& \(-\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2723 & 2667 & 2716 & 2660 & 2737 & 2701 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2723 & 2534 & 2828 & 2751 & 2646 & 2696 \\
\hline Mean & 2723 & 2600 & 2772 & 2706 & 2691 & 2698
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\)
\(=52.80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) \(=83.45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=118.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat.
Site :-Rice Res. Stn., Nagina.

Ref:-U.P. 48(13).
Type :-‘CV’.

Object:-To find out the optimum sowing dates for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 22, 29.10.1948 and 5, 12.11.1948. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings by desi plough and 1 harrowing. (b) N.A. (c) 106 lb ./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 10 md./ac. as castor cake. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (early).
(2) 4 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=22.10 .1948, D_{2}=29.10 .1948, D_{3}=5.11 .1943\) and \(D_{4}=12.11 .1948\).

\section*{3.TDESIGN :}
(i) \(2 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 20.5^{\prime}\) (b) \(351^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\). (v) Distance betweeo blocks \(3^{\prime}\). Distance between varieties \(1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}{ }^{\prime}\). One row on either side and one foot at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.

GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. Normal growth, (ii) There was some rust in late sown plots of variety NP-125. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Meerut, Gorakhpur and Raya. (b) N,A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1427 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(136.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(D\) effect is highly significant while other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|cccc|c} 
& \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{0}\) & \(D_{8}\) & \(D_{1}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 1533 & 1586 & 1404 & 1335 & 1464 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1556 & 1546 & 1382 & 1075 & 1390 \\
\hline Mean & 1544 & 1566 & 1393 & 1205 & 1427
\end{tabular}
S.E of marginal mean of \(V\)
-S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) S.E. of body of table
\(=27.89 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=39.44 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=55.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :-U.P. 48(46).
Type: : \({ }^{\prime}\) CV'.

Object :-To find out the optimum sowing date for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Cotton. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory plough ; 6 by desi and harrowing on 23.10.1948. (b) Sown bebind the plough. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(18^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring with sanai. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing with khurpi on 12.4.1948 and weeding with khurpi on 22 and 26.1.1949. (ix) N A. (x) 1, 6 and 11.4.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{NP}-125\) (medium).
(2) 5 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=25.10 .1948, D_{2}=1.11 .1948, D_{3}=8.11 .1948, D_{4}=22.11 .1948\) and
\[
\mathrm{D}_{5}=24.11 .1948
\]
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 5\) Fuct. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(32^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}-9^{\prime}\). (b) \(17^{\prime}-3^{\circ} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side, 11' on each side. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of dry grain. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Gorakhpur, Nagina and Meerut. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1213 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(196.81 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only V effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & D4 & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 1321 & 1170 & 1338 & 1310 & 1405 & 1309 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 1019 & 963 & 1299 & 1220 & 1086 & 1117 \\
\hline Mean & 1170 & 1066 & 1318 & 1265 & 1246 & 1213 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S E. of marginal mean of \(V\) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =44.06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =69.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =98.40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]}} & \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :- U.P. 49(110).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To find out the optimum sowing dates for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by victory plough, 4 ploughings by cultivator and 4 desi ploughings. (b) Sown behind tho plough. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Sanai as green manuring. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding with khurpi on 20, 22.12.1959. Only weeds taken out on 5, 6.2.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1950 and 22.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP} .125\) (medium).
(2) 5 sowing dates: \(\mathrm{D}_{1}=20.10 .1949, \mathrm{D}_{2}=27.10 .1949, \mathrm{D}_{3}=5.11 .1949, \mathrm{D}_{4}=12.11 .1949\) and \(D_{5}=19.11 .1949\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime} .9^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(29^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime} .3^{\prime \prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(11^{\prime}\) apart at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Dry grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1950. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Meerut, Kanpur (with 8 sowing dates). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1061 lb./ac.
(ii) \(200.01 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only D effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yicld of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & D8 & D. & D5 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 1013 & 1209 & 1052 & 1052 & 845 & 1034 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 1243 & 1243 & 1209 & 1164 & 582 & 1088 \\
\hline Mean & 1128 & 1226 & 1130 & 1108 & 714 & 1061 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V \quad=44.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D \quad=70.72 \mathrm{lb} . / a c_{0}\)
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=100.00 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Type :_‘CV’。

Object :-To find out the optimum sowing dates for Wheat varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 2 victory ploughings and 3 desi ploughings. (b) Sown behind desi plough. (c) 80 srs./ac. (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (c) N.A. (v) Green manuring by Sanai. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding affer 25 days of each sowing. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{Pb} .591\) (late) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP} .125\) (medium).
(2) 5 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=20.10 .1950, D_{8}=27.10 .1950, D_{8}=5.11 .1950, D_{4}=12.11 .1950^{\circ}\) and \(D_{5}=19.11 .1950\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 19^{\circ} .6^{\circ}\). (b) \(29^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}\). (v) One row on either side and \(1 \mathrm{l}^{\prime}\) at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Sutisfactory. (ii) Traces of rust. (iii) Dry grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1950. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Meerot. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1784 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(325.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) No effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & \(D_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 2039 & 1926 & 1738 & 1695 & 1577 & 1795 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 1706 & 1878 & 1695 & 1996 & 1588 & 1773 \\
\hline Mean & 1872 & 1902 & 1716 & 1845 & 1582 & 1784 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\)
\(=72.76 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=115.06 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(=162.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 52(124).}

Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate, manure and time of sowing on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings with watts plough. (b) N.A. (c) and (d) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) \(D_{1}=4.4 .1953\) and \(D_{2}=11.4 .1953\).
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 seed rates: \(S_{2}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30, S_{4}=40, S_{5}=50\) and \(S_{6}=60\) srs./ac.
(2) 2 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=21.11 .1952\) and \(D_{2}=5.12 .1952\).

Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures : \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=3 \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{L} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of F.Y.M. as B.D., \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as pot. sul, \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{3}}\) as Super and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 12 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(20^{\circ} \times 21^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime} \quad\) (v) \(11^{\prime}\) on all sides. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Etawah, Meerut, Aligarh and Bahraich. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1224 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(56.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(61.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{fac}\).
(iii) All the effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & S \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{3}\) & \(S_{4}\) & \(S_{5}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{6}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 938 & 968 & 1048 & 929 & 933 & 1075 & 982 & 1072 & 891 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1046 & 1320 & 1215 & 1169 & 1137 & 1430 & 1219 & 1359 & 1080 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 1256 & 1368 & 1615 & 1617 & 1444 & 1524 & 1471 & 1674 & 1267 \\
\hline Mean & 1080 & 1219 & 1293 & 1238 & 1171 & 1343 & 1224 & 1368 & 1079 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 1074 & 1418 & 1542 & 1345 & 1200 & 1630 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 1086 & 1019 & 1043 & 1132 & 1142 & 1055 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline 1. \(S\) marginal means & & \(=16.29 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 2. D marginal means & & \(=9.41 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 3. N marginal means & & \(=12.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 4. N means at a level of S & & \(=30.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 5. N means at a level of \(D\) & & \(=17.85 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 6. S means at a level of N & & \(=30.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), \\
\hline 7. D means at a level of \(\mathbf{N}\) & & \(=17.34 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
\hline S.E. of body of \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{S}\) table & & \(=16.29 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
Crop :- Wheaí. & Ref.:- U.P. 53(156). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra. & Type :- ‘CM’.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of seed rate and manure on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Cereal-Cereal. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.11.1953. (iv) (a) 4 plough. . ings. (b) Sown by local seed drill. (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb-591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{8}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40\) srs./ac.
Sub-plot treatments:
3 manures: \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=45 \mathrm{md}\)./ac. of F.Y.M. on green manured field applied 2 weeks before sowing as B.D. \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac, of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=60\). \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot Sul and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main : \(27^{\circ} \times 84^{\circ}\). Sub: \(27^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) Sub \(-24^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) on all sides. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Kalai, Meerut and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (iv) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{RESULTS :}
(i) 865 lb./ac.
(ii) (a) \(19.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(15.39 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All effect are highly significant.
(iv). Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrr|r} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 763 & 684 & 954 & 800 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 861 & 623 & 777 & 754 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1223 & 1120 & 770 & 1038 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 758 & 1071 & 777 & 869 \\
\hline Mean & 901 & 875 & 820 & .865
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal means
\(=7.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means
\(=5.44 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\).
\(=10.88 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(N\)
\(=11.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.
}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :-U P. } 52(118) . \\
& \text { Type :-‘CM’. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate, manure and time of sowing on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcanc. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 9 ploughings by desi and victory plough. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP. 52 (mid-early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix, N.A. (x) 3 and 4.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30_{2} S_{4}=40_{2} S_{5}=50\) and \(S_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=6.11 .1952\) and \(D_{2}=23.11 .1952\).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

3 manures : \(N_{1}=3\) C.L./ac. of F.Y.M. as B.D., \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) \(+20 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul., \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and CaO as Gypsum on 30.10.1952 and 5.11.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 12 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(38^{\prime} \times 13^{\circ}\). (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{2}\) on either aide. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Normal. (ii) Yellow rust 35\%. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1953 . (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Etawah, Banda, Meerut and Aligarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1129 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(339.4 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(203.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of \(D\) is bighly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & S2 & S3 & \(S_{4}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{5}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1130 & 1284 & 1162 & 1206 & 1046 & 1270 & 1183 & 1235 & 1131 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1096 & 994 & 1036 & 1230 & 1072 & 1184 & 1102 & 1222 & 982 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 1172 & 1196 & 1124 & 1078 & 976 & 1070 & 1103 & 1199 & 1007 \\
\hline Mean & 1133 & 1158 & 1107 & 1171 & 1031 & 1175 & 1129 & 1219 & 1040 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 1332 & 1167 & 1167 & 1209 & 1159 & 1277 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}} \ldots\) & 933 & 1149 & 1048 & 1133 & 904 & 1072 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of differences of two
1. \(S\) marginal means
\(\doteq 97.99 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. D marginal means
\(=56.57 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N marginal means
4. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at a level of \(\mathbf{S}\)
\(=41.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. \(N\) means at a level of \(D\)
\(=101.90 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. \(S\) means at a level of N
\(=58.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. D means at a level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=128.55 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{D} \times \mathrm{S}\) table
\(=74.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=97.99 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop:-Wheat.}

Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref :-U.P. 53(210).
Type :-‘CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of seedrate and manure on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 6,11.1953. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings. (b) Sown by seed arill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NP-52. . (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments:
4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40\) srs.7ac.
Sub-plot treatments:
3 manures: \(N_{1}=\) F.Y.M. at 45 mds./ac. on green manured field applied 2 weeks before sowing as B.D. \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+15 \mathrm{lb}\). \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=60\) lb./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). CaO.
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum on 2.11.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) 4 main-pk ts/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(27^{\circ} \times 28^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\circ} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.

4 GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Wheat rust. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v)
(a) Banaras, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Attara, Kalai, Gorakhpur, Meerut, Faizabad and Lucknow. (b) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1518 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(402.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(3151 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}\) Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1551 & 1518 & 1318 & 1462 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1488 & 1285 & 1586 & 1453 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1621 & 1603 & 1558 & 1593 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1605 & 1525 & 1563 & 1564 \\
\hline Mean & 1566 & 1482 & 1506 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{rl} 
1. \(S\) marginal means & \(=116.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(N\) marginal means & \(=78.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\) & \\
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(N\) & \(=222.85 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
& \(=247.53 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.
Ref :- U.P. 52(113).
Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate, manures and time of sowing on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings with watts cultivator and desi plough and turning of G.M. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) '10, 11, 12.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
All combintions of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30, S_{4}=40, S_{8}=50\) and \(S_{6}=60 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=31.10 .1952\) and \(D_{2}=15.11 .1952\).

Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures : \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=3\) C.L. ac. of F.Y.M. as B.D., \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{CaO}, \mathrm{N}_{3}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+20\) lb.jac. of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 12 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(38^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (b) \(35^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{1}\) on all sides. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Slight attack of wheat rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Banda, Meerut, Aligarh, Baharaich. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1295 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(357.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(289.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{D}\) and N are bighly significant. All interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yicld of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{4}\) & \(S_{5}\) & \(S_{0}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & D2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 620 & 934 & 1196 & 1318 & 1450 & 1350 & 1145 & 1211 & 1079 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 616 & 1154 & 1384 & 1693 & 1444 & 1644 & 1323 & 1456 & 1190 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 726 & 1383 & 1613 & 1684 & 1568 & 1526 & 1417 & 1555 & 1279 \\
\hline Mean & 654 & 1157 & 1398 & 1565 & 1487 & 1507 & 1295 & 1407 & 1183 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 666 & 1456 & 1527 & 1653 & 1629 & 1511 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}} \cdot\) & 642 & 858 & 1269 & 1478 & 1346 & 1503 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two


Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

Ref:- U.P. 53(112).
Type:- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of spacing and manures on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. applied two weeks before sowing. (vi) Pb. 591 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40\) srs/ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures : \(N_{1}=\) F.Y.M. at 45 mds./ac, on green manured field applied 2 weeks before sowing as B.D. \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{CaO}, \mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) on all sides. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Kanpur, Banda, Aligarh, Meerut, Babaraich, Gorakbpur and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(19 \mathrm{CO} \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(401.0 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(329.8 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) S effect is highly significant, N effect is significant ; interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline of grain in lb./ac. & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 1335 & 1232 & 1255 & 1274 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 1928 & 1923 & 2268 & 2040 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 1680 & 2189 & 2595 & 2155 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{4}\) & 1867 & 2362 & 2166 & 2132 \\
\hline Mean & 1702 & 1926 & 2071 & 1900 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{S.E. of differsnce of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1. S marginal means} & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2. N marginal means} & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{3. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at a level of \(S\)} & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{4. S means at a level of N} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Crop :"Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.
}

Ref :-U.P. 53(61).
Type :-‘CM'.
Object :-To study the effect of seedrate and manures on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong and Lobia. \({ }^{\text {( }}\) (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.19;3. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with praja cultivator and desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.P.-52(medium early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{2}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40\) srs./ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures: \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) F.Y.M. at 3 C.L./ac, in case the field is green manured, 6 C.L./ac. in case the field is - not green manured, \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+\) \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ace}\) of CaO . and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}+30 \mathrm{lb}\), /ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30\) lb.Jac. of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul, and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) Sub-plot: \(27^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\); main-plot \(27^{\prime} \times 84^{\prime}\). (b) Sub-plot : \(24^{\circ} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) on all sides. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) \(30 \%\) attack by rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a), (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Etawah, Kanpur, Banda, Aligarh, Meerut, Babaraich, Gorakhpur and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(537.3 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(106.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) (b) \(86.43 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) S and N effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{N s}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 261.4 & 515.7 & 553.1 & 443.4 \\
\hline \(S_{8}\) & 345.4 & 569.4 & 599.7 & 504.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & 396.7 & 693.1 & 646.4 & 578.7 \\
\hline S & 387.4 & 784.1 & 695.4 & 622.3 \\
\hline Mean & 347.7 & 640.6 & 623.6 & 537.3 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{S E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{1. \(S\) marginal means} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=43.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{2. N marginal means} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=30.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=61.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{4. S means at a level of \(N\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=66.23 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat.
Ref:- U.P. 53(207).
Site :- Govt. Agri. School Farm, Gorakhpur.
Object:-To study the effect of seed rates and manures on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil, (b) N,A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Last week of October. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) By improved seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 592 . (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{8}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40 \mathrm{srs} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 manures : \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) F.Y.M. at 3 C.L./ac. in case the field is green manured, 6 C.L./ac. in case the field is not green manured, \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of CaO . and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A}_{\mathbf{\prime}} \mathrm{S}_{5} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(27^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\) (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Below normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad. Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Kalai, Meerut, Lucknow and Bahraich. -(vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) . \(585 \quad \mathrm{Ib}\) /ac.
(ii) (a) \(102.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(108.1 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N effect alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 595 & 658 & 434 & 562 \\
\hline S & 522. & 753 & 553 & 609 \\
\hline \(S_{8}\) & \(651^{\circ}\) & 618 & 492 & 587 \\
\hline \(S_{4}\) & 609 & 632 & 506 & 582 \\
\hline Mean & 594 & 665 & 496 & 585 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. S marginal means \(\quad=29.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means
3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)
\(=27.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(N\)
\(=76.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=75.10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). &.\(\quad\) Ref:- U.P. 52(121). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai. & Type :- ‘CM’.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of seed rate, manure and date of sowing on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize and Kakun. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 9 ploughings with Gujar, desi and cultivator ploughs. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb.-591 (mid late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 seed rates : \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30, S_{4}=40, S_{5}=50\) and \(S_{4}=60\) ars./ac
(2) 2 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=9.11 .1952\) and \(D_{1}=24.11 .1952\)

Sub-plot treatments:
3 manures : \(N_{1}=3\) C.L./ac. of P.Y.M. as B.D., \(N_{2}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{8}+5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+20\) \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{5}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{B}}\) as \(\mathrm{Super}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot . Sul. and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 12 main-plots/block : 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(38^{\prime} \times 13^{\circ}\). (b) \(35^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) 1 I' alround the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras Etawah, Banda, Meerut and Bahraich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by. C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1379 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(301,2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(233.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{N}\) and D are highly dignificant. Interaction \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{D}\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & S & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{A}}\) & S & \(S_{6}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 784 & 1032 & 1136 & 1072 & 1168 & 1176 & 1061 & 1081 & 1041 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 1080 & 1496 & 1296 & 1712 & 1628 & 1632 & 1474 & 1599 & 1350 \\
\hline Na & 1360 & 1512 & 1504 & 1772 & 1676 & 1792 & 1603 & 1759 & 1447 \\
\hline Mean & 1074 & 1347 & 1312 & 1519 & 1491 & 1533 & 1379 & 1480 & 1279 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 1176 & 1523 & 1451 & 1552 & 1550 & 1627 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 973 & 1171 & 1173 & 1486 & 1432 & 1440 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3.B. of difference of two


Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

> Ref :- U.P. 53(105).

Type :- ‘CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate and manure on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Guar fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploaghinga (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb-591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil (ix) N.A. (x) 9.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{8}=20, S_{8}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40\) ars./ac.
Sab-plot treatments :
3 manures: \(N_{1}=3\) C.L./ac. of P.Y.M. in case the field is green manured, 6 C.L./ac. in case the field is not green manured, \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{3}}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) \(+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). ofK \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30\) \(\mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\). of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(27^{\circ} \times 28^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satiṣactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, At-arra, Meerut and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1211 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(286.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(215.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Ooly N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & N & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 849 & 1139 & 1260 & 1083 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 952 & 1167 & 1521 & 1213 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & 1059 & 1465 & 1400 & 1308 \\
\hline \(S_{4}\) & 989 & 1139 & 1587 & 1238 \\
\hline Mean & 962 & 1228 & 1442 & 1211 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E of difference of two
1. S marginal means
\(=116.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means
\(=76.01 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)
\(=152.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(S\) meäns at a level of \(N\)
\(=170.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(187).
Type :-'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate, manure and date of sowing on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) .A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{2}=30, S_{4}=40, S_{5}=50\) and \(S_{8}=60\) seer/ac.
(2) 2 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=5.11 .1952\) and \(D_{4}=18.11\).1952.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

3 manures : \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=3\) C.L./ac. of F.Y.M. as B.D., \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}+5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) \(+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{CaO}_{2}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{8}}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}+20\) lb ./ac. of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum. \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) applied to the entire field \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) applied 3 days before sowing. Super placed \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in the soil behind the plough. Gypsum and Fot. Sul. applied as surface dressing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot, (ii) (a) 12 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 23^{\circ}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad Etawah, Banda, Meerut, Aligarh, Gorakhpur, Bahraich and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1910 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(310.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(136.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant, \(S\) effect is significant while other effect and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & S & \(\mathbf{S}_{4}\) & S5 & S & Mean & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1543 & 1597 & 1627 & 1830 & 1778 & 1693 & 1678 & 1623 & 1733 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1760 & 1868 & 1890 & 2062 & 1998 & 1918 & 1916 & 1883 & 1949 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 1882 & 2180 & 2068 & 2222 & . 2307 & 2163 & 2137 & 2141 & 2133 \\
\hline Mean & 1728 & 1882 & 1862 & 2038 & 2028 & 1925 & 1910 & 1882 & 1938 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 1823 & 1883 & 1809 & 1998 & 1940 & 1840 & & & - \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 1633 & 1880 & 1915 & 2078 & 2115 & 2010 & , & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal means
\[
=89.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]
2. D marginal means
\(=51.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N marginal means \(\quad=27.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(N\) means at a level of \(S \quad=39.47 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\)
5. N means at a level of \(D\). \(\quad=68.37 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. \(S\) means at a level of \(N \quad=60.90 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. D means at a level of \(\mathbf{N} \quad=105.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{S}\) table \(\quad=89.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 53(150). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. & Type :- 'CM'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate and manure on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Legume-Cereal. (b) Lobia and moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11.1953. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings and Data. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) moong and lobia as G.M. (vi) C-13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing after irrigation. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=10 ; S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40\) srs./ac.

\section*{Suboplot treatments :}

3 manures : \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{F} . Y . \mathrm{M}\). at 3 C.L./ac. in case the field is green manured, 6 C.L./ac. in case the field is not green manured, \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{CaO}, \mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot . Sul. and CaO as Gypsum. Date of manuring-All manures applied on \(30.10 .1953 . \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied \(3^{\circ}\) to \(4^{\circ}\) deep in the soil behind the plough, Gypsum and potash applied as surface dressing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block ; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 28^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) \(1 \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\) on all sides of the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Rat attack, (iii) Grain and straw yield and germination per sq. yd. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, At-arra, Kalai, Gorakhpur, Meerut and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt., was conducted by C.P. (R).
3. RESULTS:
(i) \(1289 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) 378.5 lb ./ac.
(b) \(191.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only interaction \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{S}\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1132 & 1190 & 1286 & 1203 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1241 & 1498 & 1517 & 1419 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1300 & 1377 & 1220 & 1299 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1437 & 1405 & 866 & 1236 \\
\hline Mean & 1278 & 1368 & 1222 & 1289
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. S marginal means \(\quad==154.52 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
2. N marginal means
\(=67.65 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)
\(=135.30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(\mathbf{S}\) means at a level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=189.95 \mathrm{lb}\). ac .

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(138).
Type : \({ }^{〔}\) CM'.

Object:-To study the effect of N and seed rates on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1950. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with victor plough and 4 with desi. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) Between rows-9". (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-125 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding with khurpi. (ix) N.A. (x) 3 and 4.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=25, \mathrm{~N}_{3}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{3}=75\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=40, S_{\mathbf{g}}=50, S_{3}=80\) and \(S_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (b) \(36^{\circ} \times 7.5^{\circ}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1952\). (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2276 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(169.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Ooly N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb /ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{l}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2052 & 2032 & 2011 & 2182 & 2069 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2229 & 2317 & 2410 & 2260 & 2304 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 2405 & 2451 & 2508 & 2172 & 2384 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 2358 & 2358 & 2400 & 2275 & 2348 \\
\hline Mean & 2261 & 2289 & 2332 & 2222 & 2276
\end{tabular}
S.R. of any marginal mean
\(=42.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table
\(=84.96 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur .

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 51(25).}

Type :-‘CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of N and seed rates on yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1951. (iv) (a) 3 desi, 1 victory and 1 cultivator ploughing. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) 2 srs./plot of A/S as top dressing. (vi) N.P. 125. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) One weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=25, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=50\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=40, S_{2}=60, S_{3}=80\) and \(S_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Pact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 7 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times \frac{3}{2}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(654 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(298.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only S and N effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{2}\) & S8 & S4 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 301 & 487 & 264 & 462 & 378 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 446 & 607 & 830 & 882 & 691 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 322 & 799 & 752 & 965 & 710 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 690 & 882 & 757 & 1016 & 836 \\
\hline - Mean & 440 & 694 & 651 & 831 & 654 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =74.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =149.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 52(53).
Type :-'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and seed rates on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1952, (iv) (a) 8 dest, 1 victory and 1 cultivator ploughing. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) As per treatments. (d) \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 125. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of ( \(1>\) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=25, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=50\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{8}=75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
(2) 4 seed rates: \(S_{1}=40, S_{2}=60, S_{3}=80\) and \(S_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(18^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(14^{\prime} \times 10 \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times{ }^{\prime \prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Attack of brown rust-8\%. (iii) Germination counts and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952.
(b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1808 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(206.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) S effect is significant. N effect is highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(1 b_{0} / a c\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & \(S_{8}\) & S & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 933 & 1438 & 2038 & 2433 & 1712 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1048 & 1714 & 2143 & 2353 & 1814 \\
\hline - \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 905 & 1600 & 2124 & 2457 & 1772 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N a}_{3}\) & 857 & 1991 & 2315 & 2572 & 1934 \\
\hline Mean & 936 & 1686 & 2155 & 2455 & 1808 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & \(=51.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & \(=103.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat. & Ref :-U.P. 52(186). \\
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type:-'CM'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate, manure and time of sowing on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy-Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv)
(a) 4 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

\section*{Main-plot treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{2}=30, S_{4}=40, S_{5}=50\) and \(S_{8}=60\) seers/ac.
(2) 2 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=28.10 .1952\) and \(D_{2}=12.11 .1952\).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

3 manures: \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=3 \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{L} / \mathrm{ac}\). of F.Y.M. as B.D., \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{3}}\) \(+10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) +20 lb /ace of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul., \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super and CaO as Gypsum.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 12 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(12 \mathbf{1}^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (b) \(91^{\circ} \times 11^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) on all sides. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Banda, Aligarb, K̇anpur, Gorakhpur, Baharaich and Merrut. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(955.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(654.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(353.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Only the interaction \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{S}\) is significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & \(S_{3}\) & \(S_{6}\) & \(S_{6}\) & \(S_{6}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 870.9 & 830.7 & 830.7 & 864.2 & 1078.6 & 1092.0 & 927.8 & 960.2 & 895.5 \\
\hline - \(\mathbf{N}_{8}\) & 951.3 & 937.9 & 917.8 & 884.3 & 944.6 & 1065.2 & 950.2 & 1000.4 & 899.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{s}\) & 803.9 & 1112.1 & 844.1 & 1159.0 & 998.2 & 1011.6 & 988.1 & 1092.0 & 884.3 \\
\hline Mean & 875.4 & 960.2 & 864.2 & 969.2 & 1007.1 & 1056.3 & 955.4 & 1017.5 & 893.2 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 906.6 & 960.2 & 973.6 & 911.1 & 1112.1 & \(12+1.6\) & & & \\
\hline D2 & 844.1 & 960.2 & 754.8 & 1027.2 & 902.2 & 870.9 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. S marginal means
\(=189.0 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. D marginal means
\(=109.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(\mathbf{N}\) marginal means
\(=72.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
4. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)
\(=176.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. \(N\) means at a level of \(D\) \(=102.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. S means at a level of \(N\) \(=237.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. D means at a level of \(\mathbf{N}\) \(=137.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{D} \times \mathrm{S}\) table

\section*{Crop :- Wheat.}

Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref:- U.P. 53(144).
Type :- 'CM'.

Object:-To study the effect of N and seed rates on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M. (b) Sanai. (c) \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\). (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1953. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) 5.78'. (x) 15.4.1954.

2 TREATMENTS:
Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{8}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40\) srs./ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures : \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=\) F.Y.M. at \(45 \mathrm{md} . / a c\). on green manured field applied 2 weeks before sowing as B.D., \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb}\). ac . of CaO .
N applied as Ais, \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/majn-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(81^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}\). Sub-plot : \(27^{\circ} \times 17^{\prime}\). (b) Sub-plot: \(23^{\circ} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround the plot. (vi) Ye.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Fair. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination count, physiological aspects of plants, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Banda, Aligarh, Gorakhpur and Meerut. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(915.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(136.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(152.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.Jac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 693.1 & 842.9 & 955.3 & 830.4 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 702.4 & 861.7 & 1208.2 & 924.1 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 725.8 & 1123.9 & 1067.7 & 972.5 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 730.5 & 1077.1 & 1002.1 & 936.6 \\
\hline Mean & 713.0 & 976.4 & 1058.3 & 915.9
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. S marginal means \(\quad=55.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means . \(=53.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N means at a level of \(\mathrm{S} \quad=107.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(N \quad=104.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat.
Ref:- U.P. 52(168).
Site :- Tarai State Farm, (Eastern block), Matkota. Type :- ‘CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different crop rotations along with Super applied to previous crops on the subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Matkota loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.11.1952. (iv) (a) One tractor ploughing and one country ploughing followed by harrowing. Tractor ploughing for wheat. (b) Wheat sown behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) to (ix) N.A. (x) 2 to 4.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot trestments :
2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Sab-plot treatments :
8 crop rotations: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Fallow-wheat, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Lobia-Wheat, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{a}}=\) Maize-Wheat, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}=\) Guar-Wheat, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{g}}=\) Sanai as G.M.-Wheat, \(\mathbf{R}_{6}=\) Early moong seed (no seed formation)-Wheat, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{7}}=\) Early Moong as G.M.-Wheat and \(\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{g}}=\) Dhaincha-Wheat.
Super applied on 28.6 .1952 just before sowing of Kharif crops.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block; 8 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(22^{\circ} \times 3^{\circ}\). (v) Distance between plots \(=1^{\prime}\) and between blocks \(=3^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.

4 GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Rabi crop severely damaged by rats. (iii) Yield of wheat grain. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) Yea. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1642 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(399.4 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) 285.1 lb ./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|cccccccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{7}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}^{\prime}\)
\end{tabular} & 1560 & 1740 & 1500 & 1670 & 1620 & 1460 & 1780 & 1490 & 1602 \\
\hline 1510 & 1600 & 1620 & 1690 & 1710 & 1710 & 1850 & 1770 & 1682 \\
\hline 1535 & 1670 & 1560 & 1680 & 1665 & 1585 & 1815 & 1630 & 1642
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(P\) marginal means \(\quad=81.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(R\) marginal means \(\quad=116.4 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(R\) means at a level of \(P \quad=164.6 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
4. P means at a level of \(R \quad=174.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Reg. Res. Stn., Meerut.
Ref :- U.P. 52(114).
Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate, manuring and time of sowing on the yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) One ploughing by victory and 17 by desi plough. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10 to 13.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30, S_{4}=40, S_{5}=50\) and \(S_{6}=60\) srs./ac.
(2) 2 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=31.10 .1952\) and \(D_{2}=14.11 .1952\).

Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures : \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=3 \mathrm{C}\) L./ac of F.Y.M as B.D., \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) +10 lb ./ac. of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{8}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+20\) lb./ac. of CaO.
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul., \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 12 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(19^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 23^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) all round the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Etawah, Banda; Aligarh and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1603 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(43.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(40.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) All main effects and interactions are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & S & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & S8 & \(S_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1720 & 1564 & 1427 & 1720 & 1389 & 1743 & 1594 & 1743 & 1445 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1408 & 1921 & 1674 & 1564 & 1404 & 1514 & 1581 & 1684 & 1478 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 1853 & 1446 & 1750 & 1708 & 1442 & 1602 & 1634 & 1770 & 1497 \\
\hline Mean & 1660 & 1644 & 1617 & 1664 & 1412 & 1620 & 1603 & 1732 & 1473 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 1834 & 1712 & 1687 & 1877 & 1517 & 1768 & & & \\
\hline \(\cdot \mathbf{D}_{2}\) & 1486 & 1575 & 1547 & 1451 & 1306 & 1471 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. S marginal means
\(=12.43 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. D marginal means
\(=7.18 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N marginal means
\(=8.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. N mean at a level of \(S\)
\(=20.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. N mean at a level of \(D\)
\(=11.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. \(S\) mean at a level of \(N\)
\(=20.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. D mean at a level of \(N\)
\(=12.01 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
S.E. of body of \(D \times S\) table
\(=12.43 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat (Rati).
Site :- Reg. Res. Stn., Meerut.

Ref :- U.P. 53(109). Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and seed rates on yield of Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30\) and \(S_{\mathbf{4}}=40\) seers/ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures: \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=\) F.Y.M. at \(45 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on green manured field applied 2 weeks tefore sowing as B.D., \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}+10 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=60\) \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(27^{\circ} \times 28^{\circ}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) 1\(\}^{\prime}\) on all sides of the plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Elawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Kalai, Gorakhpur ard Lucknow. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1260 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(41.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(156.81 \mathrm{Jb} / 4 \mathrm{c}\).
(iii) \(S\) effect is bighly significant. \(N\) effect ir significant and interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{/ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline & \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1092 & 1115 & 1171 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1176 & 1237 & 1339 & 1126 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1223 & 1265 & 1428 & 1251 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & -7265 & 1307 & 1498 & 1305 \\
\hline Mean & 1189 & 1231 & 1359 & 1260
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal meads
\(-17.00 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(\mathbf{N}\) marginal means
\(=55.44 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)
\(=110.88 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(\mathbf{S}\) means at a level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=92.11 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Reg. Res. Stn., Varanasi. \\ Ref:- U.P. 52(109). \\ Type :~ 'CM'.}

Object :-To study the effect of seed rate, manuring and time of sowing on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1 BASAL CONDITION :}
(1) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory and 7 by dest plough. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (mid-early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29, 30, 31.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{3}=20, S_{3}=30, S_{4}=40_{8} S_{5}=50\) and \(S_{6}=60\) seers/ac.
(2) 2 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=25.10 .1952\) and \(D_{2}=7.11 .1952\).

Sub-plot treatments :
3 manures : \(N_{1}=3\) C.L. of F.Y.M./ac. as \(B . D_{2} N_{2}=20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O} .+10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{CaO} . \quad \mathrm{N}_{3}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+20\) lb. /ac. of CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul., \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) 12 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plots. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(24^{\circ} \times 23^{\circ}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\) (v) \(1 \frac{1}{\mathbf{1}^{\prime}}\) on all sides of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Slight attack of rats. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) Etawah, Banda, Meerut, Aligarh and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R)
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1468 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(288.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(246.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) S effect is highly significa nt while N effect is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & \(S_{8}\) & \(s_{4}\) & \(S_{5}\) & \(S_{6}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1352 & 1703 & 1613 & \(1652^{\circ}\) & 1420 & 1518 & 1543 & 1500 & 1586 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1290 & 1560 & 1638 & 1510 & 1277 & 1495 & 1462 & 1413 & 1510 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1302 & 1550 & - 1590 & 1400 & 1195 & 1353 & 1398 & 1390 & 1407 \\
\hline \(M e^{\text {an }}\) & 1315 & 1604 & 1614 & 1521 & 1297 & 1455 & 1468 & 1434 & 1501 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 1273 & 1584 & 1580 & 1469 & 1359 & 1340 & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 1356 & 1625 & 1648 & 1572 & 1236 & 1571 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
E. \(\quad=83.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
1. \(S\) marginal means & \(=48.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(D\) marginal means & \(=50.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
3. \(N\) marginal means & \(=123.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. \(N\) means at a level of \(S\) & \(=71.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
5. \(N\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=130.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
6. \(S\) means at a level of \(N\) & \(=75.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
7. \(D\) means at a level of \(N\) & \(=83.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Reg. Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Ref :- U.P: 53(153)
Type:- 'CM'.
Object :-To study the effect of seed rate and manuring on the yield of Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Paddy-Sugarcane-Sugarcane-Sugarcane, Moong-Wheat. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 16.11.1953. (iv) (a) 8 Ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. 3 C.L. if green manured otherwise 6 C.L. (iv) C-13. (vii) Irrigatad. (viij) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 seed rates: \(S_{1}=10, S_{2}=20, S_{3}=30\) and \(S_{4}=40\) srs. \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
Sab-plot treatments:
3 manures: \(N_{1}=\) F.Y.M. \(45 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\), on green manured field applied 2 weeks before sowing as B.D. \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{CaO} ; \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{8}}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}+30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\), af CaO .
N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. and CaO as Gypsum.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block ; 3 suk-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\) (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 25^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime \prime}\) on all sides of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack of rust and damage by hail storm. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1952-N.A. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, and Kalai. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R)
S. RESULTS:
(i) \(1762 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(380.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(167.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{S}\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1209 & 1344 & 1129 & 1227 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1690 & 2103 & 2054 & 1949 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1951 & 2065 & 1904 & 1973 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1699 & 2096 & 1895 & 1897 \\
\hline Mean & 1637 & 1902 & 1746 & 1762
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal means
2. \(\mathbf{N}\) marginal means
\(=155.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at a level of \(\mathbf{S}\)
\(=59.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=118.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(\mathbf{S}\) means at a level of N
\(=182.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.}

Ref:-U.P. 48(116).
'Type:-'I'.

Object :-To find the optimum time and intensity of irrigating Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy parva, (b) N.A. (iii) 7.12.1948/N.A. (iv) (a) 3 times with Watt's plough. Palewa done in November. Field was then ploughed thrice with country plough before sowing (b) to (e) NA. (v) Green manured with Sanai in Kharif. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) As per treatments. (viii) Weeding. (ix) Nil. (x) April, 1949.

2 TREATMENTS:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 intensities of irrigation: \(L_{1}=2^{\prime}, L_{2}=3^{\prime \prime}\) and \(L_{3}=4^{*}\).
(2) 2 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{2}=4\) weeks and \(I_{2}=5\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 16.5^{\circ}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) \(3^{\circ} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Not recorded. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) NiL (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by I.R.I.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(511 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}\)
(ii) \(60.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(L\) is highly significant while others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yleld of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{L}_{1}\) & \(L_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{L}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 444 & 551 & 569 & 521 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 438 & 515 & 549 & 501 \\
\hline Mean & 441 & 533 & 559 & 511 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{I}\) & \(=21.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.e. of marginal mean of \(L\) & \(=17.42 \mathrm{bl} . \mathrm{ac}\) \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=30.18 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).}

Site :-Field Res. Stn., Bahadrabad.

Ref :-U.P. 48(111).
Type :-'I'.
'Object :-To find the optimum time and intensity of irrigating Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam mixed with sand. (b) Refer soil onalysis, Babadrabad. (iii) 29 and 30.11.1948. (iv) (a) Ploughing by ,local practice, palewa before last ploughing. (b) Seeds sown by desi plough as per local practice. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) 100 mds./ac. of cowdung manure was applied before ploughing. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) As per treatments. (viii) Weeding after first irrigation. (ix) 3.1". (x) 17 to 26.4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 intensitics of irrigation: \(\quad L_{1}=2^{\prime \prime}, L_{2}=3^{\prime \prime}\) and \(L_{2}=4^{\prime \prime}\) depth.
Sab-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 dates of irrigation : \(D_{1}=1.1 .1949, D_{2}=11.1 .1949, D_{8}=21.1,1949\) and \(D_{4}=31.1 .1949\).
(2) 3 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{1}=4\) weeks, \(I_{2}=5\) weeks and \(I_{2}=6\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 12 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) 73' \(\times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 13.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Germination, flowering, maturing and stand of the wheat crop was very good. It was damaged by the winter winds at the time of maturing. (iil No. (iii) Grain yield, (iv) (a) 1947-1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by I.R.I.

\section*{3. RESULTS :}
(i) \(897 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(285.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(88.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & D 1 & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(D_{3}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & \(I_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{I}_{6}\) \\
\hline \(L_{1}\) & 889 & 899 & 878 & 870 & 884 & 904 & 866 & 882 \\
\hline \(L_{1}\) & 920 & 916 & 952 & 840 & 907 & 904 & 886 & 931 \\
\hline \(L_{8}\) & 949 & 911 & 868 & 870 & 900 & 911 & 888 & 900 \\
\hline Mean & 919 & 909 & 899 & 860 & 897 & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow{4}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(1_{1}\) & 916 & 959 & 901 & 848 & 906 & \multirow{3}{*}{.} & & \\
\hline \(I_{9}\) & 901 & 874 & 902 & 843 & 880 & & & \\
\hline 19 & 940 & 893 & 895 & 890 & 904 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. L marginal means
\(=67.28 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
2. D marginal means
3. I marginal means \(=24.20 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}_{\text {. }}\)
4. means in \(\mathbf{D} \times I\) table
5. D means at the same level of \(L\)
6. I means at the same level of \(L\)
7. L means at tre same level of \(I\) \(=20.95 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \(=29.63 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ace}_{0}\) \(-41.91 \mathrm{Bb} / \mathrm{ac}\) \(-36.29 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
8. \(L\) means at the same level of \(D\)

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Field Res. Stn., Bahadrabad.

Ref :-U.P. 49(220).
Type :-‘I'.

Object:-To find the optimum time and intensity of irrigating Wheat.
1. BASIL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Wheat. (c) \(100 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of cowdung manure was applied before ploughing. (ii) (a) Loam mixed with sand. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bahadrabad. (iii) 9.11.1949. (iv) (a) The field has been levelled properly aad well prepared with cowdung manure. It was ploughed 7 times both ways before sowing. (b) Sowing was done by desi plough according to local practice. (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(100 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). of
 irrigation. (ix) 4.2". (x) 18.4.1950 to 30.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 intensities of irrigation : \(L_{1}=2^{\prime \prime}, L_{2}=3^{\prime \prime}\) and \(L_{3}=4^{\prime \prime}\) depth.
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 dates of irrigation : \(D_{1}=1.12 .1949, D_{2}=11.12 .1949, D_{3}=21.12 .1949\) and \(D_{4}=31.12 .1949\).
(2) 3 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{1}=4\) weeks, \(I_{2}=5\) weeks and \(I_{2}=6\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 maia-pl गts/blo准; 12 su'כ-plots/maia-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\circ}\). (b) \(31.5^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination, flowering, maturing, and stand were very good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) 1947-1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by I.R.I.
- 5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1643 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(280.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(236.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(\dot{\mathrm{D}} \times \mathrm{I}\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & D2 & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & Mean & I 1 & \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & \(I_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\vdots \mathbf{L}^{\prime}{ }^{\mathbf{i}}\) & 1696 & 1648 & 1878 & 1789 & 1753 & 1702 & 1719 & 1837 \\
\hline \(\therefore \mathbf{L}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}\) & 1826 & 1635 & 1605 & 1414 & 1620 & 1688 & 1657 & 1515 \\
\hline \(L_{8}\) & 1514 \({ }^{\prime \prime}\) & 1586 & 1586 & 1540 & . 1556 & 1468 & 1615 & 1586 \\
\hline Mean & 1679 & 1623 & 1690 & 1581 & - 1643 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1585 & 1501 & 1746 & 1646 & 1619 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1728 & 1697 & 1601 & 1630 & 1664 & & & \\
\hline \(J_{3}\) & 1723 & 1671 & 1722 & 1468 & 1646 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. L marginal mean
2. D \(\quad=66.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=64.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. I marginal means
\(=55.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. means in \(\mathrm{D} \times I\) table
5. D means at the same level of \(L\)
\(=78.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. I means at the same level of \(L\)
\(=111.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. L means at the same level of \(I\)
\(=96.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
8. L means at the same level of \(D\)
\(-102.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=117.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :-Wheat. \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.}

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 49(84).}

Type :-'IM'.
Object:-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in come bination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Bajra+Moong (mixed). (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11.1949. (iv) (a) Palewa, 3 times ploughing by watt's plough followed by two ploughings with cultivator and 4 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 45 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 2.21". (x) First week of April 1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering stage), \(I_{2}=I_{\mathbf{1}}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germipation (at flowering stage) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milkey stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 2 times of application : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) half at sowing and half at first irrigatian.

\section*{3. DESIGN}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/blocks; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Sub-plot: \(26^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\) main-plot : \(165^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop damaged by hail storm. (ii) N.A. (iii) No. of tillers per plant, no. of green leaves per plant, no. of dry leaves per plant, shoot length of green leaves, breadths of leaf and length of roots etc. Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Bharari, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1037 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(162.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (b) \(133.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effects of \(N\) and 'control \(v s\) treatments' are highly significant. All other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 837 & 968 & 1137 & 992 & 1158 & 1018 \\
\hline \(I_{5}\) & 902 & 978 & 1155 & 1054 & 1182 & 1054 \\
\hline 18 & 882 & 927 & 1169 & 1006 & 1210 & 1039 \\
\hline Mean & 874 & 958 & 1154 & 1017 & 1183 & 1037 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means
\(=59.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. NT marginal means
\(=62.99 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. NT means at the same level of 1
\(=109.11 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT
\(=114.18 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. 50(75). } \\
& \text { Type :- 'IM'. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

\footnotetext{
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1950. (iv) (a) Preparation of land-five times ploughed with Watt's plough and once with desi plough. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nii. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 3.01". (x) 30.3.1951.
}

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{9}=I_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control \(\left(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathrm{T}_{0}=\right.\) no madure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 2 times of application : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots;block; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) main-plot \(27^{\prime} \times 150^{\prime}\); Sub-plot \(24^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(11^{\prime}\) alround ; field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround ; sown space left between main-plots-8' also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kunraghat, Etawah, Muzzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vit) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1442 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(195.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(183.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effects of \(\mathbf{T}\) and 'control vs. treatment' are significant. Interaction \(\mathbf{N} \times T\) is bighly significant while all others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lbo/ac.

\(S E\). of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I \quad=71.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}=74.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N T means at the same level of \(I \quad=149.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I mears at the same level of \(\mathbf{N} T \quad=151.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :-U.P. 51(79).
Type:--IM'.

Object : - To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in comblnation with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) Chari. (c) No. (ii) (a) Kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 1 st week of November. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown ty seed drill; (c) 40-50 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{8}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{8}}=\) no mapure)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
(2) 2 times of application : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) balf at sowing and half at lst irrigation.
3. DESIGN : -
(i) Split-plot, (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(27^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) main-plot \(27^{\prime} \times 150^{\prime}\) sub-plot \(24^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(11^{\prime}\) alround. Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround ; irtigation channel \(3^{\prime}\); sown space left between main-plots- \(8^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging. Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Hawalbagh Etawab, Bharari, Faizabad, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Meerut and Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by \(C P\).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1748 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(149.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of N is significant and effects of T and 'control \(v s\) treatment' are highly significant while all othes effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac,
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(I_{0}\) & 1124 & 1707 & 1739 & 1837 & . 1871 & 1656 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1143 & 1834 & 1964 & 1966 & 2025 & 1786 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 1167 & 1819 & 1940 & 1936 & 1996 & 1772 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1154 & 1813 & 1958 & 1958 & 2001 & 1777 \\
\hline Mean & 1147 & 1793 & 1900 & 1924 & 1973 & 1748 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{1. marginal means of I} & \(=47.32 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{2. marginal means of NT} & \(=45.30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{3. NT means at the same fevel of I} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =50.59 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =93.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref:- U.P. 52(137).
. Type ;- 'IM'.

Object : - To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Early paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 22.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) 5 ploughings with Watt's plough and levelling by pata. (b) N.A. (c) 7 chs./plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.4.1953.

\section*{2. LTREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathbf{I}_{8}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatmeots:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N .
(2) 2 times of application : \(T_{1}=\) Full at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
\(I_{1}\) give on 19.1.1953. \(I_{2}\) and \(I_{2}\) were not given as canal water was not available. Hence \(I_{3}\) and \(I_{8}\)-are identical to \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(34^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\) : (b) \(31^{\prime} \times 11^{\circ}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1\) la' \(^{\prime}\). Distance between main-plots \(=3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
(4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Bbarari, Faizabad, Mnzaffarnagar and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) Conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1911 \quad \mathrm{Bb} / \mathrm{mc}\).
(ii) (a) \(124.7 \mathrm{db} / \mathrm{mc}\).
(b) \(.69 .8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is signiicant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{Na}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{0}\) & , \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(I_{0}\) & 1585 & 1646 & 2037 & 1683 & 1979 & 1786 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1635 & 1849 & 2178 & 1901 & 2199 & 1952 \\
\hline Mean & 1623 & 1798 & 2142 & 1846 & 2144 & 1911 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(1 \quad=32.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
2. marginal means of \(N \quad=24.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. NT means at the same level of \(I_{0}\)
\(=49.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. NT means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\)
\(-28.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. I means at the same level of NT \(\quad=48.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop: Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :- U.P. 53(154).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Cereal-Cereal. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.11.1953. (iv) (a) Palewa on 22.11.1953, farm ploughings after the harvest of paddy on 1st, 6 th, 12 th , and 20th November 1953. (b) Sown by local seed drill. (c) 7 [chk. sown in leach field. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C.13. (vij) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Maio-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(X_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{2}=I_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
All combjnations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=n 0\) manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
(2) 2 times of application: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\mathrm{Half}\) at sowing and half at lst irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot: \(170^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(34^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (b) Sub-plot \(31^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \({ }^{\prime} 11^{\prime}\). Field border \(3^{\prime}\). Sown place left between main-plots \(=3^{\circ}\) also be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) There was no attack of any disease or? pest. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2063 \quad \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(28.87 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(33.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(jii) Effects of \(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{T}\) and "control va treated" are highly significant. I xcontrol wreated, \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{T}\) and \(T \times I\) are significant. \(I \times N, I \times N \times T\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline . & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & , Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 1470 & 1692 & 2266 & 1720 & 2230 & 1876 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1659 & 2004 & 2464 & 1963 & 2550 & 2128 \\
\hline \(I_{2}\) & 1679 & 1938 & 2455 & 1946 & 2537 & 2111 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 1692 & 1987 & 2447 & 2037 & 2529 & 2138 \\
\hline Mean & 1625 & 1905 & 2408 & 1916 & 2462 & 2063 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{rlr} 
1. marginal means of I & \(=9.13 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of NT & \(=11.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. NT means at the same level of I & \(=23.63 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of NT & \(=23.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site : -Govt, Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref : UU.P. 49(71).
Type :-'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Bajra+Moong (mixed). (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa, (b) N.A. (iii) 1 and 2.11.1949.
(iv) (a) 4 ploughings with Watt's plough followed by levelling with para and 4 plankings. Two ploughings with cultivator and 4 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 45 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(2.21^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 1 st week of April 1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatnents :
3 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combination of forms and levels of \(N\) : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) (a) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot\(54^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\). Sub-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Crop damaged by frost and hail. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (t) Varanasi, Kalyanpur, Bharari, Meervt, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Bulandshahr and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1291 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{sac}\).
(ii) (a) \(213.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) 119.1 lb /as.
(iii) Levels of N differ bighly significaptly. Others are not significant
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 979 & 1368 & 1313 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1112 & 1373 & 1354 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1208 & 1524 & 1391 \\
\hline Mean & 1100 & 1422 & 1353
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
1. marginal means of 1
\[
\begin{array}{r}
=100.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
=56.1 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
3. N means at the same level of I
4. I means at the eame level of \(\mathbf{N} \quad=128.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref:-U.P. 50(85).
Type:-‘IM'.

Object :-To stady the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with different levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1950. (iv) (a) Five times ploughed with Watt's plough and once with cultivator. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (erriy). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 3.01". (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=N_{0}\) irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{8}=I_{8}+\) irrigation 12

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

3 combinations of levels and forms of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\), of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) \(\mathbf{l b} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(23^{\circ} \times 3^{\prime}\). (b) Sub-plot: \(20^{\circ} \times 31^{\prime}\) and Main-plot: \(69^{\circ} \times 34^{\circ}\) (v) Sub-plot border \(=11^{\prime}\) alround. Field border \(=3^{\circ}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots \(=5^{\circ}\), sown space left between blocks \(=8^{\circ}\) also to be used is irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (b) (a) Bharari, Varanasi, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Kalai, Etawah, Muzzaffarnagar, Meerut and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
3. RESULTS:
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
(i) & 1793 & \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
(ii) & (a) & 96.1 \\
(b) & 123.2 & lb./ac.
\end{tabular}
(iii) Porms and levels of N are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 1554 & 1939 & 1752 & 1748 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1686 & 2072 & 1855 & 1871 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 1641 & 1831 & 1831 & 1768 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1602 & 1969 & 1783 & 1785 \\
\hline Mean & 1621 & 1953 & 1805 & 1793 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{- 1. marginal means of I} & lb./ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{-2. marginal means of N} & \(\mathrm{Ib} . \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{3. N means at the same level of I} & bb.ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)} & lb./ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :- U.P. 51(62).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with different levele of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Charl. (c) No. (ii) '(a) Parwa Kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.11.1951. (iv) (a) 4 ploughinge with Watt's plough. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 11 chh/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 hocing. (ix) \(2.20^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigations : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{2}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{8}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{8}=I_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks. after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of levels and forms of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No manure, \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\). \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\), ac of N as castor cake.
\(I_{1}\) given on 15.1.1952. \(I_{2}\) and \(I_{s}\) not given at all due to the non-availabilty of canal water l.e. only one irrigation was given to the experiment, hence \(I_{2}\) and \(I_{3}\) both are identical to \(I_{1}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split = plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(19^{\circ} \times 42^{\circ}\) (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). Main-plot size: \(57^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border: \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround. Field torder: \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots-5'. Sown space left between blocks- \(8^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Bharari, Kalai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Hawalbagh. Lucknow and Etawah. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Condúcted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(819.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(70.07 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(95.69 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Levels of irrigations and forms of \(\mathbf{N}\) are bighly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 572.2 & 861.7 & 740.5 & 724.8 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 699.3 & 973.8 & 880.4 & 851.2 \\
\hline Mean & 667.5 & \(945.8^{\circ}\) & 845.4 & 819.6
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\(=23.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=33.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(N\) means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\)
\(=67.66 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\)
\(=39.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N} \quad=50.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop :- Wheat. \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra. \\ \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. } 52(138) . \\
& \text { Type :- 'IM'. }
\end{aligned}
\]
}

Object : Tọ study the effect of different forms and levels of \(N\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Early paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) 5 ploughings with Watt's plough and levelling by pata. (b) N,A, (c) 40 to 50 srs,/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (v) 2.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(\mathbf{I}_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germiration (at tillering), \(I_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{8}=I_{2}\) +irrigation 12. weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
3 combinations of levels and forms of \(N: N_{0}=N o\) manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60\) lb /ac. of \(N\) as castor cake.
\(I_{1}\) given on 18.1.1953. \(I_{2}\) and \(I_{3}\) not given as water was not available in the canal. So \(I_{2}\) and \(I_{3}\) are identical to \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split - plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plots. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(19^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\) (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). Main \(=\) plot \(=57^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2^{\prime}}\) alround. Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround. Between main-plots \(=5^{\circ}\). Between blocks \(=8^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanași, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Hwalbagh, Muzaffarnagar, Bharari, Kuaraghat, and Kalai. (b) N A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1113 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(181.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(108.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of I is highly significant. Forms and levels of N are both highly significant. \(\mathrm{I} \times\) Forms of N and \(I \times\) levels of N are also highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \[
\mathbf{N}_{8}
\] & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 893 & 936 & 880 & 903 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 940 & 1536 & 1073 & \(1183^{\circ}\) \\
\hline Mean & 928 & 1386 & 1025 & 1113 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of I \(=60.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
2. marginal means of \(\mathrm{N} \quad=38.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I}_{0} \quad=76.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(I_{1} \quad=44.3 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
5. I means at the same level of \(N=792 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref : - U.P 53(155).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Cereal-Cereal. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) Palewa on 22.10.1953. 4 ploughings after the harvest of paddy on \(2,7,13\) and \(21.11 .19 \leq 3\). (b) Sown by local seed drill. (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot=treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No irrigation, \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering); \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60\) lb ./ac. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication ; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) sub-plot \(19^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\); maio-plot \(57^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). (b) Sub-plot \(16^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). ( \(x\) ) Sub-plot border \(1.5^{\circ}\). Field border \(33^{\circ}\). Sowing space left between main-plots \(5^{\prime}\). Sowing space left between blocks \(\rightarrow 8^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Etawab, Kalyanpur, Bharai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Kalai and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. ( (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1246 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(31.00 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(23.01 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(1, N\), Forms of \(N, I \times N, I \times\) Forms of \(N\) are all highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 945 & 981 & 954 & 960 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 958 & 1353 & 1310 & 1270 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 1105 & 1638 & 1378 & 1374 \\
\hline Is & 1108 & 1741 & 1481 & 1443 \\
\hline Mean & 1029 & 1428 & 1281 & 1246 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
1. marginal means of I \\
2. marginal means of N
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=12.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{3. N means at the same level of I} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
=16.27 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Wheat.}

Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Barabanki.

Ref:-U.P. 49(101).
Type :-'sM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sann for G.M. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.11.1949. (iv) (a) 5 ploughinge on \(20,25.10\) 1949, and 10, 11, 12.11.1949. (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) G.M. by Sannhemp. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 2.31". (x) 27, 28.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments : . 1
2 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering). \(I_{8}=I_{\mathbf{2}}+12\) weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatmen ts:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{8}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of CaO as Gypsum : \(G_{0}=0, G_{1}=25\) and \(G_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block; 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 2 (iv) (a) Main-plot size \(162^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). Sub-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\).(v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not good due to bad weather conditions and much moisture in the soil which was the result of heavy rains before sowing. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Kalyanpur, Bulandshahar and Luckoow. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(692.0 \quad \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) 167.0 lb./ac.
(b) \(91.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\),
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(G_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{8}}\) \\
\hline \(I_{1}\) & 629.1 & 750.4 & 720.6 & 700.1 & 727.5 & 695.5 & 677.2 \\
\hline 18 & 645.1 & 720.6 & 686.3 & 684.0 & 693.2 & 690.9 & 668.0 \\
\hline Mean & 637.1 & 735.5 & 703.5 & 692.0 & 710.4 & 693.2 & 672.6 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{0}\) & 604.0 & 813.3 & 7138 & 710.4 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{1}\) & 652.0 & 734.4 & 693.2 & 693.2 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 655.4 & 658.9 & 703.5 & . 672.6 & & & , \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S. E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\(=55.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{G}\)
3. G or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I\)
\(=37.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=52.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P\)
\(=70.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=64.8 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi),
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Barabanki.
Ref:- U.P. 50(115).
Type : - 'IM'.
Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.10.1950. (iv) (a) Prepration of land was good. (b) Sowing by seed drill. c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (medium-Jate). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
- 2 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{8}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 12 weeke after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super.: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{1}}=25\) and \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) Main-plot: \(171^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\); sub-plot : \(19^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor. No lodging. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur and Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
\(\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } & 1125 & \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\end{array}\)
(ii) (a) \(267.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(259.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1257 & 1251 & 1199 & 1236 & 1241 & 1214 & 1253 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1021 & 976 & 1049 & 1015 & 994 & 1135 & 917 \\
\hline Mean & 1139 & 1113 & 1124 & 1125 & - 1117 & 1174 & 1085 \\
\hline \(P_{0}\) & 1153 & 1084 & 1114 & 1117 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow{3}{*}{,}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1104 & 1171 & 1247 & 1174 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 1159 & 1086 & 1010 & 1885 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
1. I marginal means
2. \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{G}\) marginal means
3. \(P\) or \(G\) means at the same level of I
4. I reans at the same level of \(P\) or \(G\)
5. meana in body of \(P \times G\) table
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =72.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =86.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =122.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =123.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =1500 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]

```

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

```
Ref :- U.P. 50(133).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :-
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcanc. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.11.1950. (iv) (a) Prepartion of land was good. (b) Sowing by seed drill. (c) 50 seers ac. (d) and (e)N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (medium-late) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 harrowings. (ix) N.A. (x) 21, 22.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

\section*{Main-plot treatments:}

3 levels of irrigation : \(\left(I_{0}=\right.\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 wreks after germination (at tiliering) and \(I_{2}=I_{1}+i s\) rigation 9 weeks after germination (at fiowering).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combination of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(C a\) as Gypsum : \(G_{0}=0, G_{2}=25\) and \(G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot \(171^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) sub-plot \(19^{\circ} \times 35^{\prime}\), (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\) (v) Sub-plot border \(=3\). Irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\) sown space left between main-plots \(=8^{\circ}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory, (ii) Brown rust has affected the crop. (iii) Grain gield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalai and Pratapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1237 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(369.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(196.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Nope of the effect is significant.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 1127 & 1172 & 1143 & 1147 & 1113 & 1167 & 1162 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1298 & 1342 & 1288 & 1309 & 1375 & 1303 & 1249 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1164 & 1279 & 1325 & 1256 & 1206 & 1325 & 1237 \\
\hline Mean & 1196 & 1264 & 1252 & 1237 & 1231 & 1265 & 1216 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{0}\) & 1234 & 1240 & 1220 & 1231 : & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{Gi}_{1}\) & 1225 & 1337 & 1232 & 1265 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{2}\) & 1130 & 1215 & 1303 & '1216 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two :
1. I marginal means \(\quad=100.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(P\) or \(G\) marginal means \(=53.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. I means at the san e level of \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{G}=125.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(P\) or \(G\) means at the same level of \(I \quad=92.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. means in body of \(G \times P\) table \(=92.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Crop :- Wheat. • Ref:- U.P. 51(76).

Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Bahraich.
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. '(b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) - (a) Sandy loam. (b) N. A. (iii) 3.11 .19 j1. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (mid-early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering) and \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and 2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\mathrm{O}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of Ca as \(G y p s u m: \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}=25 \mathrm{and} \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(171^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\) ( \(\mathbf{y}\) ) Sub-plot border \(3^{\prime}\), irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\), sown space left between main-plots \(8^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Rust in 2 plote, plants were dried. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Pratapgarh and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(962 \quad \mathrm{Ib}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(298.0 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(164.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & G 2 & Mean & P. & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 943 & 946 & 970 & 953 & 944 & 943 & 972 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 908 & 930 & 1026 & 955 & 903 & 1021 & 941 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 994 & 972 & 974 & 980 & 963 & 981 & 995 \\
\hline Mead & 948 & 949 & 990 & 962 & 937 & 982 & 969 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 930 & 928 & 952 & 937 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 1006 & 933 & 1005 & 982 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P s}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 908 & 986 & 1014 & 969 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
1. marginal means of I
\(=70.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=38.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=67.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=89.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=67.0 . \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{G} \quad-38.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. G or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I \quad=67.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P \quad=89.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. means in body of \(P \times G\) table \(\quad=67.0 . \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

> Crop :-Wheat (Rabß).
> Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

\section*{Ref:.U.P. 52(116).}

Type:-'IM'.
Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 26, 27, 28, 30.10.1951. (b) N.A. (c) \(40-50\) seers/ac. in general. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (mid early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigaticn 9 weeks after germination (at flowering).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : \(G_{0}=0, G_{1}=25\) and \(G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plets/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(19^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\).
(b) \(16^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(1 \frac{1}{c}^{\circ}\), field border \(3^{\circ}\) between main-plots. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor. (ii) Yellow rust \(35 \%\) on stem. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) Na. (v) (a) Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(313.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(148.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(96.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lbo/ac.


Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Bahraich.

Ref :-U.P. 53(217).
Type :- 'TM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on Wheat:-

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b), (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1953. (iv) (a) Floughings on 6 and 7.9.1953 and 4.11.1953. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weedings on 3.12.1953 and 7.1.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1954 and 1.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of Irrigation, \(I_{0}=\) No Irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering) and \(I_{2}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(C a\) as Gypsum : \(G_{0}=0, G_{1}=25\) and \(G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication ; 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) main-plot : \(171^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). sub-plot: \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(16 \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\), field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots-4' also to be used as irrigation channel. Irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wheat rust. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b), (c) No، (v) (a) Pratapgarh and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(\quad 672.9 \mathrm{jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(252.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(172.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only the interaction \(I \times P\) is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{G i}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & \(I_{1}\) & 18 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 603.5 & 567.0 & 756.6 & 645.7 & 676.4 & 687.3 & 573.4 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 620.8 & 701.9 & 735.6 & 686.1 & 635.3 & 720.2 & 202.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 654.5 & 745.7 & 660.9 & 687.0 & 543.3 & 754.8 & 763.0 \\
\hline Mean & 626.3 & 671.5 & 721.0 & 672.9 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 6080 & 570.6 & 676.3 & 618.3 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 620.8 & 708.3 & 833.2 & 720.8 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{2}\) & 650.0 & 735.6 & 653.6 & 679.7 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=59.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(P\) or \(G\) marginal means & \(=40.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. I means at the same level of \(P\) or \(G\) & \(=82.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. \(P\) or \(G\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=70.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
5. means in the body of \(P \times G\) table & \(=70.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Ref :-U.P. 49(77).
Type :-'IM'.
Object:-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a), (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot trealments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering stage), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering stage) and \(I_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation 12 reeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combination of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) half at sowing and half at first irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(22 \times 169^{\prime}\); sub- plot: \(22^{\prime} \times 33^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Meerut, Muzaffarnsgar, Lucknow and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt, was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1245 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(346.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(270.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only control vs. treated effect is highly significant.
(Iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 897 & 1262 & 1435 & 1400 & 1538 & 1307 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1020 & 1331 & 1469 & 1296 & 1279 & 1279 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1}_{3}\) & 985 & 1141 & 1608 & 899 & 1106 & 1148 \\
\hline Mean & 968 & 1245 & 1504 & 1198 & 1308 & 1245 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
1. I marginal means
\(=126.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. NT marginal means
3. NT means at the same level of I
\(=127.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=220.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT
\(=199.7 \mathrm{ib} . \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref:-U.P. 50(76).
Type :-‘IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination wich different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.11.1950. (iv) (a) 3 harrowings. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 seer/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1951.'

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{2}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / a c\). of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(N: T_{2}=\) All at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at Ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replicati on and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(27^{\circ} \times 150^{\prime}\) and Sub-plot: \(27^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(24^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}\) alround. Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround. Irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\). Sown space left between main-plots- \(8^{\prime}\), also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Slightly below normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Kunraghat, Etawah, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Atarra, and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. was conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(699.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(149.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(189.9 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{6} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N s}_{\mathbf{T}} \mathbf{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 535.8 & 674,1 & 783.6 & 783.6 & 472.5 & 649.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 679.9 & 864.3 & 772.1 & 864.3 & 610.7 & 758.3 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 737.5 & 610.7 & 507.0 & 772.1 & 777.8 & 681.0 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 668.4 & 749,0 & 823.9 & 651.1 & 651.1 & 708.7 \\
\hline Mean & 655.4 & 724.5 & 721.6 & 767.8 & 628.0 & 699.5 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. I marginal means } & =54.54 \mathrm{jb} / \mathrm{/ac} \\ \text { 2. NT marginal means } \\ \text { 3. NT means at the same level of } \mathrm{I} & =77.53 \mathrm{jb} \text {./ac. } \\ \text { 4. I means at the same level of NT } & =155.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =149.03 \mathrm{lb} \text {./ac. }\end{array}\)

Crop :-Wheat.
Ref:-U,P. 51(83).
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Type : ©'TM'.
Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nilo (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Rankar, parwa soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.12 .1951 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) NA. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treaments :
4 levels of irrgation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=I\) Irigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{I}_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) Irrigation . 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}^{+}=\)no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lo}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(N\) : \(T_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(24^{\prime} \times 155^{\prime}\) and Sub-plot: \(24^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) \(21^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{}^{\prime}\) alround. Field border alround \(==^{\prime} 3\), Irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\). Sowing space left between main-plots=4' also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Poor. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Hawalbagh, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Faizabad, Meerut, Atarra, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) The crop kas sown late and hence poor yield. (vii) Expt. was conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1983 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(238.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(270.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is significant. Interaction \(I \times N \times T\) is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


\section*{Crop :- Wheat. \\ Site ;-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari. \\ Ref :- U.P. 52(130). \\ Type :- 'IM'.}

Object :- To study the effect of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat. (b) Sanai. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 29.7.1952 and two harrowings on 31.10.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 40 to 50 srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nii. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments:
4 levels of inrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No Irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{2}=I_{2}+I r r i g a t i o n ~ 12\) weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60: \mathrm{b} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(N: T_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(24^{\prime} \times 150^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(24^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{3}^{\prime}\), main-plot border \(=4^{\circ}\) and between blocks \(=4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight rust disease was traceable during February. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949_ 1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Atarra, Faizabad, Muzaffarnagar and Kunraghat. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. was conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(2016 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(331.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(358.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only the interaction \(I \times T\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{Na}_{3}{ }_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 1879 & 2067 & 1884 & 2442 & 1892 & 2033 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1951 & 2299 & 2257 & 1993 & 2116 & 2123 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1953 & 2089 & 1879 & 1827 & 2015 & 1953 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2099 & 1662 & 1679 & 2040 & 2302 & 1956 \\
\hline Mean & 1970 & 2029 & 1925 & 2076 & 2081 & 2016 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{1. I marginal means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{2. NT marginal means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{3. NT means at the same level of I} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=253.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{,} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{4. I means at the same level of NT} & \(=250\) & /ac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Wheat. \\ Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
}

Ref :- U.P. 53(67).

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat. (b) Sanal. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 19.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 23.8.1953, harrowing on 17.10 .1953 and 28.10.1953. (b) Improved seed drill used for sowinge (c) \(4 \mathrm{v}-50 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering) \({ }^{\text {B }}\) \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{8}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control \(\left(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\right.\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 2 times of application of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at 1 st irrigation.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/repl:cation and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A.. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot size: \(24^{\prime} \times 150^{\circ}\) and Sub-plot: \(24^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\). Sown space left tetween main-plots to serve as irrigation channel \(4^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Slight rust attack. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, K \({ }^{\text {lyanpur, Atarra, Meerut, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. }}\) (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
3. RESULTS:
(i) 1-92 lb./ac.
(ii) (a) \(228.0 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(255.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac. \\
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1882 & 1719 & 1778 & 1857 & 1620 & 1771 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1852 & 1699 & 1902 & 1719 & 1818 & 1798 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1837 & 1976 & 1877 & 1660 & 1857 & 1841 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1818 & 1709 & 1832 & 1778 & 1660 & 1759 \\
\hline Mean & 1847 & 1776 & 1847 & 1753 & 1739 & 1792
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { 1. I marginal means } & =72.10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { 2. NT marginal means } & =90.14 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { 3. NT means at the same level of I } & =180.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { 4. I means at the same level of NT } & =176.65 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{array}
\]

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref :- U.P. 49(85).
Type:-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL OONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Päddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 9.11 .1949 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Drilling by seed drill. (c) 45 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{s}=I_{\mathbf{2}}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stagel.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 applications of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) main-plot \(54^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\), Sub-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(12^{\circ} \times 34^{\circ}\). (v) \(3^{\circ}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor. (ii) Nit. (iii) No. of tillers/plant, no. of green leaves/plant, no. of dry leaves/plant, height of plant, jength of leaf and breadth of leaf. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Meerut, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Bulandshahr and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(989.3 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\).
(ii) (a) \(281.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(154.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) are highly significant and interaction \(\mathrm{I} \times\) forms of N is significant. Others are not significant. (iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 686.3 & 759.5 & 960.8 & 802.2 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 970.0 & 1262.8 & 1079.8 & 1104.2 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 805.5 & 1336.0 & 1043.2 & 1061.5 \\
\hline Mean & 820.5 & 1119.4 & 1027.9 & 989.3
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\[
=132.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\]
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
3. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{I} \quad=126.06\)
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N} \quad=168.00 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
```

Crop:- Wheat.
Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.
Ref:- U.P. 50(86),
Type :- 'IM'.

```

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and leyels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11 .1950 . (iv) (a) 3 harrowings.
(b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil, (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated.
(viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) Irrigation 12 weèeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 applications of \(\dot{N}: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\), of \(N\) as \(A / S, N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(N\) as Castor cake.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot \(60^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\); Sub-plot \(20^{\prime} \times 49^{\prime}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(1 \frac{y}{}^{\prime}\) alround. Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots \(5^{\prime}\) sown space left between blocks \(8^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Average growth. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1954. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, \(\dot{\text { Kunaraghat, Kalyanpur, Kalai, Etawah, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. }}\) (vii) Experiment condụctẹd by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1187 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(422.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(283.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(I \times\) forms of \(N\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & Meán \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) & 1080 & 1116 & 1300 & 1165 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 991 & 1175 & 1062 & 1076 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1270 & 1543 & 890 & 1234 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1128 & 1211 & 1484 & 1274 \\
\hline Mean & 1117 & 1261 & 1184 & 1187 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of I & \\
2. marginal means of N & \(=199.06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \\
& \(=115.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
& \\
& \(=231.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 51(65). \\
Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.' & Type :- 'IM'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Ranker and Kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.11.1951, (iv) (a) Ono ploughing and 2 harrowings. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) seers/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (is) \(1.98^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Maim-plot treatroeata :
4 levels of Irrigation: \(\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No irrigation, \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{\mathbf{3}}=I_{\mathbf{2}}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
3 applications of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=63 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plor (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot size: \(60^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\) and sub-plot: \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plct border=11' alround. Field border \(=3^{\circ}\) alround. Sown space left between main plots \(=5^{\circ}\). Sown space left between blocks \(=6^{\circ}\) also to be used as irrigation chandel. (vi) Yea
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging, (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953 (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Kunraghat, Kalayanpur Atarra, Etawah, Kalai, Meerut, Mazaffarnager, Hawalbagh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
3. RESULTS:
(i) 1349 lb./ec
(ii) (a) \(452.9 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(240.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Only levels of N are highly significant. No other effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{6}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline 1. & 1046 & 1327 & 1251 & 1208 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 1215 & 1391 & 1358 & 1321 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 1097 & 1353 & 1429 & 1293 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1338 & 1545 & 1839 & 1574 \\
\hline Mean & 1174 & 1404 & 1469 & 1349 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{S.E of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1. marginal means of I} & \(=184.9\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)} & \(=84.8\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{3. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at the same level of I} & \(=169.7\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)} & \(=231.0\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat.
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref:-U.P. 52(135).
Type :-'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sanal-Wheat. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil, (ii) (a) Parwa soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.11.1952. (iv) (a) One ploughing on 29.7.1952 and 2 harrowings on 31.10.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 9 chh./plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb -591 (medium late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of Irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\mathbf{I r r i g a t i o n ~} 3\) weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +Irrigation 9 weeks after;germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=\mathrm{I}_{8}\) + Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 applications of \(N: N_{1}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S\), and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as Castor cako
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Maibplot: \(60^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\); sub-plot: \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 37^{\circ}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(13^{\prime} ;\) between main-plots \(5^{\circ}\); between blocks \(6^{\prime \prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight rust was traceable during February. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalaya npur, Meerut, Kalai, Atarra, Hawalbagh, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
\(\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } & 1376 & \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)
(ii) (a) \(280.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(b) \(224.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) are higbly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & & ' 1304 & 1291 & 1478 & 1358 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & & 1278 & 1282 & 1465 & 1342 \\
\hline \(I_{2}\) & & 1313 & 1589 & 1607 & 1503 \\
\hline I & & 1033 & 1389 & 1487 & 1303 \\
\hline Mean & & 1232 & 1388 & 1509 & 1376 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{lrl} 
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{I}\) & & \(=114.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(\mathcal{N}\) & & \(=79.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. N means at the same level of \(\mathbf{I}\) & & \(=158.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of \(N\) & & \(=172.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref : - U.P. 53(68).
Type : - IM \(^{\prime}\) 。

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 22.8.1953 and harrowings on 28.10.1953. and 16.11.1953. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) \(4-5\) srs fac (d) (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding 'and hoeing at proper'time. (ix) N.A. (x) 5, 6.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of Irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) + Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{z}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{z}}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 applications of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\) No manure, \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) fand \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as Caster cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot : \(24^{\prime} \times 150^{\circ}\). sub-plot: \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround, Sown sface left between main-plot \(5^{\circ}\); block partition \(6^{\prime}\) serving as irrigation chancel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Slight incidence of rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad,Etawah, Kalayanpur, Atarra, Meerut, Kunraghat, Muzaffaroagar, Banaras and Kalai. (b) NoA (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).

\section*{'. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1150 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
(ii) (a) \(574.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(189.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 1031 & 1022 & 1031 & 1028 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1164 & 1140 & 1180 & 1161 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1206 & 1051 & 1304 & 1187 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1140 & 1215 & 1320 & 1225 \\
\hline Mean & 1135 & 1107 & 1209 & 1150
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I \quad=234.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=66.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N means at the same level of I
\(=133.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)

Crop:- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. School Farm, Bulandshahr.

Ref:- U.P. 49(97).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Green manuring (Sanai). (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27, 28.10.1949. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings by deshi plough. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring of Sanai by ploughing in on 9.8.1949. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing and weeding on 29, 30.1.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 14, 15.4.1950.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super : \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(C a\) as Gypsum : \(G_{0}=0, G_{2}=25\) and \(G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block; 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot size: \(162^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\) and sub-plot: \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur, Barabanki and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RBSULTS :
(i) \(2151 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(568.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(315.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iil) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l|l|} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 2178 & 2141 & \(\mathbf{I} \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2056 & 2196 & 2086 & 2141 & 2135 \\
\(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2050 & 2306 & 2215 & 2150 & 1952 \\
\hline Mean & 2105 & 2214 & 2135 & 2151 & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2099 & 2001 & 1928 & 2440 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 211 t & 2428 & 2343 & 2294 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=154.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. P or \(G\) marginal means & \(=105.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. P or \(G\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=148.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of \(P\) or \(G\) & \(=196.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
5. means in body of \(G \times P\) table & \(=182.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. School Farm, Bulandshahr. \(\quad\) Ref.- U.P. 49(75).

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Green manure (Sanai). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1949. (iv) (a) Ploughing in Sanai on 9.8.1949, 6 ploughings by deshi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Field green manured by Sanai. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing and weeding on 29, 31.1.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 14, 15.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 ievels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+I\) Irigation 9 weeks affer germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 applications of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\mathrm{N}_{0}\) madure \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) add \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot size: \(54^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\) and Sub-plot: \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (i) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur, Atatra, Bharari, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Hawalbagh and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
3. RESULTS:
(i) \(2245 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(240.0 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(179.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)

(iv) Av. gield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{6}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & N & Mean \\
\hline \({ }_{1}\) & 2269 & 2160 & 2233 & 2221 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 2343 & 2086 & 2672 & 2367 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 2086 & 2196 & 2160 & 2147 \\
\hline Mean & 2233 & 2147 & 2355 & 2245 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=113.1 \cdot \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. N marginal means & \(=84.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=146.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \(=164.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.
Ref :-U.P. 50(74). Type:-‘‘M'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combjnation with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nis. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Last week of October, (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments:
4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germinätion (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{3}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germina- tion (at milky stage).

Sub plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: \quad N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(N: T_{1}=A l l\) at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and \(S\) sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(25^{\prime} \times 175^{\prime}\) and Sub-plot : \(25^{\circ} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{1}^{\prime}\) alround. Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround, Irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\). Sown space left between main-plots \(=8^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Satisfactory, (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kuoraghat, Kalyanpur, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by CP.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1204, \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(369.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(245.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of \(I\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 475 & 599 & 623 & 387 & 599 & 527 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1183 & 1241 & 1687 & 1580 & 1506 & 1439 \\
\hline 18 & 1273 & 1416 & 1432 & 1236 & 1262 & 1324 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1443 & 1443 & 1644 & 1533 & 1517 & 1516 \\
\hline Mean & 1094 & 1175 & 1346 & 1188 & 1221 & 1204 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =135.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =100.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =200.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =224.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]
2. marginal means of NT
3. NT means at the same level of I
4. I means at the same level of NT

\author{
Crop:-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :- Govt. Agri, Farm, Etawah.
}

\author{
Ref:- U.P. 51(72). \\ Type :- 'IM'.
}

Object:-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at diferent levels and at different times in combi- . nation with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Last week of October, sowing was delayed. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (1x) \(1.10^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering stage), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}+\) Irrigation 9 weeksafter germination (at flowering stage) and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T o}=\mathrm{no}\) manurc)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(N: T_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) half at sowing and half at first irrigation.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sut-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot size : \(20^{\prime} \times 175^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(20^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border : \(1 \frac{1}{}^{\prime}\) alround, field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\), sown space left between main-plets : \(41^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Faizabad, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Atarra, Kunraghat, Hawalbagh and Luckncw. (b) N.A. (vi) Mil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

\section*{3. RESULTS:}
(i) \(725 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(433.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(270.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Only main effect of 1 is Dighly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ccccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 206 & 291 & 113 & 386 & 365 & 272 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 458 & 664 & 705 & 517 & 486 & 566 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 978 & 1112 & 942 & 1194 & 998 & 1045 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 911 & 1132 & 932 & 926 & 1189 & 1018 \\
\hline Mean & 638 & 800 & 673 & 756 & 760 & 725
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I\)
\(=137.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of NT
\(=95.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. NT means at the same level of \(I\)
\(=191.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT
\(=219.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri, Farm, Etawah.
Ref :- U.P. 52(132).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combiination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Chari-Wheat. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) coam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) 3 ploughinge with watts plough, 2 ploughings with cultivator, 2 ploughings with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 40 to \(50 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{am}\) (d), (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb-591 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Maln-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(X_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering stage). \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering stage) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}{ }^{+}\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
All combinations of ( 1 ) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) so manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(N: T_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) half at sowing and half at first irrigation.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot: : \(30^{\prime} \times 175^{\prime}\) and sub-plot: \(20^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\circ} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround; distance between main-plots is \(4 I^{\prime} \cdot(\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Meerut Atarra, Bharari, Faizabad, Muzaffarnagar and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS
(i) 1232 fo./ac.
(ii) (a) \(271.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(210.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of I and the control ps. treated effect are both highly significant. Others are not significant.
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(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{r|ccccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 278 & 358 & 355 & -340 & 463 & 359 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1158 & 1292 & 1426 & 1356 & 1508 & 1348 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1313 & 1611 & 1670 & 1647 & 1477 & 1544 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1439 & 1730 & 1529 & 1853 & 1838 & 1678 \\
\hline Mean & 1047 & 1248 & 1245 & 1299 & 1322 & 1232
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I \quad=85.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of NT \(\quad=74.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. NT means at the same level of \(I\)
\(=149.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT \(\quad=158.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

Ref :-U.P. 53(113).
Type : \({ }^{\text {' }}\) 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing and herrowing with watts plough, cultivator and desl plough on 13.7.1953) 6.8. 1953, 19.8.1953, 5.9.1953, 19.9.1953, 26.9.1953 and 21.10.1953. (b) Sown by improved seed drill: (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(\mathbf{I}_{0}=\) No Irrigation, \(\mathbf{I}_{1}=I r\) igation 3 beeks after germination (at tillering stage). \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=\mathrm{I}_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 ueeks after germination (at flowering stage) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as A/S: \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{Jb} / / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
(2) 2 times of a pplication of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=A l l\) at scwing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) half at sowirg and half at first irrigation.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main plots/replication and 5 sut-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) Mainplot : \(20^{\circ} \times 75^{\prime}\), : sub-plot : \(20^{\prime} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot torder. \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left betreen main-plots to serve as irrigation channel \(4.5^{\prime}\) (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) Nit. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabrd, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1297 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(319.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(356.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is bighly sigoificant ard the interaction \(I \times\) 'control ts, treated' is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{Na}_{3} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) & 770 & 981 & 934 & 746 & 546 & 795 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1130 & 1367 & 1488 & 1508 & 1611 & 1421 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & - 2054 & 1529 & 1359 & 1552 & 1513 & 1601 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1421 & 1302 & 1320 & 1400 & 1418 & 1372 \\
\hline Mean & 1344. & 1295 & 1275 & 1301 & 1272 & 1297 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(I\) & \(=101.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal mesin of \(N T\) & \(=126.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. NT means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=252.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of \(N T\) & \(=247.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

> Ref :-U.P. 50(84).
> Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :}
(i) (a) Nit. (b) Green manure. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1950. (iv) (a) Plougbings on 24.6. 19j0, 9.9 1950, 20.9.1950, 28.9.1950, 7.10.1950 and 30.10.1950. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 srs. \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid late). (vii) 1rrigated. (viii) Harrouing on 15.12.I450 (ix) N.A. (x) 23,24.4.1951.

\section*{2. TRRATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+I r\) rigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 week after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}
\(j^{3}\) applications of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\) No manure, \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.

(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication anj 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot \(60^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\); sub-plot \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround. Field border \(=2^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots \(=5^{\circ}\), sown space left between blocks \(=8^{\circ}\)-also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) After vermination, crop was attacked by kat a which disappeared after Ist Irrigation. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 19j0-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghar, Banaras, Kalyanpur, Kalai, Muzzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (vi) Nil. (vii, Expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
\(\begin{array}{llll}\text { (i) } & 1526 & \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { (i) (a) } & 150.7 & \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)
(b) \(210.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of I and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrr|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) & 778 & 908 & 1033 & 906 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 1597 & 1585 & 1680 & 1621 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{2}\) & 1520 & 2131 & 1840 & 1830 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{3}\) & 1520 & 1929 & 1787 & 1745 \\
\hline Mean & 1354 & 1638 & 1585 & 1526
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two.
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{I}=71.1 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\)
2. marginal means of \(\mathrm{N} \quad=85.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N means at the same level of \(I=171.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathrm{N}=157.1 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

Ref :-U.P. 51(63).
Type :-‘iM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combication with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.11 .1951 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 40-50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(1.10^{\circ}\) (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering, and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+I r r i g a t i o n ~ 12\) weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plof treatments:
3 applications of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=\) No manure, \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=\boldsymbol{= 0} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Castor cake.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication ard 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(69^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\) and Sub-plot: \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\prime}}\) alround. Field border \(=21^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between blocks \(=5^{\prime}\) also used as irrigation channel. Sown space left between main-plots \(=5^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Percentage of germination was poor ( \(70 \%\) ) gencral stand was good; no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iij) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bararas, Faizabad, Kupraghat, Kalyanpur Atarra, Bharari, Kalai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Hawalbagh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Eyperiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(726 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(308.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(196.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is bighly significant and forms of \(N\) effect is significant. Other effect are not significant.
(v) Av. sield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 185 & 321 & 401 & 302 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 739 & 654 & 913 & 768 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 908 & 935 & 1011 & 951 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 872 & 801 & 966 & 880 \\
\hline Mean & 676 & 678 & 823 & 726
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of I & \(=125.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
2. marginal means of N & \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=69.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

Ref:-U.P. 52(133).
Type :-‘M'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in \(\mathbf{c m m b i n a t i o n ~ w i t h ~ l e v e l s ~ o f ~ i r r i g a t i o n ~ o n ~}\) Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Chari-Wheat. (b) Charl. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11 .1952 (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with Warts plough, two ploughings with cultivator and 2 with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 40. to 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium late). (vii) Irrigated, (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments:}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

3 of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\) No manure, \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4, (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(60^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\) and sub-plot: \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(17^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround. Field border \(=2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround. Between main-plots \(=5^{\circ}\). Between blocks \(=5^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Ban ras, Faizabad, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Kalai, Atarra, Hawalbagh, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Exparimeat conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(954 \quad \mathrm{bb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(285.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(2660 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of \(I\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(N_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 490 & 341 & 414 & 415 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1077 & 1135 & 1064 & 109 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & - 1260 & 1122 & 1313 & 1232 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1106 & 1008 & 1113 & 1076 \\
\hline Mean & 983 & 902 & 976 & 954 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{1. marginal means of I} & /ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)} & /ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{3. N means at the same level of I} & & /ac: \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)} & & /ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

Ref:- U.P. 53(107).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on . Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M. (b) G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing on 13.7.1953, 6.8.1953, 19.8.1953, 5.9.1953, 19.9.1953, 26.9.1953, 5.10.1953, 21.10.1953, 30.10.1953 with Watt's and desi plough. (b) Sown by improved seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) srs/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1} \boldsymbol{+}\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms ard levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main -plot : \(40^{\prime} \times 60^{\circ}\), sub-plot : \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(2.5^{\prime}\) alround. Sowing space left between main-plots \(5^{\prime}\) and between blocks is \(5^{\prime}\) which serves as irrigation channel also. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Effected by rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Kunragbat, Kalvanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Mecrut, Muzaffarnagar and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{3. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1235 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(433.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(270.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is highly significant and forms of N effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) & 637 & 579 & 623 & : 613 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1264 & 1652 & 1002 & 1306 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1567 & , 1638 & 1531 & 1579 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 1349. & 1536 & 1442 & 1442 \\
\hline Mean & 1204 & 1351 & 1150 & 1235 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of I & \(=184.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of N & \(=95.5 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=191.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \(=241.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). Ref:- U.P. 51(57). \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad. \\ Type :- 'IM'.
}

Object :-To study the effect of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
-
(i) (a) Nil. (b) G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.11 .1951 . (iv) (a) 10 ploughings. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 40-50 srs/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(2.31^{\circ}\). ( \((x)\) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments:}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{2}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sab-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 2 times of application : \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) half at sowing and half at ist irrigation. \(I_{1}\) given on 28.12.1951. \(I_{2}\) given on 13.2.9952: \(I_{3}\) could cót be given due to western winds which ripened the plants. Hence \(I_{a}\) is identical to \(I_{2}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 225^{\circ}\), sub-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-pict border \(11^{\prime}\) alround ; field border \(5^{\circ}\) alround. Irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\); sown space left between main-plots \(4^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good No lodging. (ii) Slight attack of rust in some plots. (iii, Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Hawalbagh, Etawah, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra, Kunraghat, Lucknow and Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Considerable damage has teen done due to rats in most of the plots. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(595.6 \mathrm{lb}_{-;} \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(133.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(119.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of N doses [and control \(v s\) treated are both highly significant. None ofthe other effects is significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{~N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 297.8 & 726.7 & 544.5 & 733.4 & 617.8 & 584.0 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 366.7 & 677.8 & 615.6 & 677.8 & 655.6 & 598.7 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 445.6 & 725.6 & 574.5 & 643.4 & 610.0 & 599.8 \\
\hline Mean & 388.9 & 713.9 & 5773 & 674.5 & 623.4 & 595.6
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of
1. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) marginal means \(\quad=42.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{2}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{2}\) marginal means \(\quad=36.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. two marginal means of NT \(\quad=42.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. two NT means at the same level of \(H_{0}\) or \(I_{1} \quad=84.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
5. two NT means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}} \quad=59.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) means at the same level of \(N T \quad=86.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
7. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{2}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{2}\) means at the same level of \(N T=75.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
```

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad. . Type :-'IM'.

```

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combjnation with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) Ploughings by pariza and desi plough on 6, 29.9.1952, 9, 14.10.1952 and 9, 11.11.1952, Shur plough on 14.10.1952 and 10.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 17 chk./plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.P. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. . (x) 22.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering stage)。 \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering stage) and \(I_{2}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}_{\text {. }}\)
(2) 2 times of application: \(T_{1}=\) Full at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at first irrigation.

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(15^{\circ} \times 240^{\circ}\); sub-plot: \(15^{\prime} \times 48^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}(v)\) Sub-plot border \(1 \frac{3}{3}^{\prime}\), field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround, distance between main-plots \(4^{\prime}\), distance between blocks \(4^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (2) Attack of rust-yellow, black and orange.. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 19511953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Atarra, Bharari, Muzaffarnagar and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(717 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(180.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(133.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of N and control we treated are both highly significant. Time of application and interaction \(I \times N \times T\) are both sigaificant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(I_{0}\) & 436 & 672 & 856 & 664 & 913 & 708 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 404 & 710 & 1032 & 700 & 706 & 710 \\
\hline 12 & 534 & 842 & 846 & 706 & 892 & 764 \\
\hline Is & 566 & 861 & 737 & 607 & 664 & 687 \\
\hline Mean & 485 & 771 & 868 & 669 & 794 & 717 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{1. marginal means of I \(\quad=57.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{2. marginal means of NT \(=47.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{3. NT means at the same level of I \(\quad=94.1 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{4. I means at the same level of NT} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\(=101.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.
}

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 53(62).}

Type : '‘IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levele and at different times in combjnation with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing with prija plough, cultivator and desi plough. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d), (e) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vi) N.P. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing at the proper time are common in practico.
(ix) N.A. (x) 23.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No irrigation, \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering stage', \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering stage) and \(I_{8}=I_{8}+\) .irrigation, 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combination of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application: \(T_{2}=\) Full at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at first irrigation.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot: \(15^{\circ} \times 220^{\circ}\); sub-plot \(15^{\prime} \times 48^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 45^{\circ}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\circ}\) and field border \(4^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main plots \(4^{\prime}\) also to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) \(15-20 \%\) attacked by rust. (iii) Crain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kunrdghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Due to constant heavy rains, plots could not be prepared properly. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
3. RESULTS :
(i) \(581 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(140.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(91.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Control vs, treated, \(I \times N, I \times T\) and \(I \times\) control ws treated are all highly significant.(Interaetion \(I \times N \times T\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 254 & 643 & 820 & 627 & 708 & 610 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 690 & 700 & 399 & 721 & 648 & 632 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 396 & 560 & 747 & 554 & 612 & 574 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 379 & 477 & 526 & 588 & 576 & 509 \\
\hline Mean & 430 & 595 & 623 & 622 & 636 & 581
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\(=44.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of NT \(=32.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. NT means at the same level of I \(=64.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT \(=73.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.

Ref :- U.P. 51(64).
Type:- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Green manure. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.11.1951. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings by desi plough and 4 ploughings by pariza plough. (b) Sown by seed, drill, (c) 50 ars./ac, (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(2.31^{\prime \prime} .^{\text {( }}\) (x) N.A.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{1}+\). irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=\mathrm{I}_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=N\) manure, \(\dot{N}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\).jac. of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) lb./ac. of N as castor cake.
\(I_{1}\) given on 27.12.1951, \(I_{2}\) given on 12.2.1952 and \(I_{3}\) not given due to western winds which ripened the plants after \(2 n\) d irrigation. Hence \(I_{3}\) is identical to \(I_{2}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(57^{\prime} \times 41^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(22^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 41^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=11^{\prime}\) alround, field border \(=\) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots \(=5^{\prime}\), sown space left between blocks \(=10^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor due to late sowing. No lodging except in one plot receiving A/S. (ii) There was slight attack of rust in some of the plots. (iii) Grain yield. (iv). (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. iv) (a) Varanasi, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Bharari, Etawah, Kalai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Hawalbagh and Lucknow (b) N.A. (vi) Damage done by rats in most of the plots. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

\section*{3. RESULTS:}
- (i) \(612.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(141.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(b) \(128.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
i: . Only main effect of \(I\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yleld of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Meas \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 311.0 & 327.1 & 355.9 & 331.3 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 701.0 & 524.8 & 684.8 & 636.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 816.9 & 671.3 & 735.1 & 741.1 \\
\hline Mean & 616.4 & 548.6 & 627.7 & 6126 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of


Crop i- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 52(1:6).
Site :- Gopt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.
Type :- 'IM'.
Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASȦL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Chari-Wheat. (b) Chari. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) Plonghing by Pariza on 6, 11.11 .1952 . Ploughings by desi plough on 4, \(9,14.10 .1952\) and 7, 14, 10.11.1952 (r) N.A. (c) 40 to 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.P. 52 (medium-early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{2}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Sp'it-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(57^{\prime} \times 41^{\prime}\) sub-plot : \(22^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 41^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot bord \(: r=11^{\prime}\) alround, field bcrder \(=3^{\prime}\), distance between main-plots \(=5^{\prime}\) and distance between blocks \(=10^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Attack of rust yellow, black and orange. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Kalai, Atarra, Hawalbagh, Bharari, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS: -
(i) \(537.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(169.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(115.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 413.4 & 643.5 & 683.0 & 580.0 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 298.4 & 647.1 & 593.2 & 512.9 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 305.6 & 697.4 & 571.6 & 524.9 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 258.8 & 643.5 & 697.4 & 533.2 \\
\hline Mean & 319.0 & \(657 . \%\) & 636.3 & 537.7 \\
& & & &
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means
\(=69.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means
\(=40.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(N\) means at the same level of \(I \quad=81.8 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(N \quad=96.0 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). Ref :- U.P. 53(60).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.: Type :-‘IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong-Lobia. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing \(8-10\) times. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) srs fac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.P. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing at the proper time are common in practice. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\), 27.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{\mathbf{g}}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 comtina ion of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure. \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) lb ./ac. of N as castor cake

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv)
(a) Main plot : \(66^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\); sub-plot : \(22^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\). (b) \(19 \times 41^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots \(5^{\circ}\); block partition \(10^{\circ}\) to sarve as irrigation channel. (vi)Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) \(15-20 \%\) rust incidence. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No (v) (a) Varanasi, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kuaraghat, Kalai and Muzaffarnagar, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(492 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(61.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(117.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 324 & 568 & 517 & 470 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 306 & 625 & 550 & 494 , \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 250. & 557 & 684 & 497 \\
\hline If & 333. & 529 & 660 & 507 \\
\hline Mean & 303 & 570 & 603 & 492 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- S.E. of the difference of two
1. marginal means of 1
\(=25.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
3. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at the same level of \(I\)
\(=41.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=83.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=72.4 \mathrm{bb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop:- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Ref:- U.P. 49(82). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri, School Farm, Hawalbagh. \\ Type :-‘IM’.
}

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11 .1949 . (iv) (a) Once ploughed by victor plough, 4 times ploughed by desi plough. (b) Broadcasting (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P.4. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 5.90", (x) 8 and 9.5.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering slage), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) +irrigation 9
- weeks after germination (at flowering stage), and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=n 0\) manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}_{\text {. }}\)
(2) 2 times of application: \(T_{1}=\) full at sowing and \(T_{2}=\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}\) at sowing and \(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}\) at first irrigation.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot (ii) (a) 3 main-plots /block; 5 sub-plots/ maia-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : \(22^{\prime} \times 165^{\prime}\) Sub-plot : \(22^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Length of roots per plant, length of shoot per plant, length of leaf, breadth of leaf, fresh wt. of shoot, dry wt. of shoot, no of dry leaves, green leaves, no of grains per ear and grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) \(1949-1951\). (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut Muzaffarnagar and Lucknow. (b) N.A.(vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

\section*{RESULTS :}
(i) \(960.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(462.7 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(308.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only the interaction \(I \times N\) is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N a}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{Na}_{3} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline I 1 & 9766 & 1002.5 & 656.8 & 717.3 & 756.2 & 821.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1305.0 & 1054.4 & 738.9 & 968.0 & 963.6 & 1006.0 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 894.5 & 717.3 & 1140.8 & 868.6 & 1642.1 & 1052.7 \\
\hline Mean & 1058 خ & 924.7 & 845.5 & 851.3 & 1120.6 & 960.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I\) : \(\quad-169.0 \mathrm{lb} /\) /ac.
2. marginal means of NT
\(=145.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. NT means at the same level of I
\(=252.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT \(\quad=281.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). & & Ref :- U.P. 51(66). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. School Farm, Hawalbagh. & \(\because \quad\) Type :- ‘IM'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) No. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(11,12.12 .1951\). (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Broadcasting. (c) \(40-50\) sers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) NjI. (vi) N.P. 4 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) no irrigation \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (2t tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{3}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at fiowering) and \(I_{3}{ }^{\prime}=I_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plet treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application : \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Full at so wing ard \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at 1st irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plot/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot : \(150^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\); Sub-plot : \(15^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\), (b, \(12^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (v) Suk-plot torder \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround. Irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\), space between main-plots \(6^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor due to late sowing. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1949-1951\). (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Faizabad, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Kalyappur, Eharari, A tarra, Kunragbat and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Poor yield due to rains at harvesting. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(\quad 68.49 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(ii) (a) \(138.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(35.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop:- Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 49(72). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. School Farm, Hawalbagh. & Type :-'IM'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.11.1949. (iv) (a) Ploughing by U.P. plough No. 1: ic was ploughed by desi plough twice tefore sowing and platijing. (b) N.A. (c) 40 srs/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 4 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(5.90^{\circ}\). (x) 8, 10.5.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering): \(I_{d}=I_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plof treatmerts:}

3 combination of forms and leveis of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No manure, \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{L}}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as A/S, \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/repl'cation and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(54^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\); Sub-plot: \(18^{\prime} \times 34^{\circ}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime \prime}\), (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-19i2. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Varadasi, Kalyaopur, Atarra, Bharar!, Merut, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow and Bulandshahr. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment concucted by C.P.

\section*{S. RESULTS :}
(i) \(979 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(221.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(3385 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Oaly main effect of levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highiy signifieant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 756 & 1156 & 1111 & 1008 \\
\hline Is & 600 & 956 & 1433 & 996 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 561 & 1072 & 116 & 933 \\
\hline Mean & 639 & 1061 & 1237 & 979 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\(=106.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
3. N means at the same level of I
\(=159.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=276.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ec}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
- \(249.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. School Farm, Hawalbagh,

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 51(67).}

Type:-‘IM’.

Object:-To study the effect of different fcrms ard levels of \(N\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pađdy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13, 14.12.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) broadcasting. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d), (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 4 (medium). (vii) Irrigated, (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{2}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}\) +irrigation. 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{\mathbf{1}}=60 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as \(A / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60\) lb./ac. of N as castor calce.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot size \(48^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\) and sub-plot : \(16^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(13^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(11^{\prime}\) alround. Field torder \(3^{\prime}\) alround. SJwn spacing left between main-plots \(4^{\circ}\). Sown space left between blocks \(8^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very poor growth due to liate sowing. Stems very slender. There was mo locging. (ii) Rust infection (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Etawah. Kalai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Poor yield due to excessive rains. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(48.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(38.35 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(33.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effects of forms of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & N & Mean \\
\hline \(I_{0}\) & 64.04 & 26.20 & 32.02 & 40.75 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 32.02 & 27.65 & 66.95 & 42.21 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 36.39 & 33.47 & 98.97 & 56.28 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 46.57 & 37.81 & 84.41 & 56.27 \\
\hline Mean & 44.76 & 31.29 & 70.59 & 48.88 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of differençe of two}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{I}\) & \(=15.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\) & \\
3. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{I}\) & \\
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\) & \\
4. & \(=23.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. School Farm, Hawalbagh.
Ref:-U.P. 52(139).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.12.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing by U. P. No. 1 plough on 3.8.1952. ploughings on 28, 29.11.1952. ; \(1,3.12 .1952\) by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 40 to 50 sris./ac. (d) and (e). N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P.4. (vii) Lrrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.5.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treafments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation. \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering). \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering)and \(I_{3}=I_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatemits :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(\quad N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{a}\). of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) lb,/ac. of \(N\) as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 (iv) (a) Main-plot \(40^{\circ} \times 42^{\prime}\). Sub-plot \(14^{\prime} \times 43^{\circ}\). (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 37^{\circ}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) Field border 3'. Between main-plots \(3^{\circ}\) Between blocks \(6^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b). (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Kalai, Atarra, Bharari, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) : 708 lb./ac.
(ii) (a) \(221.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(1688 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Forms of \(\mathbf{N}\) and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) are both highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb /ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 543 & 323 & 1404 & 757 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 461 & 447 & 1183 & 697 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 427 & 406 & 1232 . & 688 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 385 & 282 & 1404 & 690 \\
\hline Mean & 454 & 365 & 1306 & 708 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\[
=90.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\]
2. marginal means of \(\mathrm{N} \quad=59.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N means at the same level of \(I \quad=119.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
4. I means at the aame level of \(\mathbf{N} . \quad=132.9 \mathrm{li} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
Ref :-U.P. 50(80)
Type :-'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Domat-Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.10.1950. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings by turn west. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 409. (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and hoeing on 12 and 15.12.1950. (ix) 3.55*. (x) 26.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No irrigation, \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +irrigation 9 weeks afier germination (at flowerıng) and \(I_{\mathbf{g}}=I_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation \(\mathbf{1 2}\). weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatmenta :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: \quad N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\),/ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) lb./ac. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. 1 (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(60^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) N.A. (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fair. (ii) Attack of rest \(30 \%\). (iii) Grain yieid. (iv) (a) \(1950-1954\). (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Varanasi, Kalyanpur, Etawah, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.

\section*{3. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1243 \quad \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(i) (a) \(165.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(202.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of I is bighly significant.
(v) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 795 & 807 & 837 & 813 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1330 & 1591 & 1709 & 1543 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1294 & 1294 & 1503 & 1365 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1246 & 1223 & 1282 & 1250 \\
\hline Mean & 1165 & 1229 & 1334 & 1243
\end{tabular}.
S.E. of difference of \(t w o\)
1. marginal means of I
\(=77.8 \mathrm{fb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=82.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}_{0}\)
3. \(N\) means at the same level of \(I\)
\(=165.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=155.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
}

Ref:- U.P. 51(58).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combinations with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Chari-Wheat. (b) Charl. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.11 .1951. iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) As per treatments. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(\mathbf{I}_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: \quad N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(I_{2}=60\) \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sab-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(60^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\) and Sub-plot : \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(17^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) all rouud the net plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bbarari, Etawah, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Hawalbagh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (ii) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1113 ib./ac.
(ii) (a) \(229.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) 136.0 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is highly significant. Main effect of forms of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) is significant. Interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{I}\) & \(=93.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of N & \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=481 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref :- U.P. 52(131).
Type:- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fodder. (c) N.A.; (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (jii) 9.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with gary plough on 15.10.1952, ploughing with desi plough on \(16.10 .19 \leq 2\), ploughing with double cultivator on 2610.1952 and ploughing with desi plough on 3.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 14.8 chk./plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Application of compost on 2.11 .1952 to the entire field. (vi) \(\mathrm{Pb}, 591\) (madium-late). (vii) Irrigated, as per treatments. (viii) Harrowing with lever harrow on 29.12.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plat treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks afier germirati8n (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flou ering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \varepsilon c\). of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) Ib.jac. of Nias castor cake.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(60^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\) and sub-plot : \(20^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 37^{\circ}(v) 11^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Poor. (ii) Nit. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Etav ah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Atarra, Hawalbagb, Bharari, Kunraghat, and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(524.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(210.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(b) \(95.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of I and main effect of levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) are highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{I} \times\) levels of N is significanal.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lbo/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& & & \\
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 200.3 & 267.1 & 311.6 & 259.7 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 427.4 & 703.4 & 653.9 & 596.6 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 373.9 & 805.8 & 658.9 & 612.9 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 418.5 & 703.4 & 765.7 & 629.2 \\
\hline Mean & 355.0 & 619.9 & 598.8 & 524.6
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=86.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(N\) marginat means & \(=33.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(N\) means at the same level of \(I_{;}\) & \(=67.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of \(N\) & \(=102.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{lr}\text { Crop :- Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref:- U.P. 53(110). } \\ \text { Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai. } & \text { Type :- ‘IM'. }\end{array}\)
Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fa.low. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1953. (iv) (a) 9 ploughings and
harrowings (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591 (latel. (vii) N.A. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-piot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\).ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) lbo/ac. of \(N\) as castor cake.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) \(4^{-}\)main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(40^{\prime} \times 60^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(20^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) all round the ret plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(I) Good. (ii) Nile (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Varanasi Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1293 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(546.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(455.5 \mathrm{tb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of \(I\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 899 & 784 & 712 & 798 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1017 & 1656 & 1656 & 1443 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1398 & 1567 & 1496 & 1487 \\
\hline 18 & 1122 & 1754 & 1460 & 1445 \\
\hline Mean & 1109 & 1440 & 1331 & 1293 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1. I marginal means} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=222.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2. N marginal means} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=161.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{3. N means at the same level of I} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=322.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{4. I means at the same level of N} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=344.7 \mathrm{ib} . \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi),
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref :-U.P. 50(122).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Xil. (b) G.M. (c) N.l. (ii) (a) Domat. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1950. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings. (b) By seed drill. (c) 5 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 409. (vii) Isrigated. (vij) Weedıng and hoeing on 26, 29.12.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.4.1 7 S1.

\section*{2.ITREATMENTS :}
-Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No irrigation. \(\mathrm{I}_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering).
Sab-plot treatments :
All comtinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{0}}=\mathbf{0}, \mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{1}}=25\) and \(\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block; 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(171^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\), sub-plot: \(19^{\circ} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Partapgarh. Baharaicn. (b, N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1334 \quad\) Ib./ac.
(ii) (a) \(290.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(293.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Main effects of I and \(P\) are both highly significant. All others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yicld of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\boldsymbol{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 865 & 1138 & 909 & 971 & 1011 & 856 & 1045 \\
\hline \(I_{1}\) & 1337 & 1677 & 1821 & 1612 & 1614 & 1670 & 1551 : \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1205 & 1459 & 1594 & 1419 & 1327 & 1390 & \(1541^{\text {' }}\) \\
\hline Mean & 1136 & 1425 & 1441 & 1334 & 1317 & 1305 & 1379 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & 1118 & 1390 & 1444 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{O}_{1}\) & 972 & 1522 & 1422 & & & , & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1317 & 1361 & 1458 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{I}\) & \(=79.1\) & \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(G\) or \(P\) & \(=80.0\) & \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), \\
3. \(G\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=138.5\) & \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P\) & \(=138.0\) & \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
5. means of the body of \(G \times P\) table & \(=138.5\) & \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).}

Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Ralai.

Ref :-U.P. 51(77).
Type :-'IM'.

Object : -To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Chart-Wheat. (b) Charl. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) ars./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 409 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 levels of irrigation: \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No irrigation, \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{I}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{z}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at floweriog).

\section*{Sab-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Supet : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, G_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication; 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iil) 4. (iv) (a) Maid-plot \(171^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). sub-plot: \(19^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) Baharaich and Partapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1048 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(416.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(203.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of I and \(P\) are highly significant. All other effects are not signficant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & \(G_{3}\) & Mean & P0 & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 724 & 698 & 711 & 711 & 698 & 633 & 802 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1227 & 1191 & 1183 & 1200 & 1098 & 1265 & 1238 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1209 & 1258 & 1236 & 1234 & 1145 & 1181 & 1376 \\
\hline Mean & 1053 & 1049 & 1043 & 1048 & 980 & 1026 & 1139 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 1006 & 961 & - 974 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1039 & 1017 & 1022 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1114 & 1169 & 1134 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E: of difference of two
1. marginal means of I
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{G}\) or \(\mathbf{P}\)
\(=98.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
3. \(G\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I\)
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P\)
\(=47.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=82.9 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\)
5. means of the body of \(G \times P\) table
\(=119.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=82.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 52(123), \\
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai. & Type :-'IM'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with desi plough on 10, 13 and 16.10.1952. Ploughing with double cu'tivator on 26.10.1952. Ploughing with double desi plough on 3.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c, 40-50 seers/ac. in general-exact amount/piot is N.A. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Compost on 27.10.1952, 31.10.1952 and 1.11.1952. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated as per treatments. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1953.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS:}

Main-plct treatments :
3 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=N\) n irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as 'uper : \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum: \(\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{1}=25\) and \(G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a)19 \(\times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime \prime}\) (v) \(11^{\prime}\) all round the cet plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) G:ain and straw yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1954\) (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experinent was conducted (y C.P. (R). \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) was rejected, hence the experiment was acalysed with two main-plot treatments only.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(3.5 .5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(98.90 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(7696 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(G\) is significant. All other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 371.9 & 3*18 & 370.1 & 361.3 & 343.7 & 380.1 & 3601 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 4.2.0 & 312.7 & 394.7 & 369.8 & 351.0 & 382.9 & 3756 \\
\hline Mean & 385.9 & 327.3 & 382.4 & 365.5 & 347.3 & 381.5 & 367.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 367.8 & 2:8.5 & 3856 & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{. . .}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 415.7 & 32.1 & 404.7 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 347.4 & 369.2 & 356.9 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marsinal means of \(I\)
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{G}\) or \(\mathbf{P}\)
3. G or \(P\) muans at the s me le el of \(I\)
\(=23.31 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=22.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the sime level of \(G\) or \(P=34.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. m-ans of the body of \(G \times P\) table \(=38.4 \mathrm{~s} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
Ref:- U.P. 53(103).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in comtination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{6}}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings and harrowings. (r) Sown by sced drill. (c) \(40-50 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591 (late). (vii) Irrigated-as per treatments. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 2,3.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatmerts :
3 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering).

\section*{Sub-plot treatcmnts:}

All combination of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{Ib}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-p'ots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main plot: \(171^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\); Sub-plot: \(19^{\circ} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 32^{\circ}\). (v) \(1 f^{\prime}\) all round the net-plot (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Partapgarh, Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(986.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(860.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(275.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,fac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & Pı & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & G & G」 & G8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & . 1050.1 & 856.9 & 1101.2 & 1002.7 & 1134.0 & 999.1 & 875.1 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1072.0 & . 969.9 & 907.9 & 983.3 & 915.2 & 1082.9 & 951.7 \\
\hline \(I_{2}\) & 955.3 & 886.0 & 1075.7 & 972.3 & 948.0 & 944.4 & 1024.6 \\
\hline Mean & 1025.8 & 904.3 & 1028.3 & 986.1 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & 1053.8 & 860.5 & 1082.9 & 999.1 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & 1032.7 & 969.9 & 1053.8 & 1008.8 & . & & \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1021.0 & 882.4 & 948.0 & 950.5 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I\)
\(=202.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(G\) or \(P\)
3. G or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I\)
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{G}\) or \(\mathbf{P}\)
\(=64.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
5. means of the body of \(G \times P\) table
```

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Ref :- U.P. 49(68).
Type :- 'IM'.

```

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Urid. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1949. (iv) (a) One ploughing by Watt's plough, one by desi plough and pata, one harrowing by tractor and 4 pata by cultivator. (b) By seed drill. (c) 45 srs/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) NıI. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculture on 17.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation: \(\mathbf{I}_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 16 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(N\) as \(A / S, N_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c_{0}\) of N as castor cake.

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot \(50^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\) Sub-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Varanasi, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Bulandshahar and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nib (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
\(\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } & 2101 & \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)
(ii) (a) \(141.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(154.0 \quad 1 \mathrm{~b} . j \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of forms of N is significant and effect of levels of N is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 2013 & 2105 & 2251 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1848 & 1958 & 2288 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1958 & 2178 & 2306
\end{tabular}\(|\)\begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean \\
\hline Mean \\
\end{tabular}

S E. of the difference of two
1. marginal means of
\(=66.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=72.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N means at the same level of \(I\)
\(=125.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{cc}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Ref :- U.P. 50(81). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. Type :- IM '.
}

Object:-To stu ty the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONUITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b, Maize and Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26, 27.10.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughings witb Watts plough on 28.9.1950. Tractor harrowing on 30.719:0. Palewa on 10 to 12 10.50. Desi pluugh and puts on 23.0 .1950 and 26.10 .30 . (b) Sowing by seed dill. c) \(43 \mathrm{sra} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (c) N.A. (v) N.l. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) \(3.45^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=\) \(I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) lb./ac. of \(N\) as castor cake.
\(I_{3}\) given on 25.1t,1950, \(I_{2}\) not given due to rains from 23.12.1950 to 16.1.1951 and \(I_{3}\) given on 3,4.3.1951. Hence \(I_{\mathbf{2}}\) becomes identical to \(I_{1}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot \(=57^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) sub-plot \(=19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b). \(19^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) alround. Field border \(=\) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots \(=5^{\prime}\). Sown space left between bloks \(=8^{\prime \prime}\)-also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fairly good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Banaras, Etawah, Kalai, Muzzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Plots of \(I_{0} N_{1}, I_{0} N_{0}, I_{2} N_{0}, I_{3} N_{1}\), were damaged by rats. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(2045 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) 229.5 lb.jac.
(b) \(228.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only the effect of levels of N is highly significant. All other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(N_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{IH}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1601 & 2319 & 2268 & 2063 \\
\hline 12 & 1358 & 2494 & 2244 & 2032 \\
\hline 13 & 1663 & 2137 & 2359 & 2053 \\
\hline Mean & 1495 & 2361 & 2279 & 2045 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of
1. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{3}\) marginal means
2. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{3}\) marginal means
3. two marginal means of \(N\)
4. two \(N\) means at the same level of \(I_{0}\) or \(I_{g}\)
5. two \(\mathbf{N}\) means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\)
6. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{3}\) means at the same level of \(N\)
7. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{3}\) means at the same level of \(N\)
\(=108.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=93.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=94.2 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(=186.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=102.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=186.9 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=161.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 51(61).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Ni.. (b) Kakun. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1951. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with desi plough, 1 ploughing with watts plough and tractor harrowings-2. (b) Seed drilled. (c) \(40-50\) scs /ac. (d) and (c) N,A. (v) Nil. (vi) C. 13 (early). (vii) Irrigated as per treatments. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(1.07^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of Irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No Irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{\mathbf{2}}=\) \(I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

Sub-plot treatments :
3 comtinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=N\) manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} /\) /ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60\) lb./ac. of \(N\) as castor cake.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A, (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot \(=57^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(=19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\) (v) \(1 \frac{1}{3}^{\prime}\) ring round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{I}_{0}, \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{I}_{1}, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) showed poor tillering otherwise crop condition was good. (ii) Nit. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Kuaraghat, Atarra, Bharari, Etawah, , Kalai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Hawalbagh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
\(\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } & 1014 & \text { lb./ac. }\end{array}\)
(ii) (a) \(279.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(135.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effects cf forms of N and levels of N are both highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 694 & 1252 & 1099 & 1015 \\
\hline \(I_{1}\) & 675 & 1326 & 1176 & 1059 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 596 & 1209 & 1047 & 951 \\
\hline Ig & 645 & 1294 & 1154 & 1031 \\
\hline Mean & 652 & 1270 & 1119 & 1014 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I \quad=114.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N} \quad \Rightarrow 47.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. N means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I}=95.78 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
4. I means at the same level of \(N=138.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(126).
Type :-‘IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDIIIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1-}\) (c) NA. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.11.1952, (iv) (a) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) ploughed in on 31.8.1952. Pioughings with watts plough and Pafa on 19, 20.9.1952. Ploughings with cultivator and Pata on9, 10.10.1952; 3.11.1952. Palewa on 20, 21.10.1952. Ploughing with desi plough and pata on 30, 31.10.1952. and 4.11 .1952 . (b) N.A. (c) \(12.7 \mathrm{ch} /\) /plot. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No Irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tilleting), \(I_{\mathbf{2}}=\) \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sab-plof treatments :}

3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{8}=60\), lb./ac, of \(\mathbf{N}\) as castor cake.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(57^{\prime} \times 35^{\circ}\); sub-plot : \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the ret plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Meerut, Kalai, Atarra, Hawalbagb, Bharari, Kuoragbat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.(R):

\section*{3. RESULTS:}
(i) \(\quad 1786 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(320.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(175.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of levels of N is highly significant and \(\mathrm{I} \times\) forms of N is significant. Others are not significant. (iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1127 & 1871 & 1857 & 1618 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 1231 & 2182 & 2273 & 1895 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1053 & 2346 & 1947 & 1782 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1181 & 2171 & 2199 & 1850 \\
\hline Mean & 1148 & 2142 & 2069 & 1786
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=130.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. N marginal means & \(=62.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=124.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \\
& \(=165.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(145).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Type :-‘IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(N\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Legume and Cereal. (b) Lobia and Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1953. (iv) (a) 6 plcughings followed by para on \(17,19,22.9 .1953 ; 8\) and 26.10.1953. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 40 to 50 srs./ac. ( \(11 \mathrm{chh} / \mathrm{plot}\) ) (d), (e) N.A. (v) Green manure with Lobia (turned in). (vi) C-í3 (medium). (vii) Irrigated-as per treatments. (viii) Interculturing with cultivator on 30.12.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of Irrigation : \(\dot{I}_{0}=\) No Irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{1}\) +Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

3 combinations of forms and levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\) Control, \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Castor cake.
\(I_{1}\) given on 13.12.53, \(I_{3}\) was not given due to rains, \(I_{3}\) was given on 12.3.54. The experiment is analysed with \(I_{0}, I_{1}\) and \(I_{3} ; I_{2}\) becoming indentical with \(I_{1}\).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4, (iv) (a) Mainp'ot : \(57^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(19^{\circ} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. Crop lodged. (ii) Black and brown rust attack. (iii) Germination per sq. yd. grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Plots which were manured with A/S were more damaged by rats due to greater lodging. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1198 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(212.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(198.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only effect of levels of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{r|rll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 916 & 1231 & 1179 & 1109 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 935 & 1294 & 1369 & 1199 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1088 & 1348 & 1414 & 1283 \\
\hline Mean & 968 & 1292 & 1333 & 1198
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of}
1. \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) marginal means
\(=86.62 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{3}\) marginal means \(\quad=75.01 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\),
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 3. iwo } N \text { marginal means } & =70.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ \text { 4. } & \\ & =140.3 \mathrm{lwo} \mathrm{N} \text {. means at the same level of } \mathrm{I}_{0} \text { or } \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{s}}\end{array}\)
4. two N means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) or \(\mathrm{I}_{3} \quad=140.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{sc}\).
5. two N means at the same level of \(\mathbf{1}_{1}\)
\(=99.22 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(6, I_{0}\) and \(I_{3}\) means at the same level of \(N\)
\(=143.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
7. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{3}\) means at the same level of \(N \quad=123.4 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 49(83).


Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different leve ls and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) NiL (b) Urd. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.10.1949. (iv) (a) One ploughing by watts plough, one by desi plough and pata; 4 ploughing by cultivarors and 4 pata. (b) Drilling. (c) 45 srs./ac. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated as per treatments. (viii) Interculturing on 17.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

\section*{Msin-plot treatments :}

3 levels of irrigation : \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\mathbf{I r r i g a t i o n} 9\) weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{\mathbf{3}}=I_{\mathbf{2}}\) +Irrigation 12 weeks after germisation (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) all at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{3}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N_A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : \(22^{\circ} \times 165^{\prime}\) Sub-plot: \(22^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Ht. of plant, leaf length, no. of tillers, no. of green leaves, length of roots, no. of dry leaves, wt. of shoot etc. grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Gorakhpur, Atarra, (Jhansi). Bharari, Meerut, Muraffarnagar, Lucknow and Hawalbagh. (b) N,A. (vi) NiI. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1666 \quad 15 . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(303.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(b) \(257.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significe \(\mathrm{n}^{+}\).
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{r}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline I 1 & 1445 & 1664 & 1546 & 1697 & 1428 & 1556 \\
\hline 12 & 1546 & 1819 & 1749 & 1680 & 1714 & 1708 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 168. & 1714 & 1798 & 1748 & 1731 & 1734 \\
\hline Mean & 1557 & 1742 & 1698 & 1708 & '1624 & 1666 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. I marginal means } & =110.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 2. NT marginal means } & =140.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 3. NT meats at the same level of I } & =242.6 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)
\(=243.6 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi), \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kal yanpur.
}

Ref:- U.P. 50(71).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :- To study the effect of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize and moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26, 27,10.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughing with watts plough on 29.9.1950, tractor harrowing on 30.9.1950, palewa on \(10,12.10 .1950\), desi plough and pata on 2310.1950 and 26.10 .1950 . (b) Seed drilled. (c) 43 srs./ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated as per treatments. (viii) Nil. (ix) \(3.45^{\prime \prime}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at illering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

All combination of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no mannre)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=3 v\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at 1st irrigation.
\(I_{1}\) on 25.11.1950, \(I_{2}\) not given due to rains from 23.12.1950 to 16.1.1951; \(I_{8}\) on 3, 4.31.1951. Hence \(I_{2}\) becomes idential to \(I_{1}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot \(175^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\). Sub-plot \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 32^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fairly good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Etawah, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Some plots were badly damaged by rats. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1958 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(3016 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(2028 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of levels of N and control ps. treated are highly signlficant and interaction \(\mathrm{I} \times \mathrm{N}\) is significant. All others are not s'gnificant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0} \mathbf{T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1} \mathbf{T}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) & 1170 & 1732 & 2283 & 1677 & 2195 & 1811 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 1344 & 2117 & 2149 & 2106 & 2312 & 2006 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{3}\) & 1480 & 2115 & 2035 & 1795 & 2443 & 2008 \\
\hline Mean & 1334 & 2020 & 2147 & 1971 & 2315 & 1958
\end{tabular}

S E. of difference of
1. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{3}\) marginal means \(=110.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
2. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{3}\) marginal means \(=95.98 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. two margital means of NT \(\quad=82.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. two NT means at the same level of \(J_{0}\) or \(I_{3} \quad=1656 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
5. two NT means at the same leiel of \(\mathrm{I}_{1} \quad=117.1^{\circ} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{3}\) means at the same levtl of NT: \(\quad=181.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) or \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) means at the same level of \(\mathrm{NT}=159.8 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
- Ref :-U.P. 51(80).

Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Type:-'IM'。

Object:-To study the effect of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Wheat at different levels and at different times in comblnations with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10 .1951 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 40-50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated: (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(\mathbf{I}_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 wecks after germination (at illering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after g :rmination (at flowering) and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milk stage).

\section*{Sab-plot treatements:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{0}} \mathrm{T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: ~ N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / a c\). of \(N_{6}\)
(2) 2 times of application : \(T_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(T_{2}=H a l f\) at sowing and half at ist irrigation.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot size : \(175^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the ret plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (al 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Hawa bagh, Etawah, Faizabad, Bharari, Atarra, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow and Meerut. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1081 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(309.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(b) \(206.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of I , kevels of N and control vs. treated are higbly significant. Othere ere not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{6}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(I_{0}\) & 150 & 243 & 561 & 470 & 459 & 377 \\
\hline \(I_{1}\) & 763 & 1236 & 1488 & 1069 & 1444 & 1201 \\
\hline 12 & 1050 & 1370 & 1425 & 1414 & 1663 & 1384 \\
\hline 13 & 916 & 1324 & 1745 & 1351 & 1466 & 1360 \\
\hline Mean & 721 & 1043 & 1305 & 1076 & 1258 & 1081 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. marginal means of I & & \(=97.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
2. marginal means of NT & & \(=73.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. NT means at the same level of I & & \(=146.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of NT & & \(=163.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(76). Type: ‘‘IM’.

Object:-To study the effect of application of N to Whiat at different le rels and at different times in combjnation with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\)-Wheat. (b) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\). (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (ii) 29.10.1952. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings and palewa; pata after every ploughing and ralewa. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nı. (vi) C-13 (medum). (vii) Lrigated as per treatmerts. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1953.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigalion 3 wieks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 werks fer germınation at Alwwering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}\) 个 Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milk stage).
Sub plot treatments :
All combinations of 1 ) and ( \(21+\) a control \(\left(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=n 0\right.\) minure \()\)
(1) 2 le els of \(N\) as \(A / s: ~ N_{1}=30 \mathrm{ar} \mathrm{d}_{2}=\mathbf{C O} \mathrm{lb}\).fac of N .
(2) 2 times cf apphcation : \(T_{1}=\) all at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and haif at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-p'ot. (b) N.A. iiii) 4. (iv) (a) Maidplot : \(1^{-5} \times 19^{\prime}\) and sub-plot: \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime \prime}\) (b) \(16 \times 32^{\prime \prime}\) (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring rcund the net plot. (ii) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Etawah, Meerut, Atarra, Bharari, Falzabad, Muzaffaroazar and Kuoraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1428 \quad \mathrm{Jh} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(333.7 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{lac}\).
(b) \(252.2 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effeit, of le.els of \(N\) and control vs treated are high'y significant. Others are act signifiant.
(jv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac. ,
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 982 & 1540 & 1564 & 1184 & 1351 & 1324 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1110 & \({ }^{-1463}\) & 1720 & 1217 & 1723 & 1447 \\
\hline 12 & 1108 & 1559 & 1717 & 1469 & 1657 & 1502 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1047 & 1438 & 1523 & 1433 & 1750 & 1438 \\
\hline Mean & 1062 & 1500 & 1631 & 1326 & 1620 & 1428 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{S.E. of diference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{1. I marginal means \(\quad=105.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) :} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{2. NT marginal means \(\quad=89.18 \mathrm{Ib}\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{3. NT means at the same level of I \(\quad=178.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{4. I means at the same level of NT} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=191.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Crop : Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 53(141).
Type:- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Legume and cereal. (b) Lobia and moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1953. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings followed by pata on \(18,23.9 .1953,9,24,25,27\), and 28.10 .1953 . (b) Seed drilled. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (11 chs/plot). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Lobia and moong türned in. (vi) C-13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated as per treatments. (viii) Interculturing with cultivator. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatmeats :}

4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 wecks after germination (at tillering); \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}\) +Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 times of application: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) all at sowing and \(\cdot \mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Half at sowing and balf at 1st irrigation.
\(I_{1}\) applied on 17.12.1953; \(I_{2}\) not applied because of rains and \(I_{8}\) applied on 9.3.1954. Hence \(I_{2}\) becomes identical to \(\mathbf{I}_{1}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(95^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Sub-plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Sown space left between main-plots \(8^{\prime}\) also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi).Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination per sq. yd., grain and straw yield in chhs./plos. (iv) (a) 19491953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Atarra, Banda, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat, and Muzaflarnagar. (b) N.A. '(vi) Plots with 60 lb ./ac. of A/S are test of all. Average yield of crop at the farm= \(18 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and in the surroucdirg area \(=1 \leq-18 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (vii) The experimert was conducted by C.P. (R).
3. RESULTS:
(i) \(1175 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(272.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(b) \(197.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effects of levela of N atd control ve treated ase both bighly significant. All others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 818 & 1006 & 1233 & 1028 & 1146 & 1046 \\
\hline \(I_{1}\) & 975 & 1166 & 1285 & 1173 & 1504 & 122! \\
\hline Iz & 878 & 1050 & 141! & 1097 & 1622 & 1212 \\
\hline Mean & 912 & 1097 & 1304 & 1118 & 1444 & 1175 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of
1. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{3}\) marginal means
\(=86.06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(I_{9}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{3}\) marginal means
\(=74.53 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. two marginal means of NT
\(=69.82 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. NT means at the same level of \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\)
\(=98.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. NT means at the same level of either \(I_{8}\) or \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{t}}\)
\(=139.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{3}\) means at the same level of NT
\(=151.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
7. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{2}\) means at the same level of NT
\(=131.4 \mathrm{lb}-/ \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).}

Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 48(100).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels \(\boldsymbol{\gamma f}\) irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil (b) Urd. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Coam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1949. (iv) (a) One ploughirg with watts flougn, ore tractor hirrowing and pala, 5 ploughings by cultivator and pata. (b) Seed drilled. (c) 45 srs lac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Iatercultu.e by planet Junior on \(\mathbf{1 5 . 1 2 . 1 9 4 9 .}\) (ix) N.A. (x) 24.4.i950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments:
2 levels ol irrigation: \(I_{3}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering). and \(I_{8}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination at milky stage).
Sub-plot treitments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 eve.s of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of a as \(G\) ypsum : \(G_{0}=0_{8} G_{1}=25\) and \(G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block; 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(162^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\) ard sub-plot :18 \(\times 40^{\circ}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the set plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL .
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and forder yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Baratanki, Bulandshahar and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2295 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(782.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{lac}\).
(b) \(383.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 2312 & 2404 & 2318 & 2345 & 2398 & 2361 & 2276 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 2367 & 2184 & 2184 & 2245 & 2166 & 2300 & 2269 \\
\hline Mean & 2340 & 2294 & 2251 & 2295 & 2282 & 2330 & 2272 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{0}\) & 2343 & 2196 & 2306 & 2282 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & 2269 & 2480 & 2242 & 2330 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2407 & 2205 & 2205 & 2272 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(I\) & \(=212.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
2. marginal means of \(G\) or \(P\) & \(=127.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
3. \(G\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(\Rightarrow 180.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P\) & \(=259.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
5. means in the body of \(G \times P\) table & \(=221.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref:-U.P.50(132).
Type :- IM .

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 45 ars./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 3.45". (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at fiowering) and \(I_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{1}+I_{r i g a t i o n ~} 12\) weeks after germination (at milly stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{6}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=O_{3} P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels CaO as \(\mathbf{G y p s u m}: \mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{2}}=25\) and \(\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main plot : \(171^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : : \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N. A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Barabanki, Banaras, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1521 \mathrm{3b} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(265.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(b) \(137.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iil) None of the effects is signifficadt.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal mean
2. G or \(P\) marginal mears
\(=62.53 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=39.64 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(\mathbf{G}\) or \(\mathbf{P}\) means at the same level of 1
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P\)
\(=55.06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. means in the tody of \(G \times P\) table
\(=77.50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=68.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Ref :- U.P. 51(75).
Type :-‘M'.

Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil, (b) Kakun. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10 .1951 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seed drilled. (c) \(40-50\) srs /ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{\mathbf{L}}+\) Irrigation 12 ueeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels CaO as of Gypsum : \(\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot \(=171^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 32^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experıment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(8464 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(176.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) 103.6 lb .1 ac .
(iii) Main effects of \(I, G\) and \(P\) and interactions \(G \times P, I \times G \times P\) are all sigaificant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{\varepsilon}}\) & Mean & O. & \(\mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 868.7 & 810.4 & 838.6 & 839.3 & 856.9 & 853.2 & 807.7 \\
\hline I 2 & 851.4 & 854.1 & 855.1 & 853.5 & 857.8 & 835.9 & 8669 \\
\hline Mean & 860.0 & 832.3 & 846.8 & 846.4 & 857.3 & 844.6 & 837.3 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & 914.8 & 862.8 & 794.4 & 857.3 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{1}\) & 824.5 & 871.0 & -838.2 & 844.6 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 840.9 & 7630 & 907.9 & 837.3 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{I}=41.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(G\) or \(P \quad=29.90 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. G or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I \quad=42.28 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P=540 \% \mathrm{lb} . / 2 \mathrm{c}\).
5. means in the body of \(G \times P\) table \(=51.77 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(112). } \\ \text { Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. } & \text { Type :- 'IM'. }\end{array}\)
Object :-To atudy the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypamm on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong T1. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with watts plough and parfa on 21.9. 1952. Ploughing with spirial harrow and Patta on 22.9.1952. Ploughing with cultivator and pata on 6.10.1952. Palewa on 8, 9.10.1952. Patta on 15.10.195 J. Ploughing with culivator and pata on 16. 17.10.1952. Ploughing with dest plough and pata 24; 25, 27.10.1952. (b) N.A. (c) \(12.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{plot}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (medium): (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=I\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{z}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (i) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of CaO as \(G y p s u m: G_{0}=0, G_{2}=25\) and \(G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(19^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 32^{\prime}\) (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the ret plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras.
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(869.8 \mathrm{tb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(431.2 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{sac}\).
(b) \(162.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(日_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{G}_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 921.6 & 860.5 & 930.7 & 904.3 & 947.1 & 856.9 & 908.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 864.2 & 828.6 & 813.1 & 835.3 & 859.6 & 850.5 & 795.8 \\
\hline Mean & 892.9 & 844.6 & 871.9 & 869.8 & 903.4 & 853.7 & 852.3 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 969.5 & 881.9 & 858.7 & 903.4 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 847.8 & 820.4 & 892.9 & 853.7 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 861.4 & 831.4 & 864.2 & 852.3 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(I\) & \(=101.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(G\) or \(P\) & \(=46.81 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3 G or \(P\) means at the same level \(I\) & \(=66.20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P\) & \(=115.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
5. means of the body of \(G \times P\) table & \(=81.08 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(143).
Type :-'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on Wheat
1. BASAL CONbITIONS :
(i) (a) Legume-Cereal. (b) Lobia and Moong, (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.10 .1953 (iv) (a) 7 ploughings and pata after every ploughing. (b) N.A. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Lobia and moong turned in on 2.9 .1953 . (vi) C-13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) Interculturing with cultivator on 1.2.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :

\section*{1}

2 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Suboplot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{8}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of CaO as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, G_{1}=25\) and \(G_{8}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(35^{\prime} \times 171^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil, slight damage by rats in few plots. (iii) Germination, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was con-
ducted by C.P.(R). ducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1165 \quad \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(150.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(170.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only interaction \(I \times P \times G\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & 1179 & 1166 & 1098 & 1148 & 1090 & 1205 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{1}\) & 1251 & 1248 & 1134 & 1211 & 1246 & 1176 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1094 & 1235 & 1082 & 1137 & 1126 & 1148 \\
\hline Mean & 1175 & 1216 & 1105 & 1165 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1139 & 1201 & 1122 & 1154 & & . \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1211 & 1232 & 1087 & 1176 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=35.40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(G\) or \(P\) marginal means & \(=35.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(P\) or \(G\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=69.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of \(P\) or \(G\) & \(=66.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
5. means in the body of \(G \times P\) table. & \(=61.57 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 49(78).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Type :-'IM'.
Object :-To study the effect of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combimation with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11.1949. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings and pata. (b) N.A. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) G.M. by sanai. (vi) NP-52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculture with one harrow on 13.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as A/S: \(N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot size : \(22^{\prime} \times 165^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(22^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) No. of tillers, length of leaves etc. Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1008 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(166.5 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(232.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(N\) and \(T\) and 'control vs treated' are all bighly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1188 & 968 & 557 & 1214 & 925 & 970 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1331 & 929 & 657 & 1331 & 959 & 1041 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1374 & 1020 & 709 & 985 & 968 & 1011 \\
\hline Mean & 1298 & 972 & 641 & 1177 & 951 & 1008 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1. marginal means of I & \(60.80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
\hline 2. marginal means of NT & \(=109.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 3. NT means at the same level of I & \(=189.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}\) \\
\hline 4. I means at the same level of NT & \(=180.2 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi):
Ref :-U.P. 50(77).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. Type:-‘IM’.
Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chart. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.11.1950. (iv) (a) Preparation to crumbling stage by 6 ploughings and 2 barrowings and 2 harrowings for taking out grass and hand weeding after irrigation. (b) Seed drilled. (c) \(40-50 \mathrm{srs}\)./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) \(1.69^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 14 and 15.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Msin-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{2}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) frrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{2}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\mathrm{No}\) manare).
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{N} A / S: N_{2}=30\) and \(N_{2}=601 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
(2) 2 times of application: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=A l l\) at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) half at sowing and half at first irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot \(16^{\prime} \times 175^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(16^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(13^{\circ} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) Stray attack of rust with negligible effect. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b), (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Etawah, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
3. RESULTS :
(i) \(1249 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) 144.5 lb ./ac.
(b) \(244.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of I is significant. "Control' treated" effect is bighly significant. No other effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathrm{T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 852 & 1458 & 1404 & 1463 & 1611 & 1358 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 816 & 1261 & 1288 & 1163 & 1360 & 1178 \\
\hline 18 & 633 & 1396 & 1315 & 1082 & 1207 & 1127 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1015 & 1458 & 1431 & 1373 & 1387 & 1333 \\
\hline Mean & 827 & 1393 & 1360 & 1270 & 1391 & 1249 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=52.67 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. NT marginal means & \(=99.68 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. NT means at the same level of I & \(=199.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of NT & \(=185.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref : UU.P. 51(81).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Type :„‘IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at'different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP.-52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(\mathbf{I}_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1} 4\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-p'ot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 lecels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N .
(2) 2 times of application : \(T_{1}=\) All at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) half at sowing and half at first irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-piot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(16^{\prime} \times 175^{\prime}\), sub-plot : \(16^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(13^{\prime} \times 32^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No Icdging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Hawallagh, Etawah, Fa zabad, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Meerut, Kalyaopur, Atarra and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. Experiment was conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(711 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\),
(ii) (a) \(147.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(166.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Main effects of \(I\) and \(N\) and 'control is treated' are all highly significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N g T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 166 & 534 & 637 & 713 & 722 & 554 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 211 & 601 & 888 & 664 & 997 & 672 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 269 & 566 & 1346 & 735 & 991 & 781 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{3}\) & 166 & 790 & 1104 & 817 & 1301 & 836 \\
\hline Mean & 203 & 623 & 994 & 733 & 1003 & 711 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=53.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
2. NT marginal means & \(=68.13 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. NT means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=136.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
3. 1 means at the same level of \(N T\) & \(=133.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}.\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref :-U.P. 52(128).
Type :- 'IM'.
Object:-To study the effect of application N to Wheat at diferent levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) 4 ploughings (b) N.A. (c) 40 to 50 srs/ac. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(0.84^{\circ}\). (x) \(10,124.1953\).

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatanents :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{2}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{g}}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application: \(T_{1}=\) Full at the sowing and \(T_{8}=\) half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. . (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : \(16^{\prime} \times 175^{\prime \prime}\), sub-plot: \(16^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(13^{\circ} \times 32^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime \prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
- (i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950—1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, - Kalyanpur, Meerut, Atarra, Bharari, Faizabad and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(464 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(133.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(82.50 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only control vs, treated is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{6} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 408 & 462. & 471 & 413 & 543 & 460 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 346 & 534 & 489 & 548 & 579 & 499 \\
\hline \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 314 & 449 & 530 & 485 & 569 & 469 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 323 & 440 & 440 & 503 & 426 & 426 \\
\hline Mean & 348 & 471 & 482 & 487 & 530 & 464 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of
\(=48.69 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of NT
\(=33.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. NT means at the same level of \(\dot{I}\)
\(=67.36 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N T}\)
\(=77.46 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub.Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:- U.P. 53(56).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Cowpea for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) 6 plougbings, rollering on 16.10 .1953 ; Palewa on 27.10.1953. (b) Seed drill. (c) \(40-50 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). (1.16 lb./plot). (d) N,A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NP-52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing are in common practice. (ix) 0.51". (x) 31.3.1954 and 1.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENT:}

\section*{Main plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{2}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{3}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \cdot \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 2 times of application: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plot/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(16 \times 175^{\circ}\), sub-plot: \(16^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(13^{\circ} \times 32^{\circ}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alrounds, Sown space left between main-plots to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) Faizatad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut and Muzaffaroagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. REJULTS:
(i) \(1298 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(216.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(273.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the etfects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.jac.


Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref:- U.P. 49(74).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effeet of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai, (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11.1949. (iv) (a) 8 ploughings and pata. (b) N.A. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) G.M. by sanai. (vi) NP-s2 (medium). (vii) Irigated. (viii) Harrowing on 13.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of Irrigation: \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combination of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=N_{0}\) manure., \(\quad N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\), of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{8}=60\) \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/ block, and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : \(54^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyappur, Atarra Bharari, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Bulandshahr and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1053 lb./ac.
(ii) (a) \(144.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(244.8 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Forms of N are significant. Levels of N are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(N_{0}\) & \(N_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 1363 & 833 & 1144 & 1113 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1400 & 668 & 1144 & 1071 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{n}}\) & 1217 & 778 & 933 & 976 \\
\hline Mean & 1327 & 760 & 1074 & 1053
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\(\begin{array}{lr}\text { 1. marginal means of } \mathbf{I} & =68.25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 2. marginal means of } \mathbf{N} & =115.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 3. } \mathbf{N} \text { means at the same level of } \mathbf{I} & =199.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 4. I means at the same level of } \mathbf{N} & =176.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 50(78).
Type:-‘'IM'。

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam, (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(1.69^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot trea'ments:
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 wecks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{2}=\mathbf{I}_{3}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{8}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) Irrigation 12 . weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: \quad N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{\mathbf{2}}=60\) \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake. .
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot: \(162 \times 31^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(18^{\prime} \times 31^{\circ}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur, Etawah, Kalai, Muzaffarragar, Meervt, Bharari, Atarra ard Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
s. RESULTS :
(i) \(1218 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) 177.2 lo./ac.
(b) 180.8 lb /ac.
(iii) Forms of N and levels of N are both highly significant. Others are not sigoificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb-/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 867 & 1548 & 1222 & 1246 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 773 & 1440 & 1222 & 1145 \\
\hline 18 & 836 & 1564 & 1391 & 1264 \\
\hline \(-\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 738 & 1551 & 1365 & 1218 \\
\hline Mean & 804 & 1551 & 13 CO & 1218 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(I\) & \(=83.54 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
2. marginal means of \(N\) & \\
3. \(N\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=73.82 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
4. I means at the same level of N. & \(=147.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:-U.P. 51(59). Type : \(-\mathbf{A M}\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(N\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDIIIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughings, pata and harrowings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-S2 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 23 and 24.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(\quad I_{0}=\) No irrigation \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 - weeks after germination (at milky stage).

Sub-plot treatments : -
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manare, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{8}}=60\) \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) Mairplot : \(54^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}\) and sub-plots : \(18^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 28^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good, No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bararas, Faizabad, Kalianpur, Atarra, Bharari, Etawah, Kalai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Hawalbagh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(738 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(151.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(116.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is significant and forms of \(\mathbf{N}\) and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) are both highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.'ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) & 196 & 987 & 551 & 578 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{1}\) & 360 & \(11 i 1\) & 711 & 727 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{2}\) & 325 & 1440 & 880 & 882 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{3}\) & 258 & 1249 & 786 & 764 \\
\hline Mean & 285 & 1197 & 732 & 738
\end{tabular}
S.E. of r ifference of two
1. marginal means of \(I\). \(\quad=71.16 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).

2 marginal means of \(\mathbf{N} \quad=47.67 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at the same level of \(\mathrm{I} \quad=95.33 \mathrm{lb}, \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathrm{N} \quad=105.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 52(129).

\section*{Type :-‘M}

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1952. (iv) (a) Palewa on 24, 25.10.1952. ploughings on \(30,3110.1952\) and 3, 5.11 .1932 Harrowings on 2, 3.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 40 to 50 srs/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 3.84", (x) 12. 13.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) firrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation \(12^{\circ}\) weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=N o\) manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathbf{N}\) as caster cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot \(18^{\prime} \times 172^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Muzaffarnagar, Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Kalai, A tarra, Hawalbagh and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(409.0 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(i) (a) \(77.38 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(143.7 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only effect of levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 255.4 & 642.9 & 433.4 & 443.9 \\
\hline 11 & 302.4 & 463.7 & 332.6 & 366.2 \\
\hline 12 & 329.3 & '508.5 & 413.3 & 417.0 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 282.2 & 460.3 & 483.8 & 408.8 \\
\hline Mean & 292.3 & 518.8 & 415.8 & 409.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means
\(=36.47 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means
\(=58.67 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
3. N means at the same level of I
\(=117.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=102.51 \mathrm{lb} \cdot / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).}

Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:-U.P. 53(57).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Legame-Cereal. (b) Cow pea for fodder. (c) Nii. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on \(15,16,24\) and \(31.10 .1953 ; 8,9.11 .1953\). Rollering on 1.11.1953 and palewa 3.11.1953. (b) Seed drill. (c) \(40-50 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). ( \(1.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{plot}\) ). (d) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NP. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hocing at the proper time. (ix) 0.51". (x) 31.3.1954 and 1.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No Irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-piot treatments :
3 combinatione of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\), \(/ a c\). of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as castor cake.

\section*{3. DESION:}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : \(54^{\prime} \times 40\); sub-plot \(18^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(b) Good. lodging. (ii) Nil, (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Bharari and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi, Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by CP.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1434 \quad 16 . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(150.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(153.3 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 1312 & 1467 & 1298 & 1359 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1352 & 1413 & 1446 & 1404 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 1500 & 1494 & 1480 & 1491 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1305 & 1561 & 1581 & 1482 \\
\hline Mean \({ }^{\text { }}\) & 1367 & 1484 & 1451 & 1434 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{rl} 
1. I marginal means & \\
2. N marginal means & \(=71.15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=62.57 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \\
& \(=125.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
& \(=124.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}.\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Kef:-U.P. 49(79).
Type :-‘IM'.
Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Bhindl. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Saddy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1949. (iv) (a) Harrowing by tractor, two ploughing by mould-board plough and two by desi ploughs. (b) Behind desi plough. (c) 50 lb./ac. (d) N.A: (e) N.A. (v) T.C. at 42 mds, in whole field on 20.9.1949. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing on 6.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.3.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) Irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All comtinations of ( 1 ) and (2)+a control ( \(N_{0} T_{0}=n 0\) manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / 3: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 times of application : \(T_{1}=F\) ull at sowing and \(T_{8}=\) half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 rain-plots/block; 5 sut-plots/nain-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) \(13^{\circ} \times 11^{\circ}\). (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Length of plants, no. of tillers, length of main ear per everge plant, no. of grains pes main ear per plant, weight of erain per ear per plant. Gain and thusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Muzafarnagar and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil.
(vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2420 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(32.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(233.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of I , levels of N , t times of application and "control w. treated" are all highly significant Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1680 & 1986 & 2291 & 2138 & 2495 & 2118 \\
\(\dot{\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}}\) & 1884 & 2138 & 2648 & 2342 & 3055 & 2413 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 2138 & 2393 & 2851 & 2698 & 3564 & 2729 \\
\hline Mean & 1901 & 2172 & 2597 & 2393 & 3038 & 2420
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of
\(=14.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of NT \(=134.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. NT means at the same level of I \(=233.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT
```

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).

```

Site :- Crop Fhysiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :- U.P. 50(116)
Type :- ‘IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong T1. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.10.1950. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by mould board, two by desi and one by cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) \(40 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) G.M. after moong and the crop turned in soil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated as per treatments. (viii) Interculturings on 30.11.1950, and 29.1.1951, (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (al flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) +2 control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure \()\).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N_{\text {. }}\)
(2) 2 times of application of \(A / S: T_{1}=\) Full at sowirg and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plcts/block; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(\mathbf{N}^{\prime}\) A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(34^{\prime} \times 14^{4}\). (b) \(31^{\circ} \times 11^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The germination of, the crop v as pocr due to cerly strfrirg of rains. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (r) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Kalyanpor, Eharari, Meerut, Kunraghat, Muzaflarnagar and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(874 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(529.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(464.9 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effocts is significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb,lac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrrrr|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 914 & 854 & 454 & 678 & 947 & 769 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 810 & 722 & 711 & 328 & 1029 & 720 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 843 & 1072 & 941 & 1401 & 930 & 1037 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1018 & 1138 & 865 & 1018 & 810 & 970 \\
\hline Mean & 896 & 947 & 743 & 856 & 929 & 874
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =193.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =189.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =379.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =390.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]
2. marginal means of NT
3. NT means at the same level of I
4. I means at the same level of NT

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. . Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different ievels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.11.1951. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (eariy). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Intercultural operations on 3, 4.12.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 26, 28.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=\) \(\mathbf{I}_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) andI \({ }_{3}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation 12 woeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure).
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(A / S: T_{1}=\) full at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Helf at sowing and half at 1 st irrigation
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(112^{\circ} \times 34^{\prime}\). (b) \(1 / 143.2\) ac. (v) Between main plots \(3^{\prime}\) and between blocks \(=4^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Below normal. (ii) N. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kuaraghat, Muzaffarnagar and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conduatei by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(458.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(236.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(220.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significan \(t\).
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) & 492.5 & 414.3 & 538.5 & 290.0 & 483.3 & 443.7 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 437.3 & 492.5 & 437.3 & 4649 & 501.7 & 466.7 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 451.1 & 529.3 & 418.9 & 501.7 & 409.7 & 462.1 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{3}\) & 566.2 & 428.1 & 345.2 & 455.7 & 506.3 & 460.3 \\
\hline Mean & 486.8 & 466.0 & 435.0 & 428.1 & 475.2 & 458.2
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\(=74.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of NT
\(=77.9 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\) :
3. NT means at the same level of \(I\).
\(=155.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT \(=158.0 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 49(86). \\ Type :-- \(\mathbf{M M}^{\prime}\).}

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii), 26.10.1949. (iv) (a) Tractor harrowing crosswise. Three times by desi plough. (b) Sown bebind the plough (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Basal dressing of T.C. on 20.10.49. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Ore hoeing and one weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(\mathbf{l}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of form and levels of \(N: N_{0}=N\) manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=\) 60 lb ,/ac. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iji) 3. (iv) (a) \(22^{\circ} \times 12^{\circ}\)
(b) \(20^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\) (v) \(1^{\prime}\) all round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Bulandshahr, Hawalbagh, and Kunraghat. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1363 \quad \mathrm{lb}\) /ac.
(ii) (a) \(156.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(55.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is significant. Effects of forms of \(N\), levels of \(N\) and interaction \(I \times\) levels of in are highly significant. Other are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{r|rrl|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 859 & 1344 & 1419 & 1207 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 971 & 1493 & 1605 & 1356 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{3}\) & 1381 & 1475 & 1718 & 1525 \\
\hline - Mean & 1070 & 1437 & 1581 & 1363
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{I}\) & \(=73.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal mears of N & \(\Rightarrow 26.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=45.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the sume le vel of N & \(=82.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). .
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. \(\quad\) Ty.P. 50(120).

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) in combination with levels of irrigation an Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong-Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1950. (iv) (a) Four ploughings by dest and victory piou'h, one by cultivator. (b) Sown behind desi plough. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) T.C. applied on 30.9.19j0. (vi) C-13 (carly). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Date of interculturing 22.11.1950 and 1.1.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{2}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}} \Rightarrow \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 combinations of form and levels of \(N: \quad N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\),/ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(N_{2}=69\) lb.Jac. of \(\mathbf{N}\) as castor cake.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(20^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) The crop was poor due to late rains. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi, Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(985 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(343.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(304.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of forms of N is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & N0 & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 622 & 850 & 850 & 774 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 912 & 1161 & 767 & 947 \\
\hline 12 & 1119 & 1410 & 850 & 1126 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1265 & 1099 & 912 & 1092 \\
\hline Mean & 980 & 1130 & 845 & 985 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(I\) & \(=162.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of N & \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=124.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \\
& \(=248.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
& \(=296.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat.
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 51(78).
Type :-'IM'。

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A: (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{8}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of \(N: \quad N_{0}=N o\) manure, \(N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60\) lb ./ac. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) ,N.A. (b) \(1 / 167\) th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Etawah, Kalai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(560.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(418.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(135.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only the interaction \(\mathrm{I} \times\) levels of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) & 467,0 & 655.2 & 553.3 & 558.5 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 703.4 & 536.5 & 526.4 & 588.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 505.1 & 553.3 & 574.6 & 544.3 \\
\hline Is & 719.0 & 493.9 & 434.6 & 549.2 \\
\hline Mean & 598.6 & 559.7 & 522.2 & 560.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \\
2. \(N\) marginal means & \(=171.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. N means at the same level of \(\dot{I}^{*}\) & \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \\
& \(=95.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
& \\
& \(=188.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref : U. \({ }^{\text {P. 49(98). }}\)
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. Type :-‘IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil, (b) Karela and Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10 .1949 and resown on 7.11.1949. (iv) (a) Cross wise ploughing by tractor, two ploughings by mould board plough, two by desi plough and planking. (b) Sown tehind desi plough (c) to (e) N.A. (v) T.C. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 20. 10. 1949. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Earthing up 10.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.3.1950,

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\dot{0}, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{9}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of CaO as \(G y p s u m: G_{0}=0, G_{1}=25\) and \(G_{9}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block, 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\), (b) 13' \(\times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur, Barabanki and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1175 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(56.63 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(137.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Levels of irrigation, doses of \(\dot{P}\) and doses of \(\mathbf{C}\) are highly significant. Others are not significani.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(I\) & \(=15.39 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
2. marginal means of \(G\) or \(P\) & \\
3. \(G\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \\
4. I means at the same level of \(G\) or \(P\) & \\
5. means in the body of \(G \times P\) table & \(=55.93 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
5. & \(=79.56 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}\) \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 50(119).
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow,


Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{g}}\) and Gypsum on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3, 4.11.1950. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by board plough, one by desi plough, one by cultivator plough. (b) Sown by desi plough. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) stable manure on 16.1950. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculturing on 8.12 .1950 and 1.1.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 levels of irrigation : \(1_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{I}_{1}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super : \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20\) and \(P_{8}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of CaO as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{1}}=25\) and \(\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block; 9 sub-plots/main-plot.
(b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 12^{\circ}\).
(b) \(23^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) ring round the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Below normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1949—1950. (b), (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur (Kanpur), Pratapgarb, Bahraich, Kalai (Aligarh) and Barabanki. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(566.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(196.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (b) \(259.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Nowe of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{6}\) & 573.6 & 492.4 & 489.7 & 518.6 & 641.2 & 543.8 & 370.7 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 522.2 & 595.2 & 579.0 & 565.5 & 573.6 & 560.1 & 562.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 557.3 & 514.1 & 773.8 & 615.1 & 633.1 & 676.4 & 535.7 \\
\hline Mean & 551.0 & 533.9 & 614.2 & 566.4 & 616.0 & 593.4 & \[
489.7
\] \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{0}\) & 611.5 & 660.2 & 576.3 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{G}_{1}\) & 549.2 & 546.5 & 684.5 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 492.4 & 395.0 & 581.7 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =53.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =70.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =122.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =113.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{G}\) or \(\mathbf{P}\)
3. \(G\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(I\)
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{G}\) or \(\mathbf{P}\)
5. means in the body of \(G \times P\) table

\section*{Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).}

Site :- National Botanical Gardens, Lucknow.

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 48(45). \\ Type :- 'IM'.}

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Threz years old guawa orchard. Chari for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15, 16.11.1943. (iv) (a) Two disc ploughings by tractor on 21.10 .1948 , one ploughing by desi plough on 9, 10.11 .1918 one disc ploughing by tractor on 12.8.1948. (b) N.A. (c) \(50 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) 6 tons of muncipal load on the whole field on 12.11.1943. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) lst week of April 1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{2}=\) One irrigation 3 weeks. after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) one irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{3}=I_{2}\) one irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
(2) 3 combination of forms and levels of \(N: N_{0}=\) No manure, \(N_{1}=A / S\) at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(N, N_{R}=\) castor cake at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact, in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 23^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Slight attack of rust in somo plants. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conduzted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(984 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(241.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only effect of levels of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(I_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 13 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 686 & 755 & 807 & 749 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 891. & 1130 & 1001 & 1007 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1149 & 1246 & 1194 & 1196 \\
\hline Mean & 909 & 1044 & \[
1001
\] & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =80.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =139.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.
Ref:-U.P. \(49(81)\)
Type:- 'IM'.
Object : - To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Early moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1949. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by victor plough and pata, 2 by desi and pata, palewa on 7.8.1949, 3 ploughings by desi and pata. (b) N.A. (c) \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb-591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14, 15.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering stage), \(I_{2}=I_{1}+\) irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering stage), and \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=n 0\) manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 time of application of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) balf at sowing and balf at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(22^{\prime} \times 165^{\prime}\), sub-plot : \(22^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Height of plants, length and breadth of leaf; root length. No. of tillers, dry wt. of shoot of green and dry leaf yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Gorakhpur, Kalyanpur, (Kanpur), Atarra (Banda), Bharari (Jhansi), Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1690 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(244.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(272.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of time of application is significant and control \(w\), treated is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1439 & 1759 & 2005 & 1945 & 2066 & 1843 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1374 & 1461 & 1677 & 1789 & 1945 & 1649 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1210 & 1491 & 1590 & 1780 & 1819 & 1578 \\
\hline Mean & 1341 & 1570 & 1757 & 1838 & 1943 & 1690
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. marginal means of I } & =89.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}, \\ \text { 2. marginal means of NT } & =128.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ \text { 3. NT means at the same level of I } & =222.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ \text { 4. I means at the same level of } \mathbf{N T} & \end{array}\)

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.

Ref :-U.P. 50(73).
Type :-‘IM’.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Last week of Oct. 1950. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 3.61*. (x) 13 and 14.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering),\(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=63 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{2}=\) full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Half at sowing and half at first irrigation.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot: \(19^{\circ} \times 110^{\prime}\); sub-plot : \(19^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1954. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Etawah, Kunraghat, Muzaffaroagar, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.

\section*{s. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1873 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
(ii) (a) \(1050 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (b) \(273.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of 'control vs treated' and interaction I \(\times\) 'control vs treated' are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1511 & 1548 & 2112 & 1756 & 1848 & 1755 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1486 & 1941 & 1904 & 1781 & 1892 & 1801 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2075 & 2100 & 2125 & 2162 & 1842 & 2061 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1118 & 2075 & 2149 & 2149 & 1892 & 1877 \\
\hline Mead & 1548 & 1916 & 2072 & 1962 & 1868 & 1873
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =383.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =111.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =223.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =432.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]
3. NT means at the same level of \(I\)

\author{
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \\ Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.
}

> Ref :-U.P. \(51(82)\).
> Type :-IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Maize and Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.11.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 4.15". (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main plot treatments:}

4 levels of irrigation : \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) no manure)
(1). 2 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{2}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 times of application of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{2}=\) full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at first irrigation.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(67 \frac{1^{\prime}}{} \times 28^{\prime}\); sub-plot : \(13 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(10 \frac{1^{\prime}}{2} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1954. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Hawalbagh, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Faizabad, Bharari, Atarra, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1558 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(577.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(261.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of 'control vs treated' is highly significant and interaction I \(\times\) 'control ws treated' is significant. Others are not significant.
\(471^{*}\)
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8} \mathrm{~T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{J}_{0}\) & & 1269 & 1440 & 1408 & 1131 & 1462 & 1342 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & & 1344 & 1761 & 1514 & 1717 & 1653 & 1598 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & & 1248 & 1611 & 1728 & 1792 & 1963 & 1668 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & & 1089 & 1450 & 1931 & 1761 & 1877 & 1622 \\
\hline Mean & & 1238 & 1566 & 1645 & 1600 & 1739 & 1558 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal mean
2. NT marginal means
3. NT means at the same level of I \(=182.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \(=92.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT
\[
=184.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\]
\[
=246.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.

Ref : - U.P. 52(115).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong and Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1952. (iv) (a) One metory plough and 7 desi ploughingg. (b) N.A. (c) \(40-50\) srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 19 and 12.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=\) No irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{3}=I_{2}\) +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control \(\left(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\right.\) No manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Full at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation. \(I_{2}\) was not given because of rains ; therefore \(I_{2}\) becomes identical with \(I_{1}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(19^{\prime} \times 34^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 31^{\circ}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) P il. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Elawah, Atarra, Bharari, Faizabad, Kalianpur, Muzaffarnagar and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil.• (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1617 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) (a) \(328.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(126.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Only main effects of I , levels of N , times of application ( I ) and 'control ws treated' are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{T}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8} \mathrm{~T}_{2}\) & Meas \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{0}\) & 920 & 1242 & 1406 & 1361 & 1496 & 1285 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 1199 & 1462 & 1711 & 1753 & 1912 & 1607 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 1547 & 1761 & 2140 & 2027 & 2365 & 1968 \\
\hline Mean & 1216 & 1482 & 1742 & 1724 & 1921 & 1617 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of
1. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{2}\) marginal means \(\quad=103.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{3}\) marginal means. \(\quad=89.94 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. two marginal means of NT \(\quad . \quad \mathbf{4 4 . 7 6} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. two NT means at the level \(\mathrm{I}_{0}\) or \(\mathrm{I}_{2} \quad=89.52 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
5. two NT means at the level I
\(=63.30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. \(I_{0}\) and \(I_{3}\) means at the same level of NT
7. \(I_{9}\) and \(I_{1}\) or \(I_{1}\) and \(I_{3}\) means at the same level of NT
\(=131.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=127.0\) lb. \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). \(\quad\). \(\quad\) Ref :-U.P. 53(108).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Meerut. \(\quad\) Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

1, BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A, (iii) 31.10.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown
behind the plough.
(c) 12 chs./plot. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vii) Nil. (ix) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 levels of irrigation: \(I_{0}=N o\) irrigation, \(I_{1}=\) Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at flowering), \(I_{2}=I_{1}\) +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and \(I_{2}=I_{2}+\) irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\) No manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) : \(N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 2 times of application of \(N\) : \(T_{2}=\) Full at sowing and \(T_{2}=\) Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ji) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot: \(: 19^{\prime} \times 170^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(19^{\circ} \times 34^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\circ} \times 31^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1350 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(98.56 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(72.80 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(I_{\text {, }}\) levels of \(N\), times of application, 'control ps treated' and interactions I \(\times N\) and IX "control is treated' are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means
\(=31.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
2. NT marginal means
3. NT means at the same level of \(I\)
\(=25.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. I means at the same level of NT
\(=51.48 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=55.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop:- Wheat (Rabi). \\ Ref:- U.P. 49(80). \\ Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Meerut. \\ ```
Type :- 'IM',
```

}

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Early moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam soil (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1949. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by victory plough and paro, two by desi and pata, palewa on $7,8.10 .1949,3$ ploughings by desi plough and pata. (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs/ac. . (d).N.A. (e) N.A. (v) NiL. (vi) Pb-591 (mid. late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16, 17.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation: $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{2}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+$ irrigatian 12 weeks after germination . (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manvie, $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . j \mathrm{cc}$, of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60^{\prime}$ $\mathrm{lb}_{\mathrm{b}} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication; 3 sut-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot: $54^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}$; Sub-plot : $18^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ ring rcund the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Height of plarts, root length, shoct lergth, leaf lepgth and breadth, tillers, green leaves and shoot length, ear length, wt. of t hoot, no. of grains; grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur, Kuiraghat, Atarra, Bharari, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Bulandshahr and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $1513 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $321.0 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $184.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only effect of levels of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. gield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 1094 | 1633 | 1400 | 1376 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1240 | 1675 | 1794 | 1570 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | 1318 | 1702 | 1766 | 1595 |
| Mean | 1217 | 1670 | 1653 | 1513 |

S.E. of difference of two

| 1. marginal means of $I$ | $=151.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. marginal means of N | $=86.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$, |
| 3. $\mathbf{N}$ means at the same level of I | $=150.5 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$ |
| 4. I means at the same level of N |  |

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site $=$ Regional Res.Stn., Meerut.

Ref:- U.P. 50(82).
Type :~ 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of $\mathbf{N}$ in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (al Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1950. (iv) (a) 14 ploughings by desi plough, 2 ploughings with victory plough. (b) Seed drill. (c) 50 srs/ac. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb-591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viij) Weeding on 15.1.1951. (ix) 3.61". (x) 14.4.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=N_{0}$ irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), $\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{1}=60$ lb.jac. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $N_{2}=60$ $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot $45^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}$; Sub-plot $15^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}$ (v) Sub-plot border $11^{\prime}$ alround. Field border $3^{\prime}$ alround. Sown space left between main-plot $5^{\prime}$, sown space left between blocks $8^{\prime}$ also to be used as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Etawah, Kalai, Banaras, Muzaffarnagar, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N,A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment concucted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1657 \quad \mathrm{lb} /$ /ac.
(ii) (a) 261.0 lb.Jac.
(b) $244.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Ooly effect of I is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb/ac.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 1082 | 1303 | 1689 | 1358 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{1}$ | 1570 | 1777 | 1660 | 1669 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | 1926 | 1615 | 1926 | 1822 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1586 | 1941 | 1808 | 1778 |
| Mean | 1541 | 1659 | 1771 | 1657 |

## S.E. of difference of two

| 1. I marginal means |  | $=123.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2. N marginal means |  |  |
| 3. N means at the same level of I | , | $=99.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 4. I means at the same level of N |  | $=199.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
|  |  | $=204.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |

## Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).

- Site :-Regional Res. Stn , Meerut.


## Ref :-U.P. 51(60).

Type : ‘‘JM’.

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong and Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1951. (iv) (a) 8 ploughings with desi plough. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) $4.15^{\prime \prime} .(\mathrm{x})$ N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

## Main-plot treatments :

4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $J_{1}=$ irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}$ +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=N$ manure, $N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $N_{2}=60$ $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N castor cake.
$I_{1}$ given on 16.12.1951. $I_{2}$ given on 1.2.1952 and $I_{3}$ not given because of rains on 2.3.1952. Hence $I_{3}$ becomes identical with $\mathrm{I}_{2}$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication ; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) $1 / 173$ acre. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Kubraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Etawah, Kalai, Muzaffarnagar, Hawalbagh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } & 1667 & \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}$
(ii) (a) $388.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $427.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 1146 | 1835 | 1424 | 1468 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{1}$ | 1690 | 1713 | 1824 | 1742 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1713 | 1652 | 1824 | 1730 |
| Mean | 1565 | 1713 | 1724 | 1667. |

S.E. of difference of

| 1. $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ marginal means | $=158.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2. $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ marginal means | $=137.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}$. |
| 3. two marginal means of $\mathbf{N}$ | $=151.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}$ |
| 4. two N means at the level $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ or $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | $=302.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 5. two N means at the same level $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | $=213.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 6. $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ or $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ means at the level N | $=293.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 7. $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ means at the same level of N | $=254.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

```
Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.
```

Ref :-U.P. 52(125).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :- To study the effeet of different forms and levals of $N$ in can'siantion with levels of itrigation on Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane ratoon. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing by Victory plough an 18.9.1952. ploughings by desi plough on 28.9.1952, 10, 13, 19, 26 and 29.10.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 40 to 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 9 C.L./ac. of F.Y.M. on 17.10.1952. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14, 15.4.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot freatments .
4 levels of Irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}$ +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}$ +irrigarion 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

Sub-plot treatments:
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N A / S$ and $N_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathbf{N}$ castor cake.
$I_{1}$ given on 5 12.1952, $I_{2}$ not given due to rains on 15 and 16.1.1 953 and $I_{3}$ given on 10.3.1953. Hence $I_{2}$ becomes identical with $I_{1}$.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 maia-plots/replication; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $28^{\prime} \times 25^{\circ}$. (b) $25 \times 22^{\prime}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{2}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Graln and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad Etawah, Kalyanpur, Kalai, Hzwalbagh, Bharari, Kuaraghat anj Muzaff aroagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by CP.(R).

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $1607 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $120.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) 96.61 lb /ac
(iii) Only effects of levels of $\mathbf{I}_{\text {, }}$ forms of N , levels of N and $\mathrm{I} \times$ forms of $\mathbf{N}$ are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{6}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 1074 | 1609 | 1227 | 1303 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{1}$ | 1446 | 1810 | 1762 | 1673 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1604 | 1858 | 1879 | 1780 |
| Mean | 1392 | 1772 | 1658 | 1607 |

## S.E. of difference of

1. $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ marginal means $\quad=49.21 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ or $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ marginal means $\quad=42.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. two $N$ marginal means
4. two $N$ means at the le vel $I_{0}$ or $I_{3}$ $=68.31 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{lac}$.
5. two $N$ means at the level $I_{1}$ $=48.30 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}$.
6. $I_{0}$ and $I_{8}$ means at the same level of $N$ $=74.38 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
7. $I_{0}$ and $I_{1}$ or $I_{1}$ and $I_{8}$ means at the same level of $N$ $=64.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :^Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.

Ref:-U.P. 53(115).
Type:-‘IM'.

Object : - To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1953. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings and harrowings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (jx) N.A. (x) $24.4 .19 \leq 4$.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}$ +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{8}=I_{2}$ +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: \quad N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}$. $/ \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $A / S$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plct. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot : $84^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}$ and sub-plot: $28^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}$. (b) $25^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}$. (v) $1.5^{\prime}$ alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Muzaffarnagar, Kalaị and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1334 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $62.72 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $\quad 59.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $I$ and levels of $N$ and interactions $I \times$ forms of $N$ and $I \times$ levels of $\dot{N}$ are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb}_{\mathrm{b}} / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ | 570 | 846 | 738 | 718 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 962 | 1252 | 1216 | 1143. |
| $I_{5}$ | 1400 | 1776 | 1868 | 1681 |
| If | 1532 | 1864 | 1980 | 1792 |
| Mean | 1116 | 1435 | 1450 | 1334 |

S.E. of difference of two
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. I marginal means } & =25.61 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 2. } \mathrm{N} \text { marginal means } & \\ \text { 3. } \mathrm{N} \text { means at the same level of } \mathrm{I} & =20.99 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} \\ 4 & \\ & =41.97 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}$
4. I means at the same level of $N \quad=42.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.
Ref:- U.P. 49(76).

Object :- To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis. Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 14.11.1949. (iv) (a) 4 ploughing by S.T. plough, and 2 by cultivator plough, 7 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 45 srs./ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb-S91 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculturing by using harrowing on 22.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 29, 30.4.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation: $I_{1}$ =irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}$ +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering stage), and $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

## Sub-plot treatments :

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control ( $\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=$ no manure).
(1) 2 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$.
(2) 2 times of application of $N: T_{2}=$ Full at sowing and $T_{2}=$ half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block; 5 sub-plots/maia-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot $20^{\circ} \times 170^{\circ}$. Sub-plot $20^{\circ} \times 34^{\circ}$. (b) $17^{\circ} \times 31^{\prime}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}$ ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Lucknow and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } & 1566 & \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}$
(ii) (a) $533.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $208.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effects of levels of N and 'control' $v$ treated' are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 1703 | 1559 | 1396 | 1644 | 1435 | 1547 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1853 | 1704 | 1477 | 1718 | 1357 | 1622 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1548 | 1598 | 1392 | 1506 | 1605 | 1530 |
| Meạn | 1701 | 1620 | 1422 | 1623 | 1466 | 1566 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. marginal means of $I$
$=194.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. marginal means of NT
$=98.17 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. NT means at the same level of $I$
$=170.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
4. I means at the same level of NT

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:- U.P. 50(72).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of $N$ to What at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) $40-50$ srs./ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb-591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) $3.62^{\circ}$. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillerring), $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{3}=I_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Suh-plot treatments :
All combination of (1) and (2) + a control ( $\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=$ no manure).
(1) 2 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$.
(2) 2 times of application of $N_{:}: T_{2}=$ Full at sowing and $T_{2}=$ half at sow ing and half at Ist irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot $=175^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}$ sub-plot $=14^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}$. (b) $11^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) $N$ il. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) $1949-1953$. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Etawah, Atarra, Kunraghat, Meerut, Bharari and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2614 lb./ac.
(ii) (a) $490.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $359.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $I$ and $T$ are highly significant. 'control vs. treated' and interaction $I \times$ 'control ys. treated' are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{1} \mathbf{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{Na}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ | 1628 | 1803 | 1984. | 2323 | 2222 | 1992 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 2418 | 2551 | 2811 | 3236 | 2949 | 2793 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 2429 | 2757 | 2790 | 3139 | 3097 | 2842 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ | 3209 | 2705 | 2540 | 2811 | 2885 | 2830 |
| Mean | 2421 | 2454 | 2531 | 2877 | 2788 | 2614 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means
$=179.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. NT marginal means
$=146.7 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}$.
3. NT means at the same level of $I$
$=293.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
4. I means at the same level of NT
$\doteq 318.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn.; Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :- U.P. 51(53).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with different levels of irrigation.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Ni. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 25.10.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. . (vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) to (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

## Main-plot treatments

4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}$; +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{8}=I_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control ( $\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=$ No manure)
(1) 2 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{1}=30$ and $N_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$.
(2) 2 times of application of $N: T_{2}=$ Full at sowing and $T_{2}=$ Half at sowing and half at 1 st irrigation.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot : $175^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}$ and sub-plot : $14^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}$. (b) $11^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953, (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Hawalbagh, Etawah, Faizabad, Kalianpur, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra, Kunraghat and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1816 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $480.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $282.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only control $v s$ treated is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  |  | $\mathbf{N o}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathrm{Na}_{\mathbf{B}} \mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{I}_{0}$ | 2116 | 2191 | 1755 | 1613 | 1989 | 1933 |
|  | I | 1751 | 1846 | 1650 | 1952 | 1443 | 1728 |
|  | $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 1861 | 1873 | 1501 | 1755 | 1702 | 1738 |
|  | Ig | 2243 | 1749 | 1914 | 1751 | 1665 | 1864 |
| - | Mean | 1993 | 1915 | 1705 | 1768 | 1700 | 1816 |
| S.E. of difference of two |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1. I marginal means |  |  |  |  | $=175.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |
|  |  | NT marginal means : |  |  |  | $=115.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .$ |  |
|  | 3. NT means at the same level of I |  |  |  |  | $=230.7 \mathrm{lb} \cdot / \mathrm{ac} .$ |  |
|  | 4. I means at the same level of NT |  |  |  |  | $=271.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |

## Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). <br> Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stni, Muzaffarnagar. <br> Ref:-U.P. 52(111). Type: ‘'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in combination with difierent levels of irrigation.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 26.10.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing by K. No. 12 plough on 5.7.1952 and 6.8.1952. Ploughing by Funn on 6 and 8.8.1952, 8 desi ploughings, 4 roller and patia. (b) N.A. (c) $40-50$ srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 7 and 11.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{2}$ + Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{3}=I_{8}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sul-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control $\left(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\right.$ No manure)
(1) 2 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{2}=30$ and $N_{y}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 2 times of application of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Full at sowing and $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Half at sowing and half at Ist irrigation.

## 3. DESIGN :

(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $14 \times 35^{\circ}$. (b) $11^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ alround (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Smut was seen in very mild form which was rouged out. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Meerut, Atarra, Bharari, Faizabad, Kalyanpur and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2518 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $903.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $308.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
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(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{3} \mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathrm{Na}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ | 1867 | 2143 | 1994 | 1835 | 1888 | 1945 |
| I1 | 3013 | 3097 | 2439 | 2992 | 3034 | 2915 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 2612 | 2439 | 2461 | 2864 | 2631 | 2601 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ | 2928 | 2546 | 2334 | 2652 | 2588 | 2610 |
| Mean | 2605 | 2556 | 2307 | 2586 | 2535 | 2518 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means
$=330.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. NT marginal means
$=125.7 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. NT means at the same level of $I$
$=251.5 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
4. I means at the same level of NT
$=399.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

## Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).

Ref:- U.P. 53(101).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.
Type :- 'IM'.
Object :-To study the effect of application of N to Wheat at different levels and at different times in com- . bination with different levels of irrigation.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nit. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 25.10.1953. (iv) (a) Palewa on 14.6.1953, 13 ploughings and 11 pata. (b) Seed drill. (c) $40-50 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}$. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 18-21.4.1954.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1} \uparrow$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $\mathrm{I}_{2}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control $\left(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{~T}_{0}=\right.$ no manure $)$.
(1) 2 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N .
(2) 2 times of application: $T_{1}=F u l l$ at sowing and $T_{2}=$ Half at sowing and half at ist irrigation.
$I_{1}$ given on $25.11 .1953, I_{2}$ and $I_{3}$ not given due to heavy rains in January and February. Hence $I_{1}$ and $I_{2}$ become identical to $\mathrm{I}_{1}$.

## 3. DESIGN :

(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot: $14^{\prime} \times 175^{\prime}$ and sub-plot $14^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}$. (b) $11^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}$ (v) Plot border $1.5^{\prime}$ and field border $3^{\prime}$ alround. Sown space left between main-plots and blocks $=6^{\prime}$ which also serves as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Crop effected by bunt. (iii) 'Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Attara, Bharari, Meerut and Kunraghat. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2078 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $303.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$
(b) $233.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Levels of irrigation are significant, others not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. $\quad$ Ref U.P. 49(73),

Object:-To study the effect of different forms and levels of $\mathbf{N}$ in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 14.11.1949. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings by S.T. plough, 9 by desi plough and 2 by cultivator and 7 plankings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) G.M. (Sanai). (vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing and lever harrowing on 22.12.1949 after first irrigation. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manure; $N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $N_{2}=60$ $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot $54^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}$ and sub-plot $18^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}$. (v) ( $3^{\prime}$ all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat, Lucknow, Bulandshahr and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESÚULTS:
(i) $2308 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $269.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $219.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effects of forms of N and levels of N are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{~N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~N}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 2509 | 2282 | 2314 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 2522 | 2087 | 2392 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | 2424 | 1945 | 2301 |
| Mean | 2485 | 2105 | 2336 |
| 2368 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | 2308 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal mean
2. N marginal means
3. $N$ means at the same level of $I$
4. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{N}$
$=127.2 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=103.3 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
$=178.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \cdot$
$=193.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.
Ref :- U.P. 50(83).
Type :~ 'IM'.
Object : $\subset$ To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 31.10.1950. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with soil turning plough. 8 ploughings with desi plough and pata. 6 ploughings with cultivator. (b) Seed drill. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb.-591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One harrowing by lever harrow. (ix) $3.62^{\prime \prime}$. (x) 17 to 19.4.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{I}_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: \quad N_{0}=$ No manure, $\quad N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60$ $60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-Plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plot/main-plots (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : $54^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. sub-plot: $18^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (b) $15^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nothing very significant. (ii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No.
(v) (a) Meerut, Kunraghàt, Kalyanpur, Etawah, Kalai, Banaras, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2314 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $246.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $163.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only sub-plot treatments are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{~N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~N}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ | 1908 | 2199 | 2271 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 2068 | 2386 | 2406 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 2106 | 2447 | 2520 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ | 2271 | 2603 | 2583 |
| Mean | 2088 | 2409 | 2445 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =116.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =67.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =133.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =159.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
$$

2. $N$ marginal means
3. $N$ means at the same level of $I$
4. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{N}$

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:- U.P. 51(54).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:--To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.
I. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar.
(iii) 25.10.1951. (iv) (a) 10 ploughings. (b) Seed drill. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil.
(vi) Pb. 591 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

## Main-plot treatments :

4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{8}=I_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: \quad N_{0}=$ No manure, $\quad N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $A / S$ and $\mathbf{N}_{2}=$ $60 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main plot: $54^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. Sub-plot: $18^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}$. (v) N. A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield.' (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banaras, Faizabad, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Etawah, Kalai, Meerut, Hawalbagh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $2619 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $282.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $389.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $I$ is highly significant and effect of levels of $N$ is significant. Othere are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


## Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).

Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 52(110).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :-Tostudy the effect of different frims erd levels of $N$ in centiraticn pith levels of irrigation on Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 26.10.1952. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by K. No. 12 plough and 1 ploughing by funn plough on 6.8 .1952 .9 ploughings by dest plough and pata, 4 rollings and pata. (b) N.A. (c) $40-50 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}$. in general. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7 to 11.4.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

## Mainoplot treatments :

4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irtigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $\dot{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{2}$ +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), $I_{8}=I_{8}$ +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{1}=60 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{N}$ as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60$ $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) $18^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}$. (b) $15^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}$ : (v) $11^{\prime}$ ' alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :

- (i) Good. (ii) Smut was seen in very mild form which was rouged out. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Banaras, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Meerut, Kalai, Atarra, Hawalbagh and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

5. RESULTS:
(i) $2429 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $653.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $305.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only effect of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ | 2220 | 2364 | 2116 | 2233 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 3257 | 2759 | 2427 | 2814 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 2883 | 2096 | 2261. | ' 2413 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ | 2593 | 1970 | 2199 | 2254 |
| Mean | 2738 | 2297 | 2251 | 2429 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =307.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =124.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =249.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =369.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
$$

2. $\mathbf{N}$ marginal means
3. N means at the same level of I
4. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{N}$

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Sugarcane Res, Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 53(102).
Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of $\mathbf{N}$ in combination with levels of irixigation on: Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 25.10.1953. (iv) (a) 12 ploughings. (b) Seed drill. (c) $40-50 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}$. ( $6.3 \mathrm{chh} . / \mathrm{plot}$ ). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) Heavy rain in the month of January. Details N.A. (x) 18 to 21.4.1954.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation: $I_{0}=$ No Irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering). $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at llowering), $I_{3}=I_{2}+i r r i g a t i o n$ 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $N_{8}=8$ lb ./ac. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : $27^{\prime} \times 54^{\prime}$; sub-plot : $18^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (b) $15^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Crop affected by bunt. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) , (a) Faizabad, Kunraghat, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kalai and Varanasi. (b) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } & 1902 & \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}$
(ii) (a) $473.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $229.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only effect of N is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  |  | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}$ |  | 2344 | 2106 | 2157 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}$ |  | 2001 | 1587 | 1628 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1940 | 1524 | 1857 | 2202 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1929 | 1814 | 1940 | 1739 |
| Mean | 2054 | 1758 | 189 | 1894 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =223.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =93.7 \\
& =187.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =270.7 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
$$

2. $\mathbf{N}$ marginal means
3. N means at the same level of $I$
4. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{N}$

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).<br>Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.<br>\section*{Ref:-U.P. 50(134).<br><br>Type :-'IM'.}

Object: -To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ and Gypsum on Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11 .1950 . (iv) (a) Palewa and 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Manuring by G.M. on 12.11.1950. (vi) N.P. 52 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 3.19. (x) 24, 25.4.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation: $J_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at fiowering).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}$ as Super: $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as $G y p s u m$ : $\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{I}}=25$ and $\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot $153^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}$ sub-plot $17^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}$. (b) $14^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil, (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalsi and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $1787 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $209.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $347.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects and their interections is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{G}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{G}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Mean | P0 | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{0}$ | 1561 | 1867 | 1916 | 1781 | 1748 | 1714 | 1882 |
| $I_{1}$ | 1892 | 1684 | 1758 | 1778 | 1734 | 1734 | 1867 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{8}$ | 1806 | 1934 | 1664 | 1801 | 1973 | 1674 | 1757 |
| Mean | 1753 | 1828 | 1779 | 1787 | 1818 | 1707 | 1835 |
| $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | 1773 | 1909 | 1773 | 1 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | 1645 | 1753 | 1723 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | 1841 | 1822 | 1842 |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means
$=57.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. $\mathbf{P}$ or $\mathbf{G}$ marginal means
3. I means at the same level of $P$ or $G$
$=94.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
4. $P$ or $G$ means at the same level of $I$
5. means in the body of $P \times G$ table
$=145.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=163.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=163.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
```
Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.
```

Ref:- U.P. 51(74).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with $\mathbf{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ and Gypsum on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sanai-wheat. (b) Sanai for fibre. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Last week of October 1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seed drill. (c) $40-50 \mathrm{srs} / \mathrm{ac}$. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil.' (vi) Pb. 591 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plof treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{2} \nrightarrow$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super: $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of CaO as Gypsum : $\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{1}=25$ and $\mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. DESIGN
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mairplot $36^{\prime} \times 153^{\prime}$. sub-plot $36^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}$. (b) $33^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}$. $11^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor stand. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Baharaich and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $850.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $405.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $189.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \cdot$
(iii) Only the effect of I is significant. All others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means $\quad, \quad=95.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. $P$ or $G$ marginal means $\quad=44.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. Por $G$ means at the same level of $I \quad=77.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
4. I means at the same level of $P$ or $G \quad=114.5 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
5. means in body of $P \times G$ table $\quad=77.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).<br>Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.

Ref:- U P. 52(120).
Type :- 'IM'.
Object : - To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ and Gypsum on =. Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11.1952. (iv) (a) 4 ploughinge. Palewa on $25,26.10 .1952$. (b) N.A. (c) $12 \mathrm{chj} / \mathrm{plot}$. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-13 (medium)* (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1, 2.4.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $\mathrm{I}_{2}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

## Sub-plot treatments :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{6}$ as Super : $P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $P_{9}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : $\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{2} \doteq 25$ and $\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $36^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}$. (b) $33^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.

[^0]4. GENERAL :
(i) Damage about $10 \%$. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Baharaich and Aligarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) - $953.3 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $227.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $97.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $I, P$ and $G$ and interactions $I \times P, I \times G$ are highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | G0 | $\mathrm{G}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{G}_{2}$ | Mean | $P_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $I_{1}$ | 492 | 502 | 607 | 534 | 541 | 510 | 550 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 743 | 883 | 1192 | 940 | 838 | 978 | 1002 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ | 1332 | 1366 | 1462 | 1387 | 1278 | 1435 | 1448 |
| Mean | 856 | 917 | 1087 | 953 | 886 | 974 | 1000 |
| $P_{0}$ | 798 | 827 | 1032 | - $\quad$. |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | 858 | 954 | 1111 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ | 912 | 970 | 1117 |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of difference of two


Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Raf:- U.P. 53(52).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.
Type :- 'IM'.
Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ and Gypsum on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.10.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings and
harrowings. (b) Sown behind desi plough. (c) $40-50$ srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A: (v) N.A. (vi) Pb. 591
, (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 5.12 .1953 and 18.12.1953. Hoeing on 9.12.1953. (ix) Rained
in February 1954, amount N.A. (x) 29.3.1954.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No Irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{8}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering).
Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super : $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : $\mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{1}=25$ and $\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b)rN.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot : $36^{\circ} \times 153^{\circ}$ and sub-plot : $36^{\circ} \times 17^{\circ}$. (b) $33^{\circ} \times 14^{\circ}$. (v) $1.5^{\circ}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. Nil. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield only; (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kala and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R):

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $1107 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $307.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $107.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effects of I and C are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{G}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{G}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{G}_{2}$ | Mean | $P_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{J}_{0}$ | 757 | 817 | 797 | 790 | 785 | 786 | 800 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 1206 | 1205 | 1296 | 1236 | 1185 | 1241 | 1282 |
| I2 | 1183 | 1322 | 1376 | 1294 | 1281 | 1288 | 1312 |
| Mean | 1049 | 1115 | 1156 | 1107 | 1084 | 1105 | 1131 |
| $P_{0}$ | 1047 | 1099 | 1105 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{P l}_{1}$ | 1088 | 1085 | 1142 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{P}_{8}$ | 1011 | 1161 | 1222 |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of difference of two

| 1. I marginal means . | $=72.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. P or $G$ marginal means |  |
| 3. P or $G$ means at the same level of $I$ | $=25.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 4. I means at the same level of $P$ or $G$ |  |
| 5. means in body of $P \times G$ table | $=80.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
|  |  |

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).<br>Ref:-U.P. 49(67).<br>Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.<br>Type :-'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 29.10.1949. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings and 1 harrowing. (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings on 5.12 .1949 and 19.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 4 and 6.4.1950

## 2. TREATMENTS:

## Main-plot treatments :

3 levels of irrigation: $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{3}=I_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatmer.ts :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: \quad N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{1}=60$ lb.jac. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $N_{2}=60$ lb ./ac. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : $54^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}$ and sub-plot: $18^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 34^{\circ}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL:

(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Height of plants, length of leaves, no. of tillers etc. Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar, Lucknow, Bulandshahr and Hawalbagh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1456 1b/ac.
(ii) (a) $105.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $59.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effects of forms and levels of N are highly significant and interaction $\mathrm{I} \times$ levels of N is signifiant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{~N}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1} \cdot$ | 1139 | 1428 | 1620 | 1396 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 1194 | 1647 | 1835 | 1559 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{3}$ | 1080 | 1446 | 1711 | 1412 |
| Mean | 1138 | 1507 | 1722 | 1456 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =49.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =28.0 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =48.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
$$

2. N marginal means
3. N means at the same level of I
4. $N$ means at the same level of
5. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{N}$

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :mU.P. 50(79).
Type :-'TM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of N in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) Last week of October, (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) $40-50$ seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P.52. (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}$ +irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: \quad N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c$. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $N_{2}=60$ $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot : $60^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}$ and sub-plot : $20^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}$. (b) $17^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No lodging. For $I_{0}$ and $I_{1}$ treatments plants were yellowish and poor in growth. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Etawah, Kalai, Muzaffarnagar, Meerut, Bharari, Atarra and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) 1244 lb /ac.
(ii) (a) 241.5 lb /ac.
(b) $226.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | Mean |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 1113 | 982 | 1169 | 1088 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 1344 | 1190 | 1365 | 1300 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1232 | 1353 | 1134 | 1240 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 1264 | 1484 | 1300 | 1349 |
| Mean | 1238 | 1252 | 1242 | 1214 |

1. marginal means of I
2. marginal means of $N$
$=113.8 \mathrm{db} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=92.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. $N$ means at the same level of $I$
$=185.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
4. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{N}$
$=189.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).<br>Site:-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :-U.P. 51(56).
Type : $\sim$ 'IM"

Object :-To study the effect of different forms and levels of $\mathbf{N}$ in combination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 3.11.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) $40-50 \mathrm{srs}$./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) $1.1^{\circ}$. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

## Main-plot treatments :

4 levels of irrigation: $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $\mathbf{I}_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{2}=I_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $N$ as $A / S$ and $N_{2}=60$ lb ./ac. of N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot : $60^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$; sub-plot : $20^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}$. (b) $17^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Kunraghat, Kalyanpur, Bharari, Etawah, Kalai, Meerut, Muzaffarnagar, Hawalbagh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $950 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $307.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $189.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effects of I , forms of $\mathrm{N}_{3}$ levels of N and interaction $\mathrm{I} \times$ forms of N are all highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $505^{\circ}$ | 777 | 577 | 6 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 808 | 982 | 859 | 620 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 841 | 1487 | 1273 | 883 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | 879 | 1594 | 824 | 1200 |
|  |  | 758 | 1210 | 883 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. marginal means of I

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =125.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =67.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =134.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =166.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { 2. marginal means of } N & & =67.1 \cdot \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { 3. } \mathrm{N} \text { means at the same level of } \mathrm{I} & =134.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
$$

4. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{N}$

Crop :-Wheat (Rali).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn , Varanasi.

Ref :-U.P. 52(127).
Type:-'IM'.

Object:-To study the effects of different forms and levels of $\mathbf{N}$ in combination' with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay lcem. (b) Refer coil 2 nalysis, Varanasi. (iii) 5.11.1952.
(iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough, 7 flctehires ty desl plough. (b) N.A. (c) $40-50$ srs./ac.
(d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52. (medivm). (vii) Jrrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}$ +irrigation 9 weeks after germinaticn (at flowering), $\mathrm{I}_{3}=\mathrm{I}_{2}$ +irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sab-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manure, $N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{jac}$. N as castor cake.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $18^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}$. (b) $15^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}$. (v) $1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}{ }^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (jii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Kalai, Atarra, Hawalbagh, Bharari, Kunraghat and Muzaffarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $1617 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $322.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $229.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effects of I and levels of N are highly significant and interaction $\mathrm{I} \times$ levels of N is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{I}_{0}$ | 822 | 709 | 840 | 790 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{1}$ | 1413 | 1983 | 1993 | 1796 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1559 | 1912 | 1968 | 1813 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | 1794 | 2220 | 2195 | 2070 |
| Mean | 1397 | 1706 | 1749 | 1617 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. Marginal
2. marginal means of $\mathbf{N}$
3. $N$ means at the same level of $I$
$=131.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. $=80.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
4. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{N}$ $=161.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. $=186.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site:- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 53(151):
Type :- 'TM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different ferms and levels of $\mathbf{N}$ in cemtination with levels of irrigation on Wheat.

## 1. B ASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane-Sugarcane-Sugarcane, moong- wheat. (b) Mcong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Vanarasi. (iii) 13.11.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploug hings. (b) Scmety secd drill. (c) 40 srs/ac. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1954.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of irrigation : $I_{0}=$ No irrigation, $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 3 weeks after germination (at tillering), $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering), $I_{3}=I_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 combinations of forms and levels of $N: N_{0}=$ No manure, $\quad N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S} . \mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N as castor cake.

## 3. DESIGN :

(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Main-plot $54^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}$, sub-plot $18^{\circ} \times 43^{\circ}$. (b) $15^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack of rust and hail storm. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Bharari, Meerut, Kunraghat, Muzaffarnagar and Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1734 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $243.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $179.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{I}$ and interaction ' $\mathrm{I} \times$ forms of N ' are highly significant. Effects of forms of N and levels of N are both significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $N_{0}$ | $N_{1}$ | $N_{2}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{I}_{0}$ | 1100 | 1398 | 1110 | 1203 |
| $\cdot I_{1} \cdot$ | 1700 | 2016 | 2119 | 1945 |
| $I_{2}$ | 1947 | 1645 | 2084 | 1892 |
| . | 1801 | 1731 | 2160 | 1897 |
| Mean | 1637 | 1698 | 1868 | 1734 |

S.E. of difference of two

| 1. marginal means of $I$ | $=99.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. marginal means of N |  |
| 3. N means at the same level of I. | $=63.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 4. I means at the same level of N |  |

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :-U.P. 49(99). Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ and Gypsum on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil: (b) Sanai. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 2.11.1949. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) G.M. of Sanai. (vi) N.P.52. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weedings on 5, and 19.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 7, and 12.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments:
2 levels of irrigation: $I_{\boldsymbol{l}}=$ Irrigation 9 wecks after germination (at flowering), $I_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{1}+i r r i g a t i o n ~ 12$ weeks after germination (at milky stage).

## Sub-plot treatments :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super : $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0_{2} \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : $G_{0}=0, G_{2}=25$ and $G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block; 9.sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Main-plot $162^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$ sub-plot : $18^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}$. (b) $12^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime}$ all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Barabanki, Bulandshahr and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.'
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1030 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) 22.05 lb ./ac.
(b) $16.07 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $I$ is significant, main effect of $P$ and $G$ and interactions $P \times G$ and $I \times P \times G$ are all highly significant. Interactions $I \times P$ and $I \times G$ are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{r}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ | Mean | $\mathbf{G}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{G}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 915 | 993 | 1101 | 1003 | 936 | 997 | 1075 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 961 | 1052 | 1158 | 1057 | 990 | 1061 | 1119 |
| Mean | 938 | 1023 | 1129 | 1030 | 963 | 1029 | 1097 |
| $\mathrm{G}_{0}$ | 901 | 952 | 1036 | 963 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{G}_{1}$ | 933 | 1034 | 1121 | 1029 |  | $\bullet$ |  |
| $\mathrm{G}_{2}$ | 979 | 1082 | 1231 | 1097 |  | , |  |

S.E. of difference of two

1. marginal means of I

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =6.00 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =5.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =7.58 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =8.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =9.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
$$

2. marginal means of $G$ or $P$
3. G or $P$ means at the same level of $I$
4. I means at the same level of $G$ or" $P$
5. means in body of $\mathbf{G} \times \mathbf{P}$ table

## Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).

Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi;

Ref :-U.P. 50(131).
'rype :-'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with ${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \dot{\mathrm{O}}_{5}$ and Gypsum on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer , soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) .A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

## Main-plot treatments :

2 levels of irrigation: $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at ficwering) and $I_{\mathbf{2}}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{8}$ as Super : $P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as Gypsum : $\mathbf{G}_{0}=0, \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}=25$ and $\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

## 3. DESIGN :

(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mabnplot : $171^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$. and sub-plot: $19^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}$. (b) $16^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{}^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Slight lodging (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kałyanpur and Barabanki. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1101 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $448.1 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $154.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb-/ac.

|  | $G_{0}$ | $\mathbf{G}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{G}_{8}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{P}^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ | 1146 | 1119 | 1082 | 1116 | 1060 | 1171 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | 1028 | 1116 | 1041 | 1062 | 1090 | 1033 |
| $\mathrm{Pa}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1170 | 1136 | 1068 | 1125 | 1102 | 1147 |
| Meean | 1115 | 1124 | 1064 | 1101 |  |  |
| $I_{1}$ | 1079 | 1107 | 1067 | 1084 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 1150 | 1141 | 1060 | 1117 |  |  |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means
$=105.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. P or $G$ marginal means
$=44.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. $P$ or $G$ means at the same level of $I$
$=63.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
4. I means at the same level of $P$ or $G$ $=83.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
5. means in body of $P \times G$ table

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). $\quad$ Ref :-U.P. 51(73).
Site:-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Object:-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with $P_{2} O_{5}$ and Gypsum on Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (a) Reier soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) Last week of October, 1951 (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) $40-50$ seers/ac. (d) and (e)N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 52 (mid-early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) to (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of irrigation : $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{2}=I_{1}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

## Sub-plot treatments :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super : $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of Ca as $\mathrm{Gypsum}: \mathrm{G}_{0}=0, \mathrm{G}_{2}=25$ and $\mathrm{G}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot: $171^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$. and sub-plot: $19^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}$. (b) $16^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}$ alround, (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experinent conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1041 \quad$ lo/ac.
(ii) (a) $447.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $242.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{8}$ | Mean | $\mathbf{I}_{1}$ | $I_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\boldsymbol{G}_{0}$ | 1012 | 1008 | 1116 | 1045 | 1086 | 1005 |
| $\mathrm{G}_{1}$ | 935 | 951 | 996 | 961 | 1101 | 821 |
| - $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1076 | 1109 | 1168 | 1118 | 1233 | 1003 |
| Mean | 1008 | 1023 | 1093 | 1041 | 1140 | 943 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$. | 1082 | 1157 | 1180 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 934 | 888 | 1007 |  |  |  |

S.E. of difference of two

1. marginal means of $I$
$=105.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
2. marginal means of $P$ or $G$
$=69.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
3. $P$ or $G$ means at the level of $I$
$=98.86 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
4. I means at the same level of $P$ or $G$
$=132.7 \mathrm{lb}$. ac .
5. means in the body of $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{G}$ table
$=121.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 52(122).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ and Gypsum an Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane and wheat (field in two parts). (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 9.11 .1952 (iv) (a) Ploughed by victory plough 9 times. (b) N.A. (c) $40-50 \mathrm{srs}$./ac., (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) NP-52 (mid-early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.4.1953.

## 2. TREATMENIS :

Maln-plot treatments :
2 levels of irrigation : $I_{1}=$ Irrigation 9 weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{2}=I_{2}+$ irrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

## Sub-plot treatments :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $P_{8} O_{5}$ as Super: $P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $P_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of CoO as $G y p s u m: G_{0}=0, G_{2}=25$ and $G_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $19^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}$. (b) $16^{\circ} \times 32^{\circ}$. (v) $1.5^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) 1628 lb./ac.
(ii) (a) $208.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $131.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{G}$ and interaction $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{G}$ are highly significant. All others are not significant
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{G}_{0}$ | Gi | $\boldsymbol{G}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 1588 | 1603 | 1727 | 1639 | 1555 | 1588 | 1774 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{2}$ | 1564 | 1545 | 1744 | 1618 | 1542 | 1577 | 1734 |
| Mean ${ }^{\text {' }}$ | 1576 | 1574 | 1735 | 1628 | 1549 | 1583 | 1754 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | 1418 | 1411 | 1817 |  |  |  |  |
| $P_{1}$ | 1551 | 1566 | 1631 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | 1760 | 1745 | 1757 |  |  |  |  |

S.E. of difference of two
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. I marginal means } & =49.25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 2. G or } P \text { marginal means } & =37.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 3. G or } P \text { means at the same level of } I & =53.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 4. I means at the same level of } G \text { or } P & =65.83 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 5. means in the body of } P \times G \text { table } & =65.54 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}$

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site:-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Ref:- U.P. 53(149).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different levels of irrigation in combination with $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ and Gypsum on Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane -Sugarcane, Fallow-Wheat. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 9.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) 13 ploughings. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NP-12. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 31.3.1954.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of irrigation : $I_{1}=I_{r r i g a t i o n ~} 9$ weeks after germination (at flowering) and $I_{2}=I_{1}$ +irrrigation 12 weeks after germination (at milky stage).

## Sub-plot treatments:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super : $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathbf{C a O}$ as Gypsum : $\mathbf{G}_{0}=0, \mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}=25$ and $\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}=50 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) Mainplot : $35^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}$ and sub-plot $19^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}$. (b) $16^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}$. (v) $1 \frac{1}{1}^{\prime}$ alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attacked by rust. Damaged by hail storm. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1695 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $267.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $146.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effect of $P$ and interactions $P \times G$ and $P \times I$ are significant, while interaction $I \times G$ is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in $\mathbf{l b}$./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean | $G_{0}$ | $G_{1}$ | $\mathrm{G}_{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 1677 | 1568 | 1773 | 1673 | 1555 | 1674 | 1789 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 1668 | 1737 | 1750 | 1718 | 1757 | 1695 | 1703 |
| Mean | 1673 | 1652 | 1761 | 1695 | 1656 | 1685 | 1746 |
| $G_{0}$ | - 1572 | 1586 | 1810 | - |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{G}_{1}$ | 1655 | 1739 | 1660 |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{G}_{2}$ | 1791 | 1633 | 1814 | , |  |  |  |

S.E. of difference of two

| 1. I marginal means | $=62.93 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. $P$ or $G$ marginal means | $=42.14 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 3. $P$ or $G$ means at the same level of $I$ | $=59.60 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 4. I means at the same level of $P$ or $G$ | $=79.55 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 5. means in the body of $P \times G$ table | $=72.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Wheat. Ref :- Complex experiments (T.C:M.), 1953.
Centre :- Varanasi (U.P.). Type :- ‘IM'.
Object :-VII-To study the effect of irrigation along with manures.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture, brownish in colour and neutral in reaction. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 16.11.1953. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) P. 52. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 39.75. (x) 7.4.1954.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20$ and $N_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(3) 3 irrigations: $I_{1}=1, I_{2}=2$ and $I_{3}=3$ times.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Triple Super.
A/S broadcast before sowing and Triple super [placed in abands behind la plough with the help of a fertilizer drill.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{2}$ fact. confd. (ii) (a) 9 plots/block and 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $20^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield data. (iv) (a) 1953-1956. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kotah, Pura, Santa, Paliad and Obdullaganj. (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $470 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $61.22 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $N$ and I Pare highly significant. Interaction $I \times N$ is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{3}$ | Meas | $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 13 | Is |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 324 | 285 | 360 | 323 | 235 | 373 | 360 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 500 | 481 | 491 | 491 | 265 | 618 | 589 |
| N | 549 | 625 | 613 | 596 | 341 | 726 | 721 |
| Mead | 458 | 464 | 488 | 470 | 280 | 572 | 557 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 275 | 302 | 265 | 280 |  |  |  |
| $\mathbf{I}_{1}$, | 574 | 554 | 589 | 572 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 525 | 535 | 611 | 557 |  |  |  |

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =20.40 \mathrm{lb} \cdot \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of any mean in body of table } & =35.34 \mathrm{lb} \sqrt{\mathrm{ac}}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Wheat. } & \text { Ref :- Complex experiments (T.C.M.), } 1953 . \\
\text { Centre :- Pura. } & \text { Type :- 'TM', }
\end{array}
$$

Object:-VII-To study the effect of irrigation along with manures.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam in texture-grey in colour. (b) pH 7.5. (iii) 12.11.1953. (iv) N.A: (v) N.A. (vi) C-13. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 38.18. (x) 9.4.1954.

## 2 TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=20$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 irrigations: $I_{1}=1, I_{2}=2$ and $I_{8}=3$ times.

N as $A / S$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Triple Super.
A/S applied by broadcast before sowing and Triple Super placed deep in bands behind a plough with the help of fertilizer drill.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3^{8}$ fact. confd. (ii) (a) 9 plots block and 3 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $44^{\prime} \times 16.5^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. Lodging was observed in plots treated with $N_{2} P_{2}, N_{2} P_{1}$ and $N_{2} P_{0}$. (ii) Slight damage by rats. (iii) Yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1953-1956. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kotah, Banaras, Satna, IPaliad and Obedullaganj. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1039 Ib./ac.
(ii) $140.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are highly significant. Ocher effect and interactions are not aipnificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| * | $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{N}_{2}$ | Mean | $I_{1}$ | $\mathrm{I}_{2}$ | 12 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | 494 | 792 | 1111 | 799 | 967 | 597 | 833 |
| $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | 833 | 1183 | 1326 | 1114 | 1080 | 1152 | 1111 |
| $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 926 | 1316 | 1367 | 1203 | 1111 | 1244 | 1255 |
| Mean | . 751 | 1097 | 1268 | 1039 | 1053 | 998 | 1066 |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | 741 | 1152 | 1265 | 1053 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{1}$ | . 689 | 1019 | 1285 | 998 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{I}_{3}$. | 823 | 1121 | 1255 | 1066 |  | - |  |


| S.E. of any marginal mean | $=46.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of any mean in the body of table | $=81.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi). ' Ref --U.P. 48(127).
Site :-B.R. Collége Res. Farm, Bichpuri (Agra). Type :-.IMV'.
Object: To study the response of three varieties of Wheat to three forms of Nitrogen in three different doses at three levels of irrigation.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam, medium texture. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri (Agra). (iii) 5.11.1948. (iv) (a) Ploughing by Meston plough on 5.8.1948. Seven more ploughings by Meston plough and 4 ploughings applied to mix and bury the organic manures. (Castor cake and compost) (b) Sown by Nai behind the plough. ( $2^{\circ}$ thick soil fell from the sides of the furrow). (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Harrowing was done on 13.12.1948. (ix) 20". (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 3 irrigations: $-I_{1}=$ low, $I_{2}=$ medium and $I_{3}=$ high.
(2) 3 varieties: $-\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-13, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{Pb} .591$ and $\mathrm{V}_{3}=$ Local.
(3) 3 sources of $N:-S_{1}=$ Compost, $S_{2}=$ Castor cake and $S_{4}=A / S$.
(4) 3 doses of $\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{N}_{1}=30, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=60$ and $\mathrm{N}_{3}=90 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

Organic manures were applied 15 days before sowing (i.e. castor cake on 17.10.1948. and compost om 18.10.1948). After application, the field was ploughed 4 times to mix these manures completely with the soil. A/S was applied as top-dressing on 24.10.1948. followed by 2nd irrigation on 28.10.1948.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times\left({ }^{3}\right)$ half plaid square in $9 \times 9$ square in which whole of each column is subjected to same irrigational treatment. (ii) (a) $9 \times 9$. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $36^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}$. (v) $3^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, ht. of the plant, tillers, green and dry leaves in the bush, fresh and dry wt. of the plant, studies of ear emergence. No. of grains per main shoot ear, wt. of grain per main shoot ear, yield and bhusa. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.R.C.
S. RESULTS :
(i) $1419 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $265.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $331.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $S$ is highly significant and that of $V$ is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.

Ref:-U.P. 53(368).
Type :-‘D'.

Object:-To test the effect of chemical herbicides on weeds and the Wheat crop in comparison with hand weeding.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.P. 720 . (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $1.00^{\circ}$. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. No weeding (control).
2. $1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{lb}$. of Esteron 245 (an ester of $2,4,5-\mathrm{T}$ ), in 163 gallons of water per acre.
3. 2.4 l . of Dicotox in 163 gallons of water per acre.
4. Hand weeding.

Hand weedings on 11.12.1953 and sprayings on 14.12.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Latin square. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Plot size : $10^{\circ} \times 10^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) NiI. (vii) Imformation collected from the "Allahabad Farmer". No origional records or the plotwise yield data were available. The Av. yield of grain and weeds corresponding to the different treatments were given in mds./ac. The Av. yield of grain as given above have been converted from the yields given in mds./ac. S.E. of the experiment or S.E. per treatment mean were not given in the "Allahabad Farmer". Experiment conducted by the Head Agronomy Department, Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $933.9 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Jb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1. | 954.5 |
| 2. | 872.2 |
| 3. | 946.3 |
| 4. | 962.7 |
| S.E./mean | N.A. |

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 48(90).
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-To determine the efficacy of fungus sulphur in controlling rust of Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A, (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 29.10.1948. (iv) (a)
to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NP-126. (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS

1. Control (undusted).
2. Sulphur dusted at 4 days interval ; total number of dustings-10.
3. Sulphur dusted at 7 days interval ; total number of dustings-6.
4. Sulphur dusted at 10 days interval ; total number of dustings-4. Sulphur dusted at $30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. Starting on 24.1.1949.
5. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 4.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A
(b) $75^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}$.
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
6. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) $\%$ infection (100 leaves examined) and yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P. Transformation has been applied as suggested by the chief statistician to Govt., U.P.
7. RESULTS :
(i) $16.62^{\circ}$
(ii) $2.8^{\circ}$
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Mean of angle corresponding to $\%$ infection in degree.

Treatments Mean angle - Transformed back mean per centages of infection after applying bias correction.

1. Control $\quad=9.60^{\circ}$
2. Sulphur dusted at 4 days interval
3. Sulphur dusted at 7 days intetval $\quad=16.52^{\circ} \quad 8.52$
4. Sulphur dusted at 10 days interval $\quad=26.43^{\circ} \quad 20.10$
S.E. /mean $=0.99^{\circ}$

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :- U.P. 49(193).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Type :- ‘D'
Object :-To determine the efficacy of fungus sulphur in controlling rusts of Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 15.11.1949. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N-P 125 . (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control (undusted).
4. Sulphur dusted at 4 days interval, starting from 23 February 1950 [subsequently dusted on 27, 3, 7, 11, 15.3.1950].
5. Sulphur dusted at 7 days interval, starting from 23.2 .19 50 [subsequently on $2,9,16.3 .1950$ ].
6. Sulphur dusted at 10 days interval, starting from 23.2.1950 [subsequently on $5,15.3 .1950$ ].

Dusting at 30 lb ./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $60^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mild rust pustule started appearing on 21.2.1950; Pustules of brown rust appeared on 23.2.1950. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2886 lb./ac.
(ii) $146.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 2765 |
| 2. | 2901 |
| 3. | 2956 |
| 4. | 2921 |
| S.E./mean | $=51.92$ It./ac. |

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kappur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(254).
Type :-'IM':

Object :-To determine the efficacy of fungus sulphur dusting in controling rusts on Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 2.11.1950. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NP-125. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control.
4. Dusting at 4 days intervals. (Number of dusting-12)
5. Dusting at 7 days intervals. (Number of dusting-7)
6. Dusting at 10 days intervals. (Number of dusting-6)

Dusting at $30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. ( $6 \mathrm{oz} . / \mathrm{plot}$ ).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $45^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii), Appearance of rust, only one pustule was found. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c), N.A, (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $3390 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 268.4 lb /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 3356 |
| 2. | 3408 |
| 3. | 3373 |
| 4. | 3422 |
| S.E./mean | $=94.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

## Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).

Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 50(50).
Type : $\boldsymbol{\sim}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}^{\prime}$.
Object:-To study the effect of spraying trace elements on the yield of Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Moong. (b) Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 4.11.1950. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) C-13 (carly). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. $5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ of Manganese chloride.
4. 5 lb , Jac. of Zinc sulphate.
5. 5 lb /ace. of Copper sulphate.

(i) R.B. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Wheat ${ }^{(1}$ A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $36.3^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Ye6,
6. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A.
(vi) Ni, (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
7. RESULTS :
(i) $2291 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 431.3 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 2530 |
| 2. | 2214 |
| 3. | 1970 |
| 4. | 2259 |
| 5. | 2484 |
| S.E./mean | $=215.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

```
Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 51(99).
Type :- 'D'.
```

Object: -To study the effect of spraying trace elements on the yield of Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Moong. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 27.10.1951. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) A/S at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N on 27.11.1952. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. 5 lb /ac. or Manganese chloride.
4. $5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Zinc sulphate.
5. 5 lb ./ac. of Copper sulphate.
6. 1 lb ./ac. of Boric acid.
7. Control-no spraying.

Date of spraying : 10.1.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $36.3^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}$ (v) N.A. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A, (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
3. RESULTS:
(i) 1224 lb./ac.
(ii) 325.9 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}$.
Treatment Av. yield

1. 1407
2. 1287
3. 954
4. 1206
$5 . \quad 1268$
S.E./mean $=162.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop:- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 52(153).
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To study the effect of spraying trace elements on the yield of Wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Wheat-Moong. (b) Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 3.11.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. and G.M. (vi) C-13 (enrly). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. 5 lb ./ac. of Manganese chloride.
2. 5 lb ./ac. of Zinc sulphate.
3. 5 lb ./ac. of Copper sulphate.
4. 1 lb ./ac. of Boric acid.
5. Control-No spraying.

Date of spraying : 7.1.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $36.3^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good, (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) $1950-1954$. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1158 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $325.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| $: 1$. | 1317 |
| 2. | 1172 |
| 3. | 906 |
| 4. | 1194 |
| S. | 1200 |
| S.E./mean | $162.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop:-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(196).
Site :-Govt. Res Farm, Kanpur.
Type: :~'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of spraying trace elements on the yield of Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Wheat-Moong. (b) Moong. (c) Top dressing with $A / \dot{S}$ at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N on 13.8.1953. (ii) (a) Loam.
(b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 4.11 .1953 . (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vi) C-13 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. 5 lb ./ac. of Manganese chloride.
4. 5 lb ./ac. of Zinc sulphate.
5. 5 lb ./ac. of Copper sulphate.
6. $1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of Boric acid.
7. Control-No spraying.

Date of spraying 29.12.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $36.3^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}$. (v) Distance between plots $=4^{\circ}$ Distance between blocks $=4^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $927.3 . \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $427.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | ---: |
| 1. | 1021.5 |
| 2. | 916.5 |
| 3. | 732.0 |
| 4. | 972.0 |
| 5. | 994.5 |
| S.E./mean | $=213.6 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 50(142).
Type :-'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of sulphur dusting and spraying on rust attack of wheat.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 13.i1.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing by victory plough and two ploughings by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 80 srs./ac. (d) Spraying between rows- $9^{\circ}$ ( 19 rows). (e) N.A. (v) A/S at 6 srs./plot. (vi) NP. 125 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4, 5.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

1. Control.
2. Sulphur dusting at 6 oz ./plot.
3. Sulphur spraying (spraying on leaves).
4. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8 . (iv) (a) $30^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime} .3^{\prime \prime}$. (b) $26^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime} .9^{\circ}$. (v) $2^{\prime} \times 3 / 4^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
5. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
6. RESULTS :
(i) $1830 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $143.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 1802 |
| 2. | 1891 |
| 3. | 1796 |
| S.E./mean | $=50.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

## Ref:-U.P.48(20).

Type s-'D'.
Object:- To study the effect of Methoxone as weed killer !against Cyperus rodundus and Asphodelus Teninfolius of Wheat.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 27.10.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) $80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Sanal as G.M. (vi) C-13 (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.4.1949.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. $1 \%$ dust at the rate of $200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
2. $10 \%$ spray at 1 gallon/ac. diluted with 30 gallons of water.
3. $10 \%$ spray at 2 gallons/ac. diluted with 30 gallons of water.
4. Control.

Date of application of Methosone 27.12.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $26^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}-3^{\circ}$. (b) $23^{\prime} \times 8^{\circ}-3^{\circ}$. (v) $11^{\prime}$ at either end of length. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Only rust was visible in traces. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1948. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1982 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $188.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1. | 1970 |
| 2. | 1999 |
| 3. | 2037 |
| 4. | 1923 |
| S.E./mean | $=76.86 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(96).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Type : ${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{D V}^{\prime}$.
Object :-To study the effect of harmone treatment of seed on the Wheat yield.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Wheat followed by sanai. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kanpur. (iii) 12.11.1953. (iv) (a) Turning of sanai on 6 and 7.9.1953 ; palewa on 21.10.1953; desi plough on 12.11.1953; cultivator on 29.9.1953 and cultivator and pata on 1.11.1953. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) $801 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. (d) $9^{\circ}$ apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 22.1.1954 with khurpi. (ix) N.A. (x) 12.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combination of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: $\mathrm{V}_{1}=$ NP-125 and $\mathrm{V}_{2}=$ NP- 710 .
(2) 4 harmone levels : $C_{0}=$ Control, $C_{1}=0.01$ p.p.m. for 20 hours, $C_{8}=0.10$ p.p.m. for 20 hours and $C_{3}=10.00$ p.p.m. for 20 hours.
Seed soaked in harmone solution.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $4 \times 2$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) $17^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}$. (b) $13^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime} \times \mathbf{1}^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, grain, straw and dry grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R). Due to unsatisfactory results the experiment is to be repeated next year. Maturing date of N.P.-125 is 21.3 .1954 and that of N.P.-710 is 14.3.1954.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1487 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $389.0 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii). Only the effect of V is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  | $C_{0}$ | $C_{1}$ | $C_{2}$ | $C_{\mathbf{3}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{V}_{1}$ | 1569 | 1672 | 1744 | 1518 |
| $\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 1477 | 1405 | 1169 | 1344 |
| Mean | 1523 | 1538 | 1456 | 1431 |

S.E. of difference of two
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. C marginal means } & =137.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}, \\ \text { 2. V marginal means } & =194.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 3. means in the body of table } & =275.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}$

Crop :-Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Agri. College Farm, Varan asi.

## Ref:-U.P. 50(323).

Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of electro-chemical treatment of Wheat on its yield and quality.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 12.11 .1950. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings with desi plough followed each time by a planker in order to crush lumps. (b) By Lyallpur seed drill. (c) 40 srs/ac. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Sanai ploughed in on 27.7.1950. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hand hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.3.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: $V_{1}=I$.P. 52 and $V_{2}=C-13$.
(2) 9 seed treatments : $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Soaked for 6 hours in $2.5 \%$ sodium chloride solution and later treated for 5 minutes, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=$ Soaked for 6 hours in $2.5 \% \mathrm{Na} \mathrm{Cl}$ and later treated electro chemically for 10 minutes, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Soaked for 6 hours in $5 \% \mathrm{Na} \mathrm{Cl}$ and later treated electro-chemically for 5 minutes, $\mathrm{T}_{4}=$ Soaked for 6 hours in $5 \% \mathrm{Na} \mathrm{Cl}$ and later treated electro-chemically for 10 minutes, $\mathrm{T}_{5}=$ Soaked for 6 hours in $2.5 \%$ calcium chloride solution and later treated electro-chemically for 5 mintes, $\mathrm{T}_{6}=$ Soaked for 6 hours in $2.5 \% \mathrm{CaCl}_{2}$ and later electro-chemically treated for 10 minutes, $\mathrm{T}_{7}=$ Soaked for 6 hours in $5 \% \mathrm{CaCl}_{2}$ and treated electro-chemically for 5 minutes, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{B}}=$ Soaked for 6 hours in $5 \% \mathrm{CaCl}_{2}$ and later treated electro-chemically for 10 minutes, $T_{9}=$ Control-Soaked for 6 hours in water.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $2 \times 9$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 18 . (b) $205.5^{\prime} \times 49.5^{\prime}$. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) $193^{\prime} \times 23 y^{\prime}$, (b) $171^{\prime} \times 21 \frac{1}{3}^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ wide atrip on each side of the plot and $4^{\prime}$ all round the field. Water channel $4^{\prime}$ wide. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Nil. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1423 . $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $115.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect $\mathbf{V}$ and of T are both highly significant. Interaction $V x T$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | T 1 | T9 | Ts | T4 | Ts | Ti | T | T ${ }_{8}$ | Ts | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{V}_{1}$ | 1405 | 1458 | 1569 | 1256 | 1246 | 1427 | 1481 | 1134 | 1350 | 1370 |
| $\mathbf{V}_{1}$ | 1479 | 1497 | 1669 | 1473 | 1432 | 1396 | 7605 | 1303 | 1434 | 1476 |
| Mean | 1442 | 1478 | 1619 | 1364 | 1339 | . 1412 | 1543 | 1218 | . 1392 | 1423 |
|  | S.E. of marginal mean of $V$ S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{T}$ S.E. of body of table |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =19.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =40.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =57.80 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Crop :- Wheat (Rabi).
Site :- Kandhari Farm, B.R. College, Agra.

Ref:- U.P. 48(128).
Type :- 'ID'.

Object :-To study the effect of pre-sowing seed treatments on the germination and yield of Pb . 591 Wheat under different irrigations.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Early guar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 10.11.1948. (iv) (a) Punjab plough on 16.8.1948, ploughing $5^{\circ}$ deep and 6 desi ploughings, harrowing on 19.8.1948. Palewa on 29.10 .1948 to only irrigated plots. Cross ploughing on 8.11 .1948 followed by pata. (b) By country seed drill $3^{\circ}$ to $4^{\circ}$ deep in furrows. (c) 43.6 srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) 100 mds. of M.C. on 27 and 28.10 .1948. mixed by hand with soil. (vi) Pb. 591. (vii) Irrigated, as per treatments. (viii) Weeding done after the tru irtigation. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.3.1949.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

## Main-plot treatments:

3 levels of irrigation : $\mathrm{I}_{0}=$ rainfed (no irrigation), $\mathrm{I}_{1}=$ Canal irrigation and $\mathrm{I}_{2}=$ Well irrigation (saline water).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 pre-treatments of seef : $T_{1}=$ control, $T_{2}=$ continuous soaking and $T_{8}=$ repeated soaking.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $34^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}$. (v) Block border 4', plot border $2^{\prime}$ and breadth of Irrigation channel $3^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) -. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $1155 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(ii) (a) $341.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $108.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main-effect of $I$ is highly significant and $T$ is significant, while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $T_{1}$ | $T_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $T_{9}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{I}_{0}$ | 244 | 358 | 366 | 323 |
| $\mathbf{I}_{1}$ | 1424 | 1695 | 1819 | 1646 |
| $I_{2}$ | 1302 | 1599 | 1590 | 1497 |
| Mean | 990 | 1217 | 1258 | 1155 |

S.E. of difference of two

1. I marginal means
2. T marginal means
3. T means at the same level of I
4. I means at the same level of $\mathbf{T}$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =139.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =44.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =76.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =152.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
$$

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Agri. Institute, Allababad.

Ref :-U.P. 53(364).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To test the effect of N manures and fertilizers on the yield of Jowar (sorghum) green fodder.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Barley. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Fine sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 29 and 30.6.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) $12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. (d) Rows 2 ' apart. (e) -. (v) N.A. (vi) Farm selection (N.A.) (vii) N.A. (viii) Weeding on 16.7.1953, interculture (cultivator used) on 18 and 20.7.1953 and interculture and earthing (cultivator used) on 30.7.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.9.1953.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control (no manure).
2. 40 lb ./ac. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$.
3. $40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}$.
4. 40 lb ./ac. of N as Castor cake.
5. 40 lb ./ac. of N as Farm compost.
6. $20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as Castor cake.
7. $20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+20 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N as Farm compost.
8. 20 lb ./ac. of $\mathbf{N}$ as $\mathbf{C} / \mathbf{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as Castor cake.
9. $20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N as Farm compost.
10. $20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathbf{N}$ as Farm compost $+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathbf{N}$ as Castor cake.

Castor cake applied on 25.7.1953 and others applied on 21.7.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) $180^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}$. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $45^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}$. (b) $41^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}$. (v) $2^{\prime}$ alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) Germination and stand very thin due to water logging in treatment 8 (block I) and treatment 9 (block VI). The yields of these two plots have been estimated. (ii) N.A. (iii) Height, stand and yield of green fodder. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The land for the above experiment was for the first time being used for experimental purposes. In the previous year this plot received a heavy application of farm compost. It seems from the growth of the crop and the yield data that there was a high residual effect of compost this year bringing in the yield figure of all the treatments to a uniform level. Field record register and the "Allahabad Farmer" were consulted. Expt. conducted by Agronomy Dept. A.A.I., Allahabad.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $36514 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $4206.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of green fodder in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield | Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 1. | 35438 | 6. | 34320 |
| 2. | 36050 | 7. | 35282 |
| 3. | 39537 | 8. | 36594 |
| 4. | 36427 | 9. | 39110 |
| 5. | 35751 | 10. | 36635 |
|  | S.E./mean excluding treatment 8 and 9 |  | $=1717.46 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
|  | S.E./mean of treatment 8 and 9 |  | $=1898.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

> Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
> Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :-U.P. 51(93).
Type : $\mathbf{c}^{\mathbf{C}} \mathrm{M}$ '. .

Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ fertilizers, alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.7 .1951 . (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by watts' plough were given to the field for preparation. (b) Sown behind the desi plough. (c) to (e) N.A: (v) Nil. (vi) to (ix) N.A. (x) 17.11.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ as Super placed $3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in furrows behind desi plough and then para applied. Date of manuring 9.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $38^{\circ} \times 28^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime}$. (v) A distance of $1^{\prime}$ to $3^{\prime}$ from plot to plot and $3^{\prime}$ to $4^{\prime}$ from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Ni. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) $1950-1952$. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kanpur, Raya, Kalai, Banaras, Partapgarh, Chirgaon and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) Conducted by Agricultural chemist. Experiment failed in the year 1950.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $476.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $34.63 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are highly significant. Interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | P. | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{8}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N。 | 373.2 | 426.5 | 499.8 | 433.2 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 453.2 | 453.2 | 526.5 | 464.3 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | 479.9 | 526.5 | 586.5 | 531.0 |
| Mean | 422.1 | 468.7 | 537.6 | 476.1 |
|  | S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  | $\begin{aligned} & =8.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =14.14 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |

$$
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Jowar (Kharif). } & \text { Ref : U.P. 52(4). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Agri. Farmi, Atarra. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
$$

Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ fertilizer, alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.7.1952. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with watts plough ( 1 before and 1 after breakage of monsoon). (b) Sown behind desi plough. (c) N.A. (d) In lines $2^{\prime}$ apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.11 to 2.12 .1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{2}=15$ and $N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied as surface dressing by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{R}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super drilled in furrows $4^{\prime \prime}$ deep behind the plough. Date of manuring 5.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) $38^{\prime} \times 28.67^{\circ}$. (b) $38^{\prime} \times 28.67^{\circ}$. (v) Between plote $1^{\prime}$ and between blocks $3^{\prime}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Damaged by birds. (iii) Grain' and straw. yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Partapgarh, Nawabganj, Bharari, Banaras and Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Ni!. (vii) The experiment conducted by Agiricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $199.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $54.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{6}$ | 116.6 | 153.3 | 196.6 | 155.5 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 189.9 | 166.6 | 193.3 | 183.3 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{2}$ | 259.9 | 246.6 | 276.6 | 261.0 |
| Mean | 188.8 | 188.8 | 222.2 | 199.9 |

S.E. of any marginal mean
$=12.82 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Iac}$.
$=22.20 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Crop:- Jowar (Kharif). | Ref:- U.P. 50(59). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari. | Type:- 'M'. |

Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa (Bundelkhand type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 17.7.1950. (iv)
(a) One hot weather ploughing and one harrowing was given by tractor. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) Thinning one and weeding pne. (ix) N.A. (x) 22 to 28.11.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 level of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=30$ and $P_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} /$ S. applied by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super placed in bands $3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in the soil and $1^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ below the seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $\mathbf{1} / 40$ ac. (v) One foot from plot to plot and three,feet from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Partapgarh and Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
3. RESULTS:
(i) $1553 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $380.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{6}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 1420 | 1560 | 1307 | 1429 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1420 | 1767 | 1493 | 1560 . |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | 1773 | 1467 | 1767 | 1669 |
| Mean | 1538 | 1598 | 1522 | 1553 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =89.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =155.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref : $\boldsymbol{\sim}$ U.P $\mathbf{5 1 ( 8 9 )}$
Type:- ' $M$ '.

Object:-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa (Bundelkhand type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1951. (iv) (a) The field was ploughed by tractor during hot weather and after rains, it was harrowed. (b) Seeds sown in lines two feet apart, behind desl plough. '(c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.12.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15$ and $N_{8}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=30$ and $P_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$N$ as $A / S$ applied by broadcast and $P_{2} O_{5}$ as Super placed $3^{n}-4^{\circ}$ deep in furrows behind the plough and then paia applied. Date of manuring 3.7.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}$. (v) A distance of $1^{\prime}$ to $3^{\prime}$ from plot to plot and $3^{\prime}$ to $4^{\prime}$ from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Raya, Kalai, Varanasi, Partapgarh, Atarra, and Chirgaon. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $2198 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $237.1 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are highly significant. Interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P b}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 1867 | 1987 | 2087 | 1980 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 2000 | 2280 | 2347 | 2209 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 2233 | 2433 | 2547 | 2404 |
| Mean | 2033 | 2233 | 2327 | 2198 |
|  | S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =55.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =96.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref:- U.P. 52(7).
Type :- 'M'.

Object : -To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Rakar and parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.7 .1952 . (iv) (a) 1 ploughing and harrowing by tractor. (b) Sown behind plough in lines $2^{\prime}$ apart. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21 to 24.11 .1952

## 2 TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{9}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied as surface dressing by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ as Super drilled in furrows $4^{\prime \prime}$ deep behind the plough. Date of manuring 4,5.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A: (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) $33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}$. (b) $33^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}$. (v) Distance between plots $1^{\prime}$ and between blocks $3^{\circ}$. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. Water logging in 2 replications which stunned the growth of the crop. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Yaranasi, Partapgarh, Nawabganj, Matkota, Atarra and Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $1018 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $92.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are highly significant. Interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{3}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 767 | 873 | 1020 | 887 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 807 | 1053 | 1213 | 1024 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{8}$ | 980 | 1153 | 1300 | 1144 |
| Mean | 851 | 1026 | 1178 | 1018 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =21.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.} \\ & =37.70 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac.} \end{aligned}$ |  |

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Chirgaon.

Ref :- U.P. 51(96).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ fertilizer applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light kabar. (b) Refer soil analysis, Chirgaon. (iii) 25.7.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughed twice by bakhar, during rainy season. (b) Sown in lines 2' apart behind desi plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) One interculture by cultivator and one thinning was done. (ix) N.A. ( $x$ ) 27 and 28.11.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super placed $3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in furrows behind the desi plough and then pata applied. Date of manuring 15.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $46.5^{\prime} \times 23.5^{\circ}$. (v) A distance of $1^{\prime}$ to $3^{\prime}$ from plot to plot and $3^{\prime}$ to $4^{\prime}$ from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No, (v) (a) Kanpur, Raya, Kalai, Varanasi, Pratapgarh, Atarra and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Crop Physiologist (Research).
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1355 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $278.4 \mathrm{lb} \cdot / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of N alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  |  $P_{0}$ $P_{\mathbf{1}}$ $P_{\mathbf{2}}$ Mean <br> $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}$ 1036 1216 1266 1173 <br> $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ 1206 1286 1385 1292 <br> $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ 1385 1684 1734 1601 <br> Mean  1209 1395 1462 |
| ---: | :--- |

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Regional Training Inṣtitute, Gazipur,

Ref :- U.P. 53(327).
Type:- ' $\mathbf{M '}^{\prime}$.

Object :-To study the effects of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ fertilizer applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) N.A. (b) Barley and Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light sandyloam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.7.1953. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) Weeding and thinning between 31.7.53 and 5.8.1953. (is) $37.53^{\circ}$. (x) 21,22 and 23.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$N$ as $A / S$ broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super placed in $4^{\circ}$ deep bands $9^{\circ}$ apart. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ placed in about $1^{\circ}$ to $2^{\circ}$ below the seed.
3. DESTGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. : (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) and (b) $25^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}$. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) $1953-$ N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $926^{\circ} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 221.1 lb ./ac.
(iii) Interaction $\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}$ alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $P_{0}$ | $P_{1}$ | $P_{1}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $N_{0}$ | 809 | 1196 | 837 | 947 |
| $N_{1}$ | 989 | 871 | 906 | 922 |
| $N_{2}$ | 1093 | 761 | 871 | 908 |
| Mean | 964 | 943 | 871 | 926 |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =52.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =90.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
$$

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site:- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.
Ref:- U.P. 51(91).

Object:-To study the effects of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam, type 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.7.1951. (iv) (a) Two ploughings, one with desi plough in the middle of June, and another with turnwrest plough in the first week of July, 2 desi ploughings for application of phosphatic fertilizer. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding and hoeing was done. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.11.1951 to 9.12.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{2}=15$ and $N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super placed $3^{6}-4^{\circ}$ deep in furrows behind the desi plough and then pata applied. Date of manuring 8.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $40.3^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yea,
4. GENERAL :
(i) Due to drought conditions, because of the absence of rains, proper grain formation did not take place and the crop was harvested at green stage. (ii) Nil. (iii) Fodder yield. ' (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kanpur, Raya, Varanasi, Pratapgarh, Atarra, Chirgaon and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Experiment failed in the year 1950. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $18486 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $1928.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) All effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of green fodder in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 9194 | 18622 | 10429 | 12748 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 13304 | 19149 | 24760 | 19071 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 21544 | 22358 | 27009 | 23637 |
| Mean | 14681 | 20043 | 20733 | 18486 |

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal moan } & =454.58 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =787.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
$$

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref :- U.P. 53(349).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the residual effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ applied to previous Wheat crop on Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Aligarh type 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.6.1953. (iv) (a) One ploughing and one palewa. (b) Broadcast. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $19^{\circ}$. (x) 29.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0$ and $N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control ( $\mathrm{P}_{0}=n 0 \quad \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ ).
(1) 2 levels of $P_{8} O_{5}: P_{1}=60$ and $P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=$ Super and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ B.M.

These manures were applied in the rabi season of 1952-1953 to wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.' (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $51.9^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of green matter only. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
4. RESULTS:
(i) $11855 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $2369.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $1733.4 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of green fodder in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 11122 | 10002 | 10812 | 12481 | 12980 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 11751 | 13000 | 12051 | 12051 | 12301 |
| Mean | 11436 | 11501 | 11432 | 12266 | 12640 |

## S.E. of difference of two

| 1. main-plot treatment marginal means | $=749.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2. sub-plot treatment marginal means | $=866.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 3. sub-plot means at a level of main-plot treatment | $=1225.7 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$. |
| 4. main-plot means at a level of sub-plot treatment | $=1327.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |


| Crop :-Jowar (Kharif). | Ref :-U.P. 50(57). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. | Type :-'M'. |

Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpar Type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 12.7.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28 to 30.11.1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ : $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ broadcast before sowing and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super placed in bands $3^{\prime \prime}$ to $4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in the soil. Manures applied on 11.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $55^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
' (i) The crop in some fields of the first 2 blocks was very patchy due to the presence of saline patches in this portion of the field. On the whole, a good crop was obtained. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Bharari, Pratapgarh, Varanasi, Kalai, Aligarh and Atarra. (vi) Ni. (vii) The expt. conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $1239 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $240.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table
$=56.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$ $=98.1 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}$

Crop : : Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 51(94).
Type:-'M'.
Object :-To study the effects of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpur type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 20.7.1951. (iv) (a) Tractor used during hot weather. In second week of July it was ploughed by Punjab plough. Field levelled. (b) Sown behind desi plough. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning and interculture operation were done towards the end of August. Earthing on 25th August. (ix) N.A. (x) 25 and 26.11.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) . 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ was broadcast before sowing and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ as Super was placed $3^{\prime \prime}$ to $4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in furrows behind the plough and then pata applied. Date of manuring 13.7.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination was good, (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Raya, Kalai, Varanasi, Pratapgarh, Atarra, Chirgaon and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $911 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 73.65 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are highly significant. Interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathbf{l b}$./ac.


Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).

## Ref :-U.P. 52(6).

Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Type : $\mathbf{r}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}$.
Object:-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied alone and in combination on yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Barley. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpur type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 6.7.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing 1st with watts plough and then with desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) N.A. (d) Lines 2 ' apart running parallel to fertilized bands. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 21 to 25.11.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15$ and $N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{2}=30$ and $P_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied as surface dressing by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super drilled in- furrows $4^{\circ}$ deep behind the ploush. Date of application 4.7.1953.
8. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) $50^{\circ} \times 21.8^{\prime}$. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good, except for low lying plots where growth was patchy and stunned due to water logging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (vi) (a) 1950-1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Varanasi, Pratapgarh, Nawabganj, Matkota, Bharari and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
3. RESULTS:
(i) 1806 lb .ac.
(ii) 154.1 lb /ac.
(iii) Main effects of $N$ and $P$ are highly significant. Interaction $N \times P$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1 lb ./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{8}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 1192 | 1385 | 1565 | 1381 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1792 | 1858 | 2051 | 1900 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 1992 | 2145 | 2271 | 2136 |
| Mean | 1659 | 1796 | 1962 | 1806 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =36.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =62.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Dairy Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 48(38).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the residual effect of Super applied to wheat at different depths on subsequent Jowar fodder crop.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Jowar-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 19.6.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 25 srs./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nii. (vi) Jowar-desi (N.A.). (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) 3 and 4.8.1948.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ ).
(1) 2 levels of Super : $P_{2}=125$ and $P_{2}=250 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 methods of application of Super: $M_{2}=$ applied at surface, $M_{2}=$ applied at $2 \mathbf{j}^{\prime \prime}$ deep and $M_{2}=$ applied at $41^{\circ}$ deep.
Super applied to wheat crop in Rabi and residual effect studied this year.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $52^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yet.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of fodder. (iv) (a) $1948-1949$. (b) Yes. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $18127 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $2381.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in lb./ac.

Control $=18080 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$


| S.E. of marginal mean of $M$ | $=841.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $P$ | $=687.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| S.E. of body of table $\quad$. | $=1190.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Dairy Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 49(88)/48(38).
Type:- ' $M$ '.

Object :-To study the residual effect of Super applied to wheat at different depths on subsequent crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Jowar fodder-wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.6.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 25 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Jowar local (N.A.) (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16 and 17.9.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control (no $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ )
(1) 2 levels of Super: $P_{1}=125$ and $P_{2}=250 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 methods of application of Super : $M_{1}=$ applied at surface, $M_{2}=$ applied $22^{n}$ deep and $M_{3}=$ applied $4 \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\prime \prime}$ deep.
Super applied to wheat crop in Rabi and residual effect studied this year.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4.
(iv) (a) N.A. .
(b) $52^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}$.
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No, (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $15379 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $2999.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in lb./ac.

|  | Control $=16275 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{M}_{1}$ | M | $\mathrm{Ma}_{\mathbf{8}}$ |  |
| $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | 14311 | 17811 | 14909 | 15677 |
| $P_{8}$ | 13692 | 13214 | 17442 | 14783 |
| Mean | 14002 | 15512 | 16175 | 15230 |


| S.E. of marginal mean of M | $=1060.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :---: | :---: |
| S.E. of marginal mean of $P$ | $=865.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| S.E. of body of table | - $1500.0 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

## Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).

Ref:- U.P. 48 (33)
Site :- Govt. Dairy Farm, Kanpur.
Type :- ${ }^{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.
Object :-To study the residual effect of different $N$ manures applied to wheat during the previous Rabi, on subsequant Jowar fodder crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Wheat-Jowar fodider. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam (b) N.A. (iii) 19.6.1948 resown on 4.7 .1948 (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Local (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. ( k ) 14 to 16.9.1948.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. Control (no manure). 5. F.Y.M. at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ of N .
2. Castor cake at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N . 6. Castor cake at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N} .+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. G.N.C. at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N . 7. G.N.C. at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N} .+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
4. A/S at 50 lb ./ac. of N . 8. F.Y.M. at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{N} .+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at $25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .

Applied to the wheat crop (Rabi) in the previous year and residual effect is studied this year.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) $\mathbf{1 / 4 0}$ ac. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal (ii) No. (iii) Fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $12,338 \quad \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $1,588.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in Ib./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield | Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 12150 | 5. | 12280 |
| 2. | 14030 | 6. | 11510 |
| 3. | 10510 |  | 7. |
| 4. | 12550 | 8. | 13100 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

S.E. $/$ mean $=794.1$ 1b./ac.

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 49(89). Type :- $\mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.

Object :-To study the residual effect of optimum doses of F.Y.M., compost and A/S applied to Wheat crop in rabi. on Jowar fodder

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Jowar fodder-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viiu) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS -
3. Control.
4. Compost at $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
5. F.Y.M. at $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
'6. Compost at $150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
6. F.Y.M. at $150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
7. Compost at $200 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
8. F.Y.M. at $200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
9. $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at 50 lb ./ac. of N .

These treatments were applied to Wheat crop.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $29^{\circ} \times 25^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Podder yield. (iv) 1949-1954 (modified in 1951). (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $11080 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$
(ii) 4077.0 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in lb./ac.


Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).<br>Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

## Ref:-U.P. 50(52)/49(89).

Type :-' $\mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.
Object :-To study the residual effect of F.Y.M., ccmpost and A/S, applied to Wheat crop in rabi, on Jowar fodder

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Jowar fodder-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.7.1950.
(iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 25 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No: (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A.
(x) 8 and 9.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

1. Control. 5. Compost at 100 lb ./ac. of N .
2. F.Y.M. at $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. Compost at 150 lb ./ac. of N .
4. F.Y.M. at $150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
5. Compost at $200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N
6. F.Y.M. at $200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
7. $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at 50 lb ./ac. of N .

These treatments were applied to Wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A: (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $29^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17912 : b./ac.
(ii) $5506.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


```
Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
```

Ref :- U.P. 51(116).

Type :- 'M".
Object : - To study the residual effect of F.Y.M., compost and A/S applied to Wheat crop in Rabi on Jowar fodder

BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Jowar fodder-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 22.7.1951.
(iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.10.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. Control.
2. F.Y.M. at $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
3. F.Y.M. at 125 lb ./ac. of N .
4. F.Y.M. at $150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .

Treatments applied to Wheat crop.
5. F.Y.M. at $175 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
6. F.Y.M. at 200 lb ./ac. of N.
7. F.Y.M. at $225 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
8. A/S at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D; (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $29^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of fodder. (iv) (a) 1951-1955 (in modified form from 1949-1950). (b) upto 1952 on one field and from 1953 on another field. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $17,371 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 3373.0 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

## Ref:- U.P. 52(163). <br> Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the residual effect of F.Y.M. and A/S, applied to Wheat cropin Rabi. on Jowar fodder.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Jowar fodder-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N. A. (iii) 3.7.1952. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.10.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control. 5. F.Y.M. at $175 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
4. F.Y.M. at $100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
5. F.Y.M. at 200 lb ./ac. of N .
6. F.Y.M. at $125 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
7. P.Y.M. at 225 lb ./ac. of N.
8. F.Y.M. at 150 lb ./ac. of N.
9. A/S at $50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .

Treatments applied to previous Wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A." (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $29^{\circ} \times 25^{\circ}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL : $\because \cdots$
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of fodder. (iv) (a) 1951-1955 (in modified form from 1949-50). (b) Yes. upto 1952 on one feld and from 1953 on another field. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $24,778 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $7580.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. . ; .
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) A v. yield of fodder in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |  | Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 22831 |  | 5. | 29080 |
| 2. | 24769 |  | 6. | 29140 |
| 3. | 21149 |  | 7. | 22741 |
| 4. | 26301 |  | 8. | 22216 |
|  |  |  | S.E./mean | $=3840.01 \mathrm{lb} . / a=$. |

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(197).
Type :- ' $M$ '.

Object :-To study the residual effect of F.Y.M. and A/S, applied to Wheat crop in Rabi, on Jowar fodder.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Jowar fodder- wheat.
(b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 26.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control. 2. F.Y.M. at $175 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
4. F.Y.M. at 100 lb ./ac. of N.
5. F.Y.M. at $200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
6. F.Y.M. at $125 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N. . 7. F.Y.M. at $225 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N.
7. F.Y.M. at $150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N .
8. A/S at 25 lb ./ac. of N .

Treatments applied to previous wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $36^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of fodder. (iv) (a) 1951-1955. (In modified form since 1949-1950). (b) Yes. (upto 1952-1953 on one field and from 1953-1954 on another field.) (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $24191 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $5074.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.


Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site:-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Object :-To study the residual effect of manuring linseed during last rabi with $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at different times on the yield of Jowar fodder.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

(i) (a) Linseed-Jowar fodder. (b) Linseed. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. ${ }^{-}$(b) N.A. (iii) 16.7.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 25 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) to (ix) N.A. (x) 16 and 17.9.1948.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. Control (no manure).
2. $A / S$ at 40 lb ./ac. of N at sowing.
3. $A / S$ at 40 lb ./ac. of N at one month after germination.
4. $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at 40 lb ./ac. of N at flowering.
5. A/S at $20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N at sowing and $20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N at one month after germination.
6. $A / S$ at 20 lb ./ac. of $N$ at sowing and 20 lb ./ac. of N at flowering.
7. $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at 20 lb ./ac. of N at one month after germination and 20 lb ./ac. of N at flowering. Only residual effect of treatments applied to Kharif crop studied.
8. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $29^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
9. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of fodder. (iv) (a) 1946-1948. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
10. RESULTS :
(i) $10285 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $3361.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Av. yield of | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| Treatment | 11165 |
| 1. | 11115 |
| 2. | 11065 |
| 3. | 9613 |
| 4. | 10464 |
| 5. | 7961 |
| 6. | 10615 |
| 7. | $=1680.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Kef :- U.P. 53(199)
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur,
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the residual effect of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied broadcast and placed deep to prsvious. Wheat crop on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Jowar fodder-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.7.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 20 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23 to 25.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 levels of $N$ as A/S: $N_{0}=0$ and $N_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $N$.
(2) 4 phosphatic treatments : $\mathrm{P}_{8}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ by broadcast, $\mathrm{P}_{8}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ by victory plough and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{3}}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ by U.P. plough with funnel.
Manures applied to wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $4 \times 2$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $31^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime} . \quad$ (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Fodder yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $25,941 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $2,506.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in lb-Jac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}$ | Mean |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 27387 | 24099 | 25855 | 27766 | 26278 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | 25138 | 25363 | 25209 | 26712 | 25606 |
| Mean | 26262 | 24731 | 25532 | 27239 | 25941 |

S.E. of marginal mean of $P$
$=793.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of marginal mean of $\mathbf{N} \quad=560.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
S.E. of body of table
$=1120.8 \mathrm{lb}$ /ac
$=1120.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 53(336).
Site :- Tarai State Farm, (Western Block), Matkota. Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the residual effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied to Wheat on Jowar crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Matkota clay loam, calcarious, (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Tractor harrowing once, ploughing by local plough once and mixing by cultivator. (b) Broadcasting. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super : $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

The treatments were applied during rabi 1952-1953 to wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $\mathbf{3} \times \mathbf{3}$ Fact. in R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 9.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 6.
(iv) (a) N.A.
(b) $49.5^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}$.
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Due to weeds, the germination was poor and uneven in growth. The effect was more serious in replications 1 and 2. (ii) N.A. (iii) As the grain formation of Jowar delayed too much only green fodder weighed and recorded. (iv) (a) $1953-$ N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Due to heavy rains, uneven germination and weeds, the experiment failed. As the yields were missing in them, the analysis has been done after rejecting two blocks. Experiment conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $5883 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $1625.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Only main effect of $P$ is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of green fodder in lb ./ac.

|  | P0 | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 4170 | 6180 | 5590 | 5313 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 4320 | 5510 | 7040 | 5623 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 4660 | 7770 | 7710 | 6713 |
| Mean | 4383 | 6487 | 6780 | 5883 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  | - $469.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |
|  |  | - $812.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ |  |  |

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Pratapgarh.

Ref - -U.P. 50(58).
Type $-\subset$ © M '.

Object:-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{8}$ applied alone Iand in [combination on the yield of Jowar crop.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 19.7 .1950 (resuwn on 26. 7. 1950 due to heavy rains after first sowing). (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Ni. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Last week of Nov., 1950.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N: \quad N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15$ and $N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels or $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{9}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as A/S was broadcast before sowing. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ and . Super placed in tande $3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}$ deep in soits $1^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}$ below the seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $35^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor stand due to abnormal weather conditions. Yield very poor. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 19501952. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Bharari and Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $130.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $43.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{P}$ and interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ are highly significant. Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{8}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 103.7 | 127.6 | 119.7 | 117.0 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 119.7 | 103.7 | 135.6 | 119.7 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 143.6 | 95.7 | 223.4 | 154.3 |
| Mean | 122.3 | 109.0 | 159.6 | 130.3 |
| S.E. any marginal mean |  | $=10.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |
| S.E. of body of table |  | $=17.59 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |  |  |

## Crop:-Jowar (Kharif).

Ref:-U.P. 51(90).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.
Type: : ‘'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ ?applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.7.195l. (iv) (a) Field prepared after two ploughings. (b) Broadcasting. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) No. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 20, 21.11.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N: \quad N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15$ and $N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}^{\prime}: \mathrm{P}_{6}=0, P_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied as broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super was placed $3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in furrows behind the victory plough and then pata applied.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A., (b) $21^{\circ} \times 331^{\prime}$. (v) A distance of $1^{\prime}$ to $3^{\prime}$ from plot to plot and $3^{\prime}$ to $4^{\prime}$ from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL:

(i) Crop suffered due to inadequate moisture, as the rains were insufficient. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Raya, Kalai, Varadasi, Atarra, Chirgaon and Bharari.
(b) N.A. (vi) The ripe crop was damaged by birds rand the resultant yield especially of grain was very poor. (vii) Expt. conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $202.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $42.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are significant. Interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lo./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}$ |  | Mean |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}$ | 134.2 | 196.1 | 206.4 | 178.9 |  |
| $\dot{N}_{1}$ | 206.4 | 206.4 | 216.7 | 209.8 |  |
| $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | 206.4 | 196.1 | 258.0 | 220.2 |  |
| Mean | 182.3 | 199.5 | 227.0 | 203.0 |  |


| S.E. of any marginal mean | $=10.03 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of body of table | $=17.37 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop:- Jowar (Kharif). $\quad$ Ref .- U.P. 52 (3)
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh
Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Barley. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1952. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings and harrowing with the first shower of rains. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. ( $x$ ) 19 to 27.11.1952.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \quad \mathrm{~N}_{2}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}:-\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \quad \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ was applied as surface dressing and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ as Super was drilled in furrows behind the plough $4^{\circ}$ deep in soil. (Fertilizers applied on 4.7.52).
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) $30^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}$. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :

- (i) Norma!. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain of straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Vararasi, Nawabganj, Matkota, Bharari and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) Yield per plot is lower becauso of usar patches and droughty conditions at the time of maturity of crop. (vii) experiment conducted by Agricultural Chemist.

5. RESULTS :
(i) $742.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $124.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are highly significant. Interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $\cdot \mathbf{P s}_{\mathbf{z}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | ' 405.6 | 764.4 | - 741.0 | 637.0 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 468.0 | 717.6 | 920.4 | 702.0 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 608.4 | 975.6 | 1084.2 | 889.2 |
| Mean | 494.0 | 819.0 | 915.2 | 742.7 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =29.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =51.01 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Pura.

## Ref :-U.P. 53 (355)

Type:-'M'.

Object : To study the effect of $\mathrm{N}_{3} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Sowar crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Kanpur Type 2 loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Pura. (iii) 16.7.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing by Gurjar plough on 6.7. 1953. Ploughing with cultivator on 8.7.1953. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) $38.9^{\circ \prime}(x) 30.11 .1953$ and 1.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0$ and $N_{1}=15 \mathrm{Jb}$./ac. of $N$.
(2) 2 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super: $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0$ and $\mathrm{P}_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ as Pot-Sulphate: $\mathrm{K}_{0}=0$ and $\mathrm{K}_{1}=30, \mathrm{~K}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$.

Date of manuring, 16.7.1953. A/S broadcast, $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ placed in $4^{\prime \prime}$ deep bands $9^{\circ}$ apart. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ about $1^{\text {T }}$ to $2^{\prime \prime}$ below the seed. Potash applied as deep placement with phosphate.

DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 2 \times 2$ partially balanced as only one replication of balanced set has been repeated 4 times as well as partially confounded design in which one degree of freedom corresponding to PK and NPK interaction is partially confounded. (ii) (a) 6 plots/block and 2 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $45^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime} \cdot$ (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Germination and growth was good. (ii) Attack of stem borer. After ripening of grain, it was totally destroyed and eaten away by the birds and monkeys. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A.
(b) N.A. (c) Nil.
(v) (a) Varanasi.
(b) N.A.
(vi) Nii. (vii) Experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) $136.7 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $120.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

S.E: of marginal mean of $\mathbf{N}$ or $\mathbf{P}$
S.E. of marginal mean of $K$
S.E. of body of table $N \times K$ or $\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{K}$
S.E. of body of table $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$
$-24.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=30.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=42.54 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
$=34.73 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res, SubuStn., Raya.

> Ref :- U.P. 51(97).

Type :- 'M'.
Object:-To study the effects of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{8}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.8.1951. (iv) (a) Final preparation of field was done by one ploughing with a dest plough on 5.8.1951. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hand weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.11 .1951 to 5.12.1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super placed $3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}$ deep in furrows behind the desi plough and then pata applied. Date of manuring 4.8.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $77^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}$. (v) A distance of $1^{\prime}$ to $3^{\prime}$ from plot to plot and $3^{\prime}$ to $4^{\prime}$ from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) No setting of grain took place and therefore the experiment had to be harvested at green stage for fodder. (ii) NiI. (iii) Yield of green matter only. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Kalai, Varanarsi, Pratapgarh, Atarra, Chirgaon and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Agricultural Chemist.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $5296 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $829.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{P}$ are highly significant ; interaction $\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}$ is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of green fodder in $\mathbf{l b}$./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 4674 | 4944 | 4789 | 4802 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 4728 | 4944 | 5806 | 5159 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{8}$ | 4754 | 5954 | 7072 | 5927 |
| Mean | 4719 | 5281 | 5889 | 5296 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =195.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =339.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 53(330).
Type:- ' $\mathbf{M}^{\prime}$. .

Object :-To study the residual effect of Super and B.M. along with A/S applied to Wheat crop on Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =195.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =339.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
$$

S.E. of body of table
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 28.6.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughings on 4.6 .1953 (once) and 27.6 .1953 (twice). (b) In lines behind plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) NiJ. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) 39.79". (x) 19.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

## Main-plot treatments :

2 levels of $N$ as $A / S: N_{0}=0$ and $N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1), ( 2 ) + a control ( $\mathrm{P}_{0}=\mathrm{No} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ )
(1) 2 levels of $P_{5} O_{5}: P_{1}=60$ and $P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 2 sources of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=$ Super and $\mathrm{S}_{2}=$ B.M.

These manures were applied in the Rabi season of 1952-1953 to wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main plots/block; 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) 1/40th ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Tae crop was affected by grass hoppers when it had grown to full height. The damage was 6 annas in a rapee. (iii) yield of fodder only. (iv) (a) 1953 -N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Kalai. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $11710 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) (a) $4413.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(b) $1489.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Effects of levels of $P$ and Source of $P$ are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in lb ./ac.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{8} \mathrm{P}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 9920 | 10960 | 11660 | 10850 | 13090 | 11296 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 10510 | 10130 | 11870 | 13230 | 14880 | 12124 |
| Mean | 10215 | 10545 | 11765 | 12040 | 13985 | 11710 |
| S.E. of difference of two |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. main-plot treatment means |  |  |  |  |  | 1395.6 |
| 2. sub-plot treatment means |  |  |  |  |  | 744.9 |
| 3. sub-plot treatment means at the same level of main-plot treatment |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 1053.6 \\ & 1683.9 \end{aligned}$ |

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref:- U.P. 53(331).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ and $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar crop.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Berseem in one portion and wheat in the other. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 1.7.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings on 29.6.1953. (b) Line sowing. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) Thinning was done on 12.8 .1953 weeding on 14 and 16.8.1953. Field drained on 22.8.1953. (ix) $37.52^{\circ}$. ( x ) 26 to 30.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of $N$ as $A / S: \quad N_{0}=0$ and $N_{1}=15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(2) 2 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super : $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0$ and $\mathrm{P}_{1}=30$. $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(3) 3 levels of $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ as Pot. Sul : $\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{K}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Manuring with $P$ and $K$ on 30.6 .1953 and manuring with $N$ on 1.7.1953. $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ placed in $4^{\circ}$ deep bands $9^{\circ}$ apart $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ is about $1^{\circ}$ to $2^{\circ}$ below the seed. $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}$ applied as deep placement with seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 2 \times 2$ partially balanced (as only one replication of balanced set has been repeated 4 times) as well as partially confounded design in which 1 d.f. corresponding to PK and NPK interaction is partially confounded. (ii) (a) 6 plots/block and 2 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) $40^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

## 4. GENERAL :

(i) Germination uniform. The southern four plots, two of control, one of $K_{\mathbf{1}}$ and one of $K_{\mathbf{2}}$ were badly affected due to heavy rains and mortality was $50 \%$ and rest of the plants in them had grown pale. (ii) Attack of grass hoppers-3 plots from each block from the north were affected. Dusting with $5 \%$ B.H.C. on 4.9.1953. The damage was mild. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Pura (Kanpur). (b) N.A. (vi) During the adobscent stage the border plants of north, east and south were damaged by farm cattle damage to the eastern and southern plots was considerable (about $\mathbf{2 5 \%}$ ). At the flowering stage and maturity stage attacked by wild birds. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $296.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $111.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | Mean | $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{K}_{0}$ | 264.8 | 300.2 | 282.5 | 267.3 | 297.7 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{1}$ | 256.8 | 333.7 | 295.2 | 294.7 | 295.7 |
| $\mathrm{K}_{2}$ | 299.7 | 325.2 | 312.5 | 265.8 | 359.2 |
| Mean | 273.8 | 319.7 | 296.7 | 275.9 | 317.5 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 247.1 | 304.7 | 275.9 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 300.4 | 334.7 | 317.5 |  |  |


| S.E. of marginal mean of $K$ | $=27.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| S.E. of marginal meáan of $N$ or $P$ | $=22.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| S.E. of body of table $K \times N$ or $K \times P$ | $=39.28 . \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |
| S.E. of body of table $N \times P$ | $=32.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |


| Crop :-Jowar (Kharif). | Ref :-U.P. 53(332) |
| :---: | :---: |
| Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi. | , Type : $\sim^{\prime} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}{ }^{\text {/ }}$ |

Object :-To study the residual effect of $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$, applied to wheat crop, on Jowar:

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 1.7.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 28, 29 and 30.6.1953. (b) Line sowing. (c) to (e) N.A. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (v) $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ at 15 $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N top dressed. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) Weeding on 16, 18.7.1953 and 7.8.1953; thinning on 2.8.1953 and field drained on 22.8.1953. (ix) $37.52^{\prime \prime}$. (x) 26 to 30.11 .1953 .
2. TREATMENTS :

Aill combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $N$ as $A / S: \quad N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30$ and $N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ as Super: $\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60$ añd $\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

Treatments were given during Rabi. 1952-53 to wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $42^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}$. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) The crop was affected due to water logging after hardly a month had passed. (ii) At grain formation, the crop was attacked by birds. The effect was quite severe on grains. (iii)' Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) Matkota. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. was conducted by A.C.
s. RESULTS :
(i) $232.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $71.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effect of $P$ alone is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

|  | $\mathbf{P}_{6}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{8}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 236.5 | 162.5 | 270.3 | 223.1 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 221.3 | 188.1 | 263.4 | 224.3 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 257.2 | 235.1 | 259.3 | 250.5 |
| Mean | 238.3 | 195.2 | 264.3 | 232.6 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean <br> S.E. of body of table |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =16.75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =29.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |

Crop :- Jower (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 50(56).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. RASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam (Varanasi type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 7.7.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.11.1950. to $\mathbf{6 . 1 2 . 1 9 5 0}$.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{9}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super placed in bands $3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in the soil. Date of manuring 7.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $35.5^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}$. (v) $1^{\prime}$ from plot to plot and $3^{\prime}$ from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Due to uneven level, badly effected by water logging in the centre. Germination was fair but due to bad weather, the crop could not progress well. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Bharari, Pratapgarh, Kalai, Aligarh and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) A portion of crop was damaged by cattle which has considerably effected final results. (vii) Experiment conducted by Agricultural Chemist.

## 5. RESULTS:

(i) $1137 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $346.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

|  | $P_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $P_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathbf{N}_{0}$ | 1166 | 1060 | 1136 | 1121 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 1288 | 970 | 1060 | 1106 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{2}$ | 1363 | 1136 | 1053 | 1184 |
| Mean | 1272 | 1055 | 1083 | 1137 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & =81.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\ & =141.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |

Crop: Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref:- U.P. 51(92).
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

## 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:

(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Varanasi type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 10.7.1951. (iv) (a) Two initial ploughings. (b) Broadcast. (c) 10 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Last week of November 1951.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=30$ and $\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super placed $3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}$ deep in furrows behind the plough and then pata applied. Date of manuring 9.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) $1 / 40$ ac. (v) A distance of $1^{\prime}$ to $3^{\prime}$ from plot to plot and $3^{\prime}$ to $4^{\prime}$ from block to block was left out. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Growth affected in early stages due to the failure of early monsoon. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Raya, Kalai, Pratapgarh, Atarra, Chirgaon and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.

## 5. RESULTS :

(i) $638.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) 144.1 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of $\mathbf{N}$ alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

|  | $P_{0}$ | $\mathrm{P}_{1}$ | $P_{8}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 420.0 | 593.3 | 600.0 | 537.8 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{1}$ | 653.3 | 640.0 | 613.3 | 635.5 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{8}$ | 740.0 | 733.3 | 753.3 | 742.2 |
| Mead | 604.4 | 655.5 | 655.5 | 638.5 |

S.E. of any marginal mean
$=33.98 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. .
S.E. of body of table $=58.84 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 52(2).
Type : ${ }^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}$.

Object :-To study the effect of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ applied alone and in combination on the yield of Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Gram. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Varanasi type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 2.7.1952. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings after first shower. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.11 .1952 to 4.12.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of $\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=15$ and $\mathrm{N}_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.
(2) 3 levels of $P_{2} O_{6}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=30$ and $P_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}$./ac.

N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$ applied on the surface by broadcast and $\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super drilled fin furrows behind the plough. Date of manuring 26.6.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) $3 \times 3$ Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a), (b) $42^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}$. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Not satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur, Pratapgarh, Nawabganj, Matkota, Bharari and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) Just after sowing when seed had not even completely sprouted there was about $2.5^{\prime \prime}$ of rains resulting in water logging at numerous places. The crop subsequenaly became very patchy and stunted and could not recover afterwards. Flowering was also scanty and the effect of treatments were not appreciable. (vii) Experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESUSTS :
(i) $246.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $55.13 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Main effects of $N$ and $P$ are highly significant. Interaction $N \times P$ is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.

|  | $\mathrm{P}_{0}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{1}$ | $\mathbf{P}_{2}$ | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 139.6 | 186.2 | 172.9 | 166.2 |
| $\mathbf{N}_{1}$ | 192.8 | 219.4 | 252.6 | 221.6 |
| $\mathrm{N}_{2}$ | 285.9 | 332.4 | 432.1 | 350.1 |
| Mean | 206.1 | 246.0 | 285.9 | 246.0 |
| S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table |  | $\begin{aligned} & =12.99 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ & =22.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \end{aligned}$ |  |  |

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Kannauj, Chibbraman (Farukhabad).

Ref :-U.P. 51(228).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the optimum dose of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ for Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A (ii) Sandy loam to Domat and Balui Domat (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. Control. (no manure)
2. $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$.
3. $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super.
4. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Fields selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the District. No. of villages 30. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
5. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by A.C. on cnltivaters' field.
6. RESULTS :
(i) 392 . lb./ac.
(ii) $43.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv). Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 340 |
| 2. | 392 |
| 3. | 443 |
| S.E./mean | $=7.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Mahrani Lalitpur (Jhansi).
Ref:-U.P. 50(240),
Type :-‘M'
Object:-To study the optimum dose of N and $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ for Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) July. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) December.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control (no manure).
4. 15 lb ./ac. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$.
5. $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ as Super.
6. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Fields selected randomly in a randomly selected village. No. of villages-8. (iii) (a) NA. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
7. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b); (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nit. (vii) The expt, was conducted by A.C. on cultivator's fields.
8. RESULTS :
(i) $707 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$,
(ii) $40.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 644 |
| 2. | 711 |
| 3. | 766 |
| S.E./mean | $=14.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |


| Crop :-Jowar (Kharif). | Ref :-U.P. 51(232). |
| :--- | :--- |
| Site :-Jhansi, Lalitpur and Moth (Jhansi). | Type :-'M'. |

Object :-To study the optimum dose of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}$ for Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control (no manure).
4. 15 lb ./ac. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$.
5. $\mathbf{1 5} \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of N as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super.
6. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Fields selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the district. No. of villages-29. (iij) (a), (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
7. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by A.C. in cultivator's fields.
8. RESULTS :
(i) $968 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $63.41 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in $\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :--- | :---: |
| 1. | 843 |
| 2. | 1003 |
| 3. | 1057 |
| S.E./mean | $=11.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. |

Crop :- Jowar (Rabi).
Ref :- U.P. 51(233).
Site :- Moth, Man Ranipur and Gortha (Jhansi).
Type :- ' $\mathbf{M '}^{\prime}$.
Object :-To draw out a fertizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Parwa and Domat. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Generally irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
3. Control (no manure).
4. $60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{s}}$.
5. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. in which villages have teen taken as replications (No of villages=12). Also in each village control was tried in one plot while $P$ was tried in two plots. Field selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the Distt. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A: (iv) N.A.

## 4. GENERAL:

(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yicld of grain. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) $628 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $50.19 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Average yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 505 |  |
| 2. | 690 |  |
|  | S.E. for control | $=14.49 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |
|  | S.E. for $P$ mean | $=10.24 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}$. |

```
Crop:-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Kanpur and Bilhaur (Kanpur).
```

Ref :-U.P. 50(245).
Type :m 'M'.

Object : - To study the optimum dose of N and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ for Jowar.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) July. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) November.

## 2. TREATMENTS :

1. Control (no manure).
2. $15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$. of $\mathbf{N}$ as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}$.
3. 15 lb ./ac. of $\mathbf{N}$ as $\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}$./ac. of $\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ as Super.
4. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Fields selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the district. No. of villages-b. (iii)
(a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
5. GENERAL :
(i) Good'crop. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. . (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist on cultivators' fields.
6. RESULTS :
(i) $789 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(ii) $41.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

| Treatment | Av. yield |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1. | 680 |
| 2. | 793 |
| 3. | 893 |
| S.E./mean | $=16.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}$ |

```
Crop:-Jowar (Kharif).
                                    Ref :-U.P. 49(189).
Site :-Ghatanpur, Kanpur (Kanpur).

Object :- To study the optimum dose of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) for Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Kanpur type 1, type 2 and type 3 soils. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practised locally. After application of manure, the field was levelled by drawing a para. (b) Seeds sown in lines parrallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(\mathbf{1}^{\prime \prime}-\mathbf{2}^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) 10.7 .1949 to 28.11.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated experiment laid out in 24 villages or fields were laidout, but only 17 trials were harvested. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. but is taken to be about \(1 / 40\) ac, (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Stand of the crop was from good to satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Agricultural Chemist. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(516 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(57.55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 388 \\
2. & 517 \\
3. & 642 \\
S.E./mean & \(=13.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Ref: \(\mathbf{m}\) U.P. 50 (243).
Site :-Varanasi and Chandauli (Varanasi).
Type s-' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\) 。
Object :-To study the optimum dose of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) for Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v). (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) July. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) November.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Fields selected randomly in a randomly selected village. No. of villages-3. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Generally good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist on cultivatore' fielde.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(768 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(224.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yicld of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 459 \\
2. & 818 \\
3. & 1027 \\
S.E./mean & \(=129.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Stte :- Kiehha. (Nainital)

Ref : - U.P. 53 (409)
Type \(\mathbf{x}^{-} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the optimum dose of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) for Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Barley. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam in one trial and loam (slightly calcarcous) in one trial. (iii) Nil. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 7.7.1953 and 8.7.1953. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N .
3. \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N} .+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied behind the plough.
3. DESIG.N:
(i) and (ii) One village was selected in the tahsil. 2 fields were selected in the village. In each field, 3 plots were taken to which 3 treatments were assigned. (iii) (a) \(55^{\circ} \times 66^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good in 1 trail. N.A. in 1 trial. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Light kaus weeds in one trial. (vii) Expt. Conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.

RESULTS :
(i) \(1962 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(193.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment diferences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1641 \\
2. & 1893 \\
3. & 2352 \\
S.E/mean & \(=136.7 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).}

Ref :-U.P. 52(324).
Site :-Allahabad Agri. Institute, Allahabad.
Type :-‘C'.
Object :-To study the optimum seed rate and spacing for Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam and Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 30.6.1952 (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) and (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 24.73'. (x) 22.9.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 seed rates: \(R_{1}=8, R_{2}=10\) and \(R_{3}=12\) srs./ac.
(2) 5 spacing between rows: \(S_{1}=11^{\prime}, S_{2}=2^{\prime}, S_{3}=21^{\prime}, S_{4}=3^{\prime}\) and \(S_{5}=\) Broadcasting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 15 . (b) \(180^{\prime} \times 48^{\prime}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
1. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Green fodder yield (harvested at booting stage). (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by the Head, Agronomy Department, Allahabad, Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.
- RESULTS :
(i) \(34467 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(4884.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of green fodder in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{3}\) & Mead \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 35276 & 36501 & 39807 & 37195 \\
\hline S & 39165 & 32923 & 41926 & 38005 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & 36112 & 32378 & \(\therefore 30473\) & . 32988 \\
\hline \(S_{4}\) & 28489 & 33448 & 36501 & 32813 \\
\hline \(\therefore \mathbf{S}_{5}\) & : 34284 & .-. 29909 & ... 29811 & 31335 \\
\hline Mean & 34665 & 33032 & 35704 & 34467 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{541}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } R & =1092.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } S & =1014.23 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =2442.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

\section*{Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).}

Site :-Allahabad Agri. Institute, Allahabad.

Ref :-U.P. 53(365).
Type:-‘C’.

Object :-To find out the optimum spacing for Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Gram. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam to Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 9.7.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 16.6.1953; on 7.7.1953 field ploughed and harrowed before resowing. (b) Sown by Malabasa. (c) 10 srs./ac. (for all spacings). (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Farm selection (N.A.) (vii) N.A. (viii) On 1 and 3.8 .1953 weeding and interculture (weeding in broadcasted plots with khurpi and interculture with hand cultivator). (ix) 48.03. ( \(\boldsymbol{x}\) ) 6.10.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

5 spacings between rows: \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=1.5^{\prime}, \mathrm{S}_{2}=2.0^{\prime}, \mathrm{S}_{3}=2.5^{\prime}, \mathrm{S}_{6}=3.0^{\prime}\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{5}=\) Broadcast.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Latin square. (ii) (a) 5 . (b) \(132^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) \(31^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(1 / 80.698\) acre. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and green fodder yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The crop was sown on 24.6.1953, but the seed did not germinate well in many of the plots. So the field was ploughed and harrowed and the sowing was done again. (First sowing discarded). Field Record Register and the "Allahabad Farmer" were consulted. Experment conducted by the Head, Agronomy Department, Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(15405 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(3701.14 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of green fodder in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & 17211 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 16431 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 16431 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 12066 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 14887 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1658.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Jowar.
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref :-U.P. 49(192).
Type :- \({ }^{-D}\) '.

Object : - To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. W. cold water and solar treatment for the control of grain smut of Jowar.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 13.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. Treated with Agrosan G.N.
3. Treated with Ceresan.
4. Treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Treated with cold water and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack of smut. ' (iii) \% of infection and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kanpur, Gorakhpur and Meerut. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.37 degrees.
(ii) 6.5939 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back mean \% of infection \\
1. & 23.58 & 16.34 \\
2. & 0.00 & 0.50 \\
3. & 9.06 & 2.98 \\
4. & 5.34 & 1.35 \\
5. & 3.89 & 0.95 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.6919\) & \\
& &
\end{tabular}

Note : - (1) Mean (angles) after transformation back to percentages are given after applying bias correction and hence 0.50 mean percent corresponds to 0.00 mean angle.
(2) The data is converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{P}\) and then analysed where P is percent infection.

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 48(92).
Type :~'D'.

Object :-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. vs cold water and solar treatments for the control of grain smut of Jowar.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Seeds treated with :
1. Control.
2. Agrosan G.N.
3. Ceresan.
4. Cold water treatment and dried in sun.
5. Cold water treatment and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 39.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 38^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. . (vi) Yes.

GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) \% infection and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Gorakhpur and Meerut. (b) .N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.P.

RESULTS:
(i) to (iv)

Treatment
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Av. yield of grain \\
in lb./ac.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean value of \\
\(\log _{\mathrm{e}}(1+\mathrm{x}) /\) plot
\end{tabular} & Mean \% infection/plot \\
708 & 0.33929 & \\
825 & 0.00000 & 0.45 \\
786 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
774 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
707 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
755 & 0.06786 & 0.00 \\
105.61 & 0.051575 & 0.09 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

On the basis of yield analysis : treatment differences fare not significant. On the basis of analysis of \(\log _{e}(1+x)\); treatment differences are highly significant.

Note :-The data has been converted into loge \((1+\mathrm{x})\) and thep analysed, where x is \(\%\) infection.

\author{
Crop :~ Jowar (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :- U.P. 49(195).
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N., vs. cold water and solar treatments for control of grain smut of Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.6.1949. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Seeds treated with :
1. Control.
2. Treated with Agrosan G.N.
3. Treated with Ceresan.
4. Treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Treated with cold water and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\) for replication 1,2 and 3 and \(37^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\) for replication 4, 5 and 6 . (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory, (ii) N.A. (iii) \% infection and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. . (c) N.A. (v) (a) Meerut, Gorakhpur and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)


Note:-On the basis of yield analysis, treatment differences are significant. On the basis of analysis of \(\log _{e}(1+x)\), treatment differences are highly significant. The \(\%\) infection (i.e.x) was converted to \(\log _{e}(1+x)\) and then analysed.

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 50(258).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. and Ceresan re. cold water and shade and cold solar treatment for the control of Jowar smus.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.7.1950. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (infection with smut spores).
2. Treated with Agrosan G.N.
3. Treated with Ceresan.
4. Treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Treated with cold water and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(44^{\circ} \times 22^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (iv) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good: (ii) Attack of smut. (iii) Percentage of infection. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 3.10 degree
(ii) 1.5295 degree
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back mean \% \\
1. & 10.50 & 3.77 \\
2. & 0.00 & 0.50 \\
3. & 0.80 & 0.52 \\
4. & 0.95 & 0.53 \\
5. & 3.23 & 0.82 \\
& &
\end{tabular}

Note :-Transformed back mean \% are given after applying bias correction and that is why 0.05 mean \% corresponds to 0.00 mean angle. The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) and then analysed where \(\mathrm{p}=\%\) infection.

\author{
Crop :- Jowar (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 53 (162).}

Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To conduct insecticidal trials against Jowar stem-borer.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam (b) N.A. (iii) 21.7.1953. (iv) (a) one ploughing and harrowing. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Local. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) One hoeing with desi plough. (ix) \(33.60^{\prime \prime}\) (July to Nov.) (x) 6.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T.
2. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) B.H.C.
3. Dusting with \(5.0 \%\) B.H.C.
4. Dustang with \(5.0 \%\) D.D.T.

5: Control (no treatment).
Spray liquid at 40 and 60 gallons and dust at 20 and 30 lb ./ac. in first and second application respectively.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(29.90^{\circ} \times 25^{\prime}\). (b) \(25.90^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) (v) \(2^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very poor and lodged also. (ii) Dusting and spraying was done on 26.8 .1953 to 16.9 .1953 . (iii) \(\%\) of plants attacked and no. of borers formed on both the above dates. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K). The reduction in the incidence and population of the pest in the treated plots and control was determined one week after last treatment and at harvest by dissecting 50 plants which were cut from ground level from each plot. Transformation done after applying bias correction.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean Angle in degrees \% of \\
affected plants
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back \\
mean \(\%\)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Av. number of borers \\
in \(\mathbf{5 0}\) affected plants
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 37.32 & 36.88 & 98.60 \\
2. & 37.50 & 37.19 & 102.60 \\
3. & 38.02 & 38.05 & 105.40 \\
4. & 38.74 & 39.28 & 107.20 \\
5. & 41.54 & 44.04 & 114.60 \\
G.M. & 38.62 & - & 105.68 \\
S.E./mean & 1.6643 & - & 6.9602 \\
Significance & N.S. & - & N.S.
\end{tabular}
```

    Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
    Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
        Ref :- U.P. }48\mathrm{ (91).
    Type :- 'D';
    Object :-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. and Ceresan vs cold water and solar treatment on control of Jowar smut.

```
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A.
(b) N.A. (c) N.A.
(ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A.
(iv) (a) to (e) N.A.
(v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Seeds treated with :
1. Control.

2: Agrosan G.N.
3. Ceresan.
4. Cold water treated and dried in sun.
5. Cold water treated and dried in shaḍe.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 39.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 38^{\prime}\). (v) Distances between plots \(=\) \(4^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}\) on either sides. Field border \(4^{\prime}\) lengthwise and \(5^{\prime}\) breadthwise. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% infection and yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur and Meerut. (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) Experiment conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield of grain in lb./ac & Mean value of \(\log _{e}(1+x) /\) plot & Av. \(\%\) infection/plot \\
1. & 778 & 0.36590 & 0.78 \\
2. & 1046 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
3. & 937 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
4. & 1094 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
S. & 969 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
G.M. & 965 & 0.07318 & 0.16 \\
S.E./mean & 79.85 & 0.11724 &
\end{tabular}

Note :-On the basis of yield analysis treatment differences are not significant. On the basis of analysis of \(\log _{c}(1+x)\) treatment differences are not significant. The \% infection (x) has converted to \(\log _{e}(1+x)\) and then analysed.

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Ref :-U.P. 49(194).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Type :-‘D'.
Object :-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. is cold water and solar treatment for the copptrol of grain smut of Jowar.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Treated with Agrosan G.N.
3. Treated with Ceresan.
4. Treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Treated with cold water and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) Plot to plot distance-4' and \(5^{\prime}\) on either side. Field border-4'. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) \(\%\) infection and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Meerut and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) Experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Mead value of \(\log _{\mathrm{e}}(1+\mathrm{x})\) & Av. \% infection \\
& & per plot & per plot \\
1. & 1037 & 0.97788 & 1.70 \\
2. & 1064 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
3. & 1053 & 0.0000 & 0.00 \\
4. & 1039 & 0.00000 & 0.00 \\
S. & 1002 & 0.10785 & 0.15 \\
G.M. & 1039 & 0.21715 & 0.37 \\
S.E./mean & 61.12 & 0.061485 &
\end{tabular}

On the basis of the yield analysis treatment differences are not significant. On the basis of analysis of \(\log _{e}(1+x)\) treatment differences are highly significant. Note :-The \% infection ( \(x\) ) was converted to \(\log _{e}(1+x)\) and then analysed.
Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 50(257). Type :-'D'.

Object :-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. and Ceresan is cold water and solar treatment for the control of Jowar smut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 6.7.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A

2 TREATMENTS:
1. Control (inoculated with smut spores).
2. Treated with Agrosan G.N.
3. Treated with Ceresan.
4. Treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Treated with cold water and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good.. (ii) Attack of smut. (iii) Percentage of infection. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by P.P.
3. RESULTS :
(i) 3.57 degree.
(ii) 2.2028 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back mean \\
percentage of infection
\end{tabular} \\
1. & & \\
2. & 11.73 & 4.56 \\
3. & 0.00 & 0.50 \\
4. & 0.00 & 0.50 \\
5. & 4.08 & 1.00 \\
S.E./mean & 2.02 & 0.62 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Nate :-Transformed back mean percentages of infection are given after applying bias correction and that is why 0.5 mean percent infection corresponds to 0.00 mean angle.
The data is converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{p}\) and then analysed.

Crop :- Jowar (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 48(93).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. we cold water and solar treatment for the control of grain smut of Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Seeds treated with :
- 1. Control.
2. Agrosan G.N.
3. Ceresan.
4. Cold water treatment and dried in sum.
5. Cold water treatment and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 39.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 38^{\prime}\). (v) Distance between plote \(4^{\prime}\) and \(3^{\prime}\) on either side of the plot. Field border \(4^{\prime}\) length wise and \(5^{\prime}\) breadth wise. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) \(\%\) of infection and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Gorakhpur and Kanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)

Treatment Av. yield of grain is lb./ac. Mean value of \(\log _{\mathrm{e}}(1+x) /\) plot \(\quad\) Mean \(\%\) infection/plot
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
1. & 604 & & 1.60104 & \(:\) \\
2. & 791 & 0.61249 & 4.24 \\
3. & 714 & & 0.62677 & 0.92 \\
4. & 649 & 1.30608 & 1.04 \\
S. & 583 & 0.81990 & 2.95 \\
G.M. & 668 & 0.99326 & 1.54 \\
S.E./mean & \(=30.80\) & 0.138628 & \(:\) & 2.14
\end{tabular}.

Note:-On the basis of yield analysis-Treatment differences 〔are highly significant. On the basis of \(\log _{e}(1+x)\) analysis where \(x\) is \(\%\) infection-Treatment differences are highly significant.

\author{
Crop :- Jowar (Kharif). \\ Site :- Regional Res. Sin., Meerut.
}

Ref:- U.P. 49(196).
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. ws cold water and solar treatment for the control of grain smut of Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) to (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. Treated with Agrosan G.N.
3. Treated with Ceresan.
4. Treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Treated with cold water and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory, (ii) N.A. (iii) \% infection and yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Gorakhpur and Bharari. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The \(\%\) infection ( \(x\) ) was converted to \(\log _{e}(1+x)\) and then analysed, experiment conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
(i) to (iv) & Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. & Mean value of \(\log _{\mathrm{e}}(1+\mathrm{x}) /\) plot & Av.\%infection/plot \\
Treatments & 421.6 & 3.14036 & 23.77 \\
1. & 496.0 & 0.68799 & 1.14 \\
2. & 481.2 & 0.07033 & 0.08 \\
3. & 401.7 & 0.33296 & 0.43 \\
4. & 307.5 & 0.20397 & 0.26 \\
5. & 421.6 & 0.88712 & 5.14 \\
G.M. & 38.40 & & 0.111722 \\
S.E./mean & Significant & & Highly significant
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Jowar (Kharif). \\ Ref :- U.P. 50(256). \\ Site :- Regional Res. Sin., Meerut. \\ Type:- 'D'.
}

Object:-To study the dressing of seed with Agrosan G.N. ys cold water and solar treatment for the control of grain smut of Jowar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (incoluated with smut spores).
2. Treated with Agrosan G.N.
3. Treated with Ceresan.
4. Treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Treated with cold water and dried in shade.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Atfack of smut. (iii) Percentage of infection. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. Transformed back, mean \% are given after applying bias correction. Experiment conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back mean \% of infection \\
1. & 23.47 & 16.24 \\
2. & 0.00 & 0.50 \\
3. & 2.19 & 0.65 \\
4. & 11.80 & 4.66 \\
5. & 8.70 & 2.78 \\
G.M. & 9.23 & \\
S.E.jmean & \(=1.2293\) & \\
Significance & Highly significant. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :- Azamgarh.

Ref:-U.P. 49(209).
Type :-‘'D'.

Object :-To test efficacy of Hexyclan [dust against the Kharl/ grass hopper (Hiroglyphus banian Fabr).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:-
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No treatment (Control)
2. Dusting with \(5 \%\) Hexyclan ( \(5 \%\) B.H.C.) at 40 lb ./ac.
3. Dusting with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. (Gamaxene D. 025) at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Dusting with \(5 \%\) D.D.T. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. Treating with poison bait (Sodium fluosilicate 1 seer, carbon 20 seers, molasses \(2 \frac{1}{1}\) seers and water 7 seers).
6. Dusting with B.H.C. ( \(5 \%\) Hexyclan) at 20 lb ./ac.
7. Dusting with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. ( \(5 \%\) Hexyclan) at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
8. Spraying with \(1 \%\) D.D.T. suspension at 150 gallon/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (R.B.D. with 4 replications). (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Population of grass hopper before and after application of treatments. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data was converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } P\) and then analysed; transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 60.70 degree.
(ii) 4.3704 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)

Treatments Mean angle Transformed back mean \% of reduction of grass hoppers seen at 16 yards of walk, 36 hours after application of treatments.


Crop :-Jowar (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 51 (242)
Type :-‘CD'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed dressing and sowing dates on the incidence of Jowar smut.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi)

8-B. (vii) to (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 methods of seed dressing: \(M_{1}=\) control (seeds inoculated with smut sporers) and \(M_{2}=\) seeds treated with Agrosan G.N.
(2) 8 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=27.6 .1951, D_{2}=3.7 .1951, D_{2}=9.7 .1951, D_{4}=16.7 .1951, D_{5}=23.7 .1951\), \(D_{6}=31.7 .1951, D_{7}=8.8 .1951\) and \(D_{8}=17.8 .1951\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 . (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of jowar smut. (iii) Percentage of infection. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 8.75 degree.
(ii) 4.0669 degree.
(iii) Effect of \(M\) alone is highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & D \({ }_{\text {d }}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & D6 & \(\mathrm{D}_{7}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 34.14 & 11.63 & 6.12 & 2.22 & 13.50 & 28.90 & 25.76 & 11.24 & 16.69 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & 0.00 & 0.00 & 6.46 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.81 \\
\hline Mean & 17.07 & 5.82 & 6.29 & 1.11 & 6.75 & 14.45 & 12.88 & 5.62 & 8.75 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) & \(\mathbf{- 2 . 0 2 0 9}\) degree \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(M\) & \(=\mathbf{1 . 0 1 6 9}\) degree \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=\mathbf{2 . 8 7 5 7}\) degree
\end{tabular}

Transformed back mean percentage
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & D & \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & D6 & \(\mathrm{D}_{7}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) \\
\hline M \({ }_{1}\) & 31.68 & 4.51 & 1.59 & 0.65 & 4.89 & 23.67 & 19.21 & 4.30 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & 0.50 & 0.50 & 1.80 & 1.80 & 0.50 & 0.50 & 0.50 & 0.50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note:-Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction and hence 0.50 mean percent corresponds to 0.00 mean angle. The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{P}\) and then analysed.

\section*{Crop :-Jowar (Kharif). \\ Ref :-U.P. 52(290). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. \\ Type :-'CD'.}

Object :-To study the effect of seed dressing and sowing dates on the incidence of Jowar smut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) 8-B. (vii) to ( \(\mathbf{x}\) ) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 methods of seed dressing : \(M_{1}=\) control (seeds inoculated with smut spores) and \(M_{2}=\) seeds treated with Agroson G.N
(2) 5 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=5.7 .1952, D_{2}=11.7 .1952, D_{3}=19.7 .1952, D_{4}=31.7 .1952\) and \(\mathrm{D}_{5}=\mathbf{2 3 . 8}\).1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(5 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of smut. (iii) Percentage of infection. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 7.34 degrees
(ii) 3.3725 degrees
(iii) Main effects of \(M\) and \(\mathbf{D}\) and interaction \(M \times D\) are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \[
D_{3}
\] & \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & D6 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & 34.16 & 17.10 & 12.00 & 10.10 & 0.00 & 14.67 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 & 0.00 \\
\hline Mean & 17.08 & 8.55 & 6.00 & 5.05 & 0.00 & 7.34 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of D & & \(=1.6865\) degree \\
S.E. of marginal mean of M & & \(=1.0666\) degree \\
S.E. of body of table & & \(=2.3847\) degree
\end{tabular}

Transformed back mean percentage
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll} 
& \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 31.68 & 9.06 & 4.79 & 3.57 & 0.50 \\
\(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 0.50 & 0.50 & 0.50 & 0.50 & 0.50 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note :-Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction and hence 0.5 mean percent corresponds to 0.00 mean angle. The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{P}\) and then analysed where \(P\) is the percent infection.

Crop :-Bajra (Kharif).
Site :-Allahabad Agri. Institute, Allahabad.

Ref :-U.P. 53(366).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of different green manure crops on Bajra.
1. (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.7.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 8 srs./ac. (d) 6 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) Thinning on 29.7 .1953 and 1, 5.8.1953. (ix) 47.62 \({ }^{\circ}\).(x) 23,24 and 25.9.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Sannhemp.
3. Cow pea.
4. Mung.
5. Dhain cha.

Sown on 7.6.1952. Ploughed into the soil on 20.9.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) \(60^{\prime} \times 73^{\prime}\). (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(69^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) Between blocks \(=4^{\prime} .3^{\circ}\) on either side. Between plots \(=1.5^{\circ} .2^{\circ}\) alround the net-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination very good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and yield of green fodder only. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by the Head, Agronomy Depart-, ment, Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.
S. RESULTS :
(i) \(23711 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(3152.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 21793 \\
2. & 24972 \\
3. & 24025 \\
4. & 24228 \\
5. & 23538 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1287.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ai}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :-Bajra.
Ref:-U.P. 49(186).
Site :mSikandra Rao and Hathras (Aligarh).
Type :- 'M'.

```

Object : -To draw out fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Aligarh type 1 and type 2 soils. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practised locally. (b) Sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) Distance of \(1^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) 26.6 .1949 to 1.8.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.9.1949 to 20.11.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

A/S added to surface at sowing time. Super placed at a depth of about \(3^{* *}-4^{\circ}\) at the sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated expt. laid out. 12 replications or trials were haid out. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) acre.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vī) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(580 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(146.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{llc} 
Treatment & & Av. yield \\
1. & 429 \\
2 & 618 \\
3. & & 693 \\
S.E./mean & & \(=42.16 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Bajra (Kharif).
Site :- In all tehsils of Aligarh.

Ref :- U.P. 50 (248).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To draw out fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) July (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) October.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. A/S at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. \(A / S\) at 15 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Field selected randomally in a randomaly selected village in the district. No. of villages-23. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Generally crop damaged by rains. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1053 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(210.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(1 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}\). Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lr}
1. & 785 \\
2. & 1110 \\
3. & 1265
\end{tabular} S.E. \(/\) mean \(=43.86 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Bajra (Kharif).
Site :m Nawabganj (Bareilly).

Ref : \(\boldsymbol{\sim}\) U.P. 50 (237).
Type:- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '.

Object :-To draw out ferlitizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A.
(b) N.A.
(c) N.A. \(\cdot\) (il
(ii) N A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved.
(v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) N.A.
(vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. \(A / S\) at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Fields selected randomly in a randcmly selected village in the district. No. of villages-4. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A.. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(146 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 29.84 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Treatment
1. 100
2. . 130
3.208
S.E./mean \(\quad=14.92 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :-Bajra (Kharif). \\ Site :-Bareilly and Aonla (Bareilly).}

\section*{- Ref :-U.P. 51(240). \\ Type:-‘'}

Object :-To draw out fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Bareilly type 3C and Bareilly type 3D. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practised locally. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{10}-2^{\circ}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) to ( \(x\) ) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathbf{S}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super.

A/S broadcasted at the time of sowing and Super is applied to one of the plots over the N dose. Super is placed at a depth of \(3^{*}-4^{\prime \prime}\) at the sole of the furrow and in the sides jof the furrows made leither by an iron plough or two desi ploughs - one behind the other in the same field.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated expt. with the above 3 .treatments laid out. 12 replications or trials. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Uniform and good condition. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was.conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1081 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(62.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 926 \\
2. & 1101 \\
3. & 1216 \\
S.E./mean & \(=18.14 \mathrm{lb}\). /ac
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Bajra (Kharif).
Site :-Etah and Jalesar (Etah).

\section*{Ref :-U.P.51(226).}

Type:-‘M'.

Object :-To draw out fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domat. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N .
3. \(A / S\) at 15 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Field selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the district. No. of villages- 15. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 911 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(81.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significan t.
(.v) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 797 \\
2. & 930 \\
3. & 1005 \\
S.E \(/\) mean & \(=21.15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Bajra (Kharif).
Site :- Institutional Research Farm, Bichpuri.
Ref:- U.P. 53(578).
Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of different spacings on yield of Bajra.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) Sanai. (i) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri. (iii) 20.7.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing by tractor and offset disc harrow. (b) Behind the plough shaped furrow at \(3^{30}\) depth. (c) 2 srs./ac. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A (v) Manuring on 18.7 .1953 by farm compost at 400 lb ./ac. by mixing it thouroghly with the soil. \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at the time of tillering given on 16.8 .1953 by putting fertilizer round each plant. (vi) Local varieties. (vii)!Nil. (viii) Thinning, gapfilling, and hand weeding. (ix) \(13.05^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 10.10 .1953 .
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 row to row spacings: \(S_{1}=1^{\prime}, S_{2}=1.5^{\prime}\) and \(S_{3}=2^{\circ}\).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 plant to plant spacings : \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=6^{\circ}, \mathrm{P}_{2}=12^{\prime}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=18^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(70^{\circ} \times 88^{\circ}\). (iii) 6 (replication no. 2 discarded after sowing as sowing was wrongly done, hence effective replications are 5.). (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) A mild attack of jowar grass hopper and top borer-plants removed. Infection of green ear disease and grain smut of bajre on the earheads. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (viii) The experiment was conducted by B.R. College, Agra.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(906.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(69.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(213.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 913.4 & 979.2 & 822.9 & 905.2 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 890.3 & 958.6 & 884.5 & 911.2 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & 872.2 & 880.5 & 954.5 & 902.4 \\
\hline Mean & 892.0 & 939.4 & 887.3 & 9062 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. S marginal means
\(=25.24 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. P marginal means
- \(77.94 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(P\) means at the same level of \(S\)
\(=135.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(S\) means at the same level of \(P\)
\(=113.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Bajra (Kharif).
Site :- Agri. Res. Farm, Ralyanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 49(191).
Types 'D'.

Object :-To study the best seed dressing for control of smut disease of Bajre.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) Refer soil analysis, Kalyanpus. \({ }^{\circ}\) - (iii) 3.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) \(8-\mathrm{B}\). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Seeds treated with Agrosan.G.N.
3. Seeds treated with Ceresan.
4. Seeds treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Seeds treated with cold water and dried in shade.

Each chemical at \(1.52 \mathrm{gms} . / \mathrm{lb}\). of seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of smut. (iii) \% infection and grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Transformai back mian percentages are given after applying bias correction. The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed where \(p=\) percentage of infection. The experiment was conducted by P.P.
3. RESULTS :
(i) 10.80 degrees.
(ii) 5.2273 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean angle & Trassformed back mean percentage of infection \\
\hline 1. & 19.39 & 11.39 \\
\hline 2. & 12.36 & 5.05 \\
\hline 3. & 5.14 & 1.29 \\
\hline 4. & 8.05 & 2.43 \\
\hline 5. & 9.08 & 2.97 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=2.1340 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Bajra (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 51(243). Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the best seed dressing for control of smut disease of Bajra.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.8.1951. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii)
N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (untreated healthy seed).
2. Inoculated seed+Agrosan G.N.
3. Seed inoculated.
4. Hot water treated seed.
5. Soil inoculated.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) and (b) 5. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Percentage of infection. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.03 degrees
(ii) 4.5282 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv)
\(\left.\begin{array}{lcc}\text { Treatment } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Mean angle (in degrees) corresponding } \\ \text { to percentage infection }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Transformed back mean } \\ \text { percentages after applying }\end{array} \\ \text { bias correction }\end{array}\right\}\)

\author{
Grop :- Bajra ( \(\kappa\) harif). \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :- U.P. 53ं(299).
Type :- 'D'.
Object:-To study the effect of chemicals in controlling green ear diseases.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.8 .1953 . (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A.. (vi) N.A.
(vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (untreated seeds).
2. Seed inoculated with oosporic material.
3. Inoculated seeds with oosporic material+Agrosan G.N:
4. Soil inoculated with oosporic material.
5. Hot water treated seeds.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) \(\%\) of green ear disease infection. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No.
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 3.70 degrees. ,
(ii) 2.2091 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean angle corresponding to \(\%\) of green ear disease infection & Transformed tack mean percentages after applying bias correction \\
\hline 1. & 1.11 & 0.54 \\
\hline 2. & 6.54 & 179 \\
\hline 3. & 2.12 & 0.64 \\
\hline 4. & 7.72 & 2.28 \\
\hline 5. & 1.01 & 0.53 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=1.1046\) degrees & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Bajra (Kharif). & Ref:- U.P. 50(253). \\
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kanpur. & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of seed dressing for controlling smut disease.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29 th July 1950 . (iv) (a) to (c) N.A: (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (untreated).
2. Seeds treated with Agrosan G.N.
3. Treated with Ceresan.

4 Treated with cold water and dried in sun.
5. Treated with cold water and dried in shade.

Chemical used at 1.52 gms . per lb . of seed.
3. DESIGN
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) \% infextion and yield of grain. (iv) (a) No. (b) [No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No.
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 22.95 degree.
(ii) 3.7282 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Mean Angles & & Transformed back mean \% of infection \\
1. & 23.42 & \(\cdots\) & 15.46 \\
2. & 20.56 & & 11.92 \\
3 & 24.00 & & 16.16 \\
4. & 23.95 & & 16.16 \\
5. & 22.82 & & 14.65 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.8641\) degree. &
\end{tabular}

Note :-The data has been converted into sin \({ }^{-1}\) \(\mathbf{V}\) and then analysed. Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction.

\section*{Crop :- Barley (Rabi). \\ Site :- Central Dairy Farm, Aligarh. \\ Ref :- U.P. 49 (24). \\ Type :- ' \(M\) '.}

Object :-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied alons and in combination on the yield of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Low lying clay ( Nligarh T.3). (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (ị) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.4 .1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
1. 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
2. 3 levels of \(P_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S wąs top dressed; \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super was applied in deep furrows ( \(3^{\circ} \times 4^{n}\) deep) so that it was not in contact with seeds ; manures applied on 1.11.1949.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) The field received washing from cattle shed, hence half of the field was highly manured. (vii) Tho experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1403 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(358.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) alone is highly sigaificant.
(vi) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


\section*{Crop :-Barley (Rabi).}

Site :-Central Dairy Farm, Aligarh.

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 51(110).}


Object :-To study the effects of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied alcne and in combination on the yield of Barley crop. .

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (Aligarh type 3) (b) N.A. (iii) 18.11.1951. (iv) (a) Four ploughings in all, two by Watt's plough and two by desi plough, followed by harrowing and levelling. (b) Sown in lines. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26 and 27.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}:-\mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) was broadcast while \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super was placed deep in tands near the root zone, through fertilizer drill and then pata applied.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (b) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Varanasi. (b) (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(700.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(202.8 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(N\) is highly significant. Interaction \(N \times P\) is significant. \(P\) effect is not sjenificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & \(\cdots\) Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 506.4 & 637.9 & 644.5 & 596.3 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 499.8 & 7826 & 756.3 & 679.6 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 874.6 & 624.7 & .979 .8 & 826.4 \\
\hline Mean & 626.9 & 681.7 & 793.5 & 700.7
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table
\(=47.80 \mathrm{lb}\). /ac. \(=82.80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{sc}\).

\section*{Crop :-Barley (Rabi). \\ Site :-Agri. Institute, Allaha bad. \\ Ref:-U.P. 51(284).}

Object :-To study the effect of organic manures on the yield of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(1.23^{*}\). (x) 17.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Farm compost at \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. Castor cake at \(\mathbf{6 0 1 \mathrm { lb }}\)./ac. of
4. T.C. at 60 lb ./ac. of N.
5. T.C. at 30 lb ./ac. of N .

Manures applied as top dressing in standing crop on 5.12.1951.

3 DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\), (v) N.A. (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by the Head, Agronomy Department, Allahab ad (A.A.I).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1707 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain io lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1628 \\
2. & 1784 \\
3. & 1981 \\
4. & 1535 \\
5. & 1608 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:-Barley (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}
Ref: -U.P 48(22).
Type :- \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of cocount oil cake on the yield of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1211.1948 . (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 24 and 25.3.1949
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. 25 lb ./ac. of N as coconut oil cake. .
3. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as coconut oil cake.
4. 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{N}\) as coconut oil cake.

Manure applied on 30-12.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and bhus a yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2121 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 177.6 bb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2111 \\
2. & 2028 \\
3. & 2123 \\
4. & 2221 \\
S.E./mean & \(=72.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 49(32).
Type :- \({ }^{\mathbf{M}}\) ’.

Object :-To study the effect of coconut oil cake on Barley crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11.1949. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with Watt's and victory plough ; 3 ploughings with cultivator plough' and 4 ploughings with desi plough. (b), N.A. (c) \(2010 z . /\) plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251 (early). (vii) Irrigated (viii) One hand weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. 25 lb ./ac. of N as coconut oil cake.
3. 50 lb ./ac. of N as coconut oil cake.
4. 75 lb ./ac. of N as coconut oil cake.

Date of manuring :-1.12.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(42.5^{\prime} \times 12.8^{\prime}\). (b) \(39.5^{\prime} \times 11.3^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of smut. (iii) Grain yield, fresh and dry. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(2961 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 251.8 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathbf{l b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2940 \\
2. & 3055 \\
3. & 3006 \\
4. & 2843 \\
S.E./mean & \(=102.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res, Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 50(22).
Type:- 'M'.
Object :-To study the residual effect of Mung \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\), Sanal and Jowar fodder crops sown in Kharif 1950.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) As per treatments. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1950. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings each with victory plough and desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\) (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-591. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing and weeding once-28.2.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 9, 10.41951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow.
2. Mung \(T_{1}\) (seed sown and straw ploughed in).
3. Sanal green manuring.
4. Jowar fodder.

1st picking of mung \(\mathrm{T}_{1}-6 / 7.9 .1950\), 2nd picking of \(m u n g \mathrm{~T}_{1}-15 / 19.9 .1950\). Turning of sanai on 6.9.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 4.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 6.
(iv) (a) \(30^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\).
(b) \(26^{\prime} \times 13.5^{\prime}\).
(v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\).
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Condition of sanal plots at time of turning-fair growth in all] plots, some of them were diseased and showed uneven growth. The crop was full of weeds. Barley crop-good. (ii) Nearly all the treatments have been affected by stiple disease equally (about \(2 \%\) incidence). Smut incidence is about \(0.5 \%\) in all the plots. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953, (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2342 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 168.7 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2462 \\
2. & 1606 \\
3. & 2659 \\
4. & 2643 \\
S.E./mean & \(=68.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 51(14) 50(22).
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the residual effect of Mung \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\), Sanai and Jowar fodder crops sown in Kharif 1950.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) As per treatments. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.10.1951. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings each with victory plough and desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow during kharif.
2. Mung \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\)-pods picked up and plants turned in during kharif.
3. Sanai (G.M.) during kharif.
4. Chari for fodder during kharif.

Sanai and Jowar were broadcasted and Mung was sown in lines \(1 \frac{1}{\prime}\) apart.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 4.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 6.
(iv) (a) \(30^{\circ} \times 15.7^{\circ}\).
(b) \(26^{\circ} \times 14.25^{\prime}\). (v) N.A.
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(l) Sanai crop was below normal nearly in all the blocks due to poor rains and late sowing and chari crop was very poor in block no. 5 due to water logging. Barley-good. (il) No. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1201 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). 117.1 lb /ac. atment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Areatment & Av. yield \\
1: & 776 \\
2. & 1305 \\
3. & 1491 \\
4. & 1232 \\
S.E./mean & \(=47.8 \mathrm{llb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 52(47)/51(14)/50(22
Type: \({ }^{-1}{ }^{\prime}\) '.

Object :-To study the residual effect of mung \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\), Sanai and Jowar fcdder crops sown in Shapif 1950.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.10 .1952 . (iv) (a) 2 ploughings each with victory plough and desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 100 lb . /ac. (d) \(9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-25 1. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow during kharif.
2. Mung \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\), pods picked up and plants turned in during kharif.
3. Sanai green manuring during kharif.
4. Chari during kharif.

Amount N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 4 (in two flanks).
(b) N.A. (iii) 6.
(iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 15.75^{\prime}\).
(b) \(26^{\prime} \times 14.25^{\circ}\). (v) N.A.
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Very good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination and yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R),

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1310 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(180.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1172 \\
2. & 1570 \\
3. & 1847 \\
4. & 650 \\
S.E./mean & -73.58 jb./ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Barley (Rabi). Ref :-U.P. 53(87)/52(47)/51(14)/50(22). \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. Type :-'M'.}

Object:-To study the residual effect of mung T-1, Sanai and Jowar fodder crops sown in kharif 1950.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (c) As per treatments. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10 .1953 . (iv) (a) 2 ploughings each with victory plough and desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ \prime}\). (e) N.A (v) Nil. (vi) C-25I (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding in mung \(T_{1}\) on 7.8 .1953 and turning in of Sanal 8 times. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow (during kharif).
2. Mung \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\), pods picked up and plants turned in during kharif, sown on 4.7.1953 and harvested on 6.8.1953.
3. Sanai green manure during kharif.
4. Chari during kharif harvested on 3.9.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 (in two flanks). (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(30^{\circ} \times 15.75^{\prime}\) (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 14.25^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good; None of the plants showed any lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, flowering and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(849 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(333.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathbf{l b}\)./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 796 \\
2. & 841 \\
3. & 897 \\
4. & 862 \\
S.E./mean & \(=136.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 51(15). Type: \(\boldsymbol{\sim}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the N, P and K requirements of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Chari for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11 .1951 . (iv) (a) 2 ploughings each by victory plough, Watt's plough and desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 2. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 25, 26 and 27.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=\mathrm{O}_{2}, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=25\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as pot. sulphate were dusted and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied in furrows before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27 in 3 flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 11.25^{\prime}\) : (b) \(36^{\circ} \times 9.75^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Incidence of smut was observed. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-continued.
(b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2615 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(383.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. All others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{K}_{6}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{8}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(\boldsymbol{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N o}_{0}\) & 2220 & 2395 & 2365 & 2327 & 2425 & 2232 & 2322 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 2704 & 2672 & 2603 & 2659 & 2562 & 2730 & 2686 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 2969 & 2721 & 2888 & 2859 & 2728 & 2932 & 2918 \\
\hline Mean & 2631 & 2596 & 2619 & 2615 & 2572 & 2631 & 2642 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 2670 & 2399 & 2647 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{- -}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 2571 & 2741 & 2583 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 2652 & 2649 & 2626 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
& 585 \\
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=72.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=127.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(50)/51(15).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the \(N, P\) and \(K\) requirements of Barley.
1. BASAİ CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Chari for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11.1952. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings each by victory plough, Watt's plough and desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 21 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 4.2.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) 25, 26.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 level of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(K_{2} O: K_{0}=0, K_{1}=50\) and \(K_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate were dusted and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied in furrows before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27 in 3 flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No: (iii) Germination and grain yield (iv) (a) 1951 -continued. (b) Yes. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(3132 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(368.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant; \(\mathbf{P}\) effect is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{Pa}_{3}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 2583 & 2917 & 2910 & 2804 & 2653 & 2879 & 2879 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 3162 & 3306 & 3306 & 3258 & 3074 & 3514 & 3187 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 3306 & 3369 & 3325 & 3333 & 3262 & 3363 & 3375 \\
\hline Mean & 3017 & 3197 & 3180 & 3132 & 2996 & 3252 & 3147 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}\) & 2961 & 2961 & 3067 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 3055 & 3419 & 3281 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 3036 & 3212 & 3193 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
\(=70.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table
\(=122.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(97)/52(50)/51(15).
Type :- © \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effects of \(N, P\) and \(K\) fertilizers on Barley
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11.1953. (iv) (a) Victory plough on 18.9.1953 ; cultivator on 30.9 .1953 ; desi plough and pata on 29.10.1953, 1 and 12.11.1953. (b) N.A. (c) 80 lb./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P. 21 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 23.1.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 31.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=25, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \quad \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{2}=50\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{8}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as pot. sulphate were dusted and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied in furrows before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27 in 3 flanks of 9 plot each. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Smut incidence affected the grain moderately. (iii) Germination, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-continued. (b) Yes. (c) N,A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R). Although design is termed randomised block yet 27 treatments are not taken in a single block but in 3 blocks each containing 9 treatments (no confounding). So efficiency of design thus decreases.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1840 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(254.1 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) and interaction \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{K}\) are highly significant. Main effect \(\mathbf{K}\) and other interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 1106 & 1213 & 1257 & 1192 & 1106 & 1295 & 1175 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1521 & 1829 & 2037 & 1796 & 1647 & 1911 & - 1829 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 2602 & 2577 & 2414 & 2531 & 2439 & 2665 & 2489 \\
\hline Mead & 1743 & 1873 & 1903 & 1840 & 1731 & 1957 & 1831 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 1634 & 1817 & 1741 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{\(\cdots\)}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 1848 & 1930 & 2093 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 1747 & 1873 & . 1873 & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =48.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =84.71 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Barley (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 50(21).}

Type : \(\boldsymbol{w}^{\prime} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).
Object:-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) manures applied alone iand in combination on the yield of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Jowar fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1950. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory and 4 ploughings with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P.21. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and.hoeing on 28.2.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 13 and 14.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
. (1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=\mathbf{0}, N_{1}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied in furrows at sowing time.
3, DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 16.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) \(1 \%\) to \(2 \%\) smut diseased plants in all the treatments were observed. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1702 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 292.4 lb ./ac.
(iii) Only main effect \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathbf{l b}\)./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline : & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 730 & 785 & 1180 & 898 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1731 & 2083 & 1761 & 1858 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 2321 & 2372 & 2255 & 2349 - \\
\hline Mean & 1594 & 1747 & 1765 & 1702 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =84.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =146.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)

Crop :- Barley (Rabi)..
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 50 (37),
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the manurial value of coconut oil cake and castor cake on Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11.1950. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory plough and 3 ploughings with desl plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) 9 .. apart., (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 28.2-1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 10/11.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control (no manure).
1. 3 levels of \(N: N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50\) and \(N_{3}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
2. 2 sources of \(N: S_{\mathbf{1}}=\) coconut oil cake and \(S_{\mathbf{2}}=\) castor cake.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 7.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4.
(a) \(36^{\circ} \times 14.25^{\prime}\)
(b) \(32^{\prime} \times 12.75^{\prime}\)
(v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Plants were diseased-5 \% (stripe and smut). (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) No.
(b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1189 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(130.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Levels of \(N\), source of \(N\) and control \(v s\) others effects are 'highly significant. Interaction levels \(x\) source is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Control=518 lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \begin{tabular}{lll}
824 & 1314 & 1386 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 951 & 1479
\end{tabular} & 1853 & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean \\
\hline Mean
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 888 & 1396 & 1620 & 1175 \\
1428 \\
\hline 1301
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\)
\(=37.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of marginal mean of N
\(=46.3 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table or control mean
\(=65.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Barley. & Ref :- U.P. 53 (209). \\
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type :- ‘M’.
\end{tabular}

Object :-The study the effect of different sources of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) fertilizer (in presence of adequate quantities of N , \(\mathbf{K}\) and Ca ) on growth and yield of Barley.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar+Guar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.10.53. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown behind the desi plough. (c) 40 sr ./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) A/S at \(50 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N+Gypsum at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{Ca}+\) Pot. Sul. at 20 lb ./ac. (vi) C-251 (Medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
2. Super at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. Kotka phosphate at \(40 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{z}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{E}}\).
4. B.M. at 40 lb . \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

Manuring on 14 and 15.10.1953 by placement.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A, (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(26^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\), (v) \(2^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Lodging due to rains on 10.1.1954. and 20.2.1954. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No.
(b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Crop Physiologist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(995 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(107.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1 lb ./ac.

Treatment Av. yield
1. 764
2. 1093
3. 976
4. 1146
S.E./mean \(=61.8 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
```

Crop:- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. Type :-'M'.
Ref:- U.P.53(192).

```

Object :-To study the effect of placement of fertilizers on growth and yield of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Green manure-Barley. (b) Sanai G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1953.
(iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seeds were sown behind desi plough. (c) N.A. (d) Lines \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil.
(vi) C-251 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 12.2.1954. (ix) 5.78.. (x) 25, 26.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 fertilizers: \(\mathrm{F}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{F}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(\mathrm{F}_{3}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. sulphate and \(\mathrm{F}_{4}=6 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO as Gypsum.
(2) \(\mathbf{3}\) methods of application of the above fertilizers: \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{By}\) broadcast, \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Placement behind plough in furrows and \(M_{3}=\) Drilled mixed with seed through improved seed drill.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (b) \(29^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2^{\prime}\) and field border \(5^{\prime}\) alround; block partition \(3^{\prime}\) and irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Unsatisfactory. Heavy lodging due to rain and wind on 10.1.1954 and 20.2.1954. (ii) Slight attack of smut. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1957. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Farrukhabad, Atarra and Pratapgarh. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1399 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(355.04 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only M effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


Crop:- Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Pura.

Ref :-U.P. 53(359).
Type a-' \(^{\prime} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}\),

Object :-To study the effect of lime, iron and F.Y.M. and their combinations on Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Kanpur type 2-loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Pura (iii) 4.12.1953. (iv) (a) Paewa; field ploughed by desi -plough. (b) Behind the, plough. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 4.70 (x) 14 and 15.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) at \(6 \mathrm{l} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .+\) lime at \(13 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. F.Y.M. at 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{N +}+\) treatment No. (2).
4. F.Y.M. at 50 lb ./ac. of N .

Date of manuring 2.12.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Latin'square. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination was good. Growth was very poor due to late sowing and late preparation of the field.
(ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil: (v) (a) Nil. (b) Nil.
(vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(430.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(75.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 376.0 \\
2. & 392.9 \\
3. & 424.8 \\
4. & 529.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=37.54 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 51(104).
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of. N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Barley crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Varanasi type 2). (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 28.10 .1951 and resown on 28.11.1951. (iv) (a) 8 pre-paratory ploughings given. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(1^{\circ}\). (x) 25 to 30.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and [2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{8}=0, N_{2}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{2}=60\) and \(P_{8}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as A/S broadcast and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super placed deep in bands near the root zone. Manuring on 26.10.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(4^{\circ} \times 26^{\prime}\) (v) A distance of \(1^{\prime}\) to \(3^{\prime}\) from plot to plot and \(3^{\prime}\) to \(4^{\prime}\) from block to block was left out. (v) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop failed due to droughty conditions and hence crop was resown after palewa-progress satisfactory but stunted due to late sowing. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Aligarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1686 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(220.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{6}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1070 & 1137 & 1270 & 1159 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1616 & 1782 & 1908 & 1769 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & . 1881 & 2187 & 2327 & 2132 \\
\hline Mean & 1522 & 1702 & 1835 & 1686 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =51.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =89.9 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Barley (Rabi). \\ Site :- Aonla (Bareilly).
}

Ref:- U.P. 50(239).
Type:- ' \(M\) '.
Object :-To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) November 1950. (vii) Generally irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) March-April.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. A/S at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. A/S at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Field selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the district. No. of villagas-4. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Generally average to poor growth. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1252 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(21.94 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.

Treatment Av. yield
1. 979
2. 1248
3. 1530
S.E./mean.\(=10.97 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
```

Crop :- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Bareilly and Baheri (Bareilly).
Ref :- U.P. 51(238).
Type :- ' $M$ '.

```

Object :-To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) to (c) N.A. (ii) Bareilly soil type 7 (A and B combined). (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practised locally. After application of manure, the field is levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(\cdot 2^{\circ}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. A/S at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .

3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated experiment laid out. 3 Ireplications or trials. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) One trial has poor growth and the other two trials were sown late and were damaged by frost. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist on cultivators' Gelds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(799 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(20.28 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in \(1 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 647 \\
2. & 817 \\
3. & 933 \\
S.E./mean & \(=11.71 \mathrm{lb}\) b./ac.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Barley (Rabi).
> Site :- Ghazipur (Ghazipur).

Ref:-U.P. 53(416).
Type:- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '.
Object : -To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) 1 trial in loam and 1 trial in sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) 7 to 8 ploughings by desf plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 30 to 40 [srs./ac. (d) \(4^{\circ}\) to \(6^{\prime \prime}\) between rows. (e) N.A. (vi) 24 and 25.10.1953. (vii) Irrigated by well. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14 and 15.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. 25 lb ./ac. of N .
3. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
4. 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied broadcast before sowing. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, placed deep in furrows behind the plough before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 2 villages were selected in the tehsil. In both the villages, one field each was selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different sizes, area \(=1 / 40 \mathrm{ac}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) One trial damaged by rats. (ii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Interaction village \(\times\) treatment has been taken as the error. (vii) Expt. conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1030 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(132.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb}_{\mathrm{o}} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 820 \\
2. & 1080 \\
3. & 1060 \\
4. & \(1160^{\circ}\) \\
S.E./mean & \(=93.80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop: -Barley.
Site :-Saidpur)(Ghazipur).

Ref:-U.P. 53(417).
Type :-‘M'.

Object :-To draw out fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) N.A. (b) Fallow for 3 trials, early paddy for 1 trial, Sanal fibre for. 1 trial and Jowar for 1 trial. (c) N.A. (ii) 4 trials in clayey loam to clayey, 2 trials in loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a' 7 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 30 to 40 srs./ac. (d) \(4^{\circ}\) to \(6^{\circ}\) between rows. (e) N.A. (vi) 24.10.53 to 13.11.53. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 8.3.1954 to 24.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. 25 lb ./ac of \(\mathrm{N}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
4. 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied broadcast before sowing. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super placed deep in furrows behind the plough.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 5 villages were selected in the Tehsil. In 1 village 2 fields were selected and in 4 villages, one field was selected. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) Different plot sizes; area \(1 / 40\) acre. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair in 3 trials, good in 2 trials and poor in 1 trial. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 19531954. continued. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Interaction village \(\times\) treatment has been taken as error because it comes out to be significant when tested against interaction treatment \(\times\) fields within villages. (vii) Expt. conducted by A.C. on-cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(955.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(197.83 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 610.0. \\
2. & 830.0 \\
3. & 1076.7 \\
4. & 1306.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=80.76 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Bilhaur and Ghatampur (Kanpur).
\[
\text { Ref :-U.P. } 49(188) .
\]

Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Kanpur type 1 soils, type 2 soils and type 3 soils. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v)
(a) As practised locally. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\circ}-2^{\circ}\) away from the fertilizer line. (c) N.A. (vi) 18.10 .1949 to 15.11 .1949 . (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.2.1950 to 9.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. A/S at 30 lb ./ac. of N .
- 3. \(A / S\) at 30 lb ./ac of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N added to surface at sowing time. Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep in the sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two dest ploughs one behind the other in the same: furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated expt. with the above three treatments laid out. 5 replications or trials were laid. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. but is taken to be about \(1 / 40\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1423 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(167.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1148 \\
2. & 1366 \\
3. & 1756 \\
S.e./mean & \(-74.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Chunar and Mirzapur. (Mirzapur).

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(284). } \\
& \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{aligned}
$$

```

Object :-To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Type 1 B (Southern Flats) Type 1C (Karail), Type 1D (Northern uplands), Type 1 E (Eastern low lands), Type 2 A (Vindhyan. up-lands), Type 2 B (Vindhyan Flats), Type 2 C (Vindhyan low lands). (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practised locally. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. . (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. \(\mathbf{A} / \mathbf{S}\) at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N added to surface at sowing time. Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}\) to \(4^{\circ}\) deep in the sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desl ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated experiment with the 3 treatments conducted. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. but roughly about 1/40 ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and bhusa yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1010 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(177.1^{1} 1 \mathrm{~b}^{\circ} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 754 \\
2. & 992 \\
3. & 1285 \\
S.B./mean : & \(=44.28 \mathrm{lb} /\) /ac.
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
' Crop :هBarley (Rabi).
Site :- Robertsganj and Dudhi (Mirzapur).
}

Ref :-U.P. 51(224).
Type:- \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).
- Object :-To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domat, Karail and Dhanusar. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A.. (vii) Irrigated. '(viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Field selected randomly in a randomly selected village in the district. No. of villages-9. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good to poor growth. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) no. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi)

Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1773 lb /ac.
(ii) \(149.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1538 \\
2. & 1787 \\
3. & 1993 \\
S.E./mean & \(=49.85 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Varanasi and Chandauli( Varanasi).

Ref :- U.P. 50(235).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) November. (vii) Generally irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) March-April.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(A / S\) at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. \(A / S\) at 30 lb ./ac. of \(N+\) Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN
(i) and (ii) Field selected randomly in randomly selected village in the district. No. of villages-14.' (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. but generally \(1 / 40\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Generally good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NiJ. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist on cultjvators' fields.
5. RESULTS .
(i) \(1629 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(184.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly signíficant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1296 \\
2. & 1577 \\
3. & 2015 \\
S.E./mean & \(=49.37 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

```

Ref :- U.P. 50(23).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object :-To study the optimum dose of N along with varieties of Barley.
- BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing with victory plough. Two ploughings by desi plough. (b) Line sowing. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251 and NP-21. (vii) Irrigated on 30.11.1950. (viii) Weeding on 28.2.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of ( 1 ) and ( 2 )
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-251\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP}-21\).
(2) 3 levels of N as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 12.75^{\prime}\). (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 11.25^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(2^{\prime}\) at each end of the plot. Between plots \(=2 \mathbf{l}^{\prime}\) and between blocks \(4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Barley C-251 had strip disease about \(2.0 \%\) and smut \(0.5 \%\). Barley NP-21 was badly affected by smut (up to \(20 \%\) in some of the plots) and strip disease ( \(0.5 \%\) ). (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. - (c) Nit. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) The experiment was to compare the yield of wheat and barley under similar conditions of manuring. In the experiment along with the 3 levels of manuring, 2 varieties each of what and barley were tested giving 12 treatments in each replication This proforma has been filled for bariey and another proforma has been filled in for wheat crop. (vii). Experiment conducted by E.B. (Rabi cereals and potatos) to Government U.P., Kanpur.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1225 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(149.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 635 & 548 & 592 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1332 & 1232 & 1282 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1718 & 1886 & 1802 \\
\hline Mean & 1228 & 1222 & 1225
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of N & \\
S.E. of marginal mean of V & \(=53.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \\
& \(=43.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
& \(=75.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Barley (Rabi).}


Object:-To study the optimum dose of N along with varieties of Barley.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11.195I. (iv) Ploughings by victory plough on 4.10 .51 , cultivator on 7.10 .1951 , desi plough on \(26,27.10 .1951\). (b) Line sowing. (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C -251 and N.P.21. (vii) Irriga ted. (viii) Weeding on 14.12.1951, and 11.1.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) 1 and 2.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{C}-251\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) N.P.-21:
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(23^{\prime} \times 12.75^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\circ} \times 11.25^{\prime}\). (c) One row on either side and \(2^{\prime}\) at each end of the plot. Between plots \(2 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\), between blocks \(4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) The experiment was to compare the yield of wheat and barley under similar conditions of manuring. In the experiment along with the 3 levels of manuring, 2 varieties each of wheat and barley were tested giving 12 treatments (in each replication). This proforma is for barley and another has been filled in for wheat crop. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (Rabl cereals and potatos) to Govt., U.P., Kanpur.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 1464 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(339.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Only main effect of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & Mead \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 819 & 1022 & 920 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1697 & 1421 & 1559 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 2063 & 1762 & 1912 \\
\hline Mean & 1526 & 1402 & 1464 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(N\) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=120.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=98.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=169.9 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U P. 52(49).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object :-To study the optimum dose of \(\mathbf{N}\) for different varieties of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughings and harrowing by victory on 10.8.1952. by cultivator on 20.9.1952 and by desi on 4,5.10.1952., 28.10.1952. and 2.11.1952. (b) Line sowing. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) C-25I. (vii) Irrigated. (viii)Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.3.53.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}\)-251 and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP}-21\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(23^{\prime} \times 12.75^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 10.75^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and at each end of the plot. Between plots \(2 \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\) between blocks \(4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Attack of rust. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The experiment was to compare the yield of wheat and barley under similar conditions of manuring. In that experiment along with the 3 levels of manuring, 2 varieties each of wheat and bariey were tested giving 12 treatments (in each replication). This proforma has been filled for barley and another has been filled in for wheat. (vii) The experiment is conducted by E.B. (Rabi cereals and potatos) to Govt., U.P. Kanpur.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2571 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(283.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of N and V are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grian in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 2132 & 2392 & 2262 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 2420 & 2913 & 2666 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 2619 & 2948 & 2784 \\
\hline Mean & 2390 & 2751 & 2571 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of marginal mean of N \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{V}\) \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & \(=100.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline & & & \(=81.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline & & & \(=141.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site:-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(94).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) on yield of Barley varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanal for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11.1953. (iv) (a) Turning in of sanal on 2.9 .1953 with victory plough ; desi plough and pata on 25 and 30.10.1953. (b) Sown behind plough. (c) 4.25 oz //plot. (d) Rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil.'(vi) C-251 and NP-21 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 18.1.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{C}-251\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{NP}-21\).
(2) 5 phosphate treatments : \(P_{0}=\) Control, \(P_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super in furrows, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super broadcast, \(\mathrm{Pa}_{\mathrm{a}}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super in furrows and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super broadcast.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(5 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(16^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 7.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight incidence of smut and rust. (iii) Grain and bhusha yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1987 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(795.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 1431 & 1758 & 2007 & 1556 & 2131 & 1777 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 2209 & 2100 & 1805 & 1960 & 2909 & 2197 \\
\hline Mean & 1820 & 1929 & 1906 & 1758 & 2520 & 1987 \\
\hline & \begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. \\
S.E. \\
S.E.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
ginal \(n\) \\
rginal \\
y of tab
\end{tabular} & of \(P\) of \(V\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =281.3 \\
& =177.8 \\
& =397.8
\end{aligned}
\] & ac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Object:-To study dibbling as a method of sowing Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai (green manure). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1953. (iv) (a) Light palewa on 12.101953. Watt's plough and pata on 11.10.1953. Desi plough and pata on 18, 27 and 31.10.1953. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) \(9^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) K-12 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) NiI. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

5 methods of sowing : \(S_{1}=1\) seed \(/\) hole, \(S_{2}=2\) seeds \(/\) hole, \(S_{3}=3\) seeds \(/\) hole, \(S_{4}=4\) seeds \(/\) hole and \(S_{5}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). broadcast.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 6^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.

Ref :-U.P. 53(91).
Type:-'C'.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of smut and rust. (iii) Grain, straw and dry grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(4475 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 497.0 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of straw in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(S_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 4527 \\
\(S_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 4807 \\
\(S_{3}\) & 4713 \\
\(S_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 4270 \\
\(S_{5}\) & 4060 \\
S.e./mean & \(=248.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Barley (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 51(13). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. } & \text { Type :- 'CV'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the optimum sowing date for different varieties of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing each with victory, desi and cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) 100 lb /ac. (d) Rows \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{NP}-21, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CN}-292\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{8}=\mathrm{CN}-294\).
(2) 3 sowing dates : \(D_{2}=19.10 .1951, D_{2}=3.11 .1951\) and \(D_{2}=20.11 .1951\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of smut disease were observed. . (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a). 1951continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1248 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(319.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of V alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(D_{1}\) & D 1 & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 2072 & 1934 & 1850 & 1952 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 722 & 906 & 733 & 787 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{8}\) & 806 & 1256 & 956 . & 1006 \\
\hline Mean & 1200 & 1365 & 1180 & 1248 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of aoy marginal mean \(=92.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=159.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Barley (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 52(44).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Type:- 'CV'.
Object : - To study the optimum sowing date for different varieties of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with victory plough, 4 with desi and 1 with cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 18.12.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 31.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{P} .-21, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{C} . \mathrm{N} .294, \mathrm{~V}_{3}=\mathrm{CN}-292\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{4}=\mathrm{K}-12\).
(2) 4 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=23\) Oct. 1952, \(D_{2}=30\) th Oct. 1952, \(D_{3}=6\) th November 1952 and \(D_{4}=13\) th November 1952.'

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good, but lodging took place when the field was irrigated and followed by strong wind. (ii) Traces of smut disease were seen. (iii) Germination and yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1951-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2688 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(.360 .7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of V alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb ./ac.


\author{
Crop :- Barley (Rabi). \\ Site : \(\boldsymbol{\text { G Govt. Res, Farm, Kanpur. }}\)
}

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 53(83).}

Type:- 'CV'.
Object :-To study the optimum sowing dates for Barley varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam, (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) Light palewa on 12.10.1953, victory plough on 19.9.1953; cultivator on 30.9.1953, spring harrowing and pata on 18.10.1953; desi plough and pata on 24.10 .1953 and 26.10 .1953 . (b) N.A. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(8^{\prime \prime}\) apart. (n) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) N.P. 21, \(V_{8}=\) C.N. 294, \(V_{3}=\) C.N. 292, and \(V_{4}=K-12\).
(2) 4 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=26.10 .1953, D_{2}=2.11 .1953, D_{3}=9.11 .1953\) and \(D_{4}=16.11 .1953\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of smut rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-continued, (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1792 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 372.9 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).


Crop :- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 50(47).
Type :- \({ }^{\text {CV }}\) '.

Object :-To study on the effect of cold storage on Barley varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.11 .1950 : (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with victory plough, 4 ploughings with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(1 \frac{1}{4} 0 \mathrm{z} / \mathrm{plot}\). (d) Between rows 1'. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 26.2.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 10, 11.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
 \(V_{7}=\) C.N. 294.
(2) \(\mathbf{2}\) methods of storage of seed: \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Cold storage and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Ordinary.
variety CN-293 was untreated and hence excluded from analysis.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(6 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(7^{\prime} \times 5^{\prime} \cdot\) (b) \(7^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (.) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1930 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 273.8 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of V alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(V_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{4}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{6}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{7}\) & Mean \\
\hline M & 2593 & 2690 & 2253 & 1961 & 810 & 1215 & 1920 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 2447 & 2333 & 2512 & 2074 & 843 & 1426 & 1939 \\
\hline Mean & 2520 & 2512 & 2382 & 2018 & 826 & 1320 & 1930 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\)
\(=96.8 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. S.E. of marginal mean of \(M\)
\(=55.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). S.E. of body of table
\(=136.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
}

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Ref: U.P. 48(14).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Type :-'CV'.
Object :-To study the optimum sowing date for Barley varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Cow peas. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) \(1.5 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), top dressed. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 31.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) N.P. 21 and \(V_{2}=C-251\).
(2) 4 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=22.10 .1948, D_{2}=29.10 .1948, D_{3}=5.11 .1948\) and \(D_{4}=12.11 .1948\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(37^{\circ} \times 19.5^{\prime}\), (v) One row on either side and \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack by rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1944-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The crop did not attain as much height as during the previous year. Yellow rust was in plenty and hence the yield was somewhat below expectation. (vii) Expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1568 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 319.7 lb ./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 1934 & 1246 & 1590 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 1400 & 1482 & 1441 \\
\hline D2 & 1749 & 1609 & 1679 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 1637 & 1485 & 1561 - \\
\hline Mean & 1680 & 1455 & 1568 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
=79.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}
\]} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of marginal mean of D} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
=113.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=159.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 50(24). Type :-"CM".

Object :-To study the optimum dose of \(N\) in combination with seed rates for Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Jow ar for fodder. (c) NiI. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing with victory plough and two ploughings with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.P.-21. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 28.2.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 15, 16.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50, N_{8}=75\) and \(N_{4}=109 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 4 seed rates : \(S_{1}=40, S_{2}=60, S_{8}=80\) and \(S_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S broadcast at the time of sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 plots in two flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(38^{\prime} \times 12.75^{\circ}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 11.25^{\circ}\). (y) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL ;
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Smut incidence is about 4 to \(5 \%\) in all the plots of different treatments. Different doses of manuring and seed rates do not seem to have any effect on disease incidence. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b)§N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2037 lb./ac.
(ii) \(274.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of N alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{4}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 1409 & 1973 & 2467 & 2467 & 2079 \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & 1622 & 1966 & 2123 & 2262 & 1993 \\
\hline S & 1387 & 2079 & 2284 & 2343 & 2023 \\
\hline \(S_{4}\) & 1519 & 2204 & 2310 & 2174 & 2052 \\
\hline Mean & 1484 & 2056 & 2296 & 2312 & 2037 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=68.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{S.E. of body of table} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=137.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

> Ref:- U.P. 51(17).
> Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the optimum dose of \(N\) in combination with seed rates for Barley.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) NiI. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11 .1951 . (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough, 1 by cultivator and 2 by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 28,29.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50\) and \(N_{3}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 4 seed rates: \(S_{1}=40, S_{2}=60, S_{3}=80\) and \(S_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S broadcast at sowing time.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 in 2 flanks. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(38^{\prime} \times 12.75^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 112^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Disease of smut was observed. (iii) Germinģtion and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953.
(b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.B. (R).

\section*{-5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1550 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(284.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1116 & 1468 & 1622 & 1808 & 1504 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1098 & 1490 & 1706 & 1559 & 1463 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1336 & 1424 & 1874 & 1856 & 1622 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1102 & 1537 & 1856 & 1958 & 1613 \\
\hline Mean & 1163 & 1480 & 1764 & 1795 & 1550
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =71.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =142.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

Crop:-Barley (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(48).
Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the optimum dose of N in combination with seed rates for Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Chari (Jowar for fodder). (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1952. (iv) (a) One ploughing with victory plough and two with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251.' (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 26/27.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50\) and \(N_{3}=75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 4 seed rates: \(S_{1}=40, S_{2}=60, S_{3}=80\) and \(S_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S broadcast at sowing time.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(18^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(14^{\circ} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes. 4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of rust. (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2418 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(373.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & Na & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2315 & 2534 & 2334 & 2686 & 2467 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 2438 & 2572. & 2400 & 2638 & 2512 \\
\hline \(S_{8}\) & 2143 & 2372 & 2543 & 2419 & 2369 \\
\hline \(S_{4}\) & 2295 & 2305 & 2543 & 2143 & 2322 \\
\hline Meas & 2298 & 2446 & 2455 & 2472 & 2418 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =92.8 \mathrm{lb} \cdot / \mathrm{a} \\
& =186.6 \mathrm{lb} \cdot / \mathrm{a}
\end{aligned}
\]
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 53(85).
Type:- ‘CM'.
Object :-To study the optimum dose of N in combination with seedrates for Barley,
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari (for fodder). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1953. (iv) (a) Light palewa on 12.10.1953, victory plough on 18.9.1953, cultivator on 30.9.1953, spring harrow and pata on 20.1.1953; desi plough and pata on 26 and 27.10.1953. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) N.A. (d) \(9^{6}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-25i (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii), Weeding on 30.1.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 31.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(N\) as A/S: \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50\) and \(N_{3}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 4 seed rates : \({ }^{-} S_{1}=40, S_{2}=60, S_{3}=80\) and \(S_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S braodcast at sowing time.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(18^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(14^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\) (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of rust and smut. (iii) Germination, sheaf, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1486 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(205.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant ; effect of S is significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 1019 & 1667 & 1724 & 2067. & 1619 \\
\hline S9 & 1038 & 1505 & 1600 & 1667.- & 1452 \\
\hline \(S_{3}\) & 1248 & 1333 & 1591 & 1591 & 1441 \\
\hline \(S_{4}\) & 1029 & 1505 & 1572 & 1619 & 1431 \\
\hline Mean & 1084 & 1502 & 1622 & 1736 & 1486 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad=51.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=102.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(192).
Type :-'CM'.

Object :-To study the jowar+guar mixtures for fodder along with levels of N and their residual effect on Barley.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar + guar. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.10 .1952. (iv) (a) After preparatory irrigation (palewa) the field was ploughed with a watt's ploughe followed by planking on 14.10 .1952 . Next day a cultivator was given followed by planking. On 20 to 22.10.1952, a second ploughing with desi plough followed by planking. (b) Seeds drilled. (c) 30 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) No interculture. (ix) N.A. (x) 9 to 11.3.1953
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of \(N\) : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30, N_{2}=60\) and \(N_{3}=90 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
5 mixtures of jowar and guar in the following ratios to give 40 lb ./ac. of seed rate:
\(\mathbf{M}_{1}=\) jowar only, \(\mathbf{M}_{2}=3: 1, M_{3}=1: 1, M_{4}=1: 3\) and \(M_{5}=\) guar only.
N as.A/S and castor cake in 1:1 ratio applied to fowar and guar.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(54.5^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (b) \(52.5^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.A.C. Plot wise yield data are not available at the station. Only the analysis of variance table and the summary table were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1072 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(258.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) 109.9 lb ./ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(M\) and interaction \(M \times N\) are highly significant. \(N\) effect is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ccccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{\prime}}{ }^{\prime}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 759 & 892 & 892 & 994 & 1429 & 993 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 734 & 883 & 960 & 947 & 1780 & 1061 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 787 & 852 & 879 & 1105 & 1534 & 1031 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1160 & 1095 & 1123 & \(1169 \cdots\) & 1463 & 1202 \\
\hline Mean & 860 & 930 & 964 & 1054 & 1551 & 1072
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. } \mathbf{N} \text { marginal means } & =57.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 2. } M \text { marginal means } & =27.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 3. } M \text { means at the same level of } N & =77.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 4. } \mathrm{N} \text { means at the same level of } \mathrm{M} & =107.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 53(121).
Type :- \({ }^{6}\) D'.

Object :-To test the efficiency of various solar treatments for the control of covered smut of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Lobia and Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.11.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with desi plough and one with victory plough. (b) Behind the plough in lines. (c) N.A. (d) 2 rows per plot 1' apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding on 5.2.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS;
1. Control.
2. 4 hours soaking of seeds and drying in sun covered with sand.
3. 4 hours soaking of seeds and drying uncovered.
4. Overnight soaking of seeds and drying in shade.
5. Sun soaking of seeds and overnight drying.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (block size \(=18^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\) ). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Smut incidence. (iii) Percentage infection. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Plant Pathologist to Govt., U.P., Kanpur.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatments & Mean value of \(\log _{\mathrm{e}}(1+\mathrm{x}) /\) plot & Mean infection \\
1. & 2.060490 & 6.850 \\
2. & 0.024395 & 0.025 \\
3. & 0.199390 & 0.245 \\
4. & 0.033830 & 0.035 \\
5. & 0.000000 & 0.000 \\
G.M. & 0.463621 & \\
S.E./mean & 0.083066 &
\end{tabular}

Note:-The data has been converted into \(\log _{e}(1+x)\) and then analysed, where \(x\) is the \(\%\) of infection.

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Object :- To test the efficiency of various chemical treatments for the control of covered smut of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Lobia and Pea. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with desi plough and one with victory plough. (b) Behind the plough in lines. (c) N.A. (d) 2 rows/plot \(1^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) C-251 (N.A.) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding on 5.2.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control. (Inoculated seed)
2. Agrosan G.N. \(1: 500\).
3. Ceresan 1:300.
4. Hervasan 1:300
5. Ceresan 1:500.
6. Agrosan \(1: 300\).
7. Hervasan 1 : 500 .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 7.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (block size \(=19^{\circ} \times 20\) ).
(b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Smut incidence. (iii) Percentage infection. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by P.P. to Govt. U.P., Kanpur.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(7.36 \mathrm{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{plot}}\).
(ii) \(1.9628 \operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{\text { p/plot. }}\)
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatments Mean value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{\mathrm{p} / \mathrm{plot}} \quad \%\) infection/plot (transformed value)
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
1. & 15.17 & \\
2. & 7.86 & \\
3. & 1.44 & \\
4. & 4.58 & \\
5. & 4.55 & 0.56 \\
6. & 7.72 & 1.13 \\
7. & 10.20 & \\
S.E./mean & 1.3879 & \\
& & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Note :- \(\mathbf{p}\) is percentage of infection.
```

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Vivekananda Laboratory; Almora.

```

\author{
Ref:- U.P. 53(124). \\ Type :-‘DV'.
}

Object:-To find out the effect of vernalisation on vegetative phase and yield of different varieties of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize. (c) 200 mds . of compost, 4 mds. of castor cake and 2 mds of a mixture of A/S+ Super. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10 .1953 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Dibbled. (c) N.A. (d) \(3^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) 200 mds . of compost and \(5: \mathrm{mds}\) of castor cake per acre. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing done whenever necessary. (ix) \(13.08^{\prime \prime}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{C}-293\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{T}-5\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) Colonial (fate).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 methods: \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Control and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Vernalised.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block; 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a), (b) \(5^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (single row plot). (v) One border row in each flank. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good crop. No lodging. (ii) Yellow rust on both the treatments in each variety; in case of Colonial barley attack of rust very severe. (iii). Vegetative phase (from sowing to ear emergence) and yield data plot wise, (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) No. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) Colonial barley is a late variety and is very susceptible to rust. Its low yield in control plots is only due to severe attack of rust. In other treatment i.e. vernalised, the yield is comparatively very high because the vernalisation shortens the vegetative phase and the plants escape much of the damage caused by the rust in later period. (vii) Although design is given as paired plot design but it was to be split-plot design as in the last years it has been mentioned as split-plot design.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(4381 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(2736.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(1542.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only the interaction \(\mathbf{V} \times \mathrm{M}\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 4233 & 3086 & 3659 \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 4764 & 4855 & 4810 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 2723 & 6625 & 4674 \\
\hline Mean & 3907 & 4855 & 4381 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(V\) marginal means
2. \(\mathbf{M}\) marginal means
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(V\)
4. V means at the same level of M
\(=1368.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=630.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=1090.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=1571.0 \mathrm{db} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(20).
Type :-'DV'.

Object :-To study the effect of seeds treated with Agrosan on the yield of different varieties of Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Ploughings 1 with victory plough, ploughings 3 with desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing on 10, 11.1.1951 and 25.21951. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{NP} .21, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{C}-251, \mathrm{~V}_{8}=\mathrm{C}-84, \mathrm{~V}_{4}=\mathrm{C}-50, \mathrm{~V}_{5}=\mathrm{K}-12\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{6}=\) CN-294.
(2) 2 methods of treating the seed: \(M_{1}=\) untreated and \(M_{2}=\) treated with Agrosan. .

The seed was treated one or two days before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(6 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 0.75^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) In untreated Agrosan G.N. plots there was effect of smut; (iii) Germination and grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1113- lb./ac.
(ii) \(156.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of V alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

```

Crop :- Maize (Kharif).
Site :- B.R. College Farm, Bichpuri (Agra).

```

Ref:- U.P. 53(377).


Object :-To study the effect of application of A/S and Super by furrow placement and broadcasting on growth, development and yield of Maize.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Maize (chari)-wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam, (b) Refer soil analysis, Agra, (iii) 22.7.1953. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation given. 2 ploughings in 2nd week of July.. (b) As per treatments. (c) 8 srs./ac. (d) Row to row-2' and plant to plant-1年 (after thinning). (e) - (v) Nil. (vi) T-414 (N.A.). (vii) Nil. (viii) Thinning on 2.8 .1953 and 1 weeding on 6.8 .1953 by \(k h u t p i\). (ix) \(8.48^{\circ}\). (x) 26.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No manure (control).
2. \(N+P\) mixture at \(3^{\text {r }}\) depth in furrows.
3. \(N+P\) mixture at \(3^{\prime \prime}\) depth to the sides of the planting row.
4. \(N+P\) mixture broadcast and harrowed into a depth of \(3^{\circ}\).
\(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{P}=45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(38^{\prime} \times 26^{\circ}\). (b) \(36^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) Block border \(=4^{\prime}\), plot border \(=2^{\circ}\) and main channel \(=4^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination-normal. (ii) N.A. (ii) Germination counts, stand of the crop, shoot height and grain yield etc. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Head of Agronomy department B.R. College, Agra.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1826 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 453.7 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Av. yeatment & Av. yield \(\quad\), \\
1. & 1307 \\
2. & 1861 \\
3. & 2354 \\
4. & 1784 \\
S.E./mean & \(=185.2 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Maize (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.}

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 49(15).}

Type := 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) manures applied alone and in combination on the yield of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa (Bundelkhand \(T_{2}\) ). (b) N.A. (iii) 6.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.12.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15\) and \(N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Manuring on 6.7.1949.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(68^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of straw. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai, Saidpur, Bharari Pratapgarh and Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by Agricultural Chemist.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(5251 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(361.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(N\) effect is highly significant, \(\mathbf{P}\) effect is significant. Interaction \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of straw in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline . \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 4291 & 4564 & 4844 & 4566 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 4965 & 5278 & 5251 & 5165 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 5979 & 5939 & 6146 & 6021 \\
\hline Mean & 5078 & 5260 & . 5414 & 5251 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=85.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=147.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Maize (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Bahraich.

```
Ref :- U.P. 52(158).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of trace elements in presence of adequate quantities of \(\mathrm{N}_{,} \mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) on the growth and yield of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bahraich. (iii) 15.7.1952. (iv)(a) N.A. (b) Dibbling. (c) 6 to 8 seers/ac. (d) Line to line \(1 \frac{y^{\prime}}{}\) and seed to seed \(1^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Maize T-41 (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(24.20^{\circ}\) : (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper (Cu) as Copper sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as Commercial Borax at 1 lb ./ac. of B.
5. Sulphur ( \(\mathbf{S}\) ) as Commercial Sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of S .
6. Zinc ( Zn ) as Zinc sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .

A basal dose of \(A / S\) at 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. Sulphate at \(25 \mathrm{lb}, \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{ac}\). is applied to all plots
Trace elements are mixed with fine earth and applied as surface dressing. Date of manuring 12.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2^{\prime}\) alround, field border \(4^{\prime}\) alround, plot bund \(1^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\) high and irrigation channel \(=2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a)'Hardoi, Etawah and Banaras. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Crop Physiologist.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2095 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(167.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & -2145 \\
2. & 2071 \\
3. & 2125 \\
4. & 2100 \\
5. & 1943 \\
6. & 2184 \\
S.E./mean & \(=68.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Maize (Kharif).
Site :- State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref :-U.P. 49(16). Type:- 'M':

Object :-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) manures applied alone and in combination on the yield and quality of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Rakar (Bundelkhand Type 1). (b) N.A. (iii) 12.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A.
(v) Ni. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2, 3.12.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15\) and \(N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Date of manuring 8, 9.7.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 68^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) The rains were scarce. Germination was good due to initial good rains. Scarcity of moisture resulted in stunted growth and the grain formation was poor. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of straw. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai, Saidpur, Pratapgarh, Kalyanpur and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 3601 Ib./ac.
(ii) 1060 lb ./ac.
(iii) P effect is significant ; N effect is highly significant ; interaction is not significant.
(iv) Ay. yjeld of straw in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 2763 & 3630 & 2803 & 3065 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2709 & 3563 & 3837 & 3370 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3657 & 4918 & 4531 & 4369 \\
\hline Mean & 3043 & 4037 & 3724 & 3601 \\
& & & \\
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=249.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & & \(=432.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Maize (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Etawah.
}

Ref:- U.P. 52(155).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of trace elements in presence of adequate quantities of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) on growth and yield of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Dibbling. (c) 6 to 8 srs./ac. (d) Line to line \(1_{\frac{1}{\prime}}^{\prime}\) and seed to seed \(1^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-41 (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper ( Cu ) as copper sulphate at \(6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as commercial borax at 1 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{B}\).
5. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of S .
6. Zinc ( Zn ) as zinc sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .

A basal dose of \(A / S\) at 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. sulphate at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{ac}\). is applied to all plots.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Latin square. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(35^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(31^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2^{\prime}\) alround, field border \(4^{\prime}\) alround, plot bund \(1^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\) high and irrigation channel \(=2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Bahraich, Hardoi and Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Crop Physiologist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1197 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(263.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Areatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1105 \\
2. & 1135 \\
3. & 1320 \\
4. & 1210 \\
5. & 1221 \\
6. & 1193 \\
S.E./mean & \(=107.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Maize (Kharif).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Hardoi.

Ref :- U.P. 52(157).
Type:- ' \(M\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of trace elements in presence of adequate quantities of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) on growth and yield of Maize.:

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.7.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Dibbling. (c) 6-8 str./ac. (d) Line to line \(1 \frac{1}{\prime}\) ' and seed to seed \(1^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Maize T-41 (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.10.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS .}
1. Control.
2. Molybdenum \(\left(\mathrm{M}_{0}\right)\) as molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper ( Cu ) as copper sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as commercial borax at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of B.
5. Sulphur ( S ) as commercial sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of S .
6. Zinc ( Zn ) as zinc sulphate at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Zn .

A basal dose of \(\mathbf{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. sulphate at \(25 \mathrm{~K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O} / \mathrm{ac}\). is applied to all plots. Trace elements mixed with fine earth and then applied uniformly all over plot before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(43^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(=2^{\prime}\) alround, field border \(=3 \frac{1}{}^{\prime}\), irrigation channel \(=2^{\prime}\) and bund \(=1^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\) high.. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Baharaich, Etawah, Banda and Varanasi. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Crop Physiologist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1829 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(234.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1771 \\
2. & 1973 \\
3. & 1722 \\
4. & 1756 \\
5. & 1740 \\
6. & 2012 \\
S.E./mean & \(=95.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Maize (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref :-U.P. 49(19).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) manures applied alone and in combination on the yield and quality of Maize.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Aligarh type). (b) N.A. (iii) 14.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nii. (vi) to (ix) N.A. (x) 2.11.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15\) and \(N_{2}=30 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=30\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Date of manuring - 13.7.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Bharari, Saidpur, Pratapgarh, Kalyanpur and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) The season was abnormal. Late and excessive rains, with very short interval through out the season, affected the crop very adversely. Due to heavy and continuous rains throughout the growing season no interculture or weeding could be done, hence the general crop was very poor. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2198 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(657.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.'
(iv) Ay. yield of grain in lb./ac.


Crop :maize (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref:- U.P. 53(348).
Type:-‘M'.

Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield of Maize crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) \&Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Aligarh type 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.6 .1953 . (iv) (a) The field was ploughed 6 times. In addition one ploughing was given by way of drilling of fertilizer. (b) Sown in lines behind the plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) and (vii) N.A. (viii) One hoeing and one weeding. (ix) \(19^{\prime \prime} .(\mathrm{x}) 10\) and 11.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: \quad N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=151 \mathrm{~b}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as sulphate of potash : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S broadcasted, \(P\) placed \(4^{*}\) deep in bands \(9^{*}\) apart. Potash applied as deep placement along with phosphate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) partially balanced (as only one replication of balanced set has been repeated 4 times) as well as partially confounded design in which one degree of freedom corresponding to PK and NPK interaction is partially confounded. (ii) (a) 6 plots/block and 2 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(45^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Growth was irregular due to water logging. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of cobs and dry stalk. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) The crop was sown rather late as there were heavy rains. The crop was badly effected and the growth was irregular due to water logging etc. Hence the results obtained are erratic. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1919 Ib./ac.
(ii) \(235.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of N and K are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

S.E. of marginal mean of \(N\) or \(P\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(K\) S.E. of body of table \(N \times P\) S.E. of body of table \(\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{K} \times \mathbf{N}\)
\(=48.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=58.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=67.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=83.2 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Maize (Kharif)
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. . Type :- \(\mathbf{M}_{6}^{6}\).

Object : - To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) manures applied alone and in combination on the yield and quality of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (Kanpur type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 12.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26, 27.9.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15\) and \(N_{2}=30 \mathrm{Ib}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Date of manuring 27, 28.6.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 49.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satsfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Green matter yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai, Saifpur, Bharari, Atarra and Pratapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2185 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(1065.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of green matter in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0} \mathrm{X}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1853 & 1773 & 2320 & 1982 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 2413 & 1933 & 1960 & 2102 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 2560 & 2600 & 2253 & 2471 \\
\hline Mean & 2275 & 2102 & 2178 & 2185 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of tables} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =251.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =434.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Maize (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Agri. College, Kanpur. \({ }^{\text {- }}\)

Ref: : U.P. 50(310).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\), P.fertilizers applied singly and in combination on Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Brinjal. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 9.7.1950. (iv) (a) Palewa on 28.5.1950, Punjab plough on \(30.5 .1950,5.7 .1950\) and planked, two subsequent ploughings by desi plough. (b) Behind the desi plough. (c) 12 seers/ac. (d) Lines \(2^{\prime}\) apart, plant to plant after thinning from \(6^{\circ}\) to \(1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\). (e) N.A. (v) 100 mds/ac. of F.Y.M. spread on 27.5.1950. (vi) T-41 (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Thinning was done on 22.7.1950. One weeding by khurpi to remove Hazardana (Phyallanthus niruri) and hirakhuri (convolrous arvensis) on 3.8.1950. Earthing done on 6.8 .1950 with a high double mould board plough. (ix) 26.72'. (x) 26.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=40\) and \(N_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\). as Super : \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=50\) and \(P_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Fertilizers mixed with sand ( 3 times) and evenly broadcasted by the side of the plant row. Next day a cultivator was used to incorporate them in the soil.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Dịcarded two rows on either side and It' at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Lodging index : -From \(24.9 \%\) to \(32.0 \%\) being heighest for \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) and lowest with \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{1}\) treatments. (ii) Mild attack of grass hopper in the 2nd week after sowing. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R. College.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2496 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(111.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1973 & 2078 & 2292 & 2114 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 2449 & 2569 & 2762 & 2593 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2620 & 2754 & 2972 & 2782 \\
\hline Mean & 2347 & 2467 & 2675 & 2496 \\
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=32.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & & \(=55.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Maize (Kharif).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :- U.P. 52(176).
Type :-'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of trace elements in presence of adequate quantities of \(\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{P}\) and \(\mathbf{K}\) on growth and quality of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Dibbling (c) 5 srs./ac. (d) Seed to seed \(9^{\circ}\) apart and row to row 11' apart. (e) N.A. (v) Phosphate to be applied in furrows while preparing the field and A/S and Pot. Sul. as top dressing one week before sowing. (vi) Jaunpuri (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as Molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper ( Cu ) as Copper sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
4. Boron (B) as Commercial Borax at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of B.
5. Sulphur ( S ) as Commercial Sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of S .
6. \(\mathrm{Zinc}(\mathrm{Zn})\) as Zinc sulphate at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Za .

A basal dose of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. sulphate at 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) is applied to all plots.
Trace elements were mixed with fine earth and applied as surface dressing 5-6 days before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(13^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (v) Irrigation channel \(2^{\prime}\), Plot bund \(1^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\) and Field border \(4^{\prime}\) alround, (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Ni. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) No. (v) (a), (b) Varanasi, Baharaich, Etawah and Hardoi. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1987 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(567.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb.fac.
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
Treatment & Av. yield & \\
1. & 1622 & \(\cdots\) \\
2. & 1457 & \\
3. & 2241 & \\
4. & 1967 & \\
5. & 1829 & \\
6. & 2804 & \\
S.E./mean & \(=231.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop : Maize (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Pratapgarh.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 49(14).}

Type :-'M'.
Object :- To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) manures applied alone and in combination on the yield and quality of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Domat (unclassified). (b) N.A. (iii) 21.6.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi)
N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.9.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15\) and \(N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=30\) and \(P_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Date of manuring 20.6.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Straw yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai, Saidpur, Bharari, Kalyanpur and Atarra. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 4235 lb./ac.
(ii). 1497 lb./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of straw in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 3565 & 3392 & 4505 & 3821 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 4969 & 4388 & 4251 & 4536 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 4082 & 4493 & 4469 & 4348 \\
\hline Mean & 4205 & 4091 & 4408 & 4235 \\
\begin{tabular}{l} 
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular} & & \(=352.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Maize (Kharif).
Site :- State Mech. Farm, Saidpur.

```

Ref:- U.P. 49(18).
Type :- 'M'.
Object:-To stady the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) manures applied alone and in combination on the yield and quality of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Mar (Bundelkhand type 3 B). (b) N.A. (iii) 14.7.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A.
(v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.12.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15\) and \(N_{2}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=30\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\). ac .

\section*{Manuring on 9.7.1949.}
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kalai, Bharari, Pratapgarh, Kalyanpur and Atarra. (v) N.A. (vi) and (vii) Nil.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1363 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(565.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(N\) is significant. Main effect \(P\) and interaction \(N \times P\) are not significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of straw in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 1014 & 1066 & 993 & 1024 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1427 & 1253 & 1273 & 1318 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 1360 & 2134 & 1747 & 1747 \\
\hline Mean & 1267 & 1484 & 1338 & 1363
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad=153.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). S.E. of body of table
\[
=230.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]
```

Crop :- Maize (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 52(159).
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Type :- 'M'.

```

Object :-To study the effect of trace elements in presence of adequate quantities of \(N, P\) and \(K\) on growth and yield of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 16.7.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Dibbling. (c) 6-8 srs./ac. (d) Line to line 11' and seed to seed 1'. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-41 (late). (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Molybdenum (Mo) as Molybdic acid at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
3. Copper ( Cu ) as Copper Sulphate at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
4. Borax (B) as Commercial Borax at 1 lb ./ac. of B.
5. Sulphur ( S ) as Commercial Sulphur at 50 lb ./ac. of S .
6. Zinc ( Zn ) as Zinc Sulphate at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .

A basal dose of \(A / S\) at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\) Super at 25 lb /ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\) Pot. Sulphate at 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) is applied to all treatments. Date of manuring 15.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(=2^{\prime}\) alround, field border \(=4^{\prime}\) alround, plot bund \(=1^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\) high and irrigation channel \(=2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Below normal. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Hardoi, Baharaich and Etawah. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by Crop Physiologist.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(437.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(144.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 305.0 \\
2. & 496.8 \\
3. & 393.5 \\
4. & 499.3 \\
5. & 516.5 \\
6. & 415.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=58.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Maize (Kharif).
Site :-Koil, Sikandra Rao (Aligarh).

Ref :-U.P. 49(185).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To draw out fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Aligarh soil type 1 and type 2. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practised locally. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{1}-2^{2}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) (a) 26.6.1949. to 1.8.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.9.1949. to 20.11.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 15 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

N added to surface at sowing ftime. Sufer is placed at a depth of gabout \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) at the sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi plough one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated experiment with the above 3 treat. laid out. Pour replications or trials were laid out. (iii) N.A., but roughly about \(1 / 40\) ac. (net area). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Agricultural Chemist on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 744 lb ./ac.
(ii) \(236.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Pb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield. \\
1. & 501 \\
2. & 859 \\
3. & 871 \\
S.E./mean & \(=118.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Maize (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(214).
Type :- \(\mathbf{M}\) '.

Object :-To find out the optimum spacing for Maize crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) 21.7.1950. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) to (e) As per treatments. (v) N.A. (vi) T-41 (medium late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}-30\) hills -3 rows with one seed /hill.
2. \(2^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}-15\) hills -3 rows with two seeds./hill.
3. \(3^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}-\) two rows-1st row 30 hills with two seeds and 2 nd row 30 hills with one seed/hill.
4. \(3^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}-t w o\) rows-1st row 15 hills with 3 seeds and 2 nd row 15 hills with 3 seeds/hill.
5. \(3^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}-t w o\) rows-1st row 10 hills with 4 seeds each and 2 nd row 10 hills with 5 seeds/hill.
6. Control (broadcast).

No. of plants/plot \(=90\) and seed rate \(=180\) sr./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. Blocks No. V and VI completely lodged hence rejected for analysis. (ii) N.A. (iii) Stand at harvest and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(O), experiment was designed with 6 replications, but 2 replications rejected as data was N.A.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(710.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 433.6 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(vi) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Areatments & Av. yield \\
1. & 926.3 \\
2. & 778.0 \\
3. & 428.3 \\
4. & 762.9 \\
5. & 505.8 \\
6. & 863.9 \\
S.E./mean & \(=710.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\title{
Crop :- Maize (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
}

\author{
Ref :- U.P. 51(193). \\ Type: ' \(C\) '.
}

Object : - To find out the optimum spacing for Maize crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 24.7.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) to (e) As per treatments. (v) N.A (vi) T-41 (medium-late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.10.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}-30\) hills -3 rows with one seed/hill.
2. \(2^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}-15\) hills -3 rows with two seeds/hill.
3. \(3^{r} \times 1^{\prime}-\) two rows-1st row 30 hills with two seeds and 2 nd row 30 hills with one seed/hill.
4. \(3^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}-\) two rows -1 st row 15 hills with 3 seeds and 2 nd row 15 hills with 3 seeds/hill.
5. \(3^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}\) two rows -1 st row 10 hills with 4 seeds and 2 nd row 10 hills with 5 seed each/hill.
6. Control (broadcast).

No. of plants/plot \(=90\) and seed with rate \(=180\) srs./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq.
(ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A.
(iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\).
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1952\). (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) None. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (O). Analysis of co-variance was performed but regression coefficient was not significant hence the results are based on usual analysis.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1325 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(139.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Av. yield of grain in & Av. yield \\
Treatment & 1310 \\
1. & 1412 \\
2. & 1209 \\
3. & 1311 \\
4. & 1114 \\
5. & 1593 \\
6. & \(56.76 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Maize (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
}
Ref :- U.P. \(\mathbf{5 2}^{2(249)}\)
Type:- 'C'.

Object:-To find out the optimum spacing for Maize crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) to (c) As per treatments. (v) N.A. (vi) T-41 (medium-late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.9.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}-30\) hills -3 rows with one seed/hill.
2. \(2^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}-15\) hills -3 rows with two seeds/hill.
3. \(3^{\circ} \times 1^{\prime}-\) two rows -1 st row 30 hills with two seeds and 2 nd row 30 hills with one seed/hill.
4. \(3^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}-\) two rows- 1 st row 15 hills with 3 seeds and 2 ad row 15 hills 3 seeds/hill.
5. \(3^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}-\) two rows-l st row 10 hills with 4 seeds each and 2 nd row 10 hills with 5 seeds/hill.

No. of plants/plot \(=90\) and seed rate \(=180\) srs./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 6 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(6^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Ni. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. ( 0 ). Analysis of co-variance was performed but reggression was not significant. Hence the results are based on usual analysis.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1903 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(284.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 2208 \\
2. & 1684 \\
3. & 2057 \\
4. & 1958 \\
5. & 1754 \\
6. & 1754 \\
S.E./mean & \(=116.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Maize (Kharif).
Ref :-U.P. 53(26).
. Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Type :-D'.
Object :-To study the effect of seed dressings on the yield of Maize.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.6.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 10 C.L./ac. spread on 1.5.1953. (vi) T-14. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
5. Harvoason. (1:750).
- 2. Agrosan G.N.
6. Harvoasan (1:400).
3. Ceresan.
7. Tritisan.
4. Fernasan.
8. Agrosan Special.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(6^{\circ} \times 34^{\circ}\). (b) \(4^{\circ} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :

1 (i) Lodged on 28.7.1953. (ii) N.A. (iii) Stand "per plot was taken and no. of cobs and yield. (iv) (a) 1953continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (O).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(523 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(216 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & & Av. yield \\
1. & 440 & 5. & 500 \\
2. & 647 & 6. & & 474 \\
3. & 634 & 7. &. & 467 \\
4. & 574 & 8. & & 447 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=88.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & & \\
& & & &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Maize (Kharif).'
Ref:-U.P. 52(146).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Object :-To see the effect of fungicides on the grain yield of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1952. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Hand weedings and earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 8, 16.9.1952 and 24.9.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1). 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{T}-41, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=T-4111\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{K}\)-local.
(2) 4 fungicides : \(\mathrm{F}_{0}=\) Control, \(\mathrm{F}_{1}=\) Agrosan, \(\mathrm{F}_{2}=\) Tillex and \(\mathrm{F}_{3}=\) Ceresan.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(4 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a), (b) \(45^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (O).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2479 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(403.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant. F is significant and interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) & \(=100.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(F\) & \(=116.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=201.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Maize (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :- U.P. 51(192).
Type s- 'DV'.
Object :-To study the effect of fungicides on the grain yield of Maize.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy. (b) N.A. (iii) 22.7.1951. (iv) (a) to (c)N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.9.1951, 3 and 15.10.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=T-41, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=T-4111\) and \(\mathrm{V}=\mathrm{K}\)-local.
(2) 4 fungicides: \(F_{0}=\) Control, \(F_{1}=A\) grosan, \(F_{2}=\) Tillex and \(F_{3}=\) Cersan.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(6^{\prime} \times 47^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (O). The yield of plot containing the variety T-41 and treatment \(F_{\mathbf{2}}\) was missing in Replication II. Hence the analysis was done by applying missing plot technique.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1476 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(186.2 \mathrm{fb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(V\) effect is highly significant. \(F\) effect is significant. Interaction is not significant. (iv) Av. yield of grain in 1b./ac..
\begin{tabular}{l|cccc|c} 
& \(F_{0}\) & \(F_{\mathbf{l}}\) & \(F_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(F_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1486 & 1689 & 1632 & 1883 & 1672 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1405 & 1641 & 1617 & 1738 & 1600 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1130 & 1207 & 1178 & 1101 & 1154 \\
\hline Mean & 1340 & 1513 & 1476 & 1574 & 1476
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two \(V\) marginal means, one of them containing a missing value
S.E. of difference of two V marginal means (none of them contains a missing value)
\(=67.46 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=65.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of difference of two F. marginal means one of them containing a missing value
\(=78.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of difference of two \(F\) marginal mean (none of them containing missing value) \(=76.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of any mean, not containg the missining value, in the body of table
\(=93.10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of mean of missing value in the body of table
\(=94.50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Crop :- Lobia.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

> Ref :- U.P. 53(214). Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To study the effect of varying doses of Calcium, Sluphur, trace elements and iron on growth and yield of Lobia.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) NiI. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12,16.7.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 15,19.6.1953. (b) Dibbling. (c) N.A. (d) Spacing between rows \(-2^{\prime}\) and between plants- \(2^{\prime \prime}\) to \(3^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and T.C. \(100 \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{ft}\). on 5.7.1953. (v) T-1. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control. \(\quad\) 5. Zinc at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Zn .
2. Calcium at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Ca .
6. Copper at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
3. Sulphur at \(50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of S .
7. Molybdenum at \(6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Mo.
4. Borax at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of B.
8. Iron at \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Fe .

Date of manuring 5.7-1953 and 2.8.1953 (trace elements).
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 131^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expcriment
conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(236 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(64.36 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significant.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac. & & \\
Treatment & Ay. yield & Treatment & Ay- yield \\
1. & 174 & 5. & 216 \\
2. & 235 & 6. & 220 \\
3. & 280 & .7. & 216 \\
4. & 293 & 8. & 253 \\
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ S.E./mean \(=32.18 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\)}
\end{tabular}
S.E. \(/\) mean \(=32.18 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Lobia.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Ref :- U.P. 50(95).
Type :- ' \(M\) ':
Object :-To study the effect of varying doses of \(\mathbf{N}\) fertilizers on the yield of Lobia.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram and Linseed. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loạm. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.7.1950. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by mould board and two by desi and one by cultivator plough and plankings. (b) Broadcasting. (c) 6 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Jhansi (medium). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 2 intercultures. (ix) N.A. (x) 8.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

7 doses of \(N\) as \(A / N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15, N_{2}=30, N_{3}=45, N_{4}=60, N_{5}=75\) and \(N_{4}=90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). N applied as top dressing on 6.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(214.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(43.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.

Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc}
\(\mathbf{N}_{6}\) & 113.1 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 144.5 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{8}\) & 187.0 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{3}\) & 199.4 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{4}\) & 267.7 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{8}\) & 309.1 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{4}\) & 280.0 \\
S.E./mean & \(=21.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Lobia.

> Ref :- U.P. 5I(126).

Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn. Lucknow. Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of varying doses of N fertilizers on the yield of Lobia.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) NiI. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.7.1951. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation. Details N.A. (b) Broadcast. (c) 12 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Jhansi (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 intercultures. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.10.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

7 doses of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=15, N_{2}=30, N_{3}=45, N_{4}=60, N_{5}=75\) and \(N_{8}=90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
N applied as top dressing on 26.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop dried due to lack of rains. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of grain. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (i) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experimant conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(342.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(100.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 244.2 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 317.0 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 292.3 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 353.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{4}\) & 426.7 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{5}\) & 414.4 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 349.4 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=58.20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Moong (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref:-U.P. 5:(342).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the residual effect of \(N\) and \(F\) on the yield of \(M\) oong.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.5.1953. (iv) (a) 2 plough with Watt's plough. (b) Broadzasting. (c) N.A. (d) and (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) Moong Type 1 (early). (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) 33.28". (x) 1.7.1953 to 15.7.1953 every 2ad day.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=60\) and \(P_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

The manures were applied in rabi-1952-53 to wheat crop.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 54.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Moong grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(152.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(9.226 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Both \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) effects are highly significant. The interaction \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of moong grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mern \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 129.9 & 141.5 & 163.2 & 144.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 136.5 & 154.9 & 168.2 & 153.2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N a}_{3}\) & 146.5 & 156.5 & 176.5 & 159.8 \\
\hline Mean & 137.6 & 151.0 & 169.3 & 152.6 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(=2.175 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of tatle} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{- \(=3.767 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Moong (Kharif).
Ref:-U.P. 52(338).
Site :m Institutional Res, Farm, B. R. College, Bichpuri.
Type :- ' M '.

```

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{P}\) with and without basal dressing of N on Moong crop and its residual effect on Wheat.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri (Agra). (iii) 1.6.1952. (iv) (a) 1 Palewa, 1 ploughing and pata each by disc harrow and desi plough. (b) Behind the plough in lines. (c) 6 seeds/ac. (d) Rows \(18^{* \prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) NiJ. (vi) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Hoeing of the plots with 'Panchangura' done on 10 th and 11 th June, again weeding and hoeing carried out when the crop was \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) month old. (ix) \(43.03^{*}\). (x) Pickings on 25, 30.7.1952, 4 and 12.8.1952.'
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 basal dressings of Farm compost : \(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No basal dressing and \(\mathbf{B}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Basal dressing at 20 lb ./ac. of N. Sub-plot treatments :

5 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=32, \mathrm{P}_{2}=64, \mathrm{P}_{3}=96\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=128 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Vegetative portion for green manures turned down on 20.8.1952. Compost and Super broadcast on 30.5.1952 followed by plough and pata to mix the manure.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(99^{\prime} \times 84^{\circ}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) and \(42^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (v) Block border \(4^{\prime}\), plot border \(2^{\prime}\), channel effect \(4^{\prime}\) and channel \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and dry weight of shoot. (iv) (a) No. (b) -. ' (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(407.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(67.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(76.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only P effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.


Crop :-Moong.
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Ref : U.P. \(50(96)\).
Type :-‘M’.
Object:-To study the effect of organic and inorganic manures on the nodulation, yield and growth of Moong.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.7.1950. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation done in the field. The field was prepared by two ploughings by mould board plough, one by cultivator, two by desi. One desi ploughing was given to mix fertilizers and manures in the field. (b) Dibbling. (c) 4 seers/ac. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) 40 mds ,/ac. stable manure was mixed in the field as basal manuring. (vi) \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 hoeing and 1 weeding. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 1st picking on 6.10.1950 and 2nd picking on 9.10.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

10 sources of 40 Ib ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{0}=\) Control (no manure), \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=\) Castor cake, \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=\) Linseed cake, \(\mathrm{S}_{3}=\) G.N.C., \(S_{4}=\) Neem cake, \(S_{5}=\) F.Y.M., \(S_{6}=T . C . S_{7}=A / S, S_{8}=A / N\) and \(S_{3}=C / N\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 2 (iv) (a) and (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P」
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(649.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(85.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(iii) Treatments are significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 384.2 & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & 686.6 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 741.4 & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 741.4 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 700.0 & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{7}}\) & 631.7 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 768.3 & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 590.2 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 741.4 & \(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 507.4 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=60.19 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Moong (Kharif).
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow .

Ref :-U.P. 50(128).
Type:-'M'.

Object:-To study the residual effect of N applied to previous crop. Wheat on the growth and yield of the following Kharif crop Moong.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.7.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing by mould board plough, one by cultivator, one cross wise ploughing by desi plough and one planking. (b) Dibbling. (c) 3 seers/ac. (d) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) \(T_{1}\) (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) 1 hoeing and 1 weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 21, 28.8.1950 and 7.9.1950.

2 TREATMENTS:
16 sources to give 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) control (no manure), \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}=A / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) Ammo. Phos. \(S_{4}=\) F.Y.M., \(S_{5}=\) T.C., \(S_{6}=\) Stable manure, \(S_{7}=\) Poultry manure, \(S_{8}=Z_{00}\) excreta, \(S_{9}=\) Castor cake, \(S_{10}=G . N . C ., S_{11}=\) Neem cake, \(S_{19}=\) Mohawa cake, \(S_{18}=\) Mustard cake, \(S_{14}=\) Linseed cake and \(\mathrm{S}_{15}=\) Kurdi cake.
Manures applied to wheat crop during 1949-1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(436 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(41.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{0}\) & 302 & \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) & 373 \\
\hline \(S_{i}\) & 426 & \(\mathrm{S}_{9}\) & 389 \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & 438 & \(\mathrm{S}_{10}\) & 516 \\
\hline \(S_{3}\) & 687 & \(\mathrm{S}_{11}\) & 302 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{4}\) & 466 & \(\mathrm{S}_{12}\) & 410 \\
\hline \(S_{5}\) & 386 & \(\mathrm{S}_{13}\) & 470 \\
\hline \(S_{8}\) & 591 & \(\dot{S}_{14}\) & 339 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) & 482 & \(\mathrm{S}_{13}\) & 392 \\
\hline & S.E./mean & lb.iac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Moong. \\ Ref :-U.P. 52(182). \\ Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. \\ Type :-'M'.}

Object :-To study the effect of different trace elements on growth and quality of Moong.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Barley + Pea and Mustard. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy Loam. (b) N.A, (iii) 7.7.1952. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings. (b) In lines by dibblling. (c) 4 sr ./ac. (v) 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{Nas}, \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, 15 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super and 15 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. (double). Phosphate will be applied \(6^{\circ}\) deep in furrows while preparing the field and \(A / S\) and Pot. Sulphate as top dressing one week before sowing of Moong. (vi) \(T_{1}\) (medium). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.9.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
6. Copper at 6 lb ./ac. of Cu .
2. Calcium at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Ca .
7. Manganese at \(5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Mn .
3. Sulphur at \(50 \mathrm{lb} /\) ac. of \(S\).
8. Molybdenum at 6 lb ./ac. of Mo.
4. Boron at \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(B\).
9. Ferreous sulphate at 2 lb ./ac. of Fe.
5. Zinc at 4 lb ./ac. of Zn .
10. Fallow.

Elements will be applied mixed with fine earth as surface dressing 5 to 6 days before sowing as to secure uniform distribution within the plot.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 10
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4.
(iv) (a) and (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\).
(v) Nil. (vi) Yes:
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain. (iv) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(484.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(131.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 381.3 & 6. & 612.5 \\
2. & 637.6 & & 7. & 346.9 \\
3. & 481.3 & \(\cdots\) & 8. & 612.5 \\
4. & 459.4 & & 9. & 368.8 \\
5. & 462.5 & & \\
& S.E./mean \(:\) & \(=65.9 .1 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Moong. & Ref :-U.P. 50(130) \\
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type:-‘M’.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\), Boron and Calcium on nodulation and yield of Moong.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. '(b) N.A. (iii) 17.7.1950. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by mould board plough, one by cultivator, 3 by desi plough fand planking (b) Dibbling in rows. (c) 3 sr./ac. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) 60 mds. stable manure mixed by desi plough. (vi) \(T_{1}\) (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) 2 hoeings and weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 9,14.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 levels of Gypsum as \(\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac.
(3) 2 levels of Boron as Borax : \(\mathrm{B}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{B}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) No. of nodules per 3 plants, fresh weight of nodules, volume of nodules, dry weight of nodules and yield of grain. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(366 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(35.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{B}\) and interactions \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{C}\) aad \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{B}\) are highly significant, where as main effect of \(\mathbf{P}\) and interaction \(\mathbf{C} \times \mathbf{B}\) are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{C}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{B}_{0}\) & 386 & 368 & 432 & 396 & 399 & 392 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{B}_{1}\) & 331 & 325 & 350 & 336 & 308 & 363 \\
\hline Mean & 359 & 347 & 391 & 366 & 354 & 378 \\
\hline C & 300 & 356 & 404. & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) & 417 & 337 & 378 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{rl} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{P}\) & \(=10.11 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(C\) or \(\mathbf{B}\) & \(=8.25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{C}\) or \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{B}\) & \(=14.30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table \(\mathbf{C \times B}\) & \(=11.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Moong (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 53(379). \\
Site :-Institutional Res. Farm, Bichpuri (Agra). & Type :-'MV'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of different methods of placement of Super on the growth, development and yield of Moong and the residual effect on Wheat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College, Bichpuri (Agra). (iii) 20.7.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by disc harrow and pata. (b) By desi plough in furrows \(1^{\circ}\) deep. (c) 一. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Nil. (viii) Thinning done on 4.8.1953. and \(9^{6}\) distance between plants were maintained within the row. Attack of weeds like Motha (Cyperus rotundus) and other annual weeds (mostly grown in inter spaces) and so weedings done by hand labour on 4, 5.8.1953 and 2, 3.9.1953. (ix) \(10.80^{\circ}\). (x) 8, 14 and 23.9.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties of Moong: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) China moong.
(2) 3 applications of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{7}\) depth in furrows directly below the seed and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{\circ}\) depth in two bands, \(3^{\prime \prime}\) away on either side of sowing line. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied on 30.7.1953. Super finely powdered and sieved before application.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) \(84^{\circ} \times 61^{\prime}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) and \(42^{\prime} \times 19^{\prime}\). (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) Block border 4', Plot border \(2^{\prime}\), channel effect \(4^{\prime}\) and channel \(4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Due to heavy rains on 26.8.1953. water logging occured for few days, some leaves of china moong plants showed dark colour and began to dry up due to water logging condition. (ii) Entire crop of china moong was heavily attacked by the green caterpillars and adults of Blister Beetle (Mylabria). Leaves were eaten up by these insects on 28.8.1953. (iii) Pod, grain yield/plant, grain yield/plot etc. (iv) (a), (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.R.C. Plotwise yield data-N.A.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(225.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(63.36 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(V\) effect is highly significant. \(P\) vs control is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & , & Treatment \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 178.0 & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 250.5 & & 358.1 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 249.1 & & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
S.E./mean & \(=22.40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

> Crop :-Moong (Rati).
> Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 51(98). \\ Type :- 'D'.}

Object:-To stud \(f\) the effect of spraying trace elements on the yield of Moong.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Moong-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.6.1951. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 3.75 srs./ac. (d), (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) Moong type 1 (medium early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.9.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Manganese chloride.
2. 5 lb ./ac. of Zinc sulphate.
3. 5 lb ./ac. of Copper sulphate.
4. 1 lb ./ac. of Boric Acid.
5. No spraying-control.

Date of spraying is 14.8 .1951 ,
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(35.3^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Moong yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(606.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(121.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av, yield \\
1. & 630.0 \\
2. & 585.0 \\
3. & 510.0 \\
4. & 660.0 \\
5. & 645.0 \\
S.E_/mean & \(=60.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Moong (Kahrif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :- U.P. 52(154).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To study the effect of spraying trace elements on the yield of Moong.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Moong-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) 50 lb /ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 27.11.1952. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.6.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 3.75 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Moong type 1 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Picking on 19 and 30.8.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. \(5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Manganese chloride.
2. 5 lb ./ac. of Zinc sulphate.
3. 5 lb ./ac. of Copper sulphate.
4. 1 lb ./ac. of Boric acid.
5. Control-no spraying.

Date of spraying : 26.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(139.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(40.69 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 174.0 \\
2. & 69.0 \\
3. & 112.5 \\
4. & 180.0 \\
5. & 163.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=20.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Moong (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 53(195).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-T0 study the effect of spraying trace elements on the yield of Moong.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Wheat-Moong. (b) Wheat. (c) F.Y.M. and G.M. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1953. (iy) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 6 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Top dressing with \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as A/S on 13.8.1952.
(vi) Moong type 1 (medium-eariy). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.9.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. \(5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Manganese choloride.
2. 5 lb ./ac. of Zinc sulphate.
3. \(5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) : of Copper sulphate.
4. \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Boric acid.
5. Control.

Date of spraying : 18.8.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(36.3^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(195 i\) to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS
(i) \(198.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(18.97 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
613.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1 b ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 220.5 \\
2. & 139.5 \\
3. & 178.5 \\
4. & 222.0 \\
5. & 232.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=9.48 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Gram. \\ Ref:- U.P. 53(138), \\ Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. \\ Type:-'M'.
}

Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}\) and Ca on the yield of Gram.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Maize-Gram. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.10 .1953 . (iv) (a) 3 ploughings (b) Sown behindthe plough. (c) 56 mds/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Gram T-87. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) 5.48". (x) 6.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(A / S\) at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
2. Super at 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. Pot. Sul. at 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\).
4. Gypsum at 60 lb ./ac. of Ca.
5. Control (no manure).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (b) \(^{\prime} 21^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1212 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(24.63 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1359 \\
2. & 1509 \\
3. & 1184 \\
4. & 1124 \\
5. & 884 \\
S.E./mean & \(=17.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Gram (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Pura.

Ref.-U.P. 53(356).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the residual, effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) on Gram crop, having already tested the residual effect on Paddy crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Ni. (b) Paddy crop. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Kanpur ftype 2, loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Pura. (iii). . N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=30\) and \(N_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

These manures were applied in rabi 1952-1953 to the wheat crop. Then residual effect tested on Paddy crop. Then again the present experiment (residual effect).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 9.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(53^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) \(1953-\) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) N.A. (b) -. (vi) NiI. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1478 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 276.4 lb ./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1666 & 1459 & 1636 & 1587 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1235 & 1718 & 1485 & 1479 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & 1223 & 1378 & 1502 & 1368 \\
\hline Mean & 1375 & 1518 & 1541 & 1478 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =65.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =112.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Gram (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 52(276). \\
Site :-Orai (Jalaun). & Type:- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To draw out fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Bundelkhand typè 2 soils and Bundelkhand type 3 soils. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) After application of manure, the field was levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\circ}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super ( 2 plots each replication).

Super in placed at a depth of about \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in the sole of the furrows and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two dest ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 12 villages selected in the district and an unreplicated experiment laid out in each village. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. but is taken to be about \(1 / 40\) ac. (iv) N.A. on cultivators' fields.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Gram and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(587 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 68.55 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 497 \\
2. & 632
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. for treatment } 1 & =19.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. for treatment } 2 & =13.99 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

Crop :-Gram (Rabi).
Site :-Kichha (Nainital).

Ref:-U.P. 53(408).
Type :n'M"

Object :-To draw out fertilizer sehedule for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize in case of 2 trials. and fallow in case of 2 trials. (c) N.A. (ii) Dumat \(\Pi\) in one trial, loamy in one, sandy loam in one and loam (slightly calcareous) in one. (iii) Nil. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) About 6 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 25.9.1953 to 6.10.1953. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.4.1954 to 3.5.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied deep behind victory plough in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Two villages with 2 fields/village were selected in the Tahsil. 3 plots/field. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(33^{\circ} \times 33^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory in 1 trial, good in 2 trials, good (poor germination) in 1 trial. (ii) Attack of gram catter piller in all the trials. (iii) Yield of grain \& Straw (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Severe weeds in all the 4 trials water logging in one trial (in \(P_{1}\) treatments), 1 trial damaged by hailstorm. Expt. conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(564 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(94.28 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 454 \\
2. & 552 \\
3. & 685 \\
S.E./mean & \(=47.14 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Gram (Rabi). \\ Site :-Allahabad Agri. Institute, Allahabad.}

> Ref :-U.P. 53(373).

Type :-‘'C.
Object :-To study the effect of spacing and seed rate on gram yield.
1. Basal conditions :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loamy. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 4.11.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) and (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-87 (N.A.). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) \(1.00^{\circ}\). (x) 30.3 .1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 row spacings :- \(S_{1}=8^{\prime \prime}, S_{8}=12^{\circ}\) and \(S_{8}=16^{\circ}\).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 seed rates : \(-\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{2 0}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{2 5}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathbf{3 0} \mathrm{sr}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(124^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\) (iii) 5. (iv) (a) Mainplot \(40^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) Sub-plot \(30^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\) (v) Replications \(4^{\prime}\) apart, main-plots \(2^{\prime}\) apart and sub-plots \(2^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Treatment values of \(S_{1} R_{2}\) in replication III and \(S_{2} R_{8}\) in replication \(I V\) were estimated as the crop in these two plots had been stolen. Experiment conducted by the Head, Department of Agronomy (A.A.I.)
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1030 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(332.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(158.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrr|l} 
& \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1120 & 1195 & 1170 & 1162 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1045 & 921 & 1145 & 1037 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{3}\) & 871 & 921 & 881 & 891 \\
\hline Mean & 1012 & 1012 & 1065 & 1030
\end{tabular}
S.E of difference of
1. \(S_{1}\) and \(S_{2}\) or \(S_{2}\) and \(S_{3}\) marginal means \(\quad=122.13 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(S_{1}\) and \(S_{2}\) marginal means
\(=123.00 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
'3. \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) or \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{g}}\) marginal means
\(=59.99 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
'4. \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) marginal means
5. \(R_{1}\) and \(R_{2}\) means or \(R_{2}\) and \(R_{1}\) means at the same level of \(S_{2}\) \(=61.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \(=103.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
same level of \(S_{3}\) \(=103.90 \mathrm{lb}\)./as.
7. Two \(R\) means at the same level of \(S_{2}\) \(=100.80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
8. \(R_{1}\) and \(R_{3}\) means at the same level of \(S_{1}\) \(=100.80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
9. \(R_{2}\) and \(R_{1}\) means at the same level of \(S_{3}\) \(=100.80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
10. \(S_{1}\) and \(S_{2}\) or \(S_{1}\) and \(S_{3}\) means at the same level of \(R_{2}\) \(=152.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
11. \(S_{1}\) and \(S_{3}\) or \(S_{2}\) and \(S_{3}\) means at the same level of \(R_{2}\) \(=152.91 \mathrm{lb}-/ \mathrm{ac}\).
12. Two \(S\) means at the same level of \(R_{1}\) \(=146.56 \mathrm{la} \cdot / \mathrm{ac}\).
13. \(S_{2}\) and \(S_{3}\) means at the same level of \(R_{2}\) \(=146.56 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
14. \(S_{1}\) and \(S_{2}\) means at the same level of \(R_{3}\) \(=146.56 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

> Crop :- Gram (Rabi).
> Site :- Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 52(248).
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of topping on Gram yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No.
(b) N.A. I(c) N.A.
(ii) (a) N.A.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 10.10.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 30 sr //ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-87 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No topping.
2. One topping.
3. Two toppings.

First topping done on 9.11.1952. Second topping done on 7.12.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N,A. (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 40^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C. (K), plotwise data N.A.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 735.9.
(ii) and (iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 773.5 \\
2. & 818.7 \\
3. & 615.5
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Gram (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(308).
Site :-Raghunath Purwa (Gonda).
Type :-‘D’.

Object :-To test the effectiveness of insecticides for the control of cut worms-Agrotis Spp.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) to (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Dusting the soil with \(10 \%\) D.D.T. at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Dusting the soil with \(10 \%\) B.H.C. at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. Dusting the soil with \(10 \%\) Toxaphene at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Poison bait with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. and bran ( 1 part \(5 \%\) B.H.C. in 10 parts of bran) at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. Control (no treatment).

Treatments applied on 23.1.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(33^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Population of cutworms on different dates, \(\%\) of mortality 2 days after application of treatment on 25.1 .1953 and 8 days after application of treatment on 1.2.1953. (iv) (a) No. )b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) p is \% morta hity. Expt. cunducted by Ento. (K) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(40.88 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) \(7.96 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant. (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean value \(\left(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\right)\) & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Av. \% mortality \\
(transformed back)
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 60.46 & 75.43 \\
2. & 59.14 & 73.45 \\
3. & 39.15 & 39.97 \\
4. & 42.68 & 45.99 \\
5. & 2.99 & 0.77 \\
S.E./mean & \(=3.98\) &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Gram (Rabi).
Site :-Bardari Farm, (Rampur).
Ref :-U.P. 53(163).
Type :-'D'.
Object :-To find out a suitable control measure against Gram pod borer-Heliothis armigora Hulen.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) October, 1953. (vii) . Unirrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) April, 1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Dusting the crop with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. at 25 lb ./ac.
2. Dusting the crop with \(5 \%\) D.D.T. at 25 lb ./ac.
3. Spraying the crop with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. suspension at 50 gallons/ac.
4. Spraying the crop with \(0.25 \%\) B.H.C. suspension at 50 gallons/ac.
5. Control (no treatment).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(37^{\circ} \times 37^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not good. (ii) Incidence of grain-pod borer observed. (iii) Incidence (\%) of gram borer. (iv) (a) 1953 -continued. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by Ento (K). on cultivators' fields. The incidence was very low during the season, henze conclusive results could not be drawn.
s. RESULTS :
(i) 14.50 degree.
(ii) 2.2414 degree.
(iii) Treatments are significantly different.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean value \(\left(\sin ^{-r} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\right)\) & Transformed back mean \\
percentages
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Lahi (Rabi).
Site :- Kichha (Nainital.)

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 53(407).}

Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To draw out fertilizer sehejule for a griculturally important soil types.
1. BÁSAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize in case of 11 trials, Fallow in case of 2 trials (c) N.A. (ii) Loam in case of 10 trials, sandy loam in case of 2 trials and light loam in case of 1 trial.' (iii) Nil. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) About 6 to 8 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 24.9.1953 to 18.11 .1953 . (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.12.1953 to 13.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

Super applied \(4^{*}\) deep behind the plough.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 3 villages were selected in the Tahsil. In first village 7 fields, in second, one field and in the third village, 5 fields were selected with 3 plots/field. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(33^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good in 11 trials, normal in 2 trials, occurrence of lodging in 4 trials. (ii) Slight damage by pests in 4 trials and N.A. for 9 trials. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953-continued. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nii (vii) Expt. conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(842 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(92.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 693 \\
2. & 864 \\
3. & 970 \\
S.E./mean & \(=25.76 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop : Lahi and Gram (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 53(410). \\
Site :-Kichha (Nainital). & Type :-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object : To draw out fer tilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. B HSAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam for 4 trials and lcam for 2 trials. (iii) Nil. (iv) N.A.
(v) (a) About 6 to 8 ploughings by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) Gram and Lahi in the ratio of \(8: 3\). (d) and
(e) N.A. (vi) 27.9.1953 to 30.9.1953. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.1.1954 to 10.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
- 2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{3}\) as Super.
3. 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

Super applied \(4^{\circ}\) deep in bands behind the victory plough.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 6 fields selected in the village in Tehsil with 3 plots/field. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good in case of 5 trials, Poor to gced in case of 1 trial. (ii) Caterpiller and cut worm to green crop. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) \(\operatorname{No}\). (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Only yield data for lahi crop has been analysed. The gram crep has failed ccrrpletely in 5 out of 6 trials. Due to cater piller and cut worm the gram crop failed completely in case of 3 trials. One trial was not harvested tecarse of poor yield. One trial was spoiled by wild animals. Expt. conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS •
(i) \(1080 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(\quad 40.85 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 969 \\
2. & 1094 \\
3. & 1176 \\
S-E./mean & \(=16.68 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Peas. : Ref:- U.P. 51(145).
Site :- Govt. Botanical Gardéns, Agri. College, Kanpur. Type :- 'CV'.
Object :-To find out the inter-relation of varieties and spacings on early and total yield of Peas.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow in kharif. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Gangetic alluvial type, light loam broun in colour and of fine texture. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing. (b) Dibbling. (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding with khurpi. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 spacings : \(S_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{2}=9^{\circ}\).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varistiys: \(V_{1}=N .3+23\) (eatly), \(\left.V_{4}=14\right) 3\) (late) and \(V_{8}=E . A\) (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-piot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(57^{\prime} \times 44.5^{\prime}\). (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(26^{\circ} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Early and total grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) In all three pickings were done by hand. Plot wise yield. The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2051.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(754.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(334.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only V effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pods in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 2298 & 2029 & 2029 & 2119 \\
\hline Sa & 2323 & 1786 & 1843 & 1984 \\
\hline Mean & 2310 & 1907 & 1936 & 2051 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. S marginal means
\[
=251.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\]
2. V marginal means \(\quad=136.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. V means at the same level of \(S \quad=192.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(S\) means at the same level of \(V \quad=296.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

> Crop :- Peas.
> Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref:- U.P. 51(220).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of Agrosan G.N. and ceresan on yield of Pea.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1951. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-18 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2, 12, 22.2.1952 and 3.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Seed treated with Agrosan G.N. with the ratio of \(2: 1000\) parts by weight of fungicide to seed.
2. Seed treated with Ceresan with the ratio \(2: 1000\) parts by weight of fungicide to seed.
3. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 23 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\prime}-8^{\prime \prime} \times 7^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging. Crop condition N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Green pea yieid. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 9.05 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.6053 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of green peas in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.40 \\
2. & 8.99 \\
3. & 8.76 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.3026\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Peas. (Rabi).
Ref:-U.P. 49(241).
Site :- Castle Grant. Orchard, B. R. College, Agra. Type :~'CDV’.
Object :-To study vernalisation response in relation to the yield of green §pods of the two varieties of - garden Pea.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) Cultivated in summer months, ploughed twice with soil turning plough and 3 times with desi plough, every time followed by levelling with pata. (b) Dibbling. (c) N.A. (d) \(3^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}\). (e) 一. (v) Compost at 18 seers/plot. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.1.1950, 3.2.1950 and then pickings at an interval of 7 days upto 5.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=20.10 .1949\) and \(D_{2}=5.11\).1949.
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(V_{1}=I . P .29\) and \(V_{2}=\) English abundance.
(2) 2 vernalisation (doses of chilling) : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=\) No chilling (control) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=21\) days chilling.

Vernalised seeds were sown and also control seeds which were brought to the same stage of germination.
3. DESIGN :
(j) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(63^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}\).
(b) \(12^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Total yield of green pods and straw and other ' characters studied. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. No plot wise yield were available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(183.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(50.67 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(20.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Ceffect is significant and interaction \(D \times V\) is highly significant. Other effects are not significank
(iv) Av. yield of green pods in lb./ac.
\[
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{C}_{0} & =192.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\mathrm{C}_{1} & =174.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. } / \mathrm{mean} & =5.02 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 215.2 & 174.4 & 194.8 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{2}\) & 162.2 & 181.5 & 171.9 \\
\hline Mean & 188.7 & 178.0 & 183.3
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two.
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. D marginal means } & =17.91 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 2. } V \text { marginal means } & =7.10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { 3. } V \text { means at the same level of } D & \end{array}\)
4. \(D\) means at the same levels of \(V\)
\[
=19.27 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\]

\section*{Crop :- Garden Pea (Rabi). \\ Site :- Institutional Farm, B.R. College Bichpuri, Agra. \\ Ref:- U P. 52(333). \\ Type:- 'C'. \\ Object:-To study the effect of different dates of sowing and staking on the germination, growth, yield and quality of Garden Pea.}
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat and the Fallow. (c) Nu. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) Field ploughed four times with dise harrow drawn by tractor. Each ploughing was followed by planking to make the soil fine and compact. (b) Seed drill (nai) attached behind a desi plough. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Top dressing at 20 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) after one and a half month of sowing under each date of sowing. The fertilizer was placed in bands in between two rows and mixed in soil by hoeing \(120 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). of M.C. before last ploughings. (vi) English Abundance (N.A.). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding after irrigation. (ix) N.A. (x) From 30.1.1953 to 3.3.1953 at week intervals.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Maln-plot treatments :
3 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=30.9 .1952, D_{2}=14.10 .1952\) and \(D_{2}=28.11 .1952\).
Sub-plot treatmonts :
2 levels of staking: \(S_{0}=\) No staking and \(S_{1}=\) Staking.
Staking : When the seedlings attained a height of \(6^{\circ}\) support was given for further growth.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication, 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Crop stand, yield of Pea.- (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. No plotwise yield data was available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(3572 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(434.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(685.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(D\) effect is highly significant, \(S\) effect is significant while interaction \(D \times S\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pea in lb./ac.


> . Crop :- Masoor (Rabi).
> Site :- Malkota (Nainital).

Ref :-U P. 52(280).
Type :- \({ }^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To draw out fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) 2 blocks on loam (non calcareous) and block on loam (slightly calcareous). (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) As practised locally. No details available. After application of manure, the field was levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) At a distance of \(1^{\prime \prime}-2^{\circ}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

Super placed at depth of about \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep at sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made either by the iron plough or two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with \(\mathbf{3}_{\text {, }}\) eplications. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very poor and stunted growth. (ii) N.A. (iii) Masoor grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (t) acd (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. on cultivator' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(115 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(20.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 80 \\
2. & 123 \\
3. & 143 \\
S.E./mean & \(=11.59 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Potato (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 50(308). \\
Site :- Castle Grant Orchard B.R. College, Agra. & Type :- ‘M’.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) applied singly and in combination on Potato crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy Ioam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College, Agra. (iii) 10 and 11.10.1950. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with soil turning ploughing pata. (b) Sowing in ridges by hand at \(4^{\circ}\) depth. (c) \(15 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(15^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) Gola (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 hoeing, 1 weeding and 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 25 to 28.1.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{4}=150\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=300 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\),
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0 \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\).

Super spread in rows at a distance of \(1 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) where the ridges were to be prepared for planting tubers on 7 and 8.10.1950. A/S and Pot. Sub. as top dressing after 40 days of sowing i.e. on 28.11.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) Confd. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication and 9 plots/block.
(b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime} \times 1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Fresh and dry wt. of tuters, yield per plot etc. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Nil (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.
g. RESULTS :
(i) 3.39 ton/ac.
(ii) \(1.6156 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 2.48 & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 3.02 & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & 3.62 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3.53 & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3.64 & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3.36 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 4.17 & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3.51 & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{3 . 1 8}\)
\end{tabular}
S.E./of any mean \(=0.3808\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra.

Ref :-U.P. 50(307).
Type : \(\mathbf{-}^{-} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) applied singly and in combination on Potato crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College, Agra. (iii) 1 and 2.11.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughing by desi plough followed by pata on 12.10.1950, cross ploughing by desi plough followed by pata on 13 and \(18 . .10 .1950\), ploughing by soil turning plough, followed by pata on 17.10.1950. (b) On ridges by hand at \(4^{\prime \prime}\) depth. (c) \(5 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\). (e) 1 . (v) N.A. (vi) Phulwa. (N.A.) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 28 and 29.3.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=80\) and \(N_{2}=160 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=240\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=480 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\). .
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\quad \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=107\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}=214 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Fertilizers mixed with soil by means of rakes on 21.10.1950 and then ridges made on 26.10.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) confounded.
(ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication and 9 plots/block.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 2.
(iv) (a) \(24^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\).
(b) \(21^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Height of the plant, no. of green leaves per plant, no. of dry leaves per plant, no. of branches per plant, dry weight of plant, total no. of tubers per plant, fresh wt. of tubers, dry wt. of tubers and yield per plot. (iv) (a) and (b) Nil. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b). Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.R.C. Plot wise yield N.A.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(6.00 \cdot\) ton/ac.
(ii) 0.5616 ton/ac.
(iii) \(N, P, K\) effects and interactions \(N \times P\) and \(N \times K\) are all highly significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 1 & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \begin{tabular}{l}
\[
x^{I}
\] \\
Mean
\end{tabular} & \(K_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & & 1.99 & 2.60 & 3.59 & 2.73 & 2.32 & 2.67 & 3.19 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & & 4.53 & 6.74 & 7.68 & 6.32 & 5.73 & 6.33 & 6.87 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & & 6.46 & 9.55 & 10.87 & 8.96 & 7.71 & 8.72 & 10.45 \\
\hline Mean & & 4.33 & 6.30 & 7.38 & 6.00 & 5.25 & 5.91 & 6.84 \\
\hline & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of any table} & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.1872 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =0.2293 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 48(126).
Site:- Institutional Res. Farm, B.R. College, Bichpuri (Agra). Type:- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of different N manures on the yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam, deficient in nitrogen and humus. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College, Bichpuri. (iii) 8 and 9.10.1948. (iv) (a) Ploughings on 13.8.1948 and 6.9.1948, by soil turning plough, on \(26.8 .1948,23,28\) and 29.9 .1948 by desl plough followed by pata. (b) Sown behind the plough \(6^{\prime \prime}\) deep. (c) 6 mds./ac. (d) \(18^{7} \times 12^{\circ}\). (e) - . (v) F.Y.M. at 10 C.L. for the field of 1.5 ac. in July was ploughed. (vi) Phulwa (in good sprouting condition). (vii) lrrigated. (viii) 2 earthings and 1 weeding. (ix) 3.20. (x) 1 to 9.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 sources of \(N: \quad S_{1}=A / S, S_{2}=\) castor cake and \(S_{3}=\) municipal compost.
(2) 4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=80\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Manuring on 6.10 .1948 with compost and powdered cake by spreading. A/S top dressed on 20.11.1948.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) \(25^{\prime} \times 267^{\prime}\). (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(26^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{2}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. (ii) Nil. (iii) Weights of plants, no. of leaves of the plants, no. of branches, fresh and dry wt. of the plant, no. of tubers for two plants, moisture \(\%\) and yield and gradation in big, medium and small tubers. (iv) (a) No. (b) -. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nii. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was (conducted by B R.C. Neither plot wise yield data nor two way table is given.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2.07 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.5298 ton/ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) ard \(\mathbf{S}\) effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1.76 & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 1.63 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1.97 & \(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2.18 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\) & 2.92 & \(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2.16 \\
& & \(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 2.31 \\
S.E./mean & 0.1081 ton/ac. & S.E./mean & 0.1248 ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato.
Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :-U.P. 51(8)
Type :-‘M'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11 .1951 . (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by tractor and 2 by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 26 seeds/rows with 12 rows/plot. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nit. (vi) Phulwa (Dohan:. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 9 and 10.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=\mathbf{0}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=150\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=300 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

All manures applied by broadcast at the time of spray.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) \(233^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(25^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\) : (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of mosaic incidence. (iii) Germination and Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1951-continued. (b), (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 7.28 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.7047 ton/ac.
(iii) NP and effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 4.76 & 5.48 & 4.86 & 5.03 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 7.74 & 8.22 & 8.94 & 8.30 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 7.54 & 9.30 & 8.66 & 8.50 \\
\hline Mean & 6.68 & 7.67 & 7.49 & 7.28 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of any \\
S.P. of bod
\end{tabular} & mean & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.2034 \text { ton. } / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& \\
& =0.3524 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Potato.}

Ref :-52(38).
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combinations on the yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (i) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(24,25.10 .1952\). (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 24 seeds/row in \(16 \mathrm{rows} /\) plot. (d) \(1.5^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa (cold storage). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) \(\mathbf{2}\) weedings. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 14.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=150\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=300 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Manures applied by broadcast at sowing time.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) \(230^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(25^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1951-continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(6.16 \quad\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) 1.0401 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only N effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yiefid of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& & & \\
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{I}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 4.40 & 6.28 & 5.44 & 5.37 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 6.58 & 6.52 & 6.66 & 6.59 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 5.70 & 6.76 & 7.06 & 6.51 \\
\hline Mean & 5.56 & 6.52 & 6.39 & 6.16 \\
& & & \\
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=0.3003\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & & \(=0.5200\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Potato. \\ Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad. \\ Ref :-U.P. 53(15). \\ Type :-‘M'.}

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) fertilizers applied alone and in combination on the yield of Potato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam (b) N:A. (iii) \(25-26 \cdot 10.1953\). (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) and (d) 16 rows per plot and 26 seeds per row, total seed used=7.70 mds. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Phulwa (cold storage) in sprouted condition. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 hoeing and 2 earthing. (ix) 2.79". (x) 7, 8.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=150\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=300 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as super applied on 24/25 oct. 1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) \(9 . \quad\) (b) N.A. (iii) \(4 . \quad\) (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime} . \quad\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic infection telow \(5 \%\) checked by using bigger and cut seed. (iii) Germination and yield of potato.. (iv) (a) 1951-continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Tho experiment was conducted by E.B. (R)
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.50 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii). 0.5009 ton./ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{C}}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 4.56 & 4.98 & 5.04 & 4.86 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 5.08 & 6.42 & 6.21 & 5.90 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 5.27 & 5.67 & 6.25 & 5.73 \\
\hline Mean & 4.97 & 5.69 & 5.83 & 5.50
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.1446\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of the body of table & \(=0.2504\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato.
Site :mGovt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukabad.

Ref: U.P. 51(105).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{\sim}^{\mathbf{\prime}}{ }^{\mathbf{M}}\).

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1951. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with tractor and another 2 by desi plough. (b) Seeds were put in the lines. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa (Dohan) seeds in sprouted condition. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing and 1 weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.19.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac. of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{1} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=150\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=300 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(25^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\) (v) \(1^{\prime}\) to \(3^{\prime}\) between plots and \(3^{\prime}\) to \(4^{\prime}\) between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1951-N.A. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 7.09 ton./ac.
(ii) 0.6478 ton./ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. Yield of potato in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 4.63 & 5.34 & 4.75 & 4.91 \\
\(\dot{N}_{1}\) & 7.54 & 7.88 & 8.85 & 8.09 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & 7.35 & 9.05 & 8.45 & 8.28 \\
\hline Mean & 6.51 & 7.42 & 7.35 & 7.09
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=0.3239\) ton./ac.

Crop :- Potato.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :- U.P. 52(13).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the effect of \(N\) and \(P\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Potato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam (Farrukhabad type 2). (b) N.A. (iii) 24, 25.10.1952. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings followed by para towards the end of Sept., 4 further ploughings followed by pata. (b) Seed sown on ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Sanai turned in after six weeks of growth. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=150\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=300 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

A/S applied as surface dressing by broadcast and Super placed in bands beneath the ridges on 24, 25.10.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(25^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (treated plots appeared to be \(3-4\) times more vigorous than the control plots). (ii) Nil. (iii) Weight of potato. (iv) (a) 1951-N.A. (b), (c) Yes. (v) (a) Kalai, Raya, Varanasi, Tissuhi, Matkota, Bharari, Atarra and Pura. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by A.C.
5. . RESULTS :
(i) 5.99 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.0114 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 4.28 & 6.11 & 5.29 & 5.23 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 6.40 & 6.34 & 6.48 & 6.41 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 5.54 & 6.57 & 6.86 & 6.32 \\
\hline Mean & 5.41 & 6.34 & 6.21 & 5.99 \\
& & & \\
\\
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=0.2920\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & & \(=0.5057\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Potato (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 53(360) \\
Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad. & Type:-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) applied alone and in combination on the yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Rabi-Potato and then Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(25,26.10 .1953\). (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by victory, 2 by Meston and 3 by desi plough. Pata also applied. (b) Sown on ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) Sanai turned in. (vi) N.A: (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A: (ix) \(2.69^{\circ}\). (x) 7, 8.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{2}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) . 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=150\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=300 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Super applied through dibbling beneath the ridges, before field preparation. A/S broadcasted on 24.10.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good growth. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato tuber yield. (iv) (a) 1951-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) There was rain during the growth period of the potato tubers which made the soil compact from the top. The tubers could not get the chance to develop freely. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.46 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.5046 ton/ac.
(iii) N and P effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potatd in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 4.53 & 4.94 & 5.00 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 5.05 & 6.39 & 6.18 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 5.24 & 5.63 & 6.22 \\
\hline Mean & 4.94 & 5.65 & 5.80 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table
\(=0.1457\) ton./ac.
\(=0.2523\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :- Potato. \\ Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.}

Ref :- U.P. 49(54).
Type :-'M'.
Object:-To study the effect of different doses of super on the yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.11.1949. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(200 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). applied on 19.11.1949, Castor cake at \(10 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). on 21.11.1949, 1 md. 14 seers 4 chs. Super on 22.11.1949 and A/S at 21 mds/ac. on 2, 3.1.1950. (vi) Phulwa (large size \(11^{\prime \prime}-2^{\circ}\) ) in sprouted condition. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 23, 25.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

5 doses of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=25, \mathrm{P}_{2}=50, \mathrm{P}_{3}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) Plots \(3^{\prime}\) apart and blocks \(4^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) No. - (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 7.41 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.4680 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\therefore\) \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 7.45 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 7.40 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 6.86 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 7.54 \\
S.E./mean & \(\mathbf{7 . 7 8}\) \\
& \(=\mathbf{0 . 1 9 1 1}\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res, Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :-U.P. 50(14).
Type : ‘‘M'.

Object:-To study the effect of different doses of Super on the yield of Potato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Ghunyan (vegetable). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(14,15.11 .1950\). (iv) (a) 6 ploughings before sowing. (b) N.A. (c) \(9^{\circ}\) apart. (d) \(2^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) City refuse at 350 mds/ac. on 2, 3.10.1950. A/S as top dressing at 11 seer/plot on 3, 4.1.1951. (vi) Phuhwa (cold storage). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings up. (ix) N.A. (x) 11 to 20.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

5 doses of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=25, \mathrm{P}_{2}=50, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
All manures applied at the time of sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) plots \(2.5^{\prime}\) apart and blocks \(2^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 11.81 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.9591 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 11.77 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 11.74 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 11.45 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 12.02 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 12.08 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.4289\) ton./ac.
\end{tabular}

1

Crop s-Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 51(4).
Type :-'M'.
Object :-To study effect of \(N, P\) and \(K\) on quality and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Jowar. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25,26.10.1951. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A.
(d) \(1.75^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) Kalmi Dosala and Kalmi new for 2 replications each. (vii) Irrigated \({ }^{\bullet}\)
(viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 10 to 13.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as A/S: \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=50\) and \(N_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Potash: \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) broadcast, \(\mathbf{K}\) applied in furrows at the time of sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.53 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.7192 ton/ac.
(iii) N and P effects are highly significant. Other effect and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & Mean & \(K_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 3.98 & 4.24 & 4.59 & 4.27 & 4.22 & 4.20 & 4.40 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 5.12 & 5.94 & 6.33 & 5.80 & 5.49 & 6.11 & 5.79 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 5.86 & 7.05 & 6.69 & 6.53 & 6.28 & 6.58 & 6.74 \\
\hline Mean & 4.99 & 5.74 & 5.87 & 5.53 & 5.33 & 5.63 & 5.64 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & 4.70 & 5.63 & 5.67 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow{2}{*}{.}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 5.30 & 5.64 & 5.95 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) & 4.96 & 5.96 & 6.00 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E of any marginal mean \(\quad=0.1199\) ton/ac.
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=0.2076\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(22).
Type :-‘M'.

Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}\) and K on quality and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(24,25.10 .1952\). (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(1.75^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa large. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 18 to 23.2.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=50\) and \(N_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Potash : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N and P broadcast, K applied in furrows at the time of sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic incidence in minute form (traces). (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954. (b) Yes.
(c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 9.07 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8803 ton/ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) effects are highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 6.21 & 6.40 & 7.26 & 6.60 & 6.59 & 6.56 & 6.65 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 9.38 & 9.54 & 9.91 & 9.61 & 9.78 & 9.54 & 9.52 \\
\hline . \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 10.70 & 11.15 & 11.19 & 11.01 & 10.96 & 10.93 & 11.15 \\
\hline Mean & 8.76 & 9.03 & 9.43 & 9.07 & 9.11 & 9.61 & 9.11 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & 8.91 & 9.09 & 9.33 & & & & \\
\hline \(K_{1}\) & 8.55 & 9.11 & 9.36 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.83 & 8.89 & 9.61 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of any marginal mean \\ S.E. of body of table}
\(=0.1467\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=0.2541\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop:-Potato (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :-U.P. 53(7).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To test the effect of N, P and \(K\) on quality and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1953 and 1.11.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 10.01 cwt /ac. (d) \(21^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as castor cake. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) Not recorded. (x) 10.3.1954. to 14.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=50\) and \(N_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N and \(\mathbf{P}\) broadcast, K applied in furrows at the time of sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 27.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(18^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A.. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R)

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 12.06 ton./ac.
(ii) 1.1368 ton./ac.
(iii) N and P effects are highly significant. Other effect and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 9.40 & 10.28 & 10.58 & 10.09 & 10.10 & 10.12 & 10.04 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 11.99 & 12.63 & 12.97 & 12.53 & 12.62 & 12.73 & 12.24 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 13.05 & 14.03 & 13.63 & 13.57 & 13.50 & 13.42 & 13.79 \\
\hline Mean & 11.48 & 12.31 & 12.39 & 12.06 & 12.07 & 12.09 & 12.02 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 11.22 & 12.62 & 12.38 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 11.64 & 12.44 & - 12.19 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) & 11.58 & 11.88 & 12.61 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table
\(=0.1893\) ton. \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=0.3282\) ton./ac.

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Type s- \({ }^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) applied at different times on yield of Potato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4,5.11.1948. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 18 to 20.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) applied at 1st earthing: \(N_{0}=0, N_{3}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50\) Ib.ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) applied at \(2 n d\) earthing : \(M_{0}=0, M_{1}=25\) and \(M_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(38^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 5.28 ton./ac.
(ii) 0.6865 ton./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton//ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & M & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 5.30 & 4.75 & 4.91 & 4.99 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & ! 5.67 & 5.31 & 5.12 & 5.37 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 5.25 & 5.59 & 5.58 & 5.47 \\
\hline Mean & 5.41 & 5.22 & 5.20 & 5.28 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table
\(=0.1982\) ton. \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). \(=0.3432\) ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Potato (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 49(47). \\
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) applied at different times on yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No.
(b) and (c) N.A.
(ii) (a) Light loam.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 28.10.1949.
(iv) (a) to (e) N.A.
(v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa large : (ordinary store). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 earthings. ' (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 6 to 9.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) applied at 1st earthing: \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) applied at 2 nd earthing: \(\mathrm{M}_{0}=0, \mathrm{M}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 23^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.96 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.7440 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.*
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \multirow{2}{*}{ Mean } \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 5.45 & 8.25 & 6.25 & 6.65 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 7.58 & 6.54 & 9.67 & 7.93 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.04 & 9.96 & 9.91 & 9.30 \\
\hline Mean & 7.02 & 8.25 & 8.61 & 7.96
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table
\(=0.5035\) ton/ac.
\(=0.8720\) ton/ac.

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 50(3).
Type:- ' \(M\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of N applied at different times on yield of Potato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
- (i) (a) No. (b) Maize. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.11.1950. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Kolmi sala (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 24 to 28.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as A/S applied at 1st earthing: \(\quad N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50\) lb./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) applied at \(2 n d\) earthing: \(M_{0}=0, M_{2}=25\) and \(M_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.09 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.7323 ton/ac.
(iii) N effect is significant, M effect is highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(M_{0}\) & \(M_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 6.64 & 7.02 & 7.20 & 6.95 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.04 & 832 & 8.62 & 8.33 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.20 & 9.30 & 9.47. & 8.99 \\
\hline Mean & 7.63 & 8.21 & 8.43 & 8.09
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.2114 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =0.3662 \text { ton/ac. }\end{array}\)

\section*{Crop :-Potato (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.}

Ref :-U.P. 51(3).
Type:- \({ }^{6} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of N applied at different times on yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Green manuring with sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loعm. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.10 .1951 . (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nib (vi) Kalmi Dosala. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) 2 earihings. (ix) N.A. (x) 7,8 and 9.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) applied at first earthing : \(N_{0}=0, N_{2}=25\) and \(N_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) applied at second earthing: \(M_{0}=0, M_{1}=25\) and \(M_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) : N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1951. (b), (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Ni. (vii) Tho expt, conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 7.86 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8158 ton/ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant, M effect is significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{M}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 6.66 & 7.42 & 8.13 & 7.40 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 7.00 & 7.96 & 7.71 & 7.56 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.15 & 8.75 & 9.00 & 8.63 \\
\hline Mean & 7.27 & 8.04 & 8.28 & 7.86 \\
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=0.2355\) ton/ac. & \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=0.4079\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(29).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of different sources of N on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Moong type-1. (c) Castor cake at \(10 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). iii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.11.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa (well sprouted). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 21 and 22.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) at \(50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
2. \(A / S / N\) at 50 lb ./ac. of N .
3. \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
4. Control (no manure).

Manures applied on 12.12.1952.
DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(60^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1952 -continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The expt. conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.62 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.7591 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.11 \\
2. & 8.88 \\
3. & 9.34 \\
4. & 7.14 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.3796\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 53(4).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Type:- "MP',

```

Object :-To study the effect of different sources of N on Potato yield.
1. BAS AL CONDITIONS ;
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.10.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) \(3.32 \mathrm{cwts} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(18^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) \(90 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). of night soil. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings (ix) N.A. (x) 4.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. \(C / N\) at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
2. \(A / S / N\) at \(50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. A/S at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
4. Control (no manure).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(17.5^{\prime} \times 30.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\) (v) \(1.25^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic incidence below \(5 \%\) which was checked by using bigger seed size and cut seed. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R)
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.67 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.4937 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highily significant.
(iv) Av. yield of Potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 14.11 \\
2. & 13.35 \\
3. & 14.08 \\
4. & 13.13 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.2016\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:-U.P. 52(27).
Typé :-'M'.
Object :-To study the efficacy of different manures and fertilizers on quality and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Green manuring with Sanai (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11 .1952 (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Sanal was turned in at the sowing time. (vi) Phulwa large. (vil) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N,A, (x) 11.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
6. G.N.C. at \(16.15 \mathrm{lb} . /\) plot.
2. F.Y.M. at 246 lb ./plot.
7. Castor cake at 14.88 lb . and B.M, at 4.62 lb ./plot.
3. Castor cake at 17.56 lb ./plot.
8. F.Y.M. at 205 lb . and B.M. at \(4.62 \mathrm{lb} . /\) plot.
4. A/S at \(4.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{plot}\),
9. A/S at 4.82 lb . and B.M. at 4.82 lb ./plot.
5. \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S} / \mathrm{N}\) at \(3.94 \mathrm{ib} . /\) plot.

Treatments 2 to 6 give 100 lb . of N , while 7 to 9 give 100 lb . of \(\mathrm{N}+1 \mathrm{lCO} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{z}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\). Castor cake was applied a day before sowing on 7.11.1952 in finely powdered form.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Very good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1952-cogtd. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 13.12 , ton/ac.
(ii) 0.5377 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 12.26 & 6. & 13.17 \\
\hline 2. & 12.72 & 7. & 13.41 ' \\
\hline 3. & 13.60 & 8. & 12.60 \\
\hline 4. & 13.38 & 9. & 12.98 \\
\hline 5. & 13.95 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :~ U.P. 53(2).
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To find the efficacy of different manures and fertilizers on quality and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) San ai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.10.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 5.77 cwt ./ac. (d) \(18^{*} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.3.1934.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
6. G.N.C. at 16.15 lb /plot.
2. F.Y.M. at 246 lb ./plot.
3. Castor cake at \(17.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{plot}\).
7. Castor cake at 14.88 lb /plot. and B.M. at \(4.62 \mathrm{lb} . /\) plot.
4. A/S at \(4.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{plot}\).
8. F.Y.M. at \(205 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{plot}\). and B.M. at 4.52 lb ./plot.
5. A/S/N at 3.94 lb ./plot.
9. \(A / S\) at 4.82 lb . and B.M. at \(4.82 \mathrm{lb} . /\) plot.

Treatments 2 to 6 give 100 lb ./ac. of N while 7 to 9 give 100 lb /ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied on 17.10.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(23.5^{\prime} \times 22.5^{\prime}\) (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.25^{\prime}\) a lround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Incidence of mosaic below \(5 \%\) and checked by using bigger seed size and cut seed. (iii) Germi-nation and yield. (iv) (a) 1952 -contd. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 11.16 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8983 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 10.05 & 6. & 12.00 \\
2. & 10.36 & 7. & 11.81 \\
3. & 12.57 & 8. & 11.50 \\
4. & 11.55 & 9. & 10.14 \\
5. & 10.48 & & \\
& & & \\
& & S.E./mean & \(=0.4492\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(17),
Type :- ' M '.

Object:-To study the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) on the quality and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11 .1950 . (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\) (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Kalmi Sala. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 18 to 20.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=50\) and \(N_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super-applied just before sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\), (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of mosaic incidence. (iii) Potato and tuber yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v)
(a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS
(i) 8.73 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.7516 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrrr|l} 
& \(P_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{1}\) & 1 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 7.50 & 6.81 & 6.89 & 7.07 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 8.53 & 9.35 & 9.70 & 9.19 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 9.45 & 10.14 & 10.16 & 9.92 \\
\hline Mean & 8.49 & 8.77 & 8.92 & 8.73
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
\(=0.2169\) ton/ac.
S.E. of body of table
\[
=0.3758 \text { ton/ac. }
\]

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 49(51).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{9}} \mathbf{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) on quality and yield of Kalm iPotato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.11 .1949 . (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Kalmi (large). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 14 and 15.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\mathrm{O}_{9} \mathrm{~N}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=25\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as B.M. applied on 16.12.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A, (iii) 4. (iv) (a), N.A. (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 24^{\circ}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of potato. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R)
5. RESULTS:
(i) 9.04 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.0784 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 8.09 & 10.00 & 10.36 & 9.48 \\
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 7.88 & 8.56 & 9.96 & 8.80 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 7.81 & 9.67 & 9.00 & 8.83 \\
\hline & 7.93 & 9.41 & 9.77 & 9.04
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table
\(=0.3113\) ton./ac.
\(=0.5392\) ton./ac.

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Karipur.

Ref:-U.P. 50(19).
Type:-‘M.

Object :-To study the effect of blood manure on quality and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Groundnut. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(23.11: 1950\). (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nii. (vi) Kalmi sala. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) \(11 / 19\) and 29.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

4 doses of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=75\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Blood manure applied as powder at the time of planting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 32.5^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of tubers/plot. (iv) (a) NJ. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R)
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(3.63 \cdot 10 \mathrm{o} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 0.5872 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cl} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 2.72 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 3.82 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & 4.03 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{3}\) & 3.97 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.2936\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Potato (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 49(52). \\
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. & Type :-'M.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of coconut cake and castor cake as manure for Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A.
(v) Nil. (vi) Kalmi (large). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 manures: \(S_{1}=\) castor cake and \(S_{2}=\) coconut cake.
(2) 3 times of application of manures: \(T_{1}=3\) weeks before sowing, \(T_{2}=\) one week before sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{3}=\) at sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 49^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.96 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8190 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of } T \text { marginal means } & =0.2364 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of S marginal means } & =0.2896 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =0.4095 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

\author{
Crop :-Potato (Rabi), \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 52(28). \\ Type:-‘'M’.}

Object :-To study the effect of ash (minerals) as top dressing on yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Moong type I. (c) Castor cake at 10 md./ac. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8 and 9.11.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\), and \(N_{1}=25 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
(2) 2 levels of \(A\) sh : \(A_{0}=0\) and \(A_{1}=10\) md. \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).

Manures applied on 29.12.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Pact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 10.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 11.22 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8195 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{A}_{0}\) & 11.18 & 11.84 & 11.51 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{A}_{1}\) & 10.57 & 11.30 & 10.93 \\
\hline Mean & 10.87 & 11.57 & 11.22 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.2898 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.4098 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Potato (Kharif). & Ref :-U.P. 53(13) \\
Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani. & Type :-M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To determine the comparative efficiency of leaf mold and castor cake.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Hilly tract-6075 high. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.4.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(24^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at \(20 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in treatment (2) only on 3.3.1953. (vi) Garbwal. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Leaf mold at \(225 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Castor-cake at \(20 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. Control (no manure).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1933-continued. (b), (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. Results:}
(i) 1.37 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.7143 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1.67 \\
2. & 1.32 \\
3. & 1.11 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.3572\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crp :- Potato (Kharif). & Ref :- U.P. 49(64). \\
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type : 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of N on tuber formation and Potato yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nii. (b) Uncultivated. (c) Nil. i(ii) (a) Sandy Ioam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11.1949. (iv) (a) Ond ploughing by tractor, one cross harrowing by tractor and one ploughing by desi plough. (b) Sowing on ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nii. (vi) Military (late). I(vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 earthings. (xi)N.A. (x) 14.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

4 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=40, N_{2}=80\) and \(N_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
N as A/S applied on 15.11.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes:
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil.' (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.97 ton/ac.
(iii). -Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 6.11 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 8.46 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 10.86 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 8.44 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=0.5629 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Potato. & Ref :- U.P. 57(132): \\
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type :- ‘M’.'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of N on tuber formation and yield of Potato:
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1951, (iv) (a) 3 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A.(v) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M. and \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Ammo. Phos. on 20.10.1951. (vi) Military (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 8 to 15.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 doses of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0 . \mathrm{N}_{1}=40, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=80\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \(\mathbf{N}\) applied on 22.10.1951. Source of \(\mathbf{N}\) is \(\mathbf{N} . \mathbf{A}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 5^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Below normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 3.27 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.9805 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{6}\) & 3.43 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3.70 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 2.82 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 3.13 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\mathbf{0 . 4 9 0 2}\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Potato.}

Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Ref: U.P. 51(85).
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of application of Pot. Sul. on growth, performance and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanal for green manuring. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26-10.1951. (iv) (a) 4 times by cultivator and 2 times by dest plough and planking etc. (b) On ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) 1: (v) Sanai turned in, \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M., \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Ammo. Phos. applied on 22, 23.10.1951 and 14.12.1951. (vi) Military (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 earthings and intercultural opera_ tions. (ix) N-A. (x) 15.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 levels of \(K\) as Pot Sul. : \(K_{0}=0, K_{1}=30, K_{2}=60\) and \(K_{2}=90 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
Pot. Sul. applied on 23.10.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(11^{\prime} \times 5^{\prime}\). (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 41^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) NiL. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 6.62 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.9536 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 6.01 \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{6 . 4 7}\) \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{6 . 8 2}\) \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 7}\) \\
S.E./mean. & \(\mathbf{0 . 9 8 3 8}\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn-, Lucknow.

Ref:- U.P. 53(148), Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of different doses of \(\mathbf{K}\) on Potato in presence of \(N, P\) and calcium as basal dressing.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.11.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by mould board plough and 3 by cultivator. Digging by Kudali on 2.11.1953. (b) Sowing under ground in lines. (c) 12 tubers of diameter \(1^{\prime \prime}\) sown/plot. (d) \(12^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super, \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of CaO as Calcium, \(150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied on 3.11 .1953 . (vi) Potato Phulwa (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) \(5.78^{\circ}\). ( \(x\) ) 2.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

5 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}=\mathbf{0}, \mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{1}}=30, \mathrm{~K}_{\mathbf{2}}=60, \mathrm{~K}_{\mathbf{3}}=90\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{4}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(15^{\circ} \times 75^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. No lodging. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of tubers. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.32 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.65 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significandy different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 6.49 \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 1 1}\) \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 3 8}\) \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathbf{8 . 0 0}\) \\
\(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathbf{7 . 6 4}\) \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.32\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}.
.. Crop :- Potato.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref q- U.P. 52(189).
Type:- ' \(\mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{1}}\).

Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N , P}\) and \(\mathbf{C a}\) applied alone and in combination on the growth and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Juar, Lobia and Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29, 30.11 .1952 and 1.12.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughings in September and October. (b) Sown behind the plough in lines. (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M. and compost +40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. applied on 24, 25.11.1952. (vi) Gola potato (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.2.1953 to 5.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=150 \mathrm{Ib}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=75 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{Ca}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+\) Castor cake in \(1: 1\) ratio, \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) as Super and Ca as Gypsum applied on 27, 28.11.1952.
3. DESIGN:.
(i) \(2^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(29^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(27^{\circ} \times 26^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Incidence of mosaic. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1955. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
S. RESULTS :
(i) 5.40 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.76 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.1909 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { S.E. of body of tables } & =0.2700 \text { ton/ac. }\end{array}\)

Crop:- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Luckn ow.

Ref :- U.P. 53(142).
Type :- ' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{P}\) and Ca applied singly and in combination on Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Lobla. (c) NiI. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1953. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by mould board plough on 18.9 .1953 and 4.10 .1953 , and 4 by cultivator, 4 cross wise ploughings fand planking on 20.9.1953 and 18.10.1953. (b) Sown behind the plough in lines. (c) 320 tubers of \(1^{\circ}\) diameter each/plot. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) T.C. and G.N.C. on 21 and 26.10.1953. (vi) Phulwa (Patna). (vi) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings up. (ix) \(5.78^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 30.3.1954 and 1.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S+G \cdot N . C\). in \(1: 1\) ratio : \(N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 2 levels of Ca as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{1}}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{5}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\) (v) \(1.5^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tuber yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955 . (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) None. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.44 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.72 ton/ac.
(iii) N effect is highly significant, P effect is significant while other effect and interactions are not significant. (iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.1802 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =0.2548 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 51(84).
. Type :-‘M’.

Object :-To study the effect of calcium alone and in combination with different forms of manures on the growth, performance and yield of Potato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.10.1951. (iv) (a) Sanai turning by mould board, ploughings four times by cultivator and 2 times by desi plough and planking etc. (b) Sown on ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) 1. (v) Nil. (vi) Gola (vii) Jrrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 17 and 18.3 .19 m 2 .

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 levels of Ca as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 6 sources of applications of fertilizers: \(\mathrm{M}_{0}=\mathbf{0}_{2} \mathrm{M}_{1}=75 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as single Super, \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=75\) lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Ammo. Phos., \(\mathrm{M}_{8}=75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as B.M., \(\mathrm{M}_{4}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Fish Guaro and \(\mathrm{M}_{6}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
Manures applied on 22 and 23.10.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 6\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Ordinary. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 3.66 ton'ac.
(ii) 1.4425 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Potato. & Ref :-U.P. 51(139). \\
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. \(\quad\) Type :-‘M'.
\end{tabular}

Object: To study the effect of different dosages of super on growth and Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10 .1951 . (iv) (a) 3 ploughings. (b) over ridgs. (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. \({ }^{-}\)(v) F.Y.M. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as A/S applied on 20.10.1951. (vi) Military (late). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) 1 weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 8 to 15.3.1952.

2 TREATMENTS :
4 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{2 5}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{g}}=50\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Super applied on 22.10.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(11^{\prime} \times 5^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. OENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 3.92 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.44 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 3.39 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{4 . 6 4}\) \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{3 . 3 6}\) \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{4 . 3 0}\) \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.72\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Potato. \\ Site :-College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi.
}

Ref :-U.P. 51/294).
Type:-'M.

Object :-To study the effect of different times of application of fertilizers.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil !analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 23.10.1951. (iv) (a) Field levelled thoroughly. (b) Planted in lines, ridges made by kudalf to cover tubern. (c) N.A. (d) \(1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) 100 mds. of well rotten P.Y.M.'mixed with soil at the time of preparing the field, 90 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) was given at the time of sowing. (vi) Patna white variety (Phulwa variety). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) After every irrigation the field was intercultured with kudali and weeds removed. Only one earthing up was done after 45 days of sowing. (ix) N.A. (x) First week of Aprid 1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

60 Jb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. applied as follows:
1. All at sowing.
2. All at germination ( 20 days after sowing with first irrigation).
3. All at earthing ( 45 days after sowing with first earthing).
4. Half at sowing + half at germination.
5. Half at sowing+half at earthing.
6. Half at germination+half at earthing.
7. \(1 / 3 \mathrm{rd}\) at sowing \(+1 / 3\) at germination \(+1 / 3\) at earthing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) \(126^{\circ} \times 19.5^{\circ}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(19.5^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (b) \(16.5^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Fresh weight of top, root, tubers and no. of tillers and tubers etc. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 7.35 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.7243 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 5.82 \\
2. & 6.07 \\
3. & 7.68 \\
4. & 7.62 \\
5. & 8.64 \\
6. & 8.81 \\
7. & 6.78 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.3622\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref :-U.P.51(295).
Type :-'M'。

Object :-To study the effect of different times of application of fertilizers.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) ! (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B. H. U., Varanasi. (iii) 23.10.1951. (iv) (a) Field levelled thoroughly. (b) Planted in lines. (c) Ridges made by kudali to cover tubers. (d) \(1 \mathbf{1}^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) 100 mds , of well rotten F.Y.M. mixed with soil at the time of preparing the field. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) at the time of sowing. (vi) Patna white variety (Phulwa variety) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) After every irrigation the field was intercultured with kudali and weeds removed. Only one earthing up was done after 45 days of sowing. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

90 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed at different stages as follows :-
1. All at sowing.
2. All at germination ( 20 days after sowing with first irrigation).
3. All at earthing ( 45 days after sowing with first earthing).
4. Half at sowing + half at germination.
5. Half at sowing+half at earthing.
6. Half at germination + half at earthing.
7. Ird at sowing + \(\frac{3}{} \mathrm{rd}\) at germination \(+\frac{7}{3} \mathrm{rd}\) at earthing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) \(126^{\circ} \times 19.5^{\prime}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(19.5^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (b) \(16.5^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Fresh weight of root, top, tubers and no. of tillers and (tubers. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 5.70 tod/ac.
(ii) 0.9724 ton./ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton./ac. Treatment Av, yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 7.52 \\
2. & 5.89 \\
3. & 4.08 \\
4. & 5.26 \\
5. & 6.07 \\
6. & 5.12 \\
7. & 5.98 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.4862\) tod./ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Potato (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P. 51(296). \\
Site :- College Farm,B.H.U., Varanasi. & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different times of application of fertilizers.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 23.10.1951. (iv) (a) Field levelled thoroughly, given necessary agricultural operations and made fit for conducting the experiment. (b) Planted in lines, ridges made by kudali to cover tubers. (c) N.A. (d) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) 100 mds. of well rotten F.Y.M. mixed with soil at the time of preparing the feld. \(90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Suiphate at the time of sowing. (vi) Patna white variety (Phulwa variety). (vii) Irrigations given at an interval of 10 days. (viii) After every irrigation the field was intercultured with hudali and weeds removed. Only one earthing up was done after 45 days of sowing. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 7.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
\(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super top dressed at different stages as follows:
1. All it sowing:
2. All at germination ( 20 days after sowing with first irrigation).
3. All at earthing ( 45 days after sowing with first earthing).
4. Half at sowing + half at germination.
5. Half at sowing+half at earthing.
6. Half at germination + half at earthing.
7. Ird at sowing + \(\frac{1}{3} \mathrm{rd}\) at germination \(+\frac{\mathrm{f}}{} \mathrm{rd}\) at earthing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) \(126^{\prime} \times 19.5^{\circ}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(19.5^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (b) \(16.5^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Fresh weight of top, root, tubers and no. of tillers and tubers. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.38 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8399 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatmert differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
1. 7.86
7.59
\(3 . \quad 6.41\)
4. \(\quad 6.80\)
5.88 .02
\(6 . \quad 7.66\)
7. \(\quad 7.30\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.4200\) ton./ac.

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref:-U.P. 53(387). Type:- \({ }^{-} \mathbf{M}\).

Object:-To study the effect of N, P and \(K\) applied alone and in combination on growth and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refe r soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 23.10.1953. (iv) (a) 2 meston plough, 4 deshl ploughs and 3 ladderings. (b) Sown in furrows and then ridges made. (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring with Sanai at 50 srs./ac. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 hoeing and 1 earthing up after 1 month of sowing. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{8}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(K_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=20\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\).

N applied at the earthing stage (after one month of sowing). \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at the time of sowing on 22.10.1953. \(\mathbf{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) applied at the time of sowing with Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) Confd. (ii) (a) 3 blocks/replication and 9 plots/block. (b) \(220^{\circ} \times 16^{\prime}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(24^{\circ} \times 16^{\prime}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{2}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Fresh weight of root, top and tubers/plot. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) NiI. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 3.91 ton/ac.
(ii) \(0.5374 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & K, & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 2.13 & 2.37 & 2.88 & 2.46 & 2.49 & 2.49 & 2.39 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}{ }^{\text {²}}\) & 3.76 & 4.58 & \(4 \cdot 88\) & 4.41 & 4.22 & 4.59 & 4.41 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 4.25 & 4.87 & 5.50 & 4.87 & 4.21 & 5.28 & 5.14 \\
\hline Mean & 3.38 & 3.94 & \[
\begin{gathered}
4.42 \\
\hline
\end{gathered}
\] & 3.91 & 3.64 & 4.12 & 3.98 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & 3.07 & 3.81 & 4.04 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 3.60 & 4.07 & 4.69 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3.48 & 3.93 & 4.54 & & & - & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad=0.0896\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Potato (Rabi). Ref :-U.P. 53(395).
Site :- College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi. . Type :-‘M'.
Object :-To study the effect of N applied at different times on yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sannhemp for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 10.11.1953. (iv) (a) First ploughing was done with desi plough 3 weeks prior to sowing. Subsequent ploughings with desi ploughs followed by planking. (b) Sown in furrows. (c) - . (d) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) 1 . (v) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and 40 glb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. were added to all the plots. (vi) Phulwa (Patna white). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeds removed during early stage by manual labour, earthing done after 30 days and hoeing 45 days after sowing. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + one control (no manure)
(1) 3 doses of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=60, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=90\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 times of application of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Single dose at the time of planting, \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=1\) dose at the time of planting \(+\frac{1}{2}\) dose 30 days after planting and \(\mathrm{T}_{3}=\frac{1}{2}\) dose at the time of planting \(+\frac{i}{}\) dose 30 days after planting \(+\frac{i}{i}\) dose 45 days after planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) \(92^{\prime} \times 64^{\prime}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(30^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (b) \(26^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\) (v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Fresh weight of tops, roots, mean no. of tubers/plot and yield of tubers. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) Nil. (v) (a) and \{b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(5.75 \mathrm{ion} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(\operatorname{aod}\) (iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

Control \(=3.36\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & T1 & T8 & T: & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 5.33 & 5.64 & 5.33 & 5.43 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 5.88 & 6.07 & 5.76 & 5.90 \\
\hline Ns & 6.61 & 7.16 & 6.34 & 6.70 \\
\hline Mean & 5.94 & 6.29 & 5.81 & 6.01 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Chhibraman (Farrukhabad).

Ref :. U.P. 51(230).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :--To draw out fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil type.
1. BAS :L CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam to domat. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N .
3. 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. in which villages have been taken as replications (No. of villages-6) ; field selected in a randomly selected village in the district). (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of carly potato. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. on cultivators" fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 1.91 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.1005 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1.67 \\
2. & 1.94 \\
3. & 2.11 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.0410\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
> Site :~ Kannauj (Farrukhabad).

Ref:-U.P. 51(231).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To draw out fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy to sandy loam and loamy soil. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved, (v) (a) to (e) N,A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (is) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N .
3. 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. in which villages have been taken as replications (No. of villages 5). Field selected randomly in the randomly selected village in the district. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of late potato.
(iv) (a) No.
(b) N.A: (c) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vi) Nili
(vii)

The experiment was conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 9.85 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.4665 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 8.73 \\
2. & 10.12 \\
3. & 10.71 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.2086\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 52(286).
Site :-Chhibraman and Karimganj (Farrukhabad). : Type :-"M’.
Object :-To draw out a fertilizer schedules for agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Farrukhabad type 2 soil. (iii) N.A. (iv) Phulwa improved. (v) (a) After application of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) the field was levelled by drawing a pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{N}\) as \(\mathbf{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

N added to surface at sowing time. Super is placed at a depth of about \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep at the sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi plough-one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated expt. with 3 treatments conducted; 12 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A., but roughly about \(1 / 40\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt, wrs conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
S. RESULTS:
(i) 4.59 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8732 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 3.59 \\
2. & 4.57 \\
3. & 5.62 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.2521\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad,
Ref:-U.P. 50(11).
Type :m'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different sizes of Potato seeds on its yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Ni1. (b) Charl. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1950. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b N.A. (c) 9 rows/plot with 20 seeds/row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime} \cdot\) (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at 480 mds./ac. on 18 an 19.10.1950 and A/S at 1.5 srs./plot on 15 and 16.12.1950. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthin up. (ix) N.A ( \(x\) ) 13.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

3 seed sizes: \(S_{1}=\) Large, \(S_{2}=\) Small and \(S_{3}=\) Chh1ri.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 49\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(8.22 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 0.7338 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tubers in ton/ac.

Treatment : • Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 9.89 \\
2. & 7.52 \\
3. & 7.26 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.3669\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato. Ref:- U.P. 51(12).
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad. 'Type :-‘C’.
Object :-To study the effect of different sizes of potato seeds on its yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.11.1951. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 9 rows/polt with 24 seeds/row. (d) \(2^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at 80 mds./ac. on 14.11 .1951 . A/S at 20 srs./plot on 2.1.1952. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 31.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

3 seed sizes : \(S_{1}=\) Large, \(S_{2}=\) Small and \(S_{3}=\) Chhari.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) \(59^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1951. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 5.55 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.4782 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tubers in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 6.14 \\
2. & 5.77 \\
3. & 4.75 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.2391\) tonias.
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Crop :-Potato.
Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.
}

Ref:- U P. 52(42).
Type :-‘C'.
Object:-To see the effect of earthings on the yield of potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 10 rows/plot with 16 seeds/row. (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at 400 mds./ac. on 26.10.1952. A/S at 2 srs./plot at the time of earthing. (vi) Phulwa (cold storage). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. One earthing on 11.12.1952.
2. Two earthings on 7 and 19.12.1952.
3. Three earthings on 3, 11 and 19.12.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(j) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) \(62.5^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iii) 5. (iv) (a) and (b) \(17.5^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.58 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.9884 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tubers in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 5.30 \\
2. & 5.94 \\
3. & 5.49 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.4420\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop: Potato.
Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm., Farruhkabad.

Ref \(\boldsymbol{z}\) U.P. 53(16).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To see the effect of earthing on the yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1953. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) Total seed used 2.125 md . (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) Castor cake at 30 md./ac. on 31.10.1953, A/S at \(1 \mathrm{sr} . / \mathrm{plot}\) on 8.12.1953, 12.12.1953 and 16.12.1953. (vi) Phulwa (cold storage) in sprouted condition. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1;weeding and hoeing. (ix) 279". (x) 8.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. One earthing on 16.12 .1953 .
2. Two earthings on 12.12.1953 and 24.12.1953.
3. Three earthing on 8.12.1953, 16.12.1953 and 24.12.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3 . (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic incidence below 5\% checked by using bigger and cut seed. (iii) Germination and yicld of potato. (iv) (a) 1952 -continued. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 5.70 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.6490 toz/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of tuber in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 5.80 \\
2. & 5.53 \\
3. & 5.77 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.2902\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Potato. \\ Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.
}
Ref :-U.P. 49(49).
Type:-‘'C'.

Object . -To study the effect of storage method on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai (G.M.) (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.5.12.1949. (iv) (a) 8 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at \(17 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 3.11 .1949 and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 9 seers 5 chh /ac. on 5.11 .1949 . (vi) Kalmi (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.3.1950.
2. TREATMENIS :

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 2 storage methods: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Kalmi cold storage and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Kalmi sand store.
(2) 2 seed sizes in sprouted condition: \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Large and \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) Small.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) N.A. (iii) \(6 .{ }^{\circ}\) (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952 . (b) No. (c) N.A, (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 9.15 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.6835 ton/ac.
(iii) \(T\) effect is highly significant, \(S\) effect is significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline T1 & 8.94 & 8.53 & 8.74 \\
\hline T \({ }_{2}\) & 9.96 & 9.16 & 9.56 \\
\hline Mean & 9.45 & 8.84 & 9.15 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & \(=0.1973\) ton/ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & \(=0.2790\) ton/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Potato.}

Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref:- U.P. 50(12).
Type: ' 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of storage method on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Samai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1950. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 12 rows/plot with 16 seeds/row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at \(250 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). on 22.10.1950 and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 1 sr //plot on 6 and 7.12.1950. (vi) Phulwa (Kalmi). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 2 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 15 and 16.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 storage methods: \(T_{1}=\) Cold and \(T_{2}=\) Ordinary.
(2) 2 seed sizes: \(S_{1}=\) Large and \(S_{2}=\) Small.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 9.40 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.1179 ton/ac.
(iii) T effect is highly significant while other effect and interaction \(\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{T}\) are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of potato in ton/ac.


Crop :- Potato.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref:- U.P. 51(9).
Type:- 'C'.

Object:-To study the effect of storage method on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.11.1951. (iv) (a) 8 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 12 rows/plot with 24 seeds/row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(200 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). on 2.11 .1951. A/S at 3 srs/plot on 29.12.1951. (vi) Kalmi Phulwa (sprouted). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Earthing up on 29/30. 12.51 and 18.1.1952. (ix) and (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 storage methods : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Cold and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Sand storage.
(2) 2 seed sizes : \(S_{1}=\) Large and \(S_{2}=\) Small.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 38^{\prime \prime}\). (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1949-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(R);
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.13 too/ac.
(ii) 0.4428 ton/ac.
(iii) \(S\) effect and interaction \(S \times T\) are highly significant. \(T\) effect is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& T_{1} \\
& T_{\mathbf{2}}
\end{aligned}
\]} & 7.96 & 6.68 & 7.32 \\
\hline & 7.04 & 6.85 & 6.94 \\
\hline Mean & 7.50 & 6.77 & 7.13 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.1278 \mathrm{ttn} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =0.1808 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop : PPotato. \\ Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad. \\ Ref:-U.P. 52(40). \\ Type :-‘C’.}

Object :-To study the effect of storage method on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Early Jowar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1952. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 12 rows/plot with 23 seeds/row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at \(20 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 24.10.1952, A/S at 2.5 srs ./plot on 16.2.1952. (vi) Phulwa (Kalmi). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) Earthing up on 16/17.12.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) 6,7.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 storage methods: \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Cold and \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Sand st orage.
(2) 2 seed sizes: \(S_{1}=\) Large and \(S_{2}=\) Small.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) \(110^{\prime} \times 16.5^{\prime}\). (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 16.5^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of tubers. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952 . (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment condusted by E. B . (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.30 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8864 ton/ac.
(iii) Only S effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yiell of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|c|c} 
& \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{\mathbf{g}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) & 7.56 & 7.27 \\
\(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 9.061 & 9.33 \\
\hline Mean & 8.31 & 8.30 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.2559 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { S.E. of body of table , } & =0.3619 \text { ton/ac. }\end{array}\)

Crop :- Potato.
Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :-U.P. 49(53).
Type : \({ }^{〔} \mathbf{C}\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of spacing and seed size on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(15,16.11 .1949\). (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(150 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 10 and 11.11.1949, castor cake at 18 md./ac. on 11 and 12.11.1949 and A/S at 1 md. 16 srs. 4 chhs./ac. on 25 to 27.12.1949. (vi) Phulwa (cold store). (vii) lrrigated. (viii) 3 weedings and 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 18 to 22.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seed sizes: \(S_{1}=\operatorname{Large}\left(1^{\prime \prime}-1 \frac{1}{\prime \prime}^{\prime \prime}\right)\) and \(S_{2}=\) Small ( \(1^{\prime \prime}-\frac{7}{4}^{\prime \prime}\) ).
(2) 2 distances between rows: \(R_{1}=2^{\prime}\) and \(R_{2}=1 \frac{1}{8}\).
(3) 3 distances between plants: \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=6^{\prime}, \mathrm{P}_{2}=9^{\circ}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=12^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.44 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.6189 ton/ac.
(iii) Only S effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{R}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 8.79 & 8.80 & 8.58 & 8.72 & 8.62 & 8.82 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{q}}\) & 8.47 & 8.02 & 7.98 & 8.16 & 8.10 & 8.22 \\
\hline Mean & 8.63 & 8.41 & 8.28 & 8.44 & 8.36 & 8.52 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 8.54 & 8.38 & 8.15 & 8.36 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 8.72 & 8.44 & 8.40 & 8.52 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S E. of marginal mean of \(S\) or \(R\) & \(=0.1264\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) & \(=0.1547\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table \(S \times R\) & \(=0.1787\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table \(S \times P\) or \(R \times P\) & \(=0.2188\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato.
Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :-U.P. 50(10).
Type :"'C'.

Object :-To find out the optimum spacing and seed size for Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(28,29.10 .1950\). (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) and (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (v) City refuse at \(48 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). on \(18,19.10 .1950\) and A/S at 1 sr/plot. (vi) Phulwa (sala, cold storage). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 7 to 10.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1). (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seed sizes : \(S_{1}=\) Large \(\left(1^{\prime \prime}-11^{\circ}\right)\) and \(S_{8}=\operatorname{Small}\left(1^{\prime \prime}-i^{\circ}\right)\).
(2) 2 distances between rows: \(R_{1}=2^{\prime}\) and \(R_{2}=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\).
(3) 3 distances between plants: \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=6^{\circ}, \mathrm{P}_{2}=9^{\circ}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=12^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 . (b) \(78^{\prime} \times 78^{\prime}\). (iii).4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952 . (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 11.23 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.6485 ton/ac.
(iii) \(\mathrm{S}, \mathrm{R}\) and P effects are highly significant while all interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c|cc|} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 11.49 & 11.78 & 11.16 & 11.48 & 10.93 & 12.02 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 11.23 & 10.87 & 10.83 & 10.98 & 10.74 & 11.21 \\
\hline Mean & 11.36 & 11.32 & 11.00 & 11.23 & 10.84 & 11.61 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 10.93 & 10.95 & 10.64 & 10.84 & \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 11.79 & 11.70 & 11.35 & 11.61 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{S}\) or \(\mathbf{R}\) & \(=0.1324\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{P}\) & \(=0.1621\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table \(\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{R}\) & \(=0.1872\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table \(S \times P\) or \(\mathbf{R} \times P\) & \(=0.2293\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm., Farrukhabad.

Ref: U.P. 51(11).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To find out the optimum spacing and seed size for Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.11.1951. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) and (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at \(80 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). on 14.11 .1951 and A/S at 3 sr/plot. on 24 to 27.12.1951. (vi) Phulwa (sala cold storage in sprouted condition). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 30,31.3.1952 and 1,2.4.1952

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 2 seed sizes : \(S_{1}=\) Large ( \(1^{\prime \prime}-11^{\prime \prime}\) ) and \(S_{2}=\) Small ( \(1^{\prime \prime}-\frac{1}{4}^{\prime}\) ).
(2) 2 distances between rows : \(R_{1}=2^{\prime}\) and \(R_{2}=1^{\prime}\).
(3) 3 distances between plants: \(P_{1}=6^{\circ}, P_{2}=9^{\circ}\) and \(P_{3}=12^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) \(77^{\prime} \times 79.7^{\circ}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of mosaic incidence. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952 (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.B. (R).
3. RESULTS:
(i) 8.15 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.4265 ton/ac.
(iii) \(S\) and \(P\) effects are highly significant. Interaction \(S \times P\) is highly significant, interaction \(P \times R\) ia significant while other effects are not significant.
'(iv) Av. yield of potato in tod/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R 1}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R s}_{\mathbf{8}}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 8.17 & 8.61 & 8.22 & 8.33 & 8.33 & 8.33 \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & 8.63 & 7.84 & 7.44 & 7.97 & 7.86 & 8.09 \\
\hline Mean & 840 & 8.22 & 7.83 & 8.15 & & \multirow{3}{*}{,} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 8.47 & 8.29 & 7.52 & 8.09 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) & 8.33 & 8.16 & 8.14 & 8.21 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) or \(R\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\)
S.E. of body of table \(S \times R\)
S.E. of body of table \(\mathbf{S} \times \mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}\)
\(=0.0870\) ton/ac. \(=0.1066\) ton/ac. \(=0.1231\) ton/ac. \(=0.1508\) ton/ac.

Crop :- Potato.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :-U.P. 52(41).
Type: - 'C'

Object :-To find out the optimum spacing and seed size for Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(29,30.10 .1952\), (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A: (v) City refuse at 400 mds/ac. on 26.10.1952 and A/S at 2.5 srs/plot on 9, 10,12 and 13.12.1952. (vi) Phulwa (cold storage). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 10 and 11.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seed sizes : \(S_{1}=\) Large \(\left(1^{\prime \prime}-1^{\prime \prime}\right)\) and \(S_{2}=\) Small (1"-1 \(\mathbf{1}^{\prime \prime}\) ).
(2) 2 distances between rows: \(\mathbf{R}_{1}=2^{\prime}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{2}=1^{\prime} \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\).
(3) 3 distances between plants : \(P_{1}=6^{\circ}, P_{2}=9^{\circ}\) and \(P_{3}=12^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 12.
(b) \(78^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. \({ }^{\text {「 (iv) (a) } 1949-1952 .}\) (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.67 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.5845 ton/ac.
(iii) \(S\) and \(P\) effects are highly significant, interaction \(S \times R\) is significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P z}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R 1}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R t}_{\mathbf{1}}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 7.60 & 6.99 & 6.44 & 7.01 & 6.74 & 7.28 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) & 7.40 & 5.97 & 5.61 & 6.33 & 6.41 & 6.25 \\
\hline Mean & 7.50 & 6.48 & 6.02 & 6.67 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 7.38 & 6.39 & 595 & 6.57 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 7.63 & 6.57 & 6.10 & 6.77 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) or \(R\) & \(=0.1462 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) & \(=0.1193 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table \(S \times R\) & \(=0.1687 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
S.E of body of table \(S \times P\) or \(\mathbf{R} \times P\) & \(=0.2067 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.
Ref :-U.P. 49(46).
Type :-'C'.
Object:-To make a comparative study of different methods and dates on sowing on Potato yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Ni. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 8 ploughings. (b) As per treatments. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at \(12 \frac{1}{2}\) mds/ac. on 23.10.1949, A/S at 13 seers \(15 \mathrm{chh} . / \mathrm{ac}\) on 30.11 .1949 . (vi) Sala (cold storage). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 12 and 13.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS.

All combinations of ( 1 ) and (2)
(1) 3 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=24.10 .1949, D_{2}=31.10 .1949\) and \(D_{3}=7.11\).1949.
(2) 2 methods of sowing: \(M_{1}=\) Ridges and \(M_{2}=\) Flat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(38^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Kanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 9.76 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.0084 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{2}\) & \(D_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(M_{1}\) & 9.65 & 10.25 & 10.05 & 9.98 \\
\(M_{2}\) & 9.70 & 9.47 & 9.45 & 9.54 \\
\hline. Mean & 9.68 & 9.86 & 9.75 & 9.76
\end{tabular}.
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(M\) S.E. of body of table
\(=0.2911\) ton/ac. \(=0.2377\) ton/ac. \(=0.4117\) ton/ac.

Crop: :- Potato .
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.
Object :-To make a comparative study of different methods and dates of sowing on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings. (b) As per treatments. (c) 10 rows/plot with 9 seeds/row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) City refuse at \(250 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and A/S at \(0.75 \mathrm{sr} . / \mathrm{plot}\). (vi) Sala cold. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding (guroi) and 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=24.10 .1950, D_{2}=31.10 .1950\) and \(D_{3}=7.11 .1950\).
(2) 2 sowing methods : \(M_{1}=\) Ridge and \(M_{2}=\) Flat.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 49^{\prime}\). (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULUTS :
(i) 11.91 . ton/ac.
(ii) 1.271 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 11.33 & 12.72 & 11.81 & 11.95 \\
\(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 12.05 & 11.86 & 11.72 & 11.88 \\
\hline MeQs & 11.69 & 12.29 & 11.76 & 11.91
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of M & \(=0.300\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of D & \(=0.367\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=0.519\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato.
Site g- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :- U.P. 50(8).
Type :"'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of sowing dates on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Ni. (b) Chari. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at 480 md ./ac. on 12.10 .1950 and A/S at 1.5 srs./plot on 15,16.12.1950. (vi) Chari of Phulwa (Kalmi) cold storage. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 7 and 8.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

\section*{8 sowing dates :}
\(D_{i}=12.10 .1950, D_{2}=19.10 .1950, D_{8}=26.10 .1950, D_{4}=2.11 .1950, D_{6}=9.11 .1950, D_{6}=16.11 .1950\),
\(D_{7}=23.11 .1950\) and \(D_{8}=30.11 .1950\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(2^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) NiL. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 14.88 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.057 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline (iv) Av. yield of & ton/ac. & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline Treatment & Av. yield &  & 14.03 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 18.34 & \[
D_{\delta} .
\] & 14.03
9.51 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\). & 19.10 & D. & 9.51 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\). & 22.02 & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}{ }^{-}\) & 7.22 \\
\hline D. & 20.90
S.E./m & = 1.248 t & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Potato (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.
}

Ref :-U.P. 53(14).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of sowing and harvesting dates on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings: (b) N.A. (c) 28 seeds/row. (d) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) -. (v) \(100 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\), as F.Y.M. on 5.10.1953. (vi) Phulwa chari in sprouted condition. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) 2 earthings and 1 hoeing and weeding.
(ix) \(2.79^{\circ}\) (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
8 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=15.10 .1953, D_{2}=22.10 .1953, D_{3}=29.10 .1953, D_{4}=5.11 .1953, D_{5}=12.11 .1953\), \(D_{6}=19.11 .1953, D_{7}=26.11 .1953\) and \(D_{8}=3.12 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
4 harvesting dates : \(H_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{2 0 . 2} .1954, \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{9}}=\mathbf{2 7 . 2 . 1 9 5 4}, \mathrm{H}_{8}=6.3 .1954\) and \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{6}}=13.3 .1954\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 8 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(48^{\circ} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iii) 4: (iv) (a) and (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic disease below \(5 \%\); checked by using bigger and cut seeds. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Sub-plot consists of only one row \(21^{\prime}\) long. The expt. was conducted by E.B.R.

RESULTS :
(i) 2.71 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.140 ton/ac.
(b) 0.534 ton/ac.
(iii) Both \(\mathbf{D}\) and \(\mathbf{H}\) effects are highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llllllll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{7}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & 2.80 & 3.27 & 3.25 & 2.64 & 1.94 & 2.10 & 1.17 & 0.75 & 2.24 \\
\(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3.31 & 3.67 & 3.77 & 2.90 & 2.24 & 2.34 & 1.49 & 0.93 & 2.58 \\
\(\mathrm{H}_{3}\) & 4.37 & 3.37 & 4.11 & 2.82 & 2.28 & 2.86 & 1.63 & 1.35 & 2.85 \\
\(\mathrm{H}_{4}\) & 4.74 & 3.57 & 4.52 & 3.17 & 2.52 & 3.33 & 2.02 & 1.61 & 3.18 \\
\hline Mean & 3.80 & 3.47 & 3.91 & 2.88 & 2.24 & 2.66 & 1.58 & 1.16 & 2.71
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. D marginal means \(\quad=0.403\) ton/ac.
2. \(H\) marginal means \(\quad=1.334\) ton/ac
3. H means at the same level of \(D \quad=0.377\) ton/ac.
4. D means at the same level of \(H \quad=0.519\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Potato.}

Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :-U.P. 50(7).
Type in'C’.

Object:-To find out suitable spacings for Gola variety of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nit. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.10.1950. (iv) (a) Five ploughings. (b) and (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at 305 mds./ac. on 10.10 .1950 and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 1.5 lb ./plot on 21,22 and 23.11 .1950 . (vi) Gola cold storage large ( \(1.5^{\circ}-2^{\circ}\) diameter). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.1.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 row spacings : \(R_{1}=1.25^{\prime}, R_{2}=1.5^{\prime}, R_{3}=1.75^{\circ}\) and \(R_{4}=2^{\circ}\).
(2) 2 seed spacings: \(S_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{2}=9^{*}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 9.93 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.893 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{R}\) and \(\mathbf{S}\) effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tuber in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R z}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{R g}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & 11.11 & 11.30 & 10.37 & 9.03 & 10.45 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 9.45 & 10.56 & 8.61 & 8.98 & 9.40 \\
\hline Mean & 10.28 & 10.93 & 9.49 & 9.01 & 9.93 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.223 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.316 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.447 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Potato (Rabi). } & \text { Ref :-'U.P. 52(39). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Pȯtato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad. } & \text { Type } \% \text { 'C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of sowing sprouted and unsprouted seed on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai (for green manuring). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1952. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 207 seeds/plot. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) Sanai green manuring, city refuse at 175 mds/ac. on 23.10 .1952 , A/S at 2 seers/plot on 9.12 .1952 . (vi) Phulwa (cold stored). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 8, 9.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 seed sizes : \(S_{1}=\) Large and \(S_{j}=\) Small.
(2) 2 conditions of seed : \(D_{1}=\) sprouted and \(D_{g}=\) unsprouted.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 16.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yem.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.R.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 8.43 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.774 top/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.'
(iv) Av. yield of tuber in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|} 
& \(S_{\mathbf{1}}\) & - \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 8.46 & 8.60 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{q}}\) & 8.89 & 7.77 \\
\hline Mean & 8.68 & 8.18 \\
& & 8.53 \\
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & 8.33 \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular} & \(=0.223\) ton/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Potato.
Ref :-U.P. 49(121).
Site :- Govt. Botanical Gardens, Agri. College Kanpur. Type :-‘C’.
Object :-To study the productivity of seeds raised from cut and whole tubers and sprouts of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.12.1949. (iv) (a) ploughed twice by victory plough followed by pata. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) \(1.75^{\prime} \times .75^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) 50 lb . of \(A / S\) and 20 lb . of Super on the entire field. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Seeds raised from whole tubers.
2. Seeds raised from cut tubers.
3. Seeds raised from sprouts.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) 344 sq. ft. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) 115 sq. ft. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. - (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C. Plot wise yield-N.A.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 20.94 ton/ac.
(ii) and (iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.43 \\
2. & 19.89 \\
3. & 22.50 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Potato.
Site :-Govt.Botanical Gardens, Agri. College, Kanpur. Type :- \({ }^{〔}\) C’.
Object :-To study the effect of different sizes of seeds sown by different methods.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Potato. (c) 50 lbs of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and 20 lb of Super. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 18.10 .1950 . (iv) (a) ploughing by victory plough followed by pata. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) \(1.75^{\prime} \times .75^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
2 sizes of potato seeds : \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=\) Small \((1.77 \mathrm{~cm})\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=\) Medium \((2.5 \mathrm{~cm})\).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 -methods of planting : \(M_{1}=\) Flat, \(M_{2}=\) Furrow and \(M_{3}=\) Ridge.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b)
172 sq. ft. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
-(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESÜLTTS :
(i) 4.65 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.633 ton/ac.
(b) 0.930 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{Ma}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & Mea \\
\hline \(\therefore \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3.60 & 4.18 & 5.10 & 4.29 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 5.17 & 5.78 & . 5.06 & 5.00 \\
\hline Mean & 4.38 & . 4.48 & 5.08 & 4.65 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal means
\(\stackrel{ }{=}=0.770\) ton/ac.
2. \(M\) marginal means \(=0.537 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(S\) \(=0.760\) ton/ac,
4. \(S\) means at the same level of \(M\) \(=0.989\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Potato.
Ref :-U.P. 50(156). '
Site :-Govt. Botanical Gardens, Agri. College, Kanpur. Type :-'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of different sizes of seed sown at different depths.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Potato. (c) 50 lb of A/S and 20 lb of Super. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.10:1950. (iv) (a) Ploughed twice by victory plough followed by pata. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) Spacing between rows \(14^{\circ}\) and between plants \(9^{\circ}\). Number of tubers in a row 24 . (e)-.(v) 50 lb of \(A / S\) and 20 lb of Super on the entire field. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

\section*{Maio-plot treatments :}

3 sizes of potato seeds : \(S_{1}=S_{\text {mall }}(1.77 \mathrm{~cm}): S_{2}=\) Medium ( 2.5 cm ) and \(S_{3}=\) Large \((3.9 \mathrm{~cm})\).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 depths of sowing: \(D_{1}=2^{\prime \prime}, D_{2}=21^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{3}=3^{\prime \prime}\).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) 93.35 sq. ft. (v) \(3 \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\) border. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yicld. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil (vii) The plot wise yield data is N.A.The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 7.64 tun/ac.
(ii) (a) 0.587 ton/ac.
(b) 0.603 ton/ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{S}\) effect and interaction \(\mathbf{S} \times \mathrm{D}\) are highly significant while D effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(D_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 6.76 & 7.01 & 7.02 & 6.96 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 783 & 8.23 & 8.14 & 8.07 \\
\hline Sa & 7.34 & 8.03 & 8.26 & 7.88 \\
\hline Mean & 731 & 7.79 & 7.81 & 7.64 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{1. S marginal means} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2. D marginal means} & \(=0.2\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{3. D means at the same level of \(S\)} & \(=3.3\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{4. \(S\) means at the same level of \(D\)} & \(=0\). & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato.
Ref :- U.P. 49(118).
Site :-Govt. Botanical Gardens, Agri. College, Kanpur. Type :- ' C '.
Object :-To stuly the effest of different sizes of Potato seeds on growth and yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Cucurbity. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Ploughed twice by victory plough followed by pata. (b) and (c) N.A. (d) \(1.75^{\prime} \times .75^{\prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) 50 lb . of \(A / S\) and 20 lb . of Super to the entire field. (vi) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

3 sizes of potato seeds : \(S_{1}=2^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=1^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{3}=11^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) 219 sq. ft. (v) Border \(3 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 12.15 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8643 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. pield \\
\(S_{1}\) & 11.07 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 12.58 \\
\(S_{8}\) & 12.81 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.3528\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 49(50).
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To study, the effect of different methods and dates of sowing on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa large (cold storage). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A (x) 12 to 13.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=11.11 .1949\) and \(D_{2}=15.11 .1949\).
(2) 2 methods of sowing : \(M_{1}=\) Ridge and \(M_{2}=\) Flat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.71 - ton/ac.
(ii) 0.681 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 8.03 & 7.71 & 7.87 \\
\hline M \({ }_{2}\) & 7.36 & 7.73 & 7.54 \\
\hline Mean & 7.70 & 7.72 & 7.71 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

> S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table
\(=0.197\) ton/ac.
\[
=0.278 \text { ton/ac. }
\]

Crop:- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 50(16),
T ype :- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different sowing methods on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanal for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11.1950. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) 384 seeds/plot. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Sanai turned in for green manuring. (vi) Kalmi sala. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 carthings cp. (ix) N.A. (x) 13 and 14.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 seed sizes: \(S_{1}=\) Large and \(S_{2}=\) Small.
(2) 2 directions of sowing : \(\mathrm{D}_{1}=\) North-south and \(\mathrm{D}_{2}=\) East-west.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tubers yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) [No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil.
(vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 8.99 ton/ac.
(i) 0.708 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only S effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 9.31 & 8.61 & 8.96 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 9.45 & 8.58 & 9.01 \\
\hline Mean & 9.38 & 8.60 & 8.99 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.204 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.289 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Potato (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref:-U.P. 50(18).
Type:-‘'C'。

Object :-To study the effect of different sowing methods on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1950. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) \(1.75^{\prime} \times .75^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(200 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). broadcast during preparation of field. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 28 and 29.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(i) 2 sizes of the seed: \(S_{1}=\) Large and \(S_{2}=\) Small.
(2) 2 methods of sowing: \(M_{1}=\) Ridge and \(M_{2}=\) Flat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24.5^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of mosaic incidence. (iii) Tuber yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.29 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.735 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(S\) effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(M_{1}\) & \(M_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 7.06 & 6.37 & 6.72 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 5.59 & 6.13 & 5.86 \\
\hline Mean & 6.33 & 6.25 & 6.29 \\
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=0.212\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & & \(=0.300\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 51(2).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different sowing methods on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Maize. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(23,24.10 .1951\). (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) Seeds \(10^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. (vi) Kalmi】 sala. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 8.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 sizes of the seed : \(S_{1}=\) Large and \(S_{2}=\) Small.
(2) 2 methods of sowing : \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Ridge and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Flat.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 8 . (iv) (a) I'.A. (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.79 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.983 ton/ac.
(i.i) Only M effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & & 5.66 & - & 6.84 & 6.07 \\
\hline Ss & & 5.12 & & 5.90 & 5.51 \\
\hline Mean & & 5.39 & & 6.19 & 5.79 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
\(=0.246\) ton/ac.
S.E. of body of table \(=0.348\) ton/ac.

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 52(24).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different sowing methods on yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Green manuring with Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(24,25.10 .1952\) (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) 240 seeds/plot. (d) \(1.75^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Sanai was turned in and castor cake at 20 mds/ac. 3 weeks before sowing. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 earthings. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 12.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 sizes of the seed : \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=\) Large and \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=\) Small.
(2) 2 methods of sowing : \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\) Ridge and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Flat.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes-
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of mosaic incidence. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No: (c) N_A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 15.19 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.106 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(M\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{I}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 14.29 & 16.59 & 15.44 \\
\hline S & 14.16 & 15.71 & 14.93 \\
\hline Mean & 14.22 & 16.15 & 15.19 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop: Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res, Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 49(44).
Type :-‘C’.

Object:-To study the effect of sowing dates on yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (o) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

6 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=18.10 .1949, D_{2}=8.11 .1949, D_{3}=15.11 .1949, D_{4}=22.11 .1949, D_{5}=29.11 .1949\) and
\[
D_{6}=6.12 .1949 .
\]
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) \(19+8\)-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(5.89^{\prime \prime}\) ton/ac.
(ii) 0.763 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\). & 6.11 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\). & 8.06 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\). & 6.39 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\). & 6.44 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\). & 5.00 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\). & 3.33 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=0.381\) ton/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Potato (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 50 (1). \\
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of sowing dates on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No.' (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loamy with kankars. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(11^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Green manure with castor cake at 12 md./ac. (vi) Phulwa (well sprouted). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 7 to 9.4 .1951 .
2. TREATMENTS :

8 sowing dates: \(\mathrm{D}_{1}=14.10 .1950, \mathrm{D}_{2}=21.10 .1950, \mathrm{D}_{3}=28 / 29.10 .1950, \mathrm{D}_{4}=5.11 .1950, \mathrm{D}_{5}=12.11 .1950\), \(D_{6}=19 / 20.11 .1950, D_{7}=27.11 .1950\) and \(D_{8}=4.12 .1950\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(22.5^{\prime} \times 4.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of mosaic incidence and white fungus growing on potato tubers were observed. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1948-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.96 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.529 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & 14.22 & \(D_{5}\) & 12.94 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{2}\) & 13.73 & \(D_{6}\) & 14.82 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{3}\) & 11.95 & \(D_{7}\) & 17.29 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{4}\) & 13.14 & \(D_{8}\) & 13.63 \\
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ S.E./mean } \\
& \(=0.765\) ton/ac..
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 51(1).
Type :-‘C’.

Object:-To study the effect of sowing dates on Potato yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) No. (b) Green manuring with Sanai, (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(1.5^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Sanai was turned in. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

6 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=19.10 .1951, \quad D_{2}=26.10 .1951, D_{3}=2.11 .1951, D_{4}=9.11 .1951, D_{6}=16.11 .1951\) and \(\mathrm{D}_{6}=23.11 .1951\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 6 .
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4 (iv) (a) N.A
(b) \(21^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\).
(v) N.A. . (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) Mosaic incidence, very very minute. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1948-continuing. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii), The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R). Only three lines instead of four lines were sown in the last treatment.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.870 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(D_{1}\) & 8.18 \\
\(D_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.65 \\
\(D_{3}\) & 7.38 \\
\(D_{4}\) & 7.14 \\
\(D_{5}\) & 7.14 \\
\(D_{4}\) & 6.35 \\
S.E./mean & -0.435 toa/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:-U.P. 52(21).
Type :ه‘'C’.

```

Object :-To study the effect of sowing and harvesting dates on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As under treatments, (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(1.75^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) N.A.(vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) As under treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
8 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=15.10 .1952, D_{2}=22.10 .1952, D_{8}=29.10 .1952, D_{4}=5.11 .1952, D_{5}=12.11 .1952, D_{6}=\) 19.11.1952, \(D_{7}=26.11 .1952\), and \(D_{8}=3.12 .1952\).

Sub-plot treatments :
4 harvesting dates: \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{3 1 . 1 . 1 9 5 3}, \mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{1 5}\).2.1953, \(\mathrm{H}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) 3.3.1953 and \(\mathrm{H}_{4}=\) 18.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 8 main-plots/block and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of potatoes. (iv) (a) 1948 -continuing. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 10.60 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.170 ton/ac.
(b) 1.184 ton/ac.
(iii) All the effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in \(t\) n/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrrrrrrr|r} 
& \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{2}\) & \(D_{3}\) & \(D_{4}\) & \(D_{5}\) & \(D_{6}\) & \(D_{7}\) & \(D_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(H_{1}\) & 13.88 & 9.96 & 8.71 & 7.61 & 5.87 & 6.07 & 3.47 & 2.53 & 7.26 \\
\(H_{2}\) & 12.37 & 13.50 & 12.55 & 10.56 & 9.11 & 8.60 & 7.49 & 6.86 & 10.13 \\
\(H_{3}\) & 12.06 & 12.47 & 11.89 & 13.34 & 11.43 & 11.02 & 10.32 & 9.73 & 11.53 \\
\(H_{4}\) & 13.23 & 14.13 & 13.44 & 14.44 & 13.22 & 12.22 & 12.53 & 13.60 & 13.48 \\
\hline Mean & 12.88 & 12.52 & 11.65 & 11.49 & 9.91 & 9.73 & 8.45 & 8.18 & 10.60
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. D marginal means
2. H marginal means
3. \(H\) means at the same level of \(D\)
\(=0.414\) ton/ac.
\(=0.296\) ton/ac.
4. D means at the same level of \(\mathbf{H}\) \(=0.837\) ton/ac. \(=0.835\) ton/ac.

Crop : Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(1).
Type :-'C’.

Object :-To study the effect of diferent sowing and harvesting dates on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Ni1. (b) Paddy (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) fto (c) N.A.
(d) Rows 1 \(z^{\prime}\) apart, distance between treatments \(1^{\prime} z^{\prime}\), between blocks \(3^{\prime}\) and seed to seed spacing \(6^{\circ}\).
(e) N.A. (v) 50 mds./ac. of night soil. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 earthings. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) As per treatments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
9 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=8.10 .1953, D_{2}=15.10 .1953, D_{3}=22.10 .1953, D_{4}=29.10 .1953, D_{5}=5.11 .1953\), \(D_{6}=12.11 .1953, D_{7}=19.11 .1953, D_{8}=26.11 .1953\) and \(D_{9}=3.12 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
4 harvesting dates : \(H_{1}=10.2 .1954, H_{2}=25.2 .1954, H_{3}=12.3 .1954\) and \(H_{4}=\mathbf{2 4 . 3 . 1 9 5 4}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 9 main-plots/block and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 13^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic incidence below \(5 \%\). Checked by using bigger seed size and cut seed. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1948-continuing. (b) Yes.' (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.00 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.313 ton/ac.
(b) 1.009 ton/ac.
(iii) Both \(\mathbf{D}\) and H effeets are highly significant while interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

S.E. of the difference of two
1. \(D\) marginal means
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. D marginal means } & =0.379 \text { tot/ac. } \\ \text { 2. H marginal means } & =0.194 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 3. H means at the sames level of } D & \\ \text { 4. D mean at the sames level of } H & \\ & =0.582 \text { ton/ac. }\end{array}\)

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 52(25).
Type :-‘C'.

Object :-To study the effect of spacing and seed size on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N:. (b) Green manuring with sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) to (e) As per treatments. (v) Sanai was turned in. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{clccc} 
Treatment & Seed size & Spacing & particulars & No. of seeds/row \\
1. & Small & \(9^{\circ}\) & Single & 27 \\
2. & Small & \(9^{\circ}\) & Double & 54 \\
3. & Large & \(9^{\circ}\) & Single & 27 \\
4. & Medium & \(9^{\circ}\) & Single & 27 \\
5. & Medium & \(9^{\circ}\) & Double & 54 \\
6. & Small & \(6^{\circ}\) & Single & 40 \\
7. & Small & \(6^{\circ}\) & Double & 80 \\
8. & Large & \(6^{\circ}\) & Single & 40 \\
9. & Medium & \(6^{\circ}\) & Single & 40 \\
10. & Medium & \(6^{\circ}\) & Double & 80 \\
11. & Small & \(41^{\circ}\) & Single & 54 \\
12. & Medium & \(41^{\circ}\) & Single & 54 \\
13. & Small & \(3^{\circ}\) & Single & 80 \\
14. & Medium & \(3^{\circ}\) & Single & 80
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 14. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 994.97\) ac. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E-B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
- (i) 9.01 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.436 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 8.00 & 8. & 9.54 \\
2. & 7.92 & 9. & 8.35 \\
3. & 10.36 & 10. & 9.52 \\
4. & 7.52 & 11. & 810 \\
5. & 9.99 & 12. & 10.47 \\
6. & 7.75 & 13. & 7.96 \\
7. & 8.50 & 14. & 12.17 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=0.718\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 53(6).
Type : \({ }^{〔} \mathrm{C}\) ’.
Object:-To study the effect of spacing and seed size on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(21^{\circ}\) apart. (e) As per treatments. (v) \(100 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). of night soil. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Seed size & Spacing & particulars & No. of seeds per row \\
1. & Small & \(9^{\prime \prime}\) & Single & 20 \\
2. & Small & \(9^{\circ}\) & Double & 40 \\
3. & Large & \(9^{\circ}\) & Single & 20 \\
4. & Medium & \(9^{\circ}\) & Single & 20 \\
5. & Medium & \(9^{\circ}\) & Double & 40 \\
6. & Small & \(6^{\prime \prime}\) & Single & 30 \\
7. & Small & \(6^{\circ}\) & Double & 60 \\
8. & Large & \(6^{\circ}\) & Single & 30 \\
9. & Medium & \(6^{\circ}\) & Single & 30 \\
10. & Medium & \(6^{\circ}\) & Double & 60 \\
11. & Small & \(4.5^{\circ}\) & Single & 40 \\
12. & Medium & \(4.5^{\circ}\) & Single & 40 \\
13. & Small & \(3^{\circ}\) & Single & 60 \\
14. & Medium & \(3^{\circ}\) & Single & 60
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 14. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 1{ }^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Below \(5 \%\) incidence of mosaic. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 10.79 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.608 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.60 \\
2. & 10.50 \\
3. & 11.22 \\
4. & 9.74 \\
5. & 12.83 \\
6. & 8.60 \\
7. & 10.86 \\
& S.E./mean
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
8. & 11.83 \\
9. & 10.83 \\
10. & 13.45 \\
11. & 9.00 \\
12. & 11.19 \\
13. & 9.69 \\
14. & 11.72 \\
0.804 ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 48(23).
Type :-‘C’.
Object :-To study the effect of seed size and spacing on Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1948. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Applied 9 C.L. of F.Y.M. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 2 to 5.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All the 12 combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seed sizes : \(S_{1}=\) small ( \(3^{\circ} \times 1^{\circ}\) ) and \(S_{2}=\) large ( \(11^{\prime \prime} \times 2^{\circ}\) ).
(2) 3 spacings between plants: \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}, \mathrm{P}_{2}=9^{\circ}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=12^{\circ}\).
(3) 2 spacing between rows: \(\mathbf{R}_{1}=1 \frac{11^{\prime}}{}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{2}=2^{\prime}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1945-1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R). Crop failed during 1949.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 5.39 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.246 ton/ac.
(iii) \(S\) effect is highly significant, interaction \(S \times P\) is significant while all other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R 1}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 5.20 & 4.97 & 5.13 & 5.10 & 5.06 & 5.14 \\
\hline \(S_{9}\) & 5.51 & 5.66 & 5.90 & 5.69 & 5.67 & 5.71 \\
\hline Mean & 5.36 & 5.31 & 5.51 & 5.39 & 5.36 & 5.42 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 5.31 & 5.28 & 5.50 & & & \\
\hline R8 & 5.40 & 5.34 & 5.52 & & - & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) or \(R\) & \(=0.050\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) & \(=0.061\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table \(S \times R\) & \(=0.071\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table \(S \times P\) or \(R \times P\) & \(=0.087\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

```

Ref :- U.P. 52(23).
Type:- 'C'.
Object:-To study the effect of earthing up of Potato crop on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Green manuring for fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. .(b) N A. (iii) 24,25.10.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(1.75^{\prime} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at \(20 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) As par treatments. (ix) N.A. (x) 14,15.3.1953.

TREATMENTS :
1. One earthing on 9.1.1953.
2. Two earthings on 10.12.1952 and 5.1.1953.
3. Three earthings on 28.11.1952 and 9.1.1953.

In case of treatment ' 3 ', only two earthings were done due to vigorous foliage growth of the crop and delay in time of carthing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 8. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic incidence in minute form. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1952 -continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 14.37 tor/ac.
(ii) 0.782 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Av. yield of potato in ton/ac. \\
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 14.00 \\
2. & 14.64 \\
3. & 14.48 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.276\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Potato (Rabi). & Ref:- U.P. 53(3). \\
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. & Type :- ‘C’..
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of earthing up of Potato on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.10.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 1.93 cwts./ac. (d) \(1.75^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) As per treatments. (ix) N.A. (x) 9,10.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. One earthing on 29.11.1953.
2. Two earthings on 29.11.1953 and 12.12.1953.
3. Three earthings on 29.11.1953, 12.12.1953 and 18.1.1954.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(22.5^{\circ} \times 23.5^{\circ}\). (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.25^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic incidence below \(5 \%\); Chesked by using bigger seed size and cut seed. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) Yes. 1952-53 continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.89 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.570 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Av. yileld \\
1. & 9.21 & \\
2. & 9.10 & \\
3. & 8.37 & \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.641 \quad\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur..
Ref:- U.P. }48\mathrm{ (25).
Type:- 'C'.

```

Object :-To study the effect of different storage methods on yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11,12.11.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 34 mds. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 26, 28, 30.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS : =
1. Cold store.
2. Ordinary store.
3. Phulwa P-P. store.

Nature of seed material just in sprouting condition.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v)' (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 4.55 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.397 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 4.77 \\
2. & 4.53 \\
3. & 4.36 \\
S.E./mean , & \(=0.162\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Kharif).
Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.

Ref:-U.P. 53(11).
Type :-‘C’.

Object :-To study the effect of earthing up on yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Hill tract-6075' ht. (b) N.A. (iii) 20.3.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Flat sown. (c) N.A. (d) \(Z^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. on 3.3 .1953 and castor cake at \(20 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (vi) Garhwal. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 1 weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.8.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No earthing.
2. One earthing.
3. Two earthings.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 10.5^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
- (i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 3.54 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.002 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2.91 \\
2. & 3.70 \\
3. & 4.02 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.409\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Potato (Kharif). & Ref :-U.P. 52(30). \\
Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To determine the optimum sowing dates of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS -
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam mixed with gravel. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 20 seeds./row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 90 mds./ac. broadcast at the sowing time. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.9.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

6 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=10.4 .1952, D_{2}=17.4 .1952, D_{3}=24.4 .1952, D_{4}=1.5 .1952, D_{5}=8.5 .1952\) and \(D_{6}=15.5 .1952\)
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Minor [attack of disease occured. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 4.78 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.735 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(D_{1 \cdot} \cdot\) & 5.98 \\
\(D_{2} \cdot\) & 6.53 \\
\(D_{3 \cdot}\) & 5.63 \\
\(D_{4} \cdot\) & 5.88 \\
\(D_{5} \cdot\) & 2.73 \\
\(D_{8} \cdot\) & 1.95 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.520\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Potato (Kharif).
Site :- Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.
Ref:- U.P. 53(8).

```

Object :-To determine the optimum sowing time of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam mixed with gravel, slopy and uneven. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 18 seeds/row. Seed used 2 mds. 24 srs. 12 chs. (d) \(2^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. on 3.8.1953. and castor cake at 20 mds ./ac. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) First earthing is due when plants are \(8^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\) in height. Successive earthings follow at a certain interval to save the crop from exposure to sun and for the developments of shoots. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.8.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

7 sowing dates: \(D_{1}=16.3 .1953, D_{2}=23.3 .1953, D_{9}=30.3 .1953, D_{4}=6.4 .1953, D_{5}=13.4 .1953, D_{6}=20.4 .1953\) and \(D_{7}=27.4 .1953\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(14^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Not strictly randomised due to certain practical difficulties.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Yield and germination of potato. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 3.54 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.957 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(D_{1}\) & 5.63 \\
\(D_{2}\) & 3.97 \\
\(D_{3}\) & 5.27 \\
\(D_{4}\) & 3.37 \\
\(D_{6}\) & 2.87 \\
\(D_{6}\) & 1.76 \\
\(D_{7}\) & 1.89 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.479\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:-Potato (Kharif). \\ Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.
}

Ref :-U.P. 50(6).
Type :- \(\boldsymbol{x}^{\prime} \mathrm{C}^{\prime}\).
Object :-To study the effect of whole vs cut Potato on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hilly tract. (b) N.A. (iii) 29,30.4.1950. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 13 seeds/ row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) No. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 29, 30.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Whole potato sown.
2. Cut potato sown.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 9. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 1.04 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.373 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 1.28 \\
2. & 0.80 \\
S.e./mean & \(=0.124\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Potato (Kharif).
Site :- Potato Sub_Stn., Kausani.

```

\section*{Ref:- U.P. 51(7).}
```

Type:- 'C'.

```

Object:-To study the effect of whole and cut Potatos on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hilly tract. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.3.1951. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 14 seeds/ row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A.
( x ) 4.9.1951 to 5.9.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Whole potatoes sown.
2. Cut potatoes sown.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potao yield. (iv) (a).Yes. 1950 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 3.24 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.451 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
1. 3.24
2. \(\quad 3.24\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.184\) ton/ac.

Crop:- Potato (Kharif).
Site :- Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.

Ref :- U.P. 52(33).
Type:- ' C '.

Object:-To compare the effect of sowing whole tubers vs cut tubers.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Hilly tract ( \(6075^{\prime}\) high). (b) N.A. (iii) 17.4.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(90 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). broadcast at the time of preparation of field. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.9.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
I. Whole tubers sown.
2. Cut tubers sown.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Some plants were diseased. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) Yes. 1950 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2.21 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.616 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2.38 \\
2. & 2.04 \\
S.E./mean & 0.251 ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato (Kharif).
Site :- Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.

Ref :- U.P. 53(9).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To determine the efficacy of cut and whole tubers.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Hill tract, \(6075^{\prime}\) ht. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(24^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. on 3.3.1953 and cake at \(20 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). on \(\mathbf{1 0 . 5 . 1 9 5 3 \text { . (vi) Garhwal }}\) (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 22 and 28.8.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 dates of sowing: \(\mathrm{D}_{1}=17.3 .1953\) and \(\mathrm{D}_{2}=2.4\).1953.
(2) 2 types of potatos: \(T_{1}=\) cut potato sown and \(T_{2}=\) whole potato sown.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. -(b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 3.13 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.914 ton/ac.
(iii) Tubers (cut vs whole) are highly significant; sowing dates and interaction are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tuber in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & D2 & Mean \\
\hline T1 & 2.92 & 1.81 & 2.36 \\
\hline T2 & 4.03 & 3.75 & 3.89 \\
\hline Mean & 3.48 & 2.78 & 3.13 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & & \(=0.264\) ton/ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & & \(=0.373\) tod/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Kiharif).
Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.

Ref :-U.P. 50(5).
Type : \({ }^{-}\)C'.

Object :-To study the efficacy of sprouted potatoes on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hilly tract. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.4.1950. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 20 seeds/row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) No. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) No. (viii) 1 earthing only. (ix) N.A. (x) 27 to 28.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sprouted seed.
2. Unsprouted seed.
3. DESIG.N :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R)-
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2.40 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.406 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tuber in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2.84 \\
2. & 1.95 \\
S.e./mean & \(=0.166\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Potato (Kharif). \\ Site :- Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.
}

Ref:- U.P. 51(5).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To study the efficacy of sprouted potatoes on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hilly tract. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.3.1951. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 14 seeds/row. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Earthing only. (ix) N.A. (x) 24 to 26.8.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sprouted seed.
' 2. Unsprouted seed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) N.A. (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N A. (vi) The germination and growth of sprouted seeds was better than the unsprouted one. Later on, due to lack of soil nutrition the plants in both the treatments were sickly in appearance. The \(\%\) of small tubers were more in each case. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.67 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.860 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is not significant.
(iv) Av.' yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 6.67 \\
2. & 6.67 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.168\) ton./ac
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Potato (Kharif).}

Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.
Ref :-U.P. 52(31).
Type : \({ }^{〔} \mathrm{C}\) '.

Object :-To determine the comparative efficacy of different Potato seed material on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Hilly tract. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.4.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 90 mds./ac. broadcast at the sowing time. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) Unirrigated. (vii) 1 weeding and earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 28 and 29.8.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Potato sown sprouted.
2. Potato sown desprouted:
3. Potato sown unsprouted.

Desprouted has been added this year only. This was done by desprouting the sprouted tubers. The sprouts were abovt \(4^{\circ}\) to \(6^{\circ}\) long.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) . " No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2.01 to \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 0.477 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2.05 \\
2. & 2.01 \\
3. & 1.98 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.195\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Crop:- Potato (Kharif).
Site :- Potato Sub-Sta., Kausani.
}

Ref :- U.P. 53(10).

Object : - To determine comparative efficacy of different potato seed material on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Hilly tract, 6015' high. (b) N.A. (iii) 18.3.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. on 3.3 .1953 and castor cake at 20 mds./ac. (vi) Garbwal (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.9.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Potato sown sprouted.
2. Potato sown desprouted.
3. Potato sown unsprouted.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Germination was \(90 \%\) or more, premature "drying up" recorded", during 2nd fortnight of June, 1953.
(ii) No. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv). (a) 1952 -continued. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No.
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2.62 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.528 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & \(\ddots\) & Av. yield \\
1. & 2.25 \\
2. & 3.30 \\
3. & 2.32 \\
& \\
S.E./mean & & \(=0.215\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Potato (Kharif)
Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani,

Ref:-U.P. 50(144).
Type:-‘C'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed size and spacing on Potato yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hilly tract ( \(6075^{\circ}\) high). (b) N.A. (iii) 30.4.1950 to 1.5.1950. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Garhwal (late). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3 to 13.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) Seed size : \(S_{1}=\) Large ( \(\left.1^{\prime \prime}-11^{\prime \prime}\right)\) and \(S_{2}=\operatorname{Small}\left(1^{\prime \prime}-i^{\prime \prime}\right)\).
(2) Distance between rows: \(\mathrm{R}_{1}=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) and \(\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=2^{\prime}\).
(3) Distance between plants : \(P_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}, P_{2}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(P_{3}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 6^{\prime}\) for \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) and \(10^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\) for \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2.64 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.939 ton/ac.
(iii) \(S\) effect is highly significant. P effect is significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
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S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) or \(S\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.192 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.156 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.221 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.271 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{Crop :-Potato (Kharif).}

Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.

Ref :-U.P. 51(141).
Type: : \({ }^{\text {C }}\) '

Object :-To study the effect of seed size and spacing on Potato yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Hilly tract ( \(6075^{\prime}\) height). (b) N.A. (iii) 15.3.1951. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Garhwal (late). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.8.1951 to 3.9.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) Seed size: \(S_{1}=\) Large ( \(\left.1^{\prime \prime}-1 \frac{1}{2}\right)\) and \(S_{2}=\) Small ( \(\left.1^{\prime \prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\right)\).
(2) Distance between rows: \(\mathrm{R}_{1}=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) and \(\mathrm{R}_{2}=2^{\prime \prime}\).
(3) Distance between plants : \(P_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}, P_{2}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(P_{3}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\) for \(R_{2}\) and \(10^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\) for \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\). (v) Plots 2.5 ' apart and blocks \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 6.49 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.647 ton/ac.
(iii) Only R effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P r}_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 6.94 & 7.23 & 6.17 & 6.78 & 7.08 & 6.48 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{9}\) & 6.22 & 6.38 & 6-00 & 6.20 & 6.90 & 5.50 \\
\hline Mean & 6.58 & 6.81 & 6.08 & 6.49 & 6.99 & 5.99 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 6.76 & 7.33 & 6.88 & 6.99 & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{\(\therefore\)}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{2}\) & 6.40 & 6.28 & 5.29 & 5.99 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) or \(S\)
S.E. of body of table \(\mathbf{R} \times S\)
S.E. of body of table \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{R}\) or \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{S}\)
\(=0.336\) ton/ac.
\(=0.274\) ton/ac.
\(=0.388\) ton/ac.
\(=0.475\) ton/ac.

Crop :- Potato (Kharif).
Site :- Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.

Ref:-U.P. 52 (32).
Type :- 'C'.

Obj \(\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{t}}\) :--To study the effect of seed size and spacing on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) No. (ii) (a) Hilly tract ; 6075 ' high. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.4 .1952 . (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) \& (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 90 md./ac. broadcast at the preparation of ficld. (vi) Garhwal. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 3 to 5.9.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) Seed size: \(S_{1}=\) large \(\left(1^{*}-1 t^{\prime}\right)\) and \(S_{2}=\) small ( \(1^{*}-11^{\circ}\).)
(2) Distance between rows : \(R_{1}=11^{\prime}\) and \(R_{2}=2^{\prime}\).
(3) Distance between plants: \(P_{1}=6^{\circ}, P_{2}=9^{\prime}\) and \(P_{3}=12^{\prime \prime}\).

12 rows/plot for \(R_{1}\) and 9 rows/plot for \(R_{2}\) spacings. No. of tubers for \(P_{1}, P_{2}\) and \(P_{s}\) spacings are 18,12 \& 9 . respectively.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii). Few plants were diseased. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 4.51 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.144 ton/ac.
(iii) \(S, P\) and \(R\) effects and interaction \(S \times P\) are highly significant. Other interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R 2}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 6.41 & 5.22 & 4.17 & 5.27 & 5.89 & 4.64 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3.76 & 3.84 & 3.65 & 3.75 & 4.50 & 2.99 \\
\hline Mean & 5.08 & 4.53 & 3.91 & 4.51 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 5.74 & 5.27. & 4.57 & 5.19 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R z}_{1}\) & 4.43 & 3.78 & 3.25 & 3.82 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) & \(=0.234\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) or \(S\) & \(=0.191\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table \(R(\times S\) & \(=0.270\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of tables \(P \times R\) or \(P \times S\) & \(=0.330\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :=Potato (Kharif).
Site :-Potato Sub-Stn:, Kausani.

Ref:-U.P. 53(12).
Type :-‘C'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed size and spacing on Potato yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDTIONS:}
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Hill tract; 6075' high. (b) N.A. (iii) 21 and 22.3.1953. (iv) (a) \&
(b) N.A. (c) \& (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. on 3.3.1953 and castor cake at \(20 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(vi) Garhwal. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 22 and 23.8.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 seed sizes : \(S_{1}=\) small and \(S_{2}=\) large.
(2) 2 row spacings : \(R_{1}=18^{\circ}\) and \(R_{2}=21^{\prime \prime}\).
(3) 2 plant spacings : \(P_{1}=6^{\prime \prime}\) and \(P_{2}=9^{\prime \prime}\).

14 rows/plot for \(R_{1}\) and 12 rows/plot for \(R_{\mathbf{2}}\) spacings. No. of tubers/row for \(P_{1}\) and \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) spacings are 18 and 12 respectively.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination and yield. (iv) (a) 1953 -contioued. (b) and (c) N.A: (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).

\section*{RESULTS :}
(i) 2.94 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.992 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.248 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =0.351 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Potato. } & \text { Ref:-U.P. 51(86). } \\
\text { Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. } & \text { Type :-‘C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To study the effect of cut ps whole tubers on growth and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Mung+maize-wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii), (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11 .1951 . (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by victory plough, 2 by cultivator and 2 by desi plough and planking etc. (b) On ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(1 \mathbf{1}^{\prime} \times \mathbf{l}^{\prime}\). (e) 1 . (v) 150 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed with first irrigation on 11.12 .1951 . (vi) Military (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 earthings and other cultural operations. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

5 types of tubers: \(T_{1}=\) wholeituber, \(T_{2}=\) tuber cut into halves, \(T_{3}=\) tuber cut into quarters, \(T_{4}=\) periderm and \(T_{5}=\) pith.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(4 \frac{1^{\prime}}{} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Ordinary. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No.
(vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. Data for year 1952-N.A.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2.96 toa/ac.
(ii) 0.456 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) & 3.89 \\
\hline T & 3.52 \\
\hline T8 & 2.59 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{T}_{6}\) & 1.90 \\
\hline Ts & 2.92 \\
\hline S.E./mean & = 0.228 ron/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :w Potato. & Ref :- U.P. 53(208). \\
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type :- 'C'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of cut vs whole tubers on growth and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with cultivator and digging. (b) On ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) T.C. applied on 21.10.1953. (vi) Military (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

5 types of tubers: \(T_{1}=\) whole tuber, \(T_{2}=\) tuber cut. into halves, \(T_{2}=\) tuber cut into quarters, \(T_{1}=\) periderm and \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{b}}=\) pith.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) 71' \(\times 9{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 3.86 ton/ac.
(ii) \(0.79 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 5.18 \\
\(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 4.37 \\
\(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 2.99 \\
\(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 4.56 \\
\(\mathbf{T}_{6}\) & \\
S.E./mean & \\
& \\
& \(=0.22\) \\
&
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:-Potato.}

Site :-Crop Phsysiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 51(87).
Type :-‘C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different sizes of Potato on its growth, performance and its yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Mung+Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.11.1951. (iv) (a) One ploughing by victory plough, 2 by cultivators and 2 by desl plough and planking etc. (b) On ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(11^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) \(150 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{a}\) :- of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 11.12 .1951 . (vi) Military (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Earthand intercultural operation. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

5 sizes of seeds : \(S_{1}=1^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=1^{\prime \prime}, S_{8}=11^{\prime \prime}, S_{4}=2^{\circ}\) and \(S_{6}=21^{\circ}\) diameter.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(4 \mathbf{l}^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.01 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.854 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Ay. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3.29 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3.80 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 5.19 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 6.99 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{5}\) & 5.79 \\
\(\mathrm{~S} . \mathrm{E} /\) /mean & \(=0.427\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Crop :- Potato (Rabi). & Ref:-U.P. 50(320). \\
Site :- College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi. &
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of desprouting seed tuber on germination, growth and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sannhemp. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, College Form, Varanasi. (iii) 23.10.1950. (iv) (a) Palewa given. Two ploughings, one tractor ploughing. Field disced, levelled and ridges laid out. (b) Planted on ridges. (c) -. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 12^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Sannhemp ploughed in using the country plough for green manuring. F.Y.M. 5 C.L./ac. and A/S at \(250 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). top dressed after \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) months of planting. (vi) Phulwa. (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A, (x) 7.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control-where no desprouting was carried out and seed tubers were retained until planting in the sprouted state.
2. Desprouted 3 weeks before planting where all sprouts were detached using the blunt end of writing nib.
3. Desprouted 2 weeks before planting using the same method as above.
4. Desprouted one week before planting-method as above.

In this manner 3, 2 and 1 week respectively elapsed in between desprouting and time of planting. This may be taken as period of rest for the desprouted seed.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) \(45^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(14^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\left(14^{\prime} \times 101^{\prime}\right.\) in layout). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 71^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Fresh weight of plants and tubers at successive interval. No. of shoots/hill etc. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) -. (v) (a), (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Av. yield in ton/ac. cannot be given due to the remark " 65 plant/net-plot out of which samples were taken out at regular interval for studies. On an average 50 plants were left over in each plot"? written in the thesis. The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}

Av. yield of tuters/plant in ozs.
Av. yield of tubers/plot in 0zs.
(i) \(5.95 \quad\) Oz./plant.
(i) 297.81 oz./plot.
(ii) 0.1153 oz./plant.
(ii) \(5.9028 \quad\) oz./plot.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in 0z./plant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in oz./plot.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Av. yield of pota & Av. yield \\
Treatment & 6.00 \\
1. & 5.96 \\
2. & 5.88 \\
3. & 5.96 \\
4 & \(=0.0576 \quad\) oz./plant.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 300.25 \\
2. & 298.50 \\
3. & 294.25 \\
4. & 298.25 \\
S.E \(/\) mean & \(=2.9514 \mathrm{oz} . /\) plot.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop : Potato (Rabi). \\ Site :-College Farm,B.H.U., Varanasi.
}

\author{
Ref :-U.P. 50(321). \\ Type:- 'C'.
}

Object :-To study the role of deflowering in potato production.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sannhemp. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, College Farm, Varanasi. (iii) 23.10.1950. (iv) (a) Palawa given. 2 ploughings. One tractor ploughing, field disced, levelled and ridges laid out. (b) Planted on ridges. (c) N.A. (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) Sannhemp ploughed in using the country plough for green manuring. 5 C.L./ac. of F.Y.M. and A/S at 250 Jb ./ac. was top dressed after \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) month of planting. (vi) Patna white (Phulwa) (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Deflowering of plants in the floral stage when the buds have just opened.
2. Defruiting of plants when the berries have just formed.
3. Control (flowers and fruits left as such to develop under natural condition):
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) \(14^{\prime} \times 38^{\prime}\). (iii) 8. (iv) (a) \(14^{\prime} \times 12\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of tubers/plant, no. of tubers'plant and mean weight/tuber. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) No (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS
(i) and (iv)
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Av. weight/tuber \\
in gm.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Av. weight of \\
tuber/plant in gm.
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Av. num er of \\
tubers/plant
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 10.95 & 223.50 & 21.32 \\
2. & 10.71 & 228.75 & 21.36 \\
3. & 9.28 & 224.12 & 24.19 \\
G.M. & 10.31 & 228.79 & 22.29 \\
S.E./plot & 0.3712 & 7.9448 & 0.9644 \\
S.E./mean & 0.1312 & 2.8089 & 0.3410 \\
Significance & Highly Sig. & Not Sig. & Highly Sig.
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi.
Ref :mU.P. 50(322).
Type :-'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of whole, one half and one quarter seed tubers with identical seed rate on growth, performance and yield of Potato.
- BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sannhemp. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, College Farm, Varanasi. (iii) 19.10.1950. (iv) (a) Palewa given, two ploughings, one tractor ploughing subsequently given, disced, levelled and ridges laid out. (b) Planting in ridges. (c) As per treatments. (d) Ridges \(18{ }^{\circ}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Sannhemp ploughed in using the country plough for green manuring. 5 C.L./ac. of F.Y.M. and A/S at \(250 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). top dressed after \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) month of planting. (vi) Patna red (Katwa)-(late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Planting of whole tubers (wt. 40 gms . each).
2. Planting of half sized tubers (wt. 20 gms. each).
3. Planting of quarter sized tubers (wt. \(10 \mathrm{gms}, ~ e a c h\) ).

Tubers cut on the day of planting. To obtain half sized seed-pieces the tubers were cut into 2 equal halves each including a position of the apical end bearing buds. The quarter sized seed pieces were similarly cut out into 4 equal parts taking care that at least one bud was included in each position.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(12^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) (length of ridge 12 ft. ; no. of rows 14 ). (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. - (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of tubers/plant and imean weight/tuber. (iv) (a) to (c) No. \(\boldsymbol{f}\) (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 4.12 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.209 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of tuber in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 4.71 \\
2. & 4.00 \\
3. & 3.65 \\
S.E.jmean & \(=0.085\) ton/ac.r
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Potato. \\ Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad. \\ - Ref :- U.P. 49(45). \\ Type:-‘CV'. \\ Object :-To study the efficacy of sowing sprouted and unsprouted Potato of different varieties.
}
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Early maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.10 .1949 . (iv) (a) 5 ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 300 mds./ac. on 18.10 .1949 , A/S at 6 seers \(4 \mathrm{ch} / \mathrm{ac}\). on 27.11 .1949 and castor cake at 10 mds./ac. on 19.10.1949. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 , weeding and 3 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 20 and 21.2.1950
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) phulwa (cold storage) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) sala (cold storage).
(2) 2 seed materials: \(M_{1}=\) sprouted and \(M_{\mathbf{2}}=\) unsprouted.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952 . (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 7.80 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.950 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 7.96 & 7.07 & Mean \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.71 & 7.46 & 7.52 \\
\hline Mean & 8.34 & 7.26 & 7.80 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.3357 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =0.4748 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

Crop :- Potato.
Site :-Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :-U.P. 50(13).
Type :-‘CV'.

Object:-To study the efficacy of sowing sprouted and unsprouted Potato of different varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil (b) Chari (jowar). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11 .1950 . (iv) (a) 3 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 16 seeds/row with 14 rows/plot. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) City refuse at 300 md./ac. on 22 and 23.10.1950 and A/S at 0.5 sr ./plot on 2.t.1951. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings up. (ix) N.A. (x) 6 and 7.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) kalami (cold storage) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) sala (cold storage).
(2) 2 seed materials : \(\mathbf{M}_{1}=\) sprouted and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) unsprouted.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) Traces of mosaic incidence. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952 (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 9.54 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.545 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & & M & Mean \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 9.64 & * & 9.32 & 9.48 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 9.64 & & 9.55 & 9.60 \\
\hline Mean & 9.64 & & 9.44 & 9.54 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.193 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.272 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref:- U.P. 51(10).
Type:- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the efficacy of sowing sprouted and unsprouted Potato of different varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Guar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10 and 11.11.1951. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by tractor and 1 by desi plough (b) N.A. (c) 24 seeds/row with 10 rows/plot. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(250 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). on 4.11 .1951 . A/S at 2 srs ./plot on 3.12.1951. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) 1rrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 25 and 30.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varities: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) Phulwa and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{F}\)-728.
(2) \({ }^{-} 2\) seed materials: \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) sprouted and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) unsprouted.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) \(78^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (iii) 8. (iv) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\) (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination and yield of potato/plot. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by E.B.(R). Modified in year 1952.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 4.92 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.632 ton/ac.
(iii) Only V effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(M_{1}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 6.40 & 6.38 & 6.39 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 3.44 & 3.47 & 3.46 \\
\hline Mean & 4.92 & 4.92 & 4.92 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table}} & \(=0.158\) ton/ac. & \\
\hline & & =0.224 ton/ac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref :- U.P. 53(18). Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the optimum sowing dates with weekly intervals for cut Potato:
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 12 seeds/row with 6 rows/plot. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at 50 md/ac. on 5.11 .1953 . A/S at \(0.514 \mathrm{lb} . /\) plot on 14.12.1953, and on 28.12.1953 as top dressing. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings up and 1 weeding and hoeing. (ix) 2.74". (x) 1.3.1954 for Hyb. 45 and 9.3.1954 for Phulwa.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) Kalmi phulwa (cut potato) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Hyb} .45\) (cut potato).
(2) 4 sowing dates : \(D_{1}=7.11 .1953, D_{8}=14.11 .1953, D_{3}=21.11 .1953\) and \(D_{4}=28.11 .1953\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(14^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(112^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic incidence below 5\%, checked'by using larger and cut seed. (iii) Germination and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b), (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.69 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.763 ton/ac.
(iii) Only V effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{2}\) & D3 & \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 4.07 & 4.07 & 4.07 & 3.33 & 3.89 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{8}\) & 7.28 & 7.78 & 7.66 & 7.28 & 7.50 \\
\hline Mean & 5.68 & 5.92 & 5.86 & 5.30 & 5.69 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\(S\) E. of marginal mean of \(V\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=0.220\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=0.156\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\(=0.440\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res.Farm, Farrukhabad.

Ref:- U.P. 49(48).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of seed size on yield of different varieties of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Early maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2 and 3.11.1949. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 25 seeds/row with 10 rows/plot (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 225 md /ac. on 26.10.1949, castor cake at \(15 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 1.11 .1949 and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 7 srs .2 chhs./ac. on 12.12.1949. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.2.1950 (military) and 8.3.1950 (others).
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) Kalami (ordinary store), \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) Sala (cold store), \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=P\) Phulwa (ordinary store) and \(V_{4}=\) Military (ordinary store).
(2) 2 seed size : \(S_{1}=\) large \(\left(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime \prime}-2^{\prime \prime}\right)\) and \(S_{2}=\operatorname{small}\left(\mathbf{1}^{\circ}-1^{\prime \prime}\right)\)
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 19^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERALL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.46 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.534 ton/ac.
(iii) V and S effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(V_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\cdot\) Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 8.53 & 9.82 & 8.08 & 5.05 & 7.87 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{2}\) & 7.95 & 8.21 & 7.87 & 4.16 & 7.05 \\
\hline Mean & 8.24 & 9.02 & 7.98 & 4.61 & 7.46
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) & \(=0.189 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\) & \(=0.133 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=0.267 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop : Potato (Rabi).}

Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 50(2).}

Type:- 'CV'.

Object:-To study the effect of spacing on Potato varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) Maize. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10 .1950 . (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing. (ix). N.A. (x) 2 to 6.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(i) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) majestic and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Phulwa.
(2) 3 row spacings : \(R_{1}=18^{\prime}, R_{2}=21^{\prime \prime}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{3}=24^{\prime \prime}\).
(3) 2 plant spacings : \(P_{1}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(P_{2}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 9.00 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 1.0296 ton/ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{V}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) effects are highly significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) or \(V\) S.E. of body of tables \(R \times P\) or \(R \times V\)
S.E. of body of table \(P \times V\)
\(=0.2574\) ton/ac.
\(=0.2101\) ton/ac.
\(=0.3640\) ton/ac. \(=0.2972\) ton/ac.

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
- Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref: : U.P. 52(26).
Type :-‘CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of spacing on Potato varieties.
1. BASAL CO VDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Green manuring with Sanat. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Sanal was turned in and Castor cake at \(20 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). broadcast at the time of preparation of feld. (vi) As per treatments (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) up-to-date and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) phulwa. \({ }^{\text {. }}\)
(2) 3 row spacings : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=18^{\circ}, \mathrm{R}_{\boldsymbol{i}}=21^{\circ}\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=24^{\circ}\).
(3) 2 plant spacings: \(P_{1}=9^{\circ}\) and \(P_{1}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Pect. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Potato Pyield. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 10.54 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.612 ton/ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{R}\) and \(P\) effects are highly significant. Interaction \(R \times V\) is significant. Other effects are not significant. (iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{R z}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) \\
\hline V1 & 11.00 & 10.37 & 10.37 & 10.58 & 10.83 & 10.33 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 11.62 & 10.28 & 9.63 & 10.51 & 10.99 & 10.033 \\
\hline Mean & 11.31 & 10.32 & 10.00 & 10.54 & 10.91 & 10.18 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 11.58 & 10.83 & 10.33 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 11.04 & 9.82 & 9.68 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) & \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) or \(V\) & \(=0.153\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of \(R \times P\) or \(R \times V\) tables & \(=0.125\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of \(P \times V\) table & \\
& \(=0.177\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :- U.P. 53(5).
Type : \({ }^{‘} \mathrm{CV}\) ’.
Object :-To study the effect of spacing on Potato varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanal for green manuring. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24, 25.10.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) \(90 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). of night soil. (vi) Up-to-date and phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=u p-t o-\) date and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) phulwa.
(2) 3 row spacings: \(\mathrm{R}_{1}=18^{\prime \prime}, \mathrm{R}_{2}=21^{\circ}\) and \(\mathrm{R}_{3}=24^{\prime \prime}\);
(3) 2 plant spacings : \(P_{1}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(P_{2}=12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(20.5^{\prime} \times 17.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.25^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mosaic incidence below \(5 \%\), checked by using bigger seeds and cut seed. (iii) Germination - and yield of potato. (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(R).
5. RESUULTS :
(i) 12.21 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.782 ton/ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{V}\) and R effects are highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{V} \times P\) is significant. Other effests are not significant. (iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) & \(=0.196 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) or \(V\) & \(=0.160\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of \(R \times P\) or \(R \times V\) tables & \(=0.277\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of \(P \times V\) table & \(=0.226\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Potato. (Rabi)
Site ;- Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra.

Ref :- U.P. 50(306).
Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed sizes, method of scwing and manures applied on Potato yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Tomato and then fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light sandy Joam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra. (iii) 10.10 .1950 . (iv) (a) 2 ploughing by soil turning' plough and 3 ploughing by desi p'ough followed by pata. (b) As per treatments. (c) \(5 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{md}, 10 \mathrm{md}\) and \(21 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\), in \(S_{1}, S_{2}\) and \(S_{2}\) respectively. (d) \(11^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (e) 1. (v) Nil. (vi) Gola (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

Majn-plot treatments :
3 seed sizes: \(S_{1}=\) big ( \(1^{\circ}\) to \(1.5^{\prime}\) ), \(S_{2}=\) medium ( \(0.5^{\prime \prime}\) to \(1^{\prime}\) ) and \(S_{2}=\) small (below \(0.5^{\prime \prime}\) ).

\section*{Seb-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 methods of sowing: \(M_{1}=\) sowing on flat followed by earthing and \(M_{2}=\) sowing \(o n\) ridges.
(2) 2 forms of manure: \(F_{1}=200 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as compost and \(\mathrm{F}_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as R.Y.M.

Manures applied on 1.10 .1950 and mixed by spade and then ridges made.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 48^{\prime}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 12\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(1.5^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of tubers ard other characters. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. Raw data N.A.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2.76 tons/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.240 ton/ac.
(b) 0.351 ton.'ac.
(iii) \(\mathbf{S}\) effect is significant. Interactions \(\mathrm{F} \times \mathrm{M}, \mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{M}\) and \(\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{M} \times \mathrm{F}\) are highly signifizant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{F}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{F}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 291 & 360 & 1.70 & 2.74 & 2.38 & 3.09 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) & 4.35 & 2.33 & 1.70 & 2.79 & 2.94 & 2.64 \\
\hline Mean & . 3.63 & 2.96 & 1.70 & 2.76 & 2.66 & 2.86 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal means
\(=0.438\) ton/ac.
2. \(\mathbf{M}\) or \(\mathbf{F}\) marginal means
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(S\)
4. \(S\) means at the same level of \(M\)
\(=0.101\) ton/ac.
\(=0.176\) ton/ac.
5. means in the body of \(\mathbf{M} \times \mathrm{F}\) table
0.144 tom

Crop :- Potato (Rabi).
Site := Agri. College, B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 51(297).
Type :- 'IM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different manures along with irrigation on growth and yield of Potato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 1.11.1951s (iv) (a) Ploughing by soil investing plough followed by several ploughings with desi plough. In all 10 ploughings followed by pata. (b) Sown in furrows. (c) \(8-10 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(18^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Patna 'white" (phulwa). (vii) As per treatments. (viii) Earthing done twice. The first was done one month after sowing and the second :20 days after sowing; 2 hoeings and weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 105 . W'tays'thet pranting'

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{, Riev:Allicombinations of (1) and (2)}


 \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\).
(2) 3 levels of irrigations: \(I_{1}=4\) irrigations after an interval of 25 to 28 days during grand period of growth af crop, \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=6\) irrigations after an interval of 20 days during the grand period of growth of crop and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=8\) irrigations after an interval of 15 days ("2. 1 ", I: 11 diuring the grand period of growth of crop.
3. DESIGN :
 .14.才
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Fresh and dry weight of tops, tubers, no. of tubers/hill and no. of stalks/hid. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 4.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.401 ton/ac.
(iii) \(M\) and I effects are highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(M_{1}\) & \(M_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2.89 & 3.14 & 399 & 3.34 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3.86 & 4.86 & 5.64 & 4.79 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 4.35 & 5.36 & 6.09 & 5.27 \\
\hline Mean & 3.70 & 4.45 & 5.24 & 4.47
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.116 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =0.200 \text { ion/ac. }
\end{array}
\]
Crop :-Potato (Kharif).
Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.

Ref :- U.P. 51 (258).
Site :-Potato Sub-Stn., Kausani.
Type :- 'D'. ."
Object :-To study the effect of pesticides in controlling Potato Epliachna.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A.' (vi) N.A. 1 (viii, N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion at 40 gallon/ac.
2. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. suspension at 40 gallon/ac.
3. Spraying with \(0.15 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion at 40 gallon/ac.
4. Spraying with \(0.15 \%\) D.D.T. suspension at 40 gallon/ac.
5. Dusting with \(5 \%\) D.D.T. dust at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. Dusting with G.205P (5\% D.D.T.+Pyrethrium) at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4.
(iv) (a) \(1 / 28\) ac.
(b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \%reduction and population of potato epliachna beetle and yield of potato. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K). As \% reduction of population of control plot is negative, \% analysis bas not been done.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 4.03 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.229 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly sıgnificant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 4.55 \\
2. & 4.52 \\
3. & 4.43 \\
4. & 4.33 \\
5. & 3.66 \\
6. & 3.57 \\
7. & 3.12 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.115\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop : \(\boldsymbol{\sim}\) Potato.}

Ref :- U.P. 53(191).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Object :-To find out the effect of phenyl solution on growth and yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. - (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.1.1954. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(21^{\text { }} \times 6^{\text {º }}\) (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Phulwa. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control-No Phenyl.
2. 5 minutes dip in phenyl solution, dried and left over for 24 hours and then sown as usual.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2 . (b) N.A. (iii) 17. (iv) (a) and (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 1\) ¹ \(^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) No.
4. GENERAL :
- (i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Potato yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N,A. (vi) Ni. (vii) The experiment was conduted by E.B. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.45 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.606 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is not significant.
(iv) Av yield of tuber in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 5.63 \\
2. & 5.27 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.147\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 50(15).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{x}^{\prime} \mathrm{D}^{\prime}\).
Object :-To find out the effect of fungicides on Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manuring. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1950. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Sanai turned in for green manuring. (vi) Kalami sala (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings. (ix) N.A. (x) 22, 23 and 24.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:-

1:- Bordeaux applied to soil just after sowing.
2. Bordeaux spray on foliage.
3. Perenox applied to soil just after sowing.
4. Perenox spray on foliage.
5. Yellow cuprocide applied to soil just after sowing.
6. Yellow cuprocide spray on foliage.
7. Perenox applied to soil and spray on foliage.
8. Control.

Dates of spraying : 8.12.1950, 8.1.1951 and 9.2.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) Nid. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tuber yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil.
(vii) The expt. was conducted by E.B.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 12.30 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.614 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 12.50 & 5. & 12.30 \\
2. & 12.25 & 6. & 12.35 \\
3. & 12.60 & 7. & 11.85 \\
4. & 12.10 & 8. & 12.45 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=0.307\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 48(94).
Type :-'D'.

Object :-To determine the efficacy of different spraying fluids in controlling blight of Potato:
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.11 .1948 . (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Majestic. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (unsprayed),
2. Sprayed with Bordeaux mixture \(1 \%\) ( \(5: 5: 50\) ) -3 sprayings at an interval of 10 days starting from 15.12.1948.
3. Sprayed with Perenox ( 3 lb . in 100 gallons of water) 3 sprayings at an interval of 10 days beginning from 15.12.1948.
4. Sprayed with Dithane D-14 ( \(1 \frac{1 \mathrm{~b}}{\mathrm{~b}}\). per 100 gallons of water) -3 sprayings at an interval of 10 days beginning from 5.12.1948.
5. Sprayed with Dithane Z-78 ( \(1 \frac{1}{\mathrm{lb}}\). per 100 gallons of water) -3 sprayings à an interval of 10 days starting on 6.12.1948.
6. Yellow cuprocide spray ( \(1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{lb}\). in 100 gallons of water) - 3 sprayings at an interval of 10 days starting from 15.12.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(45^{\circ} \times 14^{\circ}\). (v) N.A (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \(\%\) infection and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1950 . (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS:
\% of infection
(i) 7.19 angle/plot.
(ii) 3.476 angle/plot.
(ii) Treatments are highly significantly different. (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed \\
back \(\%\)
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 11.35 & 4.33 \\
2. & 2.40 & 0.68 \\
3. & 4.49 & 1.10 \\
4. & 11.64 & 4.53 \\
5. & 6.94 & 1.95 \\
6. & 6.30 & 1.69 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.419\) angle/plot
\end{tabular}

Potato yield
(i) 1.16 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.198 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Ay. yield of potato in ton/ac.

Treatment Av. yield 1.06 1.25 1.19 1.10 1.15 1.22 \(=0.081\) ton/ac.
```

Crop:- Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 49(197).
Type :-'D'.

```

Object :-To study the effect of different fungicidal sprays on the yield of Potato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1949 (gaps filled by transplanting on 2.12.1949) (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Majestic. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.3.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Bordeaux mixture \(1 \%\) ( \(5: 5: 50\) ).
3. Perenox \(0.3 \%\).
 water to make 100 gallons).
5. Dithane Z-78-1 \(\frac{1}{8} \mathrm{lb}\). in 100 gallons of water.
6. Yellow cuprocide \(1 \frac{\mathrm{l}}{\mathrm{lb}}\). in 100 gallons of water.

Sprayings done on the plants \(8^{\prime \prime}\) and \(9^{\circ}\) high.
1st sprayiag on 21.1.1950 2ad syraying on 7,8 and 9.2.1950. 3rd spraying on 25.2.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv). (a) N.A. (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Rains continuous and heavy on 29 and 30.10.1949 Due to heavy rains the germination was very poor. therefore replications were reduced to 2 from 6 and gaps filled in. (ii) Symptoms of blight appeared on 19.1.1950. (iii) \% infection and potato yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P. Transformation has been applied as suggested by the Chief Statistifician to Govt. U.P.
5. RESULTS :

\section*{\(\%\) of infection}
(i) 18.45 angle/plot
(ii) 3.388 angle/plot.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back \(\%\) \\
1. & 25.76 & 19.20 \\
2. & 12.43 & 5.08 \\
3. & 21.14 & 13.38 \\
4. & 18.52 & 10.49 \\
5. & 17.78 & 9.73 \\
6. & 15.10 & 7.21 \\
& \\
\multicolumn{2}{l}{ S.E./mean } & \(=2.396\) angle/plot
\end{tabular}

Potato yield
(i) 2.49 .ton/ac.
(ii) 0.473 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment are not significantly cifferent.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1.73 \\
2. & 3.23 \\
3. & 2.48 \\
4. & 2.00 \\
5. & 2.66 \\
6. & 2.84 \\
& \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.334\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Potato (Rabi).
Site :-Govt.Res Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 50(249).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of the application of different fungicidal sprays to the soil and foliage on the yield of Potato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Kalmi sala. (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Bordeaux Mixture \(1 \%\) applied to soil immediately after sowing.
2. Bordeaux mixture \(1 \%\) sprayed on the foliage.
3. Perenox \(0.3 \%\) applied to soil immediately after sowing.
4. Perenox \(0.3 \%\) sprayed on the foliage.
5. Yellow cuprocide \(0.15 \%\) applied to soil immediately after sowing.
6. Yellow ctiprocide sprayed on the foliage.
7. Perenox applied to soil immediately after sowing.-
8. Control.

Quantity applied to soil at 300 gallons/ac. on 3.11 .1950 and to foliage at 100 gallons/ac. on 13.12 .1950 . for first time at 400 gallons/ac. on 8,9.1.1951 and 600 gallons/ac. on 9.2:1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes. ,
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Free from fungal diseass but virus infection had started. (iii) Number of infected plants per plot. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by P.P. Number of infected plants varies from 0 to 4.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1.2145 \sqrt{ } x+\frac{1}{2} /\) plot where \(x=N_{0}\). of infected plants.
(ii) \(0.5183 \sqrt{x}+\frac{1}{2} /\) plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{lrc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{ } \mathbf{x}+\) l/plot & \begin{tabular}{c} 
No: of infected plants/plot \\
(Transformed back)
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 1.0953 & 0.7000 \\
2. & 1.2792 & 1.1364 \\
3. & 1.1844 & 0.9028 \\
4. & 0.9659 & 0.4330 \\
5. & 1.1844 & 0.9028 \\
6. & 1.4086 & 1.4842 \\
7. & 1.4142 & 1.5000 \\
8. & 1.1844 & 0.9028 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.2592\) &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Potato (Rabi). & Ref:- U.P. 52(291). \\
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of seed size in relation to virus transmission.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10 .1952 (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Medium size ( \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\prime \prime}\) approx.).
2. Small size ( \(1^{\circ}\) approx.).

In both the treatments 1 and 2, the potato tubers have been taken from mosaic affected plants as well as from healthy potato plants for each experiment. Hence thero are two separate experiments (1) with mosaic affected potatoes and (2) with healthy potatoes.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Plots and blocks \(4^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) \% of germination and no. of infected plants. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) Niv. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (vi) NiL. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}

Potato (virus infected)
(i) 62.26 degrees.
(ii) 4.894 degrees.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\), where \(p\) is \(\%\) infecton.

Potato (healthy)
(i) 17.03 degrees.
(ii) 5.796 degrees.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) where \(p\) is \(\%\) of infection
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back \\
\%infection
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 61.68 & 77.22 \\
2. & 62.84 & 78.91 \\
& S.B./mean & \(=1.998\) degrees.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back \\
\%infection
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 16.87 & 8.82 \\
2. & 17.20 & 9.16 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=2.366\) degrees
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of Paradichle rebenzene (P.D.B) against grabs in Potato fields.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) to (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart. (c) N.A. (vi) to (ix) N.A.
(x) Middle of August 1949.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. 3 gos. per linear yard applied in between the potato rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart.
2. 4 gms . per linear yard applied in between the potato row' \(2^{\prime}\) apart.
3. 5 gms . per linear yard applied in between the potato rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart.
4. 6 gms. per linear yard applied in between the potato rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart.
5. Control.

Paradichle rebenzene applied twice on 10.5.1949 and 5.7.1949 in between the potato rows.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(1 / 363\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) The assessment of result was made on the \(\%\) of damaged tubers and also the crop yield at the time of harvest in middle of 1949. \% of damaged leaves in terms of complete defoliations. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) N.A. (vi) Ni. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento. (C). en cultivator's fields. Raw data N.A.
5. RESULTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Yield of potato} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\% of damaged tubers/plot} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
(i) 1.04 ton/ac. \\
(ii) 0.2538 ton/ac.
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
(i) \(6.52 \%\) damaged tubers/plot. \({ }^{\text {. }}\) \\
(ii) \(4.07 \%\) damaged tubers/plot.
\end{tabular}}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{(iii) Treatments are significantly different.}} & (iii) Treatments & significantly different. \\
\hline & & (iv) \% damaged & bers/plot. \\
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & \% damaged tubers \\
\hline 1. & 1.01 & 1. & 3.1 \\
\hline 2. & 0.97 & 2. & 3.7 \\
\hline 3, & 1.24 & 3. & 4.8 \\
\hline 4. & 1.27 & 4. & 5.5 \\
\hline 5. & 0.73 & 5. & 15.5 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=0.1135\) ton/ac. & S.E./m & - 1.82 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Potato (Rabi). & Ref:- U.P. 49(218). \\
Site :- Kansani (Almora). & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To test the efficacy of D.D.T. and Benzone hexachloride against Epilachna vigrubocts punetata on Potato crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Manured with compost. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) Plants \(7^{0 \times}-8^{\circ}\) apart while rows \(18^{\prime \prime}\) to \(20^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) Ist week of February 1949. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) ist week of July, 1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Dusting with Benzene hexachloride (gamaxene D.O. 25).
2. - Dusting with \(5 \%\) D.D.T. dust at 50 lb ./ac.
3. Dusting with sodium fluosilicate and ash ( \(1: 8\) ) at 50 Ib ./ac.
4. Sprayipg with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. spray emulsion at 200 gallons/ac.
5. No treatment (control).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) N.A. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 100\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Nearly all the plants were infested with potato eplichana adults, grubs and eggs present, pupea not observed. (iii) Population of gurbs before and after application of treatments. Yield of potato crop in seers per plot. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 4.02 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.3439 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of potato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 3.09 \\
2. & 5.32 \\
3. & 3.44 \\
4. & 5.54 \\
5. & 2.70 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.1720\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Onion.
Ref:- U.P.49(182).
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Alambagh, Lucknow. Type :- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '.
Object : -To study the optimum requirement of \(N, P\) and \(K\) for Onion.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(9.11 .1949 / 16,19.1 .1950\). (iv) (a) 4 desi plough and 7 Punjab plough. (b) Transplanting, flat sowing. (c) N.A. (d) \(6^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Patna Red (N.A.). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings and 1 stripping. (ix) N.A. (x) 2 to 5.5.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of \(N\) as A/S: \(N_{8}=0_{8} N_{1}=50, N_{2}=100\) and \(N_{8}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as single Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=16, P_{2}=32\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=48 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 4 levels of \(K_{2} O\) as Pot. Sul. : \(K_{0}=0, K_{1}=24, K_{2}=48\) and \(K_{8}=72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Manures top dressed after one month of transplanting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 16 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Mortality counts, vegetable growth based on 100 plants, Bulb growth based on 100 plants, unstripped yield and stripped yield of onion. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 10.58 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.946 ton/ac.
(b) 1.334 ton/ac.
(iii) NPK interaction alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\mathbf{K}_{0}
\] & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & \(K_{8}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{8}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\). & 10.66 & 10.56 & 10.59 & 10.12 & 10.48 & 10.27 & 10.49 & 10.25 & 10.92 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 11.15 & 10.62 & 10.55. & 10.95 & 10.82 & 10.39 & 10.88 & 10.33 & 11.67 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 10.94 & 10.49 & 10.00 & 10.77 & 10.55 & 10.77 & 10.47 & 10.29 & 10.68 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 10.11 & 10.90 & 10.80 & 10.00 & 10.45 & 10.86 & 10.02 & 10.59 & 10.34 \\
\hline Mean & 10.72 & 10.64 & 10.49 & 10.46 & 10.58 & 10.57 & 10.47 & 10.36 & 10.90 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 10.82 & 10.41 & 10.35 & 10.72 & & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 10.59 & 10.24 & 10.50 & 10.53 & & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 10.50 & 10.32 & 10.03 & 10.60 & & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 10.95 & 11.60 & 11.07 & 10.60 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. N marginal means & \(=0.344\) ton/ac. \\
2. P or K marginal means & \(=0.236\) ton/ac. \\
3. Por \(K\) means at the same level of \(N\) & \\
4. N means at the same level of \(P\) or \(K\) & \\
5. means in the body of \(P \times K\) table & \(=0.572\) ton/ac. \\
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Onion (Rabi).
.Site :- Agri. College, B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref:- U.P. 53(394).
Type :- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of sulphur fertilization on the growth, yield and chemical composition of Onion at different stages.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U. Varanasi. (iii) 1.11.1953. (iv) (a) Field was thoroughly prepared by ploughing several times. Clods were broken, roots and weeds reqoved and the ground levelled. (b) Transplanted. (c) - . (d) \(9^{\circ} \times 9^{\circ}\). (c) N.A. (v) C.M. at \(100 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\) spread a fortnight earlier than final field preparations. (vi) Desi variety. (vii) The beds watered after transplanting. Afterwards the field was irrigated by flooding, whenever required. (viii) Hoeing and weeding after each fortnight. (ix) N.A. (x) 1st week of April.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

5 levels of sulphur : \(S_{0}=0, S_{1}=50, S_{2}=100, S_{8}=200\) and \(S_{4}=400 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
E. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 5 .
(b) \(16^{\prime} \times 73^{\prime}\). (iii) 6 .
(iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(1^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Number of leaves of onion/plant. Av. height of plant in cms. Av. maximum circumference of leaves in cms. Maximum length of root in cms. Fresh weight of onion roots, fresh weight of onion bulbs. Dry weight percentage. (iv) (a) No. (b) Nil. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 6.36 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.251 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av, yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{0}\) & 5.71 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 6.19 \\
\(\cdot \mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 6.55 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 6.74 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 6.56 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.1024\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Onion.
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref:- U.P. 50(110).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{-}^{\prime} \mathrm{C}\).

Object:-To study the effect of top pruning of seedlings on Onion yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindi. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.10 .1950 and 28.10 .1950 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Patna Red (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 trampling. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Light pruning ( \(\ddagger\) vegetative top),
2. Medium pruning (支 vegetative top).
3. Heavy pruning (full vegetative top):
4. Control (no pruning).
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\), (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL .
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by V.R.S.
3. RESULTS :
(i) 1.98 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.783 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yi ld of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield. \\
1. & 2.23 \\
2. & 1.98 \\
3. & 1.73 \\
4. & 1.99 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.39\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Onion.
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :- U.P. 50(109).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of inter cultures on Onion yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindf. (c) A/S at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.10.1950/29.11.1950. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings, 1 by watts and 2 by desi plough and one cultivator. (b) Transplanting. (c)-. (d) \(6^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (c) 1. (v) \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as A/S top dressed. (vi) Patna red (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 trampling on 8.5.1951. Hoeings as per treatments done after 3 days of each irrigation. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.5.1951.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}
1. Shallow hoeing by khurpi.
2. Deep hoeing by spade.
3. Control-no hoeing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2.30 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.446 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.
Treatment 'Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc}
1. & 2.79 \\
2. & 2.33 \\
3. & 1.78 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.223\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Onion.}

Ref:- U.P. 50(108).
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Rer. Stn., Alambagh, Lucknow. Type :- ‘C'.
Object :-To study the effect of different methods of sowing on Onion yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindl. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loám. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.10.1950/29.11.1950. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) and (d) N.A. (c) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Patna red (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 trampling. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Transplanting seedling on fiat beds.
2. Transplanting seedlings on ridges.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes:
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2.34 tons/ac.
(ii) 0.455 tons/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1. & 2.31 \\
\(2-\) & 238
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(=0.228\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Onion.}

Ref: :U.P. 50(107).
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Alambagh, Lucknow. Type :- "C'.
Object :-To find out the proper depth to which the seed is to be transplanted.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindi. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam.' (b) N.A. (iii) 4.10.1950/28.11.1950. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -, (d) N.A. (e) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Patna red (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 trampling. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.5.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. \(1.5^{\circ}\)-transplanting the seedling as to put the bulb at \(1.5^{\circ}\) depth.
2. \(3.0^{\circ}\)-transplanting the seedling as to put the bulb at \(3.0^{\circ}\) depth.
3. \(6.0^{\circ}\)-transplanting the seedling as to put the bulb at \(6.0^{\circ}\) depth.
4. Control (above the ground).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2.52 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.688 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2.50 \\
2. & 2.46 \\
3. & 3.12 \\
4. & 2.02 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.344\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Onion.
Ref :-U.P. 50(106).
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn. Alambagh, Lacknow. Type:-'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of age of seedlings on Onion yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindl. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.10.1950./as per treatments. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Patna red (medium) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 trampling. (ix) N.A (x) 24.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

Age of seedlings at transplanting: \(A_{1}=2, A_{8}=4, A_{8}=6\) and \(A_{4}=8\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2.82 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.394 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1.88 \\
2. & 3.04 \\
3. & 4.18 \\
4. & 2.18 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.197\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Onion. & Ref:-U.P. 50(104). \\
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type:-‘C'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different methods of sowing on Onion yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindi. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.10.1950/30.11.1950. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings, 1 by watts and 2 by dest plough and one by cultivator. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) \(6^{6} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) 1 . (v) 40 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed. (vi) Patna red (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) weedings and trampling (ix) N.A. (x) treatment 2 on 18.4.1951 and 1 on 24.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. By transplanting-seedling raised by seeds sown in nursery bed.
2. By sett sowing in pursery bed on the same day as in treatment 1 .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor-germination of treatment one completely failed. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 3.20 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.5192 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1.86 \\
2. & 4.55 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.2596\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Onion: Ref:-U.P. 53(285).}

Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Alambagh, Lucknow. Type :-‘C'.
Object :-To find out the efficient and economical methods of growing Onion.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) \(6^{\circ} \times 6^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M. and A/S at 25 lb ./ac. of N as top dressed. (vi) Red round (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.5.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Seed sown in nursery.
2. Seed sown in the field on the same day.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yee.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) 1953 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.73 lb /plot
(ii) 2.999 lb ./plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in lb./plot.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 7.28 \\
2. & 10.19 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.22 \mathrm{lb} /\) plot.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Onion. \\ Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow. \\ \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. 49(63). } \\
& \text { Type :- 'C'. }
\end{aligned}
\]
}

Object:-To study the effect of spacing on bulb growth and Onion.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Last week of December/24.1.1950. (iv) (a) 1 punjab ploughing and I by desi. (b) N.A. (c) -. (d) As per treatments. (e) 1. (v) 100 lb ./ac. of N as T.C. applied on 5 and 6.1.1950. (vi) Patna Red (mediúm). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings. (ix) 1.75". (x) Top on 15.4.1950 and bulb on 5.5.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

3 spacings : \(S_{1}=4^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\prime \prime} S_{2}=6^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{3}=9^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of stripped and unstripped onion. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 6.16 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.73 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 8.51 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 5.59 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{4 . 3 8}\) \\
S. E./mean & \(=0.37\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Onion.
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Réf :- U.P. 50(105).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different spacings on Onion yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindl. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(4.10 .1950 / 27.11 .1950\). (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Patna Red (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 weeding and 1 trampling on 8.5.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

4 spacings: \(S_{1}=4^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\circ}, S_{2}=6^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\circ}, S_{3}=9^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\circ} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yei.
4. GENERAL .
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 3.58 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.57 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Ar. yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(S_{1}\) & 3.67 \\
\(S_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 5.45 \\
\(S_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2.61 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 2.58 \\
S.B./mean & \(=0.29\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Onion.
Site :-Govt. vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 53(283).
Type :-'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different spacing on Onion yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nii. (b)'N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1953/9.12.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M. A/S at \(25 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). as top dressing. (vi) Red Round (medium) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.5.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

3 spacings : \(S_{2}=4^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=6^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{8}=9^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B,D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N,A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) No. of bulbs/ac. weight of onion. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 10.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.8460 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\cdot \mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 12.63 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 11.34 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 8.72 \\
\multicolumn{2}{c}{ S.E./mean } \\
& \(=0.42\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Onion.
Ref :-U.P. 49(62).
Site :-Govt. vegetable Res. Stn. Lucknow.
Type :-'l'.
Object :-To study the effect of irrigation at different intervals on Onion yield.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(9.11 .1949 / 20.1 .1950\). (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by punjab and 2 by desi. (b) transplanting, flat sowing. (c) - (d) \(6^{\circ} \times 6^{\prime \prime}\). (c) - . (v) T.C. at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 5,6.1.1950. (vi) Patna large red. (medium). (viii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings and 2 weedings. (ix) 1.75 (x) Top on 15.4.1950. and bulbs on 5.5.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

4 intervais of irrigation: \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}=10, \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=20\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{g}}=\mathbf{3 0}\) days.
3. DESIGN
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 3.92 ton/ac.
(ii). 0.48 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.

Treatment . Av. yield
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}} \quad 2.51\)
\(\mathrm{I}_{1} \quad 5.06\)
\(\mathrm{I}_{2} \quad 4.78\)
\(\mathrm{I}_{3} \quad 3.32\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.24\) ton/ac.
```

Crop :- Onion.
Ref:- U.P. 50(111).
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow': Type :- 'I'.

```

Object :-To study the effect of irrigation at different intervals on Onion yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindi. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(4.10 .1950 / 27.11 .1950\). (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Patna red (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii). 1 weeding and 1 trampling. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.5.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{0}=0, I_{1}=10, I_{\mathbf{2}}=20\) and \(I_{3}=30\) days. .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1950 . (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil(vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 3.22 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.3937 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(tv) Av. yield of onion in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 1.97 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 509 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3.17 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2.64 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.1968\) ton/ac..
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Onion. \\ Ref :- U.P. 49(119). \\ Site :- Govt. Botanical Gardens Agri. College, Kanpur. Type :-'IM'.}

Object :-To study the effect of different fertilizers and irrigations on growth, yield and quality of Onion.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.12.1949. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with soil turning plough and the field was levelled. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) \(12^{\circ} \times 6^{\prime \prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Onion (red Patna). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 irrigations: \(I_{1}=8\) irrigations after an interval of 11 days only, \(I_{2}=6\) irrigations after an interval of 16 days only and \(I_{8}=4\) irrigations after an interval of 21 days only.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 manures: \(M_{0}=0, M_{1}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(A / S, M_{2}=400 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Super and \(M_{8}=4900 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of wood ash.

\section*{3. DESIGN}
(i) Split-plot. (iv) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) 6' \(\times 9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Onion yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(\quad 153.93 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(59.86 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(55.23 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(M\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of onion in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(I_{0}\) & I 1 & \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline M \({ }_{0}\) & 143.18 & 128.56 & 119.49 & 130.41 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & 248.05 & 193.60 & 184.02 & 208.56 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 152.26 & 142.17 & 122.51 & 138.98 \\
\hline Ms & 157.80 & 134.11 & 121.27 & 137.80 \\
\hline Mean & 175.32 & 149.61 & 136.88 & 153.93 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I \quad=21.15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{M}\)
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(I\)
39.05 lb ac.
4. I means at the same level of \(\mathrm{M} . \quad=45.04 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\).

\section*{Crop :- Bhindi.}

Ref:- U.P. 52(37).
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Object :-To study different control measures against the spotted boll worm of Bhindi.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.8.1952. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with soil turning plough and then pulverising the top soil by cultivator. (b) Dibbling. (c) N.A. (d) Distance between rows \(3.5^{\prime}\) and between plants \(2.5^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) 40 lb . of N through F.Y.M. (vi) Green long. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing 3 times. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Pieking and destruction of infested shoots.
2. Picking and destruction of infes'ed shoots and fruits and spraying the crop with \(\mathbf{0 . 2 5 \%}\) D.D.T. emulsion.
3. Picking and destruction of infested shoots and fruits and the crop dusted with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. dust.
4. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(12^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(11.5^{\prime} \times 29.5^{\prime}\). (v) Guard rows between plots \(1^{\prime}\) and between blocks \(4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Attack of spotted boll worm of bhindi, cotton jassids, and banded bluster beetle and incidence of virus disease. (iii) No. of healthy and bored fruits/plot. (iv) (a) 1952-N.A. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. Experiment conducted by V.R. (H.) -
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatments & Mean angle in \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) & \% of bored fruits (transformedjback) \\
1. & 34.69 & 326 \\
2. & 30.60 & 26.2 \\
3. & 29.71 & 24.8 \\
4. & 35.80 & 34.4 \\
G.M. & 32.70 & 29.4 \\
S.E./mean & 0.87 \\
Significance & Highly significant. & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Bhindi (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 53(31).
Type :-‘D'.

Object :-To study different control measures against the spotted boll worm of Bhindi.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Ni1. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii).25.7.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with light soil turning plough followed by pata. (b) Sowing directly in field. (c) \(2 \mathrm{sr} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Sowing in lines \(\mathbf{2 1}^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\) (e) N.A. (v) 60 lb of N as F.Y.M. and A/S. (vi) Medium. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hand weedings and 2 hoeings by bullocks. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.10.1953 to 14.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS .
1. Picking and destruction of infested shoots and fruits and spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion.
2. Picking of infested fruits and shoots and dusting with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. dust.
3. Control (two plots).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 4.
(b) N.A.
(iii) N.A.
(iv) \(27^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\).
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Spotted boll worm as per treatment. (iii) Count of bored fruits and healthy fruits. (iv) (a) \(1952-\) N.A: (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. The experiment was conducted by V.R.(H).
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean & Transformed back-mean \% \\
1. & 16.75 & 7.42 \\
2. & 15.34 & 8.73 \\
3. & 17.66 & 11.28 \\
G.M. & 17.66 & 9.41 \\
S.E./mean & 0.78 & \\
Significance & Highly significant. & \\
& \multicolumn{2}{l}{}
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Bhindi.
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 50(229).
Type :-'D'.

Object :-To study different control measures against Bhindi borer.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Ploughing with desi plough followed by para. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) Green long (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying bhindi plants with \(0.2 \%\) D.D.T. suspension at 60 gallons/ac.
2. Spraying bhindl plants with 0.1\% D.D.T. suspension at 60 gallons/ac.
3. Dusting bhindl plants with gammaxene \(\mathrm{D}_{0} 25\) as such at 25 lb ./ac.
4. Dusting bhindi plants with hexyclane \(5 \%\) at 25 lb ./ac.
5. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(42^{\circ} \times 150^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Borer attack-as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of damaged fruits. (iv) (a) 1950-N.A. (but treatments changed from year to year). (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } P\) and then analysed where \(P=\) percentages of attacked fruits. Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction. Experiment conducted by V.R.(K).
.
5. RESULTS :
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back mean \(\%\) \\
1. & 17.95 & 9.91 \\
2. & 17.28 & 9.23 \\
3. & 19.22 & 11.22 \\
4. & 20.96 & 13.17 \\
5. & 34.61 & \(\cdots\) \\
G.M. & 22.00 & 32.62 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.937\) & 14.49 \\
& &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Brinjal.}

Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 49(180).
Type :-‘M'.

Object : -To find out the comparative effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) manures on Brinjal.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS;
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(14.6 .1949 / 27.7 .1949\). (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanting. (c) 一: (d) \(4^{\prime} \times 3^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Purple round. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

2 TREATMENT':
1. Control.
11. \(140 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N in equal doses as F.Y.M and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
2. 140 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
3. \(70 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
4. 35 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
5. 140 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
6. \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
7. 35 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
8. \(140 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
9. 70 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super.
10. \(\quad 35 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
F.Y.M. applied on 29.7.1949, A/S on 20.8.1949 and Super on 20.9.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 19. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(48^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Brinjal yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.32 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.28 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of brinjal in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 6.29 & 11. & 6.45 \\
\hline 2. & 6.35 & 12. & 6.70 \\
\hline 3. & 6.60 & 13. & 6.66 \\
\hline 4. & 6.39 & 14. & 6.60 \\
\hline 5: & 6.51 & 15. & 6.31 \\
\hline 6. & 6.52 & 16. & 5.64 \\
\hline 7. & 6.23 & 17. & 6.64 \\
\hline 8. & 5.92 & 18. & 6.26 \\
\hline 9. & 6.52 & 19. & 6.03 \\
\hline 10. & 5.54 & & . \\
\hline & S.E./mean & \(=0.64\) too/ac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Brinjal.
Ref :- U.P. 51(219).
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Type :-‘D'
Object :-To compare different contro 1 measure of Brinjal lace wing bug.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) \(2-3\) ploughings with soil turning plough. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) Distance between plants 2'. (e) N.A. (v) 60 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M. 2 days before transplanting and \(A / S 40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathbf{N}\) after one month of transplanting. (vi) Round black. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lime Sulphur wash spray ( \(1: 2: 10\) ) at 15 days interval.
2. Tobacco soap decoction \((1: 1: 10)\) at 15 days interval.
3. Fish oil soap spray ( \(1: 50\) ).
4. Pyrocolloid ( \(1: 400\) ) at 15 days interval.
5. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42.5^{\prime} \times 25.25^{\prime}\). (b) \(41.5^{\prime} \times 24.25^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL : •
(i) Normal. (ii) Attack for fruit and shoot borer and cotton jassids. (iii) Number of insects were continued in \(10 \%\) of plants. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Transformed back meab percentage are given after applying bias correction. The data has been converved into sin \({ }^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) and then analysed. (vii) The experiment was conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back mean \\
percentage of reduction
\end{tabular} \\
of brinjal lace wing bus
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Brinjal. \\ \(\therefore\) Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.}

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 52(36)}

Type :-'D'.
Object :-To compare different control measures against fruit and shoot borers of Brinjal.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS
(i) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1952/8.8.1952. (iv) (a) \(2-3\) ploughings with soil turning plough and pulverisation of top soil by cultivator. (b), (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M. A/S top dressed at \(8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N . (vi) Round blue. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing 3 times. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Spraying 0.3\% D.D.T. emulsion at \(40-60\) gallons/ac. after destruction of infested shoots.
2. Dusting with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. at \(8-12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). after destruction of infested shoots.
3. Control (two plots).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(10^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (b) \(9.5^{\prime} \times 24.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(f^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Attack of brinjal fruit and shoot borer, cotton jassids and brinjal epilachna. (iii) Number of bored and healthy fruits. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed where \(p=\) percent of bored fruits. (vii) The experiment was conducted by V.R.(H).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\(\left.\begin{array}{lcc}\text { Treatment } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Mean value ef } \\
\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Mean \% of bored fruits } \\
\text { transformed back }\end{array} \\
\text { 2. } & 13.30 & \\
\text { 1. } & 22.58 & \ddots\end{array}\right]\)\begin{tabular}{l}
5.7 \\
3. \\
G.M. \\
S.E./mean
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Brinjal. \\ Site:-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.
}

Ref:-U.P. 53(30).
Type :-'D'.

Object:-To compare different control measures against fruit and shoot borer of Brinjal.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.7.1953/8.8.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with light soil turning plough followed by pata and cultivator, one by desi plough, followed by pata. (b) Transplanted. (c) N.A. (d) Between plants 2 \(\mathbf{1}^{\prime}\), between rows \(3^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) 60 Ib . of N in the forms of F.Y.M. and A/S. F.Y.M. 20 days before transplanting and A/S after one month of transplanting. (vi) Round purple (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hand weeding and 2 hoeing by bullocks. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.10.1953 to 21.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Picking of infested fruits and shoots and spraying the crop with \(0.25 \%\) emulsion.
2. Picking of infested fruits and shoots and dusting with \(5 \%\) B.H.C. dust.
3. Control (two plots).
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Incidence of brinjal fruit and shoot borer. (iii) No. of healthy and bored fruits. (iv) (a) 1951-1955. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed where \(p=\) percent bored fruits. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.(H).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) & Mean\% of bored fruits transformed back \\
1. & 21.14 & 13.38 \\
2. & 17.07 & 9.04 \\
3. & 25.84 & 19.32 \\
G.M. & 22.48 & 14.97 \\
S.E./mean & 1.47 &
\end{tabular}

Treatment differences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Cabbage (Rabi). & Ref :-U.P. 49(245). \\
Site :- Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra. & Type :-D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of pre-sowing low temperate treatment of seeds on the sizo and yieldof Cabbage.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) Refer soil Ganalysis, Castle Grant Orchard, Agra. (iii) \(14.10 .1949 / 44\) days after nursing. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by soil turning plough and 4 by desi plough. Every ploughing followed by pata. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). (e) One seedling/hole. (v) N.A. (vi) Sutton's Eclipse Drumhead (medium), (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 5 harvestings on 28.2.1949, 7, 14, 21 and 26.3.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Vernalisation of seeds.

Technique of Vernalisation :-Seeds soaked in water at room temperature \(\left(26^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.\) to \(\left.28^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right)\), for 8 hours and changing water several times. After soaking, seeds taken out and moisture removed by blotting paper and clean dry towel. The seeds kept in wet cloth bags. These bags then wrapped in moist pieces of thick cloth and placed in the refrigerator, the temperature varying \(3^{\circ} \mathrm{C}-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\). Every third. day, the seeds taken out, mixed up, placed in the bag; further moistened if necessary , and replaced in refrigerator. All the precautions taken to see that seeds do not diry up and life activity remains uninturrupted. After three weeks, seeds taken out and sown in nursery.
Before sowing, the seed of control treatment were soaked and brought to the same level of germination as chilled ones. Chilled seeds were kept for \(\mathbf{1 2}\) hours after taking out of refrigerator,
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired plot. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Weight of Cabbage heads. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.

\section*{.5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(15.01 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{row}\)
(ii) \(1.133 \mathrm{lb} \cdot / \mathrm{row}\)
(iii) Treatment difference is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cabbage heads in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{row}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. weight \\
1. & 16.64 \\
2. & 13.38 \\
S.e./mean & \(=0.566 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{row}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Cabbage (Rabi).
Site :-Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra.

Ref :-U.P. 49(244).
Type :-'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of pre-sowing low temperate treatment of seeds on the size and yield of Cabbage.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) Refer soil analysis, Castle Grant orchard, Agra. (iii) 14.10.1949/44 days' after nursery. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by soil turning plough and 4 by desi plough. Every ploughing followed by pata. (b) Transplanting. (c) -- (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (e) One seedling/hole (v) N.A. (vi) Pride of garden (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 5 harvests on 28.2.1949 7, 14, 21, and 26.3.1949.
2. TREATMENT:
1. Control.
2. Vernalisation of seeds.

Technique of Vernalisation:-Seeds soaked in water at room temperature \(\left(26^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\right.\) to \(28^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) ) for 8 hours and changing water several times. After soaking seeds taken out and moisture removed by blotting paper and clean dry towel. The seeds kept in wet cloth bags. These bags then wrapped in moist pieces of thick cloth and placed in the refrigerator, the temperature varying between \(3^{\circ} \mathrm{C}-5^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\). Every third day, the seeds taken out, mixed up, placed in the bag, further moistened if necesssary and replaced in refrigerator. All the precautions taken to see that seeds do not dry up and life activity remains uninterrurted. After three weeks, seeds taken out and sown in nursery.
Before sowing, the seeds of control treatment were soaked and brought to the same level of germination as chilled ones. Chilled seeds were kept for 12 hours after taking out of refrigerator.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Paired-plot. (ii) (a) 2.
(b) N.A. (iii) 4.
(iv) (a) and (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\)
(v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Weight of cabbage heads. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.
5. RESULTS:
ij) \(24.98 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{row}\).
(ii) \(1.329 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{row}\).
(iii) Treatment difference is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cabbage heads in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{row}\).
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.36 \\
2. & 23.65 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.6646 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{row}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop \({ }^{\bullet}\)--Carrot (Rabi).
Site :-B.R. College Farm, Bichpuri, Agra.
Ref :-U.P.52(332).
Type :- \({ }^{\prime}\) '.
Object :-To study the effect of different sources and levels of \(N\) on Carrot.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College Farm, Bichpuri, Agra. (iii) 3.10 .1952 . (iv) (a) Field prepared by discing, ploughing ; levelling by pata. (b) Broadcast. (c) -. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) No. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.1.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 sources of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=\) compost and \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=A / \mathrm{S}\).
(2) 4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=40, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=80\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Carrot yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) Nil. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. No plot-wise yield data was available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.14 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.429 ton/ac.
(iii) S effect is highly significant, N effect is significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of carrot in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 4.58 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 7.16 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 6.37 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 6.46 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & 4.44 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.88 \\
S.E. of N means & \(=\mathbf{0 . 5 0 5}\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Cauliflower. Ref :- U.P. 53(284).
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow. Type :- ‘M'.
Object:-To study the effect of manuring on the subsequent yield of Cauliflower.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(1) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) F.Y M. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Raising of seedlings on:
1. Manured seed bed.
2. Unmanured seed bed.

Dose of manure-N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Due to water logging and continuous rains, transplanting was delayed by nearly 52 days. (ii) N.A(iii) Diameter of each flower. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Only observation of diameter and number of heads were available. It is not even known whether the yield data was taken or not. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 12.06 cm .
(ii) 0.645 cm .
(iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. diameter of flower in cm.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. diameter \\
1. & 12.82 \\
2. & 11.31 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.322 \mathrm{~cm}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Cauliflower.
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref:- U.P. 53(286).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To make preliminary studies on the causes of buttoning in Caulifiower with reference to manurial doses of NPK.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(13.8 .1953 / 14.11 .1953\). (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) Medium Patna (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.12.1953 to 19.1.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=50\) and \(N_{2}=75 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=100\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=50\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=100 \mathrm{lb}\). \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment. \(W\) and \(X\) components of NPK interaction partially confounded. (ii) (a) 9 Plots/block; 3 Hocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Diameter of cauliflower in cm. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S. Only observation of diameter and number of heade were available. No yield data was available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 7.83 cms.
(ii) 0.795 cms .
(iii) Main effect N and X component of NPK interaction are highly significant. Interaction PK is sigai--ifcant. Other effects are not sinificant.
(iv) Av. diameter of cauliflower in cm .
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{6}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{K}_{4}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{6}\) & 5.24 & 5.56 & 5.08 & 5.29 & 4.99 & 5.06 & 5.82 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 8.56 & 8.15 & 7.92 & - 8.21 & 8.31 & 8.44 & 7.88 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 10.10 & 10.33 & 9.57 & 10.00 & 9.74 & 10.14 & 10.12 \\
\hline Mean & 7.97 & 8.01 & 7.52 & 7.83 & 7.68 & 7.88 & 7.94 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{6}\) & 7.34 & 8.13 & 7.57 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 8.04 & 7.61 & 7.99 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 8.52 & 8.30 & 7.01 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.187 \mathrm{~cm} . \\
\text { S.E of body of table } & =0.324 \mathrm{~cm} .
\end{array}
\]
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Cauliflower. & Ref:-U.P. 53(287). \\
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow. & Type :-‘‘'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To make preliminary studies on causes of buttoning in Caulifiower with reference to time of sowing.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Transplanted. (c) -. (d) Between plant-2'. (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 60 lb ./ac. of N as B.D. top dressing by A/S at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of N. (vi) Early. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.11.1953 to 7.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

8 dates of sowing/transplanting : \(D_{1}=18.6 .1953 / 26.8 .1953, D_{2}=2.7 .1953 / 9.9 .1953, \quad D_{3}=16.7 .1953 / 23.9 .1953\), \(\mathrm{D}_{4}=\) 30.7.1953/7.10.1953. \(\mathrm{D}_{6}=13.8 .1953 / 21.10 .1953, \mathrm{D}_{6}=27.8 .1953 / 4.11 .195^{3}\) \(D_{7}=10.9 .1953 / 18.11 .1953\) and \(D_{8}=24.9 .1953 / 2.12 .1953\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) \(\dot{8}\). (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(8^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Water logging. (ii) N.A. (iii) Diameter and no. of cauliflower. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) apd (b) No. (vi) The seedlings of Tr. \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) and \(\operatorname{Tr} . \mathrm{D}_{3}\) were destroyed after transplanting due to heavy rains and water logging. (vii) The expt. was conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.593 cm .
(ii) 1.054 cm .
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. diameter of cauliflower in cm .
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. in cm. \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 10.642 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 9.245 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & 3.058 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & 5.350 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{7}\) & 2.618 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & 2.648 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.527 \mathrm{~cm}\).
\end{tabular}

Note :-Only observations of diameter and number of heads were available. No yield data was available at collection time. It is not even known whether the yield data was taken at all at the time when the experiment was conducted.

Crop :-Colocasia.
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 52(35).
Type:-'D'.

Object :-To find out the efficacy of fungicidal spray in controlling the late blight of Colocasia.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.5 .1952 (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Local variety. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.12.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Bordeaux mixture.
2. Perenox.
3. Cupravit.
4. Control (2 plots/replication)

Method of application is dusting and spraying.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5 . (b) N.A. (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) \(35^{\prime} \times 15.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(33.5^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (v) \(9^{\circ}\) all round the plot (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Normal. (ii) Attack of light blight disease-As per treatments. (iii) No. of healthy and attacked plant. after each spraying and yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b), (c) No. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\), where \(p=\%\) of infection, and then analysed.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot & \(\%\) infection transformed \\
\hline 1. & 25.62 & 19.01 \\
\hline 2. & 19.18 & 11.18 \\
\hline 3. & 30.46 & 25.94 \\
\hline 4. & 83.62 & 98.28 \\
\hline G.M. & 48.50 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E./mean except control mean \(=\mathbf{2 , 2 8 2}\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of control mean \(=1.614\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Treatment differences are highly significant.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Garlic.
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref:-U.P. 50(102)
Type:-'M'.

Object:-To find out the best time of application of N .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.10 .1950 . (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v)

Nil. (vi) Local. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

1001b./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied at :
1. Before sowing on \(\mathbf{1 0 . 1 0 . 1 9 5 0}\).
2. After sowing on \(\mathbf{3 1} 10.1950\).
3. In five monthly intervals from the date of sowing.
4. Control (no manure).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\) : (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Garlic yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(3692 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(456.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of garlic in lb ./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
1. 3936
\(2 . \quad 3657\)
2. 3881
4. 3296
S.E./mean \(\quad=\mathbf{2 2 8 . 2 ~ 1 b}\)./ac.

\section*{Crop :-Garlic. \\ Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow. \\ Ref :-U.P. 50(103). \\ Type : \({ }^{\text {' }} \mathbf{M}\) '.}

Object :-To compare the effect of different sources of N on Garlic.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.10.1950. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nif.
(vi) Local. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings and weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

100 lb ./ac. of \(N\) as : \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{S}_{2}=\) Castor cake, \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) F.Y.M. and \(\mathrm{S}_{4}=\) Control. (No manure)
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\circ} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Garlic yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment. conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(3554 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 245.2 lb .ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of garlic in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
Treatment Av. yield
\(\mathrm{S}_{1} \quad 3588\)
\(\mathrm{S}_{2} \quad 402\)
\(\mathrm{S}_{3} \quad 3530\)
\(\mathrm{S}_{4} \quad 3069\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=122.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Garlic. } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 50(100). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow. } & \text { Type :- 'C' }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To find out the best spacing for Garlic.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Bhindi. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.10.1950. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) 1 seed/hole. (v) N.A. (vi) Local. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings and weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 spacings between seeds : \(S_{1}=4^{\prime \prime} \times 4^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=6^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}, S_{8}=9^{\prime \prime} \times 9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=12^{\prime \prime} \times 12^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Garlic yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(3366 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(900.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are signifcant.
(iv) Av. yield of garlic in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 4046 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 4557 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 2381 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 2479 \\
\(\mathbf{S . E . f \text { mean }}\) & \(-450.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Garlic (Rabi).
Site :- Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra.

Ref:- U.P. 50(301).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of date of sowing, spacings and method of sowing on the yield of Garlic.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Ĺight loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Castle Grant Orchard, Agra. (iii) 1, 21.10 .1950 and 10.11.1950. (iv) (a) 2 soil turning, 3 ploughings by desi plough and pata. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) Row to row-9" and in rows as per treatments. (c) N.A. (v) \(200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\) as sieved municipal compost, mixed in soil with the help of kudali. (vi) Local. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings, 7 weedings and earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.3.1951, 4, 9.4.1951 according to sowing dates.
2. TREATMENTS :

Maın-plot treatments :
3 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=1 \cdot 10 \cdot 1950, D_{2}=21 \cdot 10.1950\) and \(D_{2}=10 \cdot 11.1950\).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 spacings: \(S_{1}=2^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=4^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{3}=6^{\prime \prime}\) between plants.
(2) 2 methods of sowing: \(M_{1}=\) in flat beds and \(M_{2}=i n\) ridges.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 6 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(10^{\circ} \times 8^{\prime}\). (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) on either side. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, no. of roots, ht. of plants, no. of leaves, diameter of bulb, dry weight of leaves, dry weight of bulbs, length of stem, diameter of dise of the bulb. No. of clove circles. no. of cloves, no. of sprouted cloves, yield per plot and no. of bulbs per plot. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. Raw data N.A.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2878 lb./ac.
(ii) (a) \(1788 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(922 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only D effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of garlic in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & 3693 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 3090 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 1851 \\
S.E./mean & \(=365 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

> Crop:- Garlic.
> Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn. Lucknow.
> Object:-To find out the best interval of irrigation.

Ref:- U.P. 50(101).
Type :-' 'I'.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Bhindi. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.10 .1950 . (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Local (vii) As per treatments. (viii) 3 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 intervals of irrigations : \(I_{1}=10, I_{2}=20, I_{3}=30\) days and \(I_{4}=\) control (no irrigation).
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(99^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Garlic yield. (iv) (a) Nò. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii)
Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2072 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) :
(ii) \(452.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of garlic in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av, yield \\
\(\cdot \mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3323 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2062 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 1892 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 1010 \\
S.E./mean & \(=226.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Pumpkin \\ Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.
}

Ref:- U.P.49(181).
Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of different combinations of methods of sowing, spacings and dates of sowing on Pumpkin yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.7.1949, 7.8.1949 and 28.8.1949.
(iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 methods of sowing : \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\) in pits and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) in flat rows.
Sub-plot treatments:
3 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=2\) weeks before normal time, \(D_{2}=7.8 .1949\) (normal time) and \(D_{2}=\mathbf{2}\) weeks after normal time.
Sub-sub-plot treatments :
3 spacings between rows and plants : \(S_{1}=5^{\prime} \times 5^{\prime}, S_{2}=8^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\) and \(S_{8}=10^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). .
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block; 3 sub-plots/main-plot; 3 sub-sub-plots/sub-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Length of plants, no. of branches. No. of plants flowered and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) NiL. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(3250 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(2384 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(2368 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(c) \(1521 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effects of \(D\) and \(S\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pumpkin in lb ./ac.


\section*{n.E. of difference of two}
1. \(M\) marginal means
\(=561.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. D marginal means
\(=683.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(S\) marginal means
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(M\)
\(=439.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. \(M\) means at a level of \(S\) \(=620.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. \(D\) means at a level of \(M\) \(=756.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\),
7. \(M\) means at a level of \(D\) \(=966.7 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. \(=968.8 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
8. \(S\) means at a level of \(D\) \(=760.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
9. D means at a level of \(S\) \(=923.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :-Pumpkin.}

Ref: \({ }^{\text {U.P. }}\) 50(112).
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Type:-'C'
Object --To find out the best time of sowing for Pumpkin.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Brinjal; (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (d) N.A. (e) One seedling/hole. (v) N.A. (vi) Local. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 4 weedings. Gap filling on 24.7.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) Pickings: 27.9.1950, 5. 12 and 29.10.1950, 6 and 8.11.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=3.7 .1950, D_{2}=18.7 .1950, D_{3}=3.8 .1950\) and \(D_{4}=18.8 .1950\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Pumpkin yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2672 lb .ac.
(ii) \(1766 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pumpkin in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\)
\end{tabular} & 5260 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & & 2941 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & & 1646 \\
S.E./mean & & \(=889\) \\
& & \(=883 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Pumpkin.
Ref :-U.P. 50(113).
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Type:-‘‘’.
Object :-To find out the best spacing for Pumpkin.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Brinjal, (c) F.Y.M. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.7.1950. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) A's per treatments. (e) One seedling/hole. (v) Nil. (vi) Local. (vii) N.A. (viii) 4 hoeings. Gap filling on 24.7.1950. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.9.19:0, 5, 12 and 29.10.1950, 6 and 11.11.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 spacings : \(S_{2}=3^{\prime \prime} \times 3^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=5^{\prime \prime} \times 5^{\prime \prime}, S_{3}=7^{\prime \prime} \times 7^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{4}=10^{\prime \prime} \times 10^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 29^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Pumpkin yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(4350 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(1694 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pumpkin in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 4406 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 4193 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 5395 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 340 S \\
S.E./mean & \(=846.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Radish. \\ Site :-Govt. Botanical Gardens, Kianpur.}

Ref :- U.P. 51(156). Type: \({ }^{\prime} C^{C}\).

Object :-To study the effect of different spacings and methods of sowing on the growth and yield of Radish.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 24.10.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Contai-long of Bombay. (vii) N.A. (viii) Thinning.
(ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 methods of sowing : \(\mathbf{M}_{1}=\) Dibbling and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Transplanting.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 spacings: \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=8^{7} \times 8^{7}, \mathrm{~S}_{2}=8^{7} \times 16^{\prime \prime}\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{8}=8^{78} \times 24^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Spilt-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block; 3sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 7^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Root and leaf yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 4.37 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 0.119 ton/ac.
(b) 0.195 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of \(M\) and \(S\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of radish in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc} 
& \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{8}\) & \(S_{3}\) \\
\hline\(M_{1}\) & 2.57 & 2.52 & 2.16 \\
\(M_{2}\) & 6.48 & 6.64 & 5.88 \\
\hline Mean & 4.52 & 4.58 & 4.02
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of M
\(=0.048\) ton/ac.
\(=0.098\) ton/ac.
\(=0.138\) ton/ac.
\(=0.123\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(S\)
3. \(S\) means at a level of \(M\)

Crop :-Spinach.
Site :-College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 53(388).
Type:-‘M'.

Object :-To study the effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on growth yield and chemical composition of Spinach;

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sann hemp. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 25.10.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughed once with Meston plough, once with tractor-cultivator and once with dest plough, then clods were broken by discing with tractor. (b) Broadcast. (c) 2 sr./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Green manured with Sann hemp. (vi) Local. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding as and when required. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.12.1953 and 14.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. No manuring.
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M,
3. 40 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
4. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M.
5. 30 lb ./ac. of N as compost.
6. 40 lb ./ac of N as compost.
7. 50 lb ./ac. of N as compost.
8. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
9. 40 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
10. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
11. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super+ 30 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul.
12. 40 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super+ \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul.
13. 50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super+ 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) \(28.32^{\prime} \times 171.2^{\prime}\). (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(26.32^{\prime} \times 10.4^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Vegetative yield, average area of leaf, leaf number per plant, air dry weight of the material, seed yield, and N, P and K contents of leaf. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1333 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 90.26 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of spinach leaves in \(\mathbf{l b}\)./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 507 \\
2. & 655 \\
3. & 786 \\
4. & 982 \\
5. & 687 \\
6. & 818 \\
7. & 982 \\
8. & 1571 \\
9. & 1964 \\
10. & 2226 \\
11. & 1670 \\
12. & 2095 \\
13. & 2390 \\
S.E./mean & \(=40.37 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
(i) \(542.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(86.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of spinach seed in İb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 261.9 \\
2. & 327.4 \\
3. & 441.9 \\
4. & 556.5 \\
5. & 311.0 \\
6. & 425.6 \\
7. & 491.1 \\
8. & 572.9 \\
9. & 671.1 \\
10. & 687.5 \\
11. & 703.9 \\
12. & 753.0 \\
13. & 851.2 \\
S.E./mean & \(=38.63 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Tomato (Rabi).
Site :- Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra.

Ref:- U.P. 49(242).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{\prime}\) ' \({ }^{\prime}\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of different fertilizers on Tomato crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Castle Grant Orchard, Agra. (iii) 20.9.1949/25.10.1949. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough and 11 ploughings by desi plough followed by planking. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) \(3^{\prime} \times 3^{\circ}\). (e) 1 seeding/hole. (v) N.A. (vi) Suttons, Abundance. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 11 hoeings and weedings, gap filling on 6.11 .1949 . (ix) N.A. (x) 120 days to 190 days after transplanting.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=80\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=160 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=240\) and \(P_{2}=480 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(K_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0, K_{1}=100\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Date of application : \(\mathbf{2 5}\) and 26.11.1949. Fertilizer mixed thoroughly then distributed evenly betwcen the rows of plants and mixed into the soil by giving a light cultivation with \(k\) udali.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment with \(Z\) component of 2 nd order interaction totally confounded with blocks. (ii) (a) 9 Plots/block ; 3 blocks/replication.(b) \(140^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) : (iii) 2. (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime} \cdot\) (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround the plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. , GENERAL:}
(i) Damage by light frost. (ii) Out break of tomato mosaic disease. (iii) Tomato yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) No plotwise yield data were available. It may kindly be observed that the yields given in \(N \times K\) are not correct as the marginal means of this table corresponding to \(K\) and \(N\) do not tally with the marginal means of \(N\) in \(N \times P\) table and of \(K\) in \(P \times K\) table. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. Transplanting was done when plants were of \(6^{\circ}\) hight.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.83 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 0.365 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{P}\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tomato in ton/ac.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of marginal mean of } \mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P} \text { or } \mathrm{K} & =0.086 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
\text { S.E. of body of any table } & =0.149 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{array}
\]

Crop:- Tomato (Rabi).
Site :- Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra. Type t-‘C’.
Object : - To study the effect of different cultural practices on yield and growth of Tomato.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Alluvial and light loam in texture. (b) Refer soil analysis, Castle Grant Orchard, Agra. (iii) 27.10.1949. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings \({ }^{\circ}\) by desi plough and pata, levelling. (b) Transplanting. (c) -. (d) As per treatments. (e) 1 plant/hole. (v) 160 sr./plot of well seived municipal compost mixed in soil by digging with kudali. (vi) Sutton's best. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMEN TS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 prunnings : \(P_{0}=\) no prunning, \(P_{1}=\) pinching of side branches and \(P_{2}=\) pinching of the top.
(2) 3 spacing from plant to plant and row to row : \(D_{1}=2^{\prime}, D_{9}=3^{\prime}\) and \(D_{3}=4^{\prime}\).
(3) 2 stakings: \(S_{1}=\) no staking and \(S_{2}=\) staking.

Prunning : In side prunning, all side branches removed as soon as they appear. Branches either rubbed off in bud conditions or chipped by a knife. In top prunning, terminal growing points were removed. Staking : As soon as the plants ware establishsd the stems were tied to bamboo poles of 6 to 7 ft . height. On growth of plants these stakes were replaced by fresh ones.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 18 . (b) \(44^{\prime} \times 82^{\prime}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Goo1. (ii) N.A. (iii) Hsight/plant, no. of branches/plant, no. of green leaves, no. of fruit clusters/ plant, yield/plant and no. of fruit/plant. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 3.56 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.989 ton/ac.
(iii) D and S effects are highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{S}\) is signiffcant. Others are not significant. (iv) Av. yield of tomato in ton/ac.


Crop :-Tomato.
Site :-Govt. Botanical Gardens, Kanpu r.
Object :-To study the effect of spacing on growth and yield of Tomato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.10.1949. (iv) (a) to (c), N.A.
(d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

3 spacing in a row : \(S_{1}=18^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=30^{\circ}\) and \(S_{3}=36^{\circ}\); Spacing between rows is \(36^{\circ}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(14^{\circ} \times 28^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tomato yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 10.40 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.736 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant:
(iv) Av. yield of tomato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(S_{1}\) & 11.65 \\
\(S_{2}\) & & 9.58 \\
\(S_{B}\) & 9.97 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.425\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Tomato.
Ref :-U.P.51(218).
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Type :-'C'.
Object:-To study the effect of time of sowing and transplanting on Tomato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A, (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
& Dates of sowiug & Dates of transplanting & \(\cdots\) & Dates of sowing & Dates of transplanting \\
1. & 3.7.1951. & 17.8 .1951. & 5. & 25.9 .1951. & 9.11 .1951. \\
2. & 24.7 .1951. & 7.9 .1951. & 6. & 16.10 .1951. & 30.11 .1951. \\
3. & 14.8 .1951. & 25.9 .1951. & 7. & 6.11 .1951. & 21.12 .1951. \\
4. & 4.9 .1951. & & 19.10 .1951. & .8. & 27.11 .1951.
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(14 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tomato yield. (iv) (a) 1951-i953 (not conducted in 1952.) (b) and (c) No: (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The ex periment was conducted by V.R.S.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 12.14 ton/ac.
(ii) 6.222 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tomato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 27.70 & 5. & 8.85 \\
2. & 20.97 & 6. & 4.54 \\
3. & 15.67 & 7. & 0.85 \\
4. & 17.51 & 8. & 1.02 \\
& S.E./mean & & \(=3.111\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Tomato.
Site :-Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :mU.P. 53(206).
Type :~' \({ }^{\prime}\) '。

Object:-To study the effect of time of sowing and transplanting on Tomato.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown in rows. (c) N.A. (d) Distance between rows 2', distance between plants 13. (c) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Desi To-so 52 (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.5.1954 to 12.6.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

8 dates of sowing/transplanting : \(D_{1}=3.7 .1953 / 17.8\).1953, \(\quad D_{2}=24.7 .1953 / 7.9 .1953, \quad D_{3}=14.8 .1953 /\) 28.9.1953, \(\quad D_{8}=4.9 .1953 / 19.10 .1953, \quad D_{5}=25.9 .1953 / 9.11 .1953, \quad D_{8}=\) 16.10 1953/30.11.1953, \(\quad D_{7}=6.11 .1953 / 21.12 .1953\) and \(D_{8}=27.11 .1953 /\) 11.1.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(14 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tomato yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (Not conducted in 1952) (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by V.R.S.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 6.95 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.850 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tomato in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.04 & 5. & 6.64 \\
2. & 8.93 & 6. & 3.26 \\
3. & 6.44 & 7. & 1.37 \\
4. & 7.77 & 8. & 1.17 \\
& & S.E./mean & \(=1.425\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Torai.
Site :- Govt. Vegetable Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 52(31).
Type:-'D'.

Object :-To study different control measures against fruit fly of Torai. .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.3.1952. (iv) (a) Two ploughings with soil turning plough and pulverisations with cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) Distance between rows \(3.5^{\prime}\) and between plants \(2.5^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) 40 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M. (vi) Smooth variety. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing 3-4 times. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lead arsenate and molasses bait spray in water dilution ( \(1: 16: 200\) by weight),
2. Sodium fluosilicate and molasszs bait spray in water ( \(1: 16: 200\) by weight).
3. Use of vinegar bait traps, vinegar 1 part and water 3 parts by weight.
4. Control.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(37.5^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (b) \(36.5^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) a plot ( \(37.5^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\) ) of bhindi to act as buffer between torai plots. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Attack of Pumpkin bsetle, fruit fly and banded blister beetle-As per treatments. (iii) \% of fruits infested by fruit fly. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ } P\), where \(P\) is \(\%\) of torai fruit infested by fruit fly, and then analysed. Experiment conducted by V.R.(H).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv),
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) P/plot & \% of toral fruits infested by fruit fy (transformed back) \\
1. & 32.37 & 28.88 \\
2. & 37.86 & 37.79 \\
3. & 40.90 & 42.94 \\
4. & 36.75 & 35.94 \\
G.M. & 36.97 & \\
S.E./mean. & 2.996 & \\
Significance & Not significant. &
\end{tabular}

Crop_:-Turnip (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 52(329).
Site :-Institutional Research Farm, Bichpuri, Agra. Type :-'M'.
Object :-To study the effech of different levels and forms of nitrogen on growth and yield of Turnip.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A: (ii) (a) Light loam containing little organic màtter. '(b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri Farm, Agra. (iii) 2.10.1952. (iv) (a) Prepared by ploughing followed by pata. (b) Sowing on ridges (t to \(\mathbf{1}^{\prime \prime}\) depth). (c) N:A. (d) \(11^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Early snow-ball. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning, weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 75 days after sowing.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 sources of \(N: \quad F_{1}=A / S, F_{2}=\) compost and \(P_{3}=\) castor cake.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}=75\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\). ac .

Fine powder of fertilizer mixed thoroughly.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 48^{\prime}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) No. of :green leaves, fresh weight of tops, roots and whole plant. Dry wt . of roots, dry wt. of whole plant and tops. Volume of roots, yield of whole plant, yield of roots and tops/plot. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) No plot wise yield dąta is available. The expt. was conducted by B.R.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(17182 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(2265.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effects of F and N are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of roots in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 7784 & \(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 30472 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 19521 & \(\cdot \mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 10305 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 24240 & \(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 24906 \\
S.E./mean & \(=654 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & S.E./mean & \(=801 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Turnip (Rabi).
Site :-Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra. \(\quad\) Réf :-U P. 50(302).
'Type :-‘CM’.
Object:-To study the effect of different ,doses and time of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) and method of planking on growth and yield of Turnip.
1. basal CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light soil. (b) Refer soil analysis, Castle Grant Orchard, Agra. (iii) 17.9.1950. (iv) (a) One ploughing by soil turning plough ffollowed tby pata. 4 ploughings by desi plough and followed by pata. (b) As per treatments. (c) - . (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \times 6^{\prime \prime}\). (e) One plant/hole. (v) Nil. (vi) Early snow-ball. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning, earthing and remodelling of ridges and light cultivation. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.12.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 methods of planting: \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) planting in flat beds in rows and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) planting in \(9^{\prime \prime}\) high ridges.

\section*{Sub-plot treat ments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 times of application of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{T}_{1}=\) at sowing and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) at the start of swelling of roots.
(2) 5 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50, N_{3}=75\) and \(N_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied on 17.9.1950 and 17.10.1950.
Method of planting: Seeds dropped by hand at a depth of \(\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}\) to \(\frac{1}{}^{\prime \prime}\).
Method of application : Evenly distributed in between the rows at the 2 nd time of application mixed by light cultivation by khurpi.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block and 10 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(56^{\prime} \times 57^{\circ}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(12^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 7^{\prime}-6^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{1} \times 1^{\prime}-6^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) No. of leaves, length of biggest leaf, breadth of biggest leaf, area of leaf, diameter of roots, length of thickened portion, shape of root, volume of roots, fresh wt. of tops, fresh weight of roots, fresh wt. of whole plant, dry wt. of tops and roots and whole plant and yield of roots. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.R.C. No plotwise yield data was available.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(59987 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) 60691 lb .ac.
(b) \(15570 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant. Interaction \(\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{P}\) is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of roots in lb./ac.
\(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) at \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=9135 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) at \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=14614 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{4}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) & T 2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 48070 & 65139 & 79050 & 87539 & 69950 & 72710 & 67190 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 72800 & 73539 & 74077 & 75914 & 74082 & 66394 & 81770 \\
\hline Mean & 60435 & 69339 & 76563 & 81726 & 72016 & 69552 & 74480 \\
\hline T1 & - 57971 & 66304 & 79162 & 74771 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline Tg & 62899 & 72374 & 73964 & 88682 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. P marginal means
\(=17520 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means
\(=6356 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(\mathbf{T}\) marginal means
\(=4495 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at a level of \(\mathbf{P}\)
\(=8989 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. T means at a level of \(P\)
\(=6356 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. P means at a level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\(=17613 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. P means at a level of \(T\)
\(=18087 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). S.E. of body of \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{T}\) table
\(=6356 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). S.E. of No means at \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) or \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\)
\(=6356 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Turnip (Rabi).
Site :-Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra.

Ref:-U.P. 51(286).
Type :-'CM'.

Object:-To study the effect of different doses along with spacing on growth, development and yield of Turnip.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Bhindi. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Castle Grant Orchard, Agra. (iii) 27.9.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) On \(9^{\prime \prime}\) ridges by hand at a depth of \(f^{\prime \prime}\) to \(\frac{1}{2}{ }^{\circ}\). (c) -. (d) As per treatments. (e) One seedling/hole. (v) Nil. (vi) Snow ball (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning, weeding, light earthing up and light cultivators. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.12.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 5 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50, N_{3}=75\) and \(N_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 plant to plant spacings: \(S_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=6^{\circ}\) and \(S_{3}=9^{\prime \prime}\).

The fertilizer was applied at the time of sowing before making the ridges. Fertilizer mixed by rake in the soil.Row to row spacing was \(1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}{ }^{\prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 15 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(12^{\prime} \times 10^{\circ}\). (b) \(10.5^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(=6^{\prime \prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) No. of leaves, length and breadth of biggest leaf, length of thickened portion of the root, fresh weight of tops, roots and whole plant ; volume of roots and yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) No plot wise yield data are available. The experiment was conducted by B.R.'.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.04 ton/ac.
(ii) 8.1817 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effects of N and S are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of roots in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 5.94 & \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 20.45 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 7.92 & \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 11.01 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 13.34 & \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & . 7.66 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 16.76 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{4}\) & 21.23 & S.E./mean & =2.112 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=2.727\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Site :-Agri. Institute, Allahabad.

Ref :- U.P. 53(367).
Type:-' \(\mathbf{M}^{\text {' }}\).

Object :-To study the effect of different forms of N on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 16.2.1953, (iv) "(a) to" (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings, one with cultivator, 4 weedings, 2 intercultures, 2 earthings and 1 tying. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.1.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

4 forms of Nitrogen :
1. \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\).
2. A/S.
3. Castor cake.
4. Control.

Half dose applied immediately after irrigation on 26 to 28.3.1953. Other half immediately after irrigation on 29 and 30.4.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) \(72^{\prime} \times 66^{\circ}\). (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\circ} \times 66^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and cane yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) NiI. (vi) il. (vii) Field record register was consulted. Experiment conducted by the Head of Agronomy Department, Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad. (A.A.I.)
5. RESULTS:
(i) 11.48 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.903 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 11.07 \\
2. & 12.51. \\
3. & 11.33 \\
4. & 11.03 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.777\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Bahraich.
Ref: :-U.P. 49(143).
Type : \({ }^{\mathbf{c}} \mathbf{M}^{\mathbf{\prime}}\).
Object:-To study the response of cane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bahraich. (iii) 24.2.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at 20 lb ./ac. of N. (vi) Co. 453 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) Feb. and March 1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\(\mathbf{P}_{0}=\) Control (no manure).
\(\mathbf{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb} /\) ac of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) drilled \(3^{\circ} \times 4^{7}\) deep in furrows before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied as Super on 24.2.1949.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(81^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable canes and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Zones : Pharenda, Baitalpur, Tamkohi, Ghughli, Chhitanni, Balrampur, Faizabad, Barhri and Sardarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.97 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.608 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield. \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 17.76 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{I}}\) & 20.09 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & 19.07 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.065\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Bahraich.

Ref :-U.P. 50(175).
Type:- ' \(\mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the response of cane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Dhanicha for seed. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bahraich. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Compost at \(15 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\) on 2.1.1950. and castor cake at \(7 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). on 15.5.1950. (vi) Co. 453 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\(\mathbf{P}_{0}=\) Control (no manure).
\(\mathrm{P}_{1}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) broadcast before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\circ} \times 4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super on 12.3.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D
(ii) (a) 3.
(b) N.A. (iii) 6.
(iv) (a)
(a) N.A.
(b) \(87^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable canes and yield. (iv) (a) 1950 and 1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Zones: Faizabad, Balrampur. Ghugli, Sardarnagar, Lakshmiganj, Tamkohi, Gauribazar, Nawabganj and Anandnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 28.83 ton/ac
(ii) 3.10 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in tonlac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 27.10 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 30.28 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 29.10 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.266\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Bahraich.

Ref :- U.P. 51(171)/50(175).
Type: © ' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\),

Object:-To study the effect of Super on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Pea. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bahraich. (iii) 17.3.1951. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with meston-5 cultivator and 4 plankings with ploughings. (b) flat sowing in lines. (c) 1566 buds'plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) between rows. (e) -. (v) Compost at 50 mds/ac. on 20.2.1951 Top dressing of G.N.C. at 7 mds 10 seers/ac. and A/S at 1 md .9 seers/ac. ( \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N ) on 17.3 .1951 . (vi) Co-453 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings by kassi and 3 hoeings by cultivator. (ix) 40'. (x) 3.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) Control (no manure).
\(\mathrm{P}_{1}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\circ}\) deep at planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super on 17.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A: (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(87^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(87^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable cane and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Zones; Captainganj, Faizabad, Nawabganj, Bahrampur, Ghughli, Tamkohi, Sardarnagar, Anandnagar, Gauribazar 〔and Bahraich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 22.87 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.825 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 22.57 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 23.61 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 22.44 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.153\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:m Sugarcane.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Bahraich.
Ref:- U.P. 53(246).
Type :-'M'.

```

Object :-To stud \(y\) the response of Sugarcane to Super in combiation with green manure.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat and then G.M. or fallow as per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Reier soil analysis, Bahraich. (iii) 30,31.1.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with desi plough levelling with the help of karaha and 2 harrowings. (b) flat sowing in lines. (c) 22178 buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) between rows. (e) -. (v) Compost at 25 lb ./ac. of N on 17 and 18.12.1952. Manuring of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 4, 5.4 .1953 where no green manuring was done. Top dressing with mixture (Source-N.A.) at 35 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{N}\) on 15.7.1953. (vi) Co-453 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings and 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) February 1954 (Date-N.A.).
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-Sugarcane (no manure).
2. Fallow-Sugarcane manured with 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied \(3^{\prime \prime}\) deep at planting.
3. Sanai as G.M.-Sugarcane.
4. Sanal as G.M.-Sugarcane. Sanai manured with 150 lb ./ac. of. \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing.
5. Sanai as G.M.-Sugarcane. Plot manured with 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of turning in Sanai.

Sanai at 60 lb ./ac. of N , turned in on 28.8.1952. Method of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(66^{\circ} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\circ} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germinatin, no. of tillers, no. of millable canes and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Zones :-Captainganj, Faizabad (3 trials), Gorakhpur (2 trails). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducled by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 28.71 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.555 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av, yield \\
1. & 28.29 \\
2. & 26.88 \\
3. & 28.86 \\
4. & 29.63 \\
5. & 29.89 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.278\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Bahraich.
}

Ref: :U.P. 49(161).
Type :- \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the comparative efficacy of different green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) G.M. as per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bahraich. (iii) 15 and 16.2.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at \(45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) Co. 453 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) Feb. and March 1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

8 kinds of G.M. sown before Sugarcane.
1. Urd seed (control).
5. Guar.
2. Sanai.
6. Dhaincha.
3. Metha.
7. Chatri-Matri.
4. Pea.
8. Fallow.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(87^{\circ} \times 21^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Zone : Balrampur, Baitalpur, Sardarnagar and Anandnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.68 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.384 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 24.43 & 5. & 24.08 \\
2. & 24.89 & 6. & 24.00 \\
3. & 27.67 & 7. & 23.53 \\
4. & 25.62 & 8. & 23.19 \\
\(\ldots\) & S.E./mean & \(=1.192\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :-Grovt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad,
Ref :-U.P. 49(44).
Type : \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{M}\) '
Object : - To study the response of Sugarcane to super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A." (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.2.1949: (iv) (a) to (e) N.A.
(v) Nil. (vi) Cos-109 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
\(\mathbf{P}_{0}=\) Control (no manure).
\(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(60^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Zones : Phasonda, Baitalpur, Tamkohi, Ghughli, Chhitanni, Balrampur, Bahraich, Bahni and Sardarnagar. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.03 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.30 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 14.43 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 15.20 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 15.45 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.531\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.

Ref:- U.P. 50(176).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.2.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Sanai for G.M. (vi) \(\operatorname{Cos} 109\) (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 25,26.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
\(P_{0}=\) Control (no manure).
\(\mathrm{P}_{1}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) broadcast before planting.
\(P_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb} / a \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\circ}-4^{*}\) deep in furrows before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 3.
(b) N.A
(iii) 6.
(iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(54^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\).
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, no. of millable cane and cane yield. (iv) (a) 1950 and 1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) Bahraich, Balrampur, Ghugli, Sardarnagar, Lakshmiganj, Tamkohi, Gauribazar, Nawabganj and Anandnagar. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.18 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.513 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 12.93 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 13.54 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 13.06 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.618\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :-' Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.

Reft-U.P. 51(172)/50(176).
Type:- \(\mathbf{- M}^{\mathbf{M}}\).

Object:-To study the response of cane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.1.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughing by M.C. cultivator on 3.1.1951., 27.1.1951, harrowing by Shahjahanpur kanta 31.12.1950, lever harrow on 2.1.1951, and ploughing by prajha plough on 25.12.1950. (b) N.A. (c) 1728 buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distance with in lines by winged deshi plough. (e) -. (v) Sanai at 50 lb ./ac of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(48 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of N on 27.1.1951. A/S at \(12 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of N as top dressing. (vi) Co 453 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by kassi on 27.2.1951, by cultivator on 22.3.1951, 8.4.1951 and 14.5.1951. Earthing up by spade on 20.8.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 1,2.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
\(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\) Control (no manure).
\(\mathrm{P}_{1}=150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ring round net plot.
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable cane and yield of cane at harvest including canes harvested for juice analysis. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) Zone: Captainganj, Faizabad, Nawabganj, Balrampur, Ghugli, Tamkohi, tirdarnagar, Anandnagar, Gauribazar and Balrampur. (vi) Nit. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.18 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 3.041 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(P_{0}\) & 19.51 \\
\(P_{1}\) & 19.07 \\
\(P_{\mathbf{Z}}\) & 18.97 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.241\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:-Sugarcane. \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. 53(247). } \\
& \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in combination with G.M. applied at different times.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) G.M. or fallow as per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.2.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by praja plough and 6 ploughings bv desi plough 'on 2.2.1953, 6.2.1953 (twice) 9.2.1953 (four times). Harrowing by Shahjahanpur kant \(a\) on \(2.2 .1953,7.2 .1953\). (b). Flat planting. (c) 1728 buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distance in lines ; furrows opened by desi plough. (e) -. (v) A/S at 55 lb ./ac. of N on 12.2.1953. Top dressing \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 35 lb ./ac. of N on 5.8 .1953 . (vi) CO. 416 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings by kudali and once earthing up by spade. (1x) N.A. (x) 13, 14 and 25.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow followed by sugarcane.
2. Fallow-Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied \(3^{\text {? }}\) deep at planting of sugarcane.
3. Sanai green manuring followed by sugarcane.
4. Sanai green manuring + Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at the time of sowing sanai followed by sugarcane.
5. Sanai green manuring+Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied at the time of turning of sanai followed by cane.
Method of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.d.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable cane and yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955 (Expt. not conducted in 1954-1955). (b), (c) No. (v) (a) Zone: Faizabad Padranna, Gorakhpur and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 11.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.145 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of \(n\) ane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.97 \\
2. & 10.55 \\
3. & 11.22 \\
4. & 13.76 \\
5. & 14.02 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.573\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref i-U.P. 50(27).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and CaO to Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M.-wheat. (b) Dhaincha (for seed). (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 18, 19.2.1950.
(iv) (a) 7 preparatory ploughings with watts and desi ploughs. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as P.Y.M. and \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). as A/S top dressing before sowing. (vi) CO.S, 109. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Earthing from 2 to 5.8 .1950 and 7 hoeings. (ix) \(44.96^{\circ}\). (x) 12.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=100\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac
(2) 2 levels of Ca ) as lime: \(\mathrm{L}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=2\) ton/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal and no lodging. (ii) Borer attacked the crop and were killed. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable canes and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.44 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.932 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.


Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub.Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 51(19).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and CaO on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat. (b) Sanai (G.M.) at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.1.1951. (iv) (a) 5 preparatory ploughings and harrowing with desi and watts ploughs. Making trenches and dismentling them. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 60-3 budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Neem cake applied in furrows at planting at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. Neem cake and A/S applied at tillering at 25 lb ./ac. of N each. Single Super ( \(18 \% \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) ) and lime applied in furrows at planting as per treatments. (vi) CO.S. 109. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings and 9 hoeings. (ix) \(27.19^{\prime \prime}\). ( x ) 29.12.1951 to 20.1.1952.
. TREATMENTS':
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=100\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of CaO as lime : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=2\) ton/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\) (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Attack of borers. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable sugarcanes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.64 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.319 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(L_{0}\) & \(L_{1}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(P_{0}\) & 17.07 & 20.06 & 18.57 \\
\(P_{1}\) & 17.66 & 20.67 & 19.17 \\
\(P_{2}\) & 18.58 & 17.78 & 18.18 \\
\hline Mean & 17.77 & 19.50 & 18.64
\end{tabular}
S.E. of \(P\) marginal means \(\quad=0.820\) ton/ac.
S.E. if L marginal means , \(=0.670\) ton/ac.
S.E. of any mean of body of table \(\quad=1.160\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. SubwStn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 52(56).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super in presence and absence of Gypsum.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat. (b) Sanal for G.M. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.2.1952. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings with victory and desi ploughs and 2 harrowings with cultivator. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) \(60-3\) budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A: (v) A/S as top-dressing at 70 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}\left(4\right.\) mds. 15 seers). (vi) CO.S. 511. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings and 4 hoeings. (ix) \(34.40^{\circ}\). (x) 7.2.1953 to 2.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=100\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of \(G y p s u m: G_{0}=0\) and \(G_{1}=1 \frac{1}{2}\) ton/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (il) Attack of borer. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 26.62 ton/ac.
(ii) \(5.013 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 27.35 & 24.32 & 25.84 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 29.07 & \(26.50{ }^{\circ}\) & 27.78 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 24.86 & 27.60 & 26.23 \\
\hline Mean & 27.09 & 26.14 & 26.62 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of \(P\) marginal means
S.E. of \(G\) marginal means
S.E. of body of table
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.773 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =1.447 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =2.507 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:- U.P. 51(22).
Type: © \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To compare the effect of application of \(A / S\) and \(C / N\) on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-Barley and Gram. (b) Chari for grain. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3.3.1951. (iv) (a) 4 preparatory ploughings with desi and victory ploughs. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) \(45-3\) budded setts/row (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings, 1 after each irrigation and 2 earthings. (ix) 27.15". ( x ) 22.12.1951 to 2.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure)
(1) 2 sources of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(41^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953 . (b) and (c) Na. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 12.90 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 3.628 ton/ac.
(iii) Only control vs others is signaificant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=8.960\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 12.34 & 13.55 & 12.94 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 14.54 & 13.64 & 14.09 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & 14.15 & 13.09 & 13.62 \\
\hline Mean & 13.68 & 13.43 & 13.55 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of S marginal means \\
S.E. of N marginal means
\end{tabular}}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.047 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =1.283 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of body of table
S.E. of coatrol vs any mean in body of table}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
\(=1.814\) ton/ac. \\
\(=2.566\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 52(58)/51(22).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. Type :-'M'.
Object : To compare the effect of application of \(A / S\) and \(C / N\) on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M. Barley. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 22.2.1952. (iv) (a) 4 preparatory ploughings with victory plough and desi plough. (b) Sown flat. (c) 45-3 budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings and earthings. (ix) \(34.40^{\circ}\). (x) 16.2.1953 to 2.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control (no manure)
(1) 2 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=C / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{2}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\) (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. No lodging: (ii) Attack of borer. (iii). Germination, no. of tillers; no. of millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b), and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 17.19 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.488 ton/ac.
(iii) Only control \(v s\) others is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=11.74\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & S & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 17.20 & 18.06 & 17.63 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 19.71 & 15.85 & 17.78 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 19.86 & 17.94 & 18.90 \\
\hline Mean & 18.92 & 17.28 & 18.10 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of S marginal means} & 718 ton \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of N marginal means} & .880 ton \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & 244 ton \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of control us any mean in body of table} & 760 tod \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 53(171)//52(58)/51(22)
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. Type :- ' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).
Object .-To compare the effect of application of \(A / S\) and \(C / N\) on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.2.1953. (iv) (a) . 8 ploughings with victory and desi ploughs. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 45 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 earthings on 25.7.1953 and 29.7.1953. (ix) 48.28 (x) 26.12 .1953 to 17.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS .}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+ a control (no manure).
(1) 2 sources of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=C / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{8}=100, \mathrm{~N}_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Date of manuring 30.4.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\circ}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal and no lodging. (ii) Attack of borer. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable cane and yield. (iv) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS .
(i) 21.93 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.363 too/ac.
(iii) \(S\) and \(N\) effects are highly significant. Interaction \(S \times N\) is not significant. Effect of control \(v s\) others is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.

Control \(=15.61\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Mean } \\
\hline\(\dot{\mathbf{N}}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 22.33 & 19.85 & 21.09 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 24.41 & 20.59 & 22.50 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{3}\) & 27.51 & 23.21 & 25.36 \\
\hline Mean & 24.75 & 21.22 & 22.98
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of N marginal means & \(=0.836 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}:\) \\
S.E. of \(S\) marginal means & \(=0.682\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.182\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of control vs any other mean in body of table & \(=1.671\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:-Sugarcane. \\ Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. \\ Ref:- U.P. 4S(4). \\ Type:- 'M'.}

Object :- To study the effect of different trace elements on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Dhaincha for seed-Sugarcane. (b) Dhain cha for seed. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam.
(b) N.A. (iii) 18.2.1948. (iv) (a) 7 preparatory ploughings with desi and watts ploughs. (b) Sown flat (c) \(40-3\) budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeing and 1 earthing up. (ix) \(48.99^{\circ}\). (x) \(12,13.3 .1949\).
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. \(\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) at 1.4 lb ./ac.
3. \(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) at \(1.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. \(\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) at \(1.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Treatments given on 7.3.1948 as top dressing.
3. DESIGN .
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 4. (b)
(b) N.A
(iii)
v) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\)
(b) \(34^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround.
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL .
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable canes and cane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.19 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.717 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.85 \\
2. & 25.36 \\
3. & 24.02 \\
4. & 24.55 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.859\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res.-Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref: U.P. 48(3).
Type :- \(\mathbf{-}^{\mathbf{M}}{ }^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of different G.M. crops manured and unmanured on the succeeding Sugarcane crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat.-G.M. (Kharif and Rabi)-Sugarcane. (b) Wheat-Sanai. (c) G.M.' (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.2.1948. (iv) (a) 10 preparatory ploughings with desi and watts plough. (b) Sown flat.(c) 60-3 budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) G.M. with Sanai on 23 and 25.9.1948, 13.10.1948. (vi) CO.S. 109. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings and 2 earthings. (ix) 48.99". (x) 16.2.1949 to 2.3.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Sanai (G.M.).
2. Sanai + Berseem.
3. Sanai+A/S. at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vì) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, no. of tillers, no. of millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G)
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.03 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.818 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatmant differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
yreatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.03 \\
2. & 23.73 \\
3. & 25.32 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.909\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:-U.P. 49(3)/48(3).
Type :- \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object:-To study the effect of different G.M. crops manured and unmanured cn the succeeding Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-G.M. (Kharif and Rabi)-Sugarcane. (b) Wheat—Sanai. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.2.1949. (iv) (a) 6 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) \(60-3\) budded setts/row. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) G.M. with sanal sown on 7.7.1948 and buried in on 23.8.1948. (vi) CO.S. 109. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 9 hoeings and 1 earthing on 11 to 13.7.1949. (ix) \(52.86^{\circ}\). (x) 9 to 11.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control-Sanai Green manured.
2. Sanal+A/S at 50 lb ./ac. of N .
3. Sanai+Berseem (Green manured).

A/S applied on 29.3.1949. Berseem sown on 6.11.1948. buried in on 27.12.1948.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ} \gamma\) (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 19481949. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. conducted by D.S.R.(G).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 26.55 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.182 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 25.40 \\
2. & 27.92 \\
3. & 26.33 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.591\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 48(2).
Type :-‘M’.

Object :-To study the effect of application of \(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(A / N\) at different levels on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M. - Wheat-Dhainc ha for seed-Sugarcane. (b) Dhaincha for seed. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 and 7.2.1948. (iv) (a) 8 preparatory ploughings with desi and watts ploughs. (b) Sown flat.' (c) \(85-3\) budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.S. 109. (viii) Irrigated. (viii) Earthing from 17.7.1948 to 21.8 .1948 and hoeings-9. (ix) \(48.99^{\circ}\). (x) 9.2.1949 to 1.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) +3 selective treatments
(1) 2 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=A / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(N: \quad N_{1}=50, N_{2}=100\) and \(N_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

3 selective treatments-
\(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) control (no manure).
\(\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{g}}=\) urine earth at 150 lb ./ac. of N .
\(\mathrm{T}_{3}=\) press mud cake at 150 lb ./ac. of N .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(85^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(79^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border left alround the gross plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.48 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.067 ton/ac:
(iii) Selective treatments differ significantly. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \mathbf{T}_{2}=18.27 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=22.03 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} \\
& \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{3}}=24.01 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]


Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U P. 53(172).
Type:-‘M'.

Object :-To study the effect of G.M. with time of application of P.fertilizers.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M.-Sugarcane. (b) Wheat-G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane 21 and 22.2.1953 and date of sowing of green manures 23.6.1952. (iv) (a) 10 ploughings with desi and victory plough. (b) N.A. (c) 85-3 budded setts/row were planted. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) |Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and \(120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as 60 lb . of N from G.M. and 60 lb . of N from \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 8.5.1953. (vi) CO.S. 443. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Earthngs on 12, 13, 16 and 22.8.1953. Hoeings 8, one or two hoeing \({ }_{s}\) after each irrigation. (ix) 48.64". (x) Sugarcane 11.2.1954 to 24.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

Mnin-plot treatments:
3 kinds of G.M. and fallows : \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Sanai, \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Dhaincha, \(\mathbf{G}_{3}=\) Cowpea and \(\mathbf{G}_{4}=\) Fallows.
Sub-plot treatments:
3 times of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}+\) a control: \(\quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=\) no manure (control), \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at sowing G.M., \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at turning in of G.M. and \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at planting sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(84^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(3^{\prime}\) border alround the gross plot was excluded. (vi) Yes.
6. GENERAL :
(i) Normal and no lodging. (ii) Attack of borer. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 28.71 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.435 ton/ac,
(b) 1.690 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. main-plot treatment marginal means & \(=1,810\) ton/ae. \\
2. sub-plot treatment marginal means & \(=0.690\) ton/ac. \\
3. sub-plot treatment means at the same level of main-plot treatment & \(=1.380\) ton/ac. \\
4. main-plot treatment means at the same level of sub-plot treatment & \(=2.169\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub.Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 48(8).
Type :- ‘M’.

Object:-To study the effect of placement of super on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}

\footnotetext{
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton (against fallow). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 5.3.1948. (iv) (a) 14 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds/ft. of a row. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 451 (mid season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings. (ix) \(31.95^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
}
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super broadcast.
3. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super in trenches.
4. 100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super dibbling \(4^{\circ}\) deep.
5. \(1 C 0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super dibbling \(7^{\circ}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(53.2^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(47.2^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) 1 row on either side and 3, at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (ii) Germination count of tiller and millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 32.39 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.820 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 33.20 \\
2. & 33.43 \\
3. & 29.46 \\
4. & 33.85 \\
5. & 31.94 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.910\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 49(10)/48(8). } \\
\text { Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn , Muzaffarnagar. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of placement of super on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Fallow Sugarcanè. (b) Guar for grain-Fallow. (c) G.N.C. at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and A/S at 20 lb./ac. of N. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 7.3.1949. (iv) (a) 8 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds per foot of a row. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.421 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings and 1 fearthing. (ix) \(22.50^{\circ}\). (x) 28.12.1949 to 21.1.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Con'rol.
2. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super broadcast.
3. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super in trenches.
4. 100 lb /ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super dibbling \(4^{4}\) deep.
5. 100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super dibbling \(7^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(53.2^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(47.2^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) 1 row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, count of tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) NiI. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 29.51 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.780 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 31.88 \\
2. & 33.79 \\
3. & 18.23 \\
4. & 32.13 \\
S. & 31.52 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.390\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Ref:- U.P. 50(33)/49(10)/48(8). \\ Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarna gar. Type :-'M'.}

Object:-To study th; effect of placement of super on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Guar-Fallow. (c) G.N.C. at 100 lb ./ac. of N. and A/S at \(20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 21.2 1950. (iv) (a) 8 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 421 (mid-season); (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 12 hoeings and earthing up in August. (ix) 38.60 \({ }^{\circ}\). (x) 29.11.1950 to 17.1.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. 100 lb ./ac. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied by broadcast.
3. 100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied in trenches.
4. 100 lb . /ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied by dibbling \(4^{\circ}\) deep.
5. 100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{2}\) as Super applied by dibbling \(7^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(53.2^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(47.2^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane countings and yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b), (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 28.06 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.233 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yietd of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 28.42 \\
2. & 25.87 \\
3. & 28.06 \\
4. & 27.65 \\
5. & 30.31 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.617\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :wSugarcane (Ratoon).
:Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 48(5).
Type :~*M'.

Object :-To find out the optimum_dose of manure for first year Ratoon.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Sanai or Moong-Sugarcane-Ratoon. (b) Sugarcane (plant cane). (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) Ratoon. (iv) (a) One preparatory ploughing (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds!in 1 ft . of a row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) spart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.421 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Earthing up in August. (ix) 31.95*. (x) 23.12.1948 to 25.12.1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

8 doses of \(N\) as \(A / S+G . N . C\). in \(1: 1\) ratio : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=80, N_{2}=100, N_{8}=120, N_{4}=140, N_{5}=160, N_{6}=180\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{7}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(75^{\circ} \times 21^{\circ}\). (b) \(69^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller and millable cane countings and yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) NiI. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.01 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.200 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment. & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 13.68 & \(\mathrm{N}_{6}\) & 25.23 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 20.83 & \(\mathrm{N}_{5}\) & 24.21 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 24.66 & \(\mathrm{N}_{6}\) & 25.23 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 25.37 & \(\mathrm{N}_{7}\) & 24.88 \\
\hline & S.E./mean & \(=1.100 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane (Ratoon).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To find out the optimum dose of manure for first year Ratoon.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Sanai or Maong-Sugarcane-Ratoon. (b) Sugarcane (plant cane). (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) Ratoon. (iv) (a) One preparatory ploughing(b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds/foot of a row. (d) Rows \(3^{\circ}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.421 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings, earthing up in July. (ix) 20.73". (x) 12.12.1949 to 20.12.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

8 doses of \(N\) as A/S+G.N.C. in 1:1 ratio: \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=80, \quad N_{2}=100, N_{3}=120, N_{4}=140, \quad N_{5}=160\), \(N_{6}=180\) and \(N_{7}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
 each end ; a distance of \(4^{\prime}\) and \(3^{\prime}\) between blocks alternately. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane counting and yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.53 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.040 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av: yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 14.97 & \(\mathbf{N}_{4}\) & 22.69 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 19.57 & \(\mathbf{N}_{5}\) & 24.46 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 19.27 & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & 23.61 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{3}\) & 21.55 & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{7}}\) & 26.12 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=1.020\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane (Ratoon).
Ref :- U.P. 50(30)/49(6)/48(5).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.
Type :~ ‘M!.

Object :-To find out the optimum dose of manure for first year R atoon.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Sanai or Moong-Sugarcane-Ratoon. (b) Plant cane (Sugarcane). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) Ratoon. (iv) (a) One preparatory ploughing. (b) Sown flat. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) 'apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 421 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings and earthing up in July. (ix) \(34.70^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
8.doses of \(N\) as A/S+G.N.C. in 1:1 ratio : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=80, N_{8}=100, N_{8}=120, \quad N_{8}=140, \quad N_{5}=160\), \(\mathrm{N}_{6}=180\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{7}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(75^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(69^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane counting and yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) No.
(c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. ' (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(M);
5. RESULTS :
(i) 22,95 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.109 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Ar. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 14.60 & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 25.91 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 22.17 & \(\mathbf{N}_{6}\) & 25.58 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 21.96 & \(\mathbf{N}_{6}\) & 25.36 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{3}\) & 22.80 & \(\mathbf{N}_{7}\) & 25.19 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=1.054\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Crop :- Sugarcane (Ratoon). } \\
& \text { Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. } \quad \text { Type :- ' } \mathbf{M} \text { '. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object :-To find out the optimum time of application of A/S over a basal dressing of F.Y.M:
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Sanai (against fallow). (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 23.2.1948. (iv) (a) 12 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds/ft. of a row (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) As per treatments. (vi) CO. 421 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings and earthing also. (ix) 31.95*. (x) 7.1.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

5 application of N at \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
1. 5 doses of 12 lb ./ac. of N each at planting and \(4 ; 8,12\) and 16 weeks after planting.
2. 3 doses of 20 lb ./ac. of N each at planting and 8 and 16 weeks after planting.
3. 2 doses of 30 lb ./ac. of N each at planting and at tillering.
4. 60 lb ./ac. of N at planting.
5. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N at tillering.
. N is applied as A/S. A basal dose of 40 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M. is applied.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42 y^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(36 \mathrm{l}^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) A row on each side and 3' at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tiller, and millable sugarcane counting and yield. (iv) (a) 19461948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S. R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 30.57 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.580 ton/ac,
(iii) Treatment differences are significaph.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 28.88 \\
2. & 29.84 \\
3. & 31.60 \\
4. & 32.09 \\
5. & 30.46 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.790\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :^ Sugarcane. Ref :- U.P. 48(9).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To asses the comparative efficacy of \(A / S\) and \(A / N\) at different levels of \(N\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton (against fallow). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 6.3.1948. (iv) (a) 15 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds/ ft. of a row. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.S. 245 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings and earthing up in August. (ix) 34.59". (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENIS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control (no manure)
(1) 2 source of \(N: S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=A / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(66^{\prime} 5^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(60.5^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller and millable sugarcane counting and yield. (iv) (a) 19461948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (M).I

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 29.50 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.372 ton/ac.
(iii) Only Control ws treated effect is' highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton./ac.
\[
\text { Control }=21.88 \text { ton/ac. }
\]
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 30.99 & 27.09 & 33.90 & 30.66 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 30.92 & 31.12 & 30.59 & 30.88 \\
\hline Mean & 30.96 & 29.10 & 32.24 & 30.77
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of \(S\) marginal mean & \(=0.871\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of \(N\) marginal mean & \(=1.066 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.508 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stu., Muzaffarnagar.}

Ref :-U.P. 48(7).
Type:- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of manures on the yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sugarcane-G.M.-Wheat-Guar. (b) Guar. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 28, 29.2.1948. (iv) (a) 19 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown fiat. (c) 3 buds/n. of a row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) - (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 boeings and 1 earthing. (ix) \(32.09^{\circ}\). (x) 14.1.1949 to 13.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
8. Press mud at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
2. A/S at 60 lb .jac. of N .
9. Press mud at 120 lb ./ac. of N.
3. A/S.at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathbf{N}\).
10. Castor cake at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N .
4. \(A / N\) at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
11. Mpl. manure at 120 lb ./ac. of N .
5. \(A / N\) at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
12. Compost at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
6. Urine earth at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
13. Mpl. compost at 120 lb ./ac. of N .
7. Urine earth at 120 lb ./ac. of N .
14. F.Y.M. at 120 lb ./ac. of N.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 14. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(59^{\prime}-91^{\prime \prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(53-91^{\prime \prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and 3' at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane counting and yield. (iv) (a) 1944-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was condncted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 32.49 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.32 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 28.45 & & 8. & 33.94 \\
2. & 32.03 & 9. & 36.64 \\
3. & 36.42 & & 10. & 35.55 \\
4. & 32.05 & 11. & 28.92 \\
5. & 33.20 & 12. & 31.75 \\
6. & 33.10 & 13. & 30.64 \\
7. & 32.26 & 14. & 29.96 \\
& & S.E./mean & & \(=1.16\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.
Ref :-U.P. 48(10).
Type :-'M'.

Object : - To study the effect of the use of catalytic agents in conjunction with manures on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton (against fallow). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer : analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 8.3.1948. (iv) (a) 12 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sowin flat. (c) 3 buds/ f. of a row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (c) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 421 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings. (ix) \(32.22^{\circ}\). (x) 4.1 .1949 to 22.1.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control. 7. F.Y.M. by 15th January.
2. Castor cake at planting.
8. F.Y.M. by 15th February.
3. Castor cake+ \(\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\).
9. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\).
4. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\).
10. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\).
5. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\).
11. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{8}\).
6. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\).
12. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\).

Castor cake and F.Y.M. applied at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}_{5} \mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) and \(\mathrm{MaSO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) at 1.4 \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{FeSO}_{\mathbf{1}}, \mathrm{MaSO}_{4}\) and \(\mathrm{CuSO}_{\mathbf{1}}\) are used as activizera.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. '(b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) 。 (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) border at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tiller, milleable cane countings and iyjeld. (iv) (a) 1949-1950 (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.43 ton./ac.
(ii) 2.122 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc}
\begin{tabular}{c} 
Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. \\
Treatment
\end{tabular} & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 16.33 & 7. & 19.11 \\
2. & 28.25 & 8. & 19.65 \\
3. & 26.92 & 9. & 21.79 \\
4. & 27.04 & 10. & 21.28 \\
5. & 28.55 & \(i 11\). & 23.68 \\
6. & 27.22 & 12. & 21.36 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=1.06\) ton/ac. & \\
& & &
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 49(9)/48(10). } \\
\text { Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To find out the effect of the use of catalytic agents in conjunction with manures on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Sanai against Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 2.3.1949. (iv) (a) 10 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds/ft. of a row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.421 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeinga and earthing up in August. (ix) 21.91". (x) 1 to 16.1.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
6. F.Y.M. by 15th January.
2. Castor cake at planting.
8. F.Y.M. by 15th February.
3. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\).
4. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\).
9. F.Y.M. +FeSO.
5. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\).
10. 'F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\).
6. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\). 12. \(\mathrm{F} . \mathrm{Y}_{.} \mathrm{M} .+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\).
11. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\).

Castor cake and F.Y.M. applied at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) and MnSO at \(28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) at 1.4 lb./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) 1 row on either side aad 3' at each énd. ,(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane countings and sugarcage yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.51 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.193 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 17.34 & 7. & 21.52 \\
2. & 27.90 & 8. & 19.90 \\
3. & 29.19 & 9. & 20.90 \\
4. & 27.17 & 10. & 19.81 \\
5. & 30.30 & 11. & 19.74 \\
6. & 29.45 & 12. & 18.93 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=1.096\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 50(36)/49(9)/48(10).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. Type :- 'M'.
Object:-To find out the effect of the use of catalytic agents in conjunction with manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton against Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muziffarnagar. (iii) 28.2.1950. (iv) 10 prepatory ploughings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 421 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings and earthing up in September. (ix) 37.57". (x) 7.12 .1950 to 8.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

1: Control. . 7. F.Y.M. by 15th January.
2. Castor at planting. 8. F.Y.M. by 15th February.
3. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\). . 9. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\).
4. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\). 10. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\).
5. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\). 11. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\).
6. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\). 12. F.Y.M. \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) -

Castor cake at F.Y.M. applied at 120 lb /ace. of \(\mathrm{N}_{3} \mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) and \(\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\) at 28 lb ./ac. and \(\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) at \(1.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \(\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}, \mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\) and \(\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) are used as achirizers.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) 1 row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) CGermination, tiller, millable cane countings and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a). 1948 to 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.03 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.990 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 12.14 & 7. & 14.99 \\
2. & 25.80 & 8. & 14.74 \\
3. & 25.14 & 9. & 14.79 \\
4. & 25.06 & 10. & 15.60 \\
5. & 24.17 & 11. & 15.85 \\
6. & 24.50 & 12. & 15.63 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=0.995\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:-U.P. 49(12).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To find out the cumulative effect of continuous application of \(A / S\) and other bulky manures.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Guar against Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 14.3.1949. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings. (b) Planted flat. (c) 80 md. seed sugarcane at 4200 bud/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) 一. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings and earthing up in August. (ix) 23.09". (x) 12.1.1954 to 26.2.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

7 sources of \(N: S_{0}=n 0\) manure, \(S_{1}=\) F.Y.M., \(S_{2}=\) G.N.C., \(S_{8}=A / S, S_{4}=A / S+\) F.Y.M., \(S_{8}=A / S+\) G.N.C. and \(S_{4}=A / S+G . N . C .+\) F.Y.M.
Dose of \(\mathbf{N}\) is 120 lb ./ac. Application of combined fertilizers is on equal Nitrogen basis.
3. DESIGN :

\footnotetext{
(i) R.B D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(83^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(4^{\prime}\) on each end. (vi) Yes.
}

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller and millable sugarcane counting and yield. (iv) (a) 1949 contd. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment cond acted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.26 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.52 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment diferences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 17.00 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 19.40 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 29.00 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 29.50 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 22.70 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & 28.50 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{6}}\) &, 23.70 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.26\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 50(34)'49(12).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To find out the cumulative effect of continuous application of \(A / S\) and other bulky manures.
1. BASÄL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton against fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 27.2.1950. (iv) (a) 8 preparatory ploughings. (b) Planted flat. (c) 80 md . seed sugarcane at 4200 bud/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 8 hoeings and earthing up in August. (ix) 39.93'. (x) 4 to 16.3.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

7 sources of \(N: S_{0}=\) no manure, \(S_{1}=\) F.Y.M., \(S_{2}=\) G.N.C., \(S_{3}=A / S, S_{6}=A / S+F . Y . M ., S_{5}=A / S+\) G.N.C. and \(S_{5}=\) A/S + G.N.C. + F.Y.M.

Dose of N is \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). Application of combined fertilizers is on equal Nitrogen basis.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(83^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) One row on each side and 4 ' on each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) \(\lambda\) il. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane counting and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949 - contd. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(M).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 21.94 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.686 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathrm{S}_{0}\) & 11.85 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{1}\) & 14.29 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 27.27 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\) & 27.04 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{4}\) & 21.51 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & 27.94 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 23.70 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.843\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 51(28)/50(34)/49(12).
Type :-' \({ }^{\prime}\) '.

Object :-To fird out the cumulative effect of continuous application of A/S and other bulky manures,
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Moong (for this season). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 24.2.1951. (iv) (a) 12 preparatory ploughings. (b) Planted fiat. (c) 80 md. seed cane at 4200 bud/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart, (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings and earthing up in July. (ix) 23.36* (x) 11.1.1952 to 7.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

7 sources of \(N: S_{0}=\) no manure, \(S_{3}=\) F.Y.M., \(S_{2}=\) G.N.C., \(S_{3}=A / S, S_{4}=A / S+\) F.Y.M., \(S_{6}=A / S+G . N . C\). and \(S_{4}=A / S+G . N . C .+F . Y . M\).
Dose of \(\mathbf{N}\) is \(\mathbf{1 2 0} \mathbf{~ l b}\)./ac. Application of combined fertilizers is on equal Nitrogen basis.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(83^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(4^{\prime}\) on each end, 5' distance between blocks. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller and millable cane counting and yield. (iv) (a) 1949-contd. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.93 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.027 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant. .
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 20.68 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 25.54 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 22.89 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 29.76 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 28.79 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & 26.53 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 27.33 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.013\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 52(64)/51(28)/50(34)/49(12).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. - Type :a'M'.
Object:-To find out the cumulative effect cf continuous application of \(A / S\) and other bulky manures.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar.
(iii) 7.3.1952. (iv) (a) 7 preparatory ploughings. (b) Planted flat. (c) 80 md . seed cane at 4200 bud/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (ear!y). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings before irrigations and 5 hoeings after irrigations. Earthing up in last week of July. (ix) 26.79". (x) 11.1.1953 to 23.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

7 sources of \(N: S_{0}=\) no manure, \(S_{1}=\) F.Y.M., \(S_{2}=\) G.N.C., \(S_{9}=A / S, S_{4}=A / S+\) F.Y.M., \(S_{6}=A / S+G . N . C\). and \(S^{\bullet}=A / S+G . N . C .+\) F.Y.M.
Dose of N is 120 lb ./ac. Application of combined fertilizers is on equal Nitrogen basis.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(83^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) One row on either side and \(4^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane countings and yield. (iv) (a) 1949-continued. (b) Ycs. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) NiI. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 25.12 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.935 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathrm{S}_{6}\) & 22.05 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 23.85 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 25.50 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 25.83 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{4}\) & 25.88 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{5}\) & 25.45 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 27.31 \\
\(\mathrm{~S} . \mathrm{E}\)./mean & \(=0.967\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 53(180)/52(64)/51(28)/50(34)/49(12).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn, Muzaffarnagar. Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To find out the cumulative effect of continuous application of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and other bulky manures.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 13.3.1953. (iv) (a) 7 preparatory ploughings. (b) Planted flat. (c) 80 maunds seed cane at 4200 bud/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings and earthing up in July. (ix) \(35.7 \mathrm{I}^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 1.12.1953 to 21.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

7 sources of \(N: S_{0}=\) no manure, \(S_{1}=\) F.Y.M., \(S_{8}=\) G.N.C., \(S_{3}=A / S, S_{4}=A / S+\) F.Y.M., \(S_{5}=A / S+\) G.N.C. and \(S_{6}=A / S+\) G.N.C. + F.Y.M.

Dose of \(N\) is \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). Application of combined fertilizers on equal Nitrogen basis. F.Y.M. was applied before planting. G.N.C. and A/S were applied after irrigation.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(83^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(4^{\prime}\) on each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Ni1. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1949-contd. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 26.81 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.197 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathrm{S}_{0}\) & 23.16 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{1}\) & 26.67 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{8}\) & 27.27 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{8}\) & 28.18 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{4}\) & 27.93 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{5}\) & 26.40 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{8}\) & 28.03 \\
S. E./mean & \(=1.098\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 51(29).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.
Type.:- \({ }^{〔}\) '.
Object:-To assess the comparative efficacy of \(A / S\) and \(C / N\) at different levels on Sugarcane,
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Cotton.Sugarcane. (b) Cotton. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 10.3.1951. (iv) (a) 24 preparatory ploughings. (b) Planted flat. (c) 70 md. seed cane, 4200 bud/ac. (d) Rows 2' apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.S. 245 (mid-season variety). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings and earthing up in August. (ix) 23.60'. (x) 6.1.1952 to 8.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure)
(1) 2 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=C / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(66 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(602^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) on each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable sugarcane counting and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 22.83 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.167 ton/ac.
(iii) Effect of N and control vs treated are both highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Ay. yield of sugarcane in tod/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Cont & & 2 ton/ac. & \\
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline S 1 & 22.13 & 23.51 & 26.05 & 23.90 \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & 22.20 & 25.09 & 24.82 & 24.04 \\
\hline Mean & 22.16 & 24.30 & 25.44 & 23.97 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of S marginal mean \\
S.E. of N marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(=0.559\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(=0.685\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\(=0.969\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. Type := 'M'.

Object :-To assess the comparative efficacy of \(A / S, C / N\) and \(A / S / N\) at different levels on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 9.3 .1952 . (iv) (a) 10 preparatory ploughings. (b) Planted flat. (c) 70 md. seed sugarcane, 4200 bud/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (c)-. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. S. 245 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 8 hoeings and earthing up in last week of July. (ix) 20.79. (x) 9.12.1952 to 20.2.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control (no manure).
(1) 3 source of \(N: S_{1}=A / S, S_{2}=C / N\) and \(S_{3}=A / S / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Date of manuring is early May 1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) \(10 .^{\circ}\) (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable sugarcane counting and yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c; No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil., (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.21 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.606 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=20.93\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 23.38 & 23.73 & 24.55 & 23.89 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 22.06 & 23.56 & 24.29 & 23.30 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) & 23.10 & 23.67 & 22.80 & 23.19 \\
\hline Mean & 22.85 & 23.65 & 23.88 & 23.46 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \(=0.355\) ton/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:- U.P. 53(178)/52(65). Type :- 'M'.

Otject :-To assess the comparative efficacy of \(A / S, C / N\) and \(A / S / N\) at different levels on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 16.2 .1953 . (iv) (a) 10 preparatory ploughings. (b) Planted flat. (c) 70 md. seed sugarcane, 4200 bud/ac. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e)-. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. S. 245 (mid season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 8 hoeings and earthing up in July. (ix) 35.71". (x) 27.11.1953 to 29.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control (no manure)
(1) 3 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S, S_{2}=C / N\) and \(S_{3}=A / S / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Fertilizers applied after 2nd irrigation i.e. in middle of May.
. 3 DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) border on each end of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller; millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment ccnducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.86 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.215 ton/ac.
(iii) Effect of control ts treated and N is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcare in lb./ac.

Control \(=16.93\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{3}\) & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Mean } \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 25.94 & 26.31 & 30.56 & 27.60 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 25.83 & 27.71 & 27.64 & 27.06 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{3}\) & .22 .70 & 27.45 & 27.52 & 25.89 \\
\hline Mean & 24.82 & 27.16 & 28.57 & 26.85
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.738\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.279\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref: ©U.P. 53(291).'
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of application of G.N.C. with and without a catalyst on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 12.3.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. G.N.C. at \(120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
2. G.N.C. at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+1 \mathrm{lb}\) catalystic mixture applied on 14.5.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) N.A.' (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.68 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.220 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
'iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 25.00 \\
2. & 22.37 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.127\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :-Regional Res. Sub-Stn., Nawabganj.

Ref :-U.P. 49(147). Type :- \({ }^{*}{ }^{\mathbf{M}}\) ’.

Object :-To find the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.3 .1949 . (iv) 9 desi ploughings and pata. Ploughing by spring harrow once and level harrow once. Turning in of sanaiby P.P. (29.9.1948). (b) Flat planting. (c) 2088 bud/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) betwcen rows. (c) -. (v) Sanai turned in, compost 164 md . on 15.21948 . at 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{N}\). G.N.C. 6 md. 5 seers on 28.2.1949. at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. Top dressing by G.N.C. at 300 lb /ac. on 8.6 .1949 and 24.7.1949. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by cultivator followed by hand kassi. (ix) \(50^{\circ}\). (x) 18.2.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
- \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\mathrm{No} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
\(P_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as broadcast at planting time.
\(\mathrm{P}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{4}\) deep at planting time.
\(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) applied as Super.
3. DESLGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(87^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (viii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.42 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.00 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differ ences are not significant-
(iv) Av. yield of sugariane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 16.66 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 17.03 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{3}} \ldots\) & 15.57 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.408\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref :-U.P. 53(238). \\
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Nawabganj. & Type :-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-Tọ study the response of Sugarcane to Super in combination with G.M.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Dhaincha as G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Clay loam. l(b) N.A. (iii) 6.3.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing by gurjar mestion and dest plough 5 times. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 2160 bud/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) between rows. (e) -. (v) Compost at 300 md./ac. (vi) CO. 421. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings with kassi and 2 with cultivator and earthing once. (ix) \(44.09^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 7 to 14.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Dhaincha green manure (control).
2. Super at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at the time of sowing Dhaincha.
3. Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at the time of ploughing in of Dhaincha.

Application of Super in treatment 2 on 5.7.1953 and in treatment 3 on 13 and 14.9.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(88^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(82^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The crop remained in water during August. Damaged by rats in December and January 1954. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination counts, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 11.99 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.40 ton/ac.
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 11.81 \\
2. & 12.19 \\
3. & 11.97 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.57\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Neoli.

Ref:-U.P. 52(198).
Type :-'M':

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light sandy loam (khaddar soil having a patches). (b) Refer soil analysis, Neoli. (iii) 29.2.1952 to 1.3.1952. (iv) (a) Turning in of sand Neoli plough. 2 harrowings by tracter, 1 Neoli ploughing, followed by planking (no other infor is available). Again 3 harrowings by tractor followed by planking twice. (b) N.A. (c) 1065 tuds/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) G.M. by sanai, A/S+G.N.C. at 12 srs./plot on 17.7.1952.Manuring with press mud and mahuwa cake on 6 to 10.12 .1951 and spreading of press mud and mahuwa cake on 11 to 15.12.1951. (vi) Co. 245 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Breaking of crusts after rains with harrow, 2 hoeings with khurpt and 2 with cultivator. Hoeing with spade after manuring. (ix) N.A. (x) 15 to 18.2.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\) control (no \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) ).
\(P_{1}=P_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). as broadcast on the field before planting.
\(\mathbf{P}_{8}=\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 60 lb ./ac. applied at \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) depth in furrows at planting time:
\(\mathrm{Pg}_{\mathrm{g}}=\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 120 lb ./ac. broadcast on the field before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{6}=\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 120 lb ./ac. applied at \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) depth in furrows at planting time. Application of Super on 22.4.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(69^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(63^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Border between plots \(13^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination count tillers, millable canc count and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a). 1952-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S). The expt. was not conducted in 1953 for want of super.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17.01 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.436 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 16.69 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 15.02 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 15.59 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 17.35 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 20.40 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.218\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Neoli.

Ref:-U.P. 53(230).
Type :- \(\mathbf{C l}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of green manuring Sugarcane with different Rabi crops.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(a) No. (b) and (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Light sandy loam. (Khaddar soil having alkaline patches). (i) (b) Refer soil analysis, Neoli. (iii) 12.3.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings and planting with Neoll plough and 2 ploughings by tractor plough ard planking. (b) N.A. (c) 543 -budded setts/row. (d) \(3^{0}\) between rows. (c) -. (v) N.A. (vi) CO 245 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hocings by cultivator and 2 by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) 28 to 29.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Merhe roots (crop for fodder).
2. Metha green manured.
3. Metha green manured \(+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 100 lb ./ac.
4. Senji roots (crop used for fodder) broadcast at the time of sowing.
5. Senji green manured.
6. Senji green manured \(+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 100 lb ./ac. broadcast at the time of sowing.
7. Berseem roots ( 3 cuttings for fodder).
8. Berseem roots ( 3 cuttings for fodder) \(+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 100 lb ./ac. applied at sowing time.
9. Pea roots (crop utilized for fodder).
10. Pea green manured.
11. Pea green manured +100 lb ,/ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at sowing time.
12. Control (no crop). Sowing of Rabi crop on 21 and 22.10.1952. Super broadcast according to treatments on 21 and 22.10.1952 at the time of sowing Rabl crop. Ist cutting of Berseem crop on 27 to 30.12.1952. 2nd cutting of Berseem crop on 15 and 16.1.1953. Cutting of G.M. on 1 to 4.2.1953. Turning in of G.M. on 7 and 8-2-1953. after planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(52^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(46^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Border between plots \(1 \mathrm{i}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yea.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Slight attack of white fly. (iii) Germination count, tiller count, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(S).

\section*{3. RESULTS :}
(i) 16.55 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.751 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 17.52 & & 7. & 19.57 \\
2. & 13.54 & & 8. & 13.09 \\
3. & 16.14 & & 9. & 15.10 \\
4. & 21.02 & 10. & 16.20 \\
5. & 14.84 & & 11. & 17.92 \\
6. & 17.90 & 12. & 15.79 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=2.348\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Neoli (Etah).

Ref :-U.P. 53(228).
Type :- \(-M^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of green manuring of cane with different \(k\) harif crops.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Piant cane of CO. 453 and after that as per treatments. (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Light sandy loam (khaddar soil having alkaline patches). (b) Refer soil analysis, Neoli. (iii) 15.2.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings by tractor and planking. (b) N.A. (c) 623-budded setts/row. (d) 3' between rows. (c) -(v) Nil. (vi) CO. 245 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings by cultivator and planking and 1 hoeing by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sanai green manured.
2. 'Sanai green manured \(+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 50 lb ./ac. broadcast at sowing time.
3. Guar green manured.
4. Guar green manured \(+\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at 50 lb ./ac. broadcast at sowing time.
5. Lobia green manured.
6. Lobia green manured \(+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 50 lb ./ac. broadcast at sowing time.
7. Dhanicha green manured.
8. Dhanicha green manured \(+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 50 lb ./ac. applied at sowing time.
9. Fallow (control).
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super at the time of sowing of green manures. Turning in of Sanal on 3.9.1952
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 (But only 5 replications considered for analysis). (iv) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Border between plots \(1 \frac{1}{3}^{\prime}:\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satislactory, one replication has been rejected from analysis due to poor yield. (ii) Slight damago duo to borers in whole of the experiment (observed on 15.6 .1953 ) shoots damaged by top borer and top rot seen on 24.8.1953 mostly in replication No. 6. (iii) Germination, tiller count, millable canes and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.21 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.80 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Ari. yield \\
\hline 1. & 23.01 & 6. & 23.64 \\
\hline 2. & 24.34 & 7. & 24.69 \\
\hline 3. & 22.01 & 8. & 26.14 \\
\hline 4. & 22.50 & 9. & 21.32 \\
\hline 5. & 21.27 & & \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=1.252\) ton/ac. & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugar cane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res: Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 48(77).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{\sim}\) ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to the application of \(\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{P}\) and \(\mathbf{K}\)

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sugarcane-Wheat-Fallow. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 26, 28.1.1948. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings with soil turning plough, 7 ploughings with desl plough and 15 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 533-budded setts/line. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO-421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings by spring tooth harrow and planking after hoeing. 5 boeings by cultivator and planking after hoeing. One hoeing by kassi. (ix) \(40.81^{\circ}\) (from March '48 to March '49). (x) 31.12.1948 to 1.6.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatmeats :
3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{8}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{fac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}_{8} \mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(531^{\prime} \times 311^{\prime}\). (b) \(\left.47!^{\prime} \times 24\right\}^{\prime}\). (v) One row left on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at either end. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Fair. (ii) Slight attack of leaf yellowing disease in October. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1935-contd. . (b) Yes-in alternate years. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
S. RESULTS:
(i) 16.52 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.721 ton/ac.
(b) 1.726 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{8}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{8}\) \\
\hline Ne, & 10.50 & 10.81 & 10.48 & 10.60 & 10.58 & 11.12 & 10.09 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 18.47 & 18.86. & 19.43 & 18.92 & 18.59 & 18.93 & 19.24 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 20.05 & 19.91 & 20.12 & 20.03 & 19.38 & 19.83 & 20.89 \\
\hline Mean & 16.34 & 16.53 & 16.68 & 16.52 & 16.18 & 16.63 & 16.74 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 15.71 & 16.01 & 16.83 & 16.18 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 16.55 & 16.42 & 16.91 & 16.63 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 16.76 & 17.16 & 16.29 & 16.74 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(N\) & \(=0.877 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(P\) or \(K\) & \(=0.407\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(K\) means at the same level of \(N\) & \(=0.705\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(P\) or \(K\) & \(=1.049\) ton/ac. \\
5. means of the body of \(P \times K\) table & \(=0.705\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 49(163)/48(77).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to the application of \(\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{P}\) and \(\mathbf{K}\).

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Cane-Wheat-Fallow. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur.
(ii)' \(30,31.1 .1949\) to 1.2 .1949. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by victory plough and 7 ploughings by desi plcugh. Akola hoe used once. Harrowing twice and pata. (b) N.A. (c) 533 - budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) N.A.' (v) Nil. (vi) CO-42l (medium). (vii) Itrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings with ka.ssi, 4 hoeings with cultivator and 3 harrowings. (ix) \(50.73^{\text {F }}\) (from February 1959 to January 1950). (x) 28, 31.12.1949, 1, 6.1.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\mathbf{0}, \mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{L}}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(!) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(53 \mathbf{1}^{\prime} \times 31 \frac{⺊^{\prime}}{}\).
(b) \(47 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime} \times 241^{\prime}\). (v) One row left on either side and \(\mathbf{3}^{\prime \prime}\) at each end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i). Good. Plots with \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\)-lodged. (ii) Attack of borers on the crop in June 1949 leaf yellowing disease observed. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and yield. (iv) (a) 1935-Still continued. (b) Yes-in alternate years. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 13.74 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.165 ton/ac.
(b) 2.611 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\). & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 8.77 & 7.35 & 7.97 & 8.03 & 7.83 & 8.01 & 8.25 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 16.74 & 16.49 & 14.93 , & 16.05 & 15.41 & 16.41 & 16.34. \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 17.13 & 17.18 & 17.15 & 17.15 & 15.76 & 16.86 & 18.83 \\
\hline Mean & 14.21 , & 13.63 & 13.35 & 13.74 & 13.00 & 13.76 & 14.47 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 13.74 & 13.02 & 12.25 & 13.00 & & & \\
\hline . \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 1455 & 13.73 & 13.00 & 13.76 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 14.35 & 14.27 & 14.80 & 14.47 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of differencc of two & \\
1. marginal means of \(N\) & \(=0.982\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(P\) or \(K\) & \(=0.615\) tan/ac. \\
3. \(P\) or \(K\) means at the same level of \(N\) & \(=1.066\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(P\) or \(K\) & \(=1.312\) ton/ac. \\
5. means of the body of \(P \times K\) table & \(=1.07\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 50,(196)/49(163)/48(77).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Shahjahanpur. Type:-‘M'.

Object :-To study the responce of Sugarcane to the application of N, P and K.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Cane-Wheat -Fallow. (b) Fallow. (c) No (ii) (a) Loam; (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 18 and 20.2.1950. (iv) 3 ploughings by victory plough, 5 ploughings by desi plongh and 4 plankings Picking of grass. (b) N.A. (c) 53 3-budded setts/line. (d).N.A. (e) 一. (v) Ni. (vi) CO 421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viji) 1 hoeing with kassi and 5 hocings with. cultivator and 1 harrowing and 2 earthings. (ix) \(38.33^{\circ}\). (x) 29.12.1950 to 21.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{2}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(K_{2} O: K_{0}=0, K_{1}=75\) and \(K_{2}=1501 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(\left.53\right|^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(471^{\prime} \times 24 \frac{1}{2}\). (v) \(32^{\prime}\) on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at either end of the gross plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Some of the shoots were effected by stem borer in June 1950. Attack of top borer and slight effect of yellowing disease in July. (iii) Germination count, tillers, millable canes and yield of cane. (iv) (a) 1935 continuing. (b) Yes-alternate years. (c) N.A. (v) (a), (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 15.17 ten/ac.
(ii) (a) 7.050 ton/ac.
(b) 1.975 ton/ac.
(iii) N effect is highly significant. P and K effects are significant. Others are ret significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{4}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 10.25 & 9.51 & 10.61 & 10.12 & 9.97 & 10.52 & 9.87 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 14.86 & 15.89 & 16.85 & 15.87 & 15.06 & 15.71 & 16.84 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & 18.81 & 19.59 & 20.15 & 19.52 & 18.30 & 19.71 & 20.54 \\
\hline Mean & 14.64 & 15.00 & 15.87 & 15.17 & 14.44 & 15.31 & 15.75 \\
\hline \(P_{0}\) & 13.95 & 13.91 & 15.47 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 14.74 & 14.94 & 16.26 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 15.23 & 16.14 & 15.88 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
1. marginal means of \(N\) & \(=1.662\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(P\) or \(K\) & \(=0.465\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(P\) or \(K\) means at the same level of \(N\) & \(=0.806\) ton/ac. \\
4. N means at the same level of \(P\) or \(K\) & \(=1.787\) ton/ac. \\
5. Means of the body of \(P \times K\) tahle & \(=0.81\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn. Shahjahanpur.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 51(187)/50(196)/49(163)/48(77).}

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to the application of \(N, P\) and \(K\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Cane-Wheat-Fallow-Cane. (from 1935 to 1951) Cane-G.M. of Sanai-Cane (from 1952 and on wards). (b) Fallow. (c) Nil: (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 12 to 14.2.1951. (iv). (a) Ploughings 3 with victory plough, 7 with desi plough, 1 with cultivator, 1 with level harrow and 4 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 53 3-budded setts/line. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO 421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 hoeing with kassi, 3 boeing with' cultivator and 1 with spring harrow. (ix) \(30.50^{\circ}\) (x) 4 to 6.1.1952. and 1, 2.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatmen is:
3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-piots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iv) (a) \(533^{\prime} \times 311^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(47 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime} \times 24 \frac{1}{2^{\prime}}\). (v) \(3 \frac{3}{\prime}^{\prime}\) on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at either end of the gross plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1935-continuing. (b) Yes -in alternate years. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.77 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.479 ton/ac.
(b) 1.811 ton/ac.
(iii). Only N effect is highly significant.
(Iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{E}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 4.25 & 4.15 & 3.67 & 4.02 & 4.04 & 4.14 & 3.88 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 9.96 & 9.85 & 9.50 & 9.77 & 9.89 & 9.82 & '9.60 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N a}{ }^{\prime}\). & 12.68 & 12.27 & 12.61 & 12.52 & 12.36 & 12.79 & 12.41 \\
\hline Mean & 8.96 & 8.76 & 8.59 & 8.77 & 8.76 & 8.92 & 8.63 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 8.56 & 8.30 & 9,43 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 9.50 & 9.09 & 8.16 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{R}}\). & 8.83 & 8.16 & 8.18 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.056 . \operatorname{ton} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =0.427 . \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =0.739 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =1.216 \text { ton } \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =0.74 \text { ton } \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{K} \quad . \quad=0.427 . t o n / a c\)
3. \(\because \mathrm{P}\) or K means at the same level of \(\mathrm{N} \quad . \quad=0.739\) ton/ac.
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(P\) or \(K\)
5. means of the body of \(P \times K\) table

Crop :- Sugarcane. Ref :- U.P. 52(238)/51(187)/50(196)/49(163)/48(77).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. : • Type :- 'M'.
Object :- To study the response of Sugarcane to the application of \(\mathbf{N}, \mathbf{P}\) and \(K\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sugarcane-Fallow-Sugarcane (from 1935 to 1951) and Sugarcane-Sanat-Sugarcane (from 1952 and onwards). (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjabanpur. (iii) 23 to 26.2.1952. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by victory plough, 4 by desi plough and 2 by cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) 53 3-budded setts/plot. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) Sanai turned in on 13 and 14.9.1951. (vi) CO. 453 (late). ivii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings, 1 hoeing by culivator, earthing and picking of grase twice. (ix) 34.16.. (x) 3 to 7.1.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{\mathbf{1}}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\). fac. of \(N\).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{8}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{6}}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(53 \mathrm{f}^{\prime} \times 31 \mathrm{I}^{\prime}\). (b) \(471^{\circ} \times 241^{\prime}\). (v) \(31^{\prime}\) left on both sides and \(3^{\prime}\) at either ends was excluded as border out of the gross plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Cood. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcano and yield. (iv) (a) 1935-continuing. (b) Yes-in alternate years. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.83 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.457 ton/ac.
(b) 3.287 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{K}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{\boldsymbol{\bullet}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\boldsymbol{P}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N a}_{0}\) & 16.02 & 15.98 & 15.32 & 15.77 & 15.73 & 16.52 & 15.07 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 23.72 & 24.21 & 23.70 & . 23.88 & 24.17 & 23.30 & 24.16 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & 24.77 & 26.75 & 26.00 & 25.84 & 25.35 & 25.12 & 27.04 \\
\hline Mean & 21.50 & 22.31 & 21.67 & 21.83 & 21.75 & 21.65 & 22.09 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 2. 01 & 21.70 & 22.53 & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{\multirow{3}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(21.31^{\circ}\) & 22.03 & 21.60 & & & & \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{P}_{\mathbf{t}}\) & 22.19 & 23.19. & 20.89 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of N
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{P}\) or K
3. \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(K\) means at the same level of \(N\)
4. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{K}\)
5. means of body of \(P \times K\) table
\(=1.286\) ton/ac.
\(=0.775\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=1.342\) ton ac.
\(=1.690\) ton/ac.
\(=1.34\) ton/ac.

> Crop :- Sugarcane. Ref :- U.P. \(53(26 J)^{\prime} 52^{\prime}(233) / 51(187) / 50(196) / 49(163) / 48(77)\). Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. Type :- 'MP.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to the application of N, P and K.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sugarcane-Fallow-Sugarcane (from 1935 to 1951) and Sugarcane-Sanai-Sugarcane (since 1952-1953). (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 30.11.1952 to 2.2.1953. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by victory plough, 1 by tractor, 7 desi ploughings, 2 harrowings and 7 plankings. (b) Flat planting. (c) 33 3-budded setts/line. (d) Rows 3t' apart. (e)-. (v) Sanai (turned in on 28.8.1952.) (vi) Co. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) Hoeings after each irrigation in addition to one bund hoeing, earthing and picking of grass. (ix) 44.19 (x) 4.1.1954.
2. TREATMEVTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=75\) and \(P_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~K}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sulphate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(53 y^{\prime} \times 311^{\prime}\). (b) \(471^{\prime} \times 241^{\prime}\). (v) \(31^{\prime}\) on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at either end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) No major incidence of pests and diseases. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield of sugarcane at harvest. (iv) (a) 1935-continuing. (b) Yes-in alternate years. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 22.78 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) \(7.659 \mathrm{tan} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) 2.485 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.

S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{llr} 
1. marginal means of \(N\) & \(=1.805\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(P\) or \(K\) & \(=0.586\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(P\) or \(K\) means at the same level of \(N\) & \(=1.014\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(P\) or \(K\) & \(=1.986\) ton/ac. \\
5. means of body of \(P \times K\) table & \(=1.01\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Crp:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
}

> Ref :- U.P. 48(75).

Type :- ' M ".

Object:-To study the effect of alternate use of G.M. crops on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 5 and 6.3.1948. (iv) (a) Ploughings by cultivators, 1 ploughing by yictory plough, 7 ploughings by desi plough and 7 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 67 3-budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Top dressing of the castor cake at 40 lb ./ac. of N on 5 and 6.3.1948. (vi) CO .453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Planking after planting, hoeing by spraying tooth harrow, planking after hoeing on 17.7.1948,..hoeing by cultivator on 7,8 and \(26.4 .1948,5,30\) and \(31.5 .1948,1.6 .1948\), hoeing by kassi \(0 n .5\) and .6 .7 .1948 . and earthing on 10.11.1948. (ix) \(40.24^{\circ}\). (x) 22, 26, 28.2.1949 and 5; 23,24, 29.3.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Sanal crop taken for fibre (fallow in Rabi).
2. Sanai green manure (fallow in Rabi).
3. Lobie crop taken for fodder (fallow in Rabi).
4. Lobia green manure (fallow in Rabi).
5. Guar crop taken for fodder (fallow in Rabi).
6. Guar green manure (fallow in \(R a b i\) ).
7. Pea crop taken for fodder (maize for fodder in Kharif).
8. Pea green manure (maize for fodder in Kharif).
9. Berseem roots-3 cutting taken for fodder (maize fodder in Kharif).
10. Berseem inter cropped with sugarcane (maize for fodder in Kharif).
11. Control (fallow in Kharif and Rabi).
12. Control (maize for fodder in Khavif and fallow in Rabi).
3. DESTGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to.(c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Erperiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 25.20 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.682 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yieid of sugarcane in too/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 25.88 & 7. & 24.92 \\
2. & 27.87 & 8. & 24.42 \\
3. & 25.25 & 9. & 27.60 \\
4. & 29.77 & 10. & 15.34 \\
5. & 23.82 & 11. & 24.70 \\
6. & 27.79 & 12. & 25.07 \\
. & S.E.jmean & \(=1.341\) tonfac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 49(60).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effezt of alternative use of green manure crops.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahajahanpur. (iii) 27.3.1949. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by victory plough, 1 desi ploughing, 1 with cultivator, picking of roots, pata and roller. (b) N.A. (c) 67 3-budded Setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Manuring by castor cake on 25 to 27.3.1949. (vi) CO.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings with cultivator, harrowing and earthing. (ix) 50.23". (x) 3) and 31.12.1949, 7 to 10,12.2.1950 and 21,24.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Sonai tops and roots (crop harvested for fibre).
2. Sanai green manure.
3. Metha green manure.
4. Metha roots (crop harvested for fodder).
5. Lobia roots (crop harvested for foider). .
6. Lobia green manure.
7. Guar roots (crop harvested for fodder).
8. Guar gre?n manure.
9. Pea roots (crop harvested for fodder).
10. Pea green manure.
11. Senji roots only (crop harvested for fodder).
12. Senji green manure.
13. Control after maize (maiz= taken for fodder).
14. Control (no crop taken).
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 14. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Growth good. Some plots of replication IV were damaged due to lodging. (ii) Slight attack of leaf yellow disease in July. (iii) Garmination count, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) NiL. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 21.83 , ton/ac.
(ii) 1.274 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly sigaificant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 23.89 & 8. & 20.86 \\
2. & 22.96 & 9. & 21.07 \\
3. & 22.72 & 10. & 23.93 \\
4. & 22.02 & 11. & 20.76 \\
5. & 21.00 & 12. & 21.86 \\
.6. & .22 .47 & 13. & 20.98 \\
7. & 20.79 & 14. & 20.29 \\
& S.Edmean & \(=0.637\) tor/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref: © U.P. 50(99).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of alternative use of green manure crops.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis,' Shahjahanpur. (iii) 15 and 16.3 .1950 . (iv) (a) Ploughing with victory plough, 2 desi ploughs, 2 plavkings 1 spring tooth harrow. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO-453 (late), (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings with cultivator, 1 with spring tooth harrow, binding and earthing. (ix) 39.87". (x) 9.2.1951 to 13.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Metha roots (crop harvested for fodder).
2. Metha green manure.
3. Metha green manure +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing.
4. Senji roots (crop harvested for fodder).
5. Senji green manure.
6. Lobia roots (crop harvested for fodder).
7. Lobia green manure.
8. Lobia green manure \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing.
9. Berseem roots ( 3 cuttings of crop for fodder).
10. Berseem roots ( 3 cuttings of crop for fodder) +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at sowing).
11. Pea roots (crop harvested for fodder).
12. Pea green manure.
13. Pea green manure +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing.
14. Control (no crop).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 14. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alromd. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Attack of white ant in one plot. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).

5, RESULTS :
(i) 19.57 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.120 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Avi yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
i. & 17.71 & 8. & 20.75 \\
2. & 19.27 & 9. & 18.29 \\
3. & 22.40 & 10. & 23.60 \\
4. & 16.89 & 11. & 16.40 \\
5. & 22.36 & 12. & 23.57 \\
i. & 15.27 & 13. & 25.52 \\
i. & 18.22 & 14. & 13.73 \\
& S.E. \(/\) mean & \(=1.56\) ton/ac. & \\
& & &
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Suagrcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 51(131).
Type z-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of alternative use of green manure crops.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 12 and 13.3.1951. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory plough, 1 by desi plough and 2 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 67 3-budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO-453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 bocings with cultivator and 2 barrowings. (ix) \(29.00^{\circ}\). (x) \(26,27.12 .1951\) and 8, 9.1.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Metha roots (crop taken for fodder).
2. Metha green manure.
3. Metha green mànure \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing.
4. Senji roots (crop taken for fodder).
5. Senfi green manure.
6. Senji green manure +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing.
7. Rerseem roots ( 3 cuttings of crop taken for fodder).
8. Berseem róots ( 3 cuttings of crop taken for fodder) +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{B}}\) at sowing.
9. Pea roots (crop taken for fodder).
10. Pea green manure.
11. Pea green manure +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at sowing.
12. Control (no crop).

Date of turning in green manuring 6 to 8.2.1951 and 25.1.1951. Date of harvesting green manures between 24.1.1951 to 8.2.1951 and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as super as on 10 to 11.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) ahround. (vi) Ycs:
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination count, tillers, millable cancs and sugarcanc yicld. (iv) (a) 19511952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was comducted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 17.64 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.516 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significame.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & \(15: 56:\) & 7. & 16.60 \\
2. & 17.00 & 8. & 20.51 \\
3. & 18.24 & 9. & 16.93 \\
4. & 14.88 & 10 & 20.42. \\
5. & 14.14 & 11. & 21.08 \\
6. & 19.09 & 12. & 17.29 \\
& & S.E. \(/\) mean & \(=1.258\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane. : .
Ref :- U.P. 52(180).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Type : \({ }^{\prime}\) ' \(M\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of alternative use of green manure crops.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 30, 31.3.1952 and 1.4.1952. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with victory plough, 2 ploughings with desi plough and planking. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO-453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kassi on 12 to 15.4.1952 and earthing on 5 to 7.9.1952. (ix) \(33.30^{\circ}\). (x) 28.1.1953 to February 1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Metha roots (crop for fodder).
2. Metha green manure.
3. Metha green manure +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing.
4. Senji roots (crop for fodder).
5. Senji green manure.
6. Se nji green manure +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing.
7. Berseem roots ( 3 cuttings of crop for fodder).
8. Berseem roots ( 3 cuitings of crop for fodder +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing).
9. Pea roots (cróp for fodder).
10. Pea green manure.
11. Pea green manure +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at sowing.
12. Control (no crop).

Sowing of green manure on 19 to 21.10.1951 and 30.10.51 Turaing in of G.M. on 8 to 14.2.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(70^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) Nil. (iii) No. of tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) No, (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nii. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.22 ton/ac.
(ii) \(2.3 j 76\) ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highiy signuficant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c} 
Ar. yield \\
1.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Sugàrcane. \\ Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shabjahanpur.
}
Ref:- U.P. 48(54).
Type :-' M '.

Object:-To study the effect and availability of different organic and inorganic manures under fallow and cropped conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Guar. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 8.3.1948. (iv) (a) 12 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) 653 -budded setts/line. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) 一. (v) Manuring of guar on 9.7.1947. (vi) CO-453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings and earthing. (ix) 40.22'. (x) 142.1949 to 19.2.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(A / S\) at 120 lb ./ac. of \(N\) on 2.3 .1948 .
2. Castor cake at 120 lb ./ac. of N applied on 16.2 .1948 .
3. G.N.C. at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N applied on \(\mathbf{1 6 . 2} .1948\).
4. M.C. at 120 lb ./ac. of N applied on 14.2.1948.
S. F.Y.M. at 120 lb ./ac. of N applied on 16.2.1948.
6. Urine earth at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N applied on \(16,18.2 .1948\).
7. Press mud at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N applied on 14.2.1948.
8. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(65^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (b) \(59^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(3^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) \(1945-1948\). (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{s. RESULTS :}
(i) \(27.15 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) 1.501 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yiel \\
1. & 32.00 & & 5. & 24.59 \\
2. & 28.79 & & 7. & 26.67 \\
3. & 27.89 & & 8. & 28.93 \\
4. & 27.53 & & 8. & 20.79 \\
& S.E./mean & & \(=0.750\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahan pur.
Ref :.U.P. 49(122).

Object :-To study the availability of different organic and inorganic mannures under cropped and fallow conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sugarcane-Fallow-Wheat-Sanai. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 9 and 10.3.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 65, three budded setts/line. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) -. (v) Sanai. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 hoeing with kassi, 4 hoeings with cultivator and earthing. (ix) \(49.79^{\circ}\), ( x ) 6 and 7.1.1950.
R. TREATMENTS:
1. \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}(20.05 \% \mathrm{~N})\) at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N applied on 8.3.1949.
2. Castor cake at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}(4.49 \% \mathrm{~N})\) applied on \(8,9.3 .1949\).
3. G.N.C. at 100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}(2.86 \% \mathrm{~N})\) applied on 9.3.1949.
4. Mahwa (Basia Latifolia) cake applied on 8 and 9.3.1949.
5. Press mud at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}(1.28 \% \mathrm{~N})\) applied cn 8 and 9.4.1949.
6. T.C. at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}(0.27 \% \mathrm{~N})\) applied on 9 and 10.3.1949.
7. F.Y.M. at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}(0.513 \% \mathrm{~N})\) applied on 9.3 .1949 .
8. Urine (cattle) earth at 120 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}(0.254 \% \mathrm{~N})\) applied on 9.3.1949.
9. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(70.5^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(64.5^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Yield data a ad sample of soil from cropped and uncropped fields. (iv) (a) to (c) No.
(v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 17.43 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.574 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 21.51 & & 6. & 18.22 \\
2. & 17.97 & & 7. & 15.29 \\
3. & 25.09 & & 8. & 15.29 \\
4. & 17.99 & & 9. & 14.25 \\
5. & 16.22 & & & \\
& S.E/mean & & -1.287 ton/ac. & \\
& & & &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
. Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref :-U.P. 49(61). \\
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. & Type :-'M.
\end{tabular}

Object : - To study the utilization of Night soil in Sugarcane cultivation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Moong. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 12 and 13.4.1949. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough, 3 by desi plough, 1 by harrow and 3 by rollerings. (b) N.A. (c) 56 three budded setts/line. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 186. (vii) Irtigated. (viii) I hoeing with kassi, 4 hoeings with cultivator and harrowing. (ix) \(50.02^{\circ}\). (x) 18.2.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. T.C. broadcasted at 200 lb ./ac. of N .
2. Night soil with Trash in trenches in inter-space at 200 lb .fac. of N.
3. Trash in trenches in inter-space.
4. Trenches only in inter-space.
5. Control (no manure).
6. A/S at \(200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(85^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(79^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Left \(3^{\prime}\) along all sides. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Lodged due to heavy rain. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 11.65 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.936 ton./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av: yield \\
1. & 12.82 \\
2. & 12.17 \\
3. & 12.48 \\
4. & 10.21 \\
5. & 10.13 \\
6. & 12.10 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.968\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Site :-Sugarcane Res Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref - U.P. 50(199).
Type:-‘M'.

Object : To investigate the effect of \(A / S, A / N, C / N\) and Mineral Super on the growth, yield and juice quality of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Non legumenous G.M.-Sugarcane-Wheat. (b) Oats. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam.' (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 22, 23.3.1950. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 3 budds/ft. of the length of row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) G.M. by oats. (vi) CO 421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(38.08^{\circ}\). (x) 2.1.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S, S_{2}=\) Sodium Nitrate and \(S_{3}=A / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

Super applied at the time of green manuring of oats.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{5}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable canc and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. 'RESULTS:
(i) 19.37 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.566 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of N and dummy treatments os others are highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{F} \times \mathrm{N}\) is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Dummy treatment of \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{S}\) combinations:
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{6}\) & \(=11.34\) ton/ac. \\
2. \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}\) & & \(=11.69\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}\) & & \(=12.01\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mead & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\boldsymbol{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 22.10 & 2676 & 24.43 & 22.82 & 25.78 & 24.69 \\
\hline \(S_{3}\) & 22.14 & 22.71 & 22.42 & 20.52 & 23.54 & 23.20 \\
\hline S3 & 22.22 & 23.35 & 22.78 & 24.56 & 22.50 & 21.29 \\
\hline Mean & 22.15 & 24.27 & 23.21 & 22.63 & 23.94 & 23.06 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 21.20 & 24.07 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 22.36 & 25.52 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 22.90 & 23.22 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1. S.E of \(S\) or \(P\) marginal means
2. S.E. of N marginal means
3. S.E. of body of \(S \times N\) or \(P \times N_{\text {- table }}\)
4. S.E of body of PXS table
\(=0.605\) ton/ac.
\(=0.494\) ton/ac.
\(=0.856\) ton/ac.
\(=1.045\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Site :-Sugarcane. Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 51(188).
Type :-'M'.

Object :--To investigate the effect of \(A / S, A / N\) and \(C / N\) and mineral Super on the growth, yield and juice quality of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Oats. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 7.3.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughings. on 5-3-1951. (b) N.A. (c) 55 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (c) -- (v) G.M. with oats on 10.21951. (vi) CO 421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings with akola and desi plough on 22.3.1951 and 4, 5.4.1951. Hoeing on 13.4.1951, 5, 6, 7.5.1951 and 27.5.1951. (ix) 28.68". (x) 22.12.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S, S_{2}=C / N\) and \(S_{3}=A / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=200 \mathrm{Jb}\)./ac. of N .
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\).

Super application in the field on 9.2.1951 at the time of turning in of oats. Manuring on 22.5.1951. (top dressed). Application of \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) on 25.7.1951 as top dressing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952 . (b) and (c) N.A.
(v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 13.56 tod/ac.
(ii) 4.259 ton/ac.
(iii) Dummy treatments vs others are highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Dummy treatments of NS combination :
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(=8.90\) ton/ac. \\
2. & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(=9.00\) ton/ac. \\
3. & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}\) & \(=8.51\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{5}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \({ }^{\prime} \mathbf{P r}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 13.80 & 18.44 & 16.12 & 16.54 & 15.35 & 16.48 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 15.03 & 15.55 & 15.31 & 12.90 & 16.15 & 16.89 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{3}\) & 15.59 & 17.21 & 16.40 & 20.09 & 13.66 & 15.45 \\
\hline Meani & 14.81 & 17.08 & 15.94 & 16.51 & 15.05 & 16.27 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 14.02 & 19.00 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 14.48 & 15.62 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 15.93 & 16.62 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1. S.E. of marginal means of \(S\) or \(P=\quad=1.003\) ton/ac.
2. S.E. of marginal means of \(N \quad=0.809\) ton/oc.
3. S.E. of body of \(S \times N\) or \(P \times N\) table \(\quad=1.421\) ton/ac.
4. S.E. of body of \(P \times S\) table \(=1.739\) ton/ac.

Ctop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 52(240).
Type :- ' M '.

Object:-To investigate the effect of \(A / S, C / N\) and \(A / N\) and mineral Super on the growth, yield and juice quality of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Oats (ploughed in). (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahánpur. (iii) 18.3.1952. (iv) (a) Application of pata on 13.1.1952. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) G.M. with oats on 11.1.1952 (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with cultivator, hoeing and weeding. (ix) 32.63*. (x) 10.12 .1952

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S, S_{2}=C / N\) and \(S_{3}=A / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, \quad N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \quad \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=75\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}\)

Application of Super on 11.21952 at the time of green manuring with oats. Manuring of N doses 0 on 28.5.1952 (method N.A.),
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3^{2}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 27. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tiller, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Missing values estimated for treatments \(S_{\mathbf{1}} N_{\mathbf{2}} P_{1}, S_{\mathbf{2}} \quad N_{1} P_{\mathbf{2}}\) and \(S_{\mathbf{2}} N_{\mathbf{2}} P_{\mathbf{2}}\) in replication I, \(S_{1} N_{1} P_{\sigma}, S_{3} N_{1} P_{0}\) in replication II and \(S_{1} N_{0} P_{0}\) in replication I. These plots were severely damaged by rats. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 16.00 ton/ac.
(ii) 203 ton/ac.
(iii) Effect of P is significant. Effect of N is highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Dummy treatments of NS combinations:
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { 1. } & \mathbf{N}_{0} \mathbf{P}_{0} & =14.86 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { 2. } & \mathbf{N}_{0} \mathbf{P}_{1} & =11.59 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { 3. } & \mathbf{N}_{0} \mathbf{P}_{2} & =14.76 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{Pa}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 18.10 & 17.54 & 17.82 & 18.15 & 17.22 & 18.09 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 15.90 & 14.95 & 15.42 & 15.01 & 14.03 & 17.23 \\
\hline S & 17.45 & 18.88 & 18.16 & 18.20 & 17.58 & 18.71 \\
\hline Mean & 17.15 & 17.12 & 17.13 & 17.12 & 16.28 & 18.01 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\) & 16.74 & 17.50 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 16.94 & 15.62 & & & & \\
\hline Ps & 17.77 & 18.24 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
1. S.E. of \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) marginal mean
2. S.E. of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) marginal mean
3. S.E. of \(P_{0}\) marginal mean
4. S.E. of \(P_{1}\) marginal mean
5. S.E. of \(P_{2}\) marginal mean
6. S.E. of \(S_{1}\) marginal mean
7. S.E. of \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) marginal mean
8. \(S . E\) of \(\mathrm{S}_{3}\) marginal mean
\(=0.59\) ton/ac. \(=0.60\) ton/ac. \(=0.76\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). \(=0.74\) ton/ac. \(=0.72 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \(=0.76\) ton/ac. \(=0.74\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). \(=0.72\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 52(193).
Type :- \(\mathbf{C M}^{\mathbf{M}}\).

Object :-To study the effect of adding a mixture of Ferrous Sulphate and lime to Castor cake, G.N.C. Mohwa cake and F.Y.M and then applying to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 22.3.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings and earthing. (ix) \(32.63^{\circ}\). (x) NA.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) +2 selective treatments.
(1) 4 sources of \(N: S_{1}=\) Castor cake at \(100 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N, S_{2}=G . N . C\). at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}_{\text {, }}\)
\[
S_{3}=\text { Mohwa cake at } 100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} \text {. of } \mathrm{N} \text { and } \mathrm{S}_{4}=\text { F.Y.M. at } 100 \mathrm{lb} \text {./ac. of } \mathrm{N} .
\]
(2) 2 levels of chemical mixture : \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) control (no chemical) and \(\mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) at \(26.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac} .+\) lime at \(13.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Selective treatments :
\(T_{1}=\) control (no manure) and \(T_{2}=A / S\) at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(37^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yob.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tiller, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(33.22 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 2.332 ton/ac.
(iii) Only effect of selective treatments is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Selective treatments :
\(\mathbf{T}_{1}=29.80 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(\mathrm{T}_{2}=35.82 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{c|cccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\begin{tabular}{c} 
\\
\(\mathrm{C}_{6}\)
\end{tabular} & 33.96 & 35.36 & 29.77 & 30.60 & 32.42 \\
\(\mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 34.13 & 34.09 & 33.93 & 34.72 & 34.22 \\
\hline Mean & 34.04 & 34.72 & 31.85 & 32.66 & 33.22
\end{tabular}
1. S.E. of marginal means of \(\mathbf{S}=0.952\) ton/ac.
2. S.E. of marginal means of \(\mathbf{C}=0.673\) ton/ac.
3. S.E. of body of table \(\quad=1.343\) ton/ac.
4. S.E. of selective treatments \(=1.343\) ton \(/ a c\).

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(220).
Type: ' \({ }^{\prime}\) M'

Object :-To study the effect of adding a mixture of Ferrous Sulphate and lime to Castor cake, G.N.C. Mohwa cake and F.Y.M. and then applying to Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 7.3.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings with kassl. (ix) 43.43". (x) 18.1.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) +2 selective treatments
'(1) 4 sources of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=\) Castor cake at 100 lb /ac. of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{S}_{2}=\mathbf{G} . \mathrm{N} . \mathrm{C}\). at 100 lb /ac. of \(\mathrm{N}_{1}-\mathrm{S}_{3}=\) Mohwa cako at \(\mathrm{ICO} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{4}}=\) F.Y.M. at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\). of N .
(2). 2 levels of chemical mixture : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=\) No chemical and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) at \(26.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .+\) lime at \(13.3 \mathrm{lb} \sqrt{\mathrm{ac}}\).

Selective treatment 3 :
\(T_{1}=\) control ( no manure) and \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N .
3. DBSIGN:
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 10 (b) N.A. (iii) 3.
(iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(40^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\).
(v) N.A. (vi) Yes. \(\cdot\)
4. GENERAL:
(i) Rats were active during the growth seasons and they were responsiblo for high mortality of tillers. Rate were responsible for erratic sugarcane yield figures. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955. (b) and (c) No._(v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{3. RESULTS :}
(i) 33.50 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.591 ton/ac.
(iii) Effect of \(\mathbf{S}\) is highly significant, effect of selective treatments is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Selective treatments :

Crop :- Sugarcane, \(\quad\) Ref:- U.P. 49(115).
Site:- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Type :- 'M'.

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Type :e 'M'.
Object :-To study the catalysing effect of pottassium permanganate, ferrous sulphate and lime upon cartor cake in improving growth and sugar content of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Berseem. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 20.3 .1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 40, three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) Castor cake at \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{sc}\). of N. (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 48.54. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}\) at 28 lb ./ac.
3. \(\mathrm{Fe} \mathrm{SO}{ }_{4}\) at \(26.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Lime at \(13.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. \((3)+(4)\).
6. (2) \(+(3)\).
7. \((2)+(3)+(4)\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (v).N.A. (vi) Yea
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii), N.A. (iii) Sugarçane yield. (iy) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) NI. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.46 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.93 too/ac.
(iii) The treatments do nol differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1. & 19.61 \\
2. & 19.30 \\
3. & 21.80 \\
4. & 20.89 \\
5. & 22.95 \\
6. & 23.13 \\
7. & 22.55 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.26\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(153).
Type :- \({ }^{-} \mathbf{M}^{\text {P }}\).
Object :-To study the catalysing effect of potassium permanganate, ferrous sulphate and lime upon castor cake in improving growth and sugar centent of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. ' (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanjpur. (iii) 30.4.1950.
(iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) \(40-3\) budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (c) -. (v) Castor cake at \(100 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) CO-421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 35.89'. (x) 5.1.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) at 26.6 lb ./ac.
4. Lime at \(13.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. \((3)+(4)\).
6. \((2)+(3)\).
7. \((2)+(3)+(4)\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 21^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL;
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield., (iv) (a) \(1949-1950\) (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 10.87 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.035 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/àc.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 12.90 \\
2. & 11.79 \\
3. & 10.92 \\
4. & 9.87 \\
5. & 7.98 \\
6. & 10.14 \\
7. & 12.52 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.17\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:-Sugarcane. \\ Sité :- Sugarcané Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
}

Ref :-U:P. 51(144).
. . . .
Type- M'.
Object :-To study the effect of manuring Sugarcane with Castor cake to which a catalyser hàs been ádded.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 21.2.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 27.1.1951. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Manuring on 25.1.1951. (vi) \(\mathrm{CO}-453\) (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings and earthing. (ix) 31.66". (x) 20.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
5. Castor cake+lime at \(13.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Castor cake.
3. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) at \(26.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Castor cake at 100 lb ./ac. of N .
6. Castor cake+ \(\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) and lime at \(13.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
7. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) and \(\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}\). at \(13.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{acc}_{2}\)
8. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}, \mathrm{KMnO}_{4}\) and lime at 13.3 lb ./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAI :}
(i) NA. (ii) N.A. (iii) Millable canes, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 22.82 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.85 ton/ac.
(iii) The treatments differ significantly.
(iv) Avi yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Trea!ment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 17.82 & S. & 26.77 \\
2. & 25.54 & 6. & 22.08 \\
3. & 23.58 & 7. & 22.57 \\
4. & 20.58 & 8. & 23.62 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=1.64\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
() Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 53(227).
Type:-‘M'.

Object:-To study the effect of methods of application of different \(N\) manures on Sugarcane

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sugarcane-Fallow-Wheat-Sanai. (b) Sanal. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 9,10 and 11.3.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 80 three budded setts/line. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) Green manuring with Sanal at 60 lb ./ac. of N. (vi) CO 453, (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 45.79". (x) 15.1.1954 (Rep. II) to 9-13.3.1954 (Rep 1, III and IV).

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) and one control (no manure)
(1) 3 sources of 60 lb /ac. of \(\mathrm{N}: S_{1}=A / S, S_{2}=G . N . C\). and \(S_{3}=A / S+G . N . C\). in \(1: 1\) ratio.
(2) 4 methods of application of \(N: M_{1}=\) By broadcast before planting, \(\mathbf{M}_{2}=\) As surface band in May
\[
\mathbf{M}_{3}=\text { As pellets in May and } \mathbf{M}_{4}=\text { As pellets at planting. }
\]

Method of preparation of pellets: For pallets of \(A / S\). The calculated quantity of \(A / S\) required for the size of the test was disolved in as little water as possible, and the soil was thoroughly mixed with representative soil sample and kneaded thoroughly. For the mixture, pellets of one inch diameter were made and applied to the plots in rows along with the setts at planting time, and near the root of cane in May. For pellets of Groundnot cake: The required quantity of the cake was finally powdered and thoroughly mixed with the representative sample of the soil of the field and then mixture was kneaded with water and pellets of one inch diameter were prepared and applied to the field as in the case of A/S pellets.
3. DESJGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 13. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) Barha \(=3^{\circ}\), Mend \(=2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, juice quality and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-195s. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 31.42 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.225 ton/ac.
(iii) Control vs treated effects alone is highly signiffcant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{Control \(=27.84\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & M \({ }_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{3}\) & M4 & Mean \({ }^{\text {' }}\) \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 31.31 & 31.56 & 31.59 & 31.13 & 31.40 \\
\hline \(S_{3}\) & 33.91 & 30.48 & 30.53 & 32.14 & 31.76 \\
\hline S3 & 34.60 & 31.58 & 31.05 & 30.80 & 32.01 \\
\hline Mean & 33.27 & 31.21 & 31.06 & 31.36 & 31.72 \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{1. S.E. of M marginal means . . \(\quad \mathbf{0 . 6 4 0}\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{2. S.E. of \(S\) marginal means \(\cdots=0.560\)} \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{3. S.E. of control or mean in body of table \(\quad=1.112\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Ref :- U.P. 49(164). \\ Site :- Sugarcane. Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. . Type : "M'.}

Object :-To asses the relative efficiency of A/S and A/N, C/N and F.Y.M. with regard to the yield and juice quailty of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 5.3.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 45 three budded setts/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO \(42 I\) (medium). ' (vii) Irrigated. (viil) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. A/S at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. \(\mathbf{A} / \mathrm{N}\) at 100 lb ./ac. of N .
4. F.Y.M. at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N.
5. \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) at 100 lb ./ac. of N .
(As C/N was not available, the treatment was not applied and so treatment 5 is also control).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(43^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (i) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 16.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.185 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant. Treatment vs control effect is not significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Treatment & Av. yield & \\
\(1+5\). & 17.94 & \\
2. & 17.14 & \\
3. & 14.83 & \\
4. & 16.90 & \\
S.E.'mean & \(=1.092\) ton/ac. & (for 2,3 and 4\()\) \\
S.E.jmean & & \(=0.712\) ton/ac. \\
& & (for 1 and 5)
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

```

Ref :-U.P. 48(48).
object :-To study the catalysing effect of manganese, Sulphate, Ferrows sulphate singly and in combination with Copper sulphate, upon Castor cale in relation to growth and sugar quality of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize for fodder. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 5.2.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 51 , three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO-421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viiii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

2 TREATMENTS:
1. Control (unmanured).

2 Castor cake alone at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. Castor cake at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{FeSO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) at 1.4 lb ./ac.
5. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. Castor cake \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4}\) at \(28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .+\mathrm{CuSO}_{4}\) at \(1.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Treatments were top dressed at sowing time.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) Yes, but details are not available. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillering, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1948. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.60 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.576 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significans.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment ' Av. yield
1. 26.60
2.24 .78
3. 25.41
\(4 . \quad 24.18\)
5. 28.19
\(6 . \quad 24.41\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=2.065\) ton/ac.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :-U.P.49(113). } \\
\text { Site :- Sưgarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. } & \text { Type :-‘'M’. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of application of Super on the juice quality and yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Berseem-Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 4.3.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 45 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Sanai as G.M. at 50 lb ./ac. of N , Top dressing of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 100 lb ./ac. of N . (vi). \(\mathrm{CO}-421\) (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(48.59^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
\(\mathrm{M}_{0}=\) Control-No Super.
\(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) placed one foot deep.
\(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) placed four inches deep with setts.
\(\mathrm{M}_{3}=\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) placed`dibbling \(7^{7}\) deep.
Super at 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(18^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yos,
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (il) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. ,(c) No. (v) (a) and
(b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.05 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.86 to /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cr} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(M_{0}\) & 21.60 \\
\(M_{1}\) & 20.12 \\
\(M_{2}\) & 19.56 \\
\(M_{3}\) & 22.93 \\
\(\ldots\) & S.E./mean \\
& \(=0.93\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 48(51). } \\
\text { Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. } & \text { Type :- ‘M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To stndy the effect of application of Potash on the yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 21.3.1948. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings and 4 pata. (b) N.A. (c) 45, three budded settis/row. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) Top dressing of \(A / S\) at 200 lb ./ac. of N on 12.4.1948. (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated.- (viii) 3 hoeings, weeding and earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.1.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No potash.
2. 75 lb ./ac. of potash in July.
3. 75 lb ./ac. of potash in May.
4. \(75 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of potash in September.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(3 Y^{-6} \times 24^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (yi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.81 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.503 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield cf sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 25.86 \\
2. & 25.66 \\
3. & 25.89 \\
4. & 21.84 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.868\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahan pur.

Ref: :- U.P. 53(219)
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of applying nitrogen fertilizers partly to soil and partly as a spray on the leaycs as weak solution on the growth, juice quality and yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 29.1.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Sanad at \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of N. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viij) 2 hoeings with cultivator, 2 hocings with kossi, 1 hoeing and earthing. (ix) 43.13*. (x) 23.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. No additional \(\mathbf{N}\) (water spray).
2. No additional \(N(A / S\) spray).
3. \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N at sowing time +10 lb ./ac. of N as top dressing at tillering time (with water spray).
4. 50 lb Jac of N at sowing time +8 lb ./ac. of N at tillering time \(+2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as spray.
5. \(100 \mathrm{lo} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N at sowing time \(+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as top dressing at tillering (water spray).
6. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N at sowing time +8 lb ./ac. of N at tillering time \(+2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as spray.

The sprayings were repeated till 2 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) had been applied. Sprayings done on leaves with a spreader. \(0.2 \%\) soil of A/S (on salt basis) was sprayed in each spray.
A/S applied on 7.4 .53 and 8.6.53 while sprayed on 11.5.53, 11.6.53, 21.7 .53 and 19.8.53
3. DESIGN: .
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RSEULTS :}
(i) 30.07 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.903 tonjac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 28.06 \\
2. & 27.94 \\
3. & 31.54 \\
4. & 29.32 \\
5. & 32.05 \\
6. & 31.49 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.099\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Ref : U. U.P. 53(262).
Type :- ' \(\mathbf{M}\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of ap?lying phosphate fertilizer partly to the soil and partly as spray over the leaves, on the growth, juice quality and yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Sharjahanpur. (iii) 29.1.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Sanai at \(65 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{az}\). of N and top dressing by \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 60 lb ./ac. of N on 7.4.1953. (vi C0.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoen3 with cultivator on 25.2.1953, 18.3.1953, hoeing with kassf on 16, 30.4.1953, 18.5.1953 and earthing on 16.8.1953. (ix) 42.46'. (x) 24.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No addilional \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) (water spray).
2. No additional \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\left(\mathrm{KH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}\right.\) spray).
3. 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at tillering time + water spray.
4. \(71 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at tille ing time +2 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as spray.
5. 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at tillering time + water spray.
6. 148 lb /ac of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at tillering time \(+2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as spray.

Spraying on 19.5.1953, 13.6.1953, 22.7.1953 and 25.8.1953. Solution of Potassium dihydrophosphate was applied on leaves till a total of \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{as}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) had been applied \(0.20 \%\) sol. of \(\mathrm{KH}_{2} \mathrm{PO} \mathrm{O}_{4}\) (on salt basis) was applied in each spraying, water used per spray \(=15\) litres. Super applied on 9.5.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N. \(\therefore\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield, (iv) (a) 1953 to 1955 . (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
3. RESULTS :
(i) 29.84 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.781 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significank
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\(1 . \quad 28.42\)
2. 28.63
3. 29.62
4. 30.59
5. . 31.49
\(6 . \quad 30.29\)
S.E./mean except treatment No. \(2=1.028\) ton/ac.
S.E. of difference of the treatment No. (2) with any other treatment mean \(=1.660\) ton/ac.

Note: Yield of treatment No. (2) in replication \(I\) was missing and has teen estimated for analysis and summary of result.
Crop: :- Sugarcane. \(\quad\) Ref:- U.P. 48(52).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. \(\quad\) Type :- 'M'. .

Object :-To study the best time and method of application of A/S to Sugarcane for better yield and quality.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Leam. (b) Refer scil arpalysis, Shahje haopur. (iii) 22.3.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) \(40,3^{\prime}\) budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (c) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 527 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing on 19.4.1948, 25.5.1948, 24.6.1948 and carthing on 11.8.1948. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.12.1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No nitrogen (control).
2. \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at sowing time.
3. 100 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at tillering time.
4. 50 lb ./ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S\) at the sowing time \(+50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at tillering time.
5. 50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at sowing +50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) in July.
6. \(50 \mathrm{lo} . \mathrm{jac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at tillering time +50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) in July.

A/S top dressed on 12.4.1948, 18.5.1948 and 13.7.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\circ} \times 37.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yea
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sogarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1946 to 1948. (b) and (c) Nu. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
3. RESULTS :
(i) 27.81 tod/ac.
(ii) 2.502 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 24.94 \\
2. & 27.76 \\
3. & 27.79 \\
4. & 30.69 \\
3. & 27.91 \\
6. & 27.74 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.445\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn. Shahjahan pur.
Ref :-U.P. 48(74).
Type:- \(\boldsymbol{-}^{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{M}^{\text {. }}\)

Object :-To study the effect of insorporation of cane trash airectly into the soil.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjaharpur. (iii) 24.1.1948. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings by soil turning plough, 8 desi ploughs and 7 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 90 3-budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) \(\rightarrow\) (v) Nil. (vi) CO 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Plankings on 25.1.1948, hoeing with kassi on 29, 32.1.1948, 13 ani 15.2.1948., 2, 3, 21 and 22.3.1948., hoeing with cultivator on \(29,30.4 .1948\)., 18, 19, 31.5.1948 to 1.6.1948., hosing with kassl again on 4 to 5.6.1948., 26.6.1948., and earthing on 27.8.1948. (ix) \(40.81^{\circ}\). (x) 12.1.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (unmanured).
2. Cane trash at \(75 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). ploughed in directly into the soil with \(\mathbf{2 0} \mathrm{md}\). of cowdung +80 md ./ac of sulphita. tion press mud and \(1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\)
3. Same as in treatment 2 but without cane trash.
4. Compost made out of 75 md . cane trash.

Manuring of compost in treatment 4 on 10.12.1947. Manuring of cowdung, A/S+Press mud on 29.6.1947. Ploughing in of trash on 29.6.1947. after spreading of trash by victory plough.
Cane trash contains : \% orgamic carbon \(=53.95, \% \mathrm{~N}=0.63\) and \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}=94.1\).
F.Y.M. (cöw dung) con'ains : organic \(25.20 \%, \% \mathrm{~N}=0.816\) and \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}=39.1\).

Compost made out of trash contains : \(\%\) organic \(=5.645, \% \mathrm{~N}=0.4516\) and \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}=12.5\)
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 ' \(^{\prime}\) (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) \({ }^{\text {(a) }} 89^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(83^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) on all sides of the gross plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fair. (ii) Attack of top borer in May, increasing in June and ending by Ju'y. Attack of yellowing disease in August only. (iii) Germination counting, tillers, millijla cı2: and sugarcane yield: (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expariment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.83 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.60 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 21.26 \\
2. & 25.39 \\
3. & 22.94 \\
4. & 25.74 \\
S.E./mean & 0.530 ton/a \(=\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn. Shahjahanpur.

> Ref =U.P. \(49(59)\) Type : ' 'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of incorporation of cane trash directly into the soì.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Cane-Wheat. (b) Wheat during 1947-48. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam , (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 6, 7.3.1949. (iv) (a) Ploughings by victory plough on 27, 28 11.194 .., 23 1.1949., 1, 2.3 1949, by desi plough on 5.3.1949, harrow on 13.7.1948., pata on 2).11.1748., 25.1 1949., 3, 4.1.1949., 5.3 1949. and 8.3 1949. (b) N.A. (c) 71, 3-budded setts/row. (d) N A. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) Co 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with cultivator on 22.4.1949., 13. 14.5.1943., 2J, 21.6.1949., harrow on 13.7.1949 and earthing up on 31.8.1949. (ix) 48.59'. (x) 27.12.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. Trash at \(150 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). +cowdung at \(20 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). +press mud at \(8 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac} .+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(1 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. Press mud at \(8 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). + cowdung at \(20 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac} .+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(1 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Compost made out of \(150 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). of trash.

Trash, Press mud, F.Y.M. and A/S applied on 17, 18.8.1948. Trash as compost applied on 1.3.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 4.
(b) N.A. (iii) 4.
(iv) (a) \(71.5^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\).
(b) \(65.5^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair, having thin canes, stunted growth. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tillers per plot, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.52 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.081 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 13.67 \\
2. & 17.43 \\
3. & 18.44 \\
4. & 16.55 \\
S.E fmean & \(=0.54\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sṭn., Shahjahanpur.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref:- U.P. 50(98) } \\
& \text { Type :- 'M' }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of incorporation of cane trash directly into the soil.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Berseem. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 10.2.1950. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings by victory plough, 5 by desi plough and 4 para. (b) N.A. (c) 50,3 budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (c) -. (v) Nil. (vi) Co-453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kass' on 24.3.1950, 18.5.1950 (on 3 plots) 31.5.1950, 1.6.1950 and hoeing with cultivator on 22.4.1950. (ix) 36.37". (x) 25.12.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of trash incorporated into soil distinctly.
2. \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of trash \(+1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(A / S\).
3. \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of trash \(+1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{MgSO}_{4}\).
4. Compost made out of \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of trash.

Fertilizers were dropped on 16 and 17.7.1950. Compost applied on 14.1.1950 and \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{g}}\) applied as Superphosphate.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(48^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(42^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination count, tilkers, millable canes and sugarcane yield/plot. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 2240 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.314 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not aignificant.
(iv) Av. yie!d of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.80 \\
2. & 21.95 \\
3. & 21.78 \\
4. & 23.06 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.658\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. . Type:- "M'.

```

Object : -To study the effect of incorporation of cane trash directly into soit.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Gram (1949-1950). (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 11.2.1951. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by victory plough, 2 by desi plough and 3 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 70,3 budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO-453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings with cultivator, 1 with kassi and 2 earthiogs. (ix) \(29.30^{\circ}\). (x) 15.12.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of trash incorporated into soil distinctly.
2. \(75 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\) of trash \(+1 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of trash \(+1 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac} \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of Magnesium sulphate.
4. Compost made out of \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of trash.
5. Control (no trash).

Manuring on 15.7.1950 of inorganic manures Addition of inorganic manure for the 2 nd time on 16.7.1950 there was heavy down pour and all the manure was washed away. Spreading of trash compost on 9.1.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(18^{\prime} \times 68^{\prime}\). (b) \(12^{\prime} \times 62^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was confucted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 15.01 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.675 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatrient effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yie'd of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 14.69 \\
2. & 16.84 \\
3. & 18.00 \\
4. & 12.72 \\
5. & 13.12 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.847\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 50(157).
Site:-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Type:-‘M'.
Object:-To study the response of sugarcane to phosphatic manures with and without F.Y.M. applied as two depths.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sugarcane \(=\) Fallow-Wheat = Sanal. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 11 and 13 3.1950. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 40,3 budded setts/line. (d) N.A. (c) (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 to 5 hoeings with kassi, 2 with cultivator and 1 earthing up. (ix) \(38.72^{\prime \prime}\). ( \(x\) ) 23, 24 and 26.2.1951 and 1.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a selective treatment
(1) 2 levels of F.Y.M.: \(F_{0}=0, F_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N.
(2) \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super or Bonemeal : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=\) Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{\circ}\) depth, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(6^{\prime \prime}\) depth. \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=\) Bonemeal at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{\circ}\) depth and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=\) Bonemeal at 150 \(1 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(6^{\prime \prime}\) depth.
Selective treatment \(T=\) Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) equivalent to N content of Bonemeal applied at \(3^{\prime \prime}\) depth.
Manures applied in furrows at the time of planting ( \(3^{\circ}\) by country plough and \(6^{\prime \prime}\) by victory plough).
3. DESIGN
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 11 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(36^{\circ} \times 28^{\circ}\). (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 32^{\circ}\). (v) Main Basha: \(3^{\circ}\), Bahra : \(2^{\circ}\), Border: \(\mathbf{2 l}^{\prime \prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Germination \%, tillers, yield data and juice analysis. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.72 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.053 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects and interaction is sigoificant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{T=26.41 ton/ac.} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Mean} \\
\hline & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{0}\) & 23.01 & 19.88 & 23.91 & 22.30 & 23.35 & 22.49 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{1}\) & 24.85 & 25.10 & 24.44 & 24.02 & 23.70 & 24.42 \\
\hline Mean & 23.93 & 22.49 & 24.18 & 23.16 & 23.52 & 23.46 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E of F marginal means } & =0.906 \text { ton } \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E of P marginal means } & =1.433 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =2.026 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane.}

Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn, Shahjahanpur.

\section*{Ref: \({ }^{-1 U . P .51(147) .}\)}

Type : \({ }^{〔}\) M’.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to phosphatic manures with and without F.Y.M. applied at two depths.

\section*{- 1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sugarcane-Fallow-Wheat-Sanai. (b) Sanal. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam: (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 24 and 25.2.1951. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 39,3 budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Basal dressing and green manuring has been done in the field and as per treatments. (vi) CO. 453 (Jate). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A.; (ix) \(31.66^{\circ}\) (x) Rep. II and IV on 20 to 27.2.1952 and Rep. I and III on 25 to 27.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2) +2 selective treatments
(1) 2 levels of F.Y.M. : \(\mathrm{F}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~F}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
(2) \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super or Bonemeal : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=\) Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{\circ}\) depth, \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(6^{\circ}\) depth, \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=\) Bonemeal at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{\prime \prime}\) depth and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=\) Bonemeal at 150 Ib ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(6^{\circ}\) depth.
Selective treatments are: \(T_{1}=\) Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) equivalent to N centent of Bonemeal at \(3^{\circ}\) depth and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) equivalent to N content of Bonemeal at \(6^{\circ}\) depth.
Nianures applied at the time of planting at the bottom of furrows ( \(3^{\circ}\) by country plough and \(6^{\circ}\) by victory slougb.)
3. DESION:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(39^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) (v) Border \(=2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The weather conditions bsing generally infavourable throughout the season Plants in the experimental plots did not make satisfactory growth. (ii) No. (iii) Juice analysis, germination \%, no. of tillers and cane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. ivii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 14.61 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.024 ton/ac.
(iii) Selective vs others component of treatments is highly signiaicant. Main effects of \(P\) and \(P\) and their interaction are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& T_{2}=16.79 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& T_{2}=17.76 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(F_{0}\) & 14.38 & 12.62 & 13.07 & 13.57 & 16.28 & 13.98 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{F}_{1}\) & 13.93 & 12.39 & 14.71 & 15.76 & 14.08 & 14.17 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{4}{*}{Mern} & 14.16 & 12.50 & 13.89 & '14.66 & 15.18 & 14.08 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of \(\mathbf{F}\) marginal mean \\
S.E. of \(P\) marginal means
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\(=0.453\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline & & & & \(=0.71\) & on/ac. & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\(=1.012\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 52(241).
Type:- 'M'.

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Phosphate manures with and without F.Y.M. applied at two depths.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sugarcane-Fallow-Wheat-Sanai-Cane. (b) Sanal. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis. Shahjahanpur. (iii) 27, 29.3.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 48,3 budded setts/line. - (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Green manuring by Sanal." (vi) CO-453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A.' (ix) \(33.30^{\circ}\) (from March 52 to January 53). (x) 8.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of ( 1 ) and ( 2 ) +2 selective treatments.
(1) 2 levels of F.Y.M. : \(F_{0}=0\) and \(P_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2). \(\mathbf{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super or Bonemeal : \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=\mathbf{0}_{3}, \mathrm{P}_{1}=\) Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{\prime \prime}\) depth, \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(6^{\circ}\) depth; \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{g}}=\) Bonemeal at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{\circ}\) depth and \(\mathrm{P}_{4}=\) Bonemeal at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(6^{\circ}\) depth.
The selective treatments are : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{1}}+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) equivalent to N content of Bonemeal at \(3^{\circ}\) depth, and \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) equivalent to N content of Bonemeal at \(6^{\circ}\) depih.
Manures applied at the time of planting at the bottom of furrows ( \(3^{\circ}\) by country plough and \(6^{\circ}\) by delta plough).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 (replication I and II rejected due to poor germination). (iv) (a) \(48^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(42^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Main irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\), Border \(=2^{\prime}\) and \(3^{\prime}\) on all the sides of the gross plot left as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination poor and not uniform. The germination in replication I and II was very poor and hence tho yields of these two replications have not been taken into consideration. (ii) Damage by termites to the setts. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The experimental plot was situated in the sandy area and great damage was done to the setts by termites and rats. Even tho germination in the Replication III and IV., which have been taken into consideration, was not uniform and consequently the data are not strictly comparable. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 15.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.695 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{F}\) is highly significant, main effect of \(\mathbf{P}\) and interaction of \(\mathbf{F} \times \mathbf{P}\) are aot significant. Selective treatments and selective vs. others are not significant.
(iv) Avs yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\[
\mathrm{T}_{1}=15.25 \text { ton/ac. }
\]
\[
\mathrm{T}_{2}=19.71 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac}
\]
\begin{tabular}{l|ccccc} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{4}}\), \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 11.60 & 14.03 & 10.69 & 8.68 & 17.36 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 13.70 & 22.51 & 20.52 & 19.15 & 17.62 \\
\hline Mean & 12.65 & 18.27 & 15.60 & 13.92 & 17.49 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of \(P\) marginal mean & \(=0.852\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of \(P\) marginal mean & \(=1.347\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.905\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Crop :- Sugarcane. & & Ref :-U.P. 48(79). \\
\hline Zone :- Barhni (Basti). & & Type : \(\sim^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of application of different levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (c) N.A. (ii) Clayey soil. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-453 (improved). (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) 7 rows in each plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 7.2.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A.' (x) 10, 12.2.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combination of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac., \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0 ., \mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} ., \mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Manures applied on 6 to 8.2.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(1) to (ii) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. with 7 replications (one replication rejected as yield in some plots was too low in comparison with others). (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 40\) of an acre. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) \(1948-1949\). (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The plot with treatment \(N_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}\) was treated missing. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S). Experiment on culuvators' Geld.

\section*{-5. RESULTS:}
(i) 16.49 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.668 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of Sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(P_{\mathbf{6}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 15.28 & 13.54 & 18.38 & 15.73 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 16.63 & 13.47 & 17.69 & 15.73 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 17.43 & 20.63 & 15.95 & 18.00 \\
\hline Mean & 16.45 & 15.88 & 17.14 & 16.49
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean \(\left(\mathrm{N}_{1}\right.\) or \(\left.\mathrm{N}_{8}\right)\) & \(=1.100\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of marginal mean \(\left(\mathrm{N}_{0}\right)\) & \(=1.148\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of marginal mean \(\left(\mathrm{P}_{0}\right.\) or \(\left.\mathrm{P}_{1}\right)\) & \(=1.100\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of marginal mean \(\left(\mathrm{P}_{2}\right)\) & \(=1.148\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of any mean (except \(\left.\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}\right)\) in the body of table & \(=1.906\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of treatment mean \(\left(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}\right)\) & \(=2.109\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Barhni (Basti).
Ref : - U.P. 49(169).
bject:-To study the effect of application of different levels of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Clayey soil. (iii) F.Y.M., according to local practice. (iv) CO 453 (improved). (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) 7 trenches at \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A.J (vi) \(13,14.2 .1948\). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14, 16.1.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S\) : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 Jevels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Manures applied in two doses-one at the time of planting and the other at the time of earthing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. ( 6 replications). (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(51^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. , (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 28.78 ton/ac.
(ii) 6.689 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcanc in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mcan \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 25.56 & 28.90 & 25.30 & 26.59 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 28.50 & 28.22 & 30.69 & 29.14 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 30.81 & 29.46 & 31.55 & 30.61 \\
\hline Mean & 28.29 & 28.86 & 29.18 & 28.78 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of any mean in the body of table
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.577 \text { ton/ac } \\
& =2.731 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Walterganj (Basti).

Ref :U.P. 49(170).
Type s- M'.

Object:-To study the effect of application of different levels of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Type D-Surface soil is fairly rich in coarse sand fraction and is at times extremely coarse. (iii) F.Y.M. according to local practice. (iv) CO. 453 (improved) (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) 8 rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. No other information is available. (e) N.A. (vi) 23,24 and 25.3.1948. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Manures applied in two doses-one at the time of sowing and the other at the time of earthing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in. R.B.D. (4 replications) (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(60^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\) ' (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield.. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S). on cultivators' field.
5. RESŨLTS:
(i) 33.67 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.568 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) and their interactions are all highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P l}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N g}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 26.91 & 31.02 & 35.14 & 31.02 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 32.95 & 32.14 & 33.50 & 32.86 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 31.57 & 36.21 & 43.65 & 37.14 \\
\hline Mean & 30.48 & 33.12 & 37.43 & 33.67 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of any marginal means \\
S.E. of any mean in the body of table
\end{tabular}}} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.767 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.284 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref :- 49 (171).
Zone :- Khalilabad (Basti).
Type:- ' \({ }^{\prime}\) '.
Object :- To study the effect of application of different levels of \(N\) and \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{g}}\) to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Peas. (c) N.A. (ii) Surface of soil from loam to claycy. (iii) F.Y.M. applied according to local practice. (iv) CO. 453 (improved). (v) (a) Slight earthing done in July. (b) and (c)• N.A. (d) 6 trenches 6 rows of sugarcane setts in each plot at \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (c) - . (vi) 26 and 27.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7,9.1.1950
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as A/S: \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\mathbf{0}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Manures put in two doses one at the time of sowing and the other at the time of earthing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. ia R.B.D. (4 replications). (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(60.5^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yjeld. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S). on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 35.24 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.720 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of N is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{a}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 31.60 & 31.24 & 32.23 & 31.69 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 34.70 & 40.90 & 35.02 & 36.87 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 35.18 & 36.67 & 39.62 & 37.16 \\
Mean & 33.83 & 36.27 & 35.62 & 35.24 \\
& & & \\
\begin{tabular}{l} 
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of any mean in body of table:
\end{tabular} & \(=0.759\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone : Barhni (Basti).

Ref:- U.P. 49(135).
Type:- 'M'.

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Domat, (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) CO. 453 mid-late (Improved). (iv) (a) 2 hoeings after planting. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 4.3.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(20^{\circ}\). (x) 20.1.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
\(P_{0}=\) Control.
\(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\), broadcast before planting.
\(?_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
- (i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivatars' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 31.74 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.200 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 29.89 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 31.43 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 33.89 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.123\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Barhni (Basti).
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Supes.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) Domat. (iii) Castor cake at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N applied on 10.2.1948 and \(A / S\) at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N applied on 16.2.1948. (iv) CO. 356 mid-late (improved). (v) (a) By tractor on 20.12.1947 and by Meston plough on 1.1.1948. Hoeings by cultivator on 2.3.1948 and 25.12 .1947 (twice). (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 16.2.1948. (vii) Palewa by means of pumping from river on 12.2.1948 and infigation (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 18.2.1948. (vi) \(20^{\circ}\). (x) 25.2.1949.
on 18.3.1948. (viii) N.A. (ix)
2. TREATMENTS :
\(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\) No Super.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows, \(3^{\prime \prime}\) to \(4^{n}\) deep.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows, \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{g}}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) in furrows, \(3^{\circ}\) to \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

4: GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) dind. (c) N.A: (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (ví) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 14.28 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.16 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 14.47 \\
\(P_{1}\) & 15.03 \\
\(P_{2}\) & 13.33 \\
S.e./mean & \(=1.29\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane. Zone :-Seohara (Bijnor).

Ref:- U.P. 48(61).
Type:- ' \(M\) '.
1. B

Object:-To find the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal as G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) 1 md, of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N}\) on 4.3.1949. (iv) CO. 421 medium (improved). (v) (a) 1 ploughing by victory plough, 2 by desi plough, 3 by desi harrow and hoeing by spade. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distance in lines. (e)-. (vi) 6.3.1949. (vii) 2 irrigations by tubewell on 5.5.1949 and 6.6.1949. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28 to 30.1.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
\(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\mathrm{No} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at planting time.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep at planting time.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 6 repllcations in R.B.D. (iii) (a) \(73^{\circ} \times 24^{\circ}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) N.A.' (v) N.4. (vi) Nit. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S). on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.45 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.776 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(P_{1}\) & 18.31 \\
\(P_{1}\) & 19.94 \\
\(P_{\mathbf{z}}\) & 20.10 \\
S.E/mean & -1.133 ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Seohara (Bijnor).
}

Ref :-U.P. 50(166).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) G.M. sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Top dressing A/S 1 md. on 23.7.1950. (iv) Co-421. (v) (a) 4 hoeings with cultivator, 11 ploughing with meston plough, 1 with desi plough and 1 with tractor. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1728 buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distance in line. (c) -. (vi) 1.3.1950. (vii) 2 irrigations by tube well on 7.2.1950, 10.4 .1950 and 6.5.1950. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1 and 2.3.1951.
2. TREATMENIS :
\(P_{0}=\) control (no manure).
\(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) broadcast before planting.
\(P_{8}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled with \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows befcre planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime-}\) (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \(\%\) and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(S). on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.69 ton/ac.
(iii) The treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(P_{\mathbf{6}}\) & 15.82 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 18.67 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & 19.21 \\
S.E.jmean & \(=1.09\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Seohara (Bijnor).

Ref :-U.P. 52(161).
Type :-‘M’.

Object :- To study the comparative utility of different green manures for Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Different G.M. crops. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO-421. (v) (a) Dest plough, 3 hoeings with the kassi, 2 with cultivator on 17.4.1950, 13.5.1950, earthing up by spade, ploughing by meston plough once and with desi plough on 3, 4, 5, and 6.2.1950. (vi) 7.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 5 and 6.2.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

The following green manures were applied as treatments.
1. Sanal.
2. Guar.
3. Lobia.
4. Dhaincha.
5. Guar for fodder.
6. Urd seed.
7. Fallow (control).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(83^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. ĠENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 14.04 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.34 ton/ac.
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 17.43 \\
2. & 15.24 \\
3. & 13.21 \\
4. & 13.68 \\
5. & 13.78 \\
6. & 11.46 \\
7. & 13.46 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.17\) ton/ac
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Seohara (Bijnor).

Ref :-U.P. 48(65).
Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the comparative utility of different green manures for Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 421 medium (improved). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) NA. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.2.1949 to 8.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Sanai.
3. Lobia (for fodder).
4. Lobia (for G.M.).
5. Guar.
6. Pea (for fodder).
7. Pea (for G.M.).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(46^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) \% germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.28 too \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 2.107 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difereaces are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Av. yield of & Av. yield \\
Treatment & 17.76 \\
1. & 22.85 \\
2. & 18.21 \\
3. & 21.16 \\
4. & 22.32 \\
5. & 19.70 \\
6. & 19.99 \\
7. & \(=1.053\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :-Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref:- U.P. 48(71). } \\ \text { Zone :- Seohara (Bijnor). } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }\end{array}\)
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to supor.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO.421-medium (improved). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.2 .1249 to 21.2.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
\(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
\(P_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep.
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep'.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(67^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (ivi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.07 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.788 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 19.12 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 21.51 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 22.58 \\
\(\mathbf{S}\) E./mean & \(=0.730\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone:- Doiwala (Dehradun).

```

Ref :- U.P.51(194).
Type :-'M'.

Object : To study the response of Sugarcane to super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Compost on 15.2.1951. (iv) CO-356 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughings 14 times from Oct. 1950 to March 1951, 2 ploughings by desl plough and 7 hocings by kassf 2 earthings. (b) Planting in furrows by flat system of plantiog. (c) 48 3-budded setts/row; 296 buds/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) Planting 14.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{2}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 methods of application: \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\) Broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{9}}=\) applied \(\mathbf{3}^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications (iii) (a) \(48^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(42^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\) (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Stripping on 8.9 .1951 to remove Pyrilla. (iii) Germination countings, 'tillers counting millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) \(1951-1952\). (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. ' (vi) Nil. ; (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 76.42 ton/ac.
(ii) 13.281 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=73.14\) ton/ac
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 80.05 & 73.87 & 76.96 \\
\(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & 80.79 & 74.27 & 77.53 \\
\hline Mean & 80.42 & 74.07 & 77.24 \\
\begin{tabular}{l} 
S.E. of any marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 52(269).
Zone :- Doiwala (Dehradun).
Type :-'M'.
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Compost 200 mds. on 24.3 .1952 . (iv) N.A. (v) (a) Ploughings 12 and 3 hoeings by kasst; earihing by spade and weeding. (b) Flat system. (c) 62, 3-budded setts/row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (vi) 5.4.1952. (vii) Irrigated (river water). (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.2.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control (no manure)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 methods of application : \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\) Broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied \(3^{\prime \prime}-\mathbf{4}^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) NiA. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1951-1952
(b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators \({ }^{\circ}\) field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 15.02 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.199 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.


\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Tamkohi(Dzoria ).}

Ref:- U.P. 48(55).
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Barley and Samai. (c) N.A. (ii) Light loam. (iii) Sanal, top dressing by A/S at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\) on 4, 13.5.1948. (iv) CO. 453 -(mid-late) improved. (v) (a) Ploughing in of sanai on 20.9.1947 by victory plough, victory plough on 27.11.1947,21.12.1947, tractor ploughing on 8.1.1948, tractor harrowing on 17.1.1948, tractor disc harrow on 27.1 .1948 and 4 hoeings by cultivator on 5.4 .1948 and by \(k\) udall on 25.4.1948, cultivator on 12.5 .1948 and 5.6.1948. (b) Flat planting. (c) 2400 buds/plot. (d) Rows 3 apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 5.2.1948. (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No Super (control).
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}\) to \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super in furrows \(3^{\circ}\) to \(4^{\circ}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications.
(iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\)
(b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 30.51 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.20 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 28.44 \\
2. & 31.80 \\
3. & 31.30 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.48\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 48(57). \\
Zone :- Tomkohi (Deoria). & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Barley. (c) N.A. (ii) Light loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. 513 (early) improved. (v) (a) 4 hoeings by cultivator on 3.4.1948, by kudali on 25.4 .1948 and again cultivator on 15.5 .1948 and 5.6.1948. 2 ploughings with victory plough. One tractor plough and one tractor harrowing (b) Flat planting. (c) 2400 buds/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 7.2.1948. (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.4.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow.
2. Sanai sown on -15.7 .1947 and ploughed in on -15.9 .1947 .
3. Lobia sown on -15.7 .1947 and ploughed in on -15.9 .1947 .
4. Guar sown on -15 7.1947 and ploughed in on -15.9.1947.
5. Peas sown on -15.101947 and pioughed in on -17.12 .1947 .
6. Oats sown on -15.10 .1947 and ploughed in on -17.12 .1947 .
7. Bajra sown on -15.7.1947 and ploughed in on -15.9.1947.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 11.81 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.90 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 10.67 \\
2. & 13.74 \\
3. & 13.96 \\
4. & 12.03 \\
5. & 11.26 \\
6. & 11.47 \\
7. & 9.52 \\
. S.E./mean & \(=1.95\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Sugarcane.
> Zone :- Baitalpur (Deoria).

Ref:- U.P.49(139).
Type :- 'M'.
Object:-To study response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BA.SAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Bajra (fodder,. (c) No. (ii) N.A. (iii) 100 lb ./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as per treatments. (iv) CO. 109-(Medium, improved). (v) (a) 5 hoeings after planting. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 1.3.1949. (vii) 3 irrigations. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 30 and 31.1.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super broadcast before planting.
3. 60 lb . Jac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super drilled \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replicatlons. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(58^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 15.61 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.850 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 16.17 \\
2 & 14.56 \\
3. & 16.11 \\
S.E. \(/\) mean & \(=1.425\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 49(140).
Zone :- Tamkohi (Deoria). Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) 'Light loam. (iii) \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) : as per treatments. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 4 heeings after plantiog. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 26.2.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11 and 12.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super broadcast before planting.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{4}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. w th, 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yiald. (iv) (a) No.- (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G). on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 10.48 ton/ac.
(ii) 1297 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.83 \\
2. & 11.48 \\
3. & 10.14
\end{tabular}
S.E./x.ean \(\quad=0.530\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref \(:-\) U.P. 49(142). \\
Zone :-Chhitanni (Deoria). & Type :-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the response of Sagarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Nil. (c) Nil. (ii) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO-453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 2 hoeings after planting. (b) to (c) N.A. (vi) 3.3.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (viii) anj (ix) N.A. (x) 9.3.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS}
1. Control.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super broadcast before planting.
3. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{-}\)dsep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(49^{\circ} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes ani sugarcane yi=ld. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conlucted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.25 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.367 ton'ac.
(iii) Treatmen' differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac-
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.69 \\
2. \(:\). & 23.78 \\
3. & 29.18 \\
S.e./mean & \(=2.184\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone:- Captainganj (Deoria).
Ref :-U.P. 51(159).
Type:-'M'.

```

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (sown on 27.7.1950). (c) Nil (ii) Bhat soils. (iii) Sanai \(\times 20\) seers of A/S on 7.2.1951. (iv) CO-453 (mid-late). Improved. (v) (a) 6 ploughings by desi plough and 2 ploughings by victory plough; 6 hoeings by kassi. (b) Flat planting followed by earthing. (c) 1512 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 7.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 4.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No manure.
2. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast in the field before sowing.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in the trenches at the time of planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(63^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(57^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N:A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germinations, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield: (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c)' N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.41 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.772 tun/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 14.96 \\
2. & 16.42 \\
3. & 17.85 \\
S.E.jmean & \(=0.886\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-Gauribazar (Deoria).}

Ref:-U.P.50(171).
Type :- \({ }^{\mathbf{M}}\) '.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Clay soil. (iii) Sanal. (iv) CO 513 (early) Improved. (v) (a) 5 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 5.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied broadcast before planting.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nih (vii) The ? experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on! cultivators' field.
3. RESULTS:
(i) 17.86 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.934 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 13.15 \\
2. & 18.85 \\
3. & 21.59 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.789\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Gauribagar (Deoria).
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.

```
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal' (G.M.) (c) NiI. (ii) Clay soil. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO 35 (mid late)(improved). (v). (a) Ploughing by traator on 13.10.1950. Harrowing by tratior on 15.10.1950, 1.11.1950 and 16.12.1950 8 hoeings by kudall. (b) N.A. (c) 1680 budi/plot. (d) N.A. (e) - . (vi) 2, 3.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(52^{\circ}\) (x) 29.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{z}}\) broadcast in the field before planting.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied at \(\mathbf{3}^{\prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows at the time of planting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Tho experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on ciltivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 42.14 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.771 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences aro highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcans in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 45.91 \\
2. & 42.59 \\
3. & 37.93 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.886\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Tamkohi (Deoria).

Ref:-U.P. 50(170)
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
i. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Biat soils. (iii) Sanai; A/S at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N. (iv) CO-513 (early) (improved): (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 2t, 25.1-1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.1.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied broadcast before planting.
3. Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-\mathbf{4}^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield- (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.66 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.351 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 18.75 \\
2. & 20.00 \\
3. & 20.23 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.368\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane,
Zone :- Tamkohi (Deoria).
- Ref :- U.P. 51(178)/50(170).

Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a. N.A. (b) Sanai sown on 23.7.1951. (c) Nil. (ii) Bhat soils. (iii) F.Y.M. at 400 md./ac. on 25.6 .1951 Gammaxene at 25 lb ./ac. on 15.1.1951; Top dressing of \(A / S\) at 20 seers in the field on 25.6.1951. (iv) CO-513 (early) (improved). (v) (a) 3 ploughings and levelling by tractor 2 ploughings by bullocks harrowing and sub soiling by tractor 4 hoeings by] kassi and earthing up by spade. (b) Flat sowing and learthing after wards. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 10.2.1951. (vii) N.'A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.3.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No manure (control).
2. Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast in field before planting.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3 \mathbf{1}^{\circ}\) depth before planting.
. Super applied on 15.1.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nij. (iii) The experinent was cercucted ty D.S.R.(G) on cultivators" feld.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.56 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.321 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 18.54 \\
2. & 19.93 \\
3. & 20.20 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.539\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Lakshmiganj (Deoria).
}

Ref:- U.P. 50(169).

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Bajra. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) F.Y.M. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as basal manuring and A/S at 40 lb ./ac. of N as top dressing on \(\mathbf{1 3 . 6}\).1950. (iv) CO .513 (early) (improved). (v) (a) 2 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 24.1.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N A. (x) 9.2.195I.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied broadcast before planting.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(58^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was condsated by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(18.84 \mathrm{tcn} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 3.461 ton/ac.
- (iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 19.07 \\
: 2. & 18.32 \\
3. & 19.34 \\
S.EJmean & \(=1.731\) top/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref:- U.P. \(49(159)\). \\
Zone :-Baitalpur (Deoria). & Type :- ' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the comparative effest of different green manures.
1. \(\because\) BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatmsnts. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO. 395 (early) improved. (v) (a) 5 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 20.2.1949. (vii) irrigated. (viii) N.A. (is) N.A. (x) 25 and 28.1.1950.

2 TREATMENTS:
1. Sanal
2. Guar.
3. Dhaincha.
4. Pea.
5. Metha.
6. Balra.
7. Fallow.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(85^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL}
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G): on cultivator's field:
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.41 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.847 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 13.03 \\
2. & 14.09 \\
3. & 13.56 \\
4. & 12.52 \\
5. & 13.79 \\
6. & 12.90 \\
7. & 14.01 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.924\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Captainganj (Deoria).

Ref:- U.P. 53(241)
Type:- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the response of Super with green manare and different times of application.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatments. (ii) Bangar (iii) A/S at \(2 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\) on 24.4.1953. and Press mud at \(100 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 8.1.1953. (iv) CO. 356 - (mid-late), (improved). (v) (a) 5 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 29.1.1953.' (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(37^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 26.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow-Sugarcane.
2. Fallow +150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at planting of Sugarcane.
3. Sanal or Dhaincha-Sugarcane.
4. Sanai or Dhaincha+ 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing of \(\mathrm{G} . \mathrm{M}\).-Sugarcane.
5. Sanai or Dhaincha +150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at turning in of G.M. -Sugarcano.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(46^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field,
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.31 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.657 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. .
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av, yield \\
1. & 6.26 \\
2. & 6.56 \\
3. & 6.03 \\
4. & 5.23 \\
5. & 7.48 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.829\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Ref:- U.P. 53(244). \\ Type:- ' \(M\) '.}

Object :-To study the response of Super with green manure and different times of application.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :
(i) (a) N,A. (b) Urd, as per treatments. (c) As per treatments. (ii) Sandy loam, (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO.443-(mid-late), improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by tractor plough on 8.10.1952, harrowing by tractor on 9.10 .1952 , 7.12 .1952 and 3 hoeings by hand kudali. (b) Trench planted. (c) 6720 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) 一. (vi) 30.1.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 41.77". (x) 3.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-Sugarcane.
2. Fallow +150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super \(3^{\circ}\) deep at planting of Sugarcane.

3 Sanal as G.M.-Sugarcane.
4. Sanal G.M. \(+150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super at sowing of Sanai-Sugarcane.
5. Sanai G.M. \(+150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super at turning of Sanai-Sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\) (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) . N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment iwas conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 26.80 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.601 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 25.22 \\
2. & 27.59 \\
3. & 24.94 \\
4. & 27.57 \\
5. & 28.69 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.80\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Faizabad (Faizabad).

Rei:-U.P. 53(240).
Type:-'M'.

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super in combination with green manures and different times of application.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) As per treatments. (ii) Loam with saline patches. (iii) A/S at 30 lb ./ac. of N on 6.3.1953. Top dressing of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 40 lb /ac. of N on 18.7.1950. (iv) \(\operatorname{COS}-364\) (improved-unreleased). (v) (a) 1 ploughings by victory plough, 2 by desi plough, 4 hoeings by kassi and earthing up by spade. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1890 buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distance in lines, furrows opend by ridger. (e) -. (vi) 17.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 3 to 4.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-Sugarcane.
2. Fallow- \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at \(3^{\prime \prime}\) depth at planting of Sugarcane.
3. Dhaincha (G.M.)-Sugarcane.
4. Dhaincha (G.M.)+Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of G.M. sowing-Sugarcane.
5. Dhaincha (G.M.) +Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at the time of turning under G.M.-Sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(63^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(57^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N N

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield at harvest (excluding the yield of cane hatvested for juice analysis). (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.68 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.434 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 10.68 \\
2. & 14.16 \\
3. & 12.13 \\
\(\cdots 4\). & 15.44 \\
5. & 15.97 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.717\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane. \(\quad\). Ref: :U.P. 53(245).
Site :-Faizabad (Faizabad).
Type :-‘'M'.
Object :-To study the response of Sugar cane to Super in combination with green manures and different times of application.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) As per treatments. (ii) Loam. (iii) A/S at \(20^{\circ} \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N and G.N.C. at 10 \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 30.1.1953. Top dressing of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 50 lb ./ac. of N on 29.6.1953. (iv) CO-416 (improved). (v) (a) 1 ploughing by victory plough, 4 ploughings by desi plough, 4 hoeings ;by kassi and earthing by ríger. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1584 buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distances : in furrows opened by ridger. (e) -. (vi) 30.1.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 19, 20 and 27.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-Sugarcane.
2. Fallow+super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at \(3^{\prime \prime}\) depth at planting of Sugarcane?
3. Sanai (G.M.)-Sugarcane.
4. Sanai (G.M.) + super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sanal sowing-Sugarcane.
5. Sanai (G.M.) + super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at the time of turning in sanai-Sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(66^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(60^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield at harvest (i.e. excluding canes harvested for juice analysis). (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(G) on cultivators \({ }^{3}\) field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 12.33 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.824 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. & 11.11 \\
2. & 11.87 \\
3. & 12.32 \\
4. & 12.68 \\
S. & 13.67 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.912\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:-Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-Faizabad (Faizabad)
}

Ref:-U.P. 51(173).
Type :-'M'.
Object :-To study the resuonse of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.) (c) Nil. (ii) Heavy loam with Alkaline patches. (iii) Sanai at \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\). \(A / S\) at 53 lb ./ac. of \(N\) on 30.1.1951. Top dressing of mixture 20 lb ./ac. of N on 6.8.1951. (iv) \(\mathbf{C O}\) 313 (early improved). (v) (a) Ploughings by mould board plough (tractor) on 15.10.1950, by dise harrow (by (ractor) on 7.11.1950, 17.12.1950, 10.1.1951 and 29.1.1951. M.C. cultivator (by tractor) on 8.12.1950. By desi on 30.1.1951. 3 hoeings by kassi and earthing by spade. (b) Flat planting in lines. (c) 1728 , buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distance, furrows opened by kudali. (e) N.A. (vi) 1.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 22 to 24.3.1952.

\section*{2., TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) broadcasted before planting.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep at planting time.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with six replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable canes, tillers and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' field.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 9.88 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.430 ton/ac. .
(ii) Treatment differences are hot significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.74 \\
2. & 9.76 \\
3. & 10.14 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.584\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Faizabad (Faizabad).

Ref :-U.P. 50(223).
Type : © \({ }^{-} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object: -To find the effect of Spade brand fertiltzer on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO 493 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughing by mould board plough (tractor) on 26.10.1951. Disc harrow (tractor) on 14.121951, 3.1.1952 28.1.1952. and 8.2.1952. (b) Flat planting. (c) N.A. (d) at \(3^{\prime}\) distance in lines. Furrows opened by bullock ridger. 9 hoeings by kudall. Earthing by spade. (e) -. (vi) 11.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 32.73'. (x) 10, 12.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. \(A / S\) at \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
2. A/S at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{G} . \mathrm{N} . \mathrm{C}_{\text {. at }} 60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
3. S. brand fertilizer at 120 lb ./ac. of N .
4. S. brand fertilizer at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. + G.N. C. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N , half at planting and half at tillering.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (iii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(70^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable canes, tillers and sugarcane yield at harvest excluding cane harvested for juice analysis (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The crop of the plot in which treatment 1 was applied in replication \(I\), was badly damaged by rats. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.30 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.584 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
& 1. \\
2. & 13.61 \\
3. & 17.71 \\
4. & 15.25 \\
& S.E./mean \\
& \\
& \(=0.792\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Sugarcane. -
Zone :- Nawabganj (Gonda).

```

Ref :-U.U. 50 (172).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of Super on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) loam. (iii) Sanai as G.M. Press mud at \(100 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\).on 24.1.1950. Top dressing by manure on 21.6.1950. (iv) CO 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 6 hoeings, (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 9.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11 and 12.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(75^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G). on cult,vators' feld.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 32.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 7.39 S ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 28.18 \\
2. & 38.74 \\
3. & 30.51 \\
S.E./mean & \(=3.307\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Nawabgunj (Gonda).

Ref :-U.P. 51(174).
Type :-'M'.

Object : - To study the effect of Super on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Press mud compost at \(100 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). mixture 1 md .10 srs . at \(55 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 15.10.1950. Top dressing of manure 5 md . on 30.5.1951. (iv) COK. 26 (improved but unreleased). (v) (a) Tractor [ploughings \(2+\) tractor harrow 2. Desi ploughing on 15.9.1950, 10, 30.10.1950, 4, 21, 25 and 30.1.1951. (b) Sown in flat system. (c) 1320 buds/plot. (d) In lines \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) Plankings 4 along with the last 4 ploughings and 3 hoeings. (vi) Planting 31.1.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17.2.1952,

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No Super.
2. Super broadcast at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) before planting.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied \(3^{7}\) deep before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G). on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 16.83 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.751 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\cdots 1\). & 16.52 \\
2. & 17.67 \\
3. & 16.30 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.375\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Balrampur (Gonda).

Ref:- U.P. 50(174).
Type: :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai. Top dressing-castor cake at 6 mds. and A/S at 2 mds. on 18.3 1950. (iv) CO.453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 3 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A: (vi) 7.2.1950 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.1.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no marure).
2. \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-\mathbf{4}^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(140^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G). Experiment on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 35.30 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.983 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 31.90 \\
2. & 35.72 \\
3. & 38.28 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.334\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Balrampur (Gonda).
Ref :-U.P. 51(175).
Type :-‘ ${ }^{\prime}$ '.

```

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.). (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai (G.M.) on 26.8 .1950 at 60 lb./ac. of N Top dressing of castor cake 2 mds .20 seers at 40 lb ./ac. of N . AmSO \(\mathrm{A}_{4}-1 \mathrm{md} .20\) seers at 40 lb ./ac. of N . (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 3 ploughings by tractor, 5 by desi plough and 3 planking along with ploughings and 3 hoeing by kassi. (b) Planting in lines. (c) 2540 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 16.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENIS :}
1. Control (no Super).
2. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcasted.
3. Super at \(150 \mathrm{ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(88^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R (G). on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 22.53 tod/ac.
(ii) 0.648 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 21.52 \\
2. & 23.74 \\
3. & 22.33 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.324\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

1

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 49(160).
Zone :- Balrampur (Gonda).

Type:- 'M'.

Object :-To study the comparative effect of different green manures.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments, (ii) Loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO.453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 2 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 19.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.2.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Sanai (G.M.).
5. Dhaincha.
2. Guar.
6. Chatri Matri.
3. Lobia.
7., Usual crop used.
4. Pea.
8. Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(91^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 20.38 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.55 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/as.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 23.02 & 5. & 19.26 \\
2. & 22.58 & 6. & 19.49 \\
3. & 19.40 & 7. & 19.91 \\
4. & 20.28 & 8. & 19.14 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=1.275\) ton/ac. & \\
& & &
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 49(137). } \\
\text { Zone :- Balrampur (Gonda). } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To study the response of cane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Castor cake at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as per treatments. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 3 hoeings after planting. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 17.2.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.2.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied broadcast before planting.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(72^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 22.71 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.821 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment"differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.56 \\
2. & 23.19 \\
3. & 24.39 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.335\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref:- U.P. 48(63).
Zone:- Balrampur (Gonda).
Type :- 'M',

```

Object : -To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) Punjab plough for turning in of Sanai on 25.7.1947, meston plough on 5.8.1947 and 15.8.1947, tractor on 7.11.1947 and 4 desi ploughings from 10.11.1947 to 10.1.1948. (b) Flat planted by spade. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) \(\mathbf{3}^{\prime}\) apart. ' (e) -- (vi) 23.2.1948. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{TREATMENTS:}
1. No Super.
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}\) to \(4^{\circ}\) deep.
3. \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ \prime}\) to \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.

Super applied on 30.5.1948.

\section*{DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(1 / 25\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G), òn cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 25.04 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.21 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.80 \\
2. & 25.71 \\
3. & 26.63 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.90\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane.}

Zone :- Ghugli (Gorakhpur).

Ref :- U.P. 48(56).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane-Ratoon. (c) N.A. (ii) Heavy loam. (iii) F.Y.M. at \(16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N at preparation of field, \(A / S\) at 18 lb ./ac. of N mat planting time [and Castor cake at 16 lb ./ac. of N -top dressing on 30.5.1948. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 8 ploughings by desi plough, 3 hoeings by kudali and earthing. (b) Trench planting by kudali. (c) 1680 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e)-. (vi) 6, 7.2.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 45.47". (x) 20, 22.1.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No Super.
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ}\) to \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ}\) to \(4^{\circ}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A.
(v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (viii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 14.56 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.467 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment diferences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. } \\
Treatment & Av. yield \\
& 1. & 13.94 \\
2. & 15.59 \\
3. & 14.17 \\
& S.E/mean & \(=0.234\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop a-Sugarcanc.
Zone :-Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur).

\author{
Ref :-U.P.48(59). \\ Type :- \({ }^{-}{ }^{\prime}\) '.
}

Object : - To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) A/S at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (iv) CO. 356 (mid. late improved.) (v) (a) 2 ploughings by mstor tractor. Trenches made by furrow. 4 hoeing by kudall. (b) Planted in trenches. (c) 1440 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 15.2.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(60^{\circ}\). (x) 16.2 .1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No Super (control).
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D.with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcans yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) The experimant was conducted by D.S.R. (G). on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.39 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.21 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yie.d of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 21.51 \\
2. & 23.52 \\
3. & 25.15 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.90\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref:-U.P. 48(62). \\
Zone :-: Pharenda (Gorakhpur). \(\quad\) Type :-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) F.Y.M. on 17.2.1948. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late improved). (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor. 3 hoeing by spade and earthing up. (b) Planted in trenches with spade. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 18.2.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 17.3.1549.

\section*{.2 TREATMENTS:}
1. No Super (control).
2. \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ \prime}\) deep.

Super applied on 4.61948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D.with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Dead hearts of top borer and stem borer removed by sickle on 20 to 27.5.1948. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. '(b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.83 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.12 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.09 \\
2. & 20.65 \\
3. & 22.75 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.68\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Ref:-U.P. 49(136).
Zone :- Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur).
Type : \({ }^{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{~ M}\) '.
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N} ; \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as per treatments. (iv) CO. 356 (mid-late) ; improved. (v) (a) 4 hoeings done after planting. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) Planted 12.2.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(60^{\circ}\). (x) 15.2.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (No manure).
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) drilled \(3^{n}-4^{4 \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yieid. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G). on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.46 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.608 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 14.60 \\
2. & & 11.92 \\
3. & & 13.86 \\
S.E./mean & & \(=1.065\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref:- U.P. 49(138). } \\ \text { Site:- Pharenda (Gorakhpur). } & \text { Type:- ' } \mathrm{M}^{\prime} \text { '. }\end{array}\)
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy lcam. (iii) \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on \(29.4 .1949 . \mathrm{P}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as per treatments. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-Jate); improved. (v) (a) 6 hoeings given after planting. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) Planting 15.2.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45^{\circ}\). (x) 27.2.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{a}\) :. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-\mathbf{1}^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.

Date of application 15.2.1919.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(67^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 37.23 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.846 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 35.70 \\
2. & 39.40 \\
3. & 36.60 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.570\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Ghugli (Gorakhpur).

Ref:- U.P. 49(141).
Type :- 'M'.

Object: - To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Heavy loam. (iii) A/S at 67 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as per treatments. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) ; improved. (v) (a) 7 hoeings after plantıng. (b) to (e) N. A. (vi) 25.1.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45.47^{\circ}\). (x) 28 to 31.1.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\text { }}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 52.2 \mathrm{ac}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experimənt was condusted by D.S R.(G) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 39.16 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.823 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & A . yield \\
1. & 41.05 \\
2. & 37.57 \\
3. & 38.87 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.911\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur).

Ref :-U.P. 50(168). Type \(\boldsymbol{m}^{-6}\) M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super,

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai as per treatments; top dressing of A/S on 4.3.1950 and 21.5.1950. (iv) CO. 356 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 4 hceings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 2.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 150 ib ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (ii) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 16.00 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.005 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 15.90 \\
2. & 16.57 \\
3. & 15.52 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.227\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :-U.P. 51(179)/50(168). \\
Zone :- Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur). & Type :- ' \(\mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) Lorm. (iii) A/S on 19.4 .1551 as top dressing. (iv) P.O.J. 2878 (mid-late)-improved but unreleased. (v) (a) Heeings by kudali on 21.2.1951 and earthing up on 22.8.1951. (b) Trenching by spades. (c) 1680 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 15.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25, 26.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No manure.
2. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) broadcast before planting.
3. Super at 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast in furrows at the time of planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replication (iii) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951: (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment qas conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESIILTS :}
(i) 18.39 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.431 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 18.47 \\
2. & \(\vdots\) \\
3. & 17.75 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.95\) \\
&
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref :-U.P. 50(173). \\
Zone :-Ghugli (Gorakhpur): & Type :-‘M'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soils. (iii) As per treatments \(+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as mohwa cake and 40 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 4.1.1950. (iv) CO-356 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 8 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 6.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 25.21951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{*}-4^{*}\) deep in furrows before planting. -
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D.with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(79^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.57 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.832 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 13.50 \\
2. & 12.80 \\
3. & 14.40 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.416\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Ghugli (Gorakhpur).

Ref :-U.P. 51(176).
Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanat (G.M.) sown on 22.6.1950. (c) Nil. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) Sanai as G.M. Applied mohwa cake mixture at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 12 to 13.8 .1951 . (iv) \(\mathrm{CO}-356\) (min-late` improved. ( v ) (a) Ploughing in of sanai by vistory plough on 12.8.1950. Ploughing by tractor. 18.1.1951 and 1.2.1951, 3 hoeings by kassl. (b) Flat planting followed by earthing. (c) 2160 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (c) - (vi) 3.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 16 and 17.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No manure.
2. 150 ib ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcasted in field one day before planting.
3. \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied on the setts at the time of sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D., 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(90^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (b) \(84^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) Yes, 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 10.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.418 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 11.08 \\
2. & 10.27 \\
3. & 10.06 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.709\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. \(550(177)\). \\
Zone :- Anandnagar (Gorakhpur). & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.). (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 4 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 21.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications, (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(57^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b), and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The. experiment was conducted by [D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's. field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 32.38 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.364 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 30.80 \\
2. & 34.13 \\
3. & 32.20
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean - 1.682 ton/ac.

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Anandnagar (Gorakhpur).

Ref :- U.P. 5I(180).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO.453 (mid-late) improved. (iv) (a) Ploughing by tractor on 12.1.1951. Ridging by spade on 3.2.1951. Harrowing by tractor on 13.1.1951. 4 hoeings by kudali. Earthing by spades on 15.7.1951. (b) N.A. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (c) -. (vi) 20.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2,2.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No manure (control).
2. Super at \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. Super at 150 lb /ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied \(3^{\circ}-\mathbf{f}^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows at the time of planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications, (iii) 'a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.4. (iii) Germination, tillers, miliable cans and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N. A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was condueted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 33.23 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.946 ton/ac.
(iii) Trea.ment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 33.46 \\
2. & 33.50 \\
3. & 32.73 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.973\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 53 (243). \\
Zone :-Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur):
\end{tabular}

Object:-To stujy the response of Supse with G.M. at difereat times of applications.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) As per treatm=nts. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO-453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by desl plough on 16.9.1952, 5.10.1952 and 7.1.1 353 Hoeing on 31 10.1952. 2 hoeings by hand kudali an 12 weedings. (b) Trench planted. (c) 6720 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 8.2.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 28.17'. (x) 24.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow-Sugarcane.
2. Fallow \(+150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}, 3^{\circ}\) deop at planting of Sugarcane.
3. Sanal as G.M.-Sugarcane.
4. Sanal as G.M. \(+150 \mathrm{lo} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at sowing of sanai-Sugarcane.
5. Sanai as G.M. \(+150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at turning in of sanai-Sugariane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 21^{\circ}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S:R. (G) on cultivator's teld.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17.56 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.513 tor/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\(1 . \quad 18.23\)
2. 15.00
3.16 .38
4. 17.48
5. 20.73
S.E./mean \(\quad=1.757\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).

Ref :-U.P. 53(242).
Type :n' \({ }^{\prime}\) '.

Object :-To study the response of Super with G.M. at different times of application.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) As per treatments. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 5 ploughings by tractor and 5 hoeings by hand kudali. (b) Trench planting. (c) 7008 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 13.3.1953. (vii) İrrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(40.06^{\circ}\). (x) 27.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-Sugarcane.
2. Fallow \(+150 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}, 3^{\circ}\) deep at planting of Sugarcane.
3. Sanai as G.M.-Sugarcane.
4. Sanal as G.M. \(+150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sowing of sanai-Sugarcane.
5. Sanai as G.M. \(+150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at turning in of sanai-Sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). '(iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 12.50 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.659 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 12.60 \\
2. & 13.24 \\
3. & 11.68 \\
4. & 12.20 \\
5. & 12.79 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.830\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur).

```
Ref:- U.P. 48(60).
Type:- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the comparative effects of different green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 356 (medium-late), improved. (v) (a) 2 ploughings by motor tractor and 5 hocings by kudali. (b) Planted in trenches. (c) 1440 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e)—. (vi) 16.2.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(60^{\circ} .(x)\) 18.2.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Berseem:
2. Sanal.
3. Pea.
4. Lobia.
5. Fallow.
6. Muttery.
7. Arhar.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 14^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G)on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 21.35 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.27 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. vield
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. & & 21.22 \\
2. & & 25.22 \\
3. & & 22.38 \\
4. & & 20.22 \\
5. & & 21.44 \\
6. & & 22.68 \\
7. & & 16.27 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.64\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 48(64). \\
Zone :- Pharenda (Görakhpur). & Type :- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the comparative effects of green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. 453 (medium-late), improved.
(v) (a) 3 ploughings by country plough, twice levelled by heriga, 3 hoeings by spade and earthing up. (b) to (c) N.A. (vi) 27.2.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 45 \({ }^{\circ}\) (x) 18.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sanai sown on 29.6.1947, buried on 29.8.1947.
2. Guar sown on 29.6.1947, buried on 29.8.1947.
3. Lobia sown on 29.6.1947, buried on 29.8.1947.
4. Pea sown on 18.10.1947, buried on 9.1.1947.
5. Mathi sown on 18.10.1947, buried on 9.1 .1948 .
6. Fallow sown on 18.10.1947, buried on 9.1.1948.
7. Rotation peas sown on 18.10.1947, buried on 25.2.1948.
3. DESIGN .
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications, (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) Dead hearts of top borer and stem borer removed by sickles from 20 to 25.7 .1948 , (iii) Germination, tillers, millable sugarcane and yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 22.32 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.76 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
1. 23.88
2. 19.73
3. 26.24
4. 20.69
5. 23.72
6. \(\quad 26.30\)
7. \(\quad 15.69\)
S.E./mean \(=2.88\) ton/ac.

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Pharenda (Gorakhpur).

Ref :-U.P. 49(158).
Type :n'M'.

Object:-To study the comparative effects of different green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) As per treatments. Also A/S+ Castor cake at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (iv) CO-453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 6 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A.' (v) 10.2.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 1.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sanai (G.M.).
2. Guar.
3. Pea.
4. Lobia.
5. Dhaincha.
6. Matri.
7. Toria (early mustard).
8. Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A (v) N.A.! (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G)ion cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 33.52 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.495 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 33.06 & 5. & 31.07 \\
2. & 33.46 & 6. & 32.52 \\
3. & 34.89 & 7. & 34.44 \\
4. & 37.26 & 8. & 31.48 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=2.248\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur).}

Ref :-U.P. 49(157).
Type:-'M'.
Object :-To study the comparative effects of different green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO-356 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 1 hoeing. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 3.2.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 5 and 6.2.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sanai.
5. Dhaincha
2. Arhar.
6. Pea.
3. Lobia.
7. Guar.
4. Matri.
8. Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D., 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.33 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.102 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significast.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 18.32 & \(5 .{ }^{\prime}\) & 22.62 \\
2. & 12.71 & 6. & 23.87 \\
3. & 25.35 & 7. & 17.81 \\
4. & 19.93 & 8. & 14.02 \\
& S.E.jmean & \(=2.551\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Hardoi (Hardoi).

Ref:-U.P. 48(69).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDTTIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Guar. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) C0.453 (late) improved. (v) (a) Plonghings by desi plough on 13 and 15.1.1948 ploughings with gujar plough after palewa on 29.2.1948. Ploughings with desi plough on 2,3 and 4.3.1948. (b) Flat planting. (c) 2160 buds/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 5.3.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(60^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 15.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied as top dressing on 17.6.1948.
1. \(\mathrm{No} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{4}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with \(\boldsymbol{\epsilon}\) replications. (iii) (a) \(72^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G). on cultivators' field.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 33.57 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.227 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 32.73 \\
2. & 33.63 \\
3. & 34.36 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.501\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Sugarcane. \(\quad\) Ref:- U.P. 48(68). Zone :- Gola (Kheri). Type :- ‘M’. ...

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane (ratoon). (c) N.A. (ii) Light loam. (iii) Top dressing by Castor cake at 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 25 lb ./ac. of N (iv) CO. 527 (early) improved. (iv) (a) Harrow plough twice. Mould board on 15.10.1947, disc on 29.10.1947, 16 and 17.10.1947. Hoeingss by kudali on 12.3.1948, 3, 4 and 11.4.1948. Earthing up on 7.5.1948 and 5.6.1948. Hoeings by cultivator on 7.5.1948 and 5.6.1948. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) -. (vi) 6 and 7.2.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45.91^{\circ}\). (x) 25.2.1949 to 7.3.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. No \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{f}\) deep.
3. \(80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{r}-4^{\circ}\) deep.

Super applied on 6, 7.2.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.49 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.402 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 19.27 \\
2. & 19.50 \\
3. & 19.71 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.981\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Sugarcane.
> Zone :- Kichha (Kheri).

Kef :- U.P. 49(146).
Type:- ' M '.
Object :-To study the response of Sugareane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) NiI. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO.421 (medium) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by mould board in June 1948, ploughings by Athens plough in June 1948 ; Oct. 1948 ; by desi plough in Dec. 1948 ;By Athen's plough on 22.2.1949; Ransom harrowing twice on 25.2.1949; planking on 27.2.1949. (b) Flat planting (c) 1458 buds/plot, (d) N.A. (c) -. (vi) 16.3.1949.(vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(60^{\circ}\). ( x\() 143.1950\).
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) broadcast at planting time.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{3}-4^{4}\) deep at planting time.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(81^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) There was no experiment during 1950-1951. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 31.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.531 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 31.65 \\
2. & 33.90 \\
3. & 30.15 \\
& S.E./mean \\
& \(=0.625\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:m Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Kichha (Kheri).}

Ref:- U.P. 51(151).
- Type :- 'M'.

Object : - To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal as G.M. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai; Top dressing of mohwa cake at 10 md./ac. on 25.6.1951. (iv) CO-527 (early) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by tractor on 21, 24.1.1951 hoeing by cultivator and kudali on 14.2.195!; 30.3.1951 and 27.4 .1951 and earthing up by tractor on 15.6.1951. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart.' (e) -. (vi) 7.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(47^{\circ}\). (x) 1.1.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. \(\mathrm{No} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) applied broadcast before planting.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (b) \(67^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) No experiment during 1950-1951. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 19.58 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.090 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 19.24 \\
2. & 18.97 \\
3. & 20.54 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.545\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Note :-2 replications have been rejected due to poor yield and yields missing. Hence only 4 replications have been included in the analysis.
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { - Crop :-Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref:-U.P. 50(163 } \\ \text { Zone :-Golagokarnath (Kheri). } & \text { Type :-‘M’. }\end{array}\)
Object: - To find out the comparative effect of different green manures.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b)*Green manure crops. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. 527. (v) (a) Ploughing by spade on 6 and 12.3.1950; 3 hoeings by kudall and cultivator on 7.4.1950 and 15 and 30.5.1950. (b) Flat sowing behind the ridge. (c) 2187 buds/plot. (d) Ridges 3' apart. (e) -. (vi) 13 and 14.3.1950. (vii) Irrigated. - (viii) N.A. (ix) \(47^{\circ}\). (x) 25 and 30.12.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Pea at 30 seers/ac.
2. Sanai at 40 seers/ac.
3. Dhaincha at 20 seers/ac.
4. Fallow (control).
5. Lobia at 25 srs./ac.
6. Urd at 20 srs,jac.
7. Pea root for fodder at \(30 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(81^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yield; (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A: (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.32 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.31 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 6.22 \\
2. & 6.35 \\
3. & 5.21 \\
4. & 4.83 \\
5. & 5.72 \\
6. & 4.45 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.16\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Golagokarnath (Kheri).
Object : - To study the response of Super in comeination with green manure on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) 5 md. of neem' cake at planting, in furrows on 18.3.1953. 14 md. of \(A / S\) on 12. 6. 1953 as top dressing. (iv) CO. 527 . (v). (a) 5 ploughings by mesten plough. 2 hoeings by kudali and 4 cultivators on 16.5 . \(1853,4.6 .1953\) (b) Flat planting. (c) 1125 buds/plot.* (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) - . (vi) 18.3.1953 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 4.5'. (x) 22 and 23.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No Super-Sanai green manuring.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at sanai sowing (broadcast).
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at zanai turning in time.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(75^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (b) \(69^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \%, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1955. (b) and (c) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.03 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.65 tod/ac.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly,
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 18.13 \\
2 & 18.51 \\
3. & 20.44 \\
S.B./mean & \(=1.89\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Zone --Lakhimpur (Kheri).}

Ref :-U.P. 53(237).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of placement of Super on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDI'TIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) ISanai as G.MA (c) N.A. (ii) Light loam. (iii) Top dressing of compost 100 md . on 22.6.1953. (iv) CO-527. (v) (a) 7 hoeings by cultivator (bullock and tractors) on 13.3.1953 and 4.4.1953. by kudali on 13.3.1953. 28.3.1953, 31.3.1953, 4.3.1953 and 13.5.1953. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1440 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 30, 31.1.1953 and 1.2.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 45". (x) 23, 24.2.1954.
2. TTEATMENTS :
1. No manure.
2. 60 lb ./ac. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super..
3. 120 lb ./ac. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime \prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 32.02 ton/ac.
(ii) 7.02 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
1. 32.72
2. 34.06
\(3 . \quad 29.29\)
S.E./mean \(=2.86\) ton/ac.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 52(202). } \\
\text { Zone :-Gola (Kheri). } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.

\section*{BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Sanai, G.N. C. , at \(10 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\) on 25.3.1952. top dressing at \(1 \frac{1}{\mathrm{t}} \mathrm{md}\)./ac on 21.6 .1952 . (iv) CO 527 (early) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by disc plough on 5.2.1952 and 2.2.1952, earthing up by tractor on 30.6.1952, hoeing by kudali on 25.2.1952 and by cultivator on 18.3.1952, 25.4.1952 and 26.5.1952. (b) Flat planting (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) - ( (vi) 10.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(40^{\circ}\). (x) 10,11 .2.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as Super before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B \(D\) with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.84 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.813 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc}
1. & 26.91 \\
2. & 26.46 \\
3. & 24.16 \\
S E./mean & \(=1.148\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Gola (Kheri).}

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 49(149).}

Type :- ' M '。
Object :- To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) Light loam. (iii) A/S at 2 md. 5 seers on 24.4.1949. (iv) CO. 453 (early) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by harrow plough on 17.2.1949. By disc harrow on 18 aad 25.2.1949. Hoeings by kudali on \(7,8,19\) and 24.4.1949; 12,14 and 23.5.1949 and 16 to 19.6.1949. Earthing up on 2 and 3.7.1949. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) -. (vi) 1 and 2.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45.91^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 1 to 8.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(\mathrm{No} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{5} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as broadcast at planting time.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}, 3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows at the time of planting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 12.02 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.022 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 11.53 \\
2. & 12.99 \\
3. & 11.53 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.642\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :-Gola (Kheri).
Ref:- U.P. 51(148).
Type:- 'M'.
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super in combination with green manures.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) As per treatments. (ii) Loam. (ii) Super as per treatments and mohwa cake at 10 md ./ac. on 3.5.1951. (iv) CO.527 (early) improved. (v) (a) 4 hoeings by kudali on 10.11.1950, 8.12.1950, 15.7.1951 and 2.4.1951. Earthing up on 20.6 .1951 by spade. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1215 buds/plot.
(d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) 一. (vi) 6.10.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(47^{\prime \prime}\) ( (x) 31.12 .1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Sanal green manure (control).
2. Super at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at the time of sowing sa nai.
3. Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at the the time of ploughing in of sanai.

Application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in (2) on 25.6.1950 and in (3) on 10.11.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(81^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) One replication has been rejected due to poor yield and missing value. Hence only 5 replications have been taken for analysis. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 30.48 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.218 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are nót significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 31.41 \\
2. & 30.28 \\
3. & 29.75 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.886\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Gola (Kheri).

Ref :- U.P. 49(147).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A, (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) No. (iv) (a) CO. 421. (v) (a) Ploughings by mould board in June 1948, plouhings by Athens in October, 1948 by disc plough in December, 1948, ransum harrowing on 25.2.1949, Iplanking on 27.2.1949, 5 hoeings by bullock cultivator on 17.4 .1949 followed by hand kassi on 17.4.1949, and hoeing by hand kassi on 7, and 28.5.1949 and 5.7.1949. (b) Flat planting by bamboo ridger with T.D. 18 tractor. (c) 1458 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e)-. (vi) 6.3.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(60^{\circ}\). (x) 14.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No manure (control);
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super broadcast.
3. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D., 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(81^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination counts and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) No. (b) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.42 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.00 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
1. \(\quad 17.03\)
2. \(\quad 16.66\)
3. \(\quad 15.57\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.408 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). .

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane.}

Zone :- Modinagar (Meerut).

\section*{Ref:- U.P. 48(85).}

Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. Super at 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. Super at \(80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{s}}\) in the form of Super applied at tillering time, as Super could not be made available at planting time.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(73^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.62 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.235 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.54 \\
2. & 25.76 \\
3. & 28.57 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.618\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Ref: U.P. 48(83).
Type : \({ }^{\text {'M'. }}\)

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) to (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No Super.
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{B}}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{4}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep.
\(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{6}}\) applied as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nia. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 30.61 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.883 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences aro highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
1. & 28.12 \\
2. & 31.09 \\
3. & 32.62
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.769 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :-Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 49(174). } \\ \text { Zone :-Simbhaoli (Meerut). } & \text { Type :- } \mathbf{- M}^{\prime} .\end{array}\)
- Zone :-Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. basal CONDIIIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Guar. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Applied \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 11.6.1949. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by pu'ja plough on 23 and 25.10 .1948 ; ; 5.11 .1948 . Ploughing by desf plough oa 25.11.1918, 2) (2.1) 13 and 25.1.19 99. Cultivation by desi plough on 25.2.1949. Cultivation on 26.2.1949; cultivation by desi plough on 2.3.1949. Applied cultivator on 25.4.1949, cultivation by M.C. cultivator on 18.5.1949 and • 16.6.1949. Digging by kassi on 26.4.1949. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 3.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) to (x) N.A.

2: TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) by broadcast.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows \(4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.

Manuring by double Super on 18.5.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. general:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 3024 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.630 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not sigaific ant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 30.18 \\
2. & 29.78 \\
3. & 30.76 \\
& S.E./mean \\
& \(=1.074\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Daurala (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 49(173).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{\sim}^{\mathbf{N}} \mathbf{M}\) '。

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) G.N.C. applied at \(15 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\) cn 8.2.1949. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ploughing on 8.1.1949 and ploughing by desi plough on 24.1.1949. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 14.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied in furrows \(4^{n}\) deep.

Sujer was applied at tillering time.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A.
(v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experi ment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.11 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.833 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differ ences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 19.46 \\
2. & 18.00 \\
3. & 16.86 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.748\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Daurala (Meerut).

Ref: : U.P. 50(220).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO-453 (improved). (v) (a) and (b) N.A.
(c) 67 setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 12.3.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure).
(1) 2 methods of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{n}\) deep.
(2) 2 levels of Super: \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(65^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) \(59^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi; Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 29.68 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.115 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of S is significant. All other effects are not significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=27.72\) ton/ac.


\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Daurala (Meerut).}

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 51(196)/50(220). \\ Type :- 'M'.}

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Metha. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-453 (improved). (v) (a) N.A. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) 63, thrse budded setts/row; 1512 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) 一. (vi) 21.2.1951. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure).
(1) 2 methods of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) Broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied in furrows \(3^{4 \prime}-4^{\text {r }}\) deep.
(2) 2 levels of Super: \(S_{1}=60\) and \(S_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) \(61^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 35.04 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.996 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of M is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\[
\text { Control }=35.28 \text { ton/ac. }
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & M 2 & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 34.34 & 35.27 & 34.80 \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & 34.67 & 35.64 & 35.16 \\
\hline - Mean & 34.50 & 35.46 & 34.98 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & \(=0.315\) ton/ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & \(=0.446\) ton/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone:- Daurala (Meerut).
Ref:- U.P. 52(268)/51(196)/50(220).
Type:- 'M'.

```

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Manuring with Okhla S'adge 93-75 md. on 29.2.1952. Manuring of \(A / S\) at 1 md .5 seers 5 chh on 7.6 .1952 . (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by desi plough on 11.4.1952 and hoeing by spade on 28.4.1252, 26.5 .1552 and hceing by desi plough on 14.6.1952. Heeing by phawra on 4.7.1952 and earthing by phawra on 25.7 .1952 . (b) Flat planting. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (vi) 9.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (8) 29.1.1953.

2, TREATMENTS :
All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure).
(1) 2 methods of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied in furrows \(\mathbf{3}^{\boldsymbol{*}-4^{n}}\) deep.
(2) \({ }^{-2}\) levels of Super : \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications (iii) (a) and (b) \(66^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's feld.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 10.02 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.748 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\[
\text { Control }=10.41 \text { ton/ac. }
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 9.89 & 9.32 & 9.60 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 9.32 & 11.15 & 10.24 \\
\hline Mean & 9.60 & 10.24 & 9.92 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.529 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =0.748 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 50(219).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{m}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-421 (improved). (v) (a) and
(b) N.A. (c) 66, three budded/setts row. (d) N.A. (e) —. (vi) 7.3.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A.
(x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a contrdl (no manure).
(1) 2 methods of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) brcadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied infurrows \(3^{n}-4^{\circ}\) deep.
(2) 2 levels of Super: \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and yield of sugarcane.' (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.

\section*{s. RESULTS:}
(i) 31.77 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.00 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=30.79\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 32.02 & 30.95 & 31.48 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 33.09 & 32.02 & 32.56 \\
\hline Mean & 32.56 & 31.48 & 32.02
\end{tabular}
S.E of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table
\(=0.707\) ton/ac.
\(=1 . \mathrm{COO}\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Ref:-U.P. 51(197)/50(219).
Type :-‘M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugaricane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Co. 421 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughing by Punjab plough on 3.8.1950., by Praza plough on 16.9.1950., 9 by dest plough and 1 pata. 3 hoeings by cultivator. (b) Pranting behind the plough by flat system of planting. (c) 49 setts/row or 1323 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 25.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21 to 29.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) +a control (no manure).
(1) 2 methods of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep.
(2) 2 levels of Super: \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(47^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' feld.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 29.50 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.176 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{M}\) and 'control vs treated' are significant while interaction \(\mathbf{M} \times S\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=28.46 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{} & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{Control \(=28.46\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & M \({ }_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 28.22 & 31.94 & 30.08 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 30.78 & 3008 & 30.43 \\
\hline Mean & 29.50 & 31.01 & 30.26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mead
S.E. of body of table
\(=0.831\) ton/ac.
\(=1.176\) ton/ac.

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 51(198).
Zone :- Hastinapur (Meerut).
Type:- ' M '.
Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 421. (v) (a) Preparation of layout on 3, 4.3.1951. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) 1728 buds/plot. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e)-. (vi) 5, 6.3.1951. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and ( 2 ) +a control (no mannre)
(1) 2 methods of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
(2) 2 levels of Super: \(\mathrm{S}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No: (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 23.91 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.889 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av, yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\[
\text { Control = } 24.14 \text { ton/ac. }
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(M_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 23.87 & 25.15 & 24.51 \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & 23.70 & 22.69 & 23.19 \\
\hline Mean & 23.78 & 23.92 & 23.85 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & \(=2.043\) ton/ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & \(=2.889\) ton/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Sugarcane.
> Zone :- Modinagar (Meerut).

Ref :- U.P. 52(266).
Type:- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Hoeing by cultivator on 2.4.1952, hoeing and weeding by cultivator on 18.4 .1952 and hoeing and weeding by spade on 30.4.1952, 16.5.1952, 27.51952 and 106.1952 , hoeing ty kassi on 15.6 .1952 and earthing by spade on 1 and 2.8.1952. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) 75, three budded setts/row; 600, three budded setts/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) 一. (vi) 23, 24.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 7 to 19.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)+a control (Sanai as G.M.)
(1) 2 methods of application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep.
(2) 2 levels of Super: \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}=60\) and \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}=120 \mathrm{lb}\).jac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) Striping from 9 to 10.8 .1952 to remove pyrilla affected leaves. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 26.99 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.961 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Control \(=25.51\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 23.20 & 28.65 & 25.92 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 29.52 & 23.56 & 26.54 \\
\hline Mean & 26.36 & 26.10 & 26.23 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=2.094\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=2.961\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Sugarcane.
> Zone :- Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Ref :- U.P. 51(201).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To study the response of Super in combination with green manures.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M.. (c) As per treatments. (ii) Loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO. 421 (improved). (v) (a) 11 ploughings by desi plough. 3 hoeings by cultivator and 1 hoeing by spade. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) 60, three budded setts/row or 1800 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 25.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1 to 8.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sanai G.M. (controi).
2. Super at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at the time of sowing of sanai.
3. Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at the time of ploughing in of samai.

Sanai sown at 1 md ./ac. on 6.7.1950 by desl plough. Application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and ploughing in of sanai on 30.8.1950 by Punjab plough.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) \(58^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was concucted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RELULTS:
(i) 31.52 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.109 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 30.69 \\
2. & 32.29 \\
3. & 31.57 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.554\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Daurala (Meerut).

Ref:- U.P. 53(282).
Type:- 'M'.

Object:-To study the response of Super with green manures.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai. (c) As per treatments. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Manuring by Okhala slug on 8.4.1953 and manuring by G.N.C. on 22.4.1953. (iv) CO-245 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughings by tractor on 10.12.1952, by desi plough on 22.1.1953 and 6.2.1953. Harrowing by disc harrow on 11.12.1952, making trenches by tractor on 22.2 1952. Hoeing by spade on 14 and 29.5.1953 and 13.6.1953. Hoeing of trenches on 20.2.1953 by spade. Planting of sugarcane by spade on 21.2.1953. Hoeing by cultivator on 23.4.1953, 155.1953 and 1.6.1953. (b) Trench planted. (c) 80, two budded setts/row and 560 two budded setts/plot. (d) Rows \(3 f^{\prime}\) apart. (e) 一. (vi) 21.2.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 19 and 20.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (samai).
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at sowing time of san ai.
3. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) spread at the time of turning of sanai.

Sowing of sanai on 5.7.1952 and turning of samai on 6.9.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

4, GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 20.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.739 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatmert & Av. yield \\
1. & 21.02 \\
2. & 21.58 \\
3. & 20.09 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.526\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Crop: \(:\) Sugarcane & Ref :- U.P. 48(81). \\
Zone :- Modinagar (Meerut).
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the comparative effects of different G.M. with different leguminous crops on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow (control).
2. Guar as G.M.
3. Lobia.
4. Pea.
5. Metha.
6. Sanai.
8. Guar for fodder.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(73^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M)'ion cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 32.25 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.277 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 36.01 \\
2. & 34.49 \\
3. & 28.65 \\
4. & 28.25 \\
5. & 29.52 \\
6. & 37.59 \\
7. & 31.26 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.639\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Sugarcane. Ref :-U.P. 50(215).
Zone :- Simbhaoli (Meerut.) Type :-'M'.

```

Object :-To study the comparative utility of G. M. to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. 421 . improved. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 83, three budded setts/rows. (d) .N.A. (e) -. (vi) 14.2.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (Fallow).
2. Guar à fodder.
3. Lobia.
4. Guar as G.M.
5. Dhaincha.
6. Sanai.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(81^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A: (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 27.33 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.686 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 24.80 \\
2. & 28.18 \\
3. & 26.03 \\
4. & 31.54 \\
5. & 26.03 \\
6. & 27.37 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.343\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 51(199)/50(215).
Type :-' M '.

Object :-To study the comparative utility of different G.M. to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-421 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughing of G.M. on 29.8.1950 by desi plough. Ploughing by praja plough on 15 and 24.9.1950; ploughing by desi plough on 1, 10, 27.10.1951, 5, 10, 22.12.1950 and 21.1.1951; ploughing and planking by dest plough and pata on 15.2.1951; ploughing by desi plough on 26.2.1951. Planking and hoeing. by kassi - on 7.3.1951 and cultivator on 5, 19.4,1951 and 21.5.1951. Spade on 20.4.1951 and 22.5.1951.
(b) Flat planting.
(c) 9 row/plot and 66 three budded setts/row.
(d) N.A. (e) - (vi) 27.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.1.1952 to 6.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (fallow).
2. Dhaincha.
3. Sanai.
4. Guar as G.M.
5. Lobia.
6. Guar as green fodder.

Sowing of G.M. on 7.7.1950 by desi plough and ploughing in of G.M. on 29.8.1950 by desi plough.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c). N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' field.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 29.20 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.601 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Ar. yield \\
1. & 25.29 \\
2. & 30.54 \\
3. & 33.25 \\
4. & 32.27 \\
5. & 27.26 \\
6. & 26.60 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.301\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Ref:-U.P. 52(261)/51(199)/50(215)
Type :-'M'

Object :-To study the comparative utility of G.M.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments: (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) G.N.C. at \(45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on \(9.6 .1952+\) A/S at 15 lb ./ac. of N on 28.6.1952. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by praja plough on 13.9.1951. Ploughing by desi plough on 20, 28.9.1952, 6, 15, 26.10.1950 and 12.11.1952. Ploughing, planking and hoeing by spade on 6.5.1952, 3 times by desi plough and pata on 13 to 15.2.1952. Hoeing by kassi on 20.3.1952. Hoeing by M.C. cultivator on 17.4.1952. (b) Flat system of planting in furrows. (c) 73 three budded setts/row ; 584 setts three budded/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (vi) 16.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 9 to 11.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Dhaincha.
3. Sanal.
4. Guar as G.M.
5. Lobia.
6. Guar as fodder.

Sown on 4.7.1952 by broadcasting. Date of turning is not available.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
- (i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's ficld.
5. RESÚLTS:
(i) 31.65 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.05 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
1. 28.78
2. 30.10
\(3 . \quad 34.50\)
4. . 33.09
\(5 . \quad 31.84\)
\(6 . \quad 31.60\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.525\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Daurala (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 50(216).
Type :-‘M'.

Object :-To study the comparative utility of G.M.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. S. 245 improved. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 77, three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 8.3.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (fallow).
2. Dhaincha as G.M.
3. Guar for G.M.
4. Guar for fodder.
5. Sanai as G.M.
6. Lobia as G.M.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications (iii) (a) \(81^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(75^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination,tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A.
(v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 14.42 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.47 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 10.95 \\
2. & 15.47 \\
3. & 17.11 \\
4. & 13.92 \\
5. & 16.75 \\
6. & 12.33 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.735\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Daurala (Meerut).

Ref :- U.P. 53(281).
Type:-'M'.
- Object :-To study the comparative utility of G.M.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy Loam. (iii) Manuring of 100 md. Ókhla sluge on 30.3.1953. and manuring 24 md . G.N. on 3.5.1953. (iv) CO.S. 321 Improved. (i) (a) Turning in of G.M. on 17.8.1952 by tractor. Ploughing by tractor on 5.12 .1952 ; ploughing by desi plough on 8 and 24.12.1952. Making of trenches on 14 to 18.1 .1952 by tractor. Spade hoeing of trenches on 29, 30.1.1953: (b) Trench planted. (c) 77 two budded setts/row or 616 two budded setts/plot. (d) Row \(3 y^{\prime}\) apart. (e) --. (vi) 4.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Fallow.
2. Guar as G.M.
3. Guar for seed.
4. Sanal.
5. Dhaincha.
6. Lobia.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) L. Sq. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 26.4^{\circ}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 20.4^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Experlment in 1951 vitiated and in 1952 it was not conducted. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS ;
(i) 25.85 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.728 ton'/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & .29 .46 \\
2. & 23.29 \\
3. & 24.61 \\
4. & 27.90 \\
5. & 24.56 \\
6. & 25.27 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.114\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :-Bilari (Moradabad).

Ref :- U.P. 49(165).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (b) Sanai as G.M. top dressing of A/S 2 md . on 14.7.1949. (iv) CO-527 (early) (improved). (v) (a) Ploughings by victory plough on 17.8.1949; four ploughings by Athens harrow (tractor) and one by M.C. cultivator on 4.3.1949. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distance in lines. (e) - (vi) 3.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings by Cawnpore cultivator and kassi. (ix) \(39.8^{\circ}\). (x) 9 to 11.1.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(\mathrm{No} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\).
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at planting time.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{*}\) deep at planting time.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and yield of sugarcanc. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. Yield of treatment 2 missing in replication 5 and was estimated. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 18.63 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.143 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment effects are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 16.87 \\
2. & 20.17 \\
3. & 18.84 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.467\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of the difference between the mean of \((2)\) and \((1)\) or \((3) \quad=0.62\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}


Ref :-U.P.48(70).

Object :- To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow after Sanai G.M. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai (G.M.) ; as per treatments. (iv) CO-S27 (early) (improved). (v) (a) Victory plough twice from July to last week of February 1948; ploughings by Gurjar plough and desi plough (twice) after rains on 12 and 13,2.1948. (b) Flat planted by desi plough. (c) 1755 buds/plot. (d) Rows 3' apart(e) -. (vi) 15.3.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings by M.C. cultivator on 12.4 .1948 ; 15.5.1948; Hoeing by kassi on 30.6.1948. (ix) \(39.80^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. \(\mathrm{No} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. 40 lb .iac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep.

Treatment applied on 13.8.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D, with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\).(b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. Plot wise data was not available. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S)on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.68 ton/ac.
(ii) N.A.
(iii) Treatment effects are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 19.73 \\
2. & 22.02 \\
3. & 23.28 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\) N.A.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 50(218).
Type :-' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai. (iv) COS-245 (improved). (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 66, threc budded setts/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 12.3.1950. (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) 1 to 6.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure).
(1) 2 methods of application: \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied \(3^{\boldsymbol{\prime}}-\mathbf{4}^{\boldsymbol{\prime}}\) deep in furrows.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yieid. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's fiela.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.33 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.663 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{P}\), interaction \(\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{P}\), control vs. treated effects are highly significant. Main effect of \(\mathbf{M}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=16.74\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{r|cc|} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 17.80 & 20.70 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 24.82 & 21.58 \\
\hline Mean & 21.31 & 21.14 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad=0.210\) ton/ac.
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=0.297\) ton/ac.

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :- U.P. 51(195)/50(218).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object: - To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanal. (iv) CO.245 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor on 7 to 9.3.1951. Ploughing by desi plough on 10.3.1951. Hoeing by kassi on 9.3.1951 and 5.4.1951. Hocing by M.C. cultivator on 27-4.1951 and 1.6.1951. Hoeing by phawara on 28.4.1951, 2.6.1951 and 5.8.1951. (b) Flat system of planting. (d) 75, three budded setts/row or 1575 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) 一. (vi) 10.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15 to 19.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure)
(1) 2 methods of application : \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) broadcast and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) applied \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep in furrows.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replicptions. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germinatton, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NiL. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 24.21 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.123 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(P, M\) and control w. treated are highly significant, The interaction \(M \times P\) is not significant.
(iv) Ay. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control-21.07 tonfac.
\begin{tabular}{l|l|l} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 25.22 & 22.82 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 26.39 & 25.57 \\
\hline Mean & 25.80 & 24.20 \\
24.02 \\
25.98 \\
\hline 25.00
\end{tabular}

> S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table \(=0.324\) ton/ac.
\[
=0.459 \text { ton/ac. }
\]

Crop :-Sugarcane
Zone :-Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref:- U.P. 52(267)/51(195)/50(218).
Type :- 'M'.

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Sanai., \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 21.7.1952 and 20 lb ./ac. of N on 19.8.1952. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) 3 ploughings by tractor and 3 by desi plough. Hoeing by kassl on 3.5.1952, 13-5.1952 and 6.6.1962. Hoeing by M.C. cultivator on 12.5.1952. and 66.1952 . Hocing by spade on 4.7.1052 (b) Flat system. (c) 68 , three budded/setts row, 584 , three budded setts/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\circ}\) apart. (vi) 6.4.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.3.1953 to 2.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control (no manure).
(1) 2 methods of application : \(M_{1}=\) manure broadcast and \(M_{2}=\) manure applied \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime}\) deep in furrows.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(66^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(60^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (x) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment pas conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator'g field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.05 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.671 ton/ac.
(iii) The interaction \(\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{P}\) and control \(v s\). treated are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Control \(=24.53\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 24.67 & 25.56 & 25.12 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P a}_{2}\) & 25.51 & 24.98 & 25.24 \\
\hline Mean & 25.09 & 25.27 & - 25.18 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(S_{2}\) E. of any marginal mean
\(=0.194\) ton/ac.
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=0.274\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Zone :- Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 52(265).
Type:-‘M'.

Object:-To study the response of Super in combination with green manure (Samai).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. at \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (c) As per treatments. (ii) Loam. (iii) A/S at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\) on 19.7.1952 and \(A / S\) at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 21.8.1952. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ploughings 4 by tractor, 2 by desi plough, Sowing by desi plough. Hoeing by kassi on 2.5.1952, 11.5.1952 and 28.6.1952. Hoeing row by M.C. cultivator on 11.5.1952, 7.6.1952 and 28.6.1952. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) 60 three budded/setts. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (vi) 2.4.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14 and 15.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Scnai (control).
2. \(60 \mathrm{lo} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at sowing time of sanai.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) spread over the crop of sanai at the time of ploughing of samai.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (ii) N.A. (iii) (a) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) (a) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's. field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.54 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.064 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 24.05 \\
2. & 25.59 \\
3. & 26.98 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.532\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}


\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane.}

Ref:- U.P. 48(82).
Zone :-Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar).
Type :- 'M'.
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Super at 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. Super at 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at tillering time.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D., wth 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 29.53 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.809 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Avi yieid of sugarcane in ton/ac.
1.) Treatment : Av. yield
inis.: Av. 27.86
2.
3. \begin{tabular}{l}
29.63 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.330\) ton/ac.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 48(84). } \\
\text { Zone :- Shamli (Muzaffarnagar). } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No Super (control).
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as Super in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep.

Super applied at tillering time.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D., with 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(60^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 35.57 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.277 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
1. . 27.55
2. 37.59
3. , 41.58 S.E./mean \(\quad=0.521\) ton/ac.
Crop:- Sugarcane. \(\quad\) Ref:- U.P. 53(280).
Zone:- Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar). \(\quad\) Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the comparative effect of different G. M. on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 245 (improved). (v) (a) N.A. (b) Flat system. (c) 32, three budded setts/row or 768, three budded setts/plot. (d) Rows 3' aparto -(e). (vi) 8.3.1953. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. ' (ix) N.A. (x) 25.2.1954 to 28.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow.
2. Lobia green manure.
3. Guar green fodder.
4. Guar green manure.
5. Sanai.
6. Dhaincha.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was cenducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESURTS:
(i) 31.70 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.732 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.49 \\
2. & 30.88 \\
3. & 33.24 \\
4. & 34.28 \\
5. & 35.32 \\
6. & 29.97 \\
S.E /mean & -1.932 ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Rohána Kalan (Muzaffarnagar).

```
Ref :-U.P. 49(178).
Type :-'M'.

Object:-To find out the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) alone and in combination on the yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Dokar-heavy clay loam, (type IV) \(\mathbf{p H}\) for the zone 5.95 . (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 22.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16 to 18.2.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Niu. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17.84 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.083 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac:
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(: P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{\mathbf{8}}\) & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Mean } \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 15.56 & 14.28 & 15.82 & 15.22 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 18.78 & 18.43 & 18.53 & 18.58 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 20.06 & 20.33 & 18.74 & 19.71 \\
\hline Mean & 18.13 & 17.68 & 17.70 & 17.84
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.491 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & =0.850 \text { ton/ac. }\end{array}\)

Crop :mSugarcane.
Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 50(217).
Type :-'M’.

Object :-To study the comparative effect of green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treeatments. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO-421 (improved). (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 92 three budded setts/rcw. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 8.3.1950. (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow (control).
2. Sanai as G.M.
3. Guar as G.M.
4. Dhaincho as G.M.
5. Lobia as G.M.
6. Guar removed for fodder with roots left and supplemented by F.Y.M. at 50 md ./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D.with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(90^{\circ} \times 31 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\). (b) \(84^{\prime} \times 25 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.86 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.127 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 13.94 \\
2. & 16.97 \\
3. & & 16.09 \\
4. & 16.12 \\
5. & 16.90 \\
6. & 15.15 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.064\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 51(200)50/(217).
Type :-'M':

Object :-To study the comparative effect of different green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-421 (improved).
(v) (a) N.A. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) 55 three budded setts/row or 1155 buds/plot. (d) N.A.
(c) -. (vi) 6 and 7.3.1951. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow.
2. Dhaincha.
3. Sanai.
4. Guar for fodder.
5. Guar for G.M.
6. Lobia.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) \(53^{\prime} \times 24 \frac{1}{1}^{\prime}\). (b) \(47^{\prime} \times 18 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) .1950-1953. (but experiment not conducted in 1952). (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expertment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 12.61 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.615 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.66 \\
2. & 10.90 \\
3. & 1386 \\
4. & 13.12 \\
S. & 13.17 \\
6. & 14.95 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.808\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzafiarnagar).
Ref :-U.P.49(177).
Type :-‘' \({ }^{\prime}\).
Object :-To find out the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) a lone and in combinations on the yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domat-Loamy soil (type IV) medium in texture, light grey to yellowish grey in colour. Averag: \(\mathrm{pH}=6.61\). (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 20.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.2.1950 to 8.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{6}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
\(A / S\) applied before sowing on 20.3.1949. Super applied on 10.8 .1949 with earthing.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(51^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 31.07 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.476 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & P0 & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 24.40 & 24.23 & 24.97 & 24.53 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 29.05 & 30.43 & 31.84 & 30.44 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 35.21 & 35.28 & 44.27 & 38.25 \\
\hline Mean & 29.55 & 29.98 & 33.69 & 31.07 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.291 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =2.236 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref : }: \text { U.P. 49(176). } \\
\text { Zone :- Shamly (Muzaffarnagar) } & \text { Type :- ‘M’. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To find out the effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) alone and in combinations on the yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Rasili-Sandy loam (type IV) \(\mathrm{pH}=7.4\), moisture \(=0.85 \%\), coarse sand \(=0.87 \%\), fine sand \(=54.41 \%\), silt \(=27.08 \%\) and clay \(=14.21 \%\). (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 23.3.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\),
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

A/S applied on 23.3.1949. before planting. Single Super applied on 12.8.1949. with earthing
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. 3 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 32.40 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 5.406 ton/ac.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 28.44 & 24.29 & 30.56 & 27.76 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 30.29 & 32.79 & 31.97 & 31.68 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 33.78 & 38.18 & 41.33 & 37.76 \\
\hline Mean & 30.84 & 31.75 & 34.62 & 32.40
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
\(=1.274\) ton/ac.
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=2.207\) ton/ac.

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Khatuali (Muzaffarnagar),

Ref :- U.P 49(175).
Type: -‘M’.

Object :-To find out the-effect of N and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) alone and in combination on the yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Rausri clay loam, (type IV). (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) 19.3.1949. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2).
(1) 3 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

A/S applied on 19.3.1949 before planting. Single Super on 13.7.1949 with earthing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) \(3 \times 3^{\prime}\) Fact. in R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(51^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nile (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 36.60 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.517 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcanc in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N o}_{0}\) & 30.55 & 32.80 & 32.37 & 31.91 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 36.87 & 36.81 & 37.03 & 36.90 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 41.79 & 39.67 & 41.54 & 41.00 \\
\hline Mean & 36.40 & 36.43 & 36.98 & 36.60 \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of taEle} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.065 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.844 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-Kichha (Nainital).}

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 50(165).}

Type: \({ }^{〔} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO.453. (v) (a) Ploughing by disc plough on 12.1950, Turning in of sanai on 31.8.1949, ploughing by harr:w plough on 13.10.1949, and on 17.10.1949. Hoeing by kasst on 7 and 8.2.1950 and 4 and 5.6.1950 and pata 5 and 6.6.1950. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1440 budds./plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 25.3.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii; N.A. (ix) \(60^{\circ}\). (x) 20.3.1951.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in furrows before planting.

Manuring on 25.3.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.,D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S). on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS : .
(i) 29.26 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.28 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.34 \\
2. & 31.04 \\
3. & 30.39 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.93\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop : Sugarcane.
,Zone :-Kichha (Nainital).

Ref :- U.P. 51(154)/50(165).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) N.A. (il) Clay loam. (iii) F.Y.M. at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 11.1.1951. (iv) CO.453. (v) (a) Ploughing by desi plough on 26, 27.12.1950. Ploughing by harrow on 25.2.1951. and 26.2.1951. (twice). Ploughing on 1.3.1951 and one by pata on 28.3 1951. 4 hoeing by kassi on 10.4.1951, 30.4.1951, and 1.5 .1951 and 25.5 .1951 . by cultivator on 17.5.1951. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1752 budds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) \(\rightarrow\) (vi) 13.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(50^{\circ}\). (x) 6, 7.4.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no manure).
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 60 Jb ./ac. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied \(3^{n}-4^{n}\) deep in furrows before planting.

Manure applied on 13.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D., with 6 replications (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1951\). (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 35.75 ton/ac.
(ii) 8.62 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 34.40 \\
2. & 36.65 \\
3. & 36.19 \\
S.E./mean & \(=3.51\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- (Nainital).
Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A, (b) Dhaincha as G.M. (c) No. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) G.N.C. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 9.2 .1952 . A/S top dressing at" 45 lb ./ac. of N Dhaincha turned in on 14.6 .1952 and \(G\) N.C. at 40 lb ./ac. on 21.5.1952. (iv) CO 453 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughings by Athens' plough on 20, 21.7.1951, Sowing of Dhanicha on 28.7.1951. Dhaincha turned in on 23 to 25.1.1951. by disc plough, ploughing by Athen's plough on 19.2-1951. by dise plough on 6, 7.1.1952, Dise harrow on 22.1.1952, pata on 20.12.1951, 23.1.1952. Picking of grass on 12.1.1952. Hoeing by kassi on 6 to 9.3.1952, by cultivator on 5.4.1952, and on 26.5.1952. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 73 three-budded setts/line. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 12.2.1252. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(50^{\circ}\). (x) 31.3.1953 to 2.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
2. 120 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 120 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep before planting.

Manure applied on 21.5.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(90^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}\). (b) \(84^{\circ} \times 12^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \(\%\) and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. . (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 27.65 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.412 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 28.66 \\
2. & 27.60 \\
3. & 26.70 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.393\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane,
Zone :- Kichha (Nainital).

Ref:-U.P. 53(236).
Type :- \({ }^{\mathbf{M}}\) ?

Object : -To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) Sanai as G.M. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (ii) Clayey loam. (iii) Spreading G.N.C. + A/S at 30 lb /ac. of N on \(\mathbf{1 2 . 2}\).1953. (iv) CO-453. (v) (a) 3 hoeings by cultivator on 10.4.1953, by kassi on 4.5 .1953 by cultivator on 25.5.1953 ; turning in of Sanai on 8.9.1952, ploughing by Athens plough on 10.5.1952, 5 to 7.2.1952, ploughing by 19-B harrow on \(\mathbf{2 0 . 1 0 . 1 9 5 2}\) and 8.2.1953, ploughing by dest plough on 12, 13.12.1952 and 27 to 29.1.1953. (b) Flat sowing, ridge drawn by tractor. (c) and (d) N.A. (e)-. (vi) 13.2.195.. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(35^{\prime \prime}\). ( \(x\) ) 17 to 18.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. No manure.
2. \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 120 lb ./ac. broadcast in the field before planting.
3. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at 120 lb ./ac. applied \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep before planting.

Super applied on 12.2. 1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \%, tillers count and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.19 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.09 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments do.not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.90 \\
2. & 23.42 \\
3. & 23.25 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.26\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Kichha (Nainital).

Ref :-U.P. 53(231). Type :-'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to applications of Super in combination with green manure.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) Clayey loam. (iii) Press mud at \(20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 9, 13.9.1952 spreading of groundnut cake and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 30 lb ./ac. of N on 10.2.1953. (iv) CO.453. (v) (a) 3hoeings with cultivator on 8.4.1953 and 24.5.1953 kassi on 10.5.1953. Sanal turned in by Athens plough on 8.9.1952 7 ploughings by Athens plough 19-B harrow and disc plough. (b) Flat sowing, ridges drawn by tractor. (c) and (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 10.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(50^{\circ}\). ( \(x\) ) 13 to 15.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Sanai green manure (control).
2. Super at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at the time of sowing Sanal.
3. Super at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at the time of ploughing in of Sanai.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(90^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(90^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \%, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) \(1953-1956\) (not in 1954). (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 37.82 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.04 ton/ac.
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 36.05 \\
2. & 38.42 \\
3. & 39.00 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.83\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 50(162). \\
\hline . Zone :- Kichha (Nainital). & Type :- 'M'. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the comparative effect of different green manures on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam (medium). (iii) Nil. (iv) CO, 453. (v) (a) 3 hocings by kassi on 12.3.1950, 29, 30.3.1950 and 12.6.1950, ploughing by desi plough on 12, 13.5.1949, ploughing by cultivator on 30, 31.5.1949, sowing of G.M. (kharif) on 29.6.1949, ploughing by bullock cultivator on 30.6.1949, and turning of G.M. on 31.8.1949 and 14.9.1949, ploughing by harrow plough on 13.10.1949, ploughing by cultivator Athens (twice on 10.4.1949), sowing of G.M. (rabi), mixing and harrow twice on 7.2.1950, pata on 18.2.1950 and harrow and pata on 10.11:1949, turning in of rabi green manure on 22.1.1950. (b) Flat planting with ridger. (c) 1440 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) 13.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(60^{\circ}\) ( (x) 18.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Sanai.
2. Dhaincha.
3. Pea.
4. Pea root +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
5. Pea \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
6. Mustard.
7. Fallow.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(60^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \(\%\) and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.31 ton/ac.
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 23.43 \\
2. & 23.82 \\
3. & 21.38 \\
4. & 21.61 \\
5. & 22.86 \\
6. & 19.36 \\
7. & 20.84 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.16\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone:- Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref:- U.P. 49(150).
Type :- 'M'.
\(: 1\)

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) 250 mds./sac. press mud. applied from 6 to 10.2.1949. (iv) CO. 186 (medium) (improved). (v) (a) Ploughings by plough and Meston on 10, 16, 17.3.1949, 16 and 19.4.1949, 4 hoeings by kudall and cultivator after planting. (b). Flat planted with ridge making plough. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) 一. (vi) 26.4.1949. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(40^{\circ}\). ( \(x\) ) 12 and 15.12.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. 60 lb ./aci of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as broadcast at the time of planting.
3. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep at the time of planting.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 10.54 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.511 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 10.64 \\
2. & 10.84 \\
3. & 10.14 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.025\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref :- U.P. 50(164)/49(150).
Type: \(\boldsymbol{\sim}^{\prime} \mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BȦSAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Top dressing mixture of Mahua cake and A/S at 10 mds. per acre on 29.5.1950. (iv) CO. 453. (v) (a) Ploughings by Meston plough on 28.1.1950, by Zamindar plough on 1, 2 and 23.2.1950. Pata by búllock on 4 and 13.3.1950. 6 hoeings by kudali cultivator on 4. 12 and 31.3.1950, 18.4.1950, 5.5.1950 and 5 to 8.6.1950 (b) N.A. (c) 1728 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 24.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. '(viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21.1.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control (no manure).
2. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{9} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied broadcast before planting.
3. \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) drilled \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{n}\) deep in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN:
(i),(ii) R.B.D. with 4. replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yicld. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 40.04 ton;ac.
(ii) 4.40 ton/ac.
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugareane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 38.80 \\
2. & 41.30 \\
3. & 40.03 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.20\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :-U.P. 48(67), \\
Zone :- Maholi (Sita pur), & Type :-'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1: BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Urd. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Groundnut at 9 mds. 15 srs, on 18.3.1948, Top dressing of A/S at 2 mds. 22 srs. on 17.5.1948. (iv) CO. 453 (late). (v) (a) Gurjar plough, twice on 1.2.1948, desi plough twice on 5.3.1948. twice on 27.3.1948, once on 31.3.1948 and once on 1.4.1948. 6 hoeings on 11 and 23.4.1948, 17 and 20.5.1948, 24.6.1948 and 3.7.1948. Earthing up on 5.7.1948. (b) Flat sowing behind the des' plough. (c) 1680 buds/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart (e) -. (vi) 1.4.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) \(30^{\circ}\). (x) 20.3.1949 to 15.4.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No manure.
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep.

Super applied on 1.4.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 45.86 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.586 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 41.09 \\
2. & 45.66 \\
3. & 50.84 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.056\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref :- U.P. 48(66).
Type :- 'M'。

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanaj for green manuring. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanal and mixture of castor cake and A/S at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (iv) CO-421 (medium). Improved. (v) (a) Desi plough on 29.4.1947, gurjar plough on 31.8.1947, Zamindar on 9.11.1947; desl plough on 10.11.1947. Mecomic cultivator applied 3 times, hand hoeings 4 times. (b) Flat sowing by spade. (c) 2880 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 12.11.1947. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(40^{\circ}\). (x) 14 and 15.3.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. \(0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{4 \prime}\) deep.
3. 80 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Ammo. Phos. applied on 11.7 .1948 by top dressing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 24.63 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.777 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 27.74. \\
2. & 23.68 \\
3. & 22.47 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.889\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref :- U.P. 51(152).
Type:-‘M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-527. (v) (a) 5 hocings by cultivator and kudali on 21.10.1950, 20, 26.11.1950, 27.2.1951 and 29.4.1951. (b) Sown fat behind the ridge maker. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) - . (vi) 15.10 .1950 . (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 20.1.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no manure).
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast before planting.
3. 60 b ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{3}\) in furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications, (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\circ}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination percentage and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.18 too/ac.
(ii) 2.30 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 12.83 \\
2. & 13.60 \\
3. & 13.11 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.93\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Ref:-U.P. 52(242).
Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur).
Type :-'M'.
Object:-To find out the effect of different doses of \(N\) on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) Domat (type IV loam). (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-527 (improved). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 30.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
2. \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. \(80 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
4. \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
5. \(160 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
6. 200 lb //ac. cf N.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), 子rd dose applied on 30.3.1950.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(81^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yield of two plots containing treatments \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(160 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N were missing and therefore analysis was done by applying missing plot technique. (vii) The experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cyltivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(7.92 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 2.602 tod/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
Treatment & Av. yield & \\
1. & 8.50 \\
2. & 9.03 \\
3. & 7.91 \\
4. & 6.47 & \\
5. & 6.94 & \\
6. & 8.66 & \\
S.E./mean not containing missing treatment & \(=1.301\) ton/ac. \\
S.E./mean containing missing treatment & \(=1.539\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur). \\ Ref:-U.P. 52(243).}

Type:-'M'.
Object :-To find out the effect of different doses of \(\mathbf{N}\) on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) Domat (type (II loam). (iii) 9 C.L. of compost. (iv) CO-527 (improved). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 21.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 7.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. 0 lb /ac. of N .
2. \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. \(80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
4. 120 lb ./ac. of N .
5. \(160 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
6. \(200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
\(\mathbf{N}\) as \(\mathbf{A} / \mathrm{S}\), \(\frac{1}{\text { fod }}\) of \(\mathbf{N}\) applied on 21.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(81^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL;
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 34.50 ton/ac.
(ii) 8.547 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 19.74 \\
2. & 32.98 \\
3. & 36.39 \\
4. & 37.27 \\
5. & 41.15 \\
6. & 39.50 \\
S.E./mean & \(=4.274\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref.-U.P.52(210). \\
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur). & \(\ddots\)
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find out the effect of different doses of \(\mathbf{N}\) on Sugarcane.
a. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Matya type IV loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. 527 . (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 28.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N .
2. \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. 80 lb ./ac. of N .
4. 120 lb ./ac. of N .
5. 160 lb ./ac. of N .
6. 200 lb ./ac. of N .
of the total \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) applied on 28.3.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(70^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\) (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i)N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 11.00 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 2.69 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
1. 5.46
2. 9.40
3. 12.90
\(4 . \quad 12.82\)
5.14 .04
\(6 . \quad 11.38\)
S.E./mean \(=1.35\) ton/ac.

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref :-U.P. 52(209).
Type:-'M.

Object : To find out the effect of different doses of N on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Domat type IV (loam). (iv) Co 527. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) 26.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10, 11.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS
1. 0 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\).
2. 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\).
3. \(80 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\).
4. 120 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\).
5. 160 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\).
6. 200 Ib ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\).

Manuring on 26.3.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(70^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS
(i) 34.72 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.01 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments differ highly significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield. \\
1, & 27.13 \\
2. & 28.09 \\
3. & 33.03 \\
4. & 40.53 \\
5. & 35.68 \\
6. & 43.89 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.50\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 52(208).
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur).
Type :-‘M’.
Object :-To find out the effect of different doses of \(\mathbf{N}\) on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) Domat II (type loam). (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. 527. (v) (a) to (c) N.A.
(vi) 25.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16, 17 and 18.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. No manure.
2. 40 lb ./ac. of N .

3: 80 lb ./ac. of N .
4. 120 lb ./ac. of N .
5. 160 lb ./ac. of N .
6. 200 lb ./ac. of N .
\(\$\) of the total N applied on 25.3.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) 4 replications laid out but some plots harvested by the cultivator, so 2 replications are taken for analysis. (iii) (a) \(70^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.-
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 56.59 ton/ac.
(ii) 20.95 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatmints do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.48 \\
2. & 35.48 \\
3. & 49.04 \\
4. & 60.53 \\
. & 70.03 \\
6. & 97.97 \\
S.E.jmean & \(=14.82\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref :~ U.P. 52(207).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To find out the effect of different doses of \(N\) on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDIIIO NS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) D נmat (type II loam). (iii) Nil. (iv) CO. 527. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 24.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 12, 13 and 14.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No manure.
2. \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
3. 80 lb ./ac. of N .
4. \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
5. \(160 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \mathrm{o}^{\circ} \mathrm{N}\).
6. 200 lb ./ac, of N.

Date of manuring 24.3.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(81^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 49.08 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.29 ton/ac.
(iii) The treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 44.17 \\
2. & 49.51 \\
3. & 45.28 \\
4. & 51.66 \\
5. & 51.69 \\
6. & 52.14 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.14\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Ref:- U.P. 51(149).
Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super in combination with manures.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) As per treatments. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO. 453 (late), (improved). (v) (a) Ploughings by meston plough (four times) on 29.9.1950, and 8.10.1950, hoeings by kudall and cultivator on 15.10.1950, 7.11.1950, 26.11.1950, 12.2.1951,14.5.1951 and 26.1.1951. (b) Flat sowing behind ridge. (c) 1215 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e)-. (vi) 9.10.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.11.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sanai green manure (control).
2. Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at the time of sowing sciai.
3. Super at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at the time of ploughing in of sanai.

Application of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) to treatment 2 on 28.6.1950 and treatment 5 on 13.8.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(81^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(75^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \(\%\) and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A: (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S). on cultivators' feids.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 22.96 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.051 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 23.36 \\
2. & 24.94 \\
3. & 20.59 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.062\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref :- U.P. 51(150).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane to Super in combination with green manures:
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) As per treatments. (ii) Loam. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) CO. 527 (early, improved). (v) (a) N.A. (b) Flat sowing behind ridge. (c) 1206 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e)-. (vi) 10.10.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Sanai green manure (control).
2. Super at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast at the time of sowing of sanai.
3. Super at 60 lb -/ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) applied at the time of ploughing in of sanai.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. ( \(\$\) ) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.07 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.87 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences, are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc}
\multicolumn{2}{l}{ Av. yield of sugarcaac in } \\
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1.. & 15.21 \\
2. & 15.79 \\
3. & 14.22 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.58\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 51(283).
Site :- Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad. Type ::‘MV’.
Object:-To test three types of manures on two varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A.. (b) Juar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Deep loam soils. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 12 to 14.2.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(36.78^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO}-331, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO}-453\).
Sub-plot treatments :
4 manures : \(\mathrm{M}_{0}=\) No manure (control), \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{M}_{3}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as castor cake, \(\mathrm{M}_{3}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as farm compost.
Farm compost applied on 31.1.1951, castor cake on 2.2.1951 and A/S on 3.2.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(100^{\prime} \times 144^{\prime}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(100^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(109^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side of the net plot left as non-experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Field record register and the "Allahabad Farmer" were consulted. Experiment conducted by the Head, Agronomy Department, Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.64 , ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.387 ton/ac.
(b) 2.653 ton/ac.
(iii) Control vs. manures differs significantly. Interaction between varieties and control \(\nu \mathrm{v}\). manures is highly significant. Main effects of varieties and source of N are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline - & \(\mathbf{M o}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{4}\) & M3 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 25.39 & 26.68 & 24.01 & 24.09 & 25.04 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 20.44 & 28.84 & 23.76 & 25.90 & 26.24 \\
\hline Mean & 22.92 & 27.76 & 26.88 & 25.00 & 25.64 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=2.199\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(M\) & \(=1.532\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(M\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=2.166\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(V\) means at a level of \(M\) & \(=2.891\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:-Sugarcane (Ratoon).
Ref :- U.P. 52(326).
Site :- Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad. Type :-'MV'.

```

Object:-To test three types of manures on two varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane (plant cane). (c) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as A/S, Castorcake and F.Y.M. there being also one control plot in each main-plot. (ii) (a) Deep loam soils. (b) Refer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 30.08. (x) 12.10.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(\mathbf{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C O} .331\) and \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C O} .453\).
Sub-plot treatments :
4 manures: \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{C}}=\) No manure (control), \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=109\). lb ./ac. of N as G.N.C. and \(M_{3}=100 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N as F.Y.M.
Manures applied as top dressing from 6 to 8.8.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(144^{\prime} \times 100^{\prime}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(100^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(94^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end . (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Field Record Register and the "Allababad Farm" were consulted. Experiment conducted by the Head, Agronomy Department, Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.
5. RESULTS :
(i). 13.58 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.753 ton/ac.
(b) 3.193 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrrr} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{3}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 15.55 & 13.35 & 14.41 & 14.24 \\
\(V_{1}\) & 9.87 & 16.25 & 13.25 & 11.73 \\
\hline Mean & 12.71 & 14.80 & 13.83 & 12.98 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(V\)
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =2.349 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.844 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =2.607 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =3.258 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]
2. marginal means of \(M\)
3. \(M\) means at a level of \(V\)
4. \(V\) means at a level of \(M\)
Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Begumabad (Meerut).

Ref:-U.P. 53(269).
Type :- 'MV'.
Object :-To find the optimum manurial combinaticn of \(N\) and \(P\) fcr different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Methi. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) F.Y.M. at 150 mds./ac. applied on 2.2.1953. (iv) Dakar -heavy loam type IV/II. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 72, 3 budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 9.3.1953. (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) 21 and 22.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421, V_{2}=C O .245\) and \(V_{3}=C O .321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), \(\frac{1}{1}\) dose on 9.3.1953 and \(\frac{8}{3}\) dose on 17.6.1953. \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super (full dose) on 9.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which X component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(72^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are:
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}\) & \(8^{\prime \prime}-23^{\prime \prime}\) & \(23^{\prime \prime}-43^{\prime \prime}\) & \(43^{\prime \prime}-73^{\prime \prime}\) \\
C/N & 11.7 & 5.5 & 6.7 & 7.8 \\
pH & 7.8 & 7.6 & 7.3 & 7.8
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 42.14 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.422 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =1.141 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of any table } & =1.976 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]
Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Bégumabad (Meerut).

Ref:- U.P. 53(270).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{m}^{〔} \mathbf{M V}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) for different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) Sewsa loam type IV. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 60 3-budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 5.5.1953. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421, V_{2}=C O .245\) and \(V_{3}=C O .321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \frac{1}{3}\) dose on \(5 \cdot 3.1953\) and dose on 16.6 .1953. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super (full dose) on 5.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication, in which \(Y\) component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (i) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}\) & \(8^{\prime \prime}-20^{\circ}\) & \(20^{\prime \prime}-32^{\prime \prime}\) & \(32^{\prime \prime}-42^{\prime \prime}\) & \(42^{\prime \prime}-56^{\circ}\) & \(56^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 5.6 & 6.42 & 6.50 & 5.50 & 5.55 & 5.0 \\
pH & 6.8 & 6.5 & 6.5 & 6.5 & 6.6 & 6.7
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivator's field. The cultivators have been reported to have been secretly applying heavy doses of \(A / S\) to experimental plots for getting bumper yield.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 37.34 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.652 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.551\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=2.686\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Begumabad (Meerut).

Ref:- U.P. 53(271).
Type:- 'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for diferent varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A.
(ii) Sandy loam (type IV). (iii)
(x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C O} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathbf{C O} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathbf{C O} .321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\}\) dose just at planting and \(\frac{1}{3}\) dose in June and full dose of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super in March. No details regarding actual date of application is available.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication. Z component of VNP interaction is totally confounded. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 45.38\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-7^{\prime \prime}\) & \(7^{\circ}-16^{\circ}\) & \(16^{\prime \prime}-30^{\circ}\) & \(30^{\circ \prime}-43^{\prime \prime}\) & \(43^{\circ}-58^{\prime \prime}\) & \(52^{\prime \prime}-72^{\circ}\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 8.2 & 5.4 & 5.6 & 4.4 & 5.7 & 5.0 \\
pH & 7.0 & 7.8 & 6.6 & 6.7 & 7.5 & 6.9
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 37.69 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.012 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of V and N are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mead & \(\boldsymbol{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 35.50 & 37.84 & 38.75 & 37.36 & 36.70 & 37.63 & 37.77 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 37.01 & 42.85 & 43.50 & 41.12 & 42.66 & 38.86 & 41.84 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 32.45 & 34.89 & 36.41 & 34.58 & 34.47 & 33.83 & 35.45 \\
\hline Mean & 34.99 & 38.53 & 39.55 & 37.69 & 37.94 & 36.77 & 38,35 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P O}_{0}\) & 34.19 & 38.91 & 40.73 & & - & - & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 34.25 & . 37.43 . & 38.63 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 36.52 & 39.25 & 39.30 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =1.004 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of any table } & =1.739 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane.}

Zone :-Beguambad (Meerut).

Ref :- U.P. 53(272).
Type:- 'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CO VDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Urid. (c) N.A. (ii) Domat (sandy loam to loam soil). (iii) 225 mds./ac. of F.Y.M. on 8.2.1953. (iv) Improved varieties. (v) (a) Hoeing by kassi-1 and hoeings by spade-4. No actual date available. (b) N.A. (c) 60 3-budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 8.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18 and 25.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=C 0.321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S} \frac{3}{3}\) dose on`8.3.1953 and \(\frac{2}{3}\) dose on 17.6 .1953 and full dose of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super on 8.5.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in one replication. \(Z\) componet of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-18^{\prime \prime}\) & \(18^{\prime \prime}-19^{\prime \prime}\) & \(19^{\circ} \ldots 35^{\circ}\) & \(35^{\prime \prime}-49^{\circ}\) & \(49^{\circ}-72^{\circ}\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 11.4 & 5.3 & 5.3 & 9.1 & 8.1 \\
pH & 6.9 & 6.9 & 6.9 & 6.8 & 6.8
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 34.79 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.795 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) and interaction \(\mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{N}\) are highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}\) is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 32.40 & 31.43 & 36.63 & 33.49 & 30.86 & 35.06 & 34.54 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 28.51 & 39.35 & 35.76 & 34.54 & 34.85 & 34.10 & 34.68 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{3}\) & 31.49 & 38.11 & 39.42 & 36.34 & 35.20 & 37.81 & 36.00 \\
\hline Mean & 30.80 & 36.30 & 37.27 & 34.79 & 33.64 & 35.66 & 35.07 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 29.36 & 35.67 & - 35.88 & & & . & - \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 34.53 & 37.21 & 3523 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{Pa}_{8}\) & 28.52 & 36.01 & 40.70 & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of any table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.598 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =1.036 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Begumabad (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 53(274).
Type:- ‘MV’.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam to loam (type IV). (iii) 225 mds ./ac. of F.Y.M. applied in April 1953. (iv) Improved variety. (v) (a) Preparation of mendhs and barhas on 23.4.1953. Ploughing by desi plough. Howing by kassi spade and desi plough. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 29.3.1953. (vii) Palewa on 20.3.1953. Irrigation by canal. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) CO. 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{8}=\) CO.321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \frac{1}{1}\) dose on 29.3.1953 and \(\frac{1}{2}\) dose on 18.6.1953. Full dose of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super on 23.4.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication. \(Z\) component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 44 \mathrm{ac}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) 4 plots were seriously damaged by white ants. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-8^{\circ}\) & \(8^{*}-22^{\circ}\) & \(22^{\prime \prime}-59^{\prime \prime}\) & \(59^{\prime \prime}-72^{\circ}\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 9.20 & 8.71 & 6.28 & 5.62 \\
pH & 7.1 & 6.9 & 6.8 & 6.7
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.81 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.759 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects and interactions are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 14.81 & 16.13 & 15.62 & 15.52 & 16.74 & 14.70 & 15.11 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 13.59 & 18.77 & 23.37 & 18.58 & 17.53 & 16.26 & 21.93 \\
\hline V3 & 14.47 & 15.39 & 19.16 & 16.34 & 21.10 & 7.97 & 19.96 \\
\hline Mean & 14.29 & 16.76 & 19.38 & 16.81 & 18.46 & 12.98 & 19.00 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 15.52 & 16.98 & 22.88 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{-} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 10.63 & 13.06 & 15.24 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{-} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(P_{2}\) & 16.72 & 20.25 & 22.04 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.586\) ton/oc. \\
S.E. of body of nny table & \(=2.748\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Begumabad (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P: 53(276).
Type :- ‘MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) Sewra-Loam Type IV. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved varisty. (v) (a) Preparation of mendhs and barhas on 24.4.1953, ploughing by cultivator on 29.4 .1953 and 16.5 .1953 by desi plough on 5.6.1953. (b) N.A. (c) 52 3-budded setts/line. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 31.3.1953. (vii) Palewa on 18.3.1953. Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 30 and 31.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(2) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} 245\). and \(\mathrm{V}_{8}=\mathrm{CO} .321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\).jac.
(3) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=40\) and \(P_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), \(\frac{1}{\text { d }}\) dose on 31.3.1953 and \(2 / 3\) dose on 17.3.1953. Full dose of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super on 31.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication. \(W\) component of VNP interaction is confounded (iii) (a) \(52^{\circ} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(46^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Condition slightly below average. Crops in plots with \(\mathrm{V}_{8} \mathrm{~N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{0}, \mathrm{~V}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{0} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{0}\) treatments damaged.
(ii) There was a heavy general attack of stem borer. Control measures taken-N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-7^{\circ}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-21^{\prime \prime}\) & \(21^{\prime \prime}-38^{\prime \prime}\) & \(38^{\prime \prime}-46^{\circ}\) & \(46^{\circ}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
C/N & 10.8 & 7.5 & 6.9 & 7.9 & 9.3 \\
pH & 6.9 & 6.5 & 6.7 & 6.7 & 6.7
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M). on cultivator's fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 17.29 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.190 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Main effect of V is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarca ne in ton/ac.


Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Begumabad (Mẹerut).

Ref :-U.P. 53(292).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea foddér. (c) No. (ii) Domat-Sandy loam Type IV. (iii) F.Y.M. at \(400 \mathrm{md} / a c\). in Feb. 1953. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 3 hoeings by spades. Preparation of mendhs and Barhas on 20 4.1953. Hoeing by desi plough on 24.6.1953. (b) N.A. (c) 70 3-budded setts/line. (d) and (c) N.A. (vi) 20.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(V_{2}=\) CO. \(245^{\prime}\) and \(V_{3}=\) CO. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}\) dose on 20.5.1953 and \(\frac{1}{3}\) dose on 18.5.1953. Full dose of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super on 20.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded in one replication. (iii) (a) \(70^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Condition moderate, germination gappy in plots with treatments \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{P}_{1}, \mathrm{~V}_{0} \mathrm{~N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}, \mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{0}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{0} \mathrm{~N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{1}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{0} \mathrm{~N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}\). (ii) Slight attack of stem borer. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-11^{\circ}\) & \(11^{\circ}-29^{\circ}\) & \(29^{\prime \prime}-48^{\prime \prime}\) & \(48^{\circ}-72^{\circ}\) \\
CNN & 12.6 & 9.7 & 7.0 & 6.5 & 4.4 \\
pH & 7.2 & 7.0 & 7.2 & 7.1 & 7.7
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experimenl was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 17.73 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.972 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of V and N are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N o}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline V1 & \(11.41^{\prime}\) & 15.40 & 18.67 & 15.16 & 15.22 & 14.42 & 15.84 \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 12.40 & 18.01 & 19.75 & 16.72 & 17.46 & 16.67 & 16.03 \\
\hline \(V_{3}\) & 17.46 & 19.66 & 26.80 & 21.31 & 21.47 & 19.98 & 22.47 \\
\hline Mean & 13.76 & 17.69 & 21.74 & 17.73 & 18.05 & 17.02 & 18.11 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 15.11 & 16.97 & 22.07 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{,}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 14.00 & 16.29 & 20.77 & & & & \\
\hline \(P_{8}\) & 12.16 & 19.81 & 22.37 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
- S.E. of body of any table \(\quad=1.139\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Zone :-Begumabad (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 53(293).
Type :-‘MV'.

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea for fodder. (c) No. (ii) Dakar loam to heavy loam. (iii) F.Y.M. at \(300 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). applied on 25.5.1953. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by spade (blind) on 25.4.1953, hoeing by cultivator on 23.6.1953. Preparation of mendhs and barhas on 7.3.1953 and repair of mendhs and barhas on 29.3.1953. (b) N.A. (c) 56 3-budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 6.3.1953. (vii) Palewa on 22.2.1953. irrigated by canal. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 24, 25.1.1954.
2. TREATMENTS ;

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} 421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} 285\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{8}=\mathrm{CO} 321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and \(P_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), \(\frac{1}{3}\) dose on 6.3.1953. and \(\frac{2}{3}\) dose on 16.6.1953. Full dose of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super on 6.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded in one replication. (iii) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) CO. 421 did not germinate uniformly and was poor ; the seed was reported to have been dried two days prior to sowing. Gederal condition was fair in June 1953, moderate at the time of harvesting. (ii) Stem borer attack in CO. 321. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experir ent was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 29.80 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.326 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(V\) and \(N\) are highly significant. Cther effects and interacticrs are not significant.
(iv) Av yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & Mean. & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 24.34 & 28.49 & 28.63 & 27.15 & 27.12 & 26.57 & 27.77 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{8}\) & 29.27 & 32.24 & 35.64 & 32.38 & 32.36 & 32.79 & \(31.99^{\circ}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 25.86 & 30.76 & 32.97 & 29.86 & 32.33 & 28.91 & \(28.35{ }^{\text {' }}\) \\
\hline Mean & 26.49 & 30.49 & 32.41 & 29.80 & 30.60 & 29.42 & 29.37 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 27.46 & 30.01 & 34.33 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 25.49 & 29.93 & 32.85 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 26.51 & 31.54 & 30.06 & & & & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =0.775 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of any table } & =1.343 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref:- U.P. 53(294).
Zone :- Begumabad (Meerut).
Type :- 'MV'.
Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Guar. (c) No. (ii) Dakar heavy loam. (iii) F.Y.M. at 200 mds ./ac. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 56 , three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 25.2.1953. (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.1.1954 and 28.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. \(421, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) CO. 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \({ }^{33}\) confounded in one replication. (iii) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iiij Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-61^{\circ}\) & \(61^{\circ}-24^{\circ}\) & \(24^{\circ}-41^{\circ}\) & \(41^{\circ}-58^{\circ}\) & \(58^{\circ}-72^{\circ}\) \\
C/N & 12.9 & 6.2 & 5.1 & - & 4.7 \\
pII & 7.1 & 6.7 & 7.0 & 7.0 & 6.9
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 29.25 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.615 too/ac.
(i) Main effect of V alone is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{\boldsymbol{*}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{g}}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 23.02 & 25.37 & 28.21 & 25.53 & 25.45 & 24.89 & 26.26 \\
\hline , \(\mathbf{V}_{8}\) & 30.20 & 29.99 & 32.65 & 30.95 & 29.79 & 32.92 & 30.14 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\). & 26.58 & 32.26 & 34.96 & 31.27 & 29.95 & 32.76 & 31.09 \\
\hline Mean & 26.60 & 29.21 & 31.24 & 29.25 & 28.39 & 30.19 & 29.16 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 24.69 & 30.23 & 30.28 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 28.07 & 29.35 & 33.15 & & & & \\
\hline - \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 27.06 & 28.04 & 32.39 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.205\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=2.087\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Begumabad (Meerut).
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. } 53(295), \\
& \text { Type :- 'MV'. }
\end{aligned}
\]
}

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Chari and guar. (c) No. (ii) Sewta-sandy loam. (iii) F.Y.M. at 350 md./ac. applied in April 1953. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by cultivator on 12.4.1953, 30.4.1953, 23.5 .1953 and 15.6.1953 and hoeing by spade on 15.4.1953. (b) N.A. (c) 60 three-budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 25.2.1953. (vii) Irrigated by canal. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 17th and 18.1.1954.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) CO. \(421, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C O} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 321 .
(l) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), \(\frac{1}{1}\) dose on 25.2 .1953 and \(\frac{1}{3}\) dose on 14.6.1953. Full dose of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super on 15.4.1953.

\section*{DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded in one replication. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}\) & \(10^{\circ}\) & \(10^{\prime \prime}-201^{*}\) & \(202^{\circ} \cdot 32^{\prime \prime}\) \\
& \(32^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 9.5 & 3.6 & 3.3 & 4.0 \\
pH & 7.8 & 6.7 & 6.6 & 6.6
\end{tabular}
(ii) The experiment was corducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivator's fields. The cultivator secretly applied heavy doses of A/S to experimental plots for getting bumper yield.

RESULTS :
(i) 29.15 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.618 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects and interactions is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{8}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 25.73 & 26.29 & 32.92 & 28.32 & 28.84 & 28.12 & 27.99 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 31.04 & 25.57 & 29.41 & 28.67 & 28.49 & 26.62 & 30.91 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{8}\) & 30.34 & 29.40 & 31.63 & 30.46 & 28.18 & 29.89 & 33.29 \\
\hline Mean & 29.04 & 27.08 & 31.32 & 29.15 & 28.50 & 28.21 & 30.73 \\
\hline \(P_{0}\) & 27.18 & 26.78 & 31.55 & & & & \\
\hline . \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 28.83 & 24.60 & 31.20 & & & & . \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 31.12 & 29.86 & 31.21 & & & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{-. .-} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.206\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=2.089\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Begumabad (Meerut).

Ref :- U.P. 53(296).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object :- To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) Local name sewta-lcamy soil type IV. (iii) F.Y.M. at 250 mds./ac. on 4.2.1953. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Preparation of Mendhs and Barhas on 3, 4.4.1953, Hoeing bycultivator. Hocing by spade on 25.5 .1953 . (b) N.A. (c) 54 3-budded setts/line. (d) N.A: (e) N.A. (vi) 4.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated by canal. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.1.1954 and 21.1.1954. 1
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{CO} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 321 .
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied t , dose on 4.3.1953 and dose on 17.6.1253. Full dose of Super on 15.4.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded in one replication. (iii) (a) \(54^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Very good. (ii) There was slight attack of smut in CO. 245 plots (as observed on 30.9.1953). (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R: (M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 32.75 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.722 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Oiher effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in tod/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & Mean & P. & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 27.46 & 30.77 & 33.37 & 30.53 & 30.83 & 28.91 & 31.86 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 30.70 & 32.20 & 37.62 & 33.51 & 33.19 & 33.87 & 33.46 \\
\hline V8 & 29.17 & 37.54 & 35.94 & 34.20 & 34.95 & 35.03 & 32.66 \\
\hline Mean & 29.11 & 33.50 & 35.64 & 32.75 & 32.99 & 32.60 & 32.66 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 28.45 & 34.97 & 35.55 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 29.98 & 32.63 & 35.20 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) & 28.90 & 32.91 & 36.17 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E of any marginal mean & \(=0.907\) ton/a:. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.572\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Faizabad (Faizabad).

Ref :- :- U.P. 53(263).
Type:- 'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domot. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 12.4.1953. (vii) Irrigated by canal. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 24, 25.2.1954
2. TREATMENTS :

All combidations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties : \(V_{1}=\) CO. 393, \(V_{2}=C O, 397\) and \(V_{2}=C O .617\).
(2) 3 lecels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\). N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded with one replication in which \(Y\) component of VNP, interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(63^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are:
Soil Analysis:
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\) & \(10^{\prime \prime}-28^{\circ}\) & \(28^{\prime \prime}-54^{\circ}\) & \(54^{\prime \prime}-66^{\circ}\) \\
pH & 7.9 & 7.9 & 7.8 & 7.7 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 6.25 & 8.18 & 14.28 & 19.00 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 3.22 & 3.91 & 3.57 & 3.65
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 12.18 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.025 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =1.342 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =2.324 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]
```

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone:- Faizabad (Faizabad).

```

\section*{Ref :- 53(264).}

Type :- ' MV ’.

Objcct :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for threedifferent varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Type IV. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 27, 28.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated . (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. \(393, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\) CO. 397 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 617.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=\mathrm{O}_{4} \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded in one replication with Wc omporent of VNP interaction. is confounded, (iii) (a) \(\mathbf{6 0 . 5} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(52.5^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-10^{\circ}\) & \(10^{\prime \prime}-32^{\circ}\) & \(32^{\circ}-52^{\circ}\) & \(52^{\prime \prime}-72^{*}\) \\
pH & 7.2 & 7.0 & 7.0 & 7.2 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 12.40 & 8.51 & 9.20 & 10.00 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 5.51 & 3.88 & 3.38 & 3.20
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) cn cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.99 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.601 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(N, P\) and \(V\) and irteracton \(V \times N\) are bighly signifcant. Interacticn \(N \times P\) is sigrifcant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\cdots \mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 21.63 & 29.66 & 31.33 & 27.54 & 26.18 & 27.97 & 28.48 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 21.24 & 22.13 & 23.33 & 22.23 & 19.35 & 23.44 & 23.91 \\
\hline V8. & 24.02 & 25.10 & 26.46 & 25.19 & 23.96 & 25.63 & 25.99 \\
\hline Mean & 22.30 & 25.63 & 27.04 & 24.99 & 23.16 & 25.68 & 26.13 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{6}\) & 19.18 & 24.66 & 25.64 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 23.47 & 25.97 & 27.60 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 24.24 & 26.26 & 27.88 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.200\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=0.347\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 53(265). \\
Zone :- Faizabad (Faizabad). & Type :- 'MV'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS : -
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 28.3.1953. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C O} .593, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{CO} .397\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .617\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\varepsilon} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 28.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded; \(X\) component of VNP confounded. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 24^{\circ}\). (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-12^{\prime \prime}\) & \(12^{\prime \prime}-30^{\prime}\) & \(30^{\prime \prime}-46^{\prime \prime}\) & \(46^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.1 & 7.1 & 7.0 & 6.8 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 8.94 & 5.36 & 4.70 & 5.36 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 8.69 & 3.54 & 3.47 & 4.75
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.19 ton/ac.
(ii) 9.139 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =3.046 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =5.276 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

Crop: Sugarcane.
Zone :-Rohana Kalan (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 50(222).
Type:- 'MV’.

Object :-To find the optimum combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Chari and Jowar. (c) N.A. (ii) Rosli, Sandy loam (Black soil). (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 64, 3-budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 13.3.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2 and 3.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. 42I, \(V_{2}=\) CO. 453 and \(V_{3}=\) C.OS. 245.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Manuring on 13.3-1950 in furrows. N applied as \(A / S\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication with VN2P interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results ó the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-7^{*}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-25^{\circ}\) & \(25^{\prime \prime}-38^{\prime \prime}\) & \(38^{\prime \prime}-52^{\prime \prime}\) & \(52^{\prime \prime}-68^{\circ}\) \\
pH & 7.0 & 6.5 & 6.0 & 6.5 & 6.0
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 30.17 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.282 too \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effest of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 27.50 & 28.48 & 32.00 & 29.33 & 28.86 & 29.90 & 29.22 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 27.43 & 34.37 & 34.27 & 32.02 & 31.95 & 33.13 & 30.99 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 24.61. & 29.87 & 32.97 & 29.15 & 27.15 & 29.27 & 31.03 \\
\hline Mean & 26.51 & 30.91 & 33.08 & 30.17 & 29.32 & 30.77 & 30.41 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 28.35 & 29.15 & 30.45 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 27.33 & 31.17 & 33.80 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 23.85 & 32.40 & 34.98 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.427\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=2.472\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcané.
Zone :-Rohana Kalan (Muzaffarnagar.)

Ref :-U.P. 50(223).
Type :-'MV’.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAE CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) Damat Sandy loam (type IV), well determined; (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 64 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 24.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREARMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421, V_{2}=\) CO. 453 and \(V_{3}=\) CO. 245.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Manuring on 24.2.1950 in furcows. \(N\) applied as \(A / S\) and \(\mathrm{F}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \(3 \times 3 \times 3\) confounded experiment in single replication with VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1951\). (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-7^{\prime \prime}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-23^{\prime \prime}\) & \(23^{\prime \prime}-36^{\prime \prime}\) & \(36^{\circ}-49^{\prime \prime}\) & \(49^{\prime \prime}-62^{\prime \prime}\) & \(62^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.0 & 6.5 & 6.0 & 6.0 & 6.0 & 5.5
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M). on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 31.86 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.276 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.092\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.891\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Rohana Kalan (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 50(224).
Type :-‘MV’.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) Dakar, clay loam (type VI) well drained. (iii) F.Y.M. 180 mds . (iv) As per treatments (all improved varieties). (v) (a) 5 ploughings.; Hoeings on 24.4.1950, 30.5.1950, 17.6.1950. and 26.6.1950. Binding of sugarcane on 7.9.1950. (b) N.A. (c) 76 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 29.3.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29 and 30.1.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. \(421, V_{g}=C O .453\) and \(V_{3}=C O .245\).
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super applied on 29, 39.1.1951. in furrows,
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) \(3^{33}\) confounded experiment in single replication with VN \({ }^{2} P\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(76^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(70^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are.
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-11^{\prime \prime}\) & \(11^{\circ}-28^{\prime \prime}\) & \(28^{\circ}-43^{\circ}\) & \(43^{\circ}-60^{\circ}\) & \(60^{\circ}-75^{\circ}\) \\
pH & 5.5 & 6.5 & 6.5 & 6.0 & 6.0
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.'
S. RESULTS :
(i) 23.83 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.001 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 22.91 & 23.16 & 23.24 & 23.10 & 21.66 & 23.60 & 24.05 \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 20.86 & 21.78 & 23.51 & 22.05 & 21.23 & 21.98 & 22.94 \\
\hline \(v_{3}\) & 23.69 & 26.28 & 29.04 & 26.34 & 26.06 & 24.11 & 28.84 \\
\hline Mean & 22.49 & 23.74 & 25.26 & 23.83 & 22.98 & 23.23 & 25.28 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 21.88 & 21.55 & 25.52 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 22.27 & 24.72 & 22.70 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 23.31 & 24.96 & 27.56 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =1.000 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =1.733 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Muzaffarnagar (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref:-U.P. 50(225).
Type :-'MV'.

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Rosli sandy loam, water logged. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 64 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 13, 14.4.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3).
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421, V_{2}=C O .453\) and \(V_{3}=C O . S .245\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\). /ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\) as Super. Manuring on 13, 14.4.1950 in furrows.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which \(\mathrm{VN}^{2} \mathrm{P}^{\mathbf{s}}\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Some of the plots have been greatly effected by white ants. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :

Depth \(\quad 0^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime} \quad 7^{\prime \prime}-29^{\circ} \quad 29^{\prime \prime}-41^{\prime \prime} \quad 41^{\prime \prime}-60^{\circ} \quad 60^{\circ}-72^{\prime \prime}\)
\(\begin{array}{llllll}\mathrm{pH} & 6.5 & 6.5 & 6.5 & 6.0 & 6.0\end{array}\)
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators ' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.99 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.769 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & P. & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \({ }^{*} 15.46\) & 18.55 & 20.59 & 18.20 & 19.57 & 23.78 & 11.25 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 20.39 & 20.74 & 27.14 & 22.76 & 20.28 & 22.12 & 25.88 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 18.71 & 21.38 & 16.93 & 19.01 & 17.97 & 22.00 & 17.05 \\
\hline Mean & 18.19 & 20.22 & 21.55 & 19.99 & 19.27 & 22.63 & 18.06 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 24.33 & 13.77 & 19.71 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 16.03 & 25.75 & 26.12 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 14.20 & 21.15 & 18.82 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =1.923 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =3.331 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Ref:-U.P. 50(226). \\ Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar). \\ Type :-'MV'.}

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
a. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Dakar Clay loam (type IV) Low land partially water logged. (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 64 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 4.4.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. \(421 . V_{2}=\) CO. 453 and \(V_{8}=\) CO.S. 245.
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 4.4.1950 in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which VNP \({ }^{2}\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(67^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
6. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-9^{\circ}\) & \(9^{\prime \prime}-26^{\circ}\) & \(26^{\circ}-48^{\circ}\) & \(48^{\circ}-63^{\circ}\) & \(63^{\circ}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 6.7 & 6.5 & 6.6 & 6.8 & 6.6
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.19 ton/ac.
(ii) 6.998 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \({ }_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 15.05 . & 14.34 & 19.27 & 16.22 & 17.72 & 14.40 & 16.54 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 17.42 & 22.75 & 28.49 & 22.89 & 24.61 & 24.07 & 19.99 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 16.39 & 17.29 & 21.69 & 18.46 & 13.75 & 19.55 & 22.07 ' \\
\hline Mean & 16.29 & 18.13 & 23.15 & 19.19 & 18.69 & 19.34 & 19.53 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{Pa}_{0}\) & 15.61 & 17.93 & 20.54 & & & & \\
\hline \(P_{1}\) & 18.76 & 14.99 & 24.27 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 14.49 & 19.46 & 24.64 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =2.266 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of table } & =3.925 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 50(227).
Type:-‘MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Chari. (c) No. (ii) Rosli Sandy loam (type IV) water logged. The field was selected next to the canal bank and was submerged for \(2 \frac{1}{3}\) months due. to a breach in the bank. (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 64. three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 21.2.1950. (vii) irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(V_{2}=\) CO. 453 and \(V_{3}=\) CO.S. 245.
(2) 3 levels af \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 21.2.1950 in furrows.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which VNP \({ }^{2}\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(64^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1951\). (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical. results of soil are :-
\[
\begin{array}{lccccc}
\text { Depth }^{\prime} & 0^{\circ}-7^{*} & 7^{\prime \prime}-2^{\circ} & 29^{\prime \prime}-41^{\circ} & 41^{\prime \prime}-60^{\circ} & 60^{\circ}-72^{\prime \prime} \\
\mathrm{pH} & 6.5 & 6.5 & 6.5 & 6.0 & 6.0
\end{array}
\]
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 17.02 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.372 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.


Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 51(209).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Cotton. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam (type IV). (iii) F.Y.M. at 300 mds /ac. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing on 19.3 1951, 21.4.1951, 21.5.1951. and 20.6.1951, (b) N.A. (c) 72 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 26.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14 and 15.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. 421. \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO.S. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\mathrm{C}, \mathrm{N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Supen Manuring on 26.2.1951. in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication with \(V N^{2} P^{2}\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(72^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good; gaps in plots with treatments \(\mathrm{V}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{0}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}\). (ii) Slight attack of Pyrilla in general throughout the whole experiment. (iii) Sugarcane yield (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi)
Analy,ical results of soil are:
\[
\begin{array}{lccccc}
\text { Depth } & 0^{\prime \prime}-7^{\prime \prime} & 7^{\prime \prime}-16^{\circ} & 16^{\prime \prime}-25^{\circ} & 26^{\circ}-46^{\circ} & 46^{\prime \prime}-64^{\prime \prime} \\
\text { pH } & 7.3 & 6.7 & 7.2 & 7.1 & 7.0
\end{array}
\]

The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 23.49 ton/ac.
(ii) \(2.238 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(N\) and \(V\) are highly significant. Main effect of \(P\) is not significant. Interaction \(N \times V\) is significant. Other interactions are not significant. .
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in top/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & Mean & P & \(P_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 19.32 & 24.18 & 27.42 & 23.64 & 22.89 & 23.58 & 24.46 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 15.03 & 24.50 & 18.78 & 19.44 & 19.96 & 19.34 & 19.01 \\
\hline \(V_{s}\) & 19.25 & 27.91 & 35.00 & 27.39 & 27.84 & 28.12 & 26.02 \\
\hline Mean & 17.87. & 25.53 & 27.07 & 23.49 & 23.56 & 23.68 & 23.22 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 18.19 & 24.81 & 27.68 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 17.04 & 26.19 & 27.82 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 18.37 & 25.60 & 25.70 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
,
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.746\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.292\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcané.
Zone :-Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 51(208).
Type :-‘MV’.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam (type IV). (iii) Sanai green manuring. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by spade on 8.4.1951, 28 to 30.4.1951, 9.5.1951, 27 to 29.5.1951. and 1.6.1951. Preparation of mordhas and barhhas on 17 and 18.3.1951. (b) N.A. (c) 71 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 17 and 18 3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 8, 9.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C 0.421, V_{2}=C 0.245\) and \(V_{3}=\) CO.S.321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} O: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=40\) and \(P_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(N\) as \(A / S\) and \(P_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 17, 18.3.1951 in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication with \(V^{2} P\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(71^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(65^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The condition of the crop was slightly below normal because of only two pre-monsoon irrigations. In treatments \(\mathrm{V}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{2}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{0}\)-poor germination. Slight attack of pyrilla in general. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lllllll} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-11^{\circ}\) & \(11^{\prime \prime}-22^{\circ}\) & \(22^{\circ}-40^{\circ}\) & \(40^{\circ}-56^{\circ}\) & \(56^{\prime \prime}-64^{\circ}\)
\end{tabular} \(64^{\circ}-72^{\circ}\)
\begin{tabular}{lllllllll}
pH & 7.3 & 7.0 & 7.3 & 7.4 & 7.3 & 7.4 & 7.1
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) cn cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.27 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.077 ton/ae.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.692\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.199\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:-Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar)-
}
Ref:-U.P. 51(207).
Type :-'MV'.

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai+Guar for seed. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam to loam (type IV). (iii) 300 mds./ac. of F.Y.M. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by kassi on 21.3.1951. by cultivator on 26.4.1951, 4.6.1951 and 1.7.1951 and by spade on 30.4.1951. 17.6.1951 and 3.7.1951. (b) N.A. (c) 61 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 15.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18 to 21.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathbf{V}_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(\mathbf{V}_{2}=\) CO. 245 and \(\dot{V}_{3}=\) CO.S. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{2}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 15.3.1951 in furrows.

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication with VNP² interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(61^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(55^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Very good at harvesting time. (ii) Slight attack of Pyrilla. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b, and
(c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-6^{\prime \prime}\) & \(6^{\circ}-12^{\prime \prime}\) & \(12^{\prime \prime}-24^{\prime \prime}\) & \(24^{\prime \prime}-39^{\circ}\) & \(39^{\prime \prime}-50^{\prime \prime}\) & \(50^{\circ}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.2 & 7.2 & 7.2 & 7.0 & 7.2 & 7.3
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 3180 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.195 ton/ac.
(ii) Main effect of N is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{Pa}_{\mathbf{g}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 28.49 & 32.88 & 37.91 & 33.09 & 34.40 & 32.96 & 32.31 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 23.99 & 31.99 & 35.01 & 30.33 & 29.19 & 33.41 & 28.38 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{3}\) & 30.82 & 30.56 & 34.55 & 31.98 & 30.82 & 30.85 & 34.26 \\
\hline Mean & 27.77 & 31.81 & 35.82 & 31.80 & 31.47 & 32.27 & 31.65 \\
\hline \(P_{0}\) & 27.92 & 32.13 & 34.37 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 29.12 & 31.84 & 35.86 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 26.27 & 31.45 & 37.23 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.398\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=2.422\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 51(206).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane Ratoon. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam (type IV). (iii) 300 mds./ac. of F.Y.M. applied. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing on 10 and 21.3.1951, 1 and 15.4.1951, 8.6.1951 and 10.7.1951 (b) N.A. (c) 72 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 2.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11 and 12.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties; \(V_{1}=C O .421, V_{2}=C O .245\) and \(V_{3}=\) CO. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\).ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and date of manuring 2.3.1951 in furrows.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \(3^{38}\) confounded experiment in single replication with VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(72^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\) : (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Slight attack of Pyrilla. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}\) —7 & \(7^{\prime \prime}-27^{\prime \prime}\) & \(27^{\prime \prime}-40^{\prime \prime}\) & \(40^{\circ}-54^{\prime \prime}\) & \(54^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 6.8 & 7.0 & 6.8 & 6.9 & 7.1
\end{tabular}
(vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S. \(\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{M})\) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.60 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.082 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant. main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) is significant. Main effect of \(\mathbf{P}\) and other interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.694\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.202\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane
Zone :- Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar).
Ref:- U.P. 51(211).
Type:- 'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Urd and guar. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam to loam (type IV). (iii) 300 mds./ac. of F.Y.M. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 2 hoeings by spade and 6 hoeings by cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) 64 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 15.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 22 to 24.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(V_{2}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(V_{3}=\) CO.S. 321 .
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0 . \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super. Manuring on 26.2.1951 in furrows.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) \(3^{33}\) confounded experiment single replication with VN2P interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of pyrilla in general. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A.
(v) N.A. (vi) The analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-7^{\prime}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-18^{\prime \prime}\) & \(18^{\circ}-34^{\prime \prime}\) & \(34^{\prime \prime}-60^{\prime \prime}\) & \(60^{\circ}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.1 & 7.3 & 6.9 & 6.7 & 7.2
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 22.68 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.694 tod/ac.
(iii) Mann effect of N is highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}\) is significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 16.31 & 24.62 & 28.73 & 23.22 & 21.53 & 22.20 & 25.93 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 15.68 & 22.93 & 25.97 & 21.53 & 21.71 & 21.67 & 21.21 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 18.24 & 22.54 & 29.10 & 23.29 & 22.51 & 22.08 & 25.29 \\
\hline Mean & 16.74 & 23.36 & 27.93 & 22.68 & 21.92 & 21.98 & 24.14 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 13.55 & 24.52 & 18.69 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 16.80 & 22.66 & 26.48 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) & 19.88 & 22.91 & 29.62 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.565\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=0.978\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Ref:- U.P. 51(210).
Zone :- Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object .-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Cotton. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam (without kankar), (type IV). (iii) Cake+F.Y.M. applied (dose-N.A, (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeings ty kassi-twice. by spade-twice and by cultivatorsix times. (b) N.A. (c) 57 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 17.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26 and 27.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. \(421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO.S. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=40\) and \(P_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 17.2.1951 in furrows.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication with \(V^{2} \mathrm{P}^{2}\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(57 \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(51^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of pyrilla in general. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A.
- (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\(\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { Depth } & 0^{\prime \prime}-6^{\prime \prime} & 6^{\circ}-12^{\prime \prime} & 12^{\circ}-28^{\prime \prime} & 28^{\prime \prime}-36^{\prime \prime} & 36^{\prime \prime}-53^{\prime \prime} & 53^{\prime}-74^{\circ}\end{array}\)
\(\begin{array}{lllllll}\mathrm{pH} & \cdot 6.4 & 7.4 & 7.3 & 6.7 & 7.3 & 7.5\end{array}\)
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 29.45 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.329 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant. Interaction \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}\) is significant Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{g}}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 23.74 & 29.71 & 34.34 & 29.26 & 29.11 & 29.93 & 28.74 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 24.81 & 29.55 & 35.04 & 29.80 & 30.04 & 28.31 & 31.05 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 23.93 & 30.80 & 33.17 & 29.30 & 29.60 & 28.59 & 29.31 \\
\hline Mean & 24.16 & 30.02 & 34.18 & 29.45 & 29.58 & 28.94 & 29.83 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 23.97 & 31.31 & 33.47 & & & & - \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 25.05 & 27.28 & 34.50 & & . & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 23.45 & 31.47 & 34.58 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.443\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=0.768\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).
}

Ref :-U.P. 50(232).
Type :- \({ }^{\mathbf{M}} \mathbf{M}\).

Object :- - To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam (type IV) Medium land, water logged increases with depth showing impedence of drainage. (iii) Nil. (iv) As per teeatments. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 64 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 4.4.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 9, 10.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{CO} .245\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A}_{1} \mathrm{~S} . \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super manuring in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded unreplicated experiment with VN2P component of the interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-8^{\circ}\) & \(8^{\circ}-20^{\prime \prime}\) & \(20^{\circ}-34^{\prime \prime}\) & \(34^{\prime \prime}-52^{\prime \prime}\) & \(52^{\prime \prime}-73^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 6.5 & 7.0 & 7.0 & 7.5 & 7.5
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 26.17 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.587 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcans in ton/az.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l|lll|} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 14.39 & 19.04 & 20.63 & 18.02 & 12.12 & 19.44 & 22.50 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 30.16 & 33.53 & 32.23 & 31.97 & 31.17 & 32.81 & 41.94 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 27.28 & \(2 . .33\) & 28.99 & 28.53 & 27.10 & 30.40 & 28.10 \\
\hline Mean & 23.94 & 27.30 & 27.28 & 26.17 & 23.46 & 27.55 & 27.51 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 22.79 & 24.53 & 23.07 & & & \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 23.45 & 31.07 & 28.12 & & \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & 25.59 & 26.29 & 30.66 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.529\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=2.648\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:Sugarcane.
Zone :-Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 50(233).
Type :- \({ }^{\mathbf{c}} \mathrm{MV}\) '.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domat Clay loam; Low lying, water logged, pH increases with depth showing impedence of drainage. (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 16.3.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.1.1951 and 8.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C O} 421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} 453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO.S. 245.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) , 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 16.3.1950 in furrows.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded unreplicated experiment in which VN \({ }^{2} P\) component of the interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4 GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime}-9^{\prime \prime}\) & \(9^{\prime \prime}-25^{\prime \prime}\) & \(25^{\prime \prime}-41^{\circ}\) & \(41^{\prime \prime}-50\) & \(50^{\prime}-61^{\prime \prime}\) & \(61^{\prime \prime}-78^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.0 & 6.9 & 6.8 & 6.8 & 6.7 & 7.6
\end{tabular}
(vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 29.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.004 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 24.78 & 31.75 & 32.06 & 29.53 & 29.36 & 27.91 & 31.32 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 28.64 & 31.11 & 32.51 & 30.75 & 32.27 & 28.74 & 31.24 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 26.38 & 28.53 & 29.44 & 28.12 & 27.86 & 29.22 & 27.28 \\
\hline Mean & 26.60 & 30.46 & 31.34 & 29.47 & 29.83 & 28.62 & 29.95 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 26.74 & 30.78 & 31.98 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 26.40 & 27.41 & 32.06 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 26.66 & 33.20 & 29.98 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.668\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.157\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 50(234).
Type :- \({ }^{\mathbf{C}} \mathbf{M V '}^{\prime}\).

Object:-To find the optimum manurial cembinaticn of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for thrce different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domat (type IV) loam, medirm land, partially nater logged. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 64 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 15.2.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O 421, V_{2}=C O 453\) and \(V_{3}=\operatorname{COS} 245\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 15.2.1950 in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded unreplicated experiment with VNP component of the interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b), (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Avalytical results of \(\frac{1}{}\) are:
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-18^{\prime \prime}\) & \(18^{\prime \prime}-33^{\circ}\) & \(33^{\prime \prime}-44^{\circ}\) & \(44^{\prime \prime}-54^{\circ}\) \\
pH & 7.0 & 6.5 & 6.5 & 6.5 & 7.0
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivators' fields. 1

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 20.51 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.883 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects and interaction is? \({ }^{\text {Tignificant. }}\)
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.294\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=2.242\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\(\cdot\)

Crop : Sugarcane.
Zone :-Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar). \(^{\text {(M }}\)

Ref :-U.P. 51(212).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Urd and then fallow. (c) No. (ii) Loam (with kankar) (type II). (iii) \(350 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of
6. F.Y.M. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeings on 17.3.1951, 25.4.1951, 25.5.1951 and 25.6.1951. (b) N.A. (c) 62 three buddrd setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 8.3.1951. (vii) Canal irrigation. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 6, 8 and 9.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties : \(V_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(V_{3}=\) COS. 245 and \(V_{3}=\) COS. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring in furrows on 8.3.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication with VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(62^{\circ} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(56^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack of Pyrilla. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-5^{\prime \prime}\) & \(5^{\circ}-14^{\prime \prime}\) & \(14^{\circ}-27^{\prime \prime}\) & \(27^{\prime \prime}-43^{\prime \prime}\) & \(43^{\circ}-53^{\prime \prime}\) & \(53^{\circ}-66^{\circ}\) \\
pH & 6.7 & 7.0 & 7.1 & 6.6 & 6.7 & 6.7
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.65 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.731 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & Po & \(P_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 18.71 & 24.16 & 26.41 & 23.09 & 22.91 & 22.79 & 23.57 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 19.13 & 24.12 & 29.17 & 24.14 & 21.53 & 27.01 & 23.87 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 19.78 & 23.71 & 27.65 & 23.71 & 24.56 & 23.01 & 23.56 \\
\hline Mean & 19.21 & 24.00 & 27.74 & 23.65 & 23.00 & 24.27 & 23.67 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 20.67 & 22.91 & 25.43 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{.} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & . 18.13 & 25.11 & 29.58 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 18.82 & 23.97 & 28.22 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad=0.577\) ton/ac.
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=1.000\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 52(255).
Type :--MV'.'

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea for fodder. (c) No. (ii) Loam (type IV). (iii) 220 md./ac. of compost. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by cultivator on 30.4.1952, 22.5.1952, 15.6.1952, 14.7.1952. 15 and 16.8.1952. Dressing of mendhs and berhes on 24.4.1952 and 8.6.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 64 three budded se!ts/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 23.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x). 25 and 26.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421, V_{2}=C O .245\) and \(V_{3}=C O .321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \quad \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on \(233.19^{\circ} 2\) in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which \(\times\) component of VNP interaction is confounded with blocks. (iii) (a) \(64^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of top borer and pyrilla-very mild and controlled. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c). N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are:
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-5^{\circ}\) & \(5^{\prime \prime}-26^{\prime \prime}\) & \(26^{\prime \prime}-43^{\circ}\) & \(43^{\prime \prime}-62^{\circ}\) & \(62^{\prime \prime}=72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
Coarse sand \% & 5.89 & 4.87 & 1.67 & 5.55 & 2.84 \\
Final sand \% & 60.70 & 52.74 & 44.16 & 46.59 & 65.12 \\
Silt \% & 17.89 & 17.36 & 19.71 & 17.40 & 12.93 \\
Clay \% & 11.93 & 20.59 & 28.28 & 26.26 & 12.90 \\
pH & 7.4 & 7.2 & 7.1 & 6.9 & 7.0 \\
C/N & 13.14 & 7.00 & 6.75 & 8.5 & 9.00
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 22.75 ron/ac.
(ii) \(1.141 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) and interastion \(V \times P\) and \(N \times P\) are significant. Main effect of \(N\) is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}{ }^{-}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 16.62 & 23.63 & 24.73 & 21.66 & 19.64 & 23.48 & 21.86 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 17.90 & 25.30 & 26.53 & 23.24 & 22.80 & 23.37 & 23.57 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 18.65 & 24.84 & 26.55 & 23.35 & 24.77 & 21.48 & 23.79 \\
\hline Mean & 17.72 & 24.59 & 25.94 & 22.75 & 22.40 & 22.78 & 23.07 \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{P}_{0}\) & 16.92 & 25.22 & 25.07 & & & & \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{P}_{1}\) & 19.81 & 2333 & 25.19 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 16.45 & 25.22 * & 27.55 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal means \(\quad\) & \(=0.380\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=0.659\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar)-}
Ref :-U.P. 52(256).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To find the optinum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane (ratoon). (c) No. (ii) Heavy loam (type IV) highly oxidised. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved variety. (v) (a) Hoeing by kassi on 15.4.1952. Hoeing by cultivator and spade on 8.5.1952 and 2.6.1952. Hoeing by cultivator on 29.6.1952. Preparation and dressing of mend/hs and barhas on 3.5.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 44 3-budded setts/line. (d) [and (e) N.A. (vi) 20.3.1952 (vii) Irrigated (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 17 to 19.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
11) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO}-421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO}-245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO}-321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{acc}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N as A/S and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring in furrows on 20.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which W component of VNP interaction is confounded with blocks. (iii) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 38^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Condition in general is good. Slight cattle damage in plols with treatments \(V_{1} N_{1} P_{0}\) and \(V_{3} N_{2} P_{2}\) (ii) A very mild attack of Pyrilla. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi)
Analytical results of the soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-6^{\prime \prime}\) & \(6^{\circ}-14^{\prime \prime}\) & \(14^{\prime \prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\) & \(34^{\prime \prime}-52^{\prime \prime}\) & \(52^{\prime \prime}+\) below \\
Coarse sand \% & 3.77 & 3.59 & 2.15 & 1.66 & 1.60 \\
Fine sand \% & 56.50 & 51.33 & 39.75 & 34.16 & 34.25 \\
Sik \% & 25.95 & 24.90 & 29.10 & 30.41 & 30.41 \\
Clay \% & 12.30 & 16.73 & 26.18 & 29.18 & 27.94 \\
pH & 7.3 & 7.3 & 7.3 & 7.3 & 7.2 \\
C/N & 9.29 & 7.20 & 5.83 & 5.40 & 6.25
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 25.30 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.216 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in tod/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean, & \(=1.072\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.857\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref:- U.P. 51(213). \\
Zone :- Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar). & Type :- 'MV',
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane

\section*{- BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Loam (with kankar), (type II). (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 54 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 25.2.1951. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18.2.1952.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421, V_{2}=C O .245\) and \(V_{3}=C O .321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 25.2.1951 in furrows.
i. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{33}\) confounded experiment in single replication with VNP \({ }^{2}\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(54^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
1. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugareane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-6^{\circ}\) & \(6^{\prime \prime}-14^{\circ}\) & \(14^{\circ}-28^{\circ}\) & \(28^{\prime \prime}-40^{\circ}\) & \(40^{\circ}-58^{\circ}\) & \(58^{\prime \prime}\)-below \\
pH & 7.0 & 7.9 & 6.9 & 6.9 & 7.4 & 6.8
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 26.10 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.349 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{lll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & & \(=0.783\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(\ddots\) & \(=1.356\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 51(222). \\
Zone :- Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar). & Type :- 'MV'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N^{\circ}\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea. (c) No. (ii) Heavy loam (type II). (iii) 260 mds. of F.Y.M.+G.M. (pea). (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeings on 15.3.1951, 10.4.1951, 26.4.1951, 9.5.1951, 22.5.1951 and 21.6.1951. (b) N.A. (c) 41 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 7.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO}-321\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lh} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring in furrows on 7.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded unreplicated experiment with VNP² component of interaction confounded. (iii) (a) \(41^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\(\begin{array}{lrccccccc}\text { Depth } & 0^{\circ}-8^{\prime \prime} & 8^{\prime \prime}-13^{\circ} & 13^{\circ}-19^{\circ} & 19^{\prime \prime}-29^{\circ} & 29^{\circ}-47^{\circ} & 47^{\prime \prime}-58^{\circ} & 58^{\circ}-71^{\circ} & 71^{\prime \prime} \text {-below } \\ \text { pH } & 7.5 & 7.3 & 7.3 & 7.2 & 7.2 & 7.2 & 7.4 & 7.6\end{array}\)
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.65 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.730 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(N\) and \(V\) are highly significant, interaction \(N \times V\) is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 23.82 & 22.93 & 25.87 & 24.21 & 25.80 & 23.67 & 23.15 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 26.93 & 25.43 & 27.44 & 26.62 & 26.73 & 26.52 & 26.60 \\
\hline \(V_{3}\) & 24.32 & 26.57 & 27.50 & 26.13 & 25.82 & 26.29 & 26.28 \\
\hline Mean & 25.02 & 24.99 & 26.94 & 25.65 & 26.12 & 25.49 & 25.34 \\
\hline - \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 25.43 & 25.80 & 27.13 & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{,}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 24.85 & 24.37 & 27.26 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 24.79 & 24.81 & 26.43 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.243\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=0.422\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 53(275).
Type :-'MV’.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Loam sand. (type III). (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 51 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 15.3.1953. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3 and 7.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. \(421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\) CO. 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}: P_{0}=0, P_{1}=40\) and \(P_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), \(\frac{1}{2}\) dose on 15.3.1953 and \(\frac{1}{3}\) dose on 11.6.1953. \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super full dose on 15.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication. \(Z\) component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(51^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(45^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Slightly gappy germination in plots with treatments \(\mathrm{V}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}, \mathrm{~V}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{2} \mathrm{P}_{2}\), and \(\mathrm{V}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{2}\) one border line in treatments : \(\mathrm{V}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{0} \mathrm{P}_{2}, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{P}_{0}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{1} \mathrm{P}_{0}\) did not germinate at all. (ii) Nil . (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are:
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-9^{\circ}\) & \(9^{\circ}-28^{*}\) & \(28^{\prime \prime}-50^{\circ}\) & \(50^{\circ}-72\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 10.7 & - & 9.3 & 9.0 \\
pH & 6.9 & 6.7 & 6.6 & 6.6
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M). on cultivators' fields.

\section*{S. RESULTS:}
(i) 21.80 ton/ac.
(ii) 7.081 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 16.82 & 16.69 & 25.75 & 19.75 & 22.85 & 21.75 & 14.67 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 19.31 & 25.86 & 22.62 & 22.60 & 21.93 & 26.67 & 19.20 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{8}\) & 15.96 & 24.51 & 28.70 & 23.06 & 29.36 & 23.09 & 16.72 \\
\hline Mean & 17.36 & 22.35 & 25.69 & 21.80 & 24.71 & 23.84 & 16.86 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 23.81 & 22.47 & 27.85 & . & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 15.14 & 26.83 & 29.54 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 13.14 & 17.77 & 19.68 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=2.360\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=4.088 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar).
Ref :-U.P. 53(273).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea for fodder. (c) No. (ii) Domat-Loam type IV. (iii) Compost at \(200 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). applied on 10.1.1953. (iv) Improved variety. (v) (a) Hoeing by spade on 8.4.1953 to 10.4.1953; 25.6.1953. Hoeing by cultivator on 23.4.1953, 15.5.1953 and 5.6.1953. Palewa on 2.3.1953. (b) N.A. (c) 51 three budded setts/ line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 11.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5, 8 and 9.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(V_{2}=\) CO. 245 and \(V_{3}=\) CO. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\), \(\frac{1}{2}\) dose on 11.3.1953 and \(\frac{2}{8}\) dose on 10.6.1953 and full dose of Super on 11.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication. \(Y\) component of VNP interaction is confounded.
(ii) N.A. (iii) (a) \(51^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(45^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL: •
(i) General condition good. The germination was uniform throughout except in treatment \(V_{3} N_{0} P_{1}\) where and slight gappiness in one of the lines was observed. (ii) Slight attack of stem borer. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are -
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-6^{\prime \prime}\) & \(6^{\prime \prime}-20^{\circ}\) & \(20^{\prime \prime}-37^{\prime \prime}\) & \(37^{\prime \prime}-54^{\prime \prime}\) & \(54^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 15.5 & 8.0 & 9.5 & 7.6 & 7.2 \\
pH & 7.2 & 6.6 & 6.5 & 6.6 & 6.7
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(M). on cultivators' felds.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 21.64 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.455 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Main effect of V and interactions \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}\) and \(\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{V}\) significant. Others are not significant.
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(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|llll|} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 16.24 & 22.52 & 24.15 & 20.97 & 21.38 & 20.40 & 20.13 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 19.76 & 23.78 & 25.61 & 23.05 & 20.66 & 23.92 & 24.57 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 16.90 & 22.23 & 23.58 & 20.90 & 20.64 & 18.15 & 23.91 \\
\hline Mean & 17.63 & 22.84 & 24.45 & 21.64 & 20.89 & 21.16 & 22.87 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 19.49 & 20.38 & 22.81 & & & \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 15.34 & 23.40 & 24.74 & & & \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 18.07 & 24.75 & 25.79 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad\) & \(=0.485\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=0.840\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } \\
& \text { Zone :- Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar). }
\end{aligned}
\]

\section*{Ref:- U.P. 52(254).}

Type:- 'MV'.
Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) No. (c) Nil. (ii) Heavy loam (type IV). (iii) Nil. (iv) As per trearments. (v) (a) Hoeing by kassi on 8.4.1952 and hoeing by cultivator on 8.4.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 61 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) NA. (vi) 5, 6.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1, 2.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{a}}=\) CO. 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 321
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 5, 6.3.1952 in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \({ }^{33}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which \(W\) component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(61^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) There was some attack of borer and pyrilla, but the damage was very mild and uniform.
(iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-6^{\circ}\) & \(6^{\prime \prime}-16^{\prime \prime}\) & \(16^{\prime \prime}-32^{\prime \prime}\) & \(32^{\prime \prime}-50^{\prime \prime}\) & \(50^{\circ}-72^{\circ}\) \\
Coarse sand \% & 2.16 & 0.98 & 2.68 & 2.88 & 2.10 \\
Fine sand \% & 38.79 & 47.41 & 41.63 & 39.46 & 43.50 \\
Silt \% & 33.97 & 27.26 & 23.93 & 20.36 & 1.96 \\
Clay \% & 18.08 & 20.05 & 27.00 & 31.24 & 30.30 \\
pH & 7.3 & 7.2 & 6.8 & 6.8 & 6.8 \\
C/N & 10.98 & 7.00 & 7.50 & 5.75 & 5.50
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{s. RESULTS :}
(i) 22.01 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.331 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(N\) and interactions \(N \times P\) and \(P \times V\) are significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{6}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 18.77 & 22.58 & 22.86 & 21.40 & 21.90 & 22.36 & 19.95 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 23.33 & 21.41 & 24.37 & 23.04 & 22.12 & 23.44 & 23.55 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{i}}\) & 19.64 & 21.63 & 23.52 & 21.60 & 19.20 & 21.27 & 24.32 \\
\hline Mean & 20.58 & 21.87 & 23.59 & 22.01 & 21.07 & 22.36 & 22.61 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 17.93 & 22.21 & 23.09 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow{3}{*}{\(\therefore\).}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 19.52 & 23.04 & 24.51 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 24.29 & 20.36 & 23.17 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.444\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=0.768\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref:- U.P. 52(253).
Zone :- Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hocing by cultivator on \(21.4 .1952,22.5 .1952\) and hoeing by spade on 22.4.1952 and 24.5.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 58 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 15.3.1952. (vii Irrigated (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 21, 22 and 23.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) CO.S 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}=\) CO.S. 321
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring in furrows on 15.3.1962.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which \(Y\) component of VNP interaction is confounded with blocks. (iii) (a) \(58^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(52^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The germination was slightly less than the average crop nearly and the condition of the crop was poor. Attack of white ants. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-6^{\prime \prime}\) & \(6^{\prime \prime}-16^{\prime \prime}\) & \(16^{\prime \prime}-33^{\prime \prime}\) & \(33^{\prime \prime}-54^{\prime \prime}\) & \(54^{\prime \prime}-70^{\prime \prime}\) \\
C/N & 10.50 & 5.0 & 7.0 & 5.33 & 6.50 \\
pH & 6.9 & 6.9 & 6.8 & 6.9 & 7.0
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.50 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.995 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of N is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 9.33 & 14.14 & 23.05 & 15.51 & 15.61 & 15.86 & 15.04 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 10.60 & 19.42 & 20.85 & 16.96 & 15.21 & 17.81 & 17.85 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 9.46 & 14.75 & 17.85 & 14.02 & 14.21. & 12.97 & 14.89 \\
\hline Mean & 9.80 & 16.10 & 20:58 & 15.50 & 15.01 & 15.55 & 15.93 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 8.16 & 15.48 & 21.39 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 10.71 & 14.85 & 21.09 & & - & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 10.52 & 17.98 & 19.28 & & & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{.} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{.} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{,} & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E of marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of any table
\end{tabular}}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.662 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =1.152 \mathrm{toh} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]}} & & \\
\hline & & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar). '

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 52(252). Type :-'MV'.}

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Loam (type IV). (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by kassi (blind) on 20.3.1952. Hoeings were done after every irrigation at an interval of 5 to 6 days but no dates were recorded. (b) N.A. (c) 46 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 7.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28 to 30.1.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. \(421, V_{2}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(\dot{V}_{3}=\) CO.S. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(\mathbf{N}\) applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring in furrows on 7.3.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \({ }^{33}\) confounded experiment in single replication in which \(\mathbf{X}\) component of VNP interaction is' confounded with blocks. (iii) (a) \(46^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Crop quite satisfactory. (ii) The top borer and pyrilla attack on CO. 421 and CO.S. 321, while variety CO.S. 245 was resistent to a good extent. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-7^{\prime \prime}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-20^{\prime \prime}\) & \(20^{\prime \prime}-33^{\prime \prime}\) & \(33^{\prime \prime}-49^{\prime \prime}\) & \(49^{\prime \prime}-70^{\circ}\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 12.25 & 9.33 & 8.33 & \(6.67^{\prime}\) & 6.50 \\
pH & 7.1 & 7.0 & 6.9 & 7.0 & 7.0
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conductef by D.S.R(M). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1864 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.172 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 13.30 & 19.93 & 20.44 & 17.89 & 17.21 & 17.51 & 18.94 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{8}\) & 14.31 & 20.24 & 20.86 & 18.47 & 16.22 & 20.35 & 18.84 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{8}\) & 15.68 - & 19.54 & 23.47 & 19.56 & 18.52 & 19.17 & 20.99 \\
\hline Mean & 14.43 & 1990 & 21.59 & 18.64 & 17.32 & 19.01 & 19.59 \\
\hline \(\boldsymbol{P}_{0}\) & 13.47 & 18.59 & 19.89 & + & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 14.70 & -19.76 & 22.57 & & & & \\
\hline \(P_{2}\) & 15.11 & 21.36 & 22.30 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table
\[
=0.724 \text { ton/ac. }
\]
\[
=1.254 \text { ton/ac. }
\]
\[
\because
\]

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Mansurpur (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 52(251).
Type :-'MV'.

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c)•N.A. (ii) Sandy loam type IV (highly oxidised). (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved variety. (v) (a) Hoeing by kassi on 8.3.1952. Hoeing by cultivator on 13.4.1952. 3, 13, 14 and 25.5.1952 and 9.6.1952. Hoeing by spade on 14.4.1952. Dressing of Mendhs and barhas on 3 and 26.4.1952. Palewa on 17.2-1952. (b) N.A. (c) 40 , three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 29.2 .1952 and 1.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 20, 21 and 22.1.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
- (1) 3 varieties: \(V_{0}=\) CO. 421, \(V_{1}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(V_{2}=\) CO.S. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{8}}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Manuring in furrows on 29.2.1952 and 1.3.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication. W component of VNP interaction is confounded. N.A. (iii) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 36^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of top borer and pyrilla in general throughout the experiment. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lllccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-5^{\prime \prime}\) & \(5^{\prime \prime}-15^{\prime \prime}\) & \(15^{\prime \prime}-32^{\prime \prime}\) & \(32^{\prime \prime}-46^{\prime \prime}\) & \(46^{\prime \prime}-66^{\prime \prime}\) \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 6.67 & 7.33 & 7.67 & 7.33 & 9.50 \\
pH & 6.8 & 7.1 & 7.1 & 7.2 & 7.1
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.27 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.912 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and V are highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{I}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 14.03 & 19.69 & 25.46 & 19.73 & 18.94 & 19.19 & 21.05 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 17.19 & 24.68 & 28.40 & 23.42 & 24.99 & 20.28 & 24.99 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 13.43 & 16.99 & 22.62 & 17.68 & 19.20 & 17.10 & 16.74 \\
\hline Mean & 14.88 & 20.45 & 25.49 & 20.27 & 21.04 & 18.86 & 20.92 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 15.69 & 19.12 & 28.33 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 15.87 & 19.05 & 21.65 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 13.09 & 23.18 & 26.50 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
- S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad=0.971\) ton/ac.
S.E. of body of any table \(\quad=1.681 \mathrm{t}^{\circ} \mathrm{n} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar).

\section*{\(\therefore\) Ref : :U.P. 51(215). \\ Type :-'MV'.}

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Peas. (c) N.A. (ii) Heavy loam (type IV). (iii) Green manuring by peas. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeings on 10.3.1951, 20.4.1951, 8, 28.5.1951 and 19.6.1951. Earthing on 10.7.1951. (b) N.A. (c) 60 three budded setts/row. (d) and (c) N.A. (vi) 26.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 1 and 2.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. \(421, V_{2}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(V_{3}=\) CO.S. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \quad \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring in furrows on 26.2.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication with \(V^{2} P^{2}\) interaction confounded. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) A slight attack of root borer and top borer in the early stages was reported by the grower. A slight attack of pyrilla was observed at harvesting. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-7^{\circ}\) & \(7^{\prime \prime}-18^{\circ}\) & \(18^{\prime \prime}-36^{\circ}\) & \(36^{\circ}-51^{\circ}\) & \(51^{\prime \prime}-63^{\circ}\) & \(63^{\prime \prime}\)-below \\
pH & 7.1 & 7.0 & 6.9 & 6.8 & 6.9 & 7.2
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 27.78 tod/ac.
(ii) \(1.431 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant. Main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 22.66 & 25.37 & 31.10 & 26.38 & 26.65 & 25.36 & 27.12 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 25.09 & 27.19 & 33.74 & 28.67 & 28.31 & 27.82 & 29.83 \\
\hline \(V_{3}\) & 25.69 & 28.31 & 30.84 & 28.28 & 27.95 & 28.65 & 28.24 \\
\hline Mean & 24.48 & 26.96 & 31.89 & 27.78 & 27.66 & 27.28 & 28.40 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 24.08 & 28.11 & 30.78 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{-} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 24.40 & 25.82 & 31.61 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 24.96 & 26.94 & 33.29 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\(\therefore\)} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.477\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=0.826\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Khatauli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref:-U.P. 51(214).
Týpe :-‘MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Chari. (c) No. (ii) Heavy loam (type IV). (iii) \(300 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of F.Y.M. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 2 hoeings. (b) N.A. (c) 52 three budded setts/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 7.3.19:51. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 13 and 16.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. 421, \(V_{2}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(V_{3}=\) CO.S. 321.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 6 and 7.3.1951 in furrows.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded experiment in single replication with VN \({ }^{2} P\) interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(52^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(46^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Condition was fair at harvesting. (ii) There was slight attack of pyrilla. The cultivator reported that there was also a slight attack of root borer in the eeginning of the experiment. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\[
\begin{array}{lccccc}
\text { Depth } & 0^{\circ}-5^{\circ} & 5^{\circ}-18^{\circ \prime} & 18^{\circ}-30^{\circ} & 30^{\circ}-41^{\circ} & 41^{\circ}-56^{\circ} \\
\mathrm{pH} & 6.9 & 6.5 & 6.8 & 7.0^{\circ} & 6.8
\end{array}
\]
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' field.

\section*{5. RESULTS}
(i) 17.21 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.869 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 15.81 & 18.84 & 18.08 & 17.58 & 17.57 & 17.61 & 17.56 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 14.48 & 17.08 & 17.81 & 16.46 & 15.98 & 16.38 & 17.01 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 17.95 & 16.39 & 18.40 & 17.58 & 17.39 & 17.57 & 17.78 \\
\hline Mean & 16.08 & 17.44 & 18.40 & 17.21 & ' 16.98 & 17.19 & 17.45 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 15.87 & 16.99 & 18.08 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 17.16 & 16.31 & 18.09 & & - & & \(\because\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 15.21 & 19.01 & 18.13 & & & & ! \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.623\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=1.079\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone ;-Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref :-U.P. 50(203).
Type:~' \(\mathbf{M V}\) '.

Object:-To find the cptimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for thrce different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domat. (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 3 Hocings. (b) to (c) N.A. (vi) 20.3.1950. (vi) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (x) 11.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .527\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 21.3.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded design in which \(Z\) component of VNP. interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(50^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\)." (b) \(44^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results \({ }^{\text {d }}\) of soil are :-
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-11^{*}\) & \(11^{\prime \prime}-28^{\prime \prime}\) & \(28^{\prime \prime}-47^{\prime \prime}\) & \(47^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH value & 7.2 & 7.0 & 7.0 & 7.0 \\
C/N. & 0.88 & 6.25 & 5.40 & 8.18 \\
C/P & 5.21 & 3.12 & 2.85 & 2.90
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 10.15 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.367 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{V}\) are significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N a}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 9.02 & 13.53 & 12.41 & 11.65 & 7.05 & 14.10 & 13.81 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 7.63 & 11.54 & 18.79 & 12.65 & 9.47 & 14.47 & 14.02 \\
\hline \(V_{3}\) & 5.28 & 4.30 & 8.81 & 6.13 & 5.75 & 5.80 & 6.85 \\
\hline Mean & 7.31 & 9.79 & 13.34 & 10.15 & 7.42 & 11.46 & 11.56 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 6.93 & 6.46 & 8.87 & \multirow{3}{*}{.} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 831 & 11.53 & 14.54 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 6.69 & 11.38 & 16.61 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean \(\quad\) & \(=1.122\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table \(\quad\) & \(=1.944\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur).

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 50(202).}
Type :- \({ }^{-} \mathbf{M V}\) '.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Domat. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 10 hoeings; no ridges. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 18.3.1950. (vii) Canal irrigation. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 12 to 20.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .527\).
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=60\) and \(N_{8}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{4}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{33}\) confonnded design in which W component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(57^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(51^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No disease. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytica results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-12^{\circ}\) & \(12^{\prime \prime}-35^{\prime \prime}\) & \(35^{\prime \prime}-58^{\prime \prime}\) & \(58^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.5 & 7.5 & 7.0 & 7.5 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 11.1 & 7.81 & 6.13 & 6.5 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 6.45 & 2.84 & 1.96 & 3.51
\end{tabular}
(vi) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 30.11 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.221 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the main effects or their interactions is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.740\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body any of table & \(=3.014\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref :- U.P. 50(201).
Type : ' MV '.

Object:-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{I. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (e) N.A. (ii) Domar. (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 30.3.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1, 2, 3.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. \(42 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{V}_{2}=\) CO. 453 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 527
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 30.3.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded design in which \(X\) component of VNP interaction is totaily confounded. (iii) (a) \(48^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(42^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) amd (ck N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-11^{\circ}\) & \(11^{\prime \prime}-24^{\circ}\) & \(24^{\circ}-50^{\circ}\) & \(50^{\prime \prime}-72^{\circ}\) \\
pH & 6.1 & 6.2 & 6.4 & 6.5 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 9.52 & 12.03 & 5.51 & 6.43 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 5.13 & 6.63 & 3.37 & 4.35
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 13.42 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.686 ton/ac.
(iii) All main effects are bighly significant. Intercations \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}\) and \(\mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{N}\) are significant. Interaction \(\mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{P}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 10.06 & 15.83 & 18.84 & 14.91 & 12.34 & 17.35 & 15.05 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V g}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 9.24 & 16.23 & 23.59 & 16.35 & 14.12 & 17.56 & 17.38 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 6.30 & 9.17 & 11.55 & 9.01 & 5.42 & 10.71 & 10.88 \\
\hline Mean & 8.53 & 13.74 & 17.99 & 13.42 & 10.63 & 15.21 & 14.44 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 7.03 & 12.24 & 12.60 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 8.63 & 14.03 & 22.98 & & & & \\
\hline \(P_{8}\) & 9.97 & 14.95 & 18.40 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.562\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=0.973\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref:- U.P. 50(200).
Type :- 'MV'.

Object : --To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Kankrili soil. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatmencs. (v) (a) 9 hoeings only. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 1.4.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13, 14, 15.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .527\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manure applied on 1.4.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded design in which \(Z\) component of VNP interaction is totally confounded. (iii) (a) \(51^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(45^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Pyrilla nymphes seen here and there. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-10^{\prime \prime}\) & \(10^{\circ}-21^{\circ}\) & \(21^{\prime \prime}-39^{\circ}\) & \(39^{\prime \prime}-50^{\prime \prime}\) & \(50^{\prime \prime}-59^{\prime \prime}\) & \(59^{\circ}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.4 & 7.7 & 7.4 & 7.6 & 7.8 & 7.9 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 6.44 & 7.14 & 6.88 & 5.71 & 6.15 & 5.48 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 6.78 & 8.82 & 11.07 & 5.58 & 3.24 & 2.04
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.05 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.627 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of N and V are highly significant, interaction \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{P}\) is significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 21.39 & . 27.38 & 35.07 & 27.95 & 27.48 & 25.91 & 30.46 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 25.17 & 31.39 & 33.01 & 29.86 & 26.47 & 31.93 & 31.17 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{3}\) & 13.01 & 16.57 & 22.44 & 17.34 & 17.52 & 16.67 & 17.84 \\
\hline Mean & 19.86 & 25.11 & 30.17 & 25.05 & 23.83 & 24.84 & 26.49 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 18.91 & 19.40 & 33.17 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}{ }^{\text {a }}\) & 17.18 & 28.00 & 29.33 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 23.49 & 27.95 & 28.03 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.876\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=1.517\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref --U.P. 50(204).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Kankrill soil. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 6 hoeings. No earthing. (vi) 11.3.1950. (vii) lrrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18 to 20.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO}-421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO}-453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{8}=\mathrm{CO}-527\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on11.3.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded design in which \(X\) component of VNP interaction is totally confounded. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Pyrilla attack noticed. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-8^{\prime \prime}\) & \(8^{\prime \prime}-17^{*}\) & \(17^{\prime \prime}-29^{\circ}\) & \(29^{\circ}-49^{\circ}\) & \(49^{\prime \prime}-61^{*}\) & \(61^{\prime \prime}-72^{\circ}\) \\
pH & 5.5 & 5.5 & 6.5 & 7.0 & 7.5 & 7.5 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 125 & 7.00 & 11.88 & 7.25 & 9.41 & 8.05 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 15.49 & 5.60 & 3.96 & 1.36 & 0.90 & 0.70
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.54 ton/ac.
(ii) 2976 tod \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant. Main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) is significant. Other effect and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 24.55 & 28.93 & 28.82 & 27.43 & 30.69 & 25.27 & 26.34 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 21.74 & 29.60 & 28.09 & 26.48 & 26.35 & 24.27 & 28.81 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{v}_{3}\) & 18.74 & 24.31 & 25.05 & 22.70 & 25.03 & 21.87 & 21.20 \\
\hline Mean & 21.68 & 27.61 & 27.32 & 25.54 & 27.36 & 23.81 & 25.45 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 24.52 & 27.61 & 29.94 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 19.45 & 27.02 & 24.95 & , & & , & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 21.06 & 28.22 & 27.07 & & - & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E of any marginal mean } & =0.992 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E of body of any table } & =1.718 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref: : U.P. 53(205).
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur).

Type :-'MV’. -

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(N\) ani \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Bhur. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeings and one earthing. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 15.3.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 23.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{C O}-421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO}-453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO}-527\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super. Manuring on 15.3.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \({ }^{33}\) confounded design fin which \(Y\) component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{n}-9^{n}\) & \(9^{\prime \prime}-20^{\circ}\) & \(20^{\prime \prime}-43^{\prime \prime}\) & \(43^{\prime}-54^{\prime \prime}\) \\
\(p \mathrm{H}\) & 6.1 & 6.0 & 5.6 & 6.1 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 6.25 & 5.37 & 2.15 & 2.00 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 5.00 & 2.01 & 1.26 & 0.42
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's fields,
5. RESULTS:
(i) 15.29 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.846 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects and their interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=1.615\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=2.798 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone ;-Hargaon (Sitapur).

Ref -U.P. 50(206).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different verieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) NA. (ii) Matyar. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeings by kudali and 3 cultivator plough. No earthing. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) 1.4.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26,27 and 28.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. \(421, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\) CO. 453 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 527 .
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super. Manuring on 1.4.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded design in which \(W\) component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(47^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) Nil. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are:
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\circ}-9^{\prime \prime}\) & \(9^{\prime \prime}-19^{\prime \prime}\) & \(19^{\prime \prime}-48^{\prime \prime}\) & \(.48^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.4 & 7.4 & 7.3 & 7.4 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 11.38 & 4.54 & 2.91 & 3.33 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 5.32 & 2.67 & 2.24 & 0.98
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(S) on cultivator's felds.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 25.80 ton/ac.
(ii) 9.417 too/ac.
(iii) None of the main effects and their interactions is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(N_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 16.11 & 24.64 & 18.58 & 19.78 & 21.92 & 16.91 & 20.50 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & 29.75 & 30.35 & 28.95 & 29.68 & 25.85 & 31.57 & 31.64 \\
\hline V3 & 26.27 & 25.22 & 32.31 & 27.93 & 27.41 & 28.49 & 27.90 \\
\hline Mean & 24.04 & 26.74 & \(26.61{ }^{\circ}\) & 25.80 & 25.07 & 25.65 & 26.68 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 23.93 & 27.73 & 23.54 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 24.66 & 25.88 & 26.42 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 23.54 & 26.61 & 29.90 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=3.139\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=5.437\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Raf:-U.P. 50(207). \\
Zone :-Hargaon (Sitapur). . & Type :-'MV'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combination of \(\mathbf{N}\) and \(\mathbf{P}\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Eankrill soit. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 4 hoeings. (b) to (c) N.A. (vi) 16.3.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 18,19 and 20.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. \(421 ; \mathrm{V}_{2}=\) CO. 453 and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\) CO. 527.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\). \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{8}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 16.3.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) \({ }^{33}\) confounded desigu in which \(Y\) component of VNP interaction is totally confounded. (iii) (a) \(45^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4.I GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) Pyrilla nymphs present. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of the soil are :-
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-8^{\prime \prime}\) & \(8^{\circ}-20^{\prime \prime}\) & \(20^{\prime \prime}-35^{\prime \prime}\) \\
\(p H\) & 7.2 & 7.1 & 3.5 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 12.38 & 8.18 & 8.12 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 18.57 & 6.75 & 3.51
\end{tabular}
(vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(S) on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.36 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.311 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of V is highly significant. Main effect of N is sigaificant. Other effect and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av, yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 10.08 & 15.97 & 15.97 & 14.01 & 12.99 & 12.31 & 16.72 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 22.54 & 24.88 & 24.88 & 24.10 & 24.02 & 23.69 & 24.58 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 16.31 & 16.18 & 18.46 & 16.98 & 15.80 & 17.44 & 17.71 \\
\hline Mean & 16.31 & 19.01 & 19.77 & 18.36 & 17.61 & 17.81 & 19.67 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{6}\) & 18.80 & 17.24 & 16.78 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 12.98 & 19.70 & 20.76 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{Pa}_{8}\) & 17.16 & 20.09 & 21.76 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=0.770\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of any table & \(=1.335\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop:- Sugarcane. & Ref:- U.P. 50(208). \\
Zone :- Hargaon (Sitapur). & Type :- 'MV'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find the optimum manurial combinations of \(N\) and \(P\) for three different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Bhur. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 15.3.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421, V_{2}=C O .453\) and \(V_{2}=C O .527\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=40\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

N applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. Manuring on 15.3.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) \(3^{3}\) confounded design in which \(X\) component of VNP interaction is confounded. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Analytical results of soil are :
\begin{tabular}{lcccc} 
Depth & \(0^{\prime \prime}-14^{\prime \prime}\) & \(14^{\prime \prime}\) & \(46^{\prime \prime}\) & \(-6^{\prime \prime}-58^{\prime \prime}\) \\
\(58^{\prime \prime}-72^{\prime \prime}\) \\
pH & 7.0 & 6.8 & 6.9 & 6.9 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) & 14.58 & 14.58 & 15.4 & 15.11 \\
\(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{P}\) & 12.44 & 5.83 & 2.3 & 3.54
\end{tabular}
(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 22.48 tod/ac.
(ii) 5333 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects and their interactions is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \[
\overline{N_{0}}
\] & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & P. & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 25.45 & 21.35 & 23.82 & 23.54 & 21.49 & 25.34 & 23.79 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 25.14 & 24.05 & 28.27 & 25.82 & 23,38 & 23.22 & 30.88 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & 15.58 & - 19.56 & 19.10 & 18.08 & 19.26 & 23.30 & 11.68 \\
\hline Mean & 22.06 & 21.65 & 23.73 & 22.48 & 21.38 & 23.95 & 22.12 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P a}_{0}\) & 23.46 & 14.01 & 26.67 & ? & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 18.77 & 25.22 & 27.86 & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 23.94 & . 25.74 & 16.67 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{lr}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =1.778 \text { ton/ac. } \\
\text { S.E. of body of any table } & =3.079 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{array}
\]

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref :- U.P. 50(192).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To find out suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
i. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) Ploughings by Meston 7 times, by cultivator 3 times, planking 5 times along the later ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) N.A. (d) 5 rows/plot, rows \(3^{\prime}\) apast. (e) N.A. (v) Sanai at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\) on 22.8.1950, top dressing 3 md . 20 seers of G.N.C. at 34 lb ./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 1 md .1 seer at 25 lb./ac. of N on 12.6.1951. (vi) CO. 453 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings by kassi and 3 by cultivator. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
i. October planting (23.10.1950).
2. November planting (27.11.1950).
3. January planting (17.1.1951).
4. February planting (11.2.1951).
5. March planting (15.3.1951).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(86^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Zones : Nawabgunj, Sardarnagar, Pharenda, Gauribazar, Captainganj and Ghugli. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.45 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.887 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.14 \\
2. & 19.27 \\
3. & 18.99 \\
4. & 18.38 \\
5. & 18.49 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.443\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :- Govt Agri. Farm, Baharaich.
Ref :-U.P. 52 (226).
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To find out methods of improving Sugarcane yield under late planting.

```
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 16.2 .52 and 20,21.3.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughings by desi plough. Harrowing also done along with ploughings. (b) Planted in furrows made by desi plough. (c) 1275, 1530, 2550 and 3060 buds/plot according to treatments. (d) 5 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (v) Compost 150 md . on 1 and 2.1.1952 and Castor cake 9 md . on 24.1•1952. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings by cultivator. (ix) N.A. (x) 1,3.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. February planting- \(3^{\prime}\) distance-setts overlapping.
. 2. March planting- \(3^{\prime}\) distance-setts overlapping.
3. March planting- \(\mathbf{3}^{\prime}\) distance-double setting.
4. March planting-2 \(\frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) distance-setts overlapping.
5. March planting \(-2 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}{ }^{\prime}\) distance-double setting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 5 .
(b) N.A. (iii) 4.
(iv) (a) and
(b) \(85^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\).
(v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(iv) Crop condition satisfactory. February planted sugarcane was better than others in growth. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. "(iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Zones : Gorakhpur, Tamkohi, Faizabad and Ghugli. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 22.86 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 3.927 tod/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac,
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.04 \\
2. & 20.67 \\
3. & 21.92 \\
4. & 21.82 \\
5. & 23.87 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.964\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref:-U.P. 51(177).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To find out suitable rotation with the Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 11.2.1951. (iv) (a) 6 ploughing by Meston and 2 by cultivator plough and 5 plankings along with ploughings. (b) Flat sowing system. (c) 1806 buds/plot. (d) 3' apart. (e) N.A. (v) Top dressing of cake at 6 md . and A/S at 2 md .20 srs. on 11.6 .1951 (vi) CO.453 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings by kassi and cultivator. (ix) N.A. (x) 5 to 20.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-sugarcane.
2. Sanai-sugarcane.
3. Sawan-sugarcane.
4. Sanal-mustard-sugarcane.
5. Jowar + Arhar -sugarcane.
6. Arhar + Moong-Peas-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(86^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) Block \(4^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) Zones : Captainganj, Sardarnagar and Anandnagar. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 28.18 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.18 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 30.97 \\
2. & 32.59 \\
3. & 26.91 \\
4. & 27.12 \\
5. & 26.50 \\
6. & 24.59 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.59\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref :-U.P. 52(233).
Type:-'C'.

Object :-To find out some suitable crop rotation for the Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) (b), As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 15.2.1952. (iv) (a) Harrowing along with hoeing. (b) N.A. (c) 1530 buds/plot. (d) 6 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (v) 220 md . i.e. \(90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N form 9 to 15.1.1952. (vi) CO. 453 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings with cultivator. (ix) N.A. (x) 15, 16.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Sanai-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Sanai-mustar-sugarcane.
5. Jowar+arhar-fallow-sugarcane.
6. Moongiarhar- fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) and (b) \(85^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Plots \(4^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Zones. : Ghugli, Captainganj, Gorakhpur, Faizabad, Anandnagar and Gauribazar (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R(G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.53 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 30.22 \\
2. & 32.96 \\
3. & 26.44 \\
4. & 29.30 \\
5. & 16.28 \\
6. & 17.62 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.27\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Sugarcane. \(\quad\) Ref:.U.P. 52(218).

Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.
Object :-To find out some suitable crop rotation for Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS':
(i) (a), (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soll analysis, Baharaich. (iii): As per treatments. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with Meston, 3 plonghings with desi plough and 1 planking. (b) Sown in lines. (c) 1440 buds/plot. (d) 3' apart. (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at 40 lb ./ac. of N on 6.10 .1952 , 31.1.1953. and 2.4.1953. Top dressing by mixture on 15.7 .1953 . (vi) CO. 453 (medium-late). (vii) Irrigated.
(viii) 2 hoeings and 1 earthing. (ix) N.A. (x) Jan, 1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
. 1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane in Jan. 1953.
2. Paddy+dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane in Jan. 1953.
3. Paddy +dhaincha-peas sugarcane in Oct. 1952.
4. - Paddy + dh aincha-gram -sugarcane in Oct. 1952.
5. Paddy-peas-sugarcane in March, 1953.
6. Paddy-gram—sugarcane in March, 1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Captainganj, Gorakhpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted byD.S.R(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.76 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 4.62 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.73 \\
2. & 20.80 \\
3. & 23.99 \\
4. & 24.43 \\
5. & 11.60 \\
6. & 11.03 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.31\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref:- U.P. 53(259).
Type: ' \(C\) '.

Object :-To find out the proper rotation with the Sugarcane crop on the basis of intensive cultivation in paddy grown areas.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 2 plohugings for October planting and \(\mathbf{3}\) ploughings for January and March planting and 1 harrowing. (b) Flat planting in line. (c) 1440 buds/plot. (d) 18 . rows/plot at \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (c) N.A. (v) \(72 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Castor cake applied in total along with the plantings on different dates and top dress:ng 16 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 15.5.1954. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) February 1955.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Paddy - fallow-sugarcane on 3.2.1554.
2. Paddy + dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane on 3.2.1954.
3. Paddy +dhaincha-peas -sugarcane on 2.10.1953.
4. Paddy + dhaincha-gram-sugarcane on 2.10. 1953.
5. Paddy-peas-sugarcane on 25.4.1954.
6. Paddy-gram-sugarcane on 25.4 .1954 .
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii). 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954.
(b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lakshmiganj, Captaingunj, Gorakhpur and Faizabad zones. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil.
(viii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 26.81 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.51 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll}
1. & 25.61 \\
2. & 23.13 \\
3. & 33.44 \\
4. & 31.95 \\
5. & 27.99 \\
6. & 18.75 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.75\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref :- U.P. 50(184).
Type:-.'C'.

Object :-To find out the proper rotation with the Sügarcane crop on the basis of intensive cultivation in paddy grown areas.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) 7 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (v) Compost 3 C.L. on 6.2 .1950 and Castor cake at 79 lb./ac. on 12 and 15.5 .1950 (vi) CO. 453 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Sanai G.M.-fallow sugarcane.
3. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-peas-sugarcane.
5. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
6. Arhar+paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(87^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Deoria, Sardarnagar, Anandnagar, Captainganj, Ghugli and Balrampur zones. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 34.56 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.79 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 34.51 \\
2. & 36.43 \\
3. & 33.80 \\
4. & 35.08 \\
5. & 30.73 \\
6. & 36.81 \\
S.E./mean & \(=113\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

    Crop :-Sugarcane.
    Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.
    Ref:-U.P. 53(258).
Type:-'C'.

```

Object :-To find out proper rotation with the Sugarcane crop on the basis of intensive cultivation in paddy - grown areas.
1. BȦSAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv)
(a) Ploughings twice by praja plough and thrice by desi plough. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1890 buds/plot.
(d) Rows 3' apart. (e) -. (v) Compost at 40 lb ./ac. of N on 27.1.1954; G.N.C. and A/S at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N at planting. Top dressing of \(A / S\) at 20 lb ./ac. of N on 16.7.1954. (vi) CO. 393 (early) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 hoeing by kudali and 1 by cuitivator. 1 earthing by ridger. (ix) N.A. (x) 28, 29.1.1955 and 1.2.1955.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane on 28.1.1954.
2. Paddy+dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane on 28.1.1954.
3. Paddy + dhaincha-peas-sugarcane on 20.10.1953
4. Paddy +dhaincha-gram-sugarcane on 20.10.1953.
5. Paddy-peas-sugarcane on 10.3.1954.
6. Paddy-gram-sugarcane on 3.4.1954.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(70^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(64^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield at harvest excluding cane harvested for sampling of juice. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lakshmiganj, Captainganj, Gorakhpur and Faizabad zones. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17.90 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.01 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 21.86 \\
2. & 21.85 \\
3. & 19.90 \\
4. & 15.69 \\
5. & 16.36 \\
6. & 11.73 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.00\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 49(4).
Type:-‘C'.

Object :-To see the effects of different Kharif crops on Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23 and 24.2.1949. (iv) (a) 4 preparatory ploughings with desi and Watt's plough. (b) Sown flat. (c) 69 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO-453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing and 1 hocing. (ix) \(52.86^{\circ}\). (x) 21.2.1950 to 3.3.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Wheat-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Wheat-chari-sugarcane.
3. Wheat-paddy-sugarcane.
4. Wheat-guar for fodder-sugarcane.
5. Wheat-sanai for G.M. - sugarcane.
6. Wheat-sanai+berseem-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround, (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(G).
.5. RESULTS :
(i) 17.42 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.633 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Treatment Av. yield
\(1 . \quad 15.24\)
2. 18.88
\(3 . \quad 15.73\)
\begin{tabular}{ll}
4. & 19.27 \\
5. & 16.90
\end{tabular}
\(6 . \quad 18.49\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=1.317\) ton./ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. \\ Ref:-U.P. 50(28). \\ Type :-'C'.}

Object :-To see the effects of different Kharifcrops on Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 22, 23.2.1950. (iv) (a) 6 preparatory ploughings with desi and Watt's ploughs. (b) Sown flat. (c) 60 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing and 8 hoeings. (ix) \(44.96^{\circ}\). (x) 4.1.1951 to 14.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Wheat-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Wheat-chari-sugarcane.
3. Wheat-paddy-sugarcane.
4. Wheat-guar-sugarcane.
5. Wheat-sanai-sugarcane.
6. Wheat-sanai+berseem-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
-4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R(G):
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.03 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.119 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & -20.59 \\
2. & 21.30 \\
3. & 20.34 \\
4. & 18.66 \\
5. & 19.83 \\
6. & 19.47 \\
S.e./mean & \(=1.059\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:-Sugarcane.}

Ref:- U.P. 51(21).
Site : Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Object :-To see the effects of different kharif crops on Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 22.2.1951. (iv) (a) 6 preparatory ploughings with desi and victory plough. (b) Sown flat. (c) 60, 3-budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 60 lb ./ac. of N as Neem cake and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}(50: 50\) ) applied at tillering. (vi) CO. 453. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 e rthing and 5 hoe.ngs. (ix) 27.19". (x) 8.1.1952 to 1.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-sugarcane.
2. Chari-sugarcane.
3.' Guar-sugarcane.
4. Sanai-sugarcane.
5. Paddy-sugarcane.
6. Sanai+berseem-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.24 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.256 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.91 \\
2. & 18.27 \\
3. & 18.65 \\
4. & 25.80 \\
5. & 19.71 \\
6. & 18.08 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.128\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Sugarcane.
> Site .- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

> Ref :- U.P. 52(54).
> Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To see the effects of different kharif crops on Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv)
(a) 5 ploughings with cultivator and desi plough. (b) N.A. (c) 60 , three budded setts/row (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Castor cake at 60 lb ./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 60 lb ./ac of N top dressed. (vi) CO. 453 (late) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings and 1 earthing. (ix) \(\mathbf{3 2 . 3 5 ^ { \circ }}\) (x) 31.1.1953 to 22.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane planted on 31.1.1952.
2. Paddy + dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane planted on 31.1.1052.
3. Paddy + dhuincha - pea-sugarcane planted on 18.10.1951.
4. Paddy-dhaincho+gram-sugarcane planted on 11.10.1951.
5. Paddy - pea-sugarcane planted on \(23,24.3\).1952.
6. Pa \(\pm d y\)-gram-sugarcane planted on 23, 24.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A.
(iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\).
(b) \(21^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes. .
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Attack of borers; borers were killed on 21.5.1952. (iii) Germination, ullers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.43 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.520 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. & & 20.56 \\
2. & & 21.41 \\
3. & 19.62 \\
4. & & 18.09 \\
5. & 20.45 \\
6. & 16.43 \\
S.E \(/\) mean & \(=1.760\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref:- U.P. 53(170).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To see the effects of different kharif crops onsSugarcane crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) and (b) As peritreatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 10 preparatory ploughings with desi and victory plough. (b) N.A. (c) 60 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) G.N.C. at 60 lb ./ac. of N and 60 lb ./ac. of N as A/S. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 earthing and hoeing. (ix) \(50.57^{\prime \prime}\). 'x) 1.2.1954 to 8.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane planted on 6.2.1953.
2. Paddy +dhaincha - fallow-sugarcane planted on 6.2.1953.
3. Paddy+dhaincha pea-sugarcane planted on 16.10.1952.
4. Paddy+dhaincha-gram -sugarcane planted on 16.10.1952.
5. Paddy-pea-sugarcane planted on \(3,4.4 .1953\).
6. Paddy-gram-sugarcane planted on \(3,4.4 .1953\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6.
(b) N.A. (iii)
iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(27^{\prime} \times 59^{\prime}\).
(b) \(21^{\circ} \times 53^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Attack of borers. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane, sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955 . (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by DS.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 20.75 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 3.105 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cl} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 21.62 \\
2. & 20.61 \\
3. & 20.62 \\
4. & 21.79 \\
5. & 20.19 \\
6. & 19.69 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.552\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :- U.P. 52(61).
Type :„C'.

Object :-To find out the possibilities of taking gram as a catch crop in Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Fodder-Sugarcane. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) Autumn 8.10.1951 and spring 17 and 18.3.1952. Gram was also sown on this date. (iv) (a) 6 preparatory ploughings for autumn sugarcane and gram. 9 preparatory ploughings for spring sugarcane. (b) Planted flat. (c) 70 md. of seed cane and 4200 buds/ac. (d) In rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart and two rows of gram between rows of sugarcane. (e) N.A. (v) Compost broadcast at 80 lb ./ac. of N before planting. (vi) CO-453 (late) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings in autumn sugarcane and 6 hoeings in spring sugarcane. Earthing up in July. (ix) \(26.62^{\circ}\). (x) 22 to 27.12.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
2 times of sowing: \(S_{\mathbf{1}}=\) autumn sowing and \(S_{\mathbf{2}}=\) spring sowing.
Sub-plot treatments :
2 levels of catch crop: \(G_{0}=\) no gram and \(G_{1}=\) gram.
\(A / S\) at 60 lb ./ac. of \(N\) and Castor cake at 20 lb ./ac. of N over the basal dressing of compost was applied in the last fortnight of May.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A.: (iii) 6. (iv) (a) Main-plot size gross \(=1 / 13.35 \mathrm{ac}\). Sub: \(75^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(69^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) border on each end of plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) Too much borer in general, most of the millable sugarcane remained stunted. Autumn planted was much affected by pyrilla damage. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane counting and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953 and 1954-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.81 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.77 ton/ac.
(b) 1.47 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(S\) and \(G\) and \(S \times G\) interaction are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 20.77 & 15.49 & 18.13 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 13.56 & 13.41 & 13.49 \\
\hline Mean & 17.17 & 14.45 & 15.81
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. \(S\) marginal means & \(=0.72 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(G\) marginal means & \(=0.60 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(G\) means at a level of \(S\) & \(=0.85 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(G\) & \(=0.94 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn. Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:-U.P. 53(177).
Type:-'C’.

Object :-To find out the possibilities of taking gram as a catch crop in Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Fodder-Sugarcaue. (b) Guar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) Autumn on 12.10.1953 and spring on 20.3.1953. Gram was also sown on these dates. (iv) (a) 4 preparatory ploughings for autumn sugarcane and gram. 12 preparatory ploughings for spring sagarcane. (b) Planted flat. (c) 80 md : of sugarcane seed; 4200 buds/ac. (d) In rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart and two rows of gram between 2 rows of Sugarcane. (e) N.A. (v) Compost broadcast at 80 lb ./ac. of N before planting. (vi) \(\operatorname{COS}-453\) (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 9 hoeings in autumn sugarcane and 8 hoeings in spring sugarcane. Earthing up in July. (ix) \(31.20^{\circ}\). (x) 27.11.1953 to \(\mathbf{3 0 . 1 1 . 1 9 5 3 .}\)

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}
.2 times of sowing : \(S_{1}=\) autumn sowing and \(S_{\mathbf{2}}=\) spring sowing.
Sub-plot treatments:
2 livels of catch crop: \(G_{0}=\) no gram and \(G_{1}=\) gram.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) Main-plot size gross \(=1 / 13.35\). Sub : \(75^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(62^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) border on each end of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1952-1953 and 1954-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(M).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 22.63 ton/ac.
- (ii) (a) 4.159 ton/ac.
(b) 1.956 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(G\) and interaction \(S \times G\) are highly significant. Main effect of \(S\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc:c} 
& \(\mathbf{G}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{G}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Miean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 26.48 & 19.46 & 22.97 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 21.71 & 22.86 & 22.29 \\
\hline Mean & 24.10 & 21.16 & 22.63
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{rlr} 
1. \(S\) marginal means & & \(=1.70 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(G\) marginal means & & \(=0.80 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(G\) means at a level of \(S\) & & \(=1.13 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(199). } \\
\text { Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Neoli. } & \text { Type :- 'C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To find out the possibility of inter cropping gram with Autumn Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanz (c) No. (ii) (a) Light sandy loam (khaddar soil having alkaline patches). (b) Refer soil analysis, Neoli. (iii) \(17.10,1952\) (October plantiog and gram) and 18.2.1953 (February planting). (iv) (a) Harrowing by tractor on 17.9.1952, ploughing by Neoli plough on 19, 23 and 29.9.1952 and 9.10.1952. Harrowing by tractor on 27.9 .1952 and 15.10 1952. Ploughing by tractor 13.10.1952. (b) N.A. (c) Seed rate of gram \(=30 \mathrm{sr}\)./ac. sugarcane 52 three budded setts/row. (d) Sown behind the plough, (e) -. (v) Sanai green manured (turning in on 16.8.1952). Application of A/S and mohwa cake at \(8 \frac{1}{2} /\) plot. (vi) Gram-local variety. Sugarcane CO-453. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with cultivator on 4,19 and 27.4.1953. Hoeing by spade on 4.6.1953 and 7.7.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) Gram 28.3.1953. Sugarcane-N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. October planting + gram inter sown.
2. October planting.
2. February planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(50^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(45^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Plot to plot distance \(=3^{\prime}\).
(vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Gram-failed due to disease and the soil is not suitable for gram cultivation. Sugarcane satisfactory.
(ii) Gram suffered very badly by wilting at the ripening in stage March 1953. No disease in sugarcane.
(iii) Germination, tiller, counting, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and
(b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.41 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.37 \\
2. & 18.02 \\
3. & 20.03 \\
S.E \(/\) mean & \(=0.63\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 4 (49).
Type:- \({ }^{\text {C }}\) '.

Object :-To study the antibiotic effect of Sorghum and Maize plants on the growth of subsequent crop of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 21.2.1943. (iv) (a) and (b) Ploughing on 29.6.1947 and 3.7.1947 (for Jowar and Maize). Ploughing and pata on 6.10.1947, 8 and 18.2.1948. (c) 50 setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Top dressing A/S at 100 lb ./ac. of N on 18.5.1948. (vi) \(\mathrm{CO}-421\) (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing and earthing on 10.8.1948. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.12.1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Sugarcane after sorghum crop i.e. roots left in the soil.
3. Sorghum (jowar) roots added superficially ( 16 srs ./plot).
4. Sugarcane after maize crop (roots of maize left in soil).
5. Maize roots ( 20 srs./plot)-added superficially.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(33^{\circ} \times 40^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1947-1949. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{s. RESULTS:}
(i) 24.75 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.37 too/ac.
(ii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 24.72 \\
2. & 24.48 \\
3. & 24.83 \\
4. & 24.26 \\
5. & 25.47 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.52\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 49(112).
Type :-‘C’.
Object :-To study the antibiotic effect of Sorghum and Maize crop and mixture on Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sorghum, Maize or Fallow as per treatments. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur., (iii) 3.3.1949. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 40 three budded setts/row and 11 rows/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Top dressing of A/S at 150 lb ./ac. of N. (vi) CO. 453 and CO. 557 . (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) '48.59" (from March 1949 to Dec. 1949). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. After sorghum crop. -
3. After maize crop.
4. Mixed with sugarcane (CO. 453).
5. Sorghum mixed with sugarcane (CO.557).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.28 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.976 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 14.47 \\
2. & 11.14 \\
3. & 15.17 \\
4. & 13.02 \\
5. & 12.60 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.683\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcańe Res. Stn. Shahjahanpur.

Ref.-U.P. 53(203).
Type:-'C'.

Object :-To study the different times of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with victory plough, 5 desi ploughings. plankings. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of G.N.C, + 10 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 10.10 .1952 in July and Oct. plots; on 6.2. in Feb. plots on 23.4 G.N.C. \(+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N to whole expt. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kassi and cultivator earthing on 16.7.1953. (ix) \(6157^{\prime \prime}\) (From August 1952 to Jan. 1954). (x) 19.1.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Adsali (July) planting on 29.7.1952.
2. Autumn (October) planting on 11.10.1952.
3. Spring (Feb.) planting on 6.2.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(65^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(59^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) on all sides of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) No. of tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-55. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D S.R(S).
5. RESULTS:
-(i) 30.68 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.573 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ron/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 27.50 \\
2. & 33.90 \\
3. & .30 .64 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.786\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref:- U.P. 51(143). \\
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. & Type :- 'C'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To compare the effect of planting Sugarcane in October and in the month of March on the growth, yield and juice quality of Sugarcane (preliminary experiment).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Top dressing at 100 lb ./ac. of N on 4.6 .1952 . (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing on 27.11.1951, 19.3.1952, 11.4.1952, 30.4.1952; 13.5.1952, weeding and hoeing on 7.1.1952. Hoeing and light earthing on \(\mathbf{1 . 3}\).1952 and earthing on 1.8.1952. (ix) \(35.27^{*}\). (x) 14.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

1: October planting on 4.10.1951.
2. March planting on 21.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(25^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Yes, but details are not available. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 30.00 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.973 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 36.04 \\
2. & 23.97 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.716\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U P. 53(221). } \\
\text { Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. } & \text { Type :- ‘C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of sowing Sugarcane setts taken from the top and lower portion of cane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shabjahanpur. (iii) 30.1.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 36,720 buds/ac. ( 34 setts/row). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Basal dressing of sanal ; top dressing of A/S at 60 lb ./ac. of N 0 17.4.1953. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with cultivator on 25.2.1953, hoeing with kassi on 16.4.1953, 30.4.1953, 18.5 .1953 and earthing on 16.8.1953. (ix) \(45.73^{\circ}\) (x) 12.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Sugarcane setts taken from top portions of cane.
2. Sugarcane setts taken from lower portion of cane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\circ}\). (v) Yes, but no details are available. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (vi) Ni. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (5).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 28.02 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.353 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 27.53 \\
2. & 28.52 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.359\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Ref :- U.P. 53 (222).
Type:- 'C'.
Object:-To study the effect of plarting cane at different seed rates on the germination, growth, juice quality and yield of Sugar cane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Sanai as green manure and A/S at 60 lb./ac. of N. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) and (viii) N.A. (ix) \(43.13^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

\section*{3 seed rates :}
1. Low ( 25,000 buds/ac.).
2. Medium ( 54,000 buds/ac.).
3. High \((65,000\) buds/ac.).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 28.48 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.827 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Ay yield of suguarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 26.97 \\
2. & 29.62 \\
3. & 28.85 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.913\) tcn/ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 53(204). } \\
\text { Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahajahanpur. } & \text { Type :- ‘C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object: :-To study the effect of intercropping Gram with Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 36 3-budded settṣ/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) 43.23". (x) 16.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Sugarcane planted on 24.10 .1952 .
2. Sugarcane planted on 24.10 .1952 intercropped with gram.
3. Gram in October, 1952 followed by sugarcane planted on 2.4.1953 after harvest of gram.
4. Sugarcane planted on 7.3.1953.

Sowing of gram 24.10.1952 and harvesting on 24.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) Left, \(3^{\prime}\) on all sides of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 21.59 ton/ac.
(ii) 7.968 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 23.42 \\
2. & -18.49 \\
3. & 27.51 \\
4. & 16.94 \\
S.E.jmean & \(=5.635\) ton/ac.'
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 48(53).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To study the effect of keeping setts under cowdung and topping before sowing on the germination and yield of Sugarcane (winter germination experiment)."

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Scnai G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 50 three budded setts/row, 7 rows/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Basal dressing of Sanai ( \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N). Top dressiog of A/S \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 dates of planting: \(D_{1}=23.11 .1948, D_{2}=23.12 .1948, D_{8}=22.1 .1949\) and \(D_{4}=23.2 .1949\).
Sub-plot treatments:
4 treatments given to setts: \(T_{1}=\) Control, \(T_{2}=\) Setts kept for one day under cowdung, \(T_{8}=\) Setts kept for two days under cowdung and \(T_{4}=\) Topping one week before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main plots/replication; 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) Yes, but no details are available. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment condncted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.59 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.673 ton/ac.
(b) 2.798 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & T 1 & \(\mathrm{T}_{2}\) & T3 & \(\mathrm{T}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 16.37 & 18.30 & 15.86 & 18.69 & 17.30 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 20.77 & 21.04 & 19.78 & 19.12 & 20.18 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 19.83 & 19.68 & 21.98 & 18.84 & 20.08 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 20.10 & 18.33 & 20.61 & 24.16 & 20.80 \\
\hline Mean & 19.27 & 19.34 & 19.56 & 20.20 & 19.59. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. D marginal means \(\quad=1.500\) ton/ac.
2. \(T\) marginal means \(\quad=1.142\) ton/ac.
3. T means at a level of \(D \quad=2.285\) ton/ac.
4. D meens at a level of \(T\). \(\quad=2.483\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 49(114).
Type:-‘C'.

Object :-To study the effect of keeping selts under cowdung and topping before sowing on the germination and yield of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai G.M. (c) No. '(ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 35 three budded setts/row (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Basal dressing of Sanal Top dressing 100 lb ./ac. of N. (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) IrrigateJ. (viii) N.A. (ix) 40.17'. (x) 12 to 18.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
4 dates of planting: \(D_{1}=23.11 .1949, D_{2}=23.12 .1949, D_{3}=29.1 .1950\) and \(D_{4}=23.2 .1950\).
Sub-plot treatments:
4 treatments given to setts: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Control (fresh setts): \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{i}}=\) Setts kept under cowdung for 24 hours, \(\mathrm{T}_{3}=\) Setts kept under cowdung for 48 hours and \(\mathrm{T}_{4}=\) Setts from cane topped 3 weeks before sowing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) Yes-but details are not available. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (xi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.34 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.745 ton/ac.
(b) 3.089 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathrm{T}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 21.88 & 23.38 & 24.36 & 21.99 & 22.90 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 23.84 & 23.15 & 26.96 & 23.73 & 24.42 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 21.76 & 22.80 & 21.42 & 24.02 & 22.50 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 22.23 & 23.03 & 24.53 & 24.36 & 23.54 \\
\hline Mean & 22.43 & 23.09 & 24.32 & 23.52 & 23.34
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. D marginal means & \(=1.324\) ton/ac. \\
2. \(T\) marginal means & \(=1.093\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(T\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=2.185\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(T\) & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-'U.P. 50(154).
Type:- 'C'.

Object:-To study the effect of keeping setts under stored cow-dung and topping before planting on th germination and yield of Sugarcane (winter germination experiment).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Basal dressing of Sanal. A/S at 100 lb ./ac. of N top dressed on 7.5.1951. (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings on 27.1.1951, 31.3.1951, 3.5.1951 and 6.6.1951. Earthing on 22.8.1951. (ix) \(31.98^{\prime \prime}\) (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 dates of planting: \(D_{1}=18.11 .1950, D_{2}=20.12 .1950, D_{3}=18.1 .1951\) and \(D_{4}=17.2 .1951\).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

4 treatments given to setts: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Control (fresh setts), \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Setts kept under stored cowdung for 24 hours, \(T_{2}=\) Setts kept under stored cowdung for 48 hours and \(T_{4}=\) Setts from cane topped 10 days tefore planting.
3. DESIGN :I
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(52^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\), (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.23 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.935 toniac.
(b) 2.106 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|cccc|c} 
& \(T_{\mathbf{I}}\) & \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 20.83 & 18.36 & 22.32 & 22.15 & 20.92 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 21.36 & 20.54 & 19.54 & 20.97 & 20.60 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 17.60 & 21.15 & 22.67 & 21.49 & 20.73 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 22.13 & 22.43 & 22.66 & 23.47 & 22.67 \\
\hline Mean & 20.48 & 20.62 & 21.80 & 22.02 & 21.23
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. \(D\) marginal means & \(=1.198\) ton/ac. \\
2. \(T\) marginal means & \(=0.860\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(T\) means at a level of \(D\). & \(=1.720\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(T\) &
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(181).
Type:- C '.

Object:-To study the effect of planting setts split longitudinally on germination and yield of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 9.4.1952. (iv) (a) to(c) N.A. (c) 20 three budded setts/row. (d) 6 rows/plot \(11^{\prime}\) apart. (v) Manuring with \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N in the form of G.N.C. and A/S (1:1). (vi) CO.K. 30 (medium-late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(31.47^{*}\) (x) 11.12.1952

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Three budded setts split into two halves and planted after dusting cut sides with gammaxene.
2. Three budded setts split into two halves and planted without dusting gammaxene at cut sides.
3. Three budded setts planted with gammaxene applied in furrows at 40 lb ./ac.
4. Three budded setts planted without gammaxene application.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) No. (iii) Germination count, tillering, millaEle cane and sugareane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953.
(b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 4.14 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.57 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 4.13 \\
2. & 2.88 \\
3. & 4.53 \\
4. & 5.03 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.29\) ton/ac,
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. \(53(205)\).
Type :-'C'.

Object:-To study the effect of planting setts split longitudinally on germination and yield of Sugarcane..
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 23.2.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughings with desi plough on \(6,7,8,20\), and 21.2 .1953 . Planking on \(7,9,11\) and 21.2.1953. (b) N.A. (c) 25 , three budded setts/row. (d) 6 rows in gross plots at \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) distance. (e) N.A. (v) G.N.C.+A/S at \(80 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N (mixing manure). (vi) CO.K. 30 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated.(viii) Hoeing with kassi on 27.3.1953, 24 and 30.4.1953. (ix) 40.55". (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Three budded setts splitted into two halves and planted after dusting cut sides with gammaxene.
2. Three budded setts splitted into two halves and planted without dusting gammaxene.
3. Three budded setts planted with gammaxene applied in furrrows at 40 lb ./ac.
4. .Three budded setts planted without gammaxene application.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(23^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination count, tillering, millable cane and sugarcaue yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c). N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.84 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.50 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 16.23 \\
\hline 2. & 11.42 \\
\hline 3. & 20.12 : \\
\hline 4. & 15.58 .. \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=1.251\) ton/ac: \\
\hline \(\cdots \cdots\) & . \({ }^{\prime}\). \({ }^{\text {a }}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane:Res, Sthi; Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 51(129).
Type :-‘C'.

Object:-TH stefy the relative effect of earthing and binding up on Sugarcane.
1, BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 28.2.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughings by victory plough and tractor planking on 7 and 8.1.1951. (b) N.A. (c) No. of setts in treatments 1 and 2-N.A. 34 setts in treatment 3 and 4 ( 3 budded). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Basal dressing castor cake at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 28.2 .1951 and top dressing of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(\mathbf{2 0} \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N on 8.5.1951. (vi) CO.6222 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Binding on 29 and 30.8.1951. Earthing on 28.8.1951. Hoeing with cultivator on 6, 7.4.1951 and 9.5.1951. Hoeing with kassi on 29:3.1951, 27.5.1951 and 18.6.1951. (ix) \(29.86^{\circ}\). (x) 16 and 17.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart, 1 sett per 3 sq. feet with earthing up.
2. Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart, 1 sett per 3 sq. feet with binding up sugarcane.
3. Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart, 1 sett per 3 sq. feet with binding up sugarcane.
4. Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart, I sett per 3 sq. feet without earthing up sugarcane and without binding sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (Replication 4 was rejected because 2 plots were badly spoiled). (iv) (a) and (b) \(51^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 24.82 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.123 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 23.99 \\
2. & 25.73 \\
3. & 26.08 \\
4. & 23.49 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.226\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Ref:- U.P. 52(179).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Type:- 'C'.
Object :-To study the relative effect of earthing and binding up of Sugarcano.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 24.3.1952. (iv)
(a) 3 ploughings by victory plough, 7 ploughings by desi plough, 1 ploughing by liver harrow and plankings.
(b) N.A. (c) 24 setts/line in two feet apart row and 42 setts/line in three feet apart rows. (d) and (e) N.A.
(v) G.N.C.and A/S on 14.5.1952 and F.Y.M. on 30.1.1952. Sanal turning on 11.9.1951. (vi) CO. 622 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kassi and cultivator earthing and binding. (ix) \(33.30^{\prime \prime}\) ( \(x\) ) 1 and 10.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Rows \(3^{3}\) apart with earthing up-one three budded sett per feet of a row.
2. Rows \(3^{\circ}\) apart with binding-one three budded sett per feet of a row.
3. Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart with binding-one three budded sett per \(11^{\prime}\) of a row.
4. Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart without binding-one, three budded sett per 12 \(^{\prime}\) of a row.
5. Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart without earthing or binding-one three budded set per feet of a row.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) (i) \(42^{\circ} \times 16^{\prime}\) (in rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart) and \(42^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\) (in rows \(3^{\circ}\) apart). (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) and \(2^{\prime}\) one either side for plots having rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart and \(3^{\circ}\) and \(3^{\circ}\) on either side for plots having rows \({ }^{3 \prime}\) apart. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
ii) Fair but sugarcane lodged in replication one. (ii) Nil. (iii) No. of tillers, miltable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nih. (vii) Enperiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 25.73 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.70 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 23.64 \\
2. & 22.35 \\
3. & 28.00 \\
4. & 28.71 \\
5. & 25.96 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.98\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Captainganj (Deoria).

Ref :- U.P. 49(155).
Type :- ‘C’.

Object :- To find the suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Early paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as F.Y.M., \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as Neem cake and 35 lb ./ac. of N as A/S. (iv) CO. 513 -(early) (improved). (v) (a) 3 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated, (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. November planting on 25.11.1949.
2. January planting on 15.1 1950.
3. February planting on 25.2.1950.
4. March planting.
5. April planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) Yes, 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 12.10 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.007 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & \(10.92 \ldots\) \\
2. & 12.52 \\
3. & 13.74 \\
4. & 11.20 \\
5. & 12.11 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.003\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Captainganj (Deoria).

Ref :- U.P. 50(191)
Type:- "C'.

Object:-To find out'a suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 120 md . of factory manure at sowing time on 29.10 .1950 (ii) Bhat soils. (iii) Top diessing A/S at 20 srs. on 7.7.1951. (iv) CO.573 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughing by victory plough on 2.7.1950 and 15.10.1950, ploughing by desi plough on 8 and 27.10. 1950 and 7 hoeings by kassi. (b) Flat sowing. (c) and (d) 1680 buds/plot and 8 rows/plot. (c) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 26.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. October planting on 29.10.1950.
2. November planting on 29.11.1950.
3. January planting on 28.1.1951.
4. February planting on 27.2.1951.
5. March planting on 24.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(70^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(64^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
14. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A (iii) Germination, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c). N.A. (v)N.A. (vi) Nil. (yii) Ths experiment was coaducted by D.S.R. (G) on cuitivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17.73 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.729 ton/ac.
(iii) Treament differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 16.36 \\
2. & 18.13 \\
3. & 16.88 \\
4. & 19.26 \\
5. & 18.00 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.864\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Captainganj (Deoria)}
Ref :- U.P. 51(165).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To study different times of planting Sugarcane in different treatments.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Early paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) 6 C.L.ac./ of press mud manure on 6.11 .1951
(iv) CO.356 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) Ploughing by desi plough. Hoeing by kassi. Earthing up on 1.8.1952. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1440 buds/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 24.1.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. November planting on 16.11 .1951 .
2. January planting on 23.1 .1952.
3. February planting on 2.2.1952.
4. March planting on 2.3.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 60^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.46 ton/ac.
(ii) \(1.783 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Tretament & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.23 \\
2. & 2113 \\
3. & 22.50 \\
4. & .21 .98 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.891\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Ref-U.P. 51(182).
Zone :-Gauribazar (Deoria).
Type :-'C'.
Object :-To improve the Sugarcane yield under late planting conditions.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.) (c) No. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) were used at planting on 7.2 .1951 and 29.3.1951. (iv) CO-513 (early) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by tractcr on 13.10.1951, harrowing by tractor on \(25.10 .1950,1.11 .1950\) and 16.12.1950, 7 hoeings and one earthing on 2.7.1951. (b) N.A. (c) and (d) 10 rows/plot in treatments 1,2 and 3. and 12 rows/plot in treatments 4 and 5 . No. of buds/plot treatment wise (1) 2160 , (2) 2160 , (3) 4320 , (4) 7592 and (5) 5184. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vij) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 23.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Normal planting (first week of February) (control).
2. Late planting at the end of March in rows at \(3^{\prime}\) distance with normal setting.
3. Late planting at the end of March in rows at \(3^{\prime}\) distance with double setting.
4. Late planting at the end of March in rows at \(2 \frac{1}{2}\) ' distance with normal setting.
5. Late planting at the end of March in rows at \(2 \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}}\) distance with double setting.

Planting of treatment 1 on 7.2.1951 and others on 29.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications (iii) (a) \(72^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) for treatments 1,2 and 3 and \(67^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\) for treatments 4 and 5. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) Yes, 1951-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The Experimeat was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 31.59 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.466 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 30.92 \\
2. & 31.77 \\
3. & 32.66 \\
4. & 28.91 \\
5. & 33.69 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.733\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Gorakhpur (Deoria).
Ref:-U.P. 52(224).
Type :- \({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) '.
Object:-To improve sugarcane yield under late planted conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam + clay loam. (iii) Mixture of Castor cake and A/S at 100 lb /ac. of N and Super at 100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{55}\). (iv) CO-513 (early) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by tracton on 1.10.1951; harrowing by tractor on 5.10.1951, 5 and 14.1.1952; trenching by tractor' on 25.1.1952; hoeing by \(k\) udali and earthing up by phawara. (b) Trench planting. (c) and (d) 10 rows and 12 rows. per plot according to treatments. No. of buds planted/plot: (1) 2160 , (2) 2160 , (3) 4320, (4) 2592 and (5) 5184. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigation by tube-well. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 11.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Normal planting in February-rows at \(3^{\prime}\) apart with single setts (control).
2. Late planting in March at \(3^{\prime}\) apart-normal setting.
3. Late planting in March at \(3^{\prime}\) apart-double setting.
4. Late Planting in March at \(21^{\circ}\) apart-normal setting.
5. Late planting in March at \(2 \mathbf{2}^{\prime}\) apart - double setting.

Dates of planting : treatment 1 on 7.2.1952 and other treatments on 23.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. As the yield for 2 replicaticns is not given, analysis has been based ca 2 replications only. (iii) (a) and (b) \(72^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Ni]. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' ficlds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 40.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.403 too/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 45.96 \\
2. & 36.60 \\
3. & 40.56 \\
4. & 3908 \\
5. & 40.16 \\
S E./mean & \(=3.818\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 49(154). } \\
\text { Zone :- Gauribazar (Deoria). } & \text { Type :- ‘C’. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To find out the suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanoi. (c) Nil. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 7 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. October planting on 20.10.1949.
2. November plant ing on 15.11.1949.
3. January planting on 15.1.1950.
4. February planting on 15.2.1950.
5. March planting on 15.3.1950.
6. April planting 15.4.1950.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 9.21 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.462 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly sigaificant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.88 \\
2. & 8.80 \\
3. & 9.37 \\
4. & 9.52 \\
5. & 10.01 \\
6. & 7.70 \\
S.E./mean & 0.231 ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
: :- Wine :- Gauribazar (Deoria).
Ref :- U.P. 50(189).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To find out suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at planting. (iv) BO.24 (improved). (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor on 13.10.1950. Horrowing by tractor on 25.10.1950 (thrice). Hoeings from 24.11.1950 to 26.6.1951. Earthing on 67.1951 . (b) N.A. (c) and (d) 1386 buds/plot and 7 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) 13.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. October planting on 28.10.1950.
2. November planting on 15.11.1950.
3. . January planting on 15.1.1951.
4. February planting on 15.2.1951.
5. March planting on 15.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N A. '(v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 37.57 ton/ac.
(ii) . . 2.329 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 44.49 \\
2. & 41.53 \\
3. & 34.32 \\
4. & 32.82 \\
5. & 34.70 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.164\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Lakshmiganj (Deoria).

Ref: : U.P. 53(250).
- Type in \({ }^{\text {'C }}\) ".

Object :-To improve cane yield under late planting conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) Press mud at 100 mds./ac. on 21 1.1953. Top dressing by castor cake at 8 mds./ac. on 222.1953 , A/S at \(2 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). on 25.2.1953. (iv) CO. 617 (medium)-improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor hoeing by cultivator and kudall. (b) Fiat planting with spade. (c) and (d) 7 rows in treatments 1,2 and 3 and 8 in treatments 4 and 5. No. of buds planted pet, plot: 1680 in treatments 1 and 2,3360 in treatment 3, 1920 in treatment 4 and 3849 in treatment 5. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N:A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Norm:al planting at the end of February 1953 in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with single setts.
2. Late planting at the end of the March and in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with normal setting, setts overlapping ont another.
3. Late planting at the end of March in rows 3' apart with double setting.

4 Late planting in rows \(2 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) apart and with setts overlapping one another.
5. Late planting in rows \(21^{\prime}\) apart and with double setting.

Dates of planting : Ireatment 1 on 22:2.1953 and treatments 2,3,4 and 5 on 25.3.1553.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications of which 2 replications were damaged. (iii) \(\boldsymbol{( a )} \mathbf{8 0} \times 25^{\circ}\). (b) \(74 \times 15^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 9.18 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.887 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treaiment & Av. yield. \\
1. & 9.80. \\
2. & 6.88 \\
3. & 9.39 \\
4. & 7.05 \\
S. & 12.78 \\
S.e./mean & \(=1.334\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-Captainganj (Deoria).
}

Ref :^ U.P. 53(249).
Type :-'C'.

Object : -To improve cane yield under late planted conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Bangar. (iii) Compost at \(200 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 15.11 .1952 . Top dressing of Compost at \(1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{md}\) /ac. on 2.5 .1953 . (iv) CO 617 (medium) improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by desi plough hoeing by kudall. (b) Flat planting with spade. (d) 7 and 8 rows/plot. Buds planted/plot in treatments 1 and \(2=1155\), treatment \(-3=2310\); treatment \(-4=1320\) and treatment \(-5=2640\). (e) (N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Normal planting at the end of Jan. 1963 in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with single setts.
2. Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with normal setting (single setts).
3. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with double setting.
4. Late planting in rows \(2 \frac{1}{}^{\prime}\) apart with setts overlapping one another.
5. Late planting in rows \(2 \frac{1}{f}^{\prime}\) apart with double setting.

Dates of planting : treatment 1 on 2.2.1953 and others on 17.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 3 replications. (iii) (a) \(55^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL
(i) N.A. (b) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.

Restutis:'
u, (i) 15.37 ton/ac.
(i) 2.558 ton \(/ a c\)
it 4 iii) Treatment differeces are not significant.
(iv) A Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 12.14 \\
\hline 2. & 15.69 \\
\hline 3. & 13.03 \\
\hline 70, \({ }^{2}\) & 17.45 \\
\hline 5. & 18.54 \\
\hline S.E-/mean & \(=1.477\) ton/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
 \\ Zone :- Tamkohi (Deoria).
}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. } 52(225) . \\
& \text { 'rype :- 'C'. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object: - To improve Sugarcane yield under late planted conditions.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai for G.M. (sown on 3.7.1951). (c) Nil. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) Castor cake at 3 md., A/S at 2 md . Super at 1 md . (iv) CO. 513. early (improved). (v) (a) Ploughiugs by tractor and levelling on 20.7.1951, 11.10.1951, ploughing by bullocks and levelling on 22.12.1951, cultivator on 19.1.1952, disc harrowing by tractor and levelling on 19.21951 . (b) Flat planting. (c) and (d) 10 rows/plot for treatments 1, 2 and 3, 12 rows for treatments 4 and 5, manuring and hoeing on 24.6.1952 and hoeing by bullocks. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 15.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Normal planting during February at \(\mathbf{3}^{\prime}\) distance-single setting.
2. Late planting at \(3^{\prime}\) distance single setting.
3. Late planting at \(3^{\prime}\) distance - double setting.
4. Late planting at \(2 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) distance-single setting.
5. Late planting at \(2 \frac{1}{}^{\prime}\) distance-double setting.

Dates of planting : treatment 1 in February, 1952 and others on 20.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications (iii) (a) and (b) \(60^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable canes, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 21.37 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.458 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ai.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 21.07 \\
2. & 20.05 \\
3. & 22.08 \\
4. & 21.21 \\
5. & 22.45 \\
S. E./mean & \(=0.729\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Sugarcane. Ref :- U.P. 50(178).
Zone:- Deoria (Deoria).
Type:- 'C'.

```

Object :-To find out suitable rotation with the Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatmrnts. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Compost top dressed on 14, 15 and 19.5.1950., (iv) CO.S 109 (medium). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 7 to 8.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.3.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-fallow- sugarcane.
2. Sanai (G.M.)-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
5. Paddy-peas-sugarcane.
6. Arhar +kodon-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(49^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A: (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D S.R. (G). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 16.67 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.941 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 17.35 \\
2. & 1786 \\
3. & 16.92 \\
4. & 16.16 \\
5. & 16.07 \\
6. & 15.65 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.471\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Ref :-U.P. 50(181).
Type:-‘'C'.
Object :-To find out suitable rotation with the Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soils. (iii) 25 lb ./ac. of N as Castor cake and \(35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as neem cake+A/S. (iv) POJ 2878 (mid-late). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 22.1.1950. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Paddy - fallow-sugarcane.

2 Fallow-fallow-sugarcanc.
3. Sanai-fallow-sutarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 5.43 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.441 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differenc̣es are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment &. Av. yield \\
1. & 5.22 \\
2. & 569 \\
3. & 5.37 \\
S.E./mean & 0.221 ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Lakshmiganj (Deoria).

Ref :-U.P. 53(255).
Type :-‘'C’.

Object :--To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and .b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) Top dressing at 1 md. 25 seer/ac. as A/S on 2.7.1954. (iv) 22.10 1953, 30.1.1954 and 24.3.1954. (v) (a) 7 ploughings. (b) Flat planting with spade. (c) 2160 buds/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot. (e) N A. (vi) CO 356 (medium-late) improved. (vil) N.A. (viii) 6 hoeings and 1 earthing up by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.3.1955.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Early Paddy-fallow-sugarcane plant in Jan. 1954.
2. Early Paddy + dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane planted in Jan. 1954
3. Early Paddy + dhaincha-peas-sugarcane planted in Oct. 1953.
4. Early Paddy + dhaincha-gram-sugarcane planted in Oct. 1953.
5. Early Paddy alone-peas - sugarcane planted in March, 1954.
6. Early Paddy alone gram-sugarcane planted in March, 1954.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) \(80^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953 to 1955
(b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 13.84 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.291 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
1. 17.25
2. 16.45
3. 17.80
4. \(\quad 14.72\)
\(5 . \quad 9.38\)
\(6 . \quad 7.47\)
S.E./mean \(\quad 1.145\) ton/ac.
Crop: :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Captainganj (Deoria).

Ref :-U.P. 52(219).
Type :-‘C’.
Object :-To find out suitable rotation for Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Bangar. (iii) Press mud at 100 md ./ac. on 8.1.1953. Top manuring of \(A / S\) at 2 md./ac. on 24.4.1953. (iv) CO. 356 (medium-late) \&(improved). (v) (a) Ploughing by desi plough. (b) Flat sowing by spade. (c) 1320 buds/plot. (d) 8 rows/piot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings by kudali. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane on 25.1.1953.
2. Paddy +dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane on 25.1.1953.
3. Paddy+dhaincha Peas-sugarcane on 15.10.1952.
4. Paddy+dhaincha-gram-sugarcane on 15.10.1952.
5. Paddy alone-peas-sugarcane on 18.3.1953.
6. Paddy alone gram-sugarcane on 18.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 3 replications. (iii) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955.
(b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.12 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.989 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 16.78 \\
2. & 15.35 \\
3. & 12.85 \\
4. & 16.03 \\
5. & 15.80 \\
6. & 13.91 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.148\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :-Captainganj (Deoria).

```
Ref:- U.P. 53(254).
Type:-‘'C’.

Object:-To find out the best rotation for Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Gram and then as per treatments: (c) N.A. (ii) Bangar. (iii) Press mud at \(100 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 20.4.1954. \(A / S\) at 1 md./ac. on 25.5 .1954 and \(1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 5.7 .1954 . (iv) CO. 617 (medium) (improved). (v) (a) 2 ploughings by dest plough. (b) Flat planting by spade. (c) 2160 buds/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by kudali, 1 earthing up by spade. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 13.1.1955.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Early paddy-fallow-sugarcane planted on 22.1.1954.
2. Early paddy + dhanicha-fallow-sugarcane planted on 21.10.1953.
-3. Early paddy +dhaincha-peas -sugarcane planted on 22.1.1954.
4. Early paddy+dhaincha-gram-sugarcane planted on 21.10.1953.
5. Early paddy alone-peas -sugarcane planted on 27.31954.
6. Early paddy alone-gram-sugarcane planted on 27.3.1954.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (i) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 16.34 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.717 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Ay. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 15.81 \\
2. & 17.59 \\
3. & 15.28 \\
4. & 13.33 \\
5. & 17.92 \\
6. & 18.10 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.358\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane.}

Zone :-Gorakhpur (Deoria).

Ref:-U.P. 52(221).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To find out the best rotation for Sugarcane crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Mixture of castor cake and A/S at 100 lb ./ac. of N on \(9.8 .1952,15.1 .1953\) and 29.3.1953. (iv) CO.511 (improved). (v) (a) 1 tractor plough, 2 harrowings by tractor. (b) Trench planted. (c) 6372 buds/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings by hand kudali . (ix) N.A. (x) 23.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane planting on 15.1.1953.
2. Paddy + dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane planting on 15.1.1953.
3. Paddy+dhaincha-peas-sugarcane planting on \(\mathbf{3 0 . 1 0 . 1 9 5 2}\).
4. Paddy+dhaincha-gram-sugarcane planting on 30.10.1952.
5. Paddy - peas-sugarcane planting on 29.3.1953.
6. Paddy-gram-sugarcane planting on 29.3.1953.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) R B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(59^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(53^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.22 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.029 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 18.66 \\
2. & 19.46 \\
3. & 20.40 \\
4. & 16.48 \\
5. & 1474 \\
6. & 19.58 \\
& S.E./mean \\
& \(=0.515\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Gorakhpur (Deoria).

Ref :- U.P. 53(253).
Type:- ' C '.

Object :-To find out the best rotation for Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO.S. 453 (medium-late) improved. (v) (a) 3 ploughings by tractor. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1620 buds/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated.:(viii) 9 ploughings by hand hoe. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1955.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane planting on 28.1.1954.
2. Paddy +dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane planting on 28.1.1954.
3. Paddy + dhaincha-peas-sugarcane planting on 29.10.1953.
4. Paddy +dhaincha-gram-sugarcane planting on 29.10.1953.
5. Paddy + peas-sugarcane planting on 3.3.1954.
6. Paddy-gram-sugarcane planting on 3.3.1954.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(59^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b). \(53^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.89 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.891 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatrrent & Av. yield \\
1. & 2504 \\
2. & 26.86 \\
3. & 19.99 \\
4. & 18.24 \\
5. & 19.83 \\
6. & 21.38 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.416\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Gauribazar (Deoria).
Zone :- Gauribazar (Deoria).

```

Ref :- U.P. 52(229),

Object :-To find out the suitable rotation for Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam and sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 397 (early) (improved). (v) (a) 1 ploughings by tractor, 1 harrowing by tractor. (b) Trench planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) 8 rows/plot. (c) N.A. (vi) 22.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings by kudal and 1 earthing up by phawara and kudal. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Sanal-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-peas-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 29.65 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.358 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 29.68 \\
2. & 32.96 \\
3. & 27.75 \\
4. & 28.20 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.679\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Captainganj (Deoria).

```

Ref:- U.P. 51(168).
Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To find out the suitable rotation for Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per trea.ments. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) Top dressing of \(A / S\) at 20 seers on 1.7.1951. (iv) CO. 356 (mid-late). (v) (a) 4 ploughings by desi plough and 1 ploughing by victory plough. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 8.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings by kassi. (ix) N.A. (x) 28 and 29.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Paddy-peas-sugarcane.
3. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications.
(iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\).
(b) \(58^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.16 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.502 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 13.11 \\
2. & 13.65 \\
3. & 12.73 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.2511\) tod/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Captainganj (Deoria).

Ref:- U.P. 52(231).
Type :-‘'C'。

Object :-To find out suitable rotation for Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) 6 C.L. of press mud cake. (iv) CO. 364 (improved). (v) (a) 1 Ploughing by meston plough and 2 desi ploughings. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1728 buds/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 9.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 10 hoeings by kudall and 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Paddy Peas-sugarcane.
3. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(64^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.14 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.025 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant
(iv) Av. y.eld of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatments & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.79 \\
2. & 22.68 \\
3. & 23.96 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.012\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- ÚU.P. 52(227). \\
Zone :- Faizabad (Faizabad). & Type:- ‘C’.
\end{tabular}

Object : - To find out suitable rotation for Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) G.N.C. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 13.2.1952. A/S at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 29.2.1952. Top dressing A/S at 30 lb ./ac. of N and G.N.C. at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 1.7.1952. (iv) CO. 313. (early) (improved). (v) (a) Ploughings by desi plough. (b) Flat planting. (c) N.A. (d) \(3^{\prime}\) distance in lines. Furrows opened by spade. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated (viii) 6 hoeings by kudali and 1 earthing up. (ix) N.A. (x) 10, 13 and 20.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane on 13.2.1952.
2. Sanai-fallow-sugarcane on 13.2.1952.
3. Maize-fallow - sugarcane on 13.2.1952.
4. Paddy fallow-sugareane on 13.2.1952.
5. Paddy reas -sugarcane on 29.2.1952.
6. Early paddy -peas -sugarcane on 29.2.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 11.19 ton/ac.
(ii) \(1.050 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 11.88 \\
2. & 12.22 \\
3. & 10.43 \\
4. & 11.00 \\
5. & 10.63 \\
6. & 10.96 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.525\) toi/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Balrampur (Gonda).

Ref:-U.P. 49(156).
Type:- \({ }^{\prime} \mathrm{C}\) ’.

Object:-To find the suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. A/S at \(33 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 12.7.1950. Castor cake at 7 mds . (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 6 hoeings. (b) N.A. (c) 5 rows/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A.
(x) 11.1.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. October planting on 19.10.1949.
2. November planting on 15.11.1949.
3. December planting-N.A.
4. January planting on 30.1.1950.
5. February planting on 16.2.1950.
6. March planting on 7.3.1950.
7. April planting-N.A.

\section*{3. DESIGN}
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(73^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Growth good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields. Gaps were filled in the case of October, November and December plantings.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 30.30 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.561 ton/ac
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 40.60 \\
2. & 33.34 \\
3. & 29.35 \\
4. & 31.75 \\
5. & 29.74 \\
6. & 29.84 \\
7. & 17.51 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.454\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Ref :- U.P. 53(248).
Zone :- Nawabganj (Gonda)
Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To suggest ways to improve Sugarcane yield in the late planting conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Manuring with press mud compost at 375 mds./ac. on 30.10 .1952 to 2.11 .1952 ( \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N is available). (iv) \(\mathbf{C O} .453\) (medium late) improved. (v) (a) 4 tractor ploughings. Hoeing by cultivator and kassi. (b) Flat planting.. (c) No. of buds planted per plot : 1050, 1260, 2520 and 2100 according to treatments. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 28.2.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 13 to 15.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Normal planting in the month of February in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with single setts.
2. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with single setts.
3. 'Planting in rows \(2 t^{\prime}\) ' apart in single setts at the end of March.
4. Planting in rows \(2 \frac{1}{2}\) apart in double setts at the end of March.
5. Planting in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart in double setts at the end of March (normal planting).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 19.63 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.733 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.43 \\
2. & 15.08 \\
5. & 17.48 \\
4. & 21.18 \\
5. & 21.99 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.367\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Nawabganj (Gonda).

Ref:-U.P. 50(186). Type :-'C':

Object :-To find out suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Press mud compost 100 mds at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 18.10.1950. Top dressing of mixture at 7 mds 20 seers ( \(49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N ) on 30.5.1951. (iv) CO. 453 (mid late) (improved). (v) (a) 1 ploughing by spade and 5 desi plough. (b) Sown flat in lines \(3^{3}\) apart. (c) 1800 buds/plot. (d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi)As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 by cultivator and 2 by kassi. 2 hoeing by desi plough, (ix) N.A. (x) 18.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. October planting (27.10.1950).
2. November planting (19.11.1950).
3. January planting (27.1.1951).
4. February planting (18.2.1951).
5. March planting (27,3.1951).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(75^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 15.03 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.979 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 9.47 \\
2. & 13.79 \\
3. & 19.91 \\
4. & 17.91 \\
5. & 14.09 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.990\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Kef :-U.P. 50(185).
Zone :-Balrampur (Gonda).
Type :-‘‘’.
Object :-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:.}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Castor cake at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 9.4.1950. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 9.4.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings. (ix) N.A. ( x ) 25.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Sanai G.M.-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Paddy + arhar-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-Pea - sugarcane.
5. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
6. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
'(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A.
(c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G). on cultivators' fields
5. RESULTS :
(i) 7.97 . ton/ac.
(ii) 1.705 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
Treatment Av. yield
1. 9.38
2. 8.02
\(3 . \quad 8.22\)
\(4 . \quad 8.03\)
\(5 . \quad 7.58\)
6. \(\quad 6.57\)
S.E./mean \(=0.696\) ton/ac.

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Nawabganj (Gonda).

Ref :- U.P. 50(182).
Type:-'C'.

Object:-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BÁSAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Press mud at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 22.2 .1950 , G.N.C. at 2 mds./ac on 22.6 .1950 and A/S at 1 md. 27 seers. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late), (improved). (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 18.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) \(S\) hocings. (ix) N.A. (x) 12.3.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Sanai G.M.-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Arhar+paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-pea-sugarcane.
5. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
6. - Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(78^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 27.01 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.574 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.-
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 34.70 \\
2. & 24.53 \\
3. & 34.81 \\
4. & 18.78 \\
5. & 24.16 \\
6. & 25.10 \\
S.e./mean & \(=1.787\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 52(220). \\
Zone :- Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur). & Type :- 'C’. \\
ject :-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop. &
\end{tabular}
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) A/S at 4 mds./ac. on 22.3 .1953 and 5.6.1953. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late), (improved). (v) (a) 2 ploughings by ordinary plough: (b) Trench planted. (c) 6480 bucs/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings by hand kudali. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Paddy-fallow - sugarcane planting on 21.1.1953.
2. Paddy+dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane planting on 21.1.1953.
3. Paddy + dhaincha-peas -sugarcane planting on 29.10.1952.
4. Paddy +dhaincha-gram-sugarcane planted on 29.10.1952.
5. Paddy-pea-sugarcane planting on 30.3.1953.
6. Paddy-gram-sugarcane planting on 30.3.1953.

Sowing of paddy + dhaincha on 19.7.1952, uprooting of dhaincha on 22.8.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL.}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.00 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.607 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Ar. yield \\
1. & 16.49 \\
2. & 15.42 \\
3. & 15.57 \\
4. & 17.06 \\
5. & 14.97 \\
6. & 16.46 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.803\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Gorakhpur (Ghorakhpur).}

> Ref :- U.P 53(251).
> Type :-‘C’.

Object :-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 453 (medium late) (improved). (v) 2 ploughings by tractor. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1674 buds/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings by hand hoe and 1 earthing by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.4.1955.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane planted on 21.1.1954,
2. Paddy+dhanicha-fallow-sugarcane planted on 21.1.1954.
3. Paddy+dhaincha-pea-sugarcane planted on 22.10.1958.
4. Paddy+dhanicha-gram-sugarcane planted on 22.10.1953.
5. Paddy-pea-sugarcane planted on 24.3.1954.
6. Paddy-gram-sugarcane planted on 24.3.1954,
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' felds.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 21.73 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.963 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.02 \\
2. & 22.80 \\
3. & 24.38 \\
4, & 20.86 \\
5. & 20.37 \\
6. & 21.96 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.981\) tod/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Sugarcane,
Zone:- Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(222). } \\
& \text { Tאpe :~'C'. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object :-To find out suitable rotation with ५ ugarcane crop.
-1 BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy cem. (iii) 75 db ./ac. of N througt mixture of A/S and G.N.C. on 17.10.1952, 25.1.1952, 2.4.1953, at the time of 'planting sugarcane. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 7 desi ploughings and 1 by tractor. (b) Trench planting. (c) 6480 buds/ plot. (d) and (c) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 10 hoeings by kudalt. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Paddy-fallow - sugarcane planted on 25.1.1953.
2. Paddy + dha ncha-fallow-sugarcane planted on 25.1.1953.
3. Paddy+dhaincha-pea-sugarcane planted on 17.10.1952.
4. Paddy +dhaincha-gram-sugarcane planted on 17.10.1952.
5. Paddy-pea-sugarcane planted on 2.4.1953.
6. Paddy - Gram-sugarcane planted on 2.4.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A. .
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-55. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was ccoducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 11.12 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.507 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av yield \\
1. & 14.08 \\
2. & 13.67 \\
3. & 9.20 \\
4. & 3.18 \\
5. & 12.12 \\
6. & 14.45 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.25\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 53(252). \\
Zone :- Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur). & Type :-‘C'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy Ioam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO, 453 (medium-late). improved. (v) (a) 2 tractor ploughings and 2 ploughings by desi plough, 1 harrowing by tractor, (b) Flat planting. (c) 1674 buds/plot. (d) 9 rows/plot. (c) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by hand spade and earthing by spade on 22.6.1954. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.3.1955.
2. TP.EATMENTS :
1. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane planting in January 1954.
2. Paddy+dhaincha-fallow-sugarcane planting in January 1954.
3. Paddy + dhaincha-pea-sugarcane planting in October 1953.
4. Paddy+dhaincha-gram-sugarcane planting in October 1953.
5. Paddy +dhaincha- pea-sugarcane planting in March 1954.
6. Paddy-gram-pea sugarcane planting in March 1954.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, milable, cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.10 ton ac.
(ii) 4.293 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & A'v. yield \\
1. & 25.33 \\
2. & 26.08 \\
3. & 21.99 \\
4. & 21.31 \\
5. & 28.84 \\
6. & 27.08 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.147\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 50(179).
Zone :- Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur).
Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) A/S on \(5 \cdot 4.1950\) and 20.5 .1950 as top dressing. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 30 and 31.1.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii)4 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 15 and 16.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Sanai-G.M.-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-pea-sugarcane.
5. Arhar-kodon-fallow-sugarcane.
6. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (iii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(74^{*} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
1. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952 . (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 16.62 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.513 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 17.75 \\
2. & 15.54 \\
3. & 16.96 \\
4. & 15.79 \\
S. & 17.17 \\
6. & 16.49 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.434\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).

Ref :-U.P.51(169).
Type:-‘C'.

Object:-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-453 (mid-late) improved.
(v) (a) Ploughing on 12.8.1951. Trenching by spade on 24.1.1951. (b) N.A. (c) 1680 buds/plot.
(d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 7.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings by spades and hudali and 1 earthing up by plough. (ix) N.A. (x) February, 1952.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.

2, Sanai (G.M.) -fallow-sugarcane.
3. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Päddy-fallow-sugarcane.
5. Paddy-pea-sugarcane.
6. Arhar-kodon-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.61 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.753 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Ar. yield \\
1. & 18.56 \\
2.* & 14.23 \\
3. & 13.15 \\
4. & 12.70 \\
5. & 15.54 \\
6. & 19.50 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.877\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop: :-Sugarcane. \\ Zone :-.Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).}

Re :-U.P. 52(230).
Type :-'C'.
Object :-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Top dressing of A/S at 4 md./ac. on 16.3.1952 and 66.1952 . (iv) CO.454 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings and trenching by bullocks and manual labour 3 times. (b) Trench planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) 8 rows/plot. (c) N.A. (vi) 7.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hocings by \(k u d a l i\) and 1 earthing up by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Sanai-fallow - sugarcane.
3. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
5. Paddy-pea-sugarcane.
6. Early arhar-pea-sugarcane.

DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.68 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.687 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ae.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.82 \\
2. & 21.64 \\
3. & 21.94 \\
4. & 19.49 \\
5. & 22.62 \\
6. & 21.59 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.844\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone: : Anandnagar (Gorakhpur).
Ref:- U.P. 50(180).
Type :- 'C'.
Object:-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sándy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 453 (mid late) (improved). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 10.2.1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) 21 and 22.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Sanai (G.M.)-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
5. Paddy-peas-sugarcane.
6. Arhar+early paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952. (b) N.A. (c) N.A, (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 32.33 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.789 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield. \\
1. & 32.43 \\
2. & 33.94 \\
3. & 35.07 \\
4. & 30.24 \\
5. & 32.43 \\
6. & 29.86 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.955\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Pharenda (Gorakhpur).

Ref :- U.P. 51(170).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To find out suitable rotation with Sugacrane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 3 ploughings by desi plough. Ridging on 26.12.1950. (b) N.A. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 4.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 hoeing, 4 hoeings by spade and 1 earthing up by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) 29.1.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Sanai-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-fallow - sugarcane.
5. Sawan-fallow-sugarcane.
6. Paddy-peas-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1952.
(b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) cn cultivators' fields.

RESULTS :
(i) 30.43 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.537 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & \(\mathrm{A} v\), yield \\
1. & 29.44 \\
2. & 34.50 \\
3. & 26.43 \\
4. & 33.20 \\
5. & 27.95 \\
6. & 31.04 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.8522\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Anandnagar (Gorakhpur).

Ref:- U.P. 52(228).
Type:- 'C'.

Object :-To find out the suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b, As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) A/S at 3 mds. 3 seers 12 chks. and G.N.C. at 4 mds. 20 seers, total \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N . (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late), (improved). (v) (a) 1 ploughing by tractor, 1 ploughing ty bullocks and harrowing by bullocks on 3.7.1951. (b) Trench planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 5.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings by kudal and 1 earthing up by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Pallow-falow-sugarcane.
2. Sanai-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Maize-fallow-sugarcane.

4 Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
5. Paddy-peas-sugarcane.
6. Early paddy-peas-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN:
(1) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952.
(b) and (c) iN.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fieids.
5. RESULTS:
- (i) 35.16 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.205 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Av. yiedment & Av. yield \\
Treatment & 37.11 \\
1. & 36.82 \\
2. & 32.01 \\
3. & 36.12 \\
4. & 24.58 \\
5. & 34.33 \\
6. & \(=2.103\) ton/ac. \\
S.E./mean &
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 50(183). } \\
\text { Zone :- Ghugli (Gorakhpur). } & \text { Type :- 'C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To find out the best rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL. CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as mahua mixture, 25 \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as mixture and \(35 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as A/S. (iv) CO. 356 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 26.1:1950. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 8 hoeings. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Fallow-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Late paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Late paddy-lathri-sugarcane.
4. Sanai-fallow-sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 46\) ac. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 13.04 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.895 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments are significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 14.15 \\
2. & 11.83 \\
3. & 12.25 \\
4. & 13.94 \\
S E./mean & \(=0.447\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref:-U.P. 52(232). \\
Zone :-Ghugli (Gorakhpur). & Type :-‘'C'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To find out suitable rotation with Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 513 (early) (improved). (v) (a) 1 ploughing by tractor, 5 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot. (d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (ij) 19, 20 and 21.2.1552. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings by kassi. (ix) N.A. (x) 25.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS ;}
1. Fallou-fallow-sugarcane.
2. Sanai-fallow-sugarcane.
3. Maize (chari)-fallow-sugarcane.
4. Paddy-fallow-sugarcane.
5. Paddy-peas-sugarcane.
6. Early paddy-fallow-sugarcane.

Sanai sowing on 26.6.1951. Maize sowing on 3.7.1951 and paddy sowing on 4.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(73^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment has ccnducted by D.S.R(G). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.65 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.959 ton/ac.
(iii) 1 reatments are not significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 19.66 \\
2. & 20.58 \\
3. & 19.21 \\
4. & 19.03 \\
5. & 17.38 \\
6. & 16.06 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.979\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Anandnagar (Gorakhpur).}

Ref :-U.P. 49(152).
Type :-‘'C’.

Object :-To find out the suitable t me of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N A. (b) Sanai (G.M.). (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Manuse on 21.10 .1949 (Name of manure and dose-N.A.). (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) (improved). (v) (a) 10 bceings. (t) to (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.2.195.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. October planting.
2. November planting.
3. January planting.
4. February planting.
5. March planting.
6. April planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) N.A. (t) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.07 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.349 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 29.81 \\
2. & 28.34 \\
3. & 27.54 \\
4. & 27.24 \\
5. & 21.35 \\
6. & 16.15 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.175\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Zone :-Pharenda (Gorakhpur).

Ref :- U.P.50(188).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To find out Jhe suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO-453 (mid-late) improved.
(v) (a) Harrowing and hoeing. Ridging; hoeing and earthing by spade. (b) N.A. (c) 1752 buds/plot.
(d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatmants. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. October planting on 18.10 .1950 .
2. November planting on 19.11.1950.
3. January planting on 19.1.1951.
4. February planting on 19.2 .1951 .
5. March planting on 19.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\) (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators* fields.
-5. RESULTS:
(i) 29.29 ton/ac.
(ii) 6.460 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 31.39 \\
2. & 31.35 \\
3. & 34.79 \\
4. & 27.16 \\
5. & 21.77 \\
S.E./mean & \(=3.230\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Sugarcane.
Ref:-U.P. 51(166).
Site :-Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).
Type :- \({ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}\) '.

Object :-To find out suitable time of planting Sugarcane in different tracts.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Sanai buried on 26.8 .1950 ( \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N). A/S at 4 mds. 5 seers/ac. ( 70 ib ./ac. of N). G.N.C. at \(6 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor, harrowing by tractor, hoeing by kudali and earthing up by spade. (b) Trench planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot (d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 25 th of each month (as per treatments). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 22.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
. 1. October planting.
2. November planting.
3. January planting.
4. February planting.
5. March planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (i.i) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. '(vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' bields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 37.15 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.997 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(1:\) & 43.79 \\
2. & 39.35 \\
3. & 31.60 \\
4. & 37.69 \\
5. & 33.30 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.498\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. - } & \text { Ref :- U.P. } 49 \text { (153). } \\
\text { Zoné :- Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur). } & \text { Type :- 'C'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-Tc find out the suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.). (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) A/S on 3.4.1950 and 19.5.1950. (iv) CO.453
(mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 9 hoeings. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) IrrigateJ.
(viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 10 and 11.2 .1951 .
2. TRE TMENTS :
1. October planting.
2. November planting.
3. January planting.
4. February planting.
5. March planting.
6. April planting
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii)(a) N.A. (b) \(74 \times 14^{\circ}\). (iv)N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Ger mination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) cn cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17.20 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.900 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Areatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.85 \\
2. & 22.34 \\
3. & 18.69 \\
4. & 13.55 \\
5. & 18.94 \\
6. & 6.80 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.950\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur).

Ref :- U.P. 50(187).
Type : ' C '。

Object :-To find out suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv)CO.453 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) Hoeings by spade and kudal. Earthing by spade. (b) N.A. (c) 1680 buds/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 26 and 27.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. October planting on 26.10.1950.
2. November planting on \(\mathbf{2 3 . 1 1 . 1 9 5 0}\).
3. January planting on 24.1.1951.
4. February planting on 16.2.1951.
5. March planting on 9.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 13.55 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 4.960 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 15.24 \\
2. & 13.98 \\
3. & 13.23 \\
4. & 10.77 \\
5. & 14.53 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.480\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Ghugli (Gorakhpur).
Object ;-TC find out suitable time of planting Sugarcane.
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal G.M. sown on 22.6.1950. (c) Nil. (ii) Bhat soil (iii) Top dressing 24 md. 26 seers of mohwa cake mixture. (containing A/S and cake at 60 lb ./ac. of N on 48.1951 . (iv) CO. 356 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by victory plough on 12.8.1950, ploughing and planting by desi plough on 20.9:1950 and 14.10-1950, digging by spades and kassion 12, 13.10.1950, earthing by kassi on 4 to 7.8 .1951 and hoeing by kassi 7 times. (b) Sown by flat system of planting followed by earthing. (c) and (d) 536 buds in 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS;}
1. October planting (20.10.1950).
2. November planting (21.11.1950).
3. January planting (10.1.1951).
4. February planting (11.2.1951).
5. March planting (12.3.1951).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL: •
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane. tillers and șugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conductcd by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 20.21 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.568 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(ic) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
1. \({ }^{\circ} \quad 18.77\)
2. . 20.82
3. \(\quad 21.18\)
\(4 . \quad 20.30\)
5. 19.98
S.E./mean \(=1.184\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :-U.P. 51(167). \\
Zone :-Ghugli (Gorakhpur). & Type :-'C'.
\end{tabular}

Object :- To study the time of planting Sugarcane in different tracts. \({ }^{\text {. }}\)
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Bajra and sugarcane (for green fodder). (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) Application of compost 180 md. on 24 to 26.11.1951. (iv) CO. 419 (late) improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor and desi plough. Furrow making. Harrowing and earthing up. (b) Trench planting. (c) and (d) 960 buds in 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 12 to 18.1.1953. .

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. November planting (28.11.1951).
2. January planting (13.1.1952).
3. Fcbruary planting (14.2.1952).
4. March planting (7.3.1952).
3. DESIGN .
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(46^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yicld. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G). on cultivators' fields.

S, RESULTS:
(i) 40.58 ton./ac.
(ii) 2.827 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 39.64 \\
2. & 41.26 \\
3. & 40.92 \\
4. & 40.49 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.414\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur).
Ref.- U.P. 51(183).
Type :n'C'.
Object:-To improve the Sugarcane yield under late planted conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.) (c) No. (ii) Loam. (lii) Sanai. (iv) CO.453 (Late) (improved) (v) (a) Trenching by spade, hoeing by kudall and earthing by spade. (b) N.A. (c) 10 and 12 rows/plot ; No. of buds/plot (treatment-wise). (1) 2400 , (2) 2400 , (3) 4800 (4) 2880 and (5) 5760 . (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) As under treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control-normal planting (January).
2. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with single setting.
3. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with double setting.
4. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(2 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\) apart with single setting.
5. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(2 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\) apart with double setting.

Dates of planting treatment 1 on 31.1.1951 and others on 23 and 27.3.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) for treatments 1,2 and 3 and \(73^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\) for treatments 4 and 5. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 9.98 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.989 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 10.64 \\
2. & 9.04 \\
3. & 9.65 \\
4. & 10.95 \\
5. & 9.63 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.995\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).

Ref :-U P. 52(234).
Type : © 'C'.
Object:-To improve Sugarcane yield under late planted conditions.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) A/S at 4 md./ac. Neem cake at \(12 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (iv) CO. 453 (late) (improved). (v) \({ }^{\text {r }}\) (a) Ploughing and trenching by spade and harrowing. (b) N.A. (c) and (d) 10 and \(12 \mathrm{rows} / \mathrm{plot}\) according to treatments buds/plot treatment-wise (1) 2400 , (2) 2400 , (3) 2880, (4) 5760 and (5) N.A. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by kudali and earthing up by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) 15 to 23.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Normal planting-February (control).
2. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with normal setting.
3. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with double setting.
4. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) apart with normal setting.
5. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) apart with double setting.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) for treatments 1,2 and 3 and \(75^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\) for 1 reatments 4 and 5. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.82 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.775 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 16.39 \\
2. & 14.98 \\
3. & 17.86 \\
4. & 16.68 \\
5. & 18.21 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.887\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).

Ref:- U.P. 53(257).
Type:- ' C '.
Object:-To improve Sugarcane yield under late planted conditions.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(1) (a) N.A. (b) Urd. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Neem cake at \(8 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and A/S at \(4 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (iv) CO.453 (improved). (v) (a) By ordinary plough on 16.9.1952, hoeing in whole field on 31.10.1952, boeing by kudali and weedings. (b) Trench planted. (c) and (d) 10 and 12 rows/plot; no. of buds/plot normal setting 9600 , double setting 19200. (e) N.A. (vi) Treatment 1 on 26.1.1953 and others on 21.3.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 28.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Normal planting in the beginning of February (control).
\(\therefore\) Late planting at the end of March in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart, with normal setting.
3. Late planting at the end of March in rows 3 ' apart with double setting.
4. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(2 \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\) apart with normal setting.
5. Late planting at the end of March in rows \(2 \frac{1}{8}\) apart with double setting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) for treatment 1,2 and 3 and \(75^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\) for treatment 4 and 5. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) 1951 to 1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.62 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.065 ton/ac,
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Ave yiedment & Av. yield \\
1. & 19.34 \\
2. & 20.02 \\
3. & 20.47 \\
4. & 20.35 \\
S. & 17.92 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.533\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone:- Pharenda (Gorakhpur).

Ref:- U.P. 51(184).
Type :- ‘C’.

Object :-To improve the Sugarcane yield under late planting conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO.453 (late) improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor on 12.1.1951, harrowing by tractor on 13.1.1951, hoeing by kudali and earthing by spade. (b) N.A. (c) and (d) 10 rows/plot in treatments 1,2 and 3 and 12 rows/plot in treatment 4 and 5. No. of buds/plot in treatment 1-8760, in treatment 2-8760, in treatment 3-17520, in treatment 4 - 10512 and in treatment 5-21024. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 27.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Normal planting-control (planting in 1st week of February).
2. Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(3^{\prime}\) distance with normal setting.
3. Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(3^{\prime}\) distance with double setting.
4. Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(2 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) distance with normal setting.
5. Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(2 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) distance with double setting.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. 'in 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) for treatment 1,2 and 3 and \(68^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime \prime}\) for treatment 4 and 5. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.37 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.806 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 30.85 \\
2. & 25.65 \\
3. & 22.98 \\
4. & 25.15 \\
5. & 22.24 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.403\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).

Ref.-U.P.52(235).
Type :-‘'C’.

Object:-To improve Sugarcane yields under late planted condition.
1, BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Sanai G.M. at 50 lb ./ac. of N; A/S at 3 mds. 3 seers 12 chh./plot and neem cake at 5 mds .25 seers/ac. i.e. at 70 lb /ac. of N . (iv) \(\mathbf{C O} .453\) (late variety) improved. ( \(v\) ' (a. Hoeing by kassi (kudal). Earthing up by spade. (b) Trench planting. (c) and (d) 10 and 12 rows/plot. No. of buds planted per plot treatment (1) 2190, (2) 2190, (3) 4380, (4) 2628 and (S) 5256. (e) N.A. (vi) 14.2 .1952 for treatment 1 and 28.3.1952 for other treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 30.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Normal planting (February)-control.
2. Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart with normal setting.
3. 'Late planting at the end of March and in rows 3 ' apart with double setting.
4. Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(2 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\) apart with normal setting.
5. Late planting at the end of March and in rcws \(2 \frac{1}{2}\) apart with double setting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) for treatments 1,2 and 3 and \(68^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime \prime}\). for treatment 4 and 5. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield at harvest (i.e. excluding cane harvested for juice analysis). (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experipent conduited by D.S.R.(G) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESLLTS:}
(i) 24.79 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.856 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 25.29 \\
2. & 22.80 \\
3. & 30.20 \\
4. & 22.30 \\
5. & 23.36 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.428\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Gorakhpur (Gorakhpur).

Ref:-U.P. 53(256).
Type:-'C'.

Object:-To improve Sugarcane yields under late planted condition.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) CO.453 (late variety) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by tractor on 2 and \(36.1952,7\) ploughings by desi plough, 4 ploughings by tractor and 7 hoeings by kudali. (b) Trench planting. (c) 8760 buds/plot in treatment 1 and 17520 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) Double setting. (vi) 23.2.1953 for treatment 1 and 1.4.1953 for other treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 13.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Normal planting (February)-control.
2. Late planting at the end of March and in row \(3^{\prime}\) apart with normal setting.
3. Late planting at the end of March and in row \(3^{\prime}\) apart with double setting.

Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(2 \frac{1}{2}\) apart with normal setting. Late planting at the end of March and in rows \(2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) apart with double setting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) for treatments 1,2 and 3 and \(68^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\) for treatments 4 and 5. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germinations, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 14.61 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.455 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 15.57 \\
2. & 14.98 \\
3. & 14.77 \\
4. & 11.67 \\
5. & 16.07 \\
S,E./mean & \(=0.728\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref :-U.P. 50(159). \\
Site :-Mehammadi (Kheri). & Type :-‘C'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find the optimum time of planting Sugarcane in different tracts for obtaining high yields.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.) (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Castor cake \(8 \mathrm{mds}+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(2 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). (iv) CO.527. (v) (a) Tractor ploughings. 5 hoeings. Earthing up by tractor. (b) Flat sowing behind ridges. (c) 1911 buds/plot (d) 7 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.10.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Middle of October 1949 (19.10.1949).
2. Middle of November 1949 (20.11.1949).
3. Middle of December 1949 (15.12.1949).
4. Middle of January 1950 (16.1.1950).
5. M ddle of February 1950 (9.2.1950).
6. Middle of March 1950 (30.3.1950).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(91^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(85^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \(\%\) and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 8.20 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.20 tod/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 11.51 \\
2. & 9.00 \\
3. & 8.47 \\
4. & 7.32 \\
5. & 8.79 \\
6. & 4.08
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.89 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
Crop:-Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 50(160).
Zone :-Kichha (Nainital).
Type :-'C'.

Object :-To find the optimum time of planting Susarcane in two different tracts for obtaining the high yields.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.) (ii) Loam (medium). (ii) G.N. cake and A/S on 30.3.1950. (iv) CO.453. (v) (a) 5 hoeings by kassi. PIoughing ty desi plough and ploughing by cultivator plough. Turning sanai by cut away athens on 31.8.1549. Ploughing by harrow plough on \(\mathbf{1 3} \mathbf{1 0}\).1949. Ploughing by cut away athens (twice) , n 17.10..949. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1440 budds/plot (d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(60^{\circ}\). (x) 18.3.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Middle of October 1949 (19.10.1949).
2. Middle of November 1949 (31.11.1949).'
3. Middle of December 1949 ( 2212 1949).
4. Middle of January 1950 (22.1.1950).
5. Middle ef February 1950 (14.2.1950).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.'
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 35.88 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.99 tod/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

Treatment Av. yield
1. 45.47
2. 36.17
\(3 . \quad 30.10\)
\(4 . \quad 35.47\)
\(5 . \quad 32.18\)
S.E./mean \(\quad 2.00\) ton/ac.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 48(1). } \\
\text { Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn , Kunraghat. } & \text { Type :- CV'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of harvesting Sugarcane on different dates
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M. Wheat-G.M. Sanai -Sugarcane. (b) Sanai. (c) Green manure. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b)'N.A. (iii) 16 to 18.1.1948. (iv) (a) 9 preparatory ploughings with desi and watts plough and 5 harrowings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 55 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) G.M. with sanal. Top dressing Catsor cake at \(25 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (f N. Sanai G.M. sown on 16 and 17.7.1947 and ploughed in 12.9.1947. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 11 hoeings and earthings from 25.7 .1948 to 16.8 .1948 . (ix) \(49.20^{\circ}\). (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS:

Man-plot treatments :
4 dates of harvesting: \(D_{1}=1.1 .1949, D_{2}=1.2 .1949, D_{8}=1.3 .1949\) and \(D_{4}=1.4 .1949\)
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{CO} .109 . \mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO.313}, \mathrm{~V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .356\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/re plication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) a \(55^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border left alround the \(n 3 t\) plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Tiller, germ ination, millable canes and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1919. (b) and (c) No. (v) ,a) and (b) Jo. (vi) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.31 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.128 ton/ac.
(b) 5.299 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly signifisant. Main effect of \(D\) and interaction \(D \times V\) are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{I}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 22.25 & 23.57 & 14.56 & 20.13 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 21.24 & 24.79 & 15.72 & 20.58 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 19.63 & 22.84 & 11.50 & 17.99 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}^{\prime}}\) & 19.66 & 12.50 & 11.48 & 14.55 \\
\hline Mean & 20.70 & 20.92 & 13.32 & 18.31
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=1.685\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=1.166\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=2.333\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=2.543 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sisb-Stn,, Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 49(2).
Type :-‘CV’.

Object:-To study the effect of harvesting Sugarcane on different dates.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M. Wheat-fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17 and 18.2.1949. (iv) (a) 8 preparatory ploughings and 3 harrowings with desi and watts plough. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 60 three bndded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Village compost at 60 lb ./ac. of N+castor cake at 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 30 lb ./ac. of N applied in trenches in Dec. 1948 and Jan, 1949 respectively. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 earthings and 8 hoeings. (ix) 53.11". (x) As per treatments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
6 dates of harvest : \(-D_{1}=21.12 .1949, D_{2}=16.1 .1950, D_{3}=30.1 .1950, D_{4}=19.2 .1950, D_{5}=11.3 .1950\) and \(D_{6}=31.3 .1950\).
Sub-plot treatments:
3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C O . 3 1 3 ,} \mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathbf{C O . 4 5 3}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .109\).
\(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) plots were harvested on 16.3.1950 instead of 31.3.1950.

\section*{3. DESIGN}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 6 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) (main-plot size net \(56^{\prime} \times 72^{\prime}\) ). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) tunds alround the net plot was excluced. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1949. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS .
(i) 18.40 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.649 ton/ac.
(b) 3.094 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) is significant. Main effect of \(\mathbf{D}\) and interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(H\) & \(=1.898\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=0.8930\) ton/ac. \\
2. \(V\) means at a level of \(H\) & \(=2.187\) ton/ac. \\
4. H means at a level of \(V\) & \(=2.606\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site:- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref:- U.P. 52(55).
Type:- 'CV'.
Object :-To study the effect of autumn \(v s\) spring planting on the yield of late varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 3 preparatory ploughings with victory and 2 harrowings with the cultivator. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 85 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Castor cakc at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. A/S at \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. Sanai and G.M. at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of N. Top dressing of castor cake and A/S. Sanai turned in. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Earthing on 14.8 .1952 and 9 hoeings. (ix) 2.35". (x) 26.1.1953 to 4.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
2 dates of planting : \(D_{1}=\) Autumn (12.11.1951) and \(D_{2}=\) Spring (7.2.1952)

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

10 varieties : \(V_{1}=S .60, V_{2}=\) CO. \(370, V_{8}=\operatorname{COS} .410, V_{4}=C O .453, V_{5}=\operatorname{COS} .475, V_{6}=S .89\), \(V_{7}=\operatorname{COS.} 429, V_{8}=\operatorname{CO} .419, V_{8}=C O S .364\) and \(V_{10}=S .46\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 10 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(84^{\prime} \times 60^{\prime}\) (v) \(3^{\prime}\) along length. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Borers attacked and were killed on 12.4 .1952 (iii) Germination, tillers millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(G).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 18.17 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.596 ton/ac.
(b) 3.059 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) is highly significant. Effect of \(\mathbf{D}\) and interaction \(\mathbf{D} \times V\) are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrrrrrrrrr|c} 
\\
\hline\(D_{1}\) & \(V_{1}\) & \(V_{2}\) & \(V_{8}\) & \(V_{4}\) & \(V_{5}\) & \(V_{6}\) & \(V_{7}\) & \(V_{8}\) & \(V_{9}\) & \(V_{10}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(D_{9}\) & 2662 & 11.17 & 19.24 & 16.86 & 9.99 & 17.54 & 18.80 & 14.72 & 21.94 & 17.38 & 17.61 \\
\hline Mean & 25.43 & 15.19 & 17.81 & 15.75 & 16.89 & 23.37 & 21.73 & 14.95 & 21.70 & 14.59 & 18.74 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D \quad=0.505\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(V \quad=2.163\) ton/ac.
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D \quad=3.059\) ton/ac.
4. D means at a level of \(V\)
\(=2.946\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 48(11):
Type :-‘CV’.

Object :-To find the optimum time of harvesting different varieties of Suga rcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) G.M.-wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) G.M. as sanai ( \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}\). of N ). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam.
(b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 17.3 .1948 . (iv) (a) 8 preparatory ploughings. (b) Planted fit. (c) 4200 buds/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Compost at 45.5 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+\) top dressing. A/S at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N}\) at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) 5 hoeings and earthing up in September. (ix) \(34.20^{\circ}\). ( \(x\) ) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
6 dates of harvesting : \(D_{1}=15.11 .1948, D_{2}=15.12 .1948: D_{3}=15.1 .1949, D_{4}=15.2 .1949, D_{5}=15.3 .1949\) and \(D_{5}=15.4 .1949\).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties: \(\mathbf{V}_{1}=C O .312, V_{1}=C O .421\) and \(V_{3}=C O .453\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 6 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iil) Germination, tiller, millable cane countings and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1848-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (ii) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 33.60 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.97 ton/ac.
(b) 1.88 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(D\) and \(V\) are significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & D & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 32.30 & 23.42 & 3036 & 31.17 & 28.64 & 27.13 & 29.94 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 3442 & 31.23 & 32.47 & 34.26 & 31.95 & 33.65 & 33.00 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{3}\) & 40.98 & 3656 & 37.12 & 37.14 & 3831 & 37.08 & 37.87 \\
\hline Mean & 36.10 & 32.40 & 33.32 & 34.19 & 32.97 & 32.62 & 33.60 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=0.93\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginai means of \(V\) & \(=0.63\) ton/ac. \\
E. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=1.54\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=1.56\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Sugarcane (Ratoon). \\ Ref:-U.P. 49(7), \\ Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub Stn., Muzaffarnagar.
}

Object :-To study the effect of time of harvest of Sugarcane plant crop on the ratooning capacity of some important varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Sanai or Moong-Sugarcane-Ratoon. (b) Sugarcane (plant cane). (c) A/S at 60 \(\mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and Ammo. Phos. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N . (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing. (b) Sown flat. (d) 3 buds/ft. of a row. (c) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) Nil. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 hoeings and earthing up. in July. (ix) \(20.73^{n}\). (x) 8.11.1949 to 10.12.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
6 dates of harvest of plant crops : \(D_{1}=15.11 .1948, D_{2}=15.12 .1948 . D_{2}=15.1 .1949, D_{4}=15.2 .1949\) and \(D_{5}=15.3 .1949\) and \(D_{6}=15.4 .1949\).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .313, \mathrm{~V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{C} 0.453\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 6 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) and (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane conntings and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 26.27 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.51 ton/ac.
(b) 3.28 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of V is highly significant, effect of D is significant and interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\), & 25.06 & 23.02 & 24.96 & 24.83 & 25.35 & 24.68 & 24.65 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 24.63 & 24.90 & 26.54 & 30.94 & 25.01 & 30.27 & 27.05 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 25.08 & 24.92 & 27.62 & 31.88 & 29.75 & 36.03 & 29.21 \\
\hline Mean & 24.92 & 24.28 & 26.37 & 29.22 & 26.70 & 30.33 & 26.97
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \\
& \(=2.09\) ton/ac. \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar:

Ref:- U.P. 49(8).
Type :- ‘CV'.

Object :-To find the optimum time of harvesting different varictie of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane or Urid. (b) Urid. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 25.2.1949. (iv) (a) 9 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds/ f. of a row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 . hoeings and earthing up in August. (ix) 26.03'. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
6 dates of harvesting : \(D_{1}=15.11 .1949, D_{2}=15.12 .1949, D_{3}=15.1 .1950, D_{4}=15.2 .1950, D_{5}=15.3 .1950\) and \(D_{6}=\) i5.4.1950.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO.313}, \mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C O} .421\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .453\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 6 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948 to 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 30.31 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.91 ton/ac.
(b) 2.57 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly significant, effect of \(D\) is significant. Interaction \(D \times V\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|cccccc|c} 
& \(\boldsymbol{D}_{\mathbf{1}}{ }^{-}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 25.04 & 28.16 & 27.92 & 27.38 & 28.30 & 22.32 & 26.52 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 28.04 & 30.17 & 32.30 & 34.26 & 29.40 & 31.40 & 30.93 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 32.55 & 34.48 & 33.23 & 34.19 & 32.69 & 34.43 & 33.60 \\
\hline Mean & 28.54 & 30.94 & 31.15 & 31.94 & 30.13 & 29.38 & 30.31
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(\dot{D}\) & \(=0.90\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=0.86\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=2.10\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=1.94\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane (Ratoon).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 50(31).
Type :-‘CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant. Sugarcane on the ratooning capacity of some important varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Sanai-Sugarcane (plant)-Ratoon. (b) Sugarcane (plant). (c) A/S at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. Amm. Phos. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (ii) (a). Light loam. (b) Refer isoil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) One preparatory ploughing. (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds \(/ \mathrm{ft}\). of a row. (d) Rows 5' apart. (f) N.A. (v) G.N.C. at \(60 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. A/S at \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings. Earthing up in July. (ix) 61.46". (x) 22.11 .1950 to 20.12.195 \(\therefore\)
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments:
6 harvesting dates : \(D_{1}=\) Mid. No v. 1949, \(D_{2}=\) Mid. Dec. 1949, \(D_{3}=\) Mid. Jan. 1950, \(D_{4}=\) Mid. Feb. 1950, \(\quad D_{5}=\) Mid. March 1950 and \(D_{6}=\) Mid. April 1950.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .314\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) (mid-season) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 6 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) Sub-plot \(=38^{\circ} \times 11^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane counting and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-. 1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.98 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.18 ton/ac.
(b) 1.96 ton,ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) and interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) are highly significant. Main effect of D is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & D & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 22.13 & 19.18 & 15.44 & 20.72 & 15.30 & 19.28 & 18.68 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 21.54 . & 20.72 & 20.85 & 25.66 & 22.25 & 24.82 & 22.64 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{8}\) & 20.87 & 19.97 & 23.11 & 27.16 & 28.01 & 28.57 & 24.62 \\
\hline Mean & 21.51 & 19.96 & 19.80 & 24.51 & 21.85 & 24.22 & 21.98 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. marginal means of } D & \\ \text { 2. marginal means of } V & =1.90 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 5. } V \text { means at a level of } D & \\ \text { 4. } D \text { means at a level of } V & \\ & =1.65 \text { ton/ac. } \\ & \end{array}\)

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 50(32).
Type :-‘CV’.

Object :-To find the optimum time of harvesting different varieties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.- Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton-Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Nuzaffarnagar. (iii) 19.2.1950. (iv) (a) 3 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Basal manuring of compost at \(45.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. Top dressing A/S at 40 lb ./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N}\) at 40 lb ./ac. of N . (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 10 hoeings. Earthing up in August. (ix) 41.14*. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
6 dates of harvesting : \(D_{1}=15.11 .1950, D_{2}=15.12\). 1950, \(D_{3}=15.1 .1951, D_{4}=15.2 .1951, D_{5}=15.3 .1951\). and \(D_{6}=15.4 .1951\).
Sub-plot tr eatments :
3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .313\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathbf{C O} .421\) (mid-season) and \(\mathrm{V}_{8}=\mathrm{CO.453}\) (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plo t. (ii) (a) 6 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b).N.A. (iii) (a) and (b) Main plot : \(58^{\prime} \times 54^{\prime}\), sub plot : \(58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable care counting and sugarcape yield: (iv) (a) 19481950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 23.42 too/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.84 tom/ac.
(b) 2.23 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(D\) and \(V\) are highly significant and interaction \(D \times V\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & D3 & \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 20.57 & 19.68 & 20.51 & 21.08 & 20.96 & 18.52 & 20.22 \\
\hline V1 & 19.26 & 23.86 & 25.99 & 25.76 & 24.35 & 25.55 & 24.13 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 23.01 & 26.40 & 24.71 & 26.79 & 28.62 & 25.86 & 25.90 \\
\hline Mean & 20.95 & 23.31 & 23.74 & 24.54 & 24.64 & 23.31 & 23.43 \\
\hline & ifferenc margina margina \(V\) mean D mean & \begin{tabular}{l}
two \\
ans of \\
ans of \\
he lev \\
the lev
\end{tabular} & & & & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.87 \mathrm{ton} \\
& =0.74 \mathrm{ton} \\
& =1.82 \mathrm{ton} \\
& =1.72 \mathrm{ton}
\end{aligned}
\] & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane. (Ratoon)
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:-U.P. 51(30).
Type:-‘CV’.

Object :-To study the effect of time of harvesting of plànt cane on the ratooning capacity of important varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Sanai or Moong-Sugarcane-Ratcon. (b) Plant sugarcane. (c) Ammo. Phos. at 60 lb ./ac. of N . A/S at 60 lb ./ac. of N. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 2 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 3 buds/ft. of a row. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings, earthing also. (ix) \(26.57^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 19 :0 22.11.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

6 dates of harvest of plant cane : \(D_{1}=15.11 .1950, D_{2}=15.12 .1950, D_{3}=15.1 .1951, D_{4}=15.2 .1951\), \(D_{5}=15.3 .1951\) and \(D_{6}=15.4 .1951\).
Sub-plot treatments: ,
3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=C 0.313, \mathrm{~V}_{8}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .453\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 6 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 15.16 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.458 ton/ac.
(b) 2.916 too/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(D\) and \(V\) are highly significant. Interaction \(\sum_{x} \quad\) is roi significant.
(iv)' Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cccccc|c} 
• & \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(D_{3}\) & \(D_{4}\) & \(D_{5}\) & \(D_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 11.65 & 12.24 & 13.29 & 11.93 & 15.63 & 12.20 & 12.82 \\
\(V_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 14.00 & 14.08 & 16.77 & 13.98 & 19.68 & 18.34 & 16.14 \\
\(V_{8}\) & 11.74 & 11.38 & 13.98 & 16.67 & 23.28 & 22.10 & 16.52 \\
\hline Mean & 12.46 & 12.57 & 14.68 & 14.19 & 19.53 & 17.55 & 15.16
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=1.630 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=0.972\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=2.381\) ton/ac. \\
4i \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=2.537\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Neoli.
Ref :-U.P. 52(197).
Type :-‘CV’.

Object :-To study the different harvesting dates of plant crop for taking ratoon crop.

\section*{1." BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) Sanai (sowing on 22.6.1951). (c) No. (ii) (a) Light sandy loam (kaddar soif having alkaline patches). (b) Refer soil analysis, Neoli. (iii) 28.1.1952 (iv) (a) Turning in of Sanal on 28.8.1951, ploughing by Neoli plough on 28.8.1951, ploughing with Neoli plough and planking on 25.11.1951, harrowing by tractor on 3 and 27.10.1951, 20.12.1951, 9 and 28.1.1952. (b) N.A. (c) and (d) 71 three budded setts/row and 7 lines'plot. (v) Sanai green manuring; G.N.C. at 11.5 sr./plot applied in furrows on 28.1.1952. Manuring with press mud and spreading on 16 to 20.12 1951. Manuring with the mixture of A/S and G.N.C at 25 srs./plot on 18.7.1952. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Mulching after rain with harrow on 5.3.1952. hoeing with khurpi on 26 and 27.4.1952, 8.5.1952, hoeing by cultivator on 21.5.1952 and 20.6.1952, hoeing with spade after manuring on 18.7.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments. 1

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 harvesting dates: \(D_{1}=15.1 .1953, D_{2}=15.2 .1953\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{C} 0.453\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(69^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\).
(b) \(63^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tiller counting, millable cane and yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 9.80 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.53 ton/ac.
(b) 1.63 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{D}\) and V are not significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcanc in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 9.09 & 9.52 & 10.28 & 9.63 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 9.65 & 11.96 & 8.27 & 9.96 \\
\hline Mean & 9.37 & 10.74 & 9.28 & 9.80 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D\)
2. marginal means of \(V\)
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\)
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\)
\(=1.13\) (on/ac.
\(=0.59\) ton/ac.
\(=1.03\) ton/ac.
\(=1.3\) ) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcané Res. Sub-Stn., Neoli.

Ref :-U.P. 53(229).
Type:-‘CV’.

Object :-To study the effect of harvesting dates of plant Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal (sown on 28.6.1952). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light sandy loam (khaddar soil having alkaline patches). (b) Refer soil analysis, Neoli. (iii) 18.2.1953. (iv) (a) Turning in of sanai on 18.8.1952, harrowing by tractor on 17.9.1952, ploughing with Neoli plough on 21 and 29.9.1952, harrowing by tractor on 2.10.1952. ploughing by Neoli plough on 7.10.1952, ploughing by tractor on \(\mathbf{1 1 . 2}\).1953, ploughing by Neoli plough on 13.2.1953, harrowing by tractor on 15.2.1953. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Sanai green manured. Application of 10 C.L. of F.Y.M. at 20 mds./C.L. on 4 to 5.2 .1953 , spreading of manure on 9 and 10.2.1953. Application of mixture of \(A / S\) and mohwa cake at 2 seers 7 ch./plot on 8.7.1953. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by cultivator on 5 and 30.4.1953, 12.5.1953 and 19.6.1953 and hoeing by spade on 10.6.1953 and 8.7.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments:
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1953, D_{2}=15.2 .1953\) and \(D_{2}=15.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{C O} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) CO. 453 .
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(54^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(48^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}\). (v) Plot to plot distance \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millatle cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1955.
(b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Mil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 13.82 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 8.91 ton/ac.
(b) 4.66 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly significant. Effect of \(D\) and interaction \(D \times V\) are not significant. (iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llr|l} 
& \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(D_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 12.91 & 12.14 & 7.04 & 10.70 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 14.43 & 20.03 & 16.35 & 16.94 \\
\hline Mean & 13.67 & 16.08 & 11.70 & 13.82
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D\)
\(=3.64\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(V \quad=1.55\) ton/ac.
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D \quad=2.69\) ton/ac.
4. D means at a level of \(V \quad=4.10 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Sugarcane:
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 48(78).
Type :-‘CV'.

Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting different varicties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Green manuring of sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 24 to 26.2.1948. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by soil turning plough, 4 ploughings by desi plough, plankings -7 times, harrowing and picking of roots twice. (b) N.A. (c) 55 three budded setts/line (d) N.A. (e) --. (v) Green manuring of sanai ( \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).) Castor cake at 43 lb ./ac. of N during 17 to 19.2.1948. Top dressing of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 37 lb ./ac. of N on 14 and 15.5.1948. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viij) Hoeing with spring tooth harrow on 14.3.1948, planking on 15 and 16.3.1948, hoeings by cultivator from 24.3 .1948 to 11.6 .1948 and earthing from 11 to 18.8 .1948 . (ix) \(40.93^{\circ}\). ( \(x\) ) As per treatments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

5 dates of harvesting: \(\quad \begin{aligned} & D_{1}=15 \text { to } 22.12 .1948, D_{2}=15 \text { to 17.1.1949, } D_{3}=15 \text { to 19.2.1949, } D_{4}=17 \text { to } \\ & 21.3 .1949 \text { and } D_{5}=29,31.3 .1949 \text { and } 3.4 .1949 .\end{aligned}\) 21.3.1949 and \(D_{5}=29,31.3 .1949\) and 3.4.1949.

Sugarcane in treatment \(D_{5}\) actually harvested at the end of March, due to the closure of the factory.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties: \(\quad V_{1}=C O .453\) (late), \(V_{2}=C O .421\) (medium) and \(V_{3}=C O .313\) (early).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 5 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) at each side of the gross plot left as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good, but due to the lodging of plots of CO. 313, it has been damaged to a great extent. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination counting, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The yield of variety CO. 453 in the main-plot treatment of April harvesting was missing and has been estimated for analysis and summary of result. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S),
5. RESULTS :
(i) 27.35 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.194 ton/ac.
(b) 2.417 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{D}\) and V are highly significant. Interaction \(\mathbf{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D\) (none of the treatment means contains missing value) \(=1.065\) ton/ac. -
2. marginal means of \(V\) (none of the treatment means contains missing value) \(=0.624\) ton/ac.
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) (none of the means contains missing value) \(=1.396\) ton/ac.
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) (none of the means contains missing value) \(=1.559\) ton/ac.
5. marginal means of \(\mathbf{D}\) (one of them contains missing value)
\(=1.080\) ton/ac,
6. marginal means of \(V\) (one of them contains missing value)
-0.634 ton/ac.
7. V means at a level of \(D\) (one of them contains missing value)
\(=1.141\) ton/ac.
8. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) (one of them contains missing value)
\(=1.650\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 49(58).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting different varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Sugarcane-wheat-fallow (or sanai). (b) Green manuring (sanai). (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 16 to 19.2.1949. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough, 8 by desi plough, 2 harrows and pata. (b) N.A. (c) 55 three budded setts/line. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) G.M. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 13.2.1949, G.N.C. at 45 lb ./ac. of N on 4.6 .1949 and \(A / S\) at \(45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 26 and 27.51949 and 4.6.1949. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with cultivator or mixing manure, 4 weedings, picking of roots, earthing and bunding. (ix) \(51.22^{\circ}\). (x) As per treatments'

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
5 dates of harvesting: \(D_{1}=15\) to 17.12.1949, \(D_{2}=16\) to 18.1.1950, \(D_{3}=15,16,20\) and 26.2.1950.
\(D_{4}=2,3,13,16,17,22\) and 23.3.1950 and \(D_{5}=11\) and 15.4.1950.
Sab-plot treatments :
3 yarieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C O} .453\) (late), \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\operatorname{CO} .313\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{3}}=\operatorname{COS} .186\) (medium).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 5 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\) (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good, lodged due to heavy rains in September. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) There has been some damage to the crop by jackals and human beings especially in varieties \(\operatorname{CO} .313\) and \(\operatorname{COS} .186\) (some plots only). (iii) Experiment was conducted by.D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 23.30 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.531 ton/ac.
(b) 2.037 ton/ac.
(iii) Only V effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \multicolumn{1}{c}{\(\mathbf{V}_{1}\)} & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 20.07 & 23.75 & 24.56 & 22.79 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 20.05 & 23.93 & 26.40 & 23.46 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 18.38 & 24.46 & 26.47 & 23.10 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 19.48 & 25.50 & 27.33 & 24.10 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & 18.67 & 24.53 & 25.97 & 23.06 \\
\hline Mean & 19.33 & 24.43 & 26.15 & 23.30
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. D maginal means \(\quad=0.843\) ton/ac
2. V marginal means \(\quad=0.526\) ton/ac.
3. V means at the same level of \(D,=1.176\) ton/ac.
4. \(D\) means at the same level of \(V{ }^{\bullet}=1.278\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 50(198).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To find the optimum time of harvesting of different Sugarcane varieties (plant cane).

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Guar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) !Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 17 and 18.3.1949. (iv) (a) Ploughing by victory plough, tractor, desi plough and pata. (b) N.A. (c) 55 three budded setts/line. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Town compost at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and A/S \& Castor cake at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as top dressing. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with cultivator earthing, hoeing with harrow and binding. (ix) \(39.94^{\prime \prime}\). (x) As per treatments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot trealments :}

5 dates of harvesting : \(D_{1}=15.12 .19+9, D_{2}=15.1 .1950, D_{2}=15.2 .1950, D_{4}=15.3 .1950\) and \(D_{5}=15.4 .1950\).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\operatorname{CO.} 453\) (late). \(V_{8}=C O .313\) (early) and \(V_{3}=\operatorname{COS} .186\) (medium).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Spli-plot. (ii) (a) 5 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(55^{\circ} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(1) Satisfactory. (ii) CO.313, in slightly effected by mosaic disease in July. (iii) Sugarcane yield. 'iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The 3 lines of April harvesting have been damaged by jackals. Plots of CO.313 are subjected to heavy damage followed by COS.186. Due to the great damage in April harvesting, April harvesting has been excluded from analysis and summary of result. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.80 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.794 ton/ac.
(b) 1.813 ton/ac.
(iii) Only V effect is highly significant.
- (iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 14.86 & 18.68 & 23.92 & 19.15 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 13.63 & 18.86 & 24.88 & 19.12 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 14.38 & 18.05 & 22.97 & 18.47 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 12.91 & 19.29 & 23.13 & 18.44 \\
\hline Mean & 13.94 & 18.72 & 23.73 & 18.80
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & & \(=0.655\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & & \(=0.573\) ton/ac. \\
3. V means at the same level of \(D\) & & \(=1.147\) ton/ac. \\
4. D means at the same level of \(V\) & & \(=1.143\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop:- Sugarcane (Ratoon). & Ref :- U.P. 49(57). \\
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shabjahanpur. & Type :- 'CV'. •
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of different times of harvesting plant Sugarcane on its ratoon.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Top dressing of G.N.C. at \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 10 to 13.6 .1949 and A/S at 75 lb ./ac. of N on 10 th to 13.6 .1949 . (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kassi and with cultivator, earthing and bunding. (ix) \(49.53^{\circ}\). (x) 16 to 26 12.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
5 dates of harvesting plant sugarcane : \(D_{1}=15\) to 22.12.1948, \(D_{2}=15\) to 17.1.1949, \(D_{3}=15\) to 19.2.1949, \(D_{4}=17\) to 21.3.1949 and \(D_{5}=28\) to 31.3.1949 and 3.4.1949.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties : \(\mathbf{V}_{1}=C O .313\) (early), \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C O} .421\) (late) and \(\mathbf{V}_{3}=\mathbf{C O} .453\) (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 5 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Badly lodged in September by rains followed by stormy wind and hence damaged. (ii) CO. 421 variety has been badly effected by yellow-leaf disease, digging of smut affected shoots on 11.5.49 (iii) Tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 29.32 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.741 ton/ac.
(b) 3.1571 ton/ac.
(iii) \(D\) effect is significant, \(V\) effect is highly significant, while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 24.77 & 21.44 & 34.47 & 26.89 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 25.51 & 23.81 & 35.91 & 28.41 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 28.22 & 24.42 & 40.76 & 31.13 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 26.22 & 27.27 & 38.01 & 30.50 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{6}\) & 26.11 & 25.97 & 36.95 & 29.68 \\
\hline Mean & 26.17 & 24.58 & 37.22 & 29.32 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. D marginal means \(=1.247\) ton/ac.
2. V marginal means \(\quad=0.815\) ton/ac.
3. V means at the same level of \(D \quad=1.822\) ton/ac.
4. \(D\) means at the same level of \(V \quad=1.941\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop:-Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 50(197).
Type :- ‘CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of different times of harvesting plant Sugarcane on its ratoon.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) Plant sugarcane planted on, 16, 19.2.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 55 , three budded setts/line for plant sugarcane. (d) N.A. (e) . (v) Top dressing of Castor cake at \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 5 and 6.6.1950 and \(A / S\) at \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 6 and 7.7.1950. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kassi, cultivator and earthing. (ix) \(37.57^{\circ}\). (x) 19 to 23.12.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments:}

5 dates of harvesting plant sugarcane : \(D_{1}=15\) to \(17.12 .1949, D_{2}=15\) to 18.1.1950, \(D_{3}=15\) to 20.2.1950, \(D_{4}=16\) to 22.3.1950 and \(D_{5}=16\) to 22.4.1950.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

3 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. 313, \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) CO. 186 (medium) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) CO. 453 (late).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 5 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack of slight yellow leaf disease in some plots of CO. 313. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sucarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S). April harvesting date ( \(D_{5}\) ) has been deleted as the plant sugarcane crop was heavily damaged, So \(D_{6}\) does not occur in this also [Refer 50(198)].
5. RESULTS:
(i) 15.01 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.960 ton/ac.
(b) 2.038 ton/ac.
(iii) Effect of \(\mathbf{D}\) is significant and effect of V is higbly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \multicolumn{1}{|c}{ Mean } \\
\cline { 1 - 5 } & & 9.92 & 14.53 & 13.53 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 12.07 & 15.72 & 1849 & 12.66 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 12.80 & 15.85 & 18.51 & 15.72 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 12.50 & 16.64 & 19.59 & 16.24 \\
\hline Mean & 11.82 & 15.68 & 17.53 & 15.01
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. D marginal means
\(=0.987\) ton/ac.
2. V marginal means
3. \(V\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{D}\)
\(=0.588\) too \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
4. D means at the same level of \(V\)
\(=1.176\) ton/ac.
4. D means at the same level of \(\quad=1.377\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 51(127).
Type : \({ }^{\prime}\) 'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of different times of harvesting plant Sugarcane of different Sugarcane varieties on its ratoon.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS .
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane. (c) T.C. at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}_{\text {, }}\) castor cake at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Castorcake at \(75 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 75 lb ./ac. on 25.5.1951. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kassi and cultivator, earthing. (ix) \(31.98^{\prime \prime}\) ( x ) 11 to 29.12.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
\(S\) dates of harvesting plant cane : \(D_{1}=17,18.12 .1951 . D_{2}=15.1\).1952. \(D_{3}=15,16,17.2 .1952\).
\(D_{4}=9.3 .1952 . \quad D_{5}=18\) to 23.4.1952.
Sub-plot treatments :
3 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C O} .313\) (early). \(\quad \mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .186\) (med),\(\quad \mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{8}}=\mathbf{C O} .453\) (late).
5. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 5 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(55^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tiller count, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (ii) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 16.86 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.208 ton/ac.
(b) 2.984 ton/ac.
(iii) Only V effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 12.71 & 19.86 & 14.21 & 15.59 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 14.24 & 19.52 & 15.84 & 16.53 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 14.03 & 22.09 & 16.00 & 17.37 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 15.33 & 23.47 & 16.69 & 18.50 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & 13.78 & 20.08 & 15.02 & 16.29 \\
\hline Mean & 14.02 & 21.00 & 15.55 & 16.86
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=1.171\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \\
3. \(V\) means at the level of \(D\) & \\
4. \(D\) means at the level of \(V\) & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shabjahanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 48(72).
Type :-‘CV'.

Object:-To study the methods of improving germination of sugarcane with special reference to planting during cold weather.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 24 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -- (v) Sanal as B.D. (date of application N.A.) and \(A / S\) at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as top dressing. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
- Main-plot treatments :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 6 dates of sowing : \(S_{1}=\) Oct. 1947, \(S_{2}=\) Nov. 1947, \(S_{3}=\) Dec. 1947, \(S_{4}=\) Jan. 1948. \(S_{6}=\) Feb. 1948 and \(\mathrm{S}_{8}=\) March 1948.
(2) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .313\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) (medium).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

5 seed treatments : seed kept under cowdung for \(T_{1}=1\) day, \(T_{2}=2\) days, \(T_{2}=3\) days, \(T_{4}=4\) days and \(\mathrm{T}_{5}=\) control (no treatment).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 12 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.32 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.834 ton/ac.
(b) 4.736 ton/ac.
(iii) Effect of S and interaction \(\mathrm{V} \times \mathrm{S}\) are highly significant. All others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & & \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) & T \({ }_{2}\) & T3 & T4 & T \({ }_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & & 19.39 & 16.67 & 17.43 & 17.18 & 23.41 & 18.81 & 17.62 & 19.59 \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & & 15.01 & 16.90 & 16.29 & 19.36 & 17.18 & 16.95 & 14.16 & 19.73 \\
\hline \(S_{3}\) & & 20.37 & 21.34 & 19.94 & 20.95 & 23.04 & 21.13 & 23.56 & 18.66 \\
\hline \(S_{4}\) & & 23.46 & 20.37 & 24.42 & 18.19 & 24.96 & 22.28 & 25.51 & 19.05 \\
\hline \(S_{5}\) & & 19.66 & 20.22 & 23.30 & 24.11 & 21.44 & 21.75 & 21.06 & 22.44 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & & 13.11 & 14.77 & 12.85 & 16.25 & 18.00 & 15.0 & 13.35 & 16.64 \\
\hline Mean & & 18.50 & 18.37 & 19.04 & 19.34 & 21.34 & 19.32 & 19.21 & 19.42 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & & 18.83 & 18.94 & 18.28 & 19.55 & 20.47 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & & 18.17 & 17.80 & 19.79 & 19.13 & 22.20 & 19.42 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(S\) marginal means \(\quad=1.506\) ton/ac.
2. V marginal means \(\quad=1.230\) ton/ac.
3. means of the body of \(S \times V\) table \(\quad=2.130\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
4. T marginal means
5. T means at the same level of \(S\)
6. T means at tha same level of \(V\)
\(=1.116\) ton/ac.
\(=2.735\) ton/ac.
\(=1.579\) ton/ac.
8. S means at the some body of \(T \quad=2.872\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Doiwala (Dehradun).

Ref:-U.P. 52(263).
Type:-'CV'.

Object :- To study the optimum time of harvesting plant of crop of cane for taking ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy and Toria. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) 300 mds. compost on 26.2.1952. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 12 ploughings; hoeing by kassi on 19.4-1952, 13.5.1952 and 16.6.1952, Weeding on 12.7.1952. (b) Flat system. (c) and (d) 59 , three budded setts/row; 472, three budded setts/plot; 8 rows 3' apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 27.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1953, D_{2}=15.2 .1953\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments:
2 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .453\) and \(V_{2}=C 0.356\).
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Split-plot design with 6 replications. (iii) (a) Main-plot \(57^{\prime} \times 48^{\prime}\). sub-plot \(57^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) Main-plot \(51^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\), sub-plot \(51^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv! N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M). on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 23.25 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.554 ton/ac.
(b) 2.192 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 23.89 & 22.95 & 24.87 & 23.90 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 22.95 & 20.54 & 24.32 & 22.60 \\
\hline Mean & 23.42 & 21.74 & 24.60 & 23.25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D\). \(=1.043\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(V \quad=0.731\) ton/ac.
3. V means at a level of \(D \quad=0.895\) ton/ac.
4. \(D\) meaes at a level of \(V \quad=1.374\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop:-Sugarcane.}

Zone :-Doiwala (Dehradun).

Ref:-U.P. 53(278).
Type : \({ }^{〔}\) CV'.

Object:-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of cane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant cane. (c) 300 mds. compost on 26.2.1952. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) 2 ploughings by desi plough, 1 hoeing by spade, 1 hoeing by khurpi. (b) (plant cane) Flat system. (c) and (d) 59 , three budded setts/row, 472 buds/plot, 8 rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigation by canal. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A.(x) 24.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1953 ; D_{2}=15.2 .1953\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments:
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{g}}=\mathrm{CO} .356\).
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Split-plot design with 6 replications. N.A. (iii) (a) Main-plot \(57^{\prime} \times 48^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(57^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) Main-plot \(51^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). and sub-plot \(51^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tiller count, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (e) 'N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields..
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.71 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.552 tan/ac.
(b) 0.791 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly significant and of \(D\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & Dg & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 21.25 & 22.19 & 23.43 & 22.29 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 20.34 & 20.85 & 22.19 & 21.13 \\
\hline Mean & 20.80 & 21.52 & 22.81 & 21.71 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=0.634\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal mean of \(V\) & \(=0.264\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=0.457\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Mohammadi (Kheri).

Ref:- U.P. 52(203).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object:-To study the optimum time of harvesting Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai as G.M. Top-dressing G.N.C. at 10 md./ac. on 25.3.1952. and A/S. \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) md./ac. on 21.6.1952. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor on 5.2.1952, 6.2.1952, furrow making by tractor on 10 and 11.2.1952, earthing up by tractor on 30.6.1952. (b) Flat planting. (c) 1752 buds/plot (d) 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 11.2.19s2. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings by kudali on 25.2.1952. and by cultivator on 18.3.1952, 25.4.1952 and 26.5.1952. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting: \(D_{1}=20.1\).1953, \(D_{2}=13.2 .1953\) and \(D_{3}=21.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO.K. 30 (mid-early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii). Split plot wilh 6 replications, 3 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (vi) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivators' fields.
5. \({ }^{\prime}\) RESULTS :
(i) 11.08 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.159 ton/ac.
(b) 2.512 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of D and V and interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{I}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 12.84 & 8.12 & 10.48 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 8.54 & 8.25 & 8.39 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 18.27 & 10.49 & 14.38 \\
\hline Mean & 13.22 & 8.95 & 11.08 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=1.290\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=0.838\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=1.451\) ton/ac. \\
4. D means at a level of \(V\) & \(=1.648\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane (Ratoon).
Zone :- Mohammadi (Kheri).

Ref :- U.P. 52(201).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object:-To study the effect of time of harvesting of plant crop Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :

\footnotetext{
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant cane. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 12.1.1953.
}

\section*{12 TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting of plant sugarcane : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1952, D_{2}=15.2\).1952 and \(D_{3}=15.3\).1952.
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{C O} . \mathrm{K} .30\) (mid-early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 6 replications in split-plot, 3 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. !(b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 3.315 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.507 ton/ac.
(b) 2.674 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly signifizant, main effect of \(D\) and isteraction \(D \times V\) are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane is ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(V_{1}\) & \(V_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(D_{2}\) & 4.970 & 1.338 & 3.154 \\
\(D_{2}\) & 5.700 & 1.819 & 3.759 \\
\(D_{3}\) & 4.871 & 1.194 & 3.032 \\
\hline Mean & 1.450 & 3.31
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=0.615\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=0.891\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=1.544\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) mean at a level of \(V\) & \(=1.253\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Golagokaranath (Kheri).

Ref :- U.P. 53(234).
Type:- ‘CV'.

Object : - To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant sugarcane. (c) G.N.C. at \(10 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 25.3 .1952 and at \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S} 1 \mathrm{t} \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 21.6.1952. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(45^{\prime \prime}\). (x) ! 6 to 18.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting of plant crop : \(D_{1}=20.1 .1953, D_{2}=13.2\).1953 and \(D_{8}=21.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments:
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO.K. 30 (mid-early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) (late).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i , (ii) Split-plot with 6 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) 73' \(\times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS}
(i) 8.78 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.65 ton/ac
(b) 3.20 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly significant. Main effect of \(D\) and interaction \(D \times V\) are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in tod/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc} 
& \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{2}\) & \(D_{3}\) \\
\hline\(V_{1}\) & 12.80 & 9.72 & 12.22 \\
\(V_{2}\) & 5.60 & 6.16 & 6.19 \\
\hline Mean & 9.20 & 7.94 & 9.20
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=1.082\) ton/ac. \\
3. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=1.067\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \\
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Sugareane, \\ Zone :- Gola (Kheri)}

Ref :- U.P. 51(157).
Type :- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the of optimum time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M.. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Mohwa cake. (iv) As per treatments (v) (a) Ploughing 4 times by tractor on 21 and 29.1.1951. Earthing up by tractor on 15.6.1951. 4 hoeings by cultivator and kudali. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 3504 buds/plot. (d) rows 3' apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 1 and 2.2.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(47^{\circ}\). (x) As per treatments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments:
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1951, D_{2}=15.2 .1951\) and \(D_{3}=15.3\).1951. .
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{C O} . \mathrm{K} .30\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C O} .453\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Spilt-plot with 6 replications. 3 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RELULTS :}
(i) 18.37 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.02 ton/ac.
(b) 4.16 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{D}\) alone is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcan= in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 21.59 & 21.70 & 13.76 & 19.02 \\
\(\mathrm{~V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 20.18 & 18.57 & 14.42 & 17.72 \\
\hline Mean & 20.89 & 20.13 & 14.09 & 18.37
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=2.05\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=1.35\) ton/ac. \\
3. V means at a level of \(D\) & \(=2.40\) ton/ac. \\
4. D means at a level of \(V\) & \(=2.66\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Daurala (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 50(221).
Type : \({ }^{\prime}\) CV'.

Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 60 three budded setts/row. (d) 18 rows/main-plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 14.3.1950. (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1951, \bar{D}_{2}=15.2\).1951 and \(D_{3}=16.3 .1951\).
Sab-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(V_{1}=\operatorname{COS} .245\) and \(V_{8}=C O .421\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Split-plot design with 4 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot (iv) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 29.39 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.988 ton/ac.
(b) 0.963 ton/ac. -
(iii) None of the effects and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yleld of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 31.65 & 31.01 & 31.33 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 30.20 & 29.06 & 29.63 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 26.72 & 27.69 & 27.21 \\
\hline Mean & 29.52 & 29.25 & 29.39
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D\)
\(=1.494\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(V\)
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) \(=0.393\) ton/ac.
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) \(=0.681 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \(=1.570\) ton/ac.

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :-Daurala (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 51(205).
Type :-‘CV'.

Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crep cf Sugarcane for taking ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Chari and guar. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 67 three budded setts/row and 2814 buds/plot. (d) 7 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 26 and 27.2.1951. (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1\).1952, \(D_{2}=15.2 .1952\) and \(D_{3}=15.3\).1952.
Sub-plot treatments:
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO. 245 and CO. 421.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) 5 replications in Split-plot. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot (iii) (a) \(65^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\).
(b) \(59^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 44.89 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 0.586 ton/ac.
(b) 0.575 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(V_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(D_{1}\) & 44.75 & 44.84 & 44.80 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 44.75 & 44.62 & '44.68 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 44.84 & 45.56 & 45.20 \\
\hline Mean & 44.78 & 45.01 & 44.89 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=0.262\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=0.210\) ton/ac. \\
4. D means at a level of \(V\) & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Daurala (Meerut).

\section*{Ref:- U.P. 52(257). \\ Type :- 'CV'.}

Object :-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) F.Y.M. at 300 md. on 10.4 .1952 and A/S at 1 md. 20 seers on 12.5.1952. (iv) As per treatments. (v) Hoeing by cultivator on 19.4.1952, 16.5.1952, hoeing by phawra on 26.5.1952 and 12.6.1952. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) 67 setts/row, 459 setts/plot. (d) 7 rows \(3^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments (vii) Irrigated (viii) N.A.(ix) N.A. (x) 13.2.1953.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments:}

3 dates of harvest of plant crop: \(D_{1}=15.1 .1952, D_{2}=15.2 .1952\) and \(D_{3}=15.3\).1952.
Sub-plot treatments:
2 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .245\) and \(V_{2}=C O .421\).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) Split-plot with 5 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) Main-plot : \(65^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(65^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\).(b) Main-plot : \(59^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(59^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.
:5. RESULTS:
(i) 22.54 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 0.609 ton/ac.
(b) 0.034 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(D\) is highly significa: \(t\). Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 22.24 & 22.19 & 22.22 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 2364 & 23.60 & 23.62 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 21.74 & 2183 & 21.78 \\
\hline Mean & 22.54 & 22.54 & 22.54
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal mean of \(D\) & \(=0.273 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=0.013 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=0.022\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Daurala (Meerut).
Ref:- U.P. 52(260).
Type :- 'CV'.
Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) 'a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Manuring with okhla sledge at 198 mds. on 28.2.1952+ A/S at 1 md. 7 seers 4 chk. on 12.6.1952. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by desi plough on 8.4.1952, 3.6.1952, hoeing by spade 26.5.1952, 21.6.1952 and earthing by phawra on 25.7.1952. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest: \(D_{1}=15.1 .1953, D_{\mathbf{2}}=15.2 .1953\) and \(D_{\mathbf{2}}=15.3\).1953.
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .245\) and \(V_{2}=C O .421\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) ànd (ii) Split-plot with 6 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(1 / 30.00\) ac. (approximately), (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 10.17 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.370 ton/ac.
(b) 1.857 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{D}\) and \(\mathbf{V}\) and their interaction are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{V}_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 9.73 & 9.19 & 9.46 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 9.67 & 9.83 & 9.75 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 11.54 & 11.05 & 11.30 \\
\hline Mean & 10.31 & 10.02 & 10.17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D\)
\(=1.376 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(V\)
\(=0.619\) ton/ac.
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\)
\(=1.072\) ton/ac.
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\)
\(=1.571\) ton/ac.

Crop : Sugarcane.
Zone :-Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Ref:-U.P. 51(204).
Type :^‘CV'.

Object :-To study the time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Manuring at 75 lb ./ac. of N on 12.5.1951. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Ploughing by praja plough and desi plough. (b) Planting of sugarcane by desi plough, flat system of planting, (c) and (d) 6 rows/plot; 65 setts (three budded)/row, 1170 buds/plot. (vi) 25.2.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii). N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1\).1952, \(D_{2}=15.2 .1952\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1952\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .421\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Split-plot with 4 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plot/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(63^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}\).
(b) \(57^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 55.35 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.710 ton/ac.
(b) 3.648 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of D is significant. Main effects of V is highly significant. Interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 46.79 & 60.46 & 53.62 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 54.97 & 64.77 & 59.87 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 49.71 & 55.41 & 52.56 \\
\hline Mean & 50.49 & 60.21 & 55.35
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=1.855 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. V means at a level of \(D\) & \\
4. D means at a level of \(V\) & \\
& \(=2.489\) ton/ac. \\
&
\end{tabular}

Crop :sugarcane (Ratoon).
Zone :-Simbhaoli (Meerut).

Ref :-U.P. 52(262).
Type :-'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant cane. (c) Manuring at 75 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M. on \(\mathbf{1 2 . 5 . 1 9 5 1}\). (ii) Clay loam. (iii) G.N.C. at 45 Jb ./ac. of N on 14.6.1952. A/S at 15 lb ./ac. of N on 5.7.1952. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Ploughing by praja plough on 31.3.1952 (for hoeing). Ploughing by desi plough on 18.4.19:2, 7.5.1952 and 25.5.1952 (for hoeing). (b) Flat system of sowing. (c) and (d) 65 (three budded) setts/row, 590 setts/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 12 to 24.12.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest of plant crop : \(D_{1}=15.1\).1952, \(D_{2}=15.2 .1952\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1952\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 variet'es: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C O} .421\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Split-plot with 4 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plot/main-plot. (iii) (a) Main-plot : \(63^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). .sub-plot : \(53^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) Main-plot : \(57^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\), sub-plot : \(57^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 29.69 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.786 ton/ac.
(b) 1.021 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(D\) and \(V\) are highly significant. Interaction \(D \times V\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 27.49 & 23.86 & 25.68 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 32.31 & 28.36 & 30.34 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 36.26 & 29.83 & 33.04 \\
\hline Mean & 32.02 & 27.35 & 29.69
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{lrl} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & & \(=1.393\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & & \(=0.417\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & & \(=0.722\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & & \(=1.484\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}


Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai (G.M.) (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Sanai (G.M.) (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by cultirator and spade on 4, 5.4.1952. Hoeing and weeding by cultivator and spade. Hoeing by kassi and earthing. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) and (d) 60 , three budded setts/row; 360 , three budded setts/plot ; 6 rows 2' apart. (e) N.A. (vi) 24 and 25.2.1952. (iii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1953, D_{2}=15.2\).1953 and \(D_{3}=15.3\).1953.
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathbf{C O} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathbf{C O} .421\).
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Splt-plot in 4 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot (iii) (a) Main-plot : \(58^{\circ} \times 36^{\prime}\). sub-plot : \(58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) Main-plot : \(52^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). sub-plot : \(52^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Stripping of Pyrilla leaves. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i).. 32.54 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.809 ton/ac.
(b) 2.979 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly significant. Others are not significant.'
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Mean } \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 33.06 & 28.90 & 30.98 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 34.97 & 29.73 & 32.35 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{3}\) & 39.33 & 29.23 & 34.28 \\
\hline Mean & 35.79 & 29.29 & 32.54
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D \quad=2.904\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(V \quad=1.216\) ton/ac.
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D \quad=2.107\) ton/ac.
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V \quad=3.264\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Ref :-U.P. 53(277).
Zone :-Modinagar (Meerut).
Object :-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant cane. (c) Sanai (G.M.) (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) N.A. (b) Flat system. (c) and (d) 60 setts/row; 350, three budded setss/plot ; 6 rows/plot 3' apart. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 6 and 7.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting of plant crop : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1953, D_{2}=15.2 .1953\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .245\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{CO} .421\).
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) Split-plot with 4 replications. 3 main- plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) Main-plot: \(58^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(58^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) Main-plot : \(52^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(52^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' flelds.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.67 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 9.541 ton/az.
(b) 4.490 tod/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is highly significant. Interaction \(D \times V\) is significant. Effect of \(D\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 9.35 & 25.58 & 17.46 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 20.14 & 21.70 & 20.92 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 15.23 & 26.02 & 20.62 \\
\hline Mean & 14.91 & 24.43 & 19.67 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1. marginal means of \(D\)} & =4.770 & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2. marginal means of V} & \(=1.833\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\)} & \(=3.175\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\)} & \(=5.272\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:-Sugarcane.}

Zone :-Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref :-U.P. 51(203).
Type :-‘CV’.

Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai+A/S at \(45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 21.7.1951. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Ploughing by desi plough on'2 and 6.3.1951. Ploughing by tractor on 3 to 5.3.1951, hoeing by kassi, cultivator, and phawra. (b) Flat system. (c) and (d) 7 rows/sub-plot, 2058 buds/plot. 49 three budded setts/row. (e) N.A. (vi) 6.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments. '
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1\).1952, \(D_{2}=15.2 .1952\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1952\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421\) and \(V_{2}=C O .245\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Split-plot with 4 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(47^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.95 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.977 ton/ac.
(b) 2.176 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects and their interaction is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & 24.20 & 27.55 & 25.88 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{2}\) & 25.86 & 24.82 & 25.34 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{3}\) & 26.44 & 26.83 & 26.64 \\
\hline Mean & 25.50 & 26.40 & 25.95.
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=0.989 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=0.888\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=1.539\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=1.470\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref:-U.P. 52(259).
Type :-'CV'.

Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting of plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Sanai G.M. at \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N+A/S at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). N on 20.71952 and \(2 \mathrm{l} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 18.8.1952. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Ploughings by tractor, disc plough and desi plough, hoeings by kassi and cultivator. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) and (d) 52, three budded setts/row and 260 three büdded setts/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 4.4.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1953, D_{2}=15.2 .1953\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
-2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=C O .421\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) CO.S. 245 .
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Split-plot with 4 replications. 3 .main-plots/blok; 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii,)(a) Main-plot: \(50^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\) and sub-plot: \(50^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) Main-plot : \(44^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(44^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 32.36 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.734 ton/ac.
(b) 2.840 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of \(V\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \(=1.367\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=1.160\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=1.008\) ton/ac. \\
& \(=1.971\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane (Ratoon).}

Zone :-Shamli (Muzaffarnagar).

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 51(202).}

Type:-‘CV’.

Object:-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon. crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) \(60 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 28.6 .1951 and 60 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 22.7.1951. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by phawara on 3.4.1951, 9.5.1951 and 19.6.1951. (b) N.A. (c) 18 rows/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 3 and 4.12.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest of plant crop: \(D_{1}=15.1 .1951, D_{2}=15.2\).1951 and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1951\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. 421, and \(V_{2}=C O .245\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Split-plot with 4 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 27\).
(b) \(54^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.93 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.777 ton/ac.
(b) 1.360 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of D and V and their interaction are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(V_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & 16.60 & 15.86 & 16.23 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 18.84 & 18.45 & 18.64 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 22.66 & 21.18 & 21.92 \\
\hline Mean & 19.37 & 18.50 & 18.93.
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D \quad=1.889\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{V} \quad=0.555\) ton/ac.
3. V means at a level of \(D \quad=0.961\) ton/ac.
4. D means at a level of \(V\). \(\quad=2.007\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane (Ratoon).
Zone :rShamli (Muzaffarnagar).

Ref ;-U.P. 52(258).
Type :-'CV'.

Object :- To study the effect of time of harvesting of plant ctop of Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Plant sugarcanc. (c) Sanai+manuring by \(A / S\) at \(45 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 21.7.1951. (ii) Loam. (iii) \(A / S\) at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 16.7 .1952 and at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 17.8 .1952 . (iv) (a) As per treatments. (v) (a) N.A. (b) Flat system of planting. (c) and (d) 49 three budded setts/row, 343 setts/plot, 7 rows \(3^{\circ}\) apart. (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 12 and 13.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 dates of harvest of plant sugarcane : \(D_{1}=15.1\).1952, \(D_{2}=15.2\).1952 and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1952\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : . \(V_{1}=C O .421\) and \(V_{\mathbf{2}}=\) CO.S. 245.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Split-plot', with 4 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot (iii) (a) Main-plot : \(47^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(47^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) Main-plot : \(41^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(41^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

4: GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) \(1951-1953\). (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.50 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.608 ton/ac.
(b) 1.042 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of D and V are highly significant. Interactions \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane (Ratoon). & Ref :- U.P. 53(279). \\
Zone :- Shamli (Muzaffarnagar). & Type :- ‘CV'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant sugarcane. (c) Sanai at 75 lb ./ac. of N+A/S. at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 20.7 .1953 and at 20. \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 18.8.1952. (ii) Loam. (iii) Top dressing 60 lb ./ac. of N as castor cake on 29.5.1953 and top drossing 60 lb ./ac. of N as \(A / S\) on 11.7.1953. (iv) As under treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by spade and M.C. cultivator on 17.4. 18.5.1953 and 18.5.1953. l(b) Flat system (c) 52 three'budded setts/row 260 setts/plot. 5 rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) i.Irigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 8.12.1953 to 10.12 .1953 .

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting plant sugarcane : \(D_{1}=15.1\).1953. \(D_{2}=15.2 .1953\), and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathbf{C O} 245\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (b) Split-plot with 4 replications. 3 main/plots block; 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) Main-plot: \(50^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\) and sub-plot : \(50^{\circ} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) Main-plot : \(44^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) and sub-plot: \(44^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.SR.(M) on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.23 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.131 ton/ac.
(b) 2.194 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) is significant, others are not the significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 15.53 & 18.44 & 18.98 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 16.28 & 18.51 & 17.40 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 17.13 & 23.49 & 20.31 \\
\hline Mean & 16.31 & 20.15 & 18.23
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two.
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { E. of difference of } & =2.566 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 1. marginal means of } D & =0.896 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 2. marginal means of } V & =1.552 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 3. V means at a level of } D & =2.790 \text { ton/ac- }\end{array}\)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U,P. 52(206). \\
Zone :- Maholi (Sitapur). & Type :- 'CV'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal for G.M- (c) No. (ii) Loam. (iii) F.Y.M. at 12 C.L./ac. on 29.1.1952. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Ploughing by tractor, earthing up by tractor and hoeings by kudali. (b) Flat planting. (c) and (d) 1752 buds/plot., 8 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 1.3.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(35^{\circ}\). (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest : \(\mathrm{D}_{1}=26.1\) 1953, \(\mathrm{D}_{2}=28.2 .1953\) and \(\mathrm{D}_{3}=9.3\).1953.
Sub-plot treatments:
\(V_{1}=\) COK. 30 (mid-early) \(V_{2}=\) CO.453(late).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) split-plot with 6 replications. 3 main-plots/replications and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\), (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conduçted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 37.95 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.451 ton/ac.
(b) 4.897 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of D and V are not significant, interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 29.43 & 44.59 & 37.01 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 43.38 & 32.92 & 38.15 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{3}\) & 37.91 & 39.44 & 38.68 \\
\hline Mean & 35.91 & 38.98 & 37.95.
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D \quad=1.409\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(V \quad=1.632\) ton/ac.
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D \quad=2.827\) ton/ac.
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V \quad=2.446\) ton/ac.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 53(233). } \\
\text { Zone :- Maholi (Sitapur), } & \text { Type :- 'CV'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) F.Y.M. at 12 C.L./ac. on 29.1.1952. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) and (d) 8 rows at \(3^{\prime}\) distance. (c) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) \(45^{\circ}\). (x) \(<6,27.12 .1953\).

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest of plant sugarcane ; \(D_{1}=26.1\).1953, \(D_{2}=18.2\).1953 and \(D_{8}=9.3\).1953.
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) COK 30 (mid-early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\) CO. 453 (late).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) Split-plot with 6 replication, 3 main-plots/block, 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 28.48 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.09 ton/ac.
(b) 2.78 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(D\) is significant, main effect of \(V\) and interaction \(D \times V\) are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lc|c} 
& \(V_{1}\) & \(V_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(D_{1}\) & 27.36 & 29.30 & 28.33 \\
\(D_{2}\) & 29.93 & 26.37 & 30.15 \\
\(D_{3}\) & 27.07 & 28.83 & 26.95 \\
\hline Mean & 28.12 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two


Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :- Haldwani (Nainital).

Ref :- U.P. 51(153).
Type:- 'CV'.

Object :-To study the optimum time of planting Sugarcane in different tracts.

\section*{BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) G.M., sanai (failed). (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) G.N.C. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} .+\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). at the time of planting and \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) top dressed. (iv) CO. 453 and CO. 421. (v) (a) Ploughing by Athens and harrow on 3.10.1950, ploughing by desi on 11.10.1950, ploughing by furrow on 12.10 .1950 and pata on 13.10.1950, 3 hoeings by kassi on 26, 27.4-1951, hoeing by cultivator on 8.5.1951 and hoeing by kassi on 26.5.1951. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1440 buds/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(50^{\circ}\). (x) 19 to 21.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
5 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=\) Middle of October, 1950, \(D_{2}=\) Middle of November, 1950, \(D_{3}=\) Middle of January, 1951, \(D_{4}=\) Middle of February, 1951 and \(D_{5}=\) Middle of March, 1951.
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .421\) and \(V_{1}=C O .453\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) Split-plot with 6 replications, 5 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A; (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 27.01 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.51 ton/ac.
(b) 5.70 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{D}\) and V are highly significant, interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
& \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{2}\) & \(D_{3}\) & \(D_{4}\) & \(D_{5}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & & 33.45 & 32.09 & 27.24 & 14.65 & 11.38 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 41.71 & 33.62 & 30.46 & 29.33 & 16.19 & 23.76 \\
\hline Mean & 37.58 & 32.85 & 28.85 & 21.99 & 13.78 & 30.26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D \quad=2.249\) ton/ac.
\(\begin{array}{rlrl}\text { 2. marginal means of } V & & =1.472 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 3. } V \text { means at a level of } D & =3.291 \text { ton/ac. }\end{array}\)
4. D means at a level of \(V\). \(=3.380\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Zone :-Kichha (Nainital).

Ref :-U.P. 52(205).
Type :-‘CV’.

Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane for taking a ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Dhaincha for G.M. (c) No. (ii) Clayey loam. (iii) Top dressing of G.N.C. at 40 lb./ac. of N on 21.5.1952 and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 45 lb ./ac. of N on 14.6.1952. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Turning in of Dhaincha by disc plough on 23 to 25.9.1951, Ploughing by Athens plough on 19.12.1951, ploughing by dise plough on 6, 7.1.1952. By dise harrow on 23.1.1952. By ransom on 12.1.1952. Pata on 20.12.1951, 23.1.1952 and 14.2.1952. Picking of grass on 12.1.1952. Hoeing by kassi and cultivator. (b) Flat planting ridges drawn by diar ridger. (c) and (d) 1314 buds/plot. 73 three budded setts/line and 6 rows/plot. (e) N.A. (vi) 12.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (Av. annual rainfall : 50". (x) As per treatments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS : -}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting : \(D_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Mid January. \(\quad \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{8}}=\) Mid February. \(\quad \mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) Mid March.
Sub-plot treatments:
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathbf{C O} .453\).
3. LESIGN:
(i) and (ii) 6 replications in split-plot. 3 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(90^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}\) (b) \(84^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination \% and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii). The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 29.27 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) . 3.759 ton/ac.
(b) 5.815 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of D is highly signifcant. Main effect of V and interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(V_{1}\) & \(V_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 31.65 & 33.73 & 32.69 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 28.58 & 31.19 & 29.88 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 25.91 & 24.56 & 25.24 \\
\hline Mean & 28.71 & 29.83 & 29.27 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{1. marginal means of \(D\)} & /ac. \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{V}\)} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{3. V means at a level of D} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{4. D means at a level of \(\mathbf{V}\)} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Kichha (Nainital).

Ref :-U.P. 52(200):
Type :-'CV'.

Object :-To study the effect of time of harvesting plant crop of Sugarcane on the yield of succeeding ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Plant cane. (c) N.A. (ii) Clayey loam. (iii) G.N.C. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 14.5 .1952 , (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Hoeing by tractor on 28.4.1952 by cultivator on 3.5.1952. and by kassi on 6.5.1952. Hoeing by kassi in Jan. plots on 28.1.1952. and in 6, 7.3.1952; on Feb. plots (b) N.A. (c) 9 rows/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) (Av. rainfall \(50^{\circ}\) ). (x) 20 to 24.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting plant cane : \(D_{1}=\) Mid January, \(D_{2}=\) Mid February and \(D_{3}=\) Mid March. 1952.
Sub-plot treatments:
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathbf{C O} .453\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 4 replications in split-plot. 3 main-plots/replicaticn and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(67^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.52 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.828 ton/ac.
(b) 3.720 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(D\) and \(V\) are significant. Interaction \(D \times V\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|l|l|l} 
& \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{~V}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 14.33 & 12.12 & 13.22 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 18.34 & 23.36 & 20.85 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & 17.72 & 25.26 & 21.49 \\
\hline Mean & 16.80 & 20.25 & 18.52
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(D\) & \(=2.414 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. marginal means of \(V\) & \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \(=1.519 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \\
& \(=2.630 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
&
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Haldwani (Nainital).

Ref :-U.P. 53(235).
Type :-‘CV’.

Object:-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crop of cane for taking a ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Clayey loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Ridges d:awn by tractor, turning in of Sanai by Athens p'ough on 8.9.1952. Ploughing by Athens plough on 10.5.1952, 11.6.1952. 5 to 7.2 .1953 by 19 B harrow on 20.10.1952, 8.2.1953, by desi plough on 12, 13.12.1952, 27 to 29.1.1953, pata on 1.2.1953. (b) Flat sowing. (c) and (d) 1344 buds/plot in 7 rows. (c) N.A. (vi) 11 and 12.2.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) Av. annual rainfall 35". (x) As per treatments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvesting : \(D_{1}=\) Mid January 1954, \(D_{2}=\) Mid February 1954 and \(D_{3}=\) Mid March 1954.
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{C} .453\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C O} .510\).
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Split-plot with 5 replications. 3 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) and (b) \(64^{\circ} \times 21^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducled by D.S.R(S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.96 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.39 ton/ac.
(b) 2.58 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) and interaction \(D \times V\) are highly significant. Main effect of \(D\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(V_{8}\) & Mean \\
\hline - \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 23.60 & 21.40 & 22.50 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 23.86 & 27.83 & 25.84 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 20.15 & 26.92 & 23.53 \\
\hline Mean & 22.54 & 25.38 & 23.96 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of difference of two} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1. marginal means of D} & \(=1.384\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{2. marginal means of \(V\)} & \(=0.860\) & \\
\hline 3. V means at a level of \(D\) & 1 of D & \(=1.489\) & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{4: \(D\) means at a level of \(V\)} & \(=1.742\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Ref:-U.P. 51(158).
Zone :-Haldwani (Nainital).
Type :-‘CV'.
Object :-To study the optimum time of harvesting plant crop of cane for taking a ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai G.M. (c) Nil. (ii) Clayey loam. (iii) F.Y.M. \(+50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N on 11.1.1951. Top dressing mohwa cake mixture applied at 50 lb ./ac. of N on 7.5.1951. (iv) As per treatments. (v) (a) Ploughing by desi on 26 and 27.12.1950. Harrow plough on 25 and 26.2.1951, pata 28.3.1951, hoeing with kassi on 9.4.1951 and 4.5.1951, hoeing by cultivator \(2 n\) 17.5.1951. hocing by kassi on 26.5.1951. (b) Flat sowing (Furrows by ridges). (c) and (d) 9 rows. (e) N.A. (vi) 20 and 21.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) Av. annual rainfall \(50^{\circ}\).(x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of harvest : \(D_{1}=15.1 .1951_{r} D_{2}=15.2 .1951\) and \(D_{3}=15.3 .1951\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .453\).
3. DESIGN:
(i), (ii) Split-plot with 6 replications. 3 main-plots/replication; 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) (a) \(67^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(61^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcane yicld. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vil) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.08 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.29 ton/ac.
(b) 2.06 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(V\) and interactions \(D \times V\) are highly significant. Main effect of \(D\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|c} 
& \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{2}\) & \(D_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 18.24 & 24.37 & 20.32 & 20.98 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 28.50 & 28.44 & 30.19 & 29.18 \\
\hline Mean & 23.57 & 26.41 & 25.25 & 25.08
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(D \quad=1.752\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(V \quad=0.687\) ton/ac.
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D \quad=1.189\) ton/ac.
4. D means at a level of V \(\quad=1.943\) ton/ae.

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

\section*{Ref:- U.P. 52(59).}

Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To see the effect of harvesting plant Sugarcane planted fiat and in trenches on its subse quent ratoon and to find out the proper time of application of manure to the ratoon crop.
1. BASAL COVDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat. (b) Dhaincha. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25 and 27.2.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) 85 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N , Castor cake at 30 lb ./ac. of N and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N top dressing- (vi) CO.453. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 earthings and hoeings. (ix) 34.40 . (x) 23.1.1953 to 20.2.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 methods of harvest : \(\mathrm{H}_{2}=\) at ridge level and \(\mathrm{H}_{2}=\) at ground level.
(2) 2 methods of planting: \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) flat planting and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=\) trench planting.

Sub-plot treatments:
4 manures to ratoon crop: \(M_{0}=n 0\) manure (control), \(M_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) to ratoon soon after harvesting the plant crop, \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\). \(/ \mathrm{ac}\). of N to ratoon at commencement of rains and \(M_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N in to two doses. \(\frac{1}{2}\) as in \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) and \(\frac{1}{2}\) as in \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(85^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\).
(b) \(79 \times 18^{\circ}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border alround the gross plot was excluded. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Attack of borers, which were killed on 16 and 20.5.1952 to 18.7.1952.
(iii) Germination, tillers, millable cıne and súgarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955 . (b) and (c) No. (v)
(a) Muzaffarnagar and Shahjahanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(G).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 19.20 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 7.49 ton/ac.
(b) 2.91 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{M}\) is highly significant. Main effect of \(\mathbf{P}\) is significant. Other effects and _interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av: yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(P_{1}\) & 11.91 & 17.53 & 17.30 & 19.08 & 16.46 & 18.53 & 14.38 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{8}\) & 16.50 & 24.42 & 24.87 & 21.62 & 21.95 & 22.58 & 21.33 \\
\hline Mean & 14.40 & 20.98 & 21.08 & 20.35 & 19.20 & 20.56 & 17.85 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & 15.58 & 22.00 & 22.85 & 21.80 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) & 13.22 & 19.96 & 19.32 & 18.90 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1. P or H marginal means & - 2.16 ton/ac. \\
\hline 2. M marginal means & \(=1.19\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 3. \(\mathbf{M}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{H}\) & \(=1.68\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 4. P or H means at the same level of M & \(=2.60\) ton/ac. \\
\hline S.E. for any mean in body of table \(\mathrm{H} \times \mathrm{R}\) & \(=2.16\) ton/ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:-U.P. 53(169). Type :- 'CM'.

Object :-To see the effect of harvesting plant Sugarcane planted flat and in trenches on its subsequent ratoon and to find out the proper time of application of manure to the ratoon crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M.-wheat G.M.-plant sugarcane. (b) Sugarcane (plant sugarcane). (b) 10 srs. G.N.C./full row of \(180^{\prime}\) and A/S at 4 srs. 12 chh./plot. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Plant sugarcane 25 and 27.2.1952 and harvesting planting sugarcane 23.1.1953 to 6.3.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Trench and flat planting as per treatments. (c) 1 three budded setts per foot of a row. (d) Rows 3 apart (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.453. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings-6 i.e. after each irrigation and earthings on 16 and 22 to 26.8.1953. (ix) \(50.21^{\circ}\). (x) 17.12.1953 to 5.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 methods of harvesting: \(\mathrm{H}_{1}=\) at ridge level and \(\mathrm{H}_{2}=\) at ground level.
(2) 2 methods of planting: \(P_{1}=\) Flat planting and \(P_{2}=\) trench planting.

Sub-plot treatments :
4 manurings of ratoon crop: \(\mathrm{M}_{0}=\) No manure (control), \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N to ratoon soon after harvesting the plant crop, \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N to ratoon at commencement of rains and \(M_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N in two doses \(\frac{1}{2}\) as in \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) and \(\frac{1}{2}\) as in \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plet. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(85^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\).
(b) \(79^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border was excluded alround the gross plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERA.L :}
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Attack of borers. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Muzaffarnagar and Shahjahanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.45 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.01 ton/ac.
(b) 1.91 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(P\) and \(M\) are highly significant. Other effect and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. P or H marginal means \(\quad=0.58 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(M\) marginal means \(\quad=0.78\) ton/ac.
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(P\) or \(H \quad=1.10\) ton/ac.
4. \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{H}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{M} \quad=1.12\) ton/ac. S.E. for any mean in body of table \(\quad=0.58\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Crop :-Sugarcane (Ratoon). & Ref :-U.P. 52(62). \\
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. & Type :-‘CM'.
\end{tabular}

Otject :-To see the effect of harvesting plant cane, planted flat and in trenches, on its subsequent ratoon and to find out the proper time of application of manures to the ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-wheat-sanai or moong-ugarcane-1atoon. (b) Sugarcane (plantcane). (c) 1. Compost at 80 lb ./ac.of N. 2. Castor cake at 20 lb ./ac. of N. 3. A/S at 60 lb ./ac. of N . (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) plant cane harvested from 20.2.1952 to 15.3.1952. (iv) (a) Trash was burnt. The ridges were dismantled after harvesting plant cane by soil turning plough and remaining ridges broken down by spade. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.S. 245 (mid-season) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings and earthing up in August. (ix) 24.62 \({ }^{\text {. }}\) (x) 29.11.1952 to 5.12.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 methods of harvesting: \(\mathrm{H}_{2}=\) at ridge level and \(\mathrm{H}_{3}=\) at ground level.
(2) 2 methods of planting: \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=\) Flat planting and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Trench planting.

Sub-plot treatments :
4 manuring to ratoon crop: \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{0}}=\mathrm{No}\) manure (control). \(\quad \mathrm{M}_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N to ratoon soon after harvesting the plant crop. \(M_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\) : of N to ratoon at commencement of rains. \(M_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) in to 2 doses: \(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}\) as in \(M_{1}\) and \(\frac{1}{2}\) as in \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(90^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(84^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) border on each end of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954
(b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 16.32 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.04 ton/ac.
(b) 1.52 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{M}\) is highly significant. Main effect of \(\mathbf{P}\) is signifivant. Other effect and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 12.63 & 17.65 & 18.85 & 18.93 & 17.02 & 14.98 & 16.27 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{Pa}_{2}\) & 11.87 & 15.83 & 18.14 & 16.65 & 15.62 & 16.56 & 17.47 \\
\hline Mean & 12.25 & 16.74 & 18.49 & 17.79 & 16.32 & 15.77 & 16.87 \\
\hline \({ }^{-} \mathrm{H}_{1}\) & 12. 8 & 17.55 & 18.96 & 18.48 & \multicolumn{3}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) & 12.02 & 15.92 & 18.02 & 17.10 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. P or H marginal means & \(=0.51 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(M\) marginal means & \(=0.54\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(P\) or \(H\) & \\
4. \(P\) or \(H\) means at the same level of \(M\) & \\
5. means in the body of tabl: \(P \times H\) & \\
& \(=0.83\) ton/ac. \\
& \(=0.38\) ton/ae.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sügarcane (Ratoon).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 53(179).
Type:-'CM'.

Object:-To see the effect of harvesting plant cane, planted flat and in trenches on its subsequent ratoon and to find out the proper time of application of manures to ratoon crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M. - wheat-sanai or moong-sugarcane ratoon. (b) Sugarcane (plant cane). (c) 1. Compost at \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. 2. Castor cake at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N . 3. A/S at 60 lb ./ac. of N. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) Plant cane harvested from 5 to 11.3.1953. (iv) Trash was burnt. The ridges were dismanled after harvesting plant cane by soil turning plough and remaining ridges broken down by spade. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.S. 245 (mid-season) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 hoeings. Earthing up in July. (ix) 28.33*. (x) 13 to 35.11.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENIS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 methods of harvesting: \(\mathrm{H}_{1}=\) At ridge level and \(\mathrm{H}_{2}=\) at ground level.
(2) 2 methods of planting: \(P_{1}=\) Flat planting and \(P_{2}=\) Trench planting.
- Sub-plot treatments:

4 manuring of ratoon crop : \(M_{0}=\) No manure (control), \(M_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) to ratoon soon after harvesting the plant crop, \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N to ratoon at commencement of rains and \(M_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) in 2 doses: \(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}\) as in \(M_{1}\) and \(\frac{1}{+}\) as in \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\).
3. DESIGN
(i) Split plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(90^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(84^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) border at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nit. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954 (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.30 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.66 ton/ac.
(b) 1.86 ton/ac.
(iii) Sub-plot treatments are highly significant. Main-plot treatments and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l|l|} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) & \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{1}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 16.17 & 28.43 & 26.27 & 29.64 & 25.13 & 25.72 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 17.43 & 29.30 & 26.79 & 28.34 & 25.46 & 25.83 \\
\hline Mean & 16.80 & 28.86 & 26.53 & 28.99 & 25.30 & 25.10 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 16.82 & 29.04 & 27.42 & 29.81 & & 24.82 \\
\(\mathbf{H}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 16.78 & 28.69 & 25.64 & 28.16 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(M\) marginal means
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =0.94 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.66 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.93 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.04 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]
2. \(\mathbf{P}\) or \(\mathbf{H}\) marginal means
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(P\) or \(H\)
4. \(H\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(M\)
5. means in \(\mathrm{P} \times \mathrm{H}\) table

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 52(237).
Type :-'CM'.

Object:-To find out the effect of placement of \(A / S\) in different doses to Sugarcane planted under different spacings between rows.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Smai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahja'ıanpur. (iii) 5 and 6.4.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughings by victory plough and desi plough and planking. (b) N.A. (c) 44 three budded setts/ row. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Sanal turned in on 17.9.1952, spreading of press mud on 11 and 12.7.1952. (vi) CO.K. 30 (medium). (vii) Irr'gated. (viii) Hoeing with kassi and binding. (ix) \(32.14^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 17. 18 and 21.2.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 placements of \(A / S: M_{1}=\) Broadcast and \(M_{2}=I n\) furrow.
(2) 2 doses of \(A / S: N_{1}=40\) and \(N_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .

Sub-plot treatments :
2 spacings between rows: \(S_{1}=2^{\prime}, S_{2}=3^{\prime}\) and \(S_{2}=4^{\prime}\).
Gross plot size is \(42^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}, 42^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\) and \(42^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) respectively.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plut. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) As per treatments. (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) at either end of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. Crop Iodged in October. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Replication III was damaged by the rats in October and November. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.09 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.23 ton/ac.
(b) 2.44 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{S}\). is highly significant. Main effcct of \(\mathbf{M}\) and interactions \(\dot{\mathcal{N}} \times \mathbf{S}\) are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Ay. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 21.92 & 27.64 & 24.80 & 26.79 & 26.30 & 27.28 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & 27.18 & 23.18 & 19.82 & 23.39 & 24.67 & 22.11 \\
\hline Mean & 27.55 & 25.41 & 22.31 & 25.09 & 25.48 & 24.69 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 26.24 & 26.71 & 23.50 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\). & 28.86 & 24.11 & 21.11 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(\mathbf{M}\) or \(\mathbf{N}\) marginal means
\(=1.077\) ton/ac.
2. means of the body of \(\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{N}\) table \(=1.523\) ton/ac,
3. S marginal means \(=0.994\) ton/ac.
4. \(S\) means at the same level of \(M\) or \(N\)
\(=1.406\) ton/ac.
5. \(M\) or \(N\) means at the same level of \(S\) \(=1.574\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahajanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(175.)
Type :-‘CM’.

Object:-To study the effect of placement of \(A / S\) in different doses to Sugarcane planted under different spacings between rows.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Moong-Sugarcane. (b) Wheat. (c) G.M. (details N.A.) (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 11 and 12.3.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Flat planting. (c) 3 budded setts/line. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.K. 30 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One hoeing after each irrigation. (ix) 45.73. (x) 24.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combination of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 placement of \(A / S: M_{1}=\) Broadcast and \(M_{2}=I n\) furrows along rows.
(2) 2 doses of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{2}=40\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .

Sub-plot treatments :
3 spacings between rows : \(S_{1}=2^{\prime}, S_{2}=3^{\prime}\) and \(S_{3}=4^{\prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(S_{1}=47^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\) \(S_{2}=47^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\) and \(S_{3}=47^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side of the gross plot and \(3^{\prime}\) at the ends. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillering, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 17.54 tod/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.724 ton/ac.
(b) 2.635 ton/ac.
(iii) On y interaction \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{M}\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yie!d of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. M or N marginal means \(\quad=0.575\) ton/ac.
2. means of body of \(\mathbf{M} \times N\) table
\(=0.813\) ton/ac.
8. \(S\) marginal means
\(=1.076\) ton/ac.
4. \(S\) means at a level of \(M\) or \(N\)
\(=1.521\) ton/ac.
5. \(M\) or \(N\) means at a level of \(S\)
\(=1.368\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop:- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res..Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Object :-To find out the utilization of night soil in Sugarcane cultivation.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Guar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) \(12,13.3\).1948. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings with soil turning plough and 7 ploughings with desi plough and 3 plankings. (b) As per treatments. (c) 70 three i udded setts/ac. (d) N.A. (e)一. (v) N.A. (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Planking, hoeing with kassi and cultivator, binding of sugarcane. (ix) \(40.22^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 30.1 .1949 and 7 and 19.2.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
2 methods of planting: \(M_{1}=\) trench planted and \(M_{2}=\) flat planted.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 manurial treatments: \(T_{0}=\) no manure, \(T_{1}=\) town compost at \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{~T}_{2}=\) poudrette (night soil compost) at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(\mathrm{T}_{3}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
Method of Applications:-Night soil was dropped in trenches in much the same manner as was done in the previous years experiment. The trenches were filled in and covered completely in the flat planted treatments. In the plots where trench planting was to be done, the trenches were widened at the top, leaving the night soil covered at the bed of the trench. Town compost was applied on 9 to. 111.1948 as basal treatment. Night soil from 1 to 11.1.1948 and A/S at planting time on 12, 13.3.1948 as top dressing].
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(79^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(63^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Yellow disease in August, increased in September, no incidence in October. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1947-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.33 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.746 ton/ac.
(b) 1.512 ton/ac.
(iii) \(T\) effect is highly significant, while \(M\) effect and interaction \(T \times M\) are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.


Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(17).
Type:- 'CM'.

Object :-To find the effect of incorporation of sugarcane trash directly into soil on Sugarcane planted in different seasons.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings with vetory plough, I desi plough for October planting, 2 ploughings by victory plough -and 2 desi ploughings for February planting and 3 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 68 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings with kassi and cultivator, harrowing and earthing. (ix) \(34.60^{\circ}\). ( x ) 8 to 10.12.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 times of planting : \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Autumn planting (19.10.1951) and \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Spring planting (10.2.1952).
Sub-plot t reatments :
9 manurial treatments : \(M_{1}=\) control (no manure), \(M_{2}=\) trash at \(75 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). applied in July, \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) trash at \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac} .+1 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied in \(\mathrm{July}, \mathrm{M}_{4}=\) trash at \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). applied in July +1 md./ac. of A/S applied \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) months before planting, \(\mathrm{M}_{5}=\) trash at \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac} .+1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{6}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of magnesium sulphate applied in July, \(\mathrm{M}_{6}=\) trash at 75 md./ac. applied in July + \(1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of magnesium sulphate applied about \(1 \frac{1}{8}\) months before planting, \(M_{7}=1 \mathrm{md}\)./ac. of \(A / S\) at planting, \(M_{8}=1\) md./ac. of \(A / S+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of magnesium sulphate at planting and \(\mathrm{M}_{9}=\) trash compost made out of \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of trash applied 11 months before planting.
Dates of application : trash compost in July : 31.7.1952, 30.10.1952 and 28.21953.
\(1 \frac{1}{2}\) months before planting : 28.9 1952, 10.2.1952 and at planting 19.10.1952.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) (a) \(68^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(62^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(1) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Germination count, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 17.45 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.828 ton/ac.
(b) 3.341 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{8}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{4}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{5}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{6}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{7}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & \(M_{9}\) & Mean \\
\hline T1 & 19.36 & 19.71 & 18.39 & 19.03 & 14.52 & 21.35 & 16.75 & 18.44 & 18.66 & 18.47 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{T}_{2}\) & 14.03 & 18.07 & 16.53 & 14.11 & 14.71 & 16.67 & 17.53 & 19.44 & 16.67 & 16.42 \\
\hline Mean & 16.70 & 18.89 & 17.46 & 16.57 & 14.62 & 19.01 & 17.16 & 18.94 & 17.66 & 17.45 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. T marginal means
\(=0.609 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(M\) marginal means
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(T\)
4. \(\mathbf{T}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{M}\)
\(=2.363\) ton/ac. \(=3.341\) ton/ac. \(=3.209 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(173).
Type:- 'CM'.

Object :-To find out the utility of incorporating sugarcane trash directly into the soil.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Wheat. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As pir treatments. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Flat planting. (c) 3 budded setts/row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings and 3 hoeings for autumn a d spring plantings respectively and earthing up during rains. (ix) 45.43". (x) Last week of December 1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 times of planting: \(T_{1}=\) autumn planting on 610.1952 and \(T_{2}=\) spring planting on 9.2.53.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

9 manurial treatments : \(M_{1}=\) control (no manure), \(M_{2}=\) trash at \(75 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\), applied in July, \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) trash at \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac} .+1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of A/S applied in July, \(\mathrm{M}_{4}=\) trash at \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). applied in July \(+1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) months before planting, \(\mathrm{M}_{5}=\) trash at \(75 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac} .+1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of magnesium sulphate applied in July, \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{B}}=\) trash at 75 md ./ac. applied in July \(+1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of magnesium sulphate applied about 1 l months before planting, \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{7}}=1 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathbf{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at planting, \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{8}}=1 \mathrm{md}\). ac./of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of magnesium sulphate at planting and \(\mathbf{M}_{9}=\) trash compost made out of 75 md ./ac. of trash applied 11 months before planting.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 9 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) Mainplot \(65^{\prime} \times 162^{\prime}\) and sub-plot \(65^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(59^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Fair. No lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillering, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment condusted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS}
(i) . 16.57 ton/ac.
(ii) (a); 4.404 ton/ac.
(b) 3.104 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant,
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{M a}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{4}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{5}\) & \(M_{6}\) & \(M_{7}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{8}\) & M9 & Mean \\
\hline T1 & 17.46 & 21.56 & 21.49 & 18.83 & 20.94 & 15.24 & 18.15 & 16.50 & 17.01 & 18.58 \\
\hline Te & \(15.97^{\circ}\) & 17.21 & 14.24 & 15.82 & 13.39 & 14.97 & 14.54 & 11.68 & 13.28 & 14.57 \\
\hline Mean & 16.72 & 19.38 & 17.86 & 17.32 & 17.16 & 15.10 & 16.34 & 14.09 & 15.14 & 16.57 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. T marginal means \(\quad=1.199\) ton/ac.
2. \(M\) marginal means \(\quad=1.792\) ton/ac.
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(T \quad=2.535\) ton/ac.
4. \(T\) means at the same level of \(M \quad=2.674\) ton/aj

\author{
Crop:- Sugarcane. \\ Ref :- U.P. 51(130). \\ Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. \\ Type :- 'CM'. \\ Object:-To study the effect of quality of seed on the yield of Sugarcane crop.
}

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 2.3.1951. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough, ploughing by harrow, by desi plough and 5 para. (b) N.A. (c) 28 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) - (v) Turning in of sanai. (vi) CO.617 (mediumlate). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeing with cultivator and 1 with desi plough. (ix) 31.02". (x) 27.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of \(N: N_{1}=120\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
Sub-plot treatments:
2 qualities of sugarcane seed : \(Q_{1}=\) thick sugarcane -1.5 to 2.5 cm . diameter and \(Q_{8}=\) thin sugarcane - 0.5 to 1.6 cm . diameter.

In \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\), G.M. \(=40\), F.Y.M. \(=20\), Cake \(=30\) and \(A / S=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. In \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\), G.M. \(=40\), F.Y.M. \(=20\), Cake \(=\) 70 and \(A \cdot S=70 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N .
Turning in of green manure (sanai) on 29.8.1951. Spreading of F.Y.M. on 1.1.1952, Spreading of castor cake on 18.2.1952. A/S on 15.5.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) and (b) \(28 \times 12^{\prime}\). ( \(v\), No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, millable cane counts and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 10.46 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.904 ton/ac.
(b) 1.936 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|c|c} 
& \(\mathrm{Q}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{Q}_{\mathbf{8}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 11.01 & 5.12 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 13.75 & 11.96
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. N marginal means
\(=2.0540\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=1.3695\) ton/ac.
\(=1.936\) ton/ac.
\(=2.468\) ton/ac.
2. Q marginal means
3. \(Q\) means at the same level of \(N\)
4. \(\mathbf{N}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{Q}\)

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 52(178).}

Type :-‘CM'。

Object :-To find out the effect of quality of seed on the yield of Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.3.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with victory plough on 29.11.1951. Ploughing with desi plough on \(6.12 .1951,4,18.1 .1952,17,19,21,28.2 .1952\), cultivator on 9.1 .1952 and spring harrow planking on 29.11.1951, 6.12.1951, 5, 8,9 and 19.1.1951, 17, 19 and 21.2.1952 and 1.3.1952. (b) N.A. (c) 40 three budded setts/row. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 617 (mid-late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with cultivator and earthing. ('x) \(33.30^{\circ}\). (x) 23.1.1953 and 23, 24.2.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 levels of \(N: N_{1}=120\) and \(N_{8}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 qualities of sugarcane seed : \(Q_{1}=\) thick sugarcane -1.5 to 2.5 cm . diameter and \(Q_{2}=\) thin sugarcane -0.5 to 1.5 cm . diameter.
In \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\), G.M. \(=40\), F.Y.M. \(=20\), Cake \(=30\) and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N . In \(\mathrm{N}_{2}, \mathrm{G} . \mathrm{M} .=40\), R.Y.M. \(=20\), Cake \(=\), 70 and \(A / S=70 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .

Turning in of G.M. (sanal) on 30.7.1952. Spreading of F.Y.M. on 18.1.1952. G.N.C. and A/S on 3.5.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 4 (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) alround (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) There was very poor germination in block I and hence it has been rejected. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954 . (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi, Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 27.80 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 0.275 ton/ac.
(b) \(2.101 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) N effect is highly significant. Q effect is significant, while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c}
. & \(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{Q}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 28.47 & 24.50 & 26.48 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 30.67 & 27.58 & 29.12 \\
\hline Mean & 29.57 & 26.04 & 27.80
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. \(N\) marginal means & \(=0.159\) ton/ac. \\
2. \(Q\) marginal means & \(=1.213\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(Q\) means at the same level of \(N\) & \(=1.715\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(Q\) & \(=1.223\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(176).
Type :-‘CM’.

Object:-To find out the effect of quality of seed on Sugarcane yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M. - Wheat-Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Wheat. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 22.2.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Flat planting. (c) Three budded setts/foot in a row. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 617 (mid-season). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Two hoeings after each irrigation and earthing up during rains. (ix) 45.73". (x) 4.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of \(N: \quad N_{1}=120\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
Sub-plot treatments:
2 qualities of sugarcane seed: \(Q_{1}=\) thick sugarcane and \(Q_{2}=\) thin sugarcane.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(48^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. No, lcdging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillering, millable, cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.01 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.483 ton/ac.
(b) 1.751 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{Q}\) effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. N marginal means
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.241 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.875 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.238 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.519 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]
2. \(Q\) marginal means
3. \(\mathbf{Q}\) means at a level of \(N\)
4. \(N\) means at a level of \(Q\)

Crop :-Sugarcane (Ratoon).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 53(174).
Type :^‘CM'.

Object : - To study the effect of cultural operations and manures on ratoon.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-G.M. of sanai-Sugarcane (plant cane)-Sugarcane (ratoon). (b) Sugarcane (plantcanes). (c) G.M. of sanai. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 7.2.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) 3 one budded sett per foot of a row. (d) rows 3' apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (mid-Jate). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings during pre-monsoon period followed by earthing up during rains. (ix) \(42.46^{\circ}\). (x) 12 to 17.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1). 2 methods of harvesting: \(H_{1}=\) Ground level and \(\mathbf{H}_{2}=\) Ridge level.
(2) 2 methods of planting: \(P_{1}=\) Flat planting and \(P_{2}=\) Trench planting.

Sub-plot treatments :
4 manurial doses : \(M_{0}=\) no manure (control), \(M_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) to ratocn scon ofter harvesting the plant crop, \(M_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{zc}\). of N to ratoon at the ccmmencement of rajns and \(\mathbf{M}_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N in to 2 equal doses: \(\frac{1}{2}\) as in \(M_{1}\) and \(\frac{1}{2}\) as in \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\).
N as A/S+G.N.C in'1: 1 ratio.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(61^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Muzaffarnagar and Gorakhpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.33 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.644 ton/ac.
(b) 2.143 ton/ac.
(iii) Ooly the effect of H is highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & 16.00 & 25.77 & 24.87 & 26.29 & 23.23 & 22.71 & 23.75 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) & 17.30 & 26.88 & 24.42 & 25.09 & 23.42 & 23.30 & 23.54 \\
\hline Mean & 16.65 & 26.32 & 24.64 & 25.69 & 23.33 & 23.01 & 23.65 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 15.95 & 26.28 & 21.08 & 25.72 & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P a}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 17.35 & 26.37 & 25.21 & 25.66 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
1. \(H\) or \(P\) marginal means
\(=0.661\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(M\) marginal means \(=0.758\) ton/ac.
3. M means at the level of \(\mathbf{H}\) or \(\mathbf{P}\) \(=1.072\) ton/ac.
4. \(H\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(M\) \(=1.139\) ton/ac.
5. means of the body of \(\mathbf{P} \times \mathbf{H}\) table \(=0.935\) ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Crop :-Sugarcane. & Ref :-U.P. 48(112). \\
Site :-Govt. Agri. School Farm, Bulandshahr. & Type :-'I'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of varying frequencies and depths of irrigation on Sugarcane yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai and Lobia. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(15,16.3 .1948\). (iv) (a) After taking sanai and lobia the plots were filled with compost manure, 12 plougoings were given before planting by soil turning and desi plough. . (b) Flat system. (c) N.A. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Sanai and lobia were sown for green fodder and green manuring. 15 carts ( 225 md .) of compost manure per acre was applied. (vi) C0.421. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding, hoeing and earthing (ix) 43.78". (x) 22.12.1948 to 6.3.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 depths of irrigation: \(L_{1}=3^{\prime \prime}, L_{2}=4^{\prime \prime}, L_{3}=5^{\prime \prime}\) and \(L_{4}=6^{\prime \prime}\).
(2) 5 intervals of irrigation: \(I_{1}=2, I_{2}=3, I_{3}=4, I_{4}=5\) and \(I_{5}=6\) weeks.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 20. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(53^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(48^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(2 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination good and tilling fair. Growth was poor in three plots which received water at intervals of 5 and 6 weeks. (ii) No. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1945-1948. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by I.R.I.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 32.72 ton/ac.
(ii) 8.256 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 34.71 & 29.76 & 34.21 & 29.19 & 32.76 & 32.13 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 35.65 & 40.56 & 37.73 & 22.89 & 30.82 & 33.53 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 36.56 & 33.48 & 29.60 & 30.35 & 29.06 & 33.41 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 35.02 & 33.02 & 34.04 & 33.13 & 34.82 & 33.41 \\
\hline Mean & 35.48 & 33.46 & 33.90 & 28.89 & 31.86 & 32.72
\end{tabular}.
S.E. of marginal means of \(L\)
\(=2.132\) ton/ac.
S.E. of marginal means of I
\(=2.383 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\)
S.E. of body of table
\(=4.767 \mathrm{toD} / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Zone :-Lakshmiganj (Deoria).

Ref :-U.P. 52(211):
Type:-‘'

Object :-To study the water requirement of Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) Press mud 6 carts; Ammo. Phos. 1 md. (iv) CO. 356 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings by tractor on 13.1.1952 and 29.2.1952, harrowing, disc plough by tractor-cross ploughing on 6.3.1952. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1200 buds/plot. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (vi) 7 to 8.3.1952. (vii) As per treatments. (viii) Hoeing by kudali on 17.3.1952, 12 (ix) \(35^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 27.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No irrigation.
2. One irrigation.
3. Two irrigations.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(50^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(44^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.06 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.030 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 11.12 \\
2. & 15.58 \\
3. & 18.49 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.515\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :- U.P. 53(239). \\
Zone :- Lakshmiganj (Deoria). & Type :- ‘I'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the water requirements of Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) Press mud at 100 mds /ac. on 21.1.1953. Top dressing by Castor cake at \(8 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 22.2.1953. A/S at \(; 2 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 22.2.1953. (iv) CO. 617 (medium) improved. (v) (a) 4 ploughings by tractor. (b) Flat planting with spade. (c) 1680 luds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 22.2.1953. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by kudali on 7.3.1953, 18.4.1953, 22.5.1953 and 10.6.1953. (ix) \(40^{\circ}\). (x) 17.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No irrigation.
2. One irrigation in mid May.
3. Two irrigation in 1st week of May and June.

Due to unfavourable weather condition, treatment \(\mathbf{3}\) could get only one irrigation and hence \(\mathbf{2}\) and \(\mathbf{3}\) are same.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(74^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1553.
(b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.330 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.280 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 7.210 \\
2. & 5.890 \\
S.E./mean'treatment (1) & \(=0.640\) ton/ac. \\
S.E./mean treatment (2) & \(=0.452\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Tamkohi (Deohia).
Ref :-U.P. 51(161).
Type :-'I'.

```

Object :-To study the water requirements of Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhar soil. (iii) 5 C.L. of F.Y.M. at sowing. (iv) CO. 356 (mediumlate). (v) (a) Ploughing by desi plough, ploughing by victory plough with planking and ploughing by tractor and levelling. (b) Trench planted. (c) 11 rows/plot and 2178 buds/plot. (r) N.A. (c) -. (vi) 5.3.1951. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings by kassi and earthing by spade and kassi. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. One irrigation in the middle of May.
2. Two irrigations, first in the middle of May and second in the middle of June.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 2 replications. (iii) (a) \(66^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(60^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yie'd. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivator's fields.

\section*{5. RE؟ULTS :}
(i) 14.27 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.309 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 13.61 \\
2. & 14.94 \\
S E./mean & \(=0.925\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane. \\ Zone :- Lakshmiganj (Deoria).}

Ref:- U.P. 51(160).
Type :- 'I'.
Object: -To study the water requirements of Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanal as G.M. sown on 19.6.1950. (c) Nil. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) 120 md . of F.Y.M. (iv) CO. 513 (early) improved. (v) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough followed by planking, 7 ploughings by desi plough, making furrows by victory plough on 19.2 .1951 (b) Flat planting system. (c) 1314 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e) - . (vi) 20 to 22.2.1951. (vii) As per treatments. (viii) 3 hoeings by kassi. (ix) N.A. ( x ) 24.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. No irrigation.
2. One irrigation in the middle of May.
3. Two irrigations, first in the middle of May and second in the middle of June.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(73^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(67^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 17.59 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.787 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1.. & 18.29 \\
2. & 17.93 \\
3. & 16.56 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.394\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U P. 52(212). } \\
\text { Zone :- Ghugli (Gorakhpur). } & \text { Type :- 'I'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the water requirements of Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sugarcane and chari for fodder. (c) N.A. (ii) Bhat soil. (iii) \(4 \frac{1}{2}\) md. of mohwa cake mixture ( \(50 \%\) of \(A / S\) and cake each) on 29.2 .1952 . (iv) CO. 356 (mid-late) improved. (v) (a) 2 ploughings by tractor, 1 ploughing by desi plough (b) Flat sowing. (c) 1800 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e)-. (vi) 29.2.1952. (vii) Irrigated (viii) 6 hoeings by kudali in all plots. (ix) \(35.1^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 24 to 29.1.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. No irrigation.
2. One irrigation in April.
3. Two irrigations, cne in April and one in May.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(60^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) \(60^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.75 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.617 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 22.89 \\
2. & 20.97 \\
3. & 18.40 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.808\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Zone :- Ghugli (Gorakhpur).

Ref:- U.P. 48(58).
Type:- 'I'.

Object :-To study the water requirements of Sugarcane crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Ratoon sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) Heavy loam. (iii) 50 md . of F.Y.M. at the preparation of field, top dressing castor cale at 4 mds, at the time of planting. (iv) CO. 453 (mid-late), improved. (v) (a) Ploughing by desi plough 8 times from 1 to 27.11.1947, (b) Trench planting. (c) 1728 buds/plot. (d) N.A. (e)-. (vi) 9, 10.2.1948. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by kudali on 9 and 10 March, 1.5.1948, 29.5.1948, 24 and 25.7.1948 and earthing up by \(k u d a l i\) on 10.8.1948. (ix). 45.47". (x) 10, 29.1.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Irrigation.
2. No irrigation
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications, (iii) (a) \(72^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\) :
(b) \(66^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G)

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 16.86 ton/ac.
(ii) 0.73 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differerence is highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of sugarcane in ten/ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 18.93 \\
2. & 14.78 \\
S.E/mean & \(=0.37\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref :m U.P. 99 (162). \\
Site im Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur. & Type :- 'IV'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of deficient and normal irrigation on the growrh of varieties of Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 5.4.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 35 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Sanal as G.M. at 60 lb /ac. of N and top dressing of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 40 lb ./ac. of N . (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) to ( \(x\) ) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=\) normal-5 irrigations in the pre-monsoon season and \(I_{2}=\) deficient -2 irrigations in the pre-monsoon season.
Sub-plot treatments :
6 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .453\) (late), \(V_{2}=C O .421\) (medium), \(V_{3}=C O .313\) (early), \(V_{4}=C O . K .26\) (medium), \(V_{5}=\) CO.S. 186 (medium) and \(V_{8}=\) CO. 622 (early).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 6 sub-p.ots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(35^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\) ' (v) N.A. (ivi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Due to faulty layout replication s.s. is pooled with error (a) to give 4 d.f. in the analysis. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 12.80 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 7.981 ton/ac.
(b) 2,:06 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of V alone is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=2.660\) ton/ac. \\
2. V marginal means & \(=1.273\) ton/ac. \\
3. V means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=1.801\) ton/ac. \\
4. I means at the same level of \(V\) & \(=3.127\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 50(152).
Type :-‘IV'.

Object :-To investigate the effect of normal and deficient irrigation on the' grou th of varicties of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 1.3.1950. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 35 , three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) G.M. as B.D. and A/S at \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of N as top dressing. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(38.72^{\circ}\). (x) 22 and 25.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 irrigations: \(I_{1}=\) one pre-monsoon irrigation (excluding pre-sowing) and \(I_{2}=\) five pre-monsoon irrigations (excluding pre-sowing).
Sub-plot treatments :
6 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) (late), \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .421\) (medium), \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathbf{C O} .313\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{4}=C O . K .26\) (medium), \(\mathrm{V}_{5}=\mathrm{CO} .186\) (medium) and \(\mathrm{V}_{6}=\mathbf{C O} 622\) (early).
3. DESIGN :
(1) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 6 sub-plots/majn-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.20 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.926 ton/ac.
(b) 2.130 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(I\) and \(V\) are highly significant. Interaction \(I \times V\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{8}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{4}\) & \(V_{5}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(I_{1}\) & 25.43 & 12.20 & 12.24 & 21.52 & 19.12 & 14.28 & 17.46 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 31.17 & 16.17 & 15.97 & 23.01 & 18.74 & 20.60 & 20.94 \\
\hline Mean & 28.30 & 14.18 & 14.10 & 22.27 & 18.93 & 17.44 & 19.20 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. . marginal means of \(I\) \(=0.556\) ton/ac.
\(=1.065\) ton/ac.
\(=1.506\) ton/ac.
\(=1.483\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(\mathbf{V}\)
3. \(V\) means at the same level of \(I\)
- 1.483 ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :m Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 51(186).
Type:- 'IV'.

Object:-To investigate the effect of normal and deficient irrigation during the pre-monsoon period on the growth, yield and juice quality of Sugarcane varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanal. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shabjahanpur. (iii) 13.2.1951. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 35, three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Sanai and top dressing of A/S at 100 lb ./ac. of \(N\) on 7.5.1951. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings on 9.4.1951 13 and 27.5.1951 and 21.6.1951, earthing on 24.8.1951 and weeds on 10.11.1951. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treaments :
2 irrigations: \(\mathrm{I}_{1}=2\) pre-monsoon irrigations (including palewa) and \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=5\) pre-monsocn irrigations (excluding palewa).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

4 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{CO} .453\) (late), \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .622\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .617\) (medium) and \(\mathrm{V}_{4}=\mathrm{CO} . \mathrm{S} .510\) (medium early).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The drought during summer adversely affected the growth of sugarcane plants particulary under deficient irrigations. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Yield of \(I_{1}\) treatments of \(V_{3}\) and \(V_{4}\) were estimated for analysis and summary of results. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 20.42 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 13.434 ton/ac.
(b) 4.425 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significan \(t\).
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{r|cccc} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{4}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 21.77 & 14.04 & 17.17 \\
Mean & 27.67 & 21.87 & 18.92 & 23.02 \\
\hline 24.72 & 17.96 & 18.04 & 20.96 & \begin{tabular}{l}
17.97 \\
22.87
\end{tabular} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of I
\(=5.558 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal means of \(V_{1}\) and \(V_{2}\)
3. marginal means of \(V\) one of them contains missing value
\(=2.557 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. marginal means of \(\mathrm{V}_{8}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{4}\) (with missing values)
5. V means at the same level of I (without missing value)
6. V means at the same level of I (one with missing value and the other without missing value) \(=2.759\) ton/ac.
\(=3.129\) ton/ac.
\(=3.613 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=3.902\) ton/ac.
7. V means at the same level of I (both are with missing values) \(\quad=4.425\) ton/ac.
8. I means at the same level of V (without a missing value)
\(=6.14\) ton/ac.
9. I means at the same level of \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{d}}\) (one is having a missing value and the other not)
\(=6.650 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop : Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref: :U.P. 53(224).
Type:-‘IV'.

Object :-To investigate the effect of normal and difficient irrigations during the pre-monsoon period on the growth, yield and juice quality of Sugarcane varieties.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 9.2.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Sanai at 40 lb ./ac. Top dressing 60 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on 21.4.1953 (at tillering time). (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5ihoeings with cultivator and kassi. (ix) 45.73.. (x) 9.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}
- 2 irrigations : \(I_{1}=\) Two pre-monsoon irrigations (difficient irrigation) and \(I_{2}=\) Five pre-monsoon irriga. tions (normal irrigation).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments}

6 varieties: \(V_{1}=C O .452\) (late), \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{CO} .622\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{CO} .617\) (medium), \(\mathrm{V}_{4}=\) CO.S. 321 (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{5}=\) CO.S. 510 (mid-early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{6}=\) CO.S. 443 (medium).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 6 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Nil. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) One replication omitted for analysis. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(25.26 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) 3.00 ton/ac.
(b) 3.06 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is significant and main effect of \(V\) is highly significant. Interaction is not sig. nificant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{B}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{6}\) & Mean \\
\hline I & 27.11 & 20.43 & 21.37 & 23.35 & 22.18 & 23.95 & 23.06 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 30.47 & 21.37 & 27.07 ' & 30.21 & 29.93 & 25.75 & 27.47 \\
\hline Mead & 28.79 & 20.90 & 24.22 & 26.78 & 26.06 & 24.85 & 25.26 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. I marginal means & \(=1.000\) ton/ac. \\
2. \(V\) marginal means & \(=1.767\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(V\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=2.499\) ton/ac. \\
4. I means at the same level of \(V\) & \(=2.824\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Object :-To study the effect of irrigation on Sugarcane and sugar yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 19.3.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 three budded setts row. (d) N.A. (e) -, (v) Sanai as B.D. and Castor cake. top dressing at 50 lb /ac. of N . (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
2 irrigations : \(\mathrm{I}_{1}=\) Palewa and one irrigation of nursery and \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=\) Palewa on 12.3.1948, and one irrigation each in April, in early May, in late May and in mid June.
Sub-plot treatments :
6 varieties : \(V_{1}=C O .313\) (early), \(V_{2}=C O .421\) (medjum), \(V_{3}=C O .331\) (late), \(V_{4}=C O .527\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{5}=\mathbf{C O} .453\) (late) and \(\mathrm{V}_{6}=\) CO. 557 (medium).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 6 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(40^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tiller counts and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1946-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 20.82 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 6.462 ton/ac.
(b) 3.440 ton/ac.
(iii) Only V effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 16.56 & 17.54 & 21.26 & 13.80 & 26.84 & 21.54 & 19.59 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 16.29 & 18.77 & 25.40 & 15.85 & 30.47 & 25.47 & 22.04 \\
\hline Mean & 16.42 & 18.16 & 23.33 & 14.82 & 28.66 & 23.50 & 20.82
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(I \quad=2.154\) ton/ac.
2. marginal means of \(V \quad=1.986\) ton/ac.
3. V means at the same level of \(I \quad=2.808\) ton/ac.
4. I means at the same level of \(V \quad=3.349\) ton/ac.

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
Ref :-U.P. 49(1).
Type :-‘IM'.
Object:-To find out the optimum level of irrigation and time of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Wheat-Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 23.1.1949. (iv) (a) 8 preparatory ploughings and 3 harrowing with desi and Watt's plough. (b) Flat sowing. (c) 60 three budded setts. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Village compost at 60 lb ./ac. of N applied in trenches in Dec. 1948. (vi) C0.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings and 1 earthing. (ix) 52.65". (x) 2 to 6.2.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

2 levels of irrigations : \(I_{1}=4\) times, \(I_{2}=6\) times and \(I_{3}=8\) times. Sub-plot treatments :

4 application of \(N\) as \(A / S: M_{0}=\) No nitrogen, \(M_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) at planting, \(M_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) at planting and at germination in two equal doses and \(M_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N in six equal doses during planting and tillering.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot
(b) N.A.
(iii) 3. (iv) (a)
\(56^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.95 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.986 ton/ac.
(b) 4.074 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of M is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 22.05 & 26.22 & 30.38 & 28.34 & 26.75 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 22.02 & 25.51 & \(26.27{ }^{\text {' }}\) & 27.00 & 25.20 \\
\hline \(I_{3}\) & 21.60 & 28.43 & 26.98 & 26.60 & 25.90 \\
\hline Mean & 21.89 & 26.72 & 27.88 & 27.31 & 25.95 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. marginal means of } I \text { : } & =2.444 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 2. marginal means of } M & \\ \text { 3. } M \text { means at the same level of } I & =1.920 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 4, I means at the same level of } M & \\ =3.326 \text { ton/ac. }\end{array}\)
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :-Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 50(26)/49(1). } \\
\text { Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. } & \text { Type :-'IM'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To find out the optimum level of irrigation and_time of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Jowar for fodder-Sugarcane. (b) Dhaincha and urid for seed. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13, 14.2.1950. (iv) (a) 3 preparatory ploughings and harrowings with Watt's plough. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 60 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings and earthing. (ix) 44.96". (x) 13.1.1951 to 10.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments:
2 levels of irrigations \(\mathrm{I}_{1}=4\) times, \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=6\) times and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=8\) times.
Sub-plot trea tments:
4 applications of \(N\) as \(A / S: M_{0}=\) No nitrogen, \(M_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) at planting, \(M_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N at planting and at germination in two equal doses and \(M_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N in six equal doses during planting and tillering,

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\).
(t.) \(50^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) Borers attacked and were killed. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.27 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.221 ton/ac.
(b) 2.779 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(I\) is significant and th a of \(M\) is highly significant. Interaction is not?significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrrr|l} 
& \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 13.10 & 18.00 & 19.42 & 22.52 & 18.26 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 16.04 & 24.08 & 24.37 & 24.51 & 22.25 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 17.58 & 24.35 & 24.86 & 26.38 & 23.29 \\
\hline Mean & \(\cdot 15.57\) & 22.14 & 22.88 & 24.47 & 21.27
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(I\) & \\
2. marginal means of \(M\) & \\
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=1.132\) ton/ac. \\
4. I means at the same level of \(M\) & \\
& \(=1.965\) ton/ac. \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. Type :- 'IM'.

Object :-To find out the optimum level of irrigation and time of application of \(\mathbf{N}\) to Sugarcane,

\section*{- BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat, Jowar fodder-Sugarcane. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29 and 30.1.1951. (iv) (a) 6 preparatory ploughing with desi and victory plough. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 60 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) Neem cake and A/S each applied at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N . (vi) CO. 453. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 8 hoeings and 4 earthings (ix) \(27.50^{\circ}\). (x) 31.12.1951 to 4.3.1952.

\section*{- TREATMENTS :}

Maid-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigations: \(I_{1}=4\) times, \(I_{2}=6\) times and \(I_{3}=8\) times.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 applications of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{M}_{0}=\) No nitrogen, \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=120 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\). of N at planting, \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N at planting and at germination in two equal doses and \(M_{3}=120 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N in six equal doses during planting and tillering.

\section*{- DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 21\). (b) \(51^{\prime} \times 15 .^{\prime}\) (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border around the plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{GENERAL :}
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).

\section*{RESULTS:}
(i) 19.40 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.197 ton/ac.
(b) 3.165 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of M is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|cccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{0}} \cdot\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 14.39 & 17.44 & 18.44 & 20.43 & 17.68 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 16.42 & 20.58 & 22.83 & 22.12 & 20.49 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 14.62 & 21.82 & 22.98 & 20.67 & 20.02 \\
\hline Mean & 15.14 & 19.95 & 21.42 & 21.07 & 19.40
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{rlr} 
1. marginal means of I & & \(=1.130\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of M & & \(=1.292\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(M\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{I}\) & & \(=2.238\) ton/ac. \\
4. I means at the same level of \(M\) & & \(=2.244\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:~U.P. 50(25).
Type :- ‘IM'.

Object :-To find out the optimum level of irrigation and \(\mathbf{N}\) to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat. (b) Dhaincha for seed. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12 and 13.2.1950.
(iv) (a) 5 preparatory ploughings with desi and Watt's plough. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) and (d) N.A.
(e)-. (v) Nil. (vi) CO. 453. (viii) Irrigated. (vii) Earthing from 30.7.1950 to 3.8.1950 and 12 hoeings.
(ix) 45.00'. (x) 22 to 28.2.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigations: \(I_{1}=4, I_{2}=8\) and \(I_{3}=12\) irrigations.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, \dot{N}_{1}=100, N_{2}=200\) and \(N_{3}=300 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
N was top dressed as A/S.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(56^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border left alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.41 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.894 ton/ac.
(b) 2.164 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline I & 12.77 & 16.92 & 18.78 & 20.64 & 17.28 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 17.40 & 20.75 & 23.09 & 22.86 & 21.02 \\
\hline 13 & 14.28 & 20.46 & 22.90 & 22.04 & 19.92 \\
\hline Mean & 14.82 & 19.38 & 21.59 & 21.85 & 19.41 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of I & \(=1.182\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of N & \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=1.020\) ton/ac. \\
4. I means at the same level of N & \\
& \(=1.767\) ton/ac. \\
& \(=1.933\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 51(20)/50(25).
Type : \({ }^{\prime}\) IM'

Object:-To find out the optimum level of irrigation and \(\mathbf{N}\) to Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Barley and Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.2.1951. (iv) (a) 3 preparatory ploughings with victory plough. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 45 three buddded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 9 hoeings and 2 earthings (ix) \(27.19^{\circ}\). (x) 1.1.1952 to 2.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=4, I_{2}=8\) and \(I_{3}=12\) irrigations.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\mathrm{O}, \mathrm{N}_{1}=100, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=200\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=300 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
Neem cake and A/S used at \(50: 50\) ratio on \(N\) basis. Neem cake applied in furrows just before planting. A/S applied in two instalments i.e. \(\frac{1}{2}\) at germination and \(\frac{1}{2}\) at tillering.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(41^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (d) \(3^{\prime}\) border alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Attack of borers. (iii) Germination, tiller, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nir. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 21.65 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.904 ton/ac.
(b) 2.928 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of N is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 11.83 & 19.28 & 20.48 & 21.85 & 18.36 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 14.08 & 24.83 & 23.73 & 29.00 & 22.91 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 16.39 & 23.12 & 27.46 & 27.75 & 23.68 \\
\hline Mean & 14.10 & 22.41 & 23.89 & 26.20 & 21.65
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal mean of \(I \quad=2.410\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
2. marginal mean of \(\mathrm{N} \quad=1.380\) ton/ac.
3. \(N\) means at the sames level of \(I \quad=2.391\) ton/ac.
4. I means at the same level of \(N \quad=3.178\) ton/ac.

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Ref :-U.P. 52(57)/51(20)/50(25).
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. Type :-'IM'.
Object :-To find out the optimum level of irrigation and \(\mathbf{N}\) to Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Green manure-Wheat. (b) Guar for seed. (c) Green manure (amount N.A.). (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13 and 14.2.1952. (iv) (a) 5 preparatory ploughings with desi and victory ploughs. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 45 three buded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO 453. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 7 hoeings one after each irrigation. (ix) \(34.40^{\circ}\). (x) 22.1.1953 to 4.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=4, I_{2}=8\) and \(I_{3}=12\) irrigations.
Sub-plot treatments :
4 levels of \(N\) : \(N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100, N_{2}=200\) and \(N_{3}=300 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N.
Castor cake and A/S used on equal nitrogen basis and applied to give the levels of N. Castor cake applied in furrows just before planting and \(A / S\) applied in two equal doses at germination and at tillering.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) Main-plot : \(41^{\prime} \times 84^{\prime}\) and Sub-plot : \(41^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(35^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (vi) \(3^{\prime}\) border alround the gross plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
- (i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Attack of borers controlled. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 28.66 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.050 ton/ac.
(b) \(3.417 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of I is significant and main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{r|rllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 17.14 & 22.65 & 28.74 & 32.56 & 25.27 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\cdot 23.61\) & 25.20 & 29.94 & 36.29 & 28.74 \\
\(\mathbf{I}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 22.97 & 29.40 & 33.95 & 41.51 & 31.96 \\
\hline Mean & 21.24 & 25.75 & 30.88 & 36.79 & 28.66
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of difference of two \\
1. marginal means of \(I\) & \(=1.653\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(N\) & \(=1.611\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(N\) means at the same level of \(I\) & \(=2.990\) ton/ac. \\
4. \(I\) means at the same level of \(N\) & \(=2.928\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref:- U.P. 52(63). \\
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. & Type :- 'IM'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To asses the response of variety COS. 321 under heavy manuring and irrigation conditions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 29.2.1952. (iv) (a) 10 preparatory ploughings. (c) Flat planted. (c) 60 md. seed sugarcane and 4200 buds/ac. (d) Rows 3' apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) COS. 321 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings in general before 1st irrigation and afterwards according to irrigational treatments one or two hoeings after each irrigation. Earthing up in July and August. (ix) \(26.79^{\circ}\). ( \(x\) ) 7 and 8.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=5, I_{2}=7\) and \(I_{3}=9\) irrigation.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0\) nitrogen, \(N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\).
Nitrogen was applied as \(A / S\) and Castor cake in equal nitrogen basis. In all the \(I_{1}, I_{2}, I_{3}, 2\) irrrigations are given past-monsoon while the rest are given pre-monsoon.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) 1 row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) border at each end of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tiller and millable cane counting and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) Yes. 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 18.78 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 2.567 ton/ac.
(b) 2.063 ton/ac.
(iii) Only main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 13.52 & 19.25 & 20.82 & 17.86 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 14.64 & 22.19 & 21.49 & 19.44 \\
\(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 12.43 & 20.97 & 23.72 & 19.04 \\
\hline Mean & 13.53 & 20.80 & 22.01 & 18.78
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of I & \(=1.048\) ton/ac. \\
2. marginal means of \(N\) & \(=0.842\) ton/ac. \\
3. N means at the same level of I & \(=1.459\) ton/ac. \\
4. I means at the same level of \(N\) & \\
& \(=1.586\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 53(181).
Type :-‘IM'.

Object :-To assess the response of variety CO.S. 321 under heavy manuring and irrigation conditions.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 14.3.1953. (iv) (a) 10 preparatory ploughings. (b) Flat planted. (c) 60 md. seed cane and 4200 buds/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.S. 321 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) 2 hoeings in general before first irrigation. Afterwards according to irrigational treatments i.e. one or two hoeings after each irrigation. Earthing up in August. (ix) \(28.34^{\prime \prime}\). ( \(x\) ) 2 and 7.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=4, I_{2}=6\) and \(I_{3}=8\) irrigations.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(N\).
Nitrogen was applied as A/S and G.N.C. in equal nitrogen basis in the month of May after irrigation. In each of \(I_{1}, I_{2}\) and \(I_{3}, 2\) irrigations are given post-monsoon while the rest are given pre-monsoon.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\) (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) 1 row on each side \(3^{\prime}\) border at each end of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mild top borer attack. No control measure was possible. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) Yes. 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.59 ton/as.
(ii) (a) 2.459 ton/ac.
(b) 1.537 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) is highly significant. \(I\) is significant while interaction is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 15.12 & 18.77 & 20.41 & 18.10 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 15.90 & 20.35 & 22.18 & 19.48 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 16.23 & 23.13 & 24.20 & 21.19 \\
\hline Mean \({ }^{\text {- }}\) & 15.75 & 20.75 & 22.26 & 19.59 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means \(\quad=1.604\) ton/ac.
2. N marginal means \(\quad=0.627 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(N\) means at the same level of \(I=1.087\) ton/ac.
4. I means at the same level of \(N=1.479\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

\section*{Ref :-U.P: 49(11).}

Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. Type :-‘IMV’.
Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane varieties to irrigation and manuring.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) \(10,11.3 .1949\). (iv) (a) 16 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) 80 md. seed cane, 4200 buds/ac. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 8 hoeings. Earthing up in September. (ix) 23.09. (x) 6.1.1950 to 25.2.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=1\) pre-scwing palewa, 2 pre-monsoon irrigations at an interval of 7 weeks and a post-monsoon irrigation, \(\mathbf{I}_{2}=1\) pre-sowing polewa, 3 monsoon irrigations at an interval of 5 weeks and 2 pcst-monsoon irrigations in Oct. and Dec. and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=1\) pre-sowing palewa, 4 pre-monsoon irrigations at an interval of 3 weeks and 3 postmonsoon irrigations in Oct., Nov. and Dec.
Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(V_{2}=\) CO.S. 421 .
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
\(\mathbf{N}\) applied as \(A / S\) and G.N.C. on equal nitrogen basis. One extra post-monsoon irrigation had to be given in all the treatments due to exceptionally dry weather.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 6 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(50^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(46^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side of plot and \(3^{\prime}\) border at each end of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, lillers, millable cane counting and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 19491950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 21.52 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.591 ton/ac.
(b) 2.056 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathrm{I}, \mathrm{V}\) and N are all highly significant. No other effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(I_{1}\) & 13.32 & 21.75 & 24.11 & 19.73 & 20.70 & 18.76 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 14.89 & 23.30 & 26.22 & 21.47 & 22.19 & 20.75 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 16.68 & 25.66 & 27.72 & 23.35 & 24.41 & 22.29 \\
\hline Mean & 14.96 & 23.57 & 26.02 & 21.52 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 15.31 & 25.22 & 26.77 & 22.43 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 14.62 & 21.92 & 25.27 & 20.60 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means
\(=0.459 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. N marginal means
\(=0.594 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. V marginal means
\(=0.485\) ton/ac.
4. \(N\) means at the same level of I
\(=1.028 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
5. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
6. V means at the same level of \(I\)
7. I means at the same level of \(V\)
\(=0.957\) ton/ac.
\(=0.839\) ton/ac.
8. means of the body of \(N \times V\) table
\(=0.751\) ton/ac.
\(=0.839 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane. \\ Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. \\ Ref:-U.P. 50(35). \\ Type :-'IMV'.}

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane varieties to irrigation and manuring.
1. BASAL CONDİTIONS :
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 8, 9.3.1950. (iv) (a) 11 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 19 hoeings, earthing up in August. (ix) \(39.93^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 11.2.1951 to 18.3.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=3\) pre-monsoon irrigations each at an interval of 4 weeks and 1 post-monsoon irrigation during Nov.; \(I_{2}=4\) pre-monsoon irrigations each at an interval of 3 weeks and 2 post-monsoon irrigations in Oct. and Dec. and \(I_{3}=5\) pre-monsoon irrigations each at an interval of 2 weeks and 3 post-monsoon irrigations in Oct., Dec. and Feb.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) CO.S. 421.
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=100\) and \(N_{2}=150 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
\(\mathbf{N}\) applied as A/S and G.N.C. on equal nitrogen basis.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 7 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(51^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side and \(3^{\prime}\) border at each end of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane counting and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.15 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.397 ton/ac.
(b) 2.584 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of N and V are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) \\
\hline I 1 & 16.03 & 24.52 & 25.34 & 21.96 & 23.22 & 20.70 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 16.92 & 25.83 & 29.11 & 23.95 & 25.04 & 22.87 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 16.23 & 26.42 & 28.00 & 23.55 & 24.80 & 22.30 \\
\hline Mean & 16.39 & 25.59 & 27.48 & 23.15 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & 17.79 & 27.02 & 28.25 & 24.35 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 14.39 & 24.17 & 26.72 & 21.96 & & \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{S.E. of the difference of two} & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{1. marginal means of \(I\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=1.269\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{2. marginal means of N} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=0.746\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{3. marginal means of \(\mathbf{V}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=0.609\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{4. N mean} & same & & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=1.292\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{5. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=1.650\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{6. V means at the same level of \(I\)} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=1.055\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{7. I means at the same level of V} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=1.472\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{8. means of the body of \(N \times V\) ta} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=1.055\) ton/ac.} & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 51(27).
Type: -‘IMV'.

Object :-To study the response of Sugarcane varieties to irrigation and manuring.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Fallow-Sugarcane. (b) Sanai (crop failed due to rains and Ramla pest). (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 14 and 15.2.1951. (iv) (a) 22 preparatory ploughings. (b) Sown flat. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \({ }^{3}\) ' apart. (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) As per treatments. (viii) 19 hoeings. Earthing up in August. (ix) 40.96". (x) 9.2.1952 to 16.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=3\) pre-monsoon irrigations each at an interval of 4 weeks and 1 postmonsoon irrigation during November, \(I_{2}=4\) pre-monsoon irrigations each at an interval of 3 weeks and 2 post-monsoon irrigations in October and December and \(I_{3}=5\) pre-monsoon irrigations each at an interval of 2 weeks and 3 postmonsoon irrigations in October, December and February.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO.S. 245 and \(V_{8}=\) CO.S. 421.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=200 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(\mathbf{N}\) applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and Castor cake on equal nitrogen basis.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 6 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(55^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(49^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) One row on each side of plot and \(3^{\prime}\) border at each end of plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Heavy pyrilla infestation, no control measure was taken (iii) Germination, tillers, : millable cane counting and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii), Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 25.93 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.072 ton/ac.
(b) 2.575 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effects of I and \(V\) are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcanc in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 21.16 & 23.10 & 22.82 & 22.36 & 23.78 & 20.94 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 27.04 & 25.46 & 26.14 & 26.21 & 27.42 & 25.01 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{3}\) & 29.41 & 29.33 & 28.96 & 29.23 & 31.40 & 27.07 \\
\hline Mean & 25.87 & 25.96 & 25.97 & 25.93 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow{2}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 27.51 & 27.66 & 27.42 & 27.53 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 24.23 & 24.26 & 24.52 & 24.34 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
1. I marginal means
\(=1.176\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(V\) marginal means
\(=0.607\) ton/ac.
3. \(\mathbf{N}\) marginal means
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(I\)
5. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
6. V means at the same level of \(I\)
7. I means at the same level of \(V\)
\(=0.743 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=1.288\) ton/ac.
\(=1.577\) ton/ac.
\(=1.051\) ton/ac.
8. means of the body of \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathrm{V}\) table
\(=1.391\) tor/ac.
\(=1.051\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Site ;-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 53(290). \\ Type:-‘TMV'.}

Object:-To study the response of Sugarcane varieties to different irrigational and manurial treatments.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(a) (a) G.M.-Wheat-Cotton-Sugarcane. (b) Cotton. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.3.1953. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings by desi plough. Levelling of field, palewa and pata twice. (b) N.A. (c) 36 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) - (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) iIrrigated. (viii) 3 hoeings by kassi, 1 by cultivator, 1 by Akola hoe on 2.3 .1953 and 3 by spade. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
- Main-plot treatments :

2 levels of irrigation : \(I_{1}=2\) pre-monsoon and 2 post-monsoon irrigations and \(I_{2}=5\) pre-monsoon and 2 post-monsoon irrigations.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO.S. 245, \(V_{2}=\) CO.S. 321 and \(V_{3}=\) CO. 312.
(2) 2 levels of \(N: N_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of compost and \(N_{2}=N_{1}+60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(A / S\).

Compost applied as basal dressing and \(A / S\) top dressed.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication and 6 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) \(34^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\circ}\) on each side of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.76 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.197 tod/ac.
(b) 2.568 tod/ac.
(iii) Main effect of V and N are highly significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & V8 & \(\mathbf{V}_{3}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{J}_{1}\) & 17.82 & 21.10 & 19.46 & 18.79 & 21.25 & 18.34 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{2}\) & 18.80 & 21.31 & 20.06 & 20.64 & 22.04 & 17.49 \\
\hline Mean & 18.31 & 21.20 & 19.76 & 19.71 & 21.65 & 17.92 \\
\hline \(\cdots \mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 19.10 & 20.32 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[b]{3}{*}{\(\cdots\)}} \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 20.11 & 23.18 & & & & \\
\hline \(V_{3}\) & 15.72 & 20.11 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means
\(=0.399\) ton/ac.
2. V marginal means \(=1.048\) ton/ac.
3. N marginal means \(=0.856\) ton/ac.
4. N means at the same level of I \(=1.211\) ton/ac.
5. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\)
6. V means at the same level of \(I\) \(=0.943\) ton/ac.
\(=1.483\) ton/ac.
\(=1.274\) ton/ac.
8. mean in the body of \(N \times V\) table
\(=1.483\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

\section*{Ref:- U.P. 52(60).}

Type :-‘CI’.

Object :-To study the effect of irrigation and cultural practices on Sugarcane yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat. (b) Guar for seed. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 18 and 20.3.1952. (iv) 4 ploughings with victory plough and desi plough, 1 ploughing with cultivator. (b) Sown flat. (c) 45 three budded setts/row in single setting. 90 three budded setts/row in double setting. (d) As per treatments. (e) -. (v) Castor cake at 30 lb ./ac. of N and F.Y.M. at 50 lb ./ac. at planting time. (Castor cake 10 md./ac. and F.Y.M. \(165 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). ). A/S at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N (top dressing). (vi) CO. 453 . (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 4 hoeings and 2 earthings.' (ix) \(33.67^{\prime \prime}\). ( x ) 17 to 26.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combination of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of irrigations: \(\mathrm{I}_{1}=3, \mathrm{I}_{\mathbf{2}}=5\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=7\) irrigations.
(2) 2 spacing between rows: \(S_{1}=2 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) and \(S_{2}=3^{\prime}\).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 types of seed: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Normal setting and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Double setting.
(2) 2 seed treatments: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Unsoaked and \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Soaked in \(\mathbf{2 \%}\) phenyl.

Irrigations given as follows : for \(\mathrm{I}_{1}=17\) and 18.4.1952, 19 and 20.5.1952 and 14 and 15.6.1952. \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=17\) and 18.4.1952, 3, 19 and 20.5.1952 and 14 and 15.5.1952 and 16.10.1952 and \(\mathrm{I}_{3}=17\) and 18.4.1952,3, 19 and 20.5.1952, 14 and 15.6.1952, 16 and 17.10.1952 and 28.11.1952.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Normal. No lojging. (ii) Attack of borers. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(G).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 25.96 ton/ac.
(ii)' (a) 4.782 ton/ac.
(b) 2.845 ton/ac.
(iii) Maineffects of \(R\) and \(I\) are highly signifiant, \(I\) and \(S\) are significant while all others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & , Mean & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{T}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 23.47 & 24.81 & 24.14 & 25.78 & 22.50 & 21.98 & 26.30 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 25.00 & 26.74 & 25.87 & 27.16 & 24.58 & 24.73 & 27.01 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 26.92 & 28.84 & 27.88 & 29.03 & . 26.73 & 26.07 & 29.69 \\
\hline Mean & 25.13 & 26.80 & 25.96 & 27.32 & 24.60 & 24.26 & 27.67 \\
\hline T 1 & 23.51 & 25.01 & 24.26 & 25.80 & 22.72 & & \\
\hline T 2 & 26.76 & \[
28.58
\] & . 27.67 & 28.85 & 26.49 & & \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 26.77 & . 27.88 & 27.32 & & & & \\
\hline S8 & 23.50 & \(25.71{ }^{\circ}\) & 24.60 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. I marginal means
2. \(S\) marginal means
3. \(T\) or \(R\) marginal means
4. T or \(\mathbf{R}\) means at a same level of \(I\)
5. I means at a same level of \(T\) or \(R\)
6. T or \(R\) means at a same level of \(S\)
7. \(S\) means at a same level of \(T\) or \(R\)
8. means of body of \(I \times S\) table
9. means of body of \(R \times T\) table
\(=1.195 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac}\). \(=0.976\) ton/ac. \(=0.581\) ton/ac.
\(=1.006\) ton/ac.
\(=1.391\) ton./ac.
\(=0.821\) tod/ac.
\(=1.136\) ton/ac.
\(=1.691\) ton/ac.
\(=0.821\) ton/ac.

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 51(185).
Type :- 'CI'.

Object :-To study the effect of planting cane at different depths and different soil moisture conditions to obtain maximum germination of different seed material of Sugarcane with and without presoaking treatment.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 11.3.1951. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by victory plough on 29.8.1950, 3.10.1950, 1 by desi plough on \(15.10 .1950,6\) harrowings by tractor, 1 harrow on 25.12 .1950 and 6 pata (b) N.A. (c) 50 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) - (v) Turning in of sanai (G.M.) at 40 lb ./ac. of N on 29.8 .1950 , spreading F.Y.M. at 20 lb ./ac. of N on 1.1.1951, Castor cake broadcast at \(45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 18.2.1951. Top dressing of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at 45 lb ./ac. of N on 15 and 19.5.1951. (vi) CO.K. 30 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings with kassion 2, 3.4.1951 in \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) plots, hoeings with cultivator on 4, 5.4.1951 in \(\mathrm{T}_{2}\) plots, hoeings with cultivator on 15 and 19.5.1951 and 21 and 23.6.1951 and earthing on 13, 14 and 16.8 .1951 (ix) 29.86", ( \(x\) ) 26.2.1952 to 3.3.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 times of irrigation: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) before planting and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) after planting.
(2) 2 depths of planting : \(D_{1}=2^{\circ}\) deep by kassi and \(D_{2}=6^{\circ}\) deep by dera plough.

\section*{Sub-plot treatments:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 soaking treatments: \(S_{0}=\) unsoaked and \(S_{1}=\) soaking in water for 20 hours.
(2) 2 portions of cane as seed : \(P_{1}=\) top (2 top sett) and \(P_{2}=\) bottom (setts) portion.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication; 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) and (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination count, tiller count, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
- (i) 17.86 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 1.999 ton/ac.
(b) 2.219 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(S\) effect is significant. All others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. T or \(D\) marginal means
\(=0.707\) ton/ac.
2. \(S\) or \(P\) marginal means
\(=0.785\) ton/ac.
3. \(S\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(T\) or \(D\)
\(=1.110\) ton/ac.
4. T or \(D\) means at the same level of \(S\) or \(P\)
\(=1.056\) ton/ac.
\(=1.000\) ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
6. means in the body of \(S \times P\) table
\(=1.110\) ton/ac.

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 52(236).
Type :- 'CI'.

Object :-To study the effect of planting cane at different depths and different soil moisture conditions to obtain maximum germination of different seed material of Sugarcane with and without presoaking treatments.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai for GM. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 22.3.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughings by victory and desi plough. Liver harrow. Pata (b) NA. (c) 40 three budded setts/row. (d)\&(e) N.A. (v) Sanai turned in on 11.9.1952, spreading of F.Y.M on 31.1.1952 and top dressing of \(A / S\) and Castor cake on 15, 16.5.1952. (vi) CO.K. 30 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kassl on \(5,6.4 .1951\) and cultivator on \(16,17.5 .1952\). Earthing cn \(24,25.9\). 952 . (ix) \(33.30^{\prime \prime}(x) 6\) to 15.3 .1953 .

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 times of irrigation : \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) before planting and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) after planting.
(2) 2 depths of planting: \(D_{1}=2 \frac{1}{}^{\prime \prime}\) to \(3^{\circ}\) and \(D_{2}=5^{\prime \prime}\) to \(6^{\prime \prime}\).

Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 soaking treatments : \(S_{0}=n 0\) soaking and \(S_{1}=\) soaking in water for a day.
(2) 2 portions of sugarcane as seed : \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) top (2-3 budded \(s\) etts) portion and \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) bottom portion.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) on two sides of the gross plot left as non-experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination count, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(22.5 \dot{5}\) ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 5.888 ton/ac.
(b) 2.433 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(P\) effect is significant. All others are no \(t\) significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & Mean & \(S_{0}\) & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline T1 & 22.76 & 22.15 & \(22.46{ }^{\circ}\) & 22.89 & 22.02 & 23.14 & 21.77 \\
\hline T8 & 22.86 & 22.42 & 22.64 & 22.86 & 22.41 & 23.40 & 21.88 \\
\hline Mean & 22.81 & 22.28 & 2255 & 22.88 & 22.22 & 23.27 & 21.82 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 23.16 & 23.38 & 23.27 & 23.26 & 23.28 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{-}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\) & 22.46 & 21.18 & 21.82 & 22.50 & 21.15 & & \\
\hline \(S_{0}\) & 23.46 & 22.30 & 22.88 & \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{' -}} \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 22.17 & 22.26 & 22.22 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. T or \(D\) marginal means & \(=1.472\) ton/ac. \\
2. \(S\) or \(P\) marginal means & \(=0.608\) ton/ac. \\
3. \(S\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(T\) or \(D\) & \\
4. \(T\) or \(D\) means at the same level of \(S\) or \(P\) & \(=0.860\) ton/ac. \\
5. means in the body of \(T \times D\) table & \\
6. means in the body of \(S \times P\) table & \\
& \(=0.082\) ton/ac. \\
&
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 53(261).
Type:-‘CI'.

Object:-To study the effect of planting cane at different depths and different soil moisture conditions to obtain maximum germination of different seed material of Sugarcane with and without pre-soaking treatments.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 13.3.1953. (iv) (a) 8 ploughings wth desi plough and 4 with victory plough. (b) N.A. (c) 40 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) N.A. (vi) CO.K. 30 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (vii) Hoeing with kassi on 24.3.1953 (irrigated plots) and 4 to 6.5.1953 and 7 to 11.6.1954. (ix) 45.73'. (x) 17. 18.2.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 times of irrigation: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) before planting and \(\mathrm{T}_{2}=\) after planting.
(2) 2 depths of planting: \(D_{1}=2 \frac{1}{}^{\prime \prime}\) to \(3^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{2}=5^{\prime \prime}\) to \(6^{\prime \prime}\).

Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 soaking treatments : \(S_{0}=\) no soaking and \(S_{1}=\) soaking in water for a day.
(2) 2 portions of sugarcane as seed : \(P_{1}=\) top (2-3 budded setts) and \(P_{2}=\) bottom portion.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 (replication I has been rejected). (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) was left at the two ends of the plot in the lengthwise direction as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Low yields in replication \(I\), hence rejected for analysis. (ii) N.A. (iii)' Germination count, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.80 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.104 ton/ac.
(b) 2.781 ton/ac.
(iii). None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & Mean & \(S_{0}\) & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{z}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) & 23.19 & 24.81 & 24.00 & 23.22 & 24.77 & 24.09 & 23.90 - \\
\hline T2 & 23.95 & 23.26 & 23.60 & 23.51 & 23.69 & 23.69 & 23.51 \\
\hline Mean & 23.57 & 24.03 & 23.80 & 23.36 & 24.23 & 23.89 & 23.70 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 23.64 & 24.15 & 23.89 & 23.99 & 23.79 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P a}_{2}\) & 23.50 & 23.91 & 23.70 & 22.74 & 24.67 & . & \\
\hline So & 22.91 & 23.82 & 23.36 & & . & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & 24.23 & 24.24 & 24.23 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. T or \(\mathbf{D}\) marginal means
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.185 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =0.803 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.135 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.431 \text { ton/ac. } \\
& =1.676 \text { ton/ac. }
\end{aligned}
\]
2. \(S\) or \(P\) marginal means
3. \(S\) or \(P\) means at the same level of \(T\) or \(D\)
4. \(T\) or \(D\) means at the same level of \(S\) or \(P\)
5. means of the body of \(\mathbf{T}\) or \(\mathbf{D}\) table
6. means of the body of \(S \times P\) table

\section*{Crop :- Sugarcane.}

Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

\section*{Ref:- U.P. 48(76).}

Type:- 'CIV'.

Object :-To find the effect of high and normal moisture content in top soil in relation to depth of planting and Sugarcane variety.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanvi as G.M. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shabjahanpur. (iii) 3 and 4.3.1948. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings by victory plough, 7 ploughings by desi plough, 1 by cultivator and 8 plankings. (b) N.A. (c) 50, three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e)-. (v) Sanai as G.M. at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 24.8.1947, applied as B.D., castor cake at 40 lb ./ac of N on 24.1 .1948 and \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N on 4.5.1948, as top dressing. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) : Planking after plantiog on 5.3.1948, hoeings by kassi in \(T_{2}\) plots on 16.3.1948 and in \(T_{1}\) plots on 17.3.1948, planting after hoeing on 23.3.1948, 2 hoeings by kassi on 14.4.1948 and 1.7.1948, 2 hoeings by cultivator on 5.5.1948 and 21.5.1948 and earthing up on 23, 24.8.1948. (ix) 40.24\%. (x) \(10,11,14.2 .1919\) and 2, 4, 11, 24.3.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
2 times of irrigation : \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) irrigation before planting and \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) irrigation after planting.
Sub-plot treatments:
4 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) CO. 527 (early), \(V_{2}=\) CO. 453 (late), \(V_{8}=\) CO. 421 (medium) and \(V_{4}=\) CO.S. 76 (medium).
Sub-sub-plot treatments:
2 depths of planting: \(D_{1}=21^{\prime \prime}-3^{\circ}\) (shallow) and \(D_{2}=5^{\circ}-6^{\prime \prime}\) (deep) by delta furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication, 4 sub-plots/main-plot and 2 sub-sub-plots/sub-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Some traces of leaf yellowing in October 1948, it is more apparent in CO. 527 in November than in other treatments. (iii) Germination, tiller counts, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1948-N.A. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.40 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.04 ton/ac.
(b) 4.01 ton/ac.
(c) 2.54 ton/ac.
(iii) \(V\) effect is highly significant, \(T \times D\) is signifcent, \(T \times V \times D\) is highly significant and all others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. T marginal means \(\quad=0.761\) ton/ac.
2. V marginal means \(\quad=1.419\) ton/ac.
3. D marginal means
\(=0.636\) ton/ac.
4. D means at the same level of \(V \quad=1.272\) ton/ac.
5. V means at the same level of \(D \quad=1.680\) ton/ac.
6. \(D\) means at the same level of \(T . \quad=0.900\) ton/ac.
7. T means at the same level of \(D \quad=0.992\) ton/ac.
8. \(V\) means at the same level of \(T \quad=2.007\) ton/ac.
9. \(T\) means at the same level of \(V \quad=1.897\) ton/ac.
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Sugarcane. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 48(89). } \\
\text { Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. } & \text { Type :- 'D'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To find out the effect of different insecticides on the incidence of top borers.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 22.3.1948. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO. 312 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Dusting gammexane at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 15 June, at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 15 July and at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and on 15 August. 1948.
3. Spraying with D.D.T. (2\%).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(59^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) \% of top bored plants. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)

Treatment Mean angle. Transformed back mean percentages
1.
9.31
2.
3.
8.43 • 2.63
G.M. 8.77 • 2.80

Significance N.S.
S.E./mean 0.516

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 49(184),
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To find out the efficacy of application of D.D.T. and gammexane to control termite.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Cotton. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 9.3.1952. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) CO. 312 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 17.1.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. 5\% D.D.T. as dip at planting (Geigy 550-50\%).
8. \(2.5 \%\) D.D.T. as dip at planting (Geigy \(550-50 \%\) ).
4. \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of D.D.T (Geigy 410) in rows after 4 weeks of planting on 8.4.1949.
5. 25 lb ./ac. of gammexane powder in furrows at planting.
6. 25 lb ./ac. of gammexane powder in rows after 4 weeks of planting on 8.4.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(58^{\circ} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of sugarcane for two rows of \(11^{\prime}\) each of sugarcane free from termite, cane attacked ty termite and sugarcane completely destroyed by termite. \% attack of termite to eye buds, ends and setts. \% eye buds germinated. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M). \(\mathrm{p}_{1}=\%\) of eye buds attacked by termite and \(\mathrm{p}_{2}=\%\) of ends attacked by termite.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(7.26 \mathrm{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ } / p_{1} /\) plot
(i) \(9.76 \mathrm{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{\mathrm{p}_{2}} /\) plot.
(ii) \(3.479 \mathrm{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}_{1} /\) plot
(ii) \(3.912 \mathrm{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}_{2} /\) plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean value of \(\operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}_{1} /\) plot & \% of eye buds attacked by termite (Transformed back) & Treatment & Mean value of \(\operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}_{2}\) & \% of ends attacked by termite (Transformed back) \\
\hline 1. & 16.72 & 8.70 & 1. & 23.38 & 16.09 \\
\hline 2. & 1.81 & 0.60 & 2. & 1.09 & 0.54 \\
\hline 3. & 0.00 & 0.50 & 3. & 1.95 & 0.62 \\
\hline 4. & 16.34 & 8.34 & 4. & 20.48 & 12.63 \\
\hline 5. ' & 4.68 & 1.16 & 5. & 8.38 & 2.60 \\
\hline 6. & 4.00 & 0.99 & 6. & 3.28 & 0.83 \\
\hline G.M. & 7.26 & & G.M. & 9.76 & \\
\hline S.E./mean & 1.420 & - & S.E./mean & 1.597 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:- U.P. 50(230).
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-To study the efficacy of application of D.D.T., gammexane and crude oil emulsion to control termite.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Cotton. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 13.3.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO.312 (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5, 6.1.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Dipping the setts in \(1 \%\) D.D.T. (No. 550) solution and planting when dry.
3. Dusting the setts with D.D.T. (No. 410) at \(5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Crude oil emulsion at the rate of 5 seer/ac. with 1 st irrigation only.
5. Dusting the setts with gammexane at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
6. Dusting the setts with gammexane at \(10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. . (ii) (a) 6.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(57^{\circ} \times 24^{\prime}\).
(v) No.
(vi) Yes.
1. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Yield of canes free from termite, attacked by termite and destroyed by termite. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M). \(\mathbf{p}_{1}=\%\) damage by termite to eye buds after 12 weeks of sowing on 8.6 .1950 and \(\mathrm{p}_{\mathbf{8}}=\%\) damage by termite to buds after 12 weeks of sowing.

RESULTS:


Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref :-U.P. 50(231).
Type :-'D'.

Object :-To study the efficacy of gammexane and D.D.T. against moth borers.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i)' (a) N.A. (b) Pea for fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 17.3 ' 1950 (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) 120 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{No}\) other details are available. (vi) CO.S. 245 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.2.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Gammexane ( \(P 520\) ) at 4 lb . in 100 gallons of water ( \(0.20 \%\) ) in the month of July.
3. Gammexane (P 520) at 8 lb . in 100 gallons of water ( \(0.4 \%\) ) in the month of July.
4. D.D.T. (Geigy-550) at 6 lb . in 100 gallons of water ( \(0.3 \%\) ) in the month of July.
5. Dusting D.D.T. (410) at 10 lb ./ac. in May, \(12 \frac{1}{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in June, \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in July and \(12 \frac{1}{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in August.
6. Dusting Gammexane at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in May, 25 lb ./ac. in June, \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in July and \(35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in August. Spraying by compréssed air sprayer, Dusting by root hand duster. Date of 1 st spraying 16.5.1950. Treatments. 2, \(3,4,5\) and 6 applied on 15.5.1950, 27.6.1950 and 27.8.1950. In the month of July albolinium at 8 oz. / 100 gallons in treatments 2 and 3 were applied in addition to details already given under the
treatments. treatments.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(58^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Counting of top bored canes at harvest, yield of healthy canes, and yield of canes attacked by borers. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(M).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 245.4 ton/ac.
(ii) 32.05 ton.ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. no. of top bored canes/plot.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. no. of canes \\
1. & 210.7 \\
2. & 241.0 \\
3. & 255.5 \\
4. & 267.2 \\
5. & 245.5 \\
6. & 252.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=16.02\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref : U.U.P. 51 (221).
Type :-'D'.

Object :-To find the effect of gammexane and D.D.T: against moth borers.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Cotton. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) \(19.3 .195 \dot{5}\). (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO. 245 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.2.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Spraying with \(0.2 \%\) BHC (Gammexane P520).
3. Spraying with \(0.4 \%\) BHC (Gammexane P 520 ).
4. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) BHC (Gammexane P520).
5. Dusting D.D.T. (No. 410 ) at 20 lb ./ac. in May, 25 lb ./ac. in June, 30 lb ./ac. in July and \(35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in August.
6. Dusting Gammexane at \(20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). in May, \(25 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). in June, \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). in July and \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in August.
Albolinium shall be mixed with treatments, 2, 3 and 4 in July and August. The rounds in order are 26 . 4.1951, 28.5. 1951, 28.6.1951 1971951 and 2981951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(58^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\). (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 21^{\circ}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Population of top borers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1950~1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi)! Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M). \(x=\) population of top borer on 13.12.1951.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(2.68 \quad \sqrt{x}+\frac{1}{2} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(0.173 \quad \sqrt{x}+\frac{1}{1} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Population of borers on 13.2.51.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{x}+\frac{1}{3}\) & Population of top borer on 13.12.1951 (Transformed back) \\
\hline 1. & 3.03 & 8.68 \\
\hline 2. & 2.54 - & 5.95 \\
\hline 3. & 2.54 & 5.95 \\
\hline 4. & 2.34 & 4.98 \\
\hline 5. & 3.19 & 9.68 \\
\hline 6. & 2.45 & 5.50 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=0.087\) ton/ac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Ref :- U.P. 52(273).
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar. Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To study the effect of gammexane and D.D.T. against moth borers.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Cotton. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 4.3.1952. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO.S. 245 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 14.1.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS}
1. Control.
2. Sprayings with \(0.20 \%\) BHC gammexane \(P 520\).
3. Sprayings with \(0.4 \%\) BHC gammexane \(P 520\).
4. Sprayings with \(0.5 \%\) BHC gammexane \(P 520\).
5. Dusting with D.D.T. (No. 410 ) at 20 lb /ac. in May, \(25 \cdot \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. in June, \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in July and \(35 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{lac}\). in August.
6. Dusting with gammexane at 20 lb ./ac. in May, 25 lb ./ac. in June, \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in.July and 35 lb ./ac. in August.
N.B. :-Albolinium is mixed for treatments 1,2 and 3 in July and August at 8 oz to 100 gallons.

Dates of operations are 19.4.1952, 6.5.1952, 17.5.1952, 23.6.1952 and 30.7.1952.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(58^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(52^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) on all sides of the plot. (vi) Yes
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study, (iii) Infestation of top borers on 7.10 .1952 and 18.11.1952, yield data of 2 rows each of \(11^{\prime}\) in respect of healthy and damaged sugarcane. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M). \(x\) is the infestation of top borers.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(7.58 \sqrt{ } \times /\) plot.
(ii) \(0.483 \sqrt{ } \mathrm{x} / \mathrm{plot}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. infestation of top borers/plot.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{ } \mathrm{z} /\) plot & Infestation of top borers on 18.11 .1952 (Transformed back) \\
1. & 7.68 & 58.98 \\
2. & 7.56 & 57.15 \\
3. & 7.46 & 55.65 \\
4. & 7.26 & 52.71 \\
5. & 7.92 & 62.73 \\
6. & 7.62 & 58.06 \\
S.E. \(/\) mean & \(=0.242\) &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:- U.P. 53(288).
Type:- 'D'.

Object:-To find out suitable control measures against the stem and the root borer.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Cotton. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagari -(iii) 20.2.1953,
(iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO.S. 245 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control (no treatment).
2. Spraying with 0.5\% D.D.T. suspension at 40 gallons/ac.
3. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) BHC. suspension at 40 gallons/ac.
4. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) chlordane suspension at 40 gallons/ac.
5. Dusting with \(5 \%\) BHC dust at \(20-35 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
6. Dusting with \(5 \%\) D.D.T. dust at \(20-35 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of attack by borers and yield of two rows of \(11^{\prime}\) each of healthy and infested sugarcanes. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment . was conducted by D.S.R. (M). \(x\) is the no. of dead hearts.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(8.11 \quad \sqrt{ }\) /plot.
(ii) \(1.347 \sqrt{ } \times /\) plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. no. of dead hearts/plot.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{ } \mathrm{x} / \mathrm{plot}\) & No. of deadhearts/plot (Transformed back). \\
\hline 1. & 8.54 & 72.93 \\
\hline 2. & 7.42 & 55.06 \\
\hline 3. & 7.94 & 63.04 \\
\hline 4. & 9.47 & 89.68 \\
\hline 5. & 7.88 & 62.09 \\
\hline 6. & 7.39 & 54.61 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=0.674\) & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Muzaffarnagar.

Ref:- U.P. 53(289).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{\sim} \mathbf{D}\) '.

Object :-To find out suitable control measure against top borer.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar for seed. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Muzaffarnagar. (iii) 11.3.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO:245 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.12.1953.

\section*{2. TRBATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) BHC.
3. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) Toxaphene.
4. Spraying with \(1.0 \%\) BHC.
5. Spraying with \(1.0 \%\) D.D.T.
6. Dusting with \(5 \%\) BHC.

Spraying on 3.7.1953, 20.8.1953 and 14.10.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii
(ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 .
(iv) (a) and (b) \(58^{\prime} \times 27\)
(v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Germination counts, tiller counts, no. of canes, \% attack of top borer, wt . of diseased and healthy sugarcane for 2 rows of \(13^{\prime}\) each and yield at harvest. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (M).

\section*{5. RESULTS}
(i) \(39.00 \mathrm{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) \(3.96 \operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) \% attack of top borers on sugarcanc.
Treatment Mean value of \(\operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot \(\quad \%\) attack of top borers on sugarcanes
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
& & & (transformed \\
1. & 41.54 & & 44.04 \\
2. & 37.18 & & 36.65 \\
3. & 35.38 & & 33.68 \\
4. & 38.29 & & 38.52 \\
5. & 40.80 & & 42.77 \\
6. & 40.82 & & 42.80 \\
S.E./mean & 1.980 & &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 51(146).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To test the relative efficiency of different weedicides with regard to the weeds growing in Sugarcane.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) Guar for grain. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 23.2.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Flat planting. (c) 40 three budded setts/row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) A/S at \(6.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{plot}\). (vi) C0.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing by kassi and earthing. (ix) \(31.60^{\circ}\) (x) 10, 11.1.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. 2-4-D sodium salt at 1 lb ./ac. of active material.
2. 2-4-D sodium salt at \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of active material.
3. Dicctox at \(0.1 \%\) solution of active material.
4. Dicotox at \(0.2 \%\) solution of active material.
5. Fernoxone at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of active material.
6. Fernoxone at \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of active material.
7. Pittsburgh weed killer at 1 lb ./ac.
8. Pittsburgh weed killer at \(2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
9. Normal cultivation.
10. Normal cultivation without hoeing and weeding.

Spraying of treatments in water at 100 gallon/ac. on 26, 27.4.1951 and 9.7.1951. 2-4-D sodium salt 2-4Dichorophenoxyacetic acid containing \(82 \%\) acid equivalent. Dicotox containing 2-4-D as its active material Pittsburgh Amine weed killer contain \(60 \%\) active material Fernoxorie- \(80 \%\) sodium salt of \(2-4\)-D.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Fairly good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillering, mortality of weed and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.76 ton/ac.
(ii) 4.272 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 24.53 & 6. & 23.33 \\
2. & 22.67 & 7. & 24.60 \\
3. & 26.15 & 8. & 23.99 \\
4. & 26.31 & 9. & 29.26 \\
5. & 18.82 & 10. & 17.95 \\
& S.E. \(/\) mean & \(=2.467\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Ref:- U.P. 52(195).
Type:- 'D'.
Object:-To test the relative efficiency of the different weedicides with regard to the weeds growing in Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 12.2 .1952 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Flat planting. (c) 33 three budded setts/row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Application of A/S at the rate of \(120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N in standing water after irrigation. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with spring tooth harrow on 27.2.1952 and hoeing with kassion 19, 20.3.1952. (ix) \(33.49^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 27.12.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(2-4-\mathrm{D}\) sodium salt at 1 lb ./ac. of active material.
2. \(2-4-\mathrm{D}\) sodium salt at 2 lb ./ac. of active material.
3. Dicotox at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of active material.
4. Dicotox at 2 lb ./ac. of active material.
5. Fernoxone at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of active material.
6. Fernoxone at 2 lb ./ac. of active material.
7. Pittsburgh weed killer at 1 lb ./ac. of active material.
8. Pittsburgh weeds killer at 2 lb ./ac. of active material.
9. Normal cultivation.
10. Normal cultivation without hoeing and weeding.

Spraying of 100 gallons of water with treatments, spraying of weedicice cn 6.8.19:2, 7.5.1952 and 18.7.1952. \(2-4\)-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid containing \(80 \%\) acid equivalent, pittsburgh weed killer at \(60 \%\) of acid equivalent, dicotox and \(2-4-\mathrm{D}\) as its active principle and fernoxone at \(80 \%\) sodium salt of \(2-4-\mathrm{D}\) active material.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fairy good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination count, tillers, mortality \% and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 19.01 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.46 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline 1. & 20.60 & 6. & 17.05 \\
\hline 2. & 19.63 & 7. & 13.30 \\
\hline 3. & 1 1. 69 & 8. & 17.21 \\
\hline 4. & 20.95 & 9. & 26.71 \\
\hline 5. & 18.13 & 10. & 19.18 \\
\hline & S.E./mean & \(=1.99\) ton/ac. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(223).
Type :- 'D'.

Object:-To test the relative efficiency of the different weedicides with regard to the weeds growing in Sugarcane fields.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 17.2.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Flat planting. (c) 25 three budded setts/row. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e)-. (v) Manuring at \(100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N with A/S on 18 and 19.5.1953. (vi) CO. 453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with kassl in control plots on \(25.4 .1953,25.5 .1953\) and 11.6 .1953 and earthing in control plots on 20.8.1953. (ix) 43.43". (x) 29.1.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. 2-4-D monohydrate at \(0.1 \%\) concentration.
2. 2-4-D monohydrate at \(0.2 \%\) concentration.
3. Dicotox at \(0.1 \%\) concentration.
4. Dicotox at \(0.2 \%\) concentration.
5. Ferioxone at \(0.1 \%\) concentration.
(Ry) spray in water, spraying of weedicides on 29, 30.4.1953 and 7.7.1953, Pittsburgh Amine weed killer- \(60 \%\) and equivalent, 2-4 dichlorophenoxyacetic acid-viz., sodium 2-4-D, monohydrate containing \(82 \%\) acid equivalent, dicotox containing 2-4-D as its active principle and fernoxone- \(80 \%\) sodium salt of 2-4-D).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fairly good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, mortality and weeds after 15 days of application and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by © D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.55 ton/ac.
(ii) 4,56 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 20.10 & 6. & 24.54 \\
2. & 24.99 & 7. & 28.16 \\
3. & 23.84 & 8. & 20.16 \\
4. & 20.53 & 9. & 24.55 \\
5. & 27.02 & 10. & 31.66 \\
& S.e./mean & \(=2.63\) ton/ac. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 51(142).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of various harmones and other chemicals on the growth, yield and sugar quality of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pea. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 3.3.1951. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 30 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Sanai, A/S at 60 lb ./ac. of N on 4.5.1951. (vi) CO.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hceings on 30.3.1951, 10.4.1951 and 31.5.1951. (ix) 29.86". (x) 21.2.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Ṕyturic acid.
3. \(\mathrm{ZnSO}_{4}\) (zinc sulphate).
4. Mixture.
5. \(\mathrm{KH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}\) (Potasium dihydro-phosphate).
6. Glutamic acid.

About 10 litres of solution was sprayed on each plot. Spraying on 22.5.1951. 13.6.1951, 13.7.1951 and 15.12.1931. (1) \(\mathrm{ZnSO}_{4}-10 \mathrm{ppm}\). (2) Mixture of Boric acid-1 ppm., \(\mathrm{KMnO}_{4}-1 \mathrm{ppm}, \mathrm{CuSO}_{4}-1 \mathrm{ppm}\), \(\mathrm{ZnCl}_{2}-1 \mathrm{ppm}\). and \(\mathrm{MgO}-1 \mathrm{ppm}\). (3) Pyruric acid- 50 ppm . (4) Glutamic- 10 ppm . (5) \(\mathrm{KH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}\) -50 ppm .
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime \prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes,
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) Ni. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 20.65 ton/ac.
(ii) 2.58 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. Treatment Av yield
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. & 19.32 \\
2. & 21.53 \\
3. & 20.89 \\
4. & 20.40 \\
5. & 22.70 \\
6. & 19.04 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.49\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Sugarcane. \\ Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
}

Ref :-U.P. 52(239).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of different chemicals on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Moong type T \(_{1}\). (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 19.2.1952. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.452 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viij) Harrowing on 28,2.1952. and 15.3.1952. Hecing on 15, 29.4.19:2. and earthing an 17.8.1952. (ix) 33.49'. (x) 29.12.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
5. Lime super
2. Pyruric acid.
6. Potassium suiphate.
3. Zinc sulphate.
7. Sodium nitrate.
4. \(\mathrm{KH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}\) (potassium dihydro-phosphate).
8. \(A / S\).
4. \(\mathrm{KH}_{2} \mathrm{PO}_{4}\) (potassium dinydro-phosphate).
Spraying on \(13,27.5 .1952,10.6 .1952,5,30.7 .1952,15.9 .1952\) and 16.10.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 8 .
(iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(37^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Treatment no. 4 and 8 were damaged by rats in replication no. III. These have been estimated for analysis and summary of results. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 18.03 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.164 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Aveatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 17.67 & & 5. & 17.92 \\
2. & 17.97 & & 6. & 16.84 \\
3. & 15.89 & & 7. & 21.36 \\
4. & 18.71 & & 8. & 18.03
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean for treatments \(1,2,3,5,6\) and 7
\[
\begin{aligned}
& =1.827 \text { ton } / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =3.164 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =3.002 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]
S.E. of difference of means of treatment nos. 4 and 8
S.E. of the difference of either of treatment means 4 or 8 with any of the treatment mean 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 or 7

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Object:-To study the effect of spraying chemicals in controlling borer attack on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A.
(b) Guar. (c) No.
(iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 60 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (c) -. (v) \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) and (viii) N.A. (ix) \(31.26^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. 0.5\% D.D.T. (Geigy no. 550) spray.
2. \(0.5 \%\) BHC (agro wet powder) spray.
3. \(0.5 \%\) chlordane spray.
4. \(5.0 \%\) BHC gammexane dust.
5. \(5 \%\) BHC (hexyclane) dust.
6. 5 \% D.D.T. (Geigy No. 405) dust.
7. Control (no treatment).

The spraying and dusting was carried out at monthly intervals. The first round was applied as soon as the egg laying tegan. Gammexane at 2) lb./ac. in furrows before planting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil.
(vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R. (S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 15.47 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.97 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 16.57 \\
2. & 16.65 \\
3. & 15.09 \\
4. & 15.35 \\
5. & 16.08 \\
6. & 14.87 \\
7. & 13.67 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.14\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Ref:-U.P. 49(168).
Type :-'D'.
Object :-To study the effect of spraying chemicals in controlling stem borer attack on Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 3.4.1949a (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 440 three budded setts/plot. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) N.A. (vi) CO. 421 (medium). (vii) and (viii) N.A. (ix) \(50.02^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 10.2.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Spraying with 2\% D.D.T. (fortnightly).
2. Spraying with \(2 \%\) BHC. (fortnightly).
3. Control.

Chemicals used : Geigy's \(50 \%\) D.D.T.. powder no. 550. I.C.I.'s gammexane P. 520 (containing \(50 \%\) BHC.). Sprayings started near about 13.6.1949 and ended on 18.7.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(55^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Germination, tillers, total dead hearts before sprayings, during sprayings and after sprayings, \% stem borer and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S). p=\% attack of stem borer.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 6.16 tod/ac.
(i) \(8.77 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) 2.083 ton/ac.
(ii) \(5.1649 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{\mathrm{p}} / \mathrm{plpt}\).
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean value of \\
\(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{\text { p }} /\) plot.
\end{tabular}
\end{tabular} \begin{tabular}{c} 
\% attack of stem borer \({ }^{\text {\% }}\) \\
(transformed back)
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Sugarcane.}

Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.
Ref:-U.P. 53(22j).
Type :-'D'.
Object :-To study the effect of spraying wak solutions of cartain chamical mixtures on the growth, juice quality and yield of Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 10.2.1953. (iv) (a) Field has been prepared before planting. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) Sanai as B.D. and A/S at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathbf{N}\) top dressed on 22.4.1953. (vi) CO.453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeing with cultivator on 26.2.1953, 19.2.1953. Hoeing with kassi on 13.4.1953, and 17.5.1953 and earthing on 17.5.1953. (ix) \(45.79^{\circ}\). (ㅈ) 8.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. \(\mathrm{FeSO}_{4} 20\) p.p.m. \(+\mathrm{MnSO}_{4} 50\) p.p.m.
3. \(\mathrm{CuSO}_{4} 1\) p.p.m. \(+\mathrm{ZnSO}_{4} 100\) p.p.m.
4. \(\mathrm{CaCl}_{2} 1000\) p.p.m. + Boric acid 1 p.p.m.
5. \(\mathrm{MnSO}_{4} 5\) p.p.m. \(+\mathrm{CaCl}_{2} 150\) p.p.m.
6. Iodine 1 ppm .
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Tillers, millable sugarcane and cane yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1955. (b) and (c) No.
(v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 29.69 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.85 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatments do not differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 31.23 \\
2. & 31.06 \\
3. & 29.48 \\
4. & 30.53 \\
S. & 28.49 \\
6. & 27.33 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.22\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :-U.P.53(226).
Type :-'D'.
- Object :-To find out the optimum number and time of application of weedicides to Sugarcane fields with a view to obtaining good weed free crop stand.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) 7.2.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Flat planting. (c) 25, three budded setts/row. (d) rows 3' apart. (e) -. (v) A/S at 100 lb./ac. of N on 18 and 19.5.1953 with irrigation. (vi) CO-453 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Hoeings by kassi on 4.4.1953, hoeings by kassi ia control on 25.4.1953, 25.5.1953, 11.6.1953 and earthings in plots on 20.8.1953. (ix) 43.43". (x) 29.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations (1) and (2) + a control.
(1) 3 times of weedicide spraying: \(W_{1}=\) Pre-emergence, end of April and July, \(W_{2}=\) Pre-emergence and July and \(W_{3}=\) April and July.
(2) 3 times of hoeing : \(\mathrm{H}_{1}=\) At germination, \(\mathrm{H}_{2}=\) At germination and in May and \(\mathrm{H}_{3}=\) At germination, in May and earthing in August.
Treatment in water spray at 100 gallons/ac. 2-4-D Amine formulation applied as \(\mathbf{0 2 \%}\) of acid equivalent ; Sprayings in pre-emergence plots on 27, 28.2.1953; Sprayings in April spraying plots on 29, 30.4.1953 ;Spraying in July spraying plots on 7.7.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fairly good. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, av. infestation of weeds per unit area after pre-emergence treatments, mortality and yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by D.S.R.(S).

\section*{5. \({ }^{\circ}\) RESULTS :}
(i) 24.76 ton/ac.
(ii) 5.986 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Control=} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{29.55 ton/ac.} \\
\hline & \(W_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{W}_{8}\) & \(\mathbf{W}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{1}\) & 22.26 & 26.96 & 23.98 & 24.40 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{2}\) & 18.84 & 27.52 & 27.73 & 24.70 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{H}_{3}\) & 19.23 & 26.98 & 24.56 & 23.59 \\
\hline Mean & 20.11 & 27.15 & 25.42 & 24.23 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=1.995\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\(=3.456\) ton/ac.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Sugarcane. Ref :- U.P. 49(151).
Zone :- Sardarnagar (Gorakhpur). Type:- 'D'.

```

Object :-To find out suitable control measures for termite in Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 10.2.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T.
2. Lead arsenate.
3. Corrosive sublimate.
4. Gammaxene.
5. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 4 replications io R.B.D. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) \(311^{\circ} \times 22^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experimens was conducted by D.S.R. (G) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 19.30 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.892 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 18.11 \\
2. & 20.41 \\
3. & 19.08 \\
4. & 19.47 \\
5. & 19.41 \\
S E./mean & \(=0.946\) ton/:
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Sugarcane. & Ref:- U.P. 49(167). \\
Zone :- Lakhimpur (Lakhimpur Kheri). & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To find out suitable control measures for termite in Sugarians.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Lahi. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 290 -improved. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 1200 buds/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 20.2.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.12.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. \(2.5 \%\) D.D.T. solution as dip.
2. \(5.0 \%\) lead arsenate solution as dip.
3. \(0.25 \%\) corrosive sublimate solution as dip.
4. Gammaxene powder at \(25 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in furrows.
5. Control.
3. DESIGN:
(i) and (ii) 4 replications in R.B.D. (iii) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination condition of eyebuds, termite damage and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 37.56 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.547 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac. Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 39.25 \\
2. & 35.75 \\
3. & 37.92 \\
4. & 42.40 \\
5. & 32.50 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.773\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sugarcane.
Ref:- U.P. 49(172).
Zone :-Khatauli (Mucaffarnagar).
Type :-' \({ }^{\prime}\) '.

Otject:-To find out suitable control measure for termites in Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) 17.3.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(2.5 \%\) D.D.T. solution as dip.
2. \(5 \%\) Lead Arsenate solution as dip.
3. \(0.25 \%\) Corrosive sublimate solution as dip.
4. Gammexane at 25 lb ./ac.
5. Control.
3. DESIGN:,
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications, (iii) (a) \(45^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A: (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R.(M). on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 53.61 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.270 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 52.69 \\
2. & 52.58 \\
3. & 51.80 \\
4. & 54.22 \\
5. & 56.76 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.635\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Haldwani (Nainital).

Ref :-U.P. 49(145).
Type :-D'.

Object:-To find out suitable control measures for termite in Sugareane.

\section*{BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay, loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 421 (medium) improved. (v) (a) Ploughings -1 by mould board plough, 3 by Athens' plough, 1 by dise plough. Parrsoms: harrowing twice and planking twice. (b) Flat planting. (c) 7 rows/plot; 1050 buds/plot ( 350 three budded setts). (d) N.A. (e) -. (vi) 6.3.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) Hoeings by bullock cultivator on 16.4 .1949 followed by hand kassi on 19.4.1949. Hoeing by hand kassi on 5, 6.5.1949, 22.6.1949 and 5, 6.7.1949 and earthing up by spade on 11 to 13.7.1949. (ix) \(60^{\circ}\), (x) 18.3.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. \(2.5 \%\) D.D.T. solution as dip.
2. \(5 \%\) Lead Arsenate solution as dip.
3. \(0.25 \%\) Corrosive sublimate solution as dip.
4. Gammexane powder at 25 lb ./ac. in furrows.
5. Conirol.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) 4 replications in R.B.D. (iii) (a) and (b) \(45^{\circ} \times 241^{\circ}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination and sugarcaze yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by D.S.R(S) on cultivators \({ }^{\circ}\) fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 41.59 ton/ac.
(ii) 3.919 tod/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
yield of sugarcane in fod/ac. & Av. yield \\
Treatment & 43.41 \\
1. & 39.82 \\
2. & 43.81 \\
3. & 44.77 \\
4. & 36.15 \\
5. & -1.959 ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Zone :-Shahjahanpur (Shahjahanpur).

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 49(166).}

Type :-‘D'.

Object :-To find out suitable control measures for termite in Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Jowar. (c) N.A. (ii) and (iii) N.A. (iv) CO. 313 (early) improved. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 1200 buds/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (vi) 1.3.1949. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.12.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. \(25 \%\) D.D.T. solution as dip.
2. \(5 \%\) Lead Arsenate solution as dip.
3. \(0.25 \%\) Corrosive sublimate solution as dip.
4. Gammexane powder at 25 lb ./ac. in furrows.
5. Control
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(45^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination condition of eyebuds, tiller counts, termite attack at harvest and yield of sugarcane. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 8.98 ton \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 4.316 ton/ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 6.46 \\
2. & 8.98 \\
3. & 11.41 \\
4. & 11.88 \\
5. & 6.18 \\
& S.E./mean \\
\multicolumn{2}{c}{\(\mathrm{p}=\%\) of termite attack }
\end{tabular}
(i) \(3.86 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) \(3.945 \mathrm{sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Mean angle and transformed back \% attack per plot.

Treatment . Mean angle (i.e. \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot) \(\quad\) Transformed back (\% of termite
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
S.E. mean attack/plot)
5.04
6.22
5.04
2.50
10.49
\(=1.972 \sin -3 \sqrt{ } /\) p/piot
1.26
1.66
1.26
0.69
3.82
\(=1.972 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } /\) p/plot

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :-Allahabad Agricultural Institute, Allahabad.

Ref:-U.P. 52(327),
Type, :-‘DM'.

Object :-To find best seed treatment and manurial schedule for Sugarcane.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) Réfer soil analysis, Allahabad. (iii) 25.2.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) CO. 453. (vii) and (viii) N.A. (ix) 29.42". (x) 24.12.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
4 sources of \(N: S_{0}=n 0\) manure (control), \(S_{1}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(N\) as F.Y.M., \(S_{z}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as G.N.C. and \(S_{3}=150 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as A/S.

Sab-plot treatments :
2 seed treatments: \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) sugarcane setts treated with gammexane dust and \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) control (untreated setts).
The setts were treated before planting to protect from white ants. Manures applied on 8.8.1952 as top dressing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) \(104^{\prime} \times 60^{\prime}\). (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(52^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(46^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at either end of the net sub-plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.A.I.:
5. RESULTS :
(i) 23.87 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 4.837 ton/ac.
(b) 4.564 ton/ac.
(iii) Only \(S\) effect is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 22.24 & 23.05 & 22.64 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 21.56 & 24.50 & 23.03 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 22.84 & 28.97 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 26.06 & 24.50 & 22.41 \\
\hline Mean & 23.18 & & 23.38 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. marginal means of \(S\) & \\
2. marginal means of \(T\) & \\
3. \(T\) means at the same level of \(S\) & \\
4. \(S\) means at the same level of \(T\) & \\
& \(=2.317\) ton/ac. \\
& \(=2.715\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res. Stn., Shahjahanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(194).
Type :- 'CD'.

Object :-To study the effect of spraying weak solution of certain chemicals on leaves on the growth, juice quality and sugarcane yield.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Shahjahanpur. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) A/S at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N at sowing on 14.10 .1952 and 104.1953. Castor cake at 40 lb ./ac. of N at tillering on 1.6.1953. (vi) \(\mathbf{C O . 4 5 3}\) (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 9 hoeings and earthing. (ix) \(44.20^{\circ}\). (x) 22.1.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinntions of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 times of planting: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=11.10 .1952\) and \(\mathrm{T}_{5}=8.3 .1953\).
(2) 4 sprayings: \(S_{1}=\) Contro] (water [spray), \(S_{8}=A / N\) spray, \(S_{8}=\) Pot. acid phosphate spray and \(\mathrm{S}_{4}^{\prime}=\) Ammo. Phos. sprays.
Spraying on 17.4.1953, 12.5.1953, 9.6.1953 and 24.7.1953 with concentration of 200 parts/million.
3.' DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 27^{\circ}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Millable cane, tillers and sugarcane yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) NH. (vii) The experiment was conducted by D.S.R. (S).

5, RESULTS:
(i) 33.93 ton/ac.
(ii) 1.682 ton/ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cccc|c} 
& \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{e}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 34.43 & 33.26 & 35.44 & 34.49 & 34.40 \\
\(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 32.18 & 34.82 & 33.38 & 33.44 & 33.46 \\
\hline Mean & 33.30 & 34.04 & 34.41 & 33.96 &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of \(T\) marginal means & \(=0.486\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of \(S\) marginal means & \(=0.687\) ton/ac. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=0.971\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop imSugarcane. - Ref :-U.P. 49(5). \\ Site :-Sugarcane Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. Type:-‘DIV'.}

Object :-To investigate the possibility of improving sugarcane yield for the late planted crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat. (b) Sanai as G.M. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.4.1949. (iv) (a) 4 preparatory ploughings and 4 harrowings with desi and watt's plough. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) 60 three budded setts/row. (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) Village compost at 60 lb ./ac. of N and Castor cake at 60 lb ./ac: of N . (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 6 hoeings and 1 earthing. (ix) \(51.45^{\circ}\). (x) 2.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 levels of irrigation : \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=3\) and \(\mathrm{I}_{2}=6\) irrigations.
Sab-plot treatments :
2 levels of insecticide : \(T_{0}=\) No insecticide and \(T_{1}=\) Insecticide applied.
Sub-sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{C O . 4 5 3}\) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C O} .395\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/replication, 2 sub-plots/main-plot and 2 sub-sub-plots/sub-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(56^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(50^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\), (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border alround the gross plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal, no lodging. (ii) No. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield. (iv) (ay 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted; by D.S.R. (G).

\section*{S.IRESULTS:}
(i) 10.37 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 0.974 ton/ac.
(b) 2.309 ton/ac.
(c) 1.486 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) and interaction \(\mathrm{I} \times \mathbf{V}\) are highly significant. Main effect of I and interaction \(\mathrm{T} \times \mathrm{V}\), \(\mathbf{I} \times \mathbf{T} \times V\) are significant while others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline , & To & \(\mathbf{T}_{1}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & V: \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 9.38 & . 9.15 & 9.26 & 10.25 & 8.28 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{8}\) & 11.15 & 11.80 & 11.48 & 14.60 & 8.35 \\
\hline Mean & 10.26 & 10.48 & 10.37 & 12.42 & 8.32 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 13.04 & 11.81 & & & - \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 7.49 & 9.14 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of tmo
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1. I marginal means & \(=0.397\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 2. \(\mathbf{T}\) marginal means & =0.943 ton/ac. \\
\hline 3. V marginal means & \(=0.607\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 4. V means at the same level of I & \(=0.858\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 5. I means at the same level of V & \(=1.026\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 6. T means at the same level of \(\mathbf{I}\) & \(=1.333\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 7. I means at the same level of \(\mathbf{T}\) & \(=1.023\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 8. V means at the same level of \(\mathbf{T}\) & \(=0.858\) ton/ac. \\
\hline 9. \(\mathbf{T}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{V}\) & \(=1.121 \mathrm{ton} / \mathrm{a}\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sugarcane.
Site :- Sugarcane Res。Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref :-U.P. 50(29),
Type :- 'DIV'.

Object :-To investigate the possibility of improving Sugarcane yield for late planted crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) G.M.-Wheat. (b) Sanal as G.M. (c) Green! manure. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 3, 4.4.1950. (iv) (a) 4 preparatory ploughings and harrowings with dest and watt's ploughs. (b) Sown in trenches. (c) and (d) N.A. (e) -. (v) 100 lb /ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and 100 lb ./ac. of N as F.Y.M. Top dressing before sowing (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 9 hoeings. (ix) \(44.07^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 24 to 29.1.1951.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plof treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
2 levels of irrigation: \(I_{1}=3\) and \(I_{2}=6\) irrigations.
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{Co}-453 ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{Co} 395\).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

2 levels of insecticide : \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{0}}=\) No insecticide, \(\mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Insecticide applied.(soacked in \(\mathbf{2 \%}\) Phenyle.)
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/ main-plot. i(b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(84^{\circ} \times 15^{\circ}\). (b) \(78^{\prime} \times 9^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) border alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. No lodging. (ii) Borers attacked. (iii) Germination, tillers, millable cane and sugarcane yield.' (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) NiL. (vii) Experiment was conducted by D.S.R.(S).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 18.12 ton/ac.
(ii) (a) 3.871 ton/ac.
(b) 1.241 ton/ac.
(iii) Main effect of V is highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{I} \times \mathrm{T}\) is significant while all others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of sugarcane in ton/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{T}_{0}\) & & \(\mathrm{T}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(I_{1}\) & 21.10 & 13.94 & 17.52 & 16.63 & & 18.41 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{I}_{1}\) & 22.58 & 14.86 & 18.72 & 18.82 & & 18.61 \\
\hline Mean & 21.84 & 14.40 & 18.12. & 17.72 & & 18.51 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{T}_{0}\) & 21.75 & 13.71 & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{-}} \\
\hline T3 & 21.94 & 15.09 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. I or } V \text { marginal means } & =1.369 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 2. } T \text { marginal means } & =0.439 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 3. T means at the same level of } I \text { or } V & =0.621 \text { ton/ac. } \\ \text { 4. I or } V \text { means at the same level of } T & \\ \text { 5. means of the body } I \times V \text { table } & =1.437 \text { ton/ac. }\end{array}\)

\author{
Crop:- Cotton (Kharif). \\ Ref :-U.P. 52(335). \\ Site :- Institutional Res. Farm, B.R. College, Bichpuri, Agra. \\ Type :- ' \(M\) '. \\ Object :-To study the effect of N on growth, development and yield of Cotton.
}
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri (Agra). (iii) 31.5.1952. (iv) (a) One cultivation by rigid shank cultivation by tractor, palewa, 4 pata, 1 ploughing by desi plough and cultivation by Mc. Cornick cultivator to mix manure. (b) By opening of furrows \(3^{\prime \prime}\) deep by desi plough and sowing seeds by hand followed by pata. (c) 10 seers/ac.' (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\). (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) 35/1. (vii) Nil. (viii) 2 weedings and 2 hoeings with khurpi, thinning done to leave the plants \(1 \mathbf{1 g}^{\prime}\) apart along with second hoeing and weeding. (ix) 43.3". (x) 7 pickings from 22.9.1952 to October.
2. TREATMENTS :

5 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=40, \mathrm{~N}_{3}=60\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{4}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
N as castor cake applied by spreading evenly at the time of sowing in well powdered form on 31.5.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(56^{\circ} \times 16^{\prime}, 56^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(48^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Block border \(4^{\prime}\), Plot border \(2^{\prime}\) and breadth of channel \(4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Water logging in fields in August due to heavy rains. Partial lodging in cotton on 25.8 .1952 due to heavy rains and strong wind. Poor germination, \(32 \%\) less stand after thinning on the basis of the spacing \(2^{\prime} \times 1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\). (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination count, ht. of main stem, no. of leaves, no. of branches, no. of fowers, no. of bolls/plant and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. The weather was not favourable to cotton cultivation due to heavy rains and wet weather and hence the low yield. No plotwise yield data was available in the thesis.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(458.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(108.21 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of seed cotton in \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cr} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 320.8 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 347.2 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 495.7 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 545.1 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 582.3 \\
S.E./mean & \(=44.18\) ton/ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Cotton (Kharif).

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 53(380).}

Site :- Institutional Research Farm, B. R. College, Bichpuri, Agra. Type:- 'M'.
Object :-To study the effect of varying doses of \(N\) with and without basal dressing of \(\mathbf{P}\) on growth, development and yield of Cotton.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri (Agra). (iii) 20.6.1953 and dibbling on 28.6.1953. (iv) (a) Palewa and ploughing. (b) Dropping the seed behind the plough and dibbling to fill up gaps. (c) N.A. (d) \(2 \frac{1^{\prime}}{} \times 2^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) 216 F. (vii) N.A. (viii) 1 thinning, 3 weedings, 2 hoeings and one desi plough run in between the rows. (ix) 13.05". (x) 5 pickings from 6.10.1953 to 13.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 5 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{2}=40, N_{3}=60\) and \(N_{4}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Super applied in furrows behind the plough at the time of sowing. \(\mathbf{N}\) broadcast at the time of sowing.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(20^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\) and \(22 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime} \times 42^{\prime}\). (b) \(15^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (v) Block border \(=3^{\prime}\) along breath and \(4^{\prime}\) along length. plot border \(=2^{\prime}\) along the length and \(2 \frac{1}{2^{\prime}}\) along breath, breadth of channel \(=4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poof germination, stand very poor due to defective germination and lack of sufficient moisture. (ii) Severe attack of stem borer in early seedling stage. (iii) Height branches, flowering, bolls, kapas (seed cotton), yield/ plant and kapas yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(753.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(136.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of kapas in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{8}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 748.4 & 798.2 & 644.9 & 736.7 & 863.3 & 758.3 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 674.6 & 759.9 & 578.4 & 855.9 & 877.3 & 749.2 \\
\hline - Mean & \(711.5^{\circ}\) & 779.0 & 611.6 & 796.3 & 870.3 & 753.7 \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|c|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of N & \(=48\) \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{P}\) & \(=30\) \\
S.E. of body of table &
\end{tabular}}} \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Cotton. \\ Site:- Govt. Cotton Res. Stn., Bulandshahr. \\ Ref :- U.'. \({ }^{\text {51(51). }}\) \\ Type:- ' \(M\) '.
}

Object:-To test the effect of pre-soaking Cotton seed in solutions on the yield and quality.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.6.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughed by desi and victory ploughs. (b) Sown behind the plough. I(c) \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) \(35 / 1\) (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. '(x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Pre-soaking of cotton seeds in solutions : \(S_{0}=\) Nil, \(S_{1}=A / S, S_{2}=\) Ammo. Phos., \(S_{8}=\) Cowdung, \(S_{8}=\) Boron solution and \(S_{6}=\) Mono Potassium Phosphate.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (b) \(32^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\). (v) 2 ' alround. (ví) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of cotton and plant no. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (C). Treatment \(S_{4}\) dropped for analysis dve to low yield.
-5. RESULTS:
(i) \(465.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(122.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of kapas in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(S_{0}\) & 410.5 \\
\(S_{\mathbf{z}}\) & 399.8 \\
\(S_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 5445 \\
\(S_{2}\) & 538.1 \\
\(S_{5}\) & 436.1 \\
S.E.Jmean & \(=61.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Cotton.
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :-U.P. 53(130).
Type:- ' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To find out the comparative efficiency of \(A / S\) and \(C / N\) on desi and American Cotton at different levels of N .

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Cotton-Pea-Green manuring-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) Green manuring. (ii) (a) Sandy loam.
(b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 23.5.1953. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings in May. (b) Sown behind the plough (c) N.A. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Desi \(35 / 1\) and American 216 F. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 harrowing, 2 weedings and 3 intercultures by cultivator and 1 thinning. (ix) 14.98". (x) 4 pickinga for desi and 3 for American Cotton.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control.
(1) 2 sources of \(N: S_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{8}-C / N\).
(2) 3 levels of \(N: N_{1}=30, N_{3}=60\) and \(N_{2}=90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

The treatments were applied to the two varieties dest \(35 / 1\) and American 216 F separately.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) 7 for each variety. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(38^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) ahound. fin) Separately done for each variety.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Mild attack of leaf roller. Assistance of plant protection staff was taken to control the pesth. (iii) Sapas yield and plant stand. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) Analysis of covasi ance technique was applied. Experiment conducted by E.B. (C).
5. RESULTS :

Variety 216 F.
(i) \(1322 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(137.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only control vs treated effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
Control & 997 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 1404 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & 1360 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{3}\) & 1377 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1288 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & 1447 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{3}\) & 1381 \\
S.E./mean & \(=55.97 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{lac}\).
\end{tabular}

Variety 35/1,
(i) \(1319 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(181.4 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(\mathbf{N}\) and control ws treated effects are highly significant while other effects are aot signifcant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline Control ., & 926 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 1269 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & 1415 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{\mathbf{3}} \mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 1342 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 1222 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & 1515 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2} \mathrm{~N}_{2}\) & 1544 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=74.04 \mathrm{lb}\). /ac. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Ref \(\mathbf{i - U . P} .52(270)\).
Type : "M"

Object :-To find the availability of N from \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) by addition of organic matter.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A, (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 31.5.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with desi and victory plough. (b) Sown behind plough. (c) \(12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) 35/1. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 intercultures with cultivator and digging. (ix) N.A. (x) 20.9.1952, 11 and 22.10.1952, 9,18 and 30.11.1952 and 5.12.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(A / S: A_{0}=0, A_{1}=2\) and \(A_{2}=4\) cots./ac.
(2) 3 levels of F.Y.M.: \(\mathrm{F}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~F}_{1}=2\) and \(\mathrm{F}_{2}=5\) ton/ac.

A/S top dressed on 31.5.1952 and F.Y.M. on 22.5.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(78^{\circ} \times 10^{\prime}\). (b) \(72^{\circ} \times 10^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Plant stand and cotton yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 389 lis./ac.
(ii) \(33.00 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only interaction \(\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{P}\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{A}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 355 & 361 & 306 & 341 \\
\(\mathbf{F}_{1}\) & 346 & 385 & 388 & 375 \\
\(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 388 & 326 & 649 & 454 \\
\hline Mean & 363 & 357 & 448 & 389
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal meas & \(=9.52 \mathrm{Ib} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E of body of table & \(=16.50 \mathrm{Jb}-\mathrm{Jac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Cotton.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :-U.P. 53(132).
Type:-‘'M'.

Object :-To find out the availability of N from \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) by addition of organic matter.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Cotton-Pea-G.M.-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) Green manuring. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 25.5 .1953 . (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with desi plough and 1 harrowing. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(16 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Desi cotion 35/1. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 weedings, 3 intercultures by cultivator and 1 thinning. (ix) \(14.98^{\circ}\). (x) 6 pickings from 27.9.1953 to 12.11.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(A / S:-A_{3}=0, A_{1}=2\) and \(A_{2}=4 \mathrm{cwt} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of compost : \(C_{0}=0, C_{1}=2\) and \(C_{2}=5\) ton/ac.

Compost applied on \(10.5 \cdot 1953\) and \(A / S\) top dressed on 14.8.1953.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact, in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(84^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\) (b) \(78^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\) (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) The crop was slightly affected by wilt. No control measures were taken. (iii) Kapas yield and plant stand. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted bv E.B.(C). As analysis of covaniance technique was applied only one S.E. has been given and marginal means have not been given.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(989 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(60.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) A effect is highly significant, \(\mathbf{C}\) effect is significant while interaction \(A \times C\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of kapas in lb./ac.


Av. S.E./mean (adjusted) \(\quad=30.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Cotton.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :-U.P. 52(272).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To find the availability of \(\mathbf{N}\) from A/S by addition of organic matter.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 9.6.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughed by victory and desi ploughs. (b) Sown behind plough. (c) \(12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) 100 F . (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 5 intercultures with cultivator, 2 weedings, 1 digging and 1 thinning. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 22.10.1952, 10, 23.11 .1952 and 11.12.1952.
2. TREATMENTS :-

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(A / S: \quad A_{0}=0, A_{1}=2\) and \(A_{2}=4 \mathrm{cwt} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of F.Y.M.: \(F_{0}=0, F_{1}=2\) and \(F_{a}=5\) ton/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(78^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(72^{\circ} \times 12^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Plant stand and cotton yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1955. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) Experiment was conducted by E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(483 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 93.80 lb ./ac.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccc|l} 
& \(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{A}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Mean } \\
\hline \(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 467 & 475 & 399 & 447 \\
\(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 615 & 577 & 456 & 549 \\
\(\mathbf{F}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 447 & 448 & 461 & 452 \\
\hline Mean & 510 & 500 & 439 & 483
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } \\ \text { S.E. of body of table } & \mathbf{- 2 7 . 0 8} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.}\end{array}\)

Crop :-Cotton.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :-U.P. 53(131).
Type : \({ }^{-}\)M'

Object :-To find out the availability of \(N\) from \(A / S\) by addition of organic matter.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Cotton-Pea_G.M.-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 24.5 .1953 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) 216 F. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 harrowing, 2 weedings, 2 intercultures and 1 thinning, (ix) \(14.98^{\prime \prime}\) (x) 10.10.1953 and 20.11.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2).
- (1) 3 levels of \(A / S: A_{0}=0, A_{1}=2\) and \(A_{2}=4 \mathrm{cwt} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 3 levels of compost : \(C_{0}=0, C_{1}=2\) and \(C_{2}=5 \mathrm{cwt}\)./ac.

Compost and A/S top dressed.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(84^{\circ} \times 16^{\circ}\). (b) \(78^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and 5 ' at each end of every plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) The crop had a mild attack of leaf roller. Assistance of plant protection staff was secured to control the pest. (iii) Kapas yield and plant stand. (vi) (a) 1952-1955. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (C). As analysis of covariance technique was applied only one S.E. has been given and marginal means have not been given.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1310 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(119.60 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only A effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(A_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{A}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{A}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline C \({ }_{0}\) & 1066 & 1333 & 1364 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) & 974 & 1437 & 1606 \\
\hline C & 977 & 1459 & 1523 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Cotton.}

Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.
Object :-To find the effect of different doses of N from \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\).

Ref :-U.P. 50(48).
Type : \(\boldsymbol{-}^{〔} \mathrm{M}^{\prime}\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 19.5.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughing once with victory plough and twice with desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) P. American (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 harrowing, 3 hoeings, 3 weedings and 1 thinning: (ix) \(17.63^{\circ}{ }^{\circ}\) (x) 8.10.1950, 24.11.1950 and 14.11.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

4 doses of \(N\) as \(C / N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=20, N_{2}=40\) and \(N_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
N applied on 20.9.1950.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N_A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(60^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}:\) (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Plant stand and cotton yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vi)) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(401.10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(64.18 \mathrm{lb} /\) /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\(\mathrm{N}_{6} \quad 371.8\)
\(\mathrm{N}_{1} \quad 432.8\)
\(\mathrm{N}_{8} \quad 423.9\)
\(\mathrm{N}_{8} \quad 375.7\)
S.E/mean \(\quad \quad 32.09 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
```

Crop:- Cotton.
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. SubuStn., Raya..

```

Ref :- U.P. 51(216).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To find the effect of manures as basal dose in combination with inorganic manures.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 96.1951 . (iv) (a) Once cultivated with victory plough and once with desi plough. (b) Sown behind plough. (c) \(12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1^{\prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) 100 F. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 harrowing, 1 hoeing and 1 thinning. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.10.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
2. 20 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\).
3. 40 lb /ac. of N as \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\).
4. \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\).
5. \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (b) \(76^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\) : (v) One row on either side and \(2^{\prime}\) at each end of every plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) kapas yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. ( (vii) Experiment conducted by R.B. (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 677 1b./ac.
(ii) \(44.18 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatments are highly significantly different.
(iv) Av. yield of kapas in lb./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
1. 551
2. 684
3. 777
4. 739
\(5 . \quad 633\)
S.E./mean \({ }^{-} \quad=18.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Cotton.
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref s- U.P. 53(129)
Type - \(\mathbf{M M}^{\mathbf{1}}\)

Object :-To find out the reaction of lime in addition to the application of \(A / S\) and \(C / N\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Cotton-Peas-G. M.-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) G. M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysif, Raya. (iii) 21.5.1953. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) American cotton 216 F. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 harrowing 1 weeding . with khurpi, 2 intercultures by cultivator and 1 thinning. (ix): 14.98". (x) 3 pickings on 8.10.1953, 29.10.1953 and 25.11.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 levels of lime : \(\mathrm{L}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{L}_{1}=300 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 5 levels of \(N: N_{0}=N\) o manure, \(N_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(N\) as \(A / S, N_{\mathbf{z}}=60 \mathrm{mb} / \mathrm{fac}\) of N as \(A / \mathrm{S}_{3} \mathrm{~N}_{3}=40\) lb -/ac. of N as \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{4}=60 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac. of N as \(\mathrm{C} / \mathrm{N}\).
Lime applied on 23.8.1953 and \(A / S, C / N\) applied on 30.8.1953.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2 \times 5\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 10. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(78^{\prime} \times 12^{\circ}\) : (b) \(72^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) One 10 w on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end of every plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) The crop had a mild attack of. leaf roller, assistance of plant protection stafl was secured to control the pest. (iji) Kapas yield and plant stand. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment conducted by E.B. (C). Analysis of covariance technique appried.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(984 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(828.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of kapas in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|ccccc|} 
& \(N_{0}\) & \(N_{1}\) & \(N_{3}\) & \(N_{8}\) & \(N_{6}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{L}_{0}\) & 933 & 986 & 978 & 903 & 996 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{1}\) & 911 & 1048 & 990 & 1052 & 1043 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Av. S.E./mean (adjusted) \(\quad=338.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop:- Cotton. \\ Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.
}

Ref :- U.P. 48(88).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To find out the effect of application of A/S at flowering of Cotton.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Barley. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 21, 27.5.1948. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by victory plough, 1 ploughing by desi plough and ploughed by cultivator. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) C-520 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 harrowings, 4 weedings and 1 thinining. (ix) \(28.48^{\prime \prime}\).(x) \(29,30.9 .1948,10,11,16,17,25.10 .1948\) and 8.11.1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. 40 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied at flowering time on 4.9.1948.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2 . (b) N.A. (iii) 20 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 80^{\prime}\). (b) \(32^{\prime} \times 74^{\prime}\). (v) 3 rows on either sido and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end of every plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of cotton. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Ni. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(790.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(117.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment difference is highly significant.
(iv) A v. yield of cotton in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 731.5 \\
2. & 850.4 \\
S.E./mean & \(=26.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Cotton.
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.
Ref :- U.P. 48(86).
Type:- 'M'.
Qbject:-To. study the effect of T.C. on Cotton .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 4.6.1948. (iv) (a) Ploughing by victory plough, ploughings with desi plough twice on 4.6.1948. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) 20 lb./ac. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) P. American (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 3 weedings, 2 harrowings, 1 thinning and 1 cultivation. (ix) 27.76. (x) 22.10.1948, 7.11.1948 and 23.11.1948.

\section*{2. \({ }^{\text {PTREATMENTS : }}\)}

4 doses of N as T.C. : \(\mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{1}=50, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=100\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=150 \mathrm{Jb}\)./ac.
Manures applied on 3.6.1948.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(60^{\prime} \times 18^{\circ}\). (b) \(54^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\). (v) 2 rows and \(3^{\prime}\) at each ead of plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of cotton. (iv) (a) 1945-1948. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 471.4 lb /ac.
(ii) \(133.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 361.8 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 393.1 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 564.9 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 565.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=54.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Cotton.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :-U.P. 49(13).
Type : \(=\mathbf{M}\).

Object :-To study the effect of Coconut cake on Cotton yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) G. M.-Wheat-Cotton-Peas. (b) Wheat. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis. Raya. (iii) 31.5.1949. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by desi plough, and 1 ploughing by victory plough (b) N.A. (c) 20 lb ./ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C 520 . (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Harrowing and weeding. (ix) 38.86'. (x) 4 pickings on 8, 17 and 29.10.1949 and 10.11.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

5 levels of \(N: N_{0}=0, N_{1}=25, N_{2}=50, N_{3}=75\) and \(N_{4}=100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
N as Coconut cake applied on 9.7.1949.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(34^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) 2 rows and \(3^{\prime \prime}\) al each end. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Plant stand and cotton yield. (iv) (a) to : (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. fri) Nito (vii) Experiment was conducted by E.B.(C).
3. RESULTS :
(i) \(493.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(101.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 399.1 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 486.6 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 493.8 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 559.7 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 527.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(-41.46 \mathrm{Ib} . /\) ec.
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Cotton. \\ Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.
}

Ref :-U.P. 50(269).
Type:- 'M'.
Object: - To study the effect of \(N\) on the incidence of Cotton leaf roller.
i. basal Condimons:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis; Raya. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) 100-F (early and P.American. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{e}}=\mathbf{0}, \mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}}=40\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(1 / 43\) acre. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) As under study. (iii) \% incidence. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Kalyanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K). Transformed back m:an percentages are given after applying bias correction.
5. RESULTS:

Variety : 100-F
(i) 29.09 degrees.
(ii) 7.221 degrees.
(iii) Treatment diflerences are highly significant.
(iv) Incidence observations.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed \\
back mean\%
\end{tabular} \\
& & 6.84 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 14.62 & 20.30 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 26.59 & 51.81 \\
\(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 46.05 & \\
S.E./mean \(=3.610\) degrees.
\end{tabular}

Variety : P. American
(i) 34.93 degrees.
(ii) 14.352 degrees.
(iii) Treatments are not significantly different
(iv) Incidence observations.

Treatment Mean angle Transformed
back mean\%
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{6}\) & 32.21 & 28.62 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 38.71 & 39.22 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 33.68 & 30.94 \\
\hline S.E. \(]\) & mean \(=\) & degrees \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Cotton.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Stn., Bulandshahr.

Ref :-U.P. 52(271).
Type :-'MV'.

Object :-To study the effect of different manurial solutions on Cotton yield.
1. BASAL CODITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A (iii) 5.6.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughed by desi and victory plough. - (b) Sown behind plough. (c) \(10 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. ' (vii) N.A. (viii) Thinning. (ix) and (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
8 different manures: \(M_{0}=\) No manure, \(M_{1}=A / S\) at \(2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{M}_{2}=\) Ammo. Phos. at \(1-2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}, \mathrm{M}_{8}=\) Cowdung at \(0.05 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}_{5} \mathrm{M}_{4}=\) Bora solution at \(4 \mathrm{oz} . / \mathrm{ac}\)., \(\mathrm{M}_{5}=\) Pot. Phos, at \(\mathbf{1 - 2 \mathrm { lb }} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{,} \mathrm{M}_{8}=\) Soaking in water for 3 hours and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{7}}=\) Mixture of ash, cowdung and \(A / S\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(V_{1}=35 / 1\) and \(V_{2}=100-F\).
Cowdung at 3 times the seed weight and ash equal to seed weight given to form mixture.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 8 main-plots/block and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(20^{\circ} \times 12\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and at each end. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Cotton yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Due to poor germination treatment \(M_{4}\) was dropped out from analysis. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(520 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(119.3 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(128.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of kapas in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & M \({ }_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{M s}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & M \({ }^{\text {b }}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{7}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 643 & 659 & 468 & 596 & 479 & 500 & 495 & 549 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 505 & 452 & 489 & 505 & 463 & 580 & 447 & . 492 \\
\hline Mean & 574 & 556 & 478 & 550 & 471 & 540 & 471 & 574 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
. . S.E. of difference between two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. M marginal means & \(=59.66 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(V\) marginal means & \(=34.27 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(V\) means at the same level of \(M\) & \\
4. \(M\) means at the same level of \(V\) & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Cotton (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref:-U:P. 50(267).
Type:-‘MV'.

Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathbf{N}\) on the incidence of Cotton leaf roller.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning and weeding etc. (ix) and (x) N.A:
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{P}\). American and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=100 \mathrm{~F}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0, \mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}=40\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{2}}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(78^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Percentage of incidence of cotton leaf roller. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 71.02 degrees.
(ii) 6.488 degrees.
(iii) Only N effect is highly significant.
(iv) Incidence of cotton leaf roller.

Mean angle
Transformed back mean percentages of incidence
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{0}\) & 60.86 & 58.04 & 59.45 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{1}\) & 72.81 & 75.49 & 74.15 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 76.77 & 82.20 & 79.48 \\
\hline Mean & 70.15 & 71.89 & 71.02
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{l|ll}
1 & \(V_{1}\) & \(V_{8}\) \\
\hline\(N_{0}\) & 76.04 & 71.78 \\
\(N_{1}\) & 90.89 & 93.26 \\
\(N_{1}\) & \(9+.35\) & 97.68
\end{tabular}
S.E. of V marginal mean
\(=1.873\) degree.
S.E. of N marginal mean \(\quad=2.294\) degree.
S.E. of body of table
\(=3.244\) degree.

\section*{Crop :- Cotton.}

Ref:- U.P. 52 (147).
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Stn., Bulandshahr.
-Type :- 'C’.
Object :- To study the effect on Cotton yield when taken after rabl crops.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.5.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughed by desi and victory plough. (b) Sown behind the desi plough. (c) \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (c) N.A. (v) No. (vi) \(35 / 1\) (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) Weedings, hoeing and thinning. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Cotton after wheat.
2. Cotton after barley.
3. Cotton after pea.
4. Cotton after lentil.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(32^{\circ} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(2^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Cotton yield and plant stand. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by R.B. (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1917 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\)
(ii) \(171.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & & Av. yield \\
1. & & 1874 \\
2. & & 1890 \\
3. & \(\ddots\) & 2002 \\
4. & 1901 \\
S.E./mean & \(=85.62 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Cotton.}

Ref:- U.P. 51(52).
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Stn., Bulandshahr. Type :- 'C'.
Object :-To study the effect on Cotton yield when taken after rabi crops.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) and (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.6.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Behind the plough. (c) \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart and plants \(11^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C. 520 (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) Thinning (ix)N.A. (x) Pickings on 26.9.1951, 5.10.1951, 16.10.1951 and 29.10.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Cotton after wheat in rabi.
2. Cotton after barley in rabi.
3. Cotton after pea in rabi.
4. Cotton after pea +barley in rabi.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(45^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(41^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and 2' at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Plant stand and cotton yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and
(b) No. (vi) Nil, (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(654.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 104.1 lb .ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of kapas in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 717.4 \\
2. & 694.9 \\
3. & 569.4 \\
4. & 636.8 \\
S.E./mean & \(=52.05 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
- Crop :-Cotton. \(\quad\) Ref:-U.P. 51(217).
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res.Stn., Bulandshahr. \(\quad\) Type :-'CM'.

Object:-To find out a method to increase the Cotton yield by the best combination of treatments and work out the economics.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown behind plough. (c) \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) 35/1. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control-no manure, one hand weeding and one bullock interculture.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{N}\) as \(A / S\) applied at early flowering, two hand weedings and two bullock intercultures during early growing period.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) \(12^{-}\)(iv) (a) \(78^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (b) \(72^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Coton yield: (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1006 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(115.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment difference is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in \(1 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
Treatment . Av, yield
\begin{tabular}{rrr}
1. & 862 \\
2. & 1150
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(\quad=56.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Cotton.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :-U.P. 48(87).
Type :-'CM'.

Object :-To study the effect on Cotton yield when taken after légeminous crops.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 7,8.6.48. (iv)
(a) 4 ploughings with victory plough. (b) Sown behind desi plough. (c) \(20 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) Rows \(11^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO.520 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) harrowings, 4 weedings and thinning. (ix) \(27.76^{\circ}\). (x) \(6,7,15\) and 23.10.1948 and 7.11.1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 rabi crops : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) wheat, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) gram, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) barley and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}=\) peas.
(2) 2 manures given to rabi crops : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=\) no manure and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

Sub-plot treatments :
2 manures given to cotton crop: \(N_{0}=n o\) manure and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\). of \(N\) as A/S.
A/S given on 4.9.1948 as top dressing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 8 main-plots/replication; 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(80^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\).
(b) \(70^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Two rows on either side and \(5^{\prime}\) at each end of every plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Plant stand and cotton yield. (iv) (a) 1946 to 1949. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS-:}
(i) \(448.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(188.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(61.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & 419.7 & 485.5 & 452.6 & 358.1 & 547.1 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 392.8 & 432.7 & 412.8 & 419.9 & 405.7 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R g}_{\mathbf{g}}\) & 423.4 & 435.4 & 429.4 & 476.2 & 382.6 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{4}\) & 504.9 & 493.9 & 499.4 & 556.0 & 442.8 \\
\hline Mean & 435.2 & 461.9 & 448.5 & 452.5 & 444.5 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 439.3 & 465.8 & & & \\
\hline \(P_{1}\) & 431.1 & 458.0 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 1. R marginal means & \(=66.53 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 2. \(P\) marginal means & \(=47.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 3. \(\mathbf{N}\) marginal means & \(=15.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 4. N means at the same level of \(\mathbf{R}\) & \(=30.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 5. \(N\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{P}\) & \(=21.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 6. \(\mathbf{R}\) means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\) & \(=69.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline 7. P means at the same level of \(\mathbf{N}\) & \(=49.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{P}\) table & \(=66.53 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Cotton.
Ref:- U.P. 49(179)/48(87).
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya,
Type:- 'CM'.
Object :-To study the effect on Cotton yield when taken after leguminous crops.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) As per treatments. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 6, 7.6.1949. (i:; (a) 3 ploughings with victory plough. (b) Behind the plough. (c) 20 lb ./ac. (d) Rows \(1 \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\prime}\) apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) CO-520 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One harrowing, 4 weedings and thinning. (ix) 38.86". (x) Pickings on 4, 5.10.1949, 14, 26, 27.10.1949, 11, 12, 23.11.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 rabi crops: \(\dot{R}_{1}=\) gram, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{g}}=\) wheat, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) peas and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}=\) - barley.
(2) 2 manures given to rabi crops : \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=\mathrm{no}\) manure and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{1}}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.

Sub-plot treatments :
2 manures given to cotton crop : \(N_{0}=n 0\) manure and \(N_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\), of \(N\) as \(A / S\).
A/S given on 26.8.1,49 as top dressing.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 8 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) \(4 . \%^{\prime}\) (iv) (a) \(80^{\circ} \times 18^{\circ}\). (b) \(70^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) Two rows on either side and \(5^{\prime}\) at each end ef every plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Plant number and yield of cotton. (iv) (a) 1946-1949. (b) Yes. '(c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(\quad 534.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(161.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(63.0 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{N}\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.

S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. \(R\) marginal means & & \(=57.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(P\) marginal means & \(=40.46 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(N\) marginal means & & \(=15.76 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. \(N\) means at the same level of \(R\) & & \(=31.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
5. \(R\) means at the same level of \(N\) & & \(=61.40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
6. \(N\) means at the same level of \(P\) & & \(=22.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
7. \(P\) means at the same level of \(N\) & & \(=43.42 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
S.E. of body of \(R \times P\) table & & \(=57.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Cotton.
> Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 5I(50). \\ Type :- ‘CM'.}

Object :-To find out a method to increase Cotton yield by the best combination of treatments and work out economics.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 9.6.1951. (iv) (a) Ploughed by victory plough once and twice by desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) \(35 / 1\) (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 1 harrowing, 1 cultivator, 1 Akola and 1 thinoing. (ix) \(16.63^{\circ}\). (x) 10.11.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control-no manure, one hand weeding and one bullock inter culture.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied at early flowering; 2 band weedings and 2 bullock inter cultures during early growing periods.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2 (b) N.A. (iii) 12 . (iv) (a) \(78^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (b) \(72^{\circ} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime} \times 2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of cotton and plant number. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B.(C). .
5. RESULTS:
(i) 819 lb./ac.
(ii) 95.60 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment difference is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Av. yeld & Av. yield \\
1. & 577 \\
2. & 1062 \\
S.E.E/mean & \(=27.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Cotton.
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref:-U.P. 52(148).
Type :-'CM'.

Object:-To find out a method to increase Cotton yield by the best combination of treatments and work out the economics.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 31.5.1952. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing with victory plough and 3 ploughings with desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) N.A. (d) Rows 2 ' apart. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) \(35 / 1\) (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings and 2 cultivators. (ix) N.A. (x) 7 pickings from 20.9.1952 to 5.12.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control-no manure, one hand weeding and one bullock interculture.
2. 60 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) applied at early stages of flowering, 2 hand weedings and 2 intercultures.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 12 . (iv) (a) \(78^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (b) \(72^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and \(3^{\prime}\) at each end of every plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Cotton yield and plant stand. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Expt. was conducted ry E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(384.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(92.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment difference is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\(\therefore\) Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 272.4 \\
2. & 496.6 \\
S.E./mean & \(=26.57 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Cotton.}

Ref :-U.P. 50(228).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Type : © ‘CMV’.
Object :-To study the effect of various cultural practices on the yield of Cotton.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam (b) N.A. (iii) 26.5.1950. (iv) (a) Field ploughed by cultivator.' (b) Sown by cotton planter in lines and broadcast. (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) As per treatments. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

Aill combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 cultural and manurial treatments : \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+2\) weedings +6 hoeings + spacing \(2^{\prime} \times 1_{1^{\prime}}\) : \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+2\) weedings +4 hoeings + spacing \(2^{\prime} \times 1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=\) No manure +2 !weedings +4 hoeings and broadcasting seed.
(2) 4 medium varieties: \(V_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathbf{C} 520, V_{\mathbf{2}}=35 / 1, V_{\mathbf{3}}=\) Perso American and \(V_{\mathbf{4}}=100 \mathrm{~F}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(78^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (v) ' N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Cotton yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(667.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(125.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Both V and C effects are highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{V} \times \mathrm{C}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(C_{1}\) & \(C_{2}\) & \(C_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 708.1 & 775.2 & 352.3 & 611.9 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 1302.2 & 1117.3 & 674.9 & 1031.5 \\
\hline \(V_{8}\) & 703.2 - & 631.8 & 345.5 & 560.2 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{4}\) & 568.5 & 500.8 & 334.8 & \(468.0{ }^{\circ}\) \\
\hline Mean & 820.5 & 756.3 & 426.9 & '667.9' \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(C\) S.E. of body of table}} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
=36.22 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\]} \\
\hline & & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(=31.37 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=62.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).}} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Cotton (Kharif).}

Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :- U.P. 50 (268).
Type :- 'CMV'.

Object:-To study the effect of manuring and interculture operations on Cotton varieties in controling the infection oi pests and diseases.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 28.5.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) As per treatments. (ix) and (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) Perso American and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=100\).F.
(2) 3 manurial and intercultural operations: \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=2\) weedings, \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+2\) weedings +2 hoeings, and \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+2\) weedings +4 hoeings.
3. DESIGN:.
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact: in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(78^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(72^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) \(3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of infected plants. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by-Ento (K). Transformed back mean percentage are given after applying bias correction.
4. RESULTS :
(i) 31.90 degrees.
(ii) 11.48 degrees.
(iii) Only C effect is significant.
(iv) Av, mean angles.

Transformed back mean percentages of infected plants.
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l|l|} 
& \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{i}}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 14.62 & 32.23 & 23.42 \\
\(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 28.24 & 36.42 & 32.33 \\
\(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 36.42 & 43.86 & 39.96 \\
\hline Mean & 29.64 & 34.17 & 31.90 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) & 6.84 & 28.62 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{2}\) & 22.68 & 35.40 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{3}\) & 51.83 & 31.24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of \(V\) marginal means
S.E. of C marginal means
S.E. of body of table
\(=3.364\) degree.
\(=4.058\) degree.
\(=5.739\) degree.

Crop:- Cotton.
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :- U.P. 50 (49).
Type :- ‘CMV'.

Object :-To work out the economics of optimum cultivation practices in relation to the out-turn of Kapas.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii; (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 28.5.1950. (iv) (a) 1 plough--ing with victory plough and 2 ploughings with desi plough. (b) Sjwn behind the plough. (c) 20 lb ./ac. (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\circ}\). (e) -. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings, 6 hoeings and 1 thinning. (ix) \(36.26^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 cultural and manurial treatments : \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+2\) weedings +6 hoeings + spacing \(2^{\prime} \times 1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\), \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+2\) weedings +4 hoeings +2 spacing \(\times 1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=\) No manure +2 weedings +4 hoeings and broadcasting of seed.
(2) 4 medium varieties: \(V_{1}=C .520, V_{2}=35 / 1, V_{3}=\) Perso American and \(V_{4}=100 . F\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(78^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime}\). (b) \(72^{\prime} \times 14^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ij) No. (iii) Plant stand and kopas yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Ni. (vii) Experiment was conducted by E.B. (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(805.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 159.4 lb ./ac.
(iii) Both \(V\) and \(C\) effects are highly significant while interaction is not signo...mano.
(iv) Av. yield of kapas in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(C_{1}\) & C & \(\mathrm{C}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 805.5 & 848.3 & 852.1 & 835.3 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 754.5 & 1011.7 & 1058:3 & 941.5 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 572.2 & 832.5 & 1022.2 & . 808.9 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{4}\) & 593.9 & 620.5 & 690.7 & 635.0 \\
\hline - Mean & 681.5 & 828.3* & 905.8. & 805.2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) & \(=45.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(C\) & \(=39.85 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=79.71 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Cotton (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm., Belatal.

Ref:-U.P. 53 3:3).
Type :-'D':

Object :-To study the effect of different control measures against the spotted bollworms of Cotton.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam: (b) N.A. (iii) 18.7.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) Nilr. (vi) 35/1. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) Oct. and Nov. 1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Dusting with 5\% D.D.T. (Guiesrol 405, 5\% D.D.T.)
2. Dusting with \(5 \%\) BHC. (Gammexane \(5 \%\) B.HC.)
3. Spraying with \(0.2 \%\) BHC. (Agrocide wett powder 5\% BHC.)
4. Spraying with 0.2\% D.D.T. (Guesrol 550, 5\% D.D.T.)
5. Removal of tops of seedlings from below the bored plants and destruction of insect within, followed by treatment.
6. Control.

Dust at 8 lb ./ac. Sprays at 20 gallons/ac. First application on 15.8.1953. Second application on 6.9.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) (a) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6 .
(b) N.A.
(iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(22^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (iv) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% incidence of pest before and after application of treatments. ( 20 plants were examined for each plot). (iv) (a) 1953-contd. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Invesse transformation has been done after applying bias correction. The experiment was conducted bye Ento (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean value & \begin{tabular}{c} 
\% incidence of pest on 26.9.1953/plot \\
(transformed back)
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 43.08 & 46.68 \\
2. & 43.09 & 46.70 \\
3. & 40.10 & 41.56 \\
4. & 42.12 & -45.03 \\
5. & 43.08 & 46.68 \\
6. & 44.03 & 48.32 \\
S.E./mean & \(2.058 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
& &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Cotton (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt. Cotion Res. Str., Bulandshahar \\ Ref: : U.P. 53(133). \\ Type :- 'D'.}

Object:-To fin out the effect of treating cotton seed with perenox upon the yield of \(35 / 1\) and 126 F Cotton varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Green manuring-Wheat - Cotton-Pea-Sanai. (b) Wheat. (c) Green manuring with sanai. (ii) (a) and (b) Loamy. (iii) 28.5 .1953 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown in lines behind the plough. (c) \(16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) \(2^{\prime} \times 1.5^{\prime}\) (c) 一. (v) Nil. (vi) \(35 / 1\) (desi) and 216 F (carly). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning done after one month of sowing. (ix) \(18.52^{\circ}\). (x) 5 pickings for \(35 / 1\) variety on \(25.9 .1953,4,11,23.10 .1953\) and 14.11.1953. and 3 pickings for 216F variety on \(\mathbf{1 2}\).10.1953 and 21.11.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Seed dressed with 1 part of Perenox to 300 parts of seed weight.
3. Seed dressed w.th 1 part of Perenox to 400 parts of seed weight.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(38^{\circ} \times 12^{\prime}\) (b) \(34^{\circ} \times 8^{\circ}\). (v) One row on either side and \(2^{\prime}\) at each end. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) N.A. (iii) Kapas yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (C).
5. RESULTS :

Variety : 35/1
(i) \(996 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(134.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 928 \\
2. & 1026 \\
3: & 1033 \\
S.E./mean & \(=55.06 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Variety 216F
(i) \(1218 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(121.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1193 \\
2. & 1204 \\
3. & 1258 \\
S.E./mean & \(=49.45 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. } 50(298) . \\
& \text { Type :- ‘D'. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object : - To study the effect of different control measures against Cotton leaf roller.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Perso American and 100 F. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2: TREATMENTS:}
1. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) D.D.T. suspension in water.
2. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) BHC. suspension.
3. Dusting with pyrodust 400.
4. Dusting with toxaphene dust.

Dust used at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and spray at 100 gallons/ac.; application in 1st week of September, 1950 for all treatments.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 3 for each variety. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(78^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) 50 plants were examined for leaf roller disease. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil (vi) Nil. (vii) The analysis has been done after transforming the data to \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) where \(p=\%\) of plants having, rolled leaves. Transformation has been done after applying bias correction. The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Variety : Perso American} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Variety 100 F} \\
\hline (i) to (iv) & & & (i) to (iv) & & \\
\hline Treatment & Mean angle per pot & \% of plants having rolled leaves (transformed back) & Treatment & Mean angle per plot & \% of plants having rolled leaves (transformed back) \\
\hline 1. & 73.71 & 91.68 & 1. & 74.67 & 92.57 \\
\hline 2. & 66.09 & 83.33 & 2. & 54.89 & 66.83 \\
\hline 3. & 65.96 & 83.07 & 3. & 7669 & 94.25 \\
\hline 4. & 71.69 & 90.70 & 4. & 84.52 & 98.61 \\
\hline G.M. & 69.36 & & G.M. & - 72.69 & \\
\hline S.E./me & 3.486 & - - & S.E./mean & 5.401 & \\
\hline Signific & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Net significant} & Significance & Significant & , \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop . Cotton (Kharif).
Ref :- U.P. 49(216).
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub. Stn., Raya. Type :- 'D'.
Object:-To study the effect of different control measures against the Cotton leaf roller.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 19.5.1949. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Perso American (early). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 2nd pi_king on 9.11.1949.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Hand picking of rolled leaves.
2. Dusting with sodium fluosilicate.
3. Dusting with \(5 \%\) benzene-hexachloride dust.
4. Dusting with 5\% D.D.T. dust.
5. Control.

Insecticides dusted at \(80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). in last week of August and first week of October.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A.
b) \(36^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}-3^{\circ}\). (v) \(4^{\prime}\) all round the plot.
(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Yield and number of plants. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. . (v) (a) No. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(322 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(90.19 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of cotton in \(\mathrm{lb}_{\mathrm{b}} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yleld \\
1. & 374 \\
2. & 255 \\
3. & 328 \\
4. & 368 \\
S. & 283 \\
S.E./mean & \(=36.82 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Cotton (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref: I-U.P. 50(266). Type :- \({ }^{-} D^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of different control measures against Cotton leaf rolier.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 19 and 21.5 .1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.10.1950, \(\mathbf{1 0 . 1 1 . 1 9 5 0}\) and 13.12.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Hand picking of rolled leaves and destruction of larvae and pupae inside the leaves.
2. Dusting with sodium fluosilicate in the ratio of \(1: 8\) to ash.
3. Dusting with gammexane.
44. Dusting with (guesrol 405) 5\% D.D.T. dust.
5. Spraying with (guesrol 550) 0.5\% D.D.T.
6. - Control.

Dusted at 50 lb ./ac. and suspension liquid at 100 gallon per acre once in last week of August.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b, N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. '(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Percentage of plants having rolled leaves, one week and one month after application ftreatments. (iv) (a) \(1949-1950\) (modified this year). (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) and then analysed. The experiment was conducted by tato(K).
5. RESULTS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{(i) to (iv) \% of rolled leaves one week after application} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{(iv) to (iv) \(\%\) of rolled leaves one month after application.} \\
\hline Treatment \({ }^{\text { }}\) & Mean angle & Mean \% of rolled leaves (transformed back) & Mean angle & Mean \% of
rolled leaves
(transformed back). \\
\hline 1 & 14.92 & 7.03 & 11.04 & 4.11 \\
\hline 2. & 2588 & 19.36 & 16.23 & 8.23 \\
\hline 3. & 19.18 & 11.19 & 11.64 & 4.53 \\
\hline 4. & 13.51 & 5.94 & 8.53 & 2.68 \\
\hline 5. & 1233 & 5.01 & 4.09 & 1.00 \\
\hline 6. & . 53 & 0.88 & 0.96 & 0.53 \\
\hline G.M. & 14.89 & & 8.75 & \\
\hline S.E./mean & 2.379 & & 2.146 & \\
\hline Significance & Highly, sig & ant & Highly sign & \\
\hline
\end{tabular} -

\author{
Crop :-Cotton (Kharif). \\ Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.
}
Ref :-U.P. 53(312).
Type: ©'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of different control measures against the spotted boll worms of Cotton.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Wheat or Rabi crop-Cotton. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 20.5.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Perso American and 216 F. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) October and November, 1953.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS:}
1. Dusting with 5\% D.D.T. (guesrol 405, 5\% D.D.T.).
2. Dusting with \(5 \%\) BHC. (gammexane D.O. \(25,5 \%\) BHC.).
3. Spraying with \(2 \%\) BHC. (agrocide wettable powder, \(50 \%\) BHC.).
4. Spraying with \(0.2 \%\) (guesral \(550,50 \%\) D.D.T.).
5. Removal of tops of seedlings from below the bored plant and destruction of insect within, followed by a ireatment.
6. Control.

Dust at \(8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and sprays at 20 gallons/ac ; first application on 9.8.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a).6. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 27.2^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% incidence of pest before and 10 days after application. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Bias correction has been applied while transforming back the means. The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) where p is the \(\%\) incidence and then analysed. The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) to (iv) \% incidence 10 days after 1 st application.
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & \begin{tabular}{c} 
\% incidence of pest \\
(transformed back)
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 44.04 & 48.34 \\
2. & 43.07 & 46.66 \\
3. & 43.08 & 46.68 \\
4. & 36.66 & 35.79 \\
5. & 42.12 & 45.03 \\
6. & 49.32 & 57.45 \\
G.M. & 43.05 & \\
S.E./mean & 1.364 & \\
Significance & \\
\end{tabular}
```

, Crop :- Cotton (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Cotton Rés. Sub-Stn., Raya.

```

Ref :- U.P. 53(135).
. Type:-"D'.

Object :-To find out the effect of treating Cotton seed with Perenox on its yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Cotton-Pea-G.M.-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) G.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 9.6.1953. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Sown behind plough. (c) N.A. (d) Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart ; plant to plant 11 \({ }^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) 216 F and \(35 / 1\) (desi cotton). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Harrowing, 3 weedings and hoeing. (ix) 14.98". (x) Picking dates for \(216 \mathrm{~F}: \mathbf{1 6 . 1 0 . 1 9 5 3 , 9 . 1 1 . 1 9 5 3}\) and 24.11.1953. Picking dates for 35/1:1.10.1953, 16.10.19:3, 24.10.1953, 9.11.1953 and 24:11.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Seed dressed with 1 part of Perenox to 300 parts of seed by weight.
3. Seed dressed with 1 part of Perenox to 400 parts of seed by weight.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6 . (iv) (a) \(74^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(66^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) One row on either side and 4 ft. at each end of every plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Fair. (ii) Attack of leaf roller on 216 F plots only. (iii) Yield of kapest. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Cotton Research Station, Bulandshahar. (vi) Nil (vii) The expesiment was conducted by E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS:

Variety : \(\mathbf{2 1 6} \mathbf{F}\)
(i) \(581.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(68.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av, yield of kapas in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 575.8 \\
2. & 599.9 \\
3. & 567.7 \\
S.e./mean & \(=27.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Variety : 35/1} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{(i) \(477.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{(ii) \(86.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{(iv) Av. yield of kapas in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline Treatment & Ave yield & \\
\hline 1. & 454.7 & \\
\hline 2. & 477.4 & \\
\hline 3. & 501.1 & \\
\hline S.E./mean & - 35.41 lb & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Tobacco.
Site :- College Farm, B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P. 53(385).
Type:- ' \({ }^{\prime}\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of single and split application of \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) on growth, yield and quality of Tobacco.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONs:}
(i) (a) Nil, (b) Fa.1.w (c) Nil. (ii) (a Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Ploughed with victory plough, twice with Meston plough and twice with desi plough and planking. (b) Transplanting. (c) 一. (d) Between rows \(2 \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\); between plants \(2^{\prime}\). (e) 2 seedlings/hole ; 1 seedling/hole. (v) A mixture of 1 lb . triple Super and 1 lb . Pot. Sul. par plot. (vi) I.P. 58 (Improved chewing and hooka type). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning, topping and suckering. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of ' 1 l and (2) + a control.
(1) 3 doses of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{1}=30, N_{2}=60\) and \(N_{3}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 applications of doses: \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) single dose, \(\mathrm{F}_{2}=1\) dose at transplanting +1 dose 2 'months after transplanting and \(\mathrm{F}_{\mathbf{z}}=\frac{1}{\ddagger}\) dose at transplanting \(+\frac{1}{\mathbf{1}}\) dose 2 months after transplanting.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) iO. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 22.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 17.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (i) N.A (iii) Fresh and dry weight of plant, no. of leaves, ht. of plant etc. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(771.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(15.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Effect of \(V\) and control \(y s\). treated are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of tobacco in Ib./ac.

Control \(=631.4 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{F}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{F}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{F}_{5}\) & Mean \\
\hline 1 & 720.5 & 722.5 & 715.4 & 719.5 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 7905 & 794.2 & 785.4 & 793.0 \\
\hline 18 & 850.6 & 861.2 & 840.4 & 850.7 \\
\hline Mean & 787.2 & 792.6 & 780.4 & 786.7 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of tab e} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& =4.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =7.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:- Jute (Kharif).}

Ref :- U.P. 51(298).
Site :- Jute Exptl. and Demon. Farm, Gograghat. - Type :- ‘C’.
Object:-To compare different methods of sowing Jute.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
- (i) (a) and (b) Nil. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.3.1951. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) Plant to plant distance \(=3^{\circ}\) and between rows as per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) and (vii) N.A. (viii) Weeding. (ix) \(10.68^{\prime \prime}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

4 methods of sowing:
1. Sowing by broadcasting.
2. Sowing at a distance of \(1^{\prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\) line by line.
3. Sowing at a distance of \(1^{\prime}-6^{\prime \prime}\) line by line.
4. Sowing at a distance of \(1^{\prime}-0^{\circ}\) line by line.

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4 . (b) \(175^{\prime} \times 10^{\circ}\). (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 10^{\circ}\). (b) \(1 / 144\) ac. (v) Distance between plots\(3^{\prime}\), and distance between blocks- \(3^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Wt. of green jute plant, wt. of wet fibre and wt. of dry fibre. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experıment was conducted by J.D.O.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1564 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(703.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of dry fibre in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1606 \\
2. & 1509 \\
3. & 1699 \\
4. & 1444 \\
& S.E./mean \\
& \(=351.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Jute (Kharif). . . Ref:- U.P. 51(299).
Site :-Jute Exptl. and Demon. Farm, Gograghat. Type - 'C'.
Object:-To compare different methods of sowing Jute.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) N.A. . (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 19.3.1851. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (d) Plant to plant distance \(=3^{\prime}-4^{\circ}\) ard distance between lines as per treatments. (c) N.A. (v) to (vii) N.A. (viii) Weeding. (ix) \(10.68^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

3 m . thods of sowing
1. Sowing by broadcasting and pata.
2. Sowing in lines at a distance of \(6^{\circ}\) apart and pata.
3. Sowing in lines at a distance of \(1^{\prime}\) apart and pafa.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) \(135^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (b) \(1 / 60.5 \mathrm{ac}\). (v) Distance between. blocks \(=3^{\prime}\) and distance between plots \(=2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Wt. of green jute plant, wt. of wet fibre and wt. of dry fibro. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by J.D.O.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1248 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(393.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of dry fibre in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 931 \\
2. & 1598 \\
3. & 1213 \\
S.E./mean & \(=196.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Jute (Kharif).
Ref :-U.P. 52(341),
Site :- Jute Exptl. and Demon. Farm, Gograghat. Type :-‘C’.

```

Object :-To compare different seed rates.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.7.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) D-154. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(15.50^{\prime \prime}\) ( (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

3 seed rates : \(S_{2}=3, S_{2}=4\) and \(S_{8}=41\) seer/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (b) \(1 / 60.3 \mathrm{ac}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Wt. of green jute plant, wt. of wet fibre, and wt. of dry fibre. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by J.D.O.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(821.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(401.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av: yield of dry fibre in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 368.3 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1184.2 \\
\(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{9 1 2 . 9}\) \\
S.E./mean & \(=\mathbf{2 0 0 . 8} \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{lll}
\text { Crop :- Groundnut (Kharif). } & \ddots & \text { Ref :- U.P. 53(28). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. } & \therefore \quad \text { Type :- 'CV'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To find out the best time of harvesting different varieties of Groundnut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari and gram. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1953. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) 13.375". (x) As per treatments.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations (1) and (2)
(1) 4 dates of harvesting: \(D_{1}=9.10 .1953, D_{2}=19.10 .1953, D_{3}=29.10 .1953\) and \(D_{4}=9.11 .1953\).
(2) 4 varieties : \(V_{1}=\) R.B. 1 (early), \(V_{2}=\) T.M.V. 2 (early), \(V_{3}=\) A.K. \(12-24\) (early) and \(V_{4}=T .19\) (late).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 19 \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL .
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) \% of germination, growth, \(50 \%\) flowering date, yield, weight of two parts in gra.z no. of kernels in 100 parts, wts of kernels in gm., kernel size, \(\%\) of oil content, free fatty acids and wt. O. unhealthy kernel and their \%. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.(O).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(203.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 101.9 lb ./ac.
(iii) V effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pod in 16 ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{c|cccc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 161.2 & 176.7 & 83.7 & 96.1 & 129.4 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 139.5 & 136.4 & 167.4 & 133.3 & 144.2 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 158.1 & 130.2 & 89.9 & 117.8 & 124.0 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 430.9 & 471.2 & 362.7 & 406.1 & 417.7 \\
\hline Mean & 222.4 & 228.6 & 175.9 & 188.3. & 203.8
\end{tabular}
S.E. of any marginal mean
S.E. of body of table
\(=29.43 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=58.87 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Groundnut (Kharif).
Site :- Govt Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(27).
Type :- ‘CV'.

Object:- To find out the best seed rate and spacing for different varieties of Groundnut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari and gram. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.7.1953. (iv) (a) and (b)
N.A. (c) and (d) As per treatments. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii)
N.A. (ix) \(13.375^{\prime \prime}\). ( \(x\) ) N,A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
2 spacings between rows : \(S_{3}=1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\) and \(S_{2}=2^{\prime}\).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{L}}=\mathrm{T}-25\) (late) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{EC} 1699\).
(2) 3 seed rates : \(R_{1}=40, R_{2}=60\) and \(R_{i}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 2 main-plots/block and 6 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(46^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) \% germination, growth, \(50 \%\) flowering date and groundnut yield. (iv) (a) \(1953-\) N.A.
(b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (O).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(238.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(24.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(87.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(V\) and \(R\) effect and interaction \(V \times R\) are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pod in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{1}\) & - Mean & \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) \\
\hline R1 & 209.6 & 143.8 & 176.7 & 255.2 & 98.2 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{R}_{2}\) & 224.5 & 259.5 & 242.0 & 229.7 & 254.3 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R g}_{8}\) & 297.3 & 294.6 & 295.9 & 356.0 & 235.9 \\
\hline Mean & 243.8 & 232.6 & 238.2 & & - \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 291.7 & 268.9 & 280.3 & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 195.8 & 196.4 & 196.1 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{S.E. of difference of two}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. \(S\) marginal means & \(=8.21 \ldots . . .\). \\
2. \(V\) marginal means & \(=29.12 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(R\) marginal means & \(=35.66 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. \(V\) means at a level of \(S\) & \(=41.18 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). \\
S. \(S\) means at a level of \(V\) & \(=30.27 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
6. \(R\) means at a level of \(S\) & \(=50.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
7. \(S\) means at a level of \(R\) & \(=42.01 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
& S.E. of body of \(V \times R\) table
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Groundnut (Kharif). \\ Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}
Ref:- U.P. 52(250).
Type:- 'CV'.

Object :-To find out the best time of harvesting different varieties of Groundnut.
1. BASAL, CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) As per treatments.

2 TREATMENTS:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 dates of harvesting: \(D_{1}=12,13.10 .1952, D_{2}=21,22.10 .1952, D_{3}=28,2910.1953\) and \(D_{4}=4\), 5.11.1952.
(2) 4 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) T. 19 (late), \(V_{2}=\) T.M.V-2 (late), \(V_{3}=\) R.B. 1 (late) and \(V_{4}=\) A.K. 12-24 (late).
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(4 \times 4\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(24^{\prime} \times 50^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL.:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, growth, flowering and yield of pods. (iv) (a) 1952-N.A. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Data considered only for two replications because in one replication pig destroyed many plots. The original plot-wise data was not available, the analysis and the average yield has been given by research station. The experiment was conducted by E.B. (O).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1132 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(176.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Ar. yield of pod in lb./ac.


Crop:-Groundnut (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:-U.P. 50(250).
Type :-'D'.

Object:-To test the efficacy of various seed treatments on germination and stand of Groundnut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.6.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Local. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Agrosan G.N.
2. Ceresan.
3. Copper carbonate.
4. Spergon (dust).
5. Spergon (wettable).
6. .Phygonel.
7. Control.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) and (b) 2 rows/plot. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) \% of germination. (iv) \(1950-1952\). (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P. Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction. The yield data could not be taken due to damage by Porcupines:
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & \% germination (transformed back) \\
1. & 62.48 & 78.41 \\
2. & 56.17 & 68.81 \\
3. & 54.78 & 66.53 \\
4. & 58.44 & 72.37 \\
5. & 54.84 & 66.63 \\
6. & 47.06 & 53.56 \\
7. & 51.20 & 60.59 \\
S.E./mean & 55.00 & \\
Significane & Significant & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Groundnut (Kharif). - Ref :-U.P. 51(244). ,
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. Type :-‘D'.
Object :-To test the efficacy of various seed dressings on germination and stand of Groundnut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (iii) 8.6.1951. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 500 seeds/treatmen (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-25. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Agrosan G.N.
5. Phygon.
2. Ceresan.
6. Tillex.
3. Spergon.
7. Copper carbonate.
4. Spergon (wettable).
8. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) 4 rows/plot. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (ii) \% germination. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P. The data has been converted in \(\operatorname{Sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) and then enalysed.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 65.42 degrees.
(ii) 4.933 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) \% germination.

Treatment' Mean angle transformed back
Treatment Mean angle transformed back
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
& & mean \(\%\) \\
5. & 61.06 & 76.33 \\
6. & 69.42 & 87.22 \\
7. & 64.82 & 81.58 \\
8. & 60.33 & 75.25
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Groundnut (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 52(292).
Type :-'D'.

Object :-To test the efficacy of various seed treatments in germination, stand and yield of Groundnut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 22.7.1952. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vi) T. 25 for 1st expt. and T. 27 for 2nd expt. (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Tritisap 1: 30 dosage.
3. Agrosan G.ìN. \(1: 30\) dosage.
4. Ceresan 1: 30 dosage.
5. Tillex \(1: 30\) dosage.
6. Spergon \(1: 30\) dosage.
7. Hevasan is \(\mathbf{3 0}\) dosage.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 for 1 st expt. and 2 for 2 nd expt. (iv) (a) and (b) 1 st expt.-single row of \(40^{\prime}\) and 2 nd expt.-single row of \(80^{\circ}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Percentage of germination. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Mil. (vii) Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction. The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analyeed. The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{1st expt. : (i) to (iv)} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{2nd expt. : (i) to (iv)} \\
\hline , Treatment & Mean angle in degrees & Mean \%transformed back & Treatment & \begin{tabular}{l}
Mean angle \\
in degrees
\end{tabular} & Mean \%transformed back \\
\hline 1. & 48.23 & 55.54 & 1. & 37.38 & 38.03 \\
\hline 2. & 44.40 & 49.01 & 2. & 41.48 & 43.96 \\
\hline 3. & 36.25 & 35.17 & 3. & 35.59 & 34.06 \\
\hline 4. & 37.32 & 36.83 & 4. & 38.05 & 38.12 \\
\hline 5. & 49.42 & - 57.62 & 5. & 45.58 & 50.99 \\
\hline 6. & 47.66 & 54.55 & 6. & 44.42 & 49.01 \\
\hline 7. & 46.05 & 51.77 & 7. & 43.26 & 47.03 \\
\hline G.M. & 44.19 & & G.M. & 40.82 & \\
\hline S.E./mean & 4.036 & & S.E./mean & 3.998 & \\
\hline Significance & N.S. & & Significance & N.S. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :-Groundnut.
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

```

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 50(251). \\ Type :-‘D'.}

Object :-To study the efficacy of sulphur dusting at different intervals in controlling leaf spots of Groundnut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.6.1950. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T. 27 (late) and T. 31 (early). (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. 7 sulphur dustings at an interval of 7 days.
2. 5 sulphur dustings at an interval of 10 days.
3. 3 sulphur dustings at an interval of 15 days.
4. Control (no dusting).

Sulphur dusting from 20.8 .1950 at the rate of \(30 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Leaf spot-as per treatments. (iii) \% of áffected leaves and pod yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nif. (vii) Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction. The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } / p\) and then analysed. The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Variety T. 27 : (i) to (iv)} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Variety T. 31 : (i) to (iv)} \\
\hline Treatment & Mean angle in degrees & Mean \%transformed back & Treatment & \begin{tabular}{l}
Mean angle \\
in degrees
\end{tabular} & Mean \%transformed back \\
\hline 1. & 55.02 & 66.93 & 1. & 52.58 & 62.97 \\
\hline 2. & 43.85 & 48.12 & 2. & 60.04 & 74.84 \\
\hline 3. & 53.75 & 64.85 & 3. & 59.86 & 74.55 \\
\hline 4. & 66.88 & 84.32 & 4. & 70.18 & 88.12 \\
\hline G.M. & 54.88 & & G.M. & 6066 & \\
\hline S.E./mean & 3.423 & & S.E./mean & 2.926 & \\
\hline Significance & Significant & & Significance & N.S. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Groundnut (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. \(51(241)\).
Type :- 'D'.

Object:-To study the efficacy of sulphur dusting at different intervals in controlling leaf spots of Groundnut.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27 and 28.6.1951. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T. 25 (late) T. 31 and B. 1 (early). (vii) to (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. No dusting (control).
2. 5 sulphur dustings at an interval of 10 days.
3. 4 sulphur dustings at an interval of 15 days.

Sulphur dusting started on 29.8 .1951 at the rate of 16 lb /ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Leaf spot-2s per treatment. (iii) \(\%\) of diseased área in a leaf and groundnut yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by P.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}

Groundnut late variety (Kharif)
(i) \(2113 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(357.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pod in 1 lb /ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1750 \\
2. & 2506 \\
3. & 2128 \\
S.e./mean & \(=160.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Groundnut early varietiy (kharif).
(i) \(1171 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(494.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pod in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1400 \\
2. & 840 \\
3. & 1274 \\
S.E./mean & \(=221.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Groundnut (Kharif). & Ref:- U.P. 52(293). \\
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To test the efficacy of sulphur dusting at different intervals in controlling the leaf spots of Groundnut.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 8.7.1952. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T. 25 (late) (vii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. Sulphur dusting at an interval of 10 days.
3. Sulphur dusting at an interval of 15 days.
4. Copper sandoz dust ( \(7 \frac{1}{2}\) metallic copper) at an interval of 15 days.

Date of 1st dusting 7.10.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Leaf spot-as per treatments. (iii) Groundnut yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1953\). (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1158 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) :
(ii) \(494.6 \mathrm{Jb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pod in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1132 \\
2. & 1038 \\
3. & 1400 \\
4. & 1062 \\
S.E./mean & \(=20.19 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Groundnut (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Object:-To test the efficiency of sulphur dusting at different intervals in controlling leaf spots of Groundnut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.7.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings. (b) N.A: (c) N.A. (d) 9 rows in a plot and distance between plots \(6^{\circ}\). (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) T-25 (late). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) One weeding done. (ix) 33.28". (x) 12.11.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control
2. Dusting at the interval of 10 days.
3. Dusting at the interval of 15 days.

Dusting done at the rate of \(16 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\). of sulphur mixed with finer powdered dust.'
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes. :
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Badly damaged by pocupines. Sulphur dusting as per treatments. (iii) \% leaf affected and yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a).No. (b) N.A. (vi) The disease appeared in mild form and therefore only two dustings were given. There was heavy rainfall just after sowing which affected germination of seed in general. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.(G).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(233.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(139.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pods in lb./ac.


Crop :-Groundnut (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 50(252).
Type : \({ }^{-}\)D'.

Object :-To determine the efficacy of various fungicide sprays in controlling leaf spots of Groundnut.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 28.6 .1950 . (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A.
(vi) T-27 (late) ; T-31 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Bordeaux mixture + linseed oil.
2. Perenox ( 4.5 ozs. in \(\mathbf{1 0}\) gallons)+linseed oil.
3. Dilhan Z.78+linseed oil.
4. Dilhan D-14+linseed oil.
5. Control.

Number of sprays-3. Interval between sprays 15 days. First spraying on 21:8.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yés.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of leaf spots-as per treatments. (iii) Percentages of affected pods. (iv) (a) 19501951. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Transformed back-mean percentages are given after applying the bias correction. The data has been converted into \(\sin 1-\sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) and then analysed. The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS:

Variety T-27 : (i) to (iv) Variety T-31 : (i) to (iv)
Treatment Mean angle mean \% Treatment Mean angle mean\%-
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\author{
Crop :-Groundnut (Kharif). \\ Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
}

Ref :-U.P. 51(245).
Type :-'D'.

Object:-To dètermine the efficacy of various copper fungicidal sprays in controlling leaf spots of Groundnut.
1. basal CONDITIONS
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 28.6.1951. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) T-25 (late), T. 31 and RB1 (early) maturing variety. (vii) to ( \(x\) ) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control (no spraying).
2. Bordeaux mixture \((2: 2: 5)+\) linseed oil as sticker.
3. Perenox \(0.15 \%+\) linseed oil.
4. Cupravite \(0.15 \%+\) linseed oil.

Spraying done at an interval of 15 days. Number of spraying is 4. 1st spraying on 4.9.1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 4.
(b) N.A. (iii) 4.
(iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(10^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Groundnut yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1951. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P. As exact percentage of disease was not given replication-wise only yield data was analysed.
5. RESULTS:

Variety T-25:
(i) \(2770 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(355.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pods in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2398 \\
2. & 2730 \\
3. & 2853 \\
4. & 3098 \\
S.E./mean & \(=177.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Treatment Av. yie


(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of pods in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av.yield \\
1. & 1453 \\
2. & 1085 \\
3. & 1400 \\
4. & 1348 \\
S.E./mean & \(=278.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Castor.
Ref :-U.P. 53(29).
Type :-‘'C’.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Object :-To' see the effect of time of sowing and spacing on the growth of Castor.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Chari and gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 144 seeds or \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) chk/plot. (d) As per treatments. (e) 2 seeds/hole. (v) Nil. (vi) T-3 (late). (vii). Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(13.3^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=7.7 .1953, D_{2}=7.8 .1953, D_{3}=12.9 .1953\) and \(D_{4}=1\) st week of October.
Sub-plot treatrents :
3 spacings : \(S_{1}=3^{\prime}-2^{\prime \prime}, S_{2}=3^{\prime \prime}-3^{\prime \prime}\) and \(S_{3}=3^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(12 \times 24\). (b) \(6^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime} .^{\prime}\) (v) \(3^{\prime}\) along breadth only. (vi) No.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Attack of alternaria. (iii) No. of plants, flowering \%, growth, disease and pest incidences, ht. of plants and length of spikes, maturity and yield. (iv) (a) 1953-N.A. (b) No (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B.O.
5. ReSULTS:
(i) \(459.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(250.9 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(135.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{D}\) effect is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of castor in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{3}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 813.0 & 554.3 & 627.3 & 664.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 520.3 & 535.0 & 617.5 & 557.6 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 413.3 & 310.8 & - 340.7 & 354.9 \\
\hline D \({ }_{4}\) & 287.0 & 277.2 & 218.6 & 260.9 \\
\hline Mean & 508.4 & 419.3 & 451.0 & 459.6 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of the difference of two
1. D marginal means
\(=102.4 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(S\) marginal means \(=47.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. \(S\) means at the same level of \(D\)
\(=95.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
4. D means at the same level of \(S\) \(=128.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Linseed (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 52(246)/51(190).
Site :- Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur. Type :- 'MV'.
Object :-To study the effect of different organic and inorganic manures on Linseed.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 18.10.1952. (iv) (a) Two deep ploughings by victory plough and the stubble removed with a chain harrow and 3 ploughings by country plough. (b) Sown in rows. (c) N.A. (d) Rows 1' apart. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatmentis. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) 2.34". (x) 20.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\mathrm{T}-1193-2\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{T}-477-3 / 2\) (late).
(2) 7 applications of manures : \(M_{0}=\) no manure, \(M_{2}=\) F.Y.M., \(M_{2}=\) G.N.C., \(M_{2}=\) Blood manure, \(M_{4}=\) \(A / S, M_{5}=\) Super and \(M_{6}=\) Pot. Sul.
Amount of manure applied-N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(7 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 14. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(34^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 18^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) all round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor germination. (ii) N.A. (iii) Flowering, maturity of crop, height of plant, no. of basal branches/ plot, no. of seed bell and yield of linseed. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. The experiment was cancelled in 1951. (b) Yes. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C. (K). Original data were not available, only summary and the analysis were available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1001 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(129.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Loth M and V effects are highly sisnificant.
(iv) Av. yield of liaseed in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{0}\) & 900 & \(V_{1}\) & 1081 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & 1062 & \(\mathrm{V}_{8}\) & 921 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & 946 & S.E./mean \(=\) & \(24.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & 1120 & & \\
\hline M & 1181 & - & \\
\hline M6 & 857 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{6}\) & 942 & . & \\
\hline S.E./mean = & \(45.82 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Til (Kharif).
Ref:- U.P. 49(56).
Type :- 'CV'.

```
Object:-To study the effect of different sowing dates on different Til varieties.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil.- (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) 4 thinnings. (ix) N.A. (x) 23,27.9.1949 and 3 to 13.10.1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments:
4 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=16.6 .1949, D_{2}=27.6 .1949, D_{3}=8.7 .1949\) and \(D_{4}=18.7 .1949\).
Sub-plot treatments:
4 varieties: \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=\mathrm{T}-10\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{T}-11\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathrm{T}-17\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{4}=\) Kalyanpur local (mid-early). \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{4}}\) was not included in analysis as germination was very poor.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/blozk and 4 sub-plots/main-plot.- (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(15^{\circ} \times 53^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not satisfactory. (ii) Attack of phyllody and wilt.: (iii) Yield of til. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Soon after 4th sowing, there were very heavy and continuous rains, hence there was practically no germination. The plots were resown on 7 August to see if very late sowing proves successful but again the germination was poor and the growth was far from normal. So 4th sowing was neglected from analysis. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (O).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
\(\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } & 130.4 & \text { lb./ac. }\end{array}\)
(ii) (a) \(78.37 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(38.32 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(V\) effect and interaction \(D \times V\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of til in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 169.1 & 119.8 & 31.3 & 172.6 & 132.2 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 191.1 & 210.5 & 106.5 & 121.1 & 157.3 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{i}}\) & 170.4 & 98.6 & 69.1 - & 104.8 & 110.7 \\
\hline Mean & 176.9 & 143.0 & 69.0 & 132.8 & 130.4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. D marginal means & \(=27.71 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(V\) maginal means & \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \\
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\) & \\
& \(=27.64 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
&
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Til (Kharif).}

Site :- Govt. Res, Farm, Kanpur.
Object:-To study the effect of different sowing dates on Til varieties.
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Ref :- U.P. 50(46). } \\
& \text { Type :- 'CV'. }
\end{aligned}
\]
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatmants. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 150 oz/plot. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) No. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) N.A. (viii) 3 thinnings and 3 weedings. (ix) N.A. (x) \(D_{1}-18\) and 20.9 .1950 and \(9.10 .1950, D_{2}-30.9 .1950, D_{3}-23.10 .1950\) and \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{4}}-16.11 .1950\).

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=18.6 .1950, D_{2}=3.7 .1950, D_{3}=22.7 .1950\) and \(D_{4}=17.8 .1950\).
Sub-plot treatments :
4 varieties \(\cdot \mathrm{V}_{1}=T .10\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{T}-11\) (early), \(\mathrm{V}_{3}=\mathrm{T}-17\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{4}=\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{K}}\) anpur local (medium early).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/block and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 44^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Damage by rust. (iii) Til yield. (iv) (a) 1949—1950. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (O).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(116.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) 129.7 lb ./ac.
(b) \(67.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) D effect is significant. Effect of V and interaction \(\mathrm{D} \times \mathrm{V}\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of \(t i l \mathrm{in} \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

S.E. of difference of two
1. D marginal means \(\quad . \quad=45.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. V marginal means \(\quad \therefore \quad=\mathbf{2 3 . 7} 1 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. V means at a level of \(D \quad=47.4 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
4. \(D\) means at a level of \(V\)
\(=61.5 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Crop :- Mustard (Rabi).
Site :- Agri. College, B.H.U., Varanasi.

Ref ;- U.P. 54(386).
Type :- ' \(M\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}\) and K on the yield, growth and oil content of Mustard.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Međium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Agriculture College, B.H.U., Varanasi (iii) 26.10.1953. (iv) 5 ploughings and planking after every ploughing. (b) Drilling. (c) 3 seers/ac. (d) Rows \(2^{\prime}\) apart. (e) -. (v) N.A. (vi) R.T.11. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) Hoeing, thinning and weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=45 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{1}=20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2^{3}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) \(36.5^{\prime} \times 176^{\prime}\). (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) \(22^{\prime} \times 36.5^{\prime}\). (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 33.5^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime} \times 11^{\prime}\) all round the plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Very poor. (ii) Crop badly damaged by aphids - B.H.C. (5\%) dusted on 8.1.1954, tobacco-decoction sprayed at 60 gallons/ac. on 17.1.1954. The field was heavily infected with white ants. These damaged many plots. (iii) Oil content of seed, weight of shoot and yield. (iv) (a) to (c) Nill. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B H.U.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(194.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) -
(ii) \(73.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effect of N is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of mustard in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 147.2 & 159.2 & 153.2 & 138.8 & 167.7 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 233.4 & 238.0 & 235.7 & 216.8 & 254.4 \\
\hline Mean & 190.3 & 198.6 & 194.4 & 177.8 & 211.1 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & 176.5 & 179.1 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 204.1 & 218.1 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =21.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\ \text { S.E. of body of any table } & =29.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .\end{array}\)

Crop: :-Mustard (Rabi).
Ref :-U.P. 53(390).
Site :-Agri. College, B.H.U., Varanasi.
Type :-'MV'.
Object :-To study the effect of F.Y.M., neem cake andffertilizer mixture on growth, yield and chemical - 1 composition of different varieties of Mustard.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium Ioam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Agricultural College, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) 8 ploughings and planking and harrowing after every ploughing. (b) Sown in lines in \(2^{\prime \prime}\) deep furrows. (c) N.A. (d) Line to line distance-2'. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) R.T. 11 (early) and AGH-A (late). (vij) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 4 manures : \(M_{0}=\) control (no manure), \(M_{1}=\) F.Y.M. at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) neem cake at \(50 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N and \(\mathrm{M}_{3}=\) fertilizer mixture \((\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}\) and K ) in the proportion \(50: 100: 50\) at 50 lb . ac . of N .
(2) 2 varieties: \(V_{1}=\) R.T. 11 and \(V_{2}=A G H-A\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) \(62^{\prime} \times 106^{\circ}\). (iii) 3. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(29^{\circ} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Mustard yield, fat \% etc. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(526.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(102.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{V}\) and M are highly significant. Interaction \(\mathrm{M} \times \mathrm{V}\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of mustard in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{M}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}\) & M3 & Mean \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 550.8 & 572.8 & 797.1 & 831.1 & 676.7 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) & 234.3 & 320.4 & 444.6 & 508.7 & 377.0 \\
\hline Mean & 392.6 & 424.1 & 620.8 & 669.9 & 526.8 \\
\hline & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
S.E. of \(M\) marginal mean \\
S.E. of V marginal mean \\
S.E. of body of table
\end{tabular}}} & & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =42.0 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =29.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =59.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{aligned}
\]} & \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :-Mustard. } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 53(389). } \\ \text { Site :-Agri. College, B.H.U., Varanasi. } & \text { Type :-'CMV'. }\end{array}\)
Object :-To study the effect of spacing and fertilizers on different varieties of Mustard.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Medium loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) 26.10.1953. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings and planking after every ploughing. (b) Dibbled in furrows. (c) 3 seers/ac. (d) As per, treatments. (e) -. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Thinning, light hoeing and weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 1.3.1954.
2. TREATMENIS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 spacings between rows: \(S_{1}=1 \frac{1}{2^{\prime}}\) and \(S_{2}=2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). ,
(2) 2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=\) RT. 11 (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=\mathrm{AGH}-\mathrm{A}\) (late).
(3) 3 levels of fertilizers : \(M_{0}=\) no manure, \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{O}\) and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) \(36^{\prime} \times 136^{\prime}\). (iii) 3. '(iv) (a) \(11^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (b) \(9^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) One row left as border alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not satisfactory. (ii) Attack of white ants and aphids B.H.C. dusted at \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and spraying with tobacco decoction at 50 gallon/ac. (iii) Seed yield, no. of seeds per pod, height of plant, etc. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(143.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(61.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effects cf \(M, V\) and \(S\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of mustard in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{M}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{2}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & S8 \\
\hline \(V_{1}\) & 107.5 & 184.8 & 233.3 & 175.2 & 207.0 & 143.4 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 69.7 & 126.9 & 139.4 & 112.0 & 142.4 & 81.6 \\
\hline Mean & 88.6 & 155.8 & 186.3 & 143.6 & 174.7 & 112.5 \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 103.0 & 195.4 & 225.7 & & & \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & 74.2 & 116.3 & 146.9 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

S,E. of marginal mean of \(M\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(V\) or \(S\) S.E' of body of M \(\times V\) or \(M \times S\) table S.E. of body of \(S \times V\) tabfe
\(=17.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=14.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=25.0 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\)
\(\Rightarrow 20.4\) Ib./ac.

\section*{Crop :-Mustard. \\ Site :-Agri. College, B.H.U., Varanasi.}

Kef :-U.P. 53(i96).
Type:-‘MV'.

Object :-To study the effect of date of sowing and fertilizers an different varieties of Mustard.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) G.M. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Medium loam: (b) Refer soil analysis, Agricultural College, B.H.U., Varanasi. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings and planking after every ploughing. (b, Sown in furrows. (c) 3 srs./ac. (d) Between rows \(11^{\prime}\); between plants \(9^{\circ}\). (e) -. (v) G.M. applied Quantity N.A. (vi) As per treatmens. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) 2 weedings, thinning and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.2.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3)
(1) 2 varieties: \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) RT. 11 (early) and \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=A G H-A\) (late).
(2) 2 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=24.10 .1953\) and \(D_{2}=3.11 .1953\).
(3) 3 Ievels of fertilizers : \(M_{0}=n 0\) manure, \(M_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+20 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=80 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}+40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\).
N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}, \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super and \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul.
The fertilizers were applied 20 days after sowing as top dressing in between rows of the plants.
3. ' DESIGN :
(i) \(2 \times 2 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 12. (b) \(38.5^{\prime} \times 180^{\prime}\). (iii) 3 . (iv) (a) \(38.5^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (b) \(35.5^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\), (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL, -
(i) Poor. (ii) The crop was severely infested with aphids; first dusted with B.H.C. (5\%) at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 5.1.1954 and subsequently tobacco decoction was sprayed on 15.1.1954 at 60 gallon/ac. Attack of white ants also. (iii) Mustard yield, height of plant and no. of seeds/plot. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) No. (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by B.H.U.
5. RESUULTS:
(1) \(259.6 \mathrm{Jb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(93.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only main effects of \(\mathrm{M}, \mathrm{V}\) and D are highly significant.
(iv) Av, yield of mustard in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|ccc|c|cc|} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 201.3 & 384.7 & 408.8 & 331.6 & 472.6 & 190.6 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 121.5 & 216.8 & 224.6 & 187.6 & 322.1 & 53.2 \\
\hline Mean & 161.4 & 3008 & 316.7 & 259.6 & 397.3 & 121.9 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 254.9 & 457.0 & 480.0 & & & \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 67.9 & 144.6 & 153.3 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(M\)
S.E. of marginal mean of V or D
S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{V}\) or \(\mathbf{M} \times \mathbf{D}\) table S.E. of \(\mathbf{V} \times \mathbf{D}\) table
\(=27.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=22.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=38.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=31.3 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Crop :-Mustard (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 49(213).
Type :- \(D\) '

Object :-To test the efficacy of D.D.T. and Gamexane against Mustard aphids.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Rai type-9. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Dusting with Gammexane ( \(5 \%\) B.H.C.) at \(60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion ( \(16 \%\) D.D.T. diluted with water in the ratio of \(1: 63\) ) at 300 gallons/ac.
3. Spraying with \(\mathbf{2 \%}\) soap solution at \(\mathbf{3 0 0}\) gallons/ac.
4. Nó treatment.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi; Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of aphids. Contrcl means as per treatments. (iii) Volume of mustard aphids. (iv) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Ento.(K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{Treatment} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Av. vol. of aphids in c.c.} & \multirow[b]{3}{*}{7 days after application} \\
\hline & 24 hrs after & 3 days after & \\
\hline & application & application & \\
\hline 1. & 3.80 & 4.38 & 4.80 \\
\hline 2. & 2.55 & 1.70 & 1.25 \\
\hline 3. & 1.25 & 1.42 & 1.75 \\
\hline 4. & 3.90 & 4.42 & 4.88 \\
\hline Mean & 2.88 & 2.98 & 3.17 \\
\hline S.E./mean & 0.064 & 0.096 & 0.05 \\
\hline Significance & highly significant & highly significant & highly significant \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Mustard (Rabi). \\ Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Meerut.
}

Ref :- U.P. 49(215).

Object :-To test the efficacy of D.D.T. and gamexane against Mustard aphids.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) 11.1.1948. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Rai type-9. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

TREATMENTS :
1. Dusting with gammexane ( \(5 \%\) B.H.C.) at 60 lb ./ac.
2. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion at 30 gallon/ac.
3. Dusting with \(2 \%\) soap solution at 30 gallon/ac.
4. No treatment (control).

Treatments applied on 27.1.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(33^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Ycs.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of aphids. Control means as per treatments. (iii) Volume of aphids. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) No. of aphids per c.c \(=1000\) approximately. The experiment was conducted by Ento. (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)

Av. vol. of aphids in c.c.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & 24 hrs . after application & \begin{tabular}{l}
f aphids in c.c. \\
3 days after application
\end{tabular} & 7 days after application \\
\hline 1. & 13.62 & 16.50 & 17.05 \\
\hline 2. & 1.18 & 0.88 & 0.35 \\
\hline 3. & 0.45 & 1.15 & 1.60 \\
\hline 4. & 13.62 & 18.12 & 18.32 \\
\hline Mean & 7.22 & 9.16 & 9.33 \\
\hline S.E./mean & 0.186 & 0.455 & 0.141 \\
\hline Significance & highly significant & highly significant & highly significant \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Rape (Rabi). \\ Site :- Matkota (Nainital).
}

Ref :- U.P. 52(279).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) One block on loam (slightly calcareous); two blocks on sandy loam and one block on clay loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) After manuring, levelling by pata. (b) Seeds sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}-2^{\circ}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. 25 lb ./ac of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. \(50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super placed at a depth of about \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) at the sole of the furrow and in the side of the row made either by the iron plough or two dest ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of grain and straw. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Ni. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. on cultivator's fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1185 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(141.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yièld of rape in lb./ac.

Treatment Av. yield
1. 850
2. 1290
3.1415
S.E. \(/\) mean \(=70.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
```

Crop :- Berseem (Rabi).
Ref:-U.P. 53(372).
Site :- Agri. Institute, Allahabad.
Type :- 'M'.

```

Object : -To study thevresponse of Berseem to the application of fertilizers.

\section*{: 1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Fine sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Agri. Institute, Allahabad. (iii) 31.10.1953: (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) 10 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(12^{\prime \prime}\). (x) Four cuttings on 25 to 28.10.1954, 6.3.1954, 10.4.1954 and 5.5.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2) and (3) \(+\mathrm{T}_{1}\) ( 40 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{N}+120 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of Mg ).
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{8} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) 2 levels of \(K\) as Pot. Chloride : \(K_{0}=0\) and \(K_{1}=41.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Fertilizers were spread on the ploughed land and mixed with the surface soil by cultivation just before the crop was planted.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9 . (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of dry matter per acre from 4 cuttings, height of berseem plants before taking the first cutting, estimated amount of red leaflets on plants prior to taking the first cutting, yield of dry matter in the weeds in the frst cutting. Height of weeds at the time of first cutting. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Weeds, particularly bathwa, were present on all the plots of berseem. Information collected from the "Allahabad Farmer". No original records or the plotwise yield data were available. Experiment was conducted by A.A.I.on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(9501 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(935.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{P}\), interaction \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{N} \times \mathrm{K}\) are significant. Other effects are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of dry berseem in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\[
\mathbf{T}_{1}=9652 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\]
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 8336 & 10195 & 9265 & 9467 & 9064 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 8957 & 10442 & 9699 & 9467 & 9932 \\
\hline Mean & 8646 & 10319 & 9482 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & 8755 & 10179 & 9467 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 8537 & 10459 & 9498 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { S.E. of any marginal mean } & =234.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
\text { S.E. of body of any table or } T_{1} \text { mean } & =330.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} .
\end{array}
\]

Crop :-Berseem (Rabi).
Site :-Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :mU.P. 53(125).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of Ammonium molybdate on the yield of berseem fodder.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Chari-Berseem. (b) Chari. (c) \(80 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). of F.Y.M. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.10.1953.
(iv) (a) Two ploughings with soil turning plough and two with desi plough. (b) Broadcast. (c) 12 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Local. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) Ist cutting on 2.12.1953, 2nd cutting on 8.1.1954, 3rd cutting on 171.1954 and final harvest on 1.5.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Treated with Ammonium molybdate at \(1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 2. (b) N.A. (iii) 12 . (iv) (a) \(15^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (b) \(13^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime} \times 6^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of berseem fodder, bhusa and seed. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C. or cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(332.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(i) \(49145 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(52.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment difference is not significant.
(ii) \(5336 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment difference is not significant.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 345.5 \\
2 & 318.6 \\
S.E \(/\) mean & \(=15.23 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
(iv) Av. yield of berseem fodder in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 48447 \\
2. & 49813 \\
S.E. \(/\) mean & \(=1540 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{a}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Guar.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 51(125).
Type:-'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of different doses of \(\mathbf{P}\) and CaO on yield and growth of Guar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.7.1951. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation. (b) Broadcast. (c) 8 seers/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) \(50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N in the form of stable manure on 25.7.1951. (vi) Guar local (medium). (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) 30.11.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{CaO}: \mathrm{C}_{0}=0, \mathrm{C}_{1}=30\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as Super and CaO as Gypsum. Date of manuring 27.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 3\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 17^{\prime}\), (v) \(11^{\prime}\) alround the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Crop suffered badly due to lack of rains. (vii) Experiment was conducted by C.P. on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(535.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(178.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{0}\) & 658.6 & 698.9 & 404.3 & 587.3 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) & 564.5 & 684.3 & 359.5 & 536.1 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) & 469.3 & 509.6 & 473.8 & 484.2 \\
\hline Mean & 564.1 & 630.9 & 412.5 & 535.9 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of any marginal mean & \(=72.7 \mathrm{lb}\) \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=102.8 \mathrm{lb}\)
\end{tabular}} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Kakun (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 50(45). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalyanpur. } & \text { Type :- 'CV'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-To study the effect of different dates of sowing on different varieties of Kakun.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 3.21 seers/ac. (d) Between rows 1'. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 18 and 19.8.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

4 dates of sowing: \(D_{1}=5.6 .1950, D_{2}=20.6 .1950, D_{3}=5.7 .1950\) and \(D_{4}=20.7 .1950\).
Sub-plot treatments:
2 varieties : \(\mathrm{V}_{1}=T 4 A / 2-1\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}=T 43 \mathrm{~A} / 1-1\) (early).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(17^{\prime} \times 5^{\circ}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 53^{\prime}\). (v) \(\frac{1^{\prime}}{}\) along breadth on both sides. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, flowering, tillering and grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The experiment was actually laid with two crops the two varieties each of sawan and kakun being taken in the sub-plots. There were 4 sub-plots in each main-plot, two for each crop. Another proforma has been filled in for the sawan crop. (vii) Experiment conducted by E.B. (Oilseeds) to Govt., U.P., Kanpur.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(978 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(408.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(336.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{D}\) effect is highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
& \(D_{1}\) & \(D_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(D_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(D_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 547 & 1753 & 1003 & 659 & 990 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 713 & 1683 & 1049 & 417 & 965 \\
\hline Mean & 630 & 1718 & 1026 & 538 & 978
\end{tabular}.
S.E. of difference of two
1. \(D\) marginal means
\(=182.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. \(V\) marginal means
\(=106.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. V means at a level of \(D\)
\(=212.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. D means at a level of \(V\)
\(=236.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :-Sawan (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. Type :-‘CV'.
Object :-To study the effect of different dates of sowing on different varieties of Sawan.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) As per treatments. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 3.21 seer/ac. (d) Between. rows 1'. (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) As per treatments. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) on 18, 19.8.1950. and \(\mathrm{V}_{2}\) on 2.9.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
4 dates of sowing : \(D_{1}=5.6 .1950, D_{2}=20.6 .1950, D_{3}=5.7 .1950\) and \(D_{4}=20.7 .1950\).
Sub-plot treatments :
2 varieties: \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{1}}=\mathrm{T} 46\) (early) and \(\mathrm{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{T} 4108\) (early).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 2 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(17^{\prime} \times 53^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 53^{\prime}\). (v) \(\frac{1^{\prime}}{}{ }^{\prime}\) along the breadth on both sides. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination, flowering, tillering and grain yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The experiment was actually laid with two crops the two varieties each of sawan and kakun being taken in the sub-plots. There were 4 sub-plots in each main-plot, two for each crop. Another proforma has been filled in for the kakun crop. (vii) The experiment was conducted by E.B. (oil seed) to Govt. U.P., Kanpur.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1174 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(235.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(252.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) \(D\) and \(V\) effects are higbly significant. Interaction \(D \times V\) is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & D4 & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{V}_{1}\) & 1667 & 1942 & 1181 & 671 & 1365 \\
\hline \(V_{2}\) & 941 & 1361 & 981 & 649 & 983 \\
\hline Mean & 1304 & 1652 & 1081 & 660 & 1174 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. D marginal means & \(=105.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
2. \(V\) marginal means & \(=80.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(V\) means at a level of \(D\) & \\
4. D means at a level of \(V\) & \(=160.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sanai (Kharif).
Site :-B.R. College Farm, Bichpuri (Agra)
Ref :-U.P. 52(340).
Type :-'M'.
Object:- To study the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) on the growth of Sanai and the effect of different dates of green manuring with Sanai on the succeeding Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Ni. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri Farm, Agra. (iii) 6.7.1952. (iv) (a) Field harrowed two times (before sowing of sanai) by disc harrow after rains. (b) Broadcast. (c) 40 seer/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C 12 . (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil. (ix) 43.3. (x) As per treiments.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 dates of burying sanat \(: D_{1}=3.8 .1952, D_{2}=31.8 .1952\) and \(D_{2}=16.9 .1952\).
Sub-plot trestments :
3 doses of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=80\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=160 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast on 6.7 .1952 !before sowing of sanai and then mixed in soil by harrowing with dise harrow.
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(37^{\prime} \times 26^{\circ}\). \(39^{\circ} \times 26^{\prime}, 39^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\) and \(37^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination count, height of plants, root length, number and size of nodules. Periodic nitrogen contribution to field after ploughing in of sanai and yield of green matter. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. No original plot-wise yield data or analysis is given and hence S.E.'s and results could not be given.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(24768 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. yield of sanai in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & 13659 & 17938 & 19584 & 17060 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{9}}\) & 24521 & 27977 & 30528 & 27675 \\
\(\mathbf{D}_{\mathbf{s}}\) & 25920 & 30034 & 32750 & 29568 \\
\hline Mean & 21367 & 25316 & 27621 & 24768
\end{tabular}

\title{
Crop :-Sanai (Kharif). \\ Site :-B.R. College Farm, Bichpuri, Agra.
}

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 53(384). \\ Type :-‘ \({ }^{\prime}\) '.}

Object:-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) on the growth of Sanai and the effect of different dates of green manuring with Samai on the succeeding Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar+Arhar. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri Farm, Agra. (iii) 27.7.1953. (iv) (a) Field harrowed once with disc harrow. (b) Broadcast. (c) 40 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) C. 12. (vii) and (vii) Nil. (ix) 13.05". (x) 1, 4 and 18.9.1953.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 dates of burying sanai: \(D_{1}=1.9 .1953, D_{2}=14.9 .19\) j3 and \(D_{3}=22.9 .1953\).
Sub-plot treatments :
3 doses of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{0}}=\mathbf{0}, \mathrm{P}_{1}=80\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}=160 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) broadcast on 27.7.1953 before sowing sanai and then mixed in soil by harrowing with dise harrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(40^{\circ} \times 28^{\prime}\), \(40^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}, 39^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}, 33^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}, 38^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\) and \(38^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:

1
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attack of caterpillar. (iii) Germination count, stand of the crop, height of plants, number of leaves, root studies, root length, length of lateral root, wt. of lateral root, no. of nodules per plant and sanai yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. No original plot-wise yield data or analysis is given and hence S.E's and conclusions could not be given.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(29001 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) N.A.
(iii) N.A.
(iv) Av. yield of sanai in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{2}\). & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 15634 & 19337 & 22217 & 19063 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{8}\) & 24686 & 30857 & 36041 & 30528 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 31433 & 35959 & 44846 & 37413 \\
\hline Mean & 23918 & 28718 & 34368 & 29001 \\
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{S.E.'s-N.A.} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sanai (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Ref :-U.P. 48(36).
Type:- \(\mathbf{- C M}^{\mathbf{M}}\).
Object :-To study the effect of applying Super to green madure crop and its effect on the subsequent Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sanoi-wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.7.1948. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A.
(x) 30 and 31.8.1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Sanai grown without \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\).
2. Sanal grown with 25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. Sanal grown with 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
4. Sanai grown with 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
5. Sanai +25 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying of sanai.
6. Sanai+ 50 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying of sanai.
7. Sanal +75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying of sanai.
8. Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(37.5^{\prime} \times 28.5^{\circ}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Sanal yield. (iv) (a) 1945-1954. Y(experiment was concelled in 1951.) (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The object of the experiment was to study the effect of G.M. on wheat. Hence no analysis has been carried out for sanai crop. The experiment was conducted by A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}

Av. yield of sanal in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline - 1. & 6847 & 5. & 7785 \\
\hline 2. & 7724 & 6. & 8396 \\
\hline 3. & 8050 & 7. & 8743 \\
\hline 4. & \[
8783
\]
G.M. & \[
\begin{gathered}
8 . \\
=8047 \mathrm{lb} .
\end{gathered}
\] & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Sanai (Kharif).
Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :-U.P. 49(87).
Type :-'M'.

Object:-To study the effect of applying Super to green manure crop and its effect on the subsequent Wheat crop.

\section*{1. BÁSAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. '(iii) 13.6.1949. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13 and 14.8.1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Sanai grown without \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. Sanai grown with 75 Jb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. Sanai grown with \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\).
4.' Sanai grown with 125 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
5. Sanai +75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) at the time of burying of Samai.
6. Sanai +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying of Sanai.
7. Sanal \(+125 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying of Sanai.
8. Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28.5^{\circ} \times 37.5^{\circ}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) No. (iii) Sanai yield. (iv) (a) 1945-1954 (experiment. was cancelled in 1951.) (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N. A. (vi) N.A. (vii) The object of expt. was to study the effect of G.M. on wheat. Hence no analysis has been carried out for sanai crop. The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:

Av. yield of sanal in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 8987 & 5. & 8732 \\
2. & 8233 & 6. & 10495 \\
3. & 7622 & 7. & 9262 \\
4. & 9150 & 8. & - \\
& G.M. & \(=8926 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{lc}\text { Crop :-Sanai (Kharif). } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 50(51). } \\ \text { Site :-Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur. } & \text { Type :-'M'. }\end{array}\)
Object:-To study the effect of applying Super to green manure crop and its effect on the subsequent Wheat crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.7.1950. (iv) (a), (b) N.A. (c) 50 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.8.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Sanai grown without \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. Sanai grown with \(75 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) -
3. Sanai grown with \(100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
4. Sanai grown with 125 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
5. Sanai+ \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying of Sanai.
6. Sanai +100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying of Sanai.
7. Sanai +125 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying of Sanai.
8. Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(28.5^{\prime} \times 37.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory (ii) No. (iii) Sanai yield. (iv) (a) 1945-1954 (experiment was cancelled for 1951). (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A: (vi) N.A. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. The object of the expt. was to study the effect of G.M. on wheat. Hence no analysis has been carried out for sanai crop.
5. RESULTS :

Av. yield of sanai in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 8782 & \(5 .-\) & 9272 \\
-2. & 9884 & 6. & 10189 \\
3. & 9069 & 7. & 10393 \\
4. & 12125 & 8. & - \\
& G.M. & \(=9959 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sanai (Kharif).
Site:- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.
Object .-To study the effect of applying Super to G.M. crop and its effect on the subsequent Wheat crop.,
BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Sanoi-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.7.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers/ac. (v) NiL. (vi) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.9.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Sanai grown without \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. Sanai grown with \(75 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. Sanai grown with 1 CO lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
4. Sanai grown with 125 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
5. Sanai \(+75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying.
6. Sanai \(+100 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying.
7. Sanai \(+125 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying.
8. Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8 .
(b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(37.5^{\circ} \times 28.5^{\prime}\) (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Yield of sanai. (iv) (a) 1945-1954. (experiment was concelled for 1951.) (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N,A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The object of the experiment was to study tho effect of G.M. on wheat. Hence no analysis has been carried out for sanai crop: The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :

Av. yield of sanai in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\(\because\) 1. & 11117 & 5. & 11657 \\
2. & 11280 & 6. & 10994 \\
3. & 11708 & 7. & 12197 \\
4. & 12747 & 8. & - \\
& & G.M. & \(=11671 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Sanai (Kharif).
Site :- Govt. Res. Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 53(198).
Type :- 'M'.

Object :-To study the effect of applying Super to G.M. crop and its effect on the subsequent Wheat crop.

\section*{1: BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat. (b) Wheat. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 9.7.1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) 50 seers./ac: (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 23.9.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Sanai grown without \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
2. Sanai grown with 75 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
3. Sanal grown with 100 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
4. Sanai grown with 150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
5. Sanai+ \(75 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying.
6. Sanai \(+100 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying.
7. Sanai +150 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) at the time of burying.
8. Fallow.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(37.5^{\prime} \times 28.5^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Sanai yield. (iv) (a) 1945-1954. (experiment was concelled for 1951.) (b) Yes. (c) No. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The object of the experiment is to study the effect of G.M. on wheat. Hence no analysis has been carried out for sanai crop. The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :

Av. yield of sanai in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 10179 & 5. & 10780 \\
2. & 11585 & 6. & 11361 \\
3. & 11861 & 7. & 10842 \\
4. & 11728 & 8. & - \\
& G.M. & \(11191 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Oats (Rabi) & Ref :- U.P. 52(281). \\
Site :- Matkota (Nainital). & Type:- 'M'.
\end{tabular}

Object : - To draw out a fertilizer schedule for agricuiturally important soil types.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a! to (c) N.A. (ii) 3 blocks on loam (slightly calcareous), one block on loam (bighly calcareous), one block on sandy loam and one block on loam (non calcareous). (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) After manuring the field was levelled by pata. (b) Seed sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer band. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\prime \prime}\) to \(2^{\circ}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. '(x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. 30 lb ./ac. of N .
3. \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{N}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super. N added to surface at sowing time. Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ},-4^{\prime \prime}\) at the sole of the furrow and on the side of the seed, row made 'either by the iron plough or two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Blocks selected in the farm and R.B.D. with 6 replications laid out. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Normal but attacked by rats at seed formation stage causing heavy damage. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of oats grain and straw. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(498 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(32.61 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 405 \\
2. & 496 \\
3. & .593 \\
S.E./mean & \(=13.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :- U.P. 50(88).
Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed on yield and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcanc. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Parwa soil. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1950. (iv) (a) Ploughed five times by Watt's plough and once with desi plough. Again ploughing by desi plough and subsequently covered by planking after broadcasting seed. (b) Broadcast after mixing the seeds of both crops in the given proportions. (c) Wheat 50 seers/ac. Gram 30 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{Jac}\). of N. (vi) Wheat C-13-(early), Gram-Local (late). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 3.01*. (x) 30.3.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } \\
& Wheat & \(:\) & Gram \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\multicolumn{3}{l}{ Seed required in chk./gross piot } \\
Wheat & \(:\) & Gram \\
0 & \(:\) & 10 \\
3.2 & \(:\) & 8 \\
6.4 & \(:\) & 6 \\
\hline 8.0 & \(:\) & 5 \\
9.6 & \(:\) & 4 \\
12.8 & \(:\) & 2 \\
16.0 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround, irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\) and plot border 1 if' \(^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Very good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of Wheat+Gram (Rabi). (iv) (a) 1950-1954. (b) Yes. (c) N.A. (iv) (a) Kalyanpur (Kanpur), Lucknow, Baharaich and Partapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1513 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 281.9 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatments differ significantly.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1436 \\
2. & 1496 \\
3. & 1531 \\
4. & 1464 \\
5. & 1881 \\
6. & 1424 \\
7. & 1360 \\
S.E./mean & \(=141.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Wheat and Gram. \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.
}

Ref:- U.P. 52(96).

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed on yield, and residual effect on the succeeding \(k\) harif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 22 rand 23.11.1952. (iv) (a) ploughings with Watt's plough and pata. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 3 C.L. of well decayed F.Y.M. applied to entire field, 14 md . of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field 2 days before sowing. (vi) Wheat C. 13 and Gram.87. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } & Seed required in chk./gross plot. \\
Wheat & \(:\) & Gram & Gram & \(:\) & Wheat \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & \(:\) & 20.3 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 5.0 & \(:\) & 16.3 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 10.1 & \(:\) & 12.2 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 12.7 & \(:\) & 10.1 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 15.2 & \(:\) & 8.0 \\
6. 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 20.3 & \(:\) & 4.0 \\
7. 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 25.4 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(-3^{\prime}\), airound and plot border-1 \({ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield of Wheat+Gram (iv) (a) 1950 to, 1954. (experiment not conducted in 1951.). (b) and (c) No.' (v) (a) Lucknow, Varanasi, Kanpur, Bahraich. Pratapgarh, Aligarh, Etawah and Jhansi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1354 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(41.78 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1496 \\
2. & 1543 \\
3. & 1237 \\
4. & 1022 \\
5. & 1627 \\
6. & 1277 \\
7. & 1277 \\
S.E./mean & \(=20.89 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Wheat and Gram: \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.
}

\section*{Ref :- U.P. 53(157). \\ 'Type:- ' X '.}

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Cereal-cereal. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) 4 ploughings after harvest of paddy on \(2,7,13\) ánd 21.10.1953, and palewa on 22.10.1953. (b) Sown by local seed -drill, wheat sown first in lines east-west behind the plough, subsequently gram was to be similarly sown north-south i.e., across the wheat lines. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 3 C.L. of F.Y.M. on 10.11.1953, fertilizers on \(21.11 .1953-1 \neq \mathrm{md}\). of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the sides. (vi) Wheat C. 13 and gram. 87 (improved). (viii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportions} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in chk./plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Gram & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & : & 25.3 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 20 & . 5.0 & : & 16.3 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 10.0 & : & 12.0 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & - 50 & 12.5 & : & 10.0 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 15.0 & : & 8.0 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 20.3 & : & 4.0 \\
\hline 7. & 0 & : & 100 & 25.4 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. .(iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) Field border- \(3^{\prime}\) alround, plot border-11' alround and irrigation channel-3'. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield of wheat and gram. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Kalyanpur, Baharaich, Kalai and Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. Yvi) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1377 lb./ac.
(ii) 36.15 lb /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1589 \\
2. & 1544 \\
3. & 1224 \\
4. & 1058 \\
5. & 1733 \\
6. & 1175 \\
7. & 1314 \\
S.E./mean & \(=18.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Gram and Linseed.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :-U.P. 52(98).
Type :-‘X'

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and Linseed grown mixed, on yield and the residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Light kabar, clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.11.1952. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with Watt's plcugh and pata. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A (v) 3 C.L. of well decayed F.Y.M. applied all over the field. 1ł mds. of super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows beh nd the plough all over the field. (vi) Gram : T. 87 (late). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
4. Seed rate proportions & Seed rate in chk./gross plot of \\
Gram & Linseed & Gram & \(:\) & Linseed \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & \(:\) & 6.1 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 4.0 & \(:\) & 4.8 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 8.1 & \(:\) & 3.6 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 10.1 & \(:\) & 3.0 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 12.2 & \(:\) & 2.4 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 16.3 & \(:\) & 1.2 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 20.3 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border=112. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Poor. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Varanasi, Baharaich and Hamirpur. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(577 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(18.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 130 \\
2. & 288 \\
3. & 465 \\
4. & 543 \\
5. & 627 \\
6. & 892 \\
7. & 1094 \\
S.E./mean & \(=9.36\) lb./ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Gram and Linseed.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.

Ref :-U.P. 53(159).
Type :-‘X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and Linseed grown mixed, on yield and residual effect on the suceeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.11.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings after harvest of paddy on \(2,7,13\) and 21.11 .1353. (b) Sown by local seed drillto obtain uniform distribution of seeds all over the field. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A, (v) F.Y.M. applied on 10.11.1953-3 C.L. Fertilizer appiled on 21.11.1953-1\& mds of Super at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field. (vi) Gram : 87 and linseed (improved). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate pri portions} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in chk./plot} \\
\hline & Gram & : & Linseed & Gram & : & Linseed \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & : & 6.1 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 4.0 & : & 4.8 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 8.1 & : & 3.6 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 10.1 & : & 3.0 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & - 40 & 12.2 & : & 2.4 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 16.3 & : & 1.2 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 20.3 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\circ} \times 33^{\prime}\) : (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) Field border=3' ahound. Plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). Irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield of gram and linseed. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Baharaich, Belatal (Hamirpur) and Hardoi, (vi) Nil. (vii) Ipe experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(538 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(8.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac;
Treatment Av yield
1. 110
2. 262
3. . 401
\(4 . \quad 553\)
\(5 . \quad 604\)
\(6 . \quad 819\)
\(7 . \quad 1018\)
S.E./mean \(=4.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Barley and Pea. & Ref:-U.P. 52(97). \\
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra. & Type :-X'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed, on yield, and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N A. (ii) Kabar ; Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.11 .1952 (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with Watt's plough and pata. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Manuring ón 20.11.1952. (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 mds .) of F.Y.M. applied to entire field. (2) 14 mds. of super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field 2 days before sowing. (vi) Barley-C. 251 (medium); Pea-T. 163 early.(vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{rcccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed required in chk./plot } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Barley } & \(:\) & Pea & Barley & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 190 & 0.0 & Pea & 20.3 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 4.0 & \(:\) & 16.3 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 8.1 & \(:\) & 12.2 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 10.1 & \(:\) & 10.1 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 12.2 & \(:\) & 8.1 \\
6 & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 16.3 & \(:\) & 4.0 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 20.3 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(-3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border=11 \(\mathbf{1}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii)-No. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-56. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Faizabad, Etawah, Kanpur, Hardoi and Aligarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was couducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(577.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 16.14 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatoment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 499.0 \\
2. & 591.2 \\
3. & 429.6 \\
4. & 677.3 \\
5. & 726.4 \\
6. & 671.3 \\
7. & 450.0 \\
S.E./mean & \(=8.07 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Barley and Pea.
Ref :-53(158).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Atarra.
Type :-‘X'.
Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed on yield and residual effect on the sucseeding kharij crop.

\section*{1, LBASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Legume-Cereal. (b) Dhaincha. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 24.11.1953. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings after harvest of paddy on 4, 8, 14, 22.11.1953. Palewa on 29.10.1953. Barley to be sown first in lines east-west behind the plough and then pea to north-south of it across barley lines. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) R.Y.M.- 3 C.L. on 11.11.1953. \(1 t\) mds. Super at the depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field 22.11.1953. (vi) Barley-2s1 (improved) ; Pea-163. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 16.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate in chk./plot } \\
& Barley & \(:\) & Pea & Barley & \(:\) & Pea \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & \(:\) & 20.3 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 4.0 & \(:\) & 16.3 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 8.1 & \(:\) & 12.2 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 10.1 & \(:\) & 10.1 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 12.2 & \(:\) & 8.1 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 16.3 & \(:\) & 4.0 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 20.3 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround. Irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\). Plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) No. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Kalyanpur. Kalai, Etawah. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(634.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(15.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 556.5 \\
2. & 640.2 \\
3. & 463.1 \\
4. & 792.2 \\
5. & 751.5 \\
6. & 704.8 \\
7. & 533.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=7.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Wheat and Gram. \(\quad\) Ref :- U.P. 50(89).'
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich. \(\quad\) Type :- 'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i, (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 1.11.1950., (iv) (a) Ploughing by desi plough and subsequently covered by planking. (b) Broadcast after mixing the seeds in the given proportion. (c) Wheat at 50 seers/ac. and gram at 30 seers/ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. at 40 lb ./ac. of N. (vi) Wheat-NP52 (medium-early) and gram-local (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Harrowing twice. (ix) 3.08 (x) 18.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Seed rates Proportion} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Seed required in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline Wheat & Gram & Wheat & : Gram \\
\hline 1. 0 & : 100 & 0 & 10 \\
\hline 2. 20 & - 80 & 3.2 & 8 \\
\hline 3. 40 & 60 & \(\cdots-6.4\) & 6 \\
\hline 4. 50 & 50 & 8.0 & 5 \\
\hline 5. 60 & 40 & 9.6 & 4 \\
\hline 6. 80 & 20 & 12.8 & 2 \\
\hline 7. 100 & - 0 & 16.0 & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround, plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) alround and irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Atarra Kalyanpur, Lucknow and Partapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1061 \quad \mathrm{Bb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(-214.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 175 \\
2. & 1066 \\
3. & 1034 \\
4. & 1265 \\
5. & 1352 \\
6. & 1257 \\
7. & 1281 \\
S.E./mean & \(=107.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Wheat and Gram. \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.
}

Ref :- U.P. 51(71).
Type :- 'X'.
Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed on yield and its residual effoct on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) No. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) Last week of October. (ivs (a) Ploughings by desi plough and sursequently covered by planking. (b) Broadcast after mixing both the seeds in the given proportion: (c) Wheat 50 seers/ac. and gram 30 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (i) G.M. at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) of N. (vi) Wheat-NP. 52 (medium early) and gram-local (late). (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

Seed rate Proportions
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Wheat & \(:\) & Gram \\
0 & \(:\) & 100 \\
20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}

Seed used in chk./gross plot.
\begin{tabular}{rcc} 
Wheat & \(:\) & Gram \\
00 & \(:\) & 10.0 \\
3.2 & \(:\) & 8.0 \\
1.4 & \(:\) & 6.0 \\
8.0 & \(\vdots\) & 5.0 \\
9.6 & \(\vdots\) & 4.0 \\
12.8 & \(:\) & 2.0 \\
16.0 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 32^{\circ}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround, plot border \(=11^{\prime}\) alround and irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\). (vi), Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii). Yield of wheat and gram grain. (iv) 1950-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Partapgarh, Etawah and Kanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(455.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(173.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac. Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. & 103.4 \\
2. & 429.6 \\
3. & 596.7 \\
4. & 544.9 \\
5. & 461.4 \\
6. & 636.4 \\
7. & 413.7 \\
S.E./mean & \(=86.96 . \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram.
Site:-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref :-U.P. 52(83).
Type :-'X'.

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 3.11.1952. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings on 25.10.1952 and 1, 4.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Date of manuring 16.10 .1952 . (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. all over the field. (2) \(1 \nmid \mathrm{md}\). of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows tehind the plough all over the field 2 days before sowing. (vi) Wheat NP. 52, Gram-T-87. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 6.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Gram & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 15.2 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 5.0 & : & 12.2 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 10.1 & : & 9.1 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 12.7 & : & 7.6 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 15.2 & : & 6.1 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 20.3 & : & 3.0 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 25.4 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround, plot border 11': (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Poor. (ii) Attacked by yellow rust- \(35 \%\) damage. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv), (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) No: (v) (a) Lucknow, Varanasi, Kanpur, Partapgarh, Aligarh, Banda, Etawah and Jhansi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(627.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(211.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 256.1 \\
2. & 469.1 \\
3. & 762.3 \\
4. & 860.4 \\
5. & 777.8 \\
6. & 730.0 \\
7. & 538.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=105.7 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref :-U.P. 53(266).
Type : ' \(\mathbf{X}\) ':

Object :- To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) NiJ. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 3, 4.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 6,7.9.1953 and 1.11.1953. (b) Wheat is to be sown first in line east west behind plough, subsequently gram to be sown similarly. (c) Wheat-50 seers/ac.; Gram-30 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. or compost to be applied 2-3 weeks before sowing all over the field. \(1+\mathrm{md}\). of Super to be applied at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field, a couple of days before sowing. (vi) Wheat-NP; 52 ;'Gram-T: 87. (vii) Ir rigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{cccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) \\
Gram \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 0 & : & 15.2 \\
\hline 5.0 & : & 12.2 \\
\hline 10.1 & : & 9.1 \\
\hline 12.7 & : & 7.6 \\
\hline 15.2 & : & 6.1 \\
\hline 20.3 & : & 3.0 \\
\hline 25.4 & : & 2.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN .
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime} .{ }^{\circ}\) (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround, plot border \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\), irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Gram failed-reason not given. (ii) White rust. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1429 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(694.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 451 \\
2. & 1241 \\
3. & 1902 \\
4. & 2113 \\
5. & 1229 \\
6. & 1854 \\
7. & 1212 \\
S.E /mean & \(=347.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref:-U.P. 53(216).
Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the physiological response of mixed crops to application of fertilisers.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Dhaincha. (c) No. (ii) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 4.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 16, 20.10.1953 and harrowing on 22.10.1953. (b) By a seed drill, gram sown in between two rows of wheat. (c) Wheat-25 seer/ac. and gram-10 seer/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Wheat-Cl3 (early) and gram-T. 87 (late). (vii) Irrigated: (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (N)
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{8}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. (P)
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. (K)
(4) 2 levels of CaO as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (C)

Manuring on 10, 12, 26.10.1953 and 1, 2.11.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{4}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(22^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\) : (v) \(1 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Gram failed-reason not recorded. (ii) Wheat rust, other details-N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1953N.A. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Gram failed-reason not recorded. Hence. the yield of wheat is taken for analysis. (vii) The erperiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1445 . \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(294.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
(iii) Interaction \(N \times P\) is highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not significant.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Fac
tor} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Mean Response} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\[
\mathbf{N}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Absence Presence}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{K} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{} \\
\hline & & Absence & Presence & & & Absence & Presence & Absence & Presence \\
\hline N & 155.9 & ... & ... & 391.3 & -79.4 & 102.5 & 209.4 & 130.0 & 181.9 \\
\hline P & 105.4 & 340.6 & -129.7 & \(\cdots\) & ... & 150.2 & 60.6 & 132.2 & 78.0 \\
\hline K & 82.3 & 28.9 & 135.7 & 127.1 & 37.5 & & ... & 89.5 & 75.1 \\
\hline C & 170.4 & 144.4 & 196.4 & 197.8 & 142.9 & 177.6 & 163.2 & ... & -." \\
\hline \multicolumn{6}{|c|}{S.E. of differential response} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{\(=120.4 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Barley.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 52(82).}

Type :-‘X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Barley, grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sugarcane. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 3 and, 4.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 29, 30 and 31.10.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) \({ }^{\prime}\).A. (v) (i) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied equally' all over the field. (ii) it md. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field 2 days before sowing. Date of manuring 15, 16.10.1952. (vi) Wheat-NP-52 and barley-NP-31 (medium early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 5.4.1953.'
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } & Seed required in chk./gross plot \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) & Barley & Wheat & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & Barley \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 5.0 & \(:\) & 16.3 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 10.1 & \(:\) & 12.2 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 12.7 & \(:\) & 10.1 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 15.2 & \(:\) & 8.1 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 20.3 & \(:\) & 4.0 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 25.4 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime} . \circ\) (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Yellow rust upto stem and ears. (iii) Grain and straw, yield. (iv) (a), 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Hardoi and Partapgarh. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1064 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(448.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1385 \\
2. & 1142 \\
3. & 1149 \\
4. & 973 \\
5. & 938 \\
6. & 997 \\
7. & 865 \\
S.E./mean & \(=\mathbf{2 2 4 . 3} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat and Barley (Rabi). & Ref:- U.P. 53(268). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich. & Type :- 'X'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Barley, grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 5 and 6.11:1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 3,4 and 12.10.1953. (b) Sown by seed drill. (c) Wheat -50 srs./ac. and barley \(-40 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. or compost to be applied equally all over the field 2-3 weeks before sowing. (2) \(1 \Varangle\) md. of Super to be applied at depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind plough all over field a couple of days before sowing. (vi) Wheat-NP. 52 and barley-NP.21. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1952.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed used in chl./gross plot. } \\
Wheat & \(:\) & Barley & Wheat & : & Barley \\
1. 0 & 0 & 100 & 0 & \(:\) & 20.3 \\
2. 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 5.0 & \(:\) & 16.3 \\
3. 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 10.1 & \(:\) & 12.2 \\
4. 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 12.7 & \(:\) & 10.1 \\
5. 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 15.2 & \(:\) & 8.1 \\
6. 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 20.3 & \(:\) & 4.0 \\
7. 0 & \(:\) & 100 & & 25.4 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround, plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2^{\prime}}\) and irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wheat rust and smut in barley. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1153 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(358.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 880 \\
2. & 1307 \\
3. & 982 \\
4. & 1046 \\
5. & 1265 \\
6. & 1321 \\
7. & 1267 \\
S.E./mean & \(=179.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Gram and Linseed.
Ref :- U.P. 52(85).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.
Type:- 'X'.
Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and Linseed grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 4.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 2 and 8.10.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md.) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied equally all over the field. (2) \(1 \Varangle\) md. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough 2 days before sowing. Date of manuring 29.10.1952. (vi) Gram-T. 87 (late) linseed 1193. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 6.4.1953.
2. TREATMEMTS :
\begin{tabular}{lcc}
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } \\
Gram & \(:\) & Linseed \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) \\
2. 20 & \(:\) & 100 \\
2. 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
4. 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
6. 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
7. 100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Seeds used in chk./gross plot. \\
Gram & \(:\) & Linseed \\
0.0 & \(:\) & 6.7 \\
3.0 & \(:\) & 4.8 \\
6.1 & \(:\) & 3.6 \\
7.6 & \(:\) & 3.0 \\
9.1 & \(:\) & -2.4 \\
12.2 & \(:\) & 1.2 \\
15.2 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) atround and plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2^{\prime}}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Yellow rust on stem. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) Lucknow, Varansai, Hamirpur and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(570.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(110.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Av. yeatment & Av. yield \\
Tre & 663.0 \\
1. & 610.3 \\
3. & 587.6 \\
4. & 674.9 \\
5. & 561.2 \\
6. & 642.6 \\
7. & 251.3 \\
S.E./mean & \(=55.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Gram and Linseed.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref :-U.P. 53(267).
Type :-‘X'.

Object : -To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and Linseed grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. LBASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 8.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 3,4 and 24.10 .1953 . (b) Gram sown by seed drill in rows and: linseed sown so as to obtain uniform distribution all over field. (c) As per treatments. gram=30 seers/ac.: and linseed=12 seers/ac.(d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y M. or compost : applied equally all over the field 2-3 weeks before sowing and (2) \(1 f^{\prime}\) md. of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field, a couple of days before sowing. (vi) Gram T. 87 and linseed 1193 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & Seed used in chk./gross plot \\
\multicolumn{2}{c}{ Gram } & \(:\) & Linseed & Gram & \(:\) & Linseed \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0 & \(:\) & 6.1 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 3.0 & \(:\) & 4.8 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 6.1 & \(:\) & 3.6 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 7.6 & \(:\) & 3.0 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 9.1 & \(:\) & 2.4 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 12.2 & \(:\) & 1.2 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 15.2 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround, irrigation channel \(=3^{\prime}\) and plot border \(=1 \mathbf{1}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Rust. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(721.8 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(310.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Avi'yield \\
1. & 506.2 \\
2. & 823.3 \\
3. & 852.0 \\
4. & 617.5 \\
5. & 951.4 \\
6. & 700.1 \\
7. & 601.9 \\
S.B./mean & \(=155.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Masturd.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Baharaich.

Ref :-U.P. 52(81).
Type :- 'C'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Mustard grown mixed on yie and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Baharaich. (iii) 2.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughings on 29, 30.10.1952 and 2.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied all over the field and (2) \(1 \neq \mathrm{md}\). of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough 2 days before sowing. (vi) Wheat -N.P. 52 (medium early) and mustard-local. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) Wheat 5.4.1953 and mustard 15.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seeds used in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Mustard & Wheat & . & Mustard \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & & 1.5 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 5.0 & : & 1.2 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 10.1 & & 0.9 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 12.7 & : & 0.7 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 15.2 & : & 0.6 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 20.3 & & 0.3 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 25.4 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround and plot border \(=1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Yellow rust upto stem. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953 (experiment failed in 1953). (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Etawah and PRaya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(954 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(242.5 \mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 512 \\
2. & 890 \\
3. & 932 \\
4. & 997 \\
5. & 1038 \\
6. & 1045 \\
7. & 1264 \\
S.E./mean & \(=121.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop:-Gram and Linseed. \\ Site :-Gọvt. Agri. Res. Farm, Belatal.}

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 52(90). \\ Type :-'X'.}

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions on Gram and Linseed mixed on yield and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
\(\therefore\) CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Kabar mixed with Parwa clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 7.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with Watt's plough on 3.11.1952. Ploughing with desi plough on 4 and 5.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) Gram \(30 \mathrm{sr} . / \mathrm{ac}\). and lineseed \(12 \mathrm{sr} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. 3 C.L. on 2.11 .1952 all over the field. Super on 7.11 .1952 ; placed at a depth of \(3-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field. (vi) Gram T87 (late) Linseed T2. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Gram 27.3.1953. Linseed 2.4.1953.

\section*{TREATMENTS :}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc} 
& \multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate in chk./gross plot. } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Gram } & \(:\) & Linseed & Gram & \(:\) & Linseed \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & \(:\) & 6.1 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & & 3.0 & \(:\) & 4.8 \\
2. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 6.1 & \(:\) & 3.6 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 7.6 & \(:\) & 3.0 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & & 9.1 & \(:\) & 2.4 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 12.2 & \(:\) & 1.2 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 15.2 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround, plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Both gram and linseed suffered from wilt. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Varanasi, Baharaich and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(237.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(59.89 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significani.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & & Av. yield \\
1. & & 76.6 \\
2. & \(\therefore\) & 173.5 \\
3. & & 198.6 \\
4. & 221.4 \\
5. & & 327.9 \\
6. & & 315.9 \\
7. & & 345.8 \\
S.E/mean & & \(=29.94 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\title{
Crop :-Gram and Linseed.
}

Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Belatal.
Ref :-U.P. 53(98).

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and Linseed grown mixed on yield and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Kabar. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.10.1953. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings by Watt's plough and 5 with desi plough. (b) Gram to be sown first through seed drill in rows and after it linseed is sown uniformally; behind the plough. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (a) 45 md . of well decayed F.Y.M. or compost to be applied equally all over the field \(2-3\) weeks beforc sowing (b) 1.25 md. of Super to be placed at the depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field a couple of days before sowing (20.10.1953). (vi) Gram T87 (late) linseed local. (vii) Nil. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 8.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{REATMENTS :} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in chk./plot} \\
\hline & Gram & & Linseed & Gram & : & Linseed \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 6.1 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 3.0 & : & 4.8 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 6.1 & : & 3.6 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 7.6 & : & 3.0 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 9.1 & : & 2.4 \\
\hline 6. & \(80^{-}\) & : & 20 & 12.2 & : & 1.2 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 15.2 & : & . 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\circ}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\). field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Block partition \(\mathbf{3 '}^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Bad. (ii) Nominal damage due to wilt disease and rust to linseed. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Banda, Baharaich. (vi) During the month of January 1954, the linseed capsuls were damaged by the frost when temperature went as low as \(31^{\circ} \mathrm{F}\). The gram crop escaped as it was late variety. (vii) The experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(571.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 133.4 lb /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 320.7 \\
2. & 432.0 \\
3. & 489.4 \\
4. & 605.5 \\
5. & 554.1 \\
6. & 746.7 \\
7. & 853.2 \\
S.E./mean & \(=66.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram.
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref:rU.P. 52(94).
Type :-‘X'.

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Sanai/Wheat. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Parwa soil, clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) \(11,12.11 .1952\). (iv) (a) Ploughing on 28.7.1952; 2 harrowings on 26, 31.10.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Date of manure 1.11 .1952 ( 1 ) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied all over the field. (2) 1\(\}\) md. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{*}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field 2 days before sowing. (vi) Wheat-Pb-597; Gram T-87 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seeds used in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Gram & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & : & 20.3 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 5.0 & : & 16.3 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 10.1 & : & 12.2 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 12.7 & : & 10.1 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 15.2 & : & 8.1 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 20.3 & : & 4.0 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 25.4 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border \(1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Slight rust was traceable in wheat during February. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Varanasi, Kanpar, Baharaich, Pratapgarh, Aligarh, Banda and Etawah. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(2074 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(151.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1429 \\
2. & 1986 \\
3. & 1965 \\
4. & 2149 \\
5. & 2353 \\
6. & 2408 \\
7. & 2226 \\
S.E./mean & \(=75.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Site :-State Mechanised Farm, Bharari.

Ref:-U.P. 53(66):
Type \(\mathbf{m}^{6} \mathbf{X}\).

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sanai-Wheat. (b) Sanai. (c) Ni1. (ii) (a) Parwa. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing 8-10 times oa 20.8.1953 and 28.10.1953. Harrowing on 14.11.1953. (b) Wheat to be sown first in lines eastwest behind the plough ; similarly gram to be sown north-south in lines. (c) Wheat 50 seers/ac.; Gram 40 seers/ac, (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) (1) 45 md./ac. of well decayed F.Y.M. on 10.11.1953. (2) 1.25 md./ac. of Super to be placed \(3^{\circ}-4^{*}\) deep in soil in furrows behind the plough all over the field on 16.11.1953. (vi) Wheat- Pb 591, Gram-T-87. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing at the proper time are common in practice. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate lb./plot } \\
Wheat & \(:\) & Gram & Wheat & \(:\) & Gram \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0 & \(:\) & 2.61 \\
2. 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 0.64 & \(:\) & 2.09 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 1.29 & \(:\) & 1.57 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 1.63 & \(:\) & 1.29 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 1.95 & \(:\) & 1.04 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 2.61 & \(:\) & 0.52 \\
7. 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 3.26 & \(:\) & 0.9
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\circ}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) alround and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround and block partition \(3^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight effect of rust and frost. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Partapgarh, Kanpur, Banda, Baharaich, Aligarh and Etawah. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1343 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(319.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(1 \mathrm{l} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1180 \\
2. & 1553 \\
3. & 1067 \\
4. & 1464 \\
5. & 1529 \\
6. & 1436 \\
7. & 1172 \\
S.E./mean & \(=159.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Barley, Gram and Mustard.}

Site :-Institutional Res. Farm, Bichpuri (Agra).

Ref :-U.P. 50(315).
Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the mixed cropping of Barley (cereal), Gram (legume) and Mustard (oil seeds) grown in alternate rows or otherwise under rainfed condition.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Fallow-wheat, guar-fallow, sanai-wheat, fallow-gram, barley-mustard. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Well drained, apparently light loam with av. fertility, porus and friable, possessing a good water holding capacity. (b) Refer soil analysis, Bichpuri. (iii) 25.10.1950. (iv) (a) 6 ploughing by tractor ( \(5^{\prime \prime}\) \(6^{\circ}\) ) and off set disc harrrow and 1 ploughing by Punjab plough and 1 by Watt's plough and 5 ploughings by desi plough. (b) N.A. (c). When crop raised pure. 45 seer/ac.-barley, 30 seer/ac.-gram and 3 seer/ac. -mustard. Crops when raised in mixture. Barley- 22.5 seer/ac, gram-15.0 seer/ac. and mustard-1.5 seer/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Barley-C.251, gram-N.P.25, and mustard (pili sarson). local. (vii) N.A. (viii) No intercultural operations were done, weeds were allowed to grow as such for study. (ix) 0.49". (x) Barley and mustard on 22 to 24.3.1951. Gram on 8, 9.4.1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Barley sown pure.
2. Gram sown pure.
3. Mustard sown pure.
4. Barley-gram sown in alternate rows of pure stand.
5. Barley-mustard sown in alternate rows of pure stand.
6. Gram-mustard sown in alternate rows of pure stand.
7. Barley-gram sown mixed in the same row.
8. Barley-mustard sown mixed in the same row.
9. Gram-mustard sown mixed in the same row.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) \(115^{\prime} \times 82^{\prime}\). (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(39^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}, 39^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}, 37^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\) and \(37^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) Block border \(=4^{\prime}\) and Plot border \(=2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Germination counts, highest in barley followed by mustard and gram. (ii) N.A. (iii) Germination counts, stand of crops ( 5 lines), height of plant, fresh and dry weight of plants number of green tillers and green branches per plant, no. of dry tillers, no. of green and dry leaves, no. of days taken for earing. No. of ear bearing tillers, number of non bearing tillers, weight of grain per plant etc. (iv) (a) No. (b) No. (c) Nil (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The exjeriment was conducted by B.R.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1627 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(243.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatarent differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1 b ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & Treatment & Av. yieJd \\
1. & 1627 & 5. & 1869 \\
2. & 1964 & 6. & 1396 \\
3. & 1225 & 7. & 1377 \\
4. & 1732 & & 8. \\
& & 9. & 1738 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=121.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Wheat and Mustard. \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.
}

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 52(88), \\ Type:-'X'.}

Object:-To study the effect of differing seed rate propertions of Wheat and Mustard grown mixed on yield and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md ) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied all over the field 2-3 . weeks before sowing. (2) \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) mds of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{*}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field 2 days before sowing. (vi) to (ix) N.A. (x) Mustard-2.4.1953 and wheat-14.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed required in chk./gross plot } \\
& Wheat & \(:\) & Mustard & Wheat & \(:\) & Mustard \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & \(:\) & 1.5 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 5.0 & \(:\) & 1.2 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 10.1 & \(:\) & 0.9 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 12.7 & \(:\) & 0.7 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 15.2 & \(:\) & 0.6 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & & 20.3 & \(:\) \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & & 25.4 & 0.3 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border 112. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Mustardly Aphis. (iii) Grain and straw yield. • (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Baharaich and Raya. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C:P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(888 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 173.5 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(fv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lr} 
1. & 520 \\
2. & 924 \\
3. & 820 \\
4. & 822 \\
5. & 872 \\
6. & 1003 \\
7. & 1253
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(=86.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

\title{
Crop :- Wheat and Mustard (Rabi). \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.
}

Ref:-U.P. 53(114).
Type:-‘X'.
Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Mustard grown mixed on yield and residual effect on succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) NiI. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing on 4 and 11.7.1953, 12.8.1953. 19 and 26.9 .1953 and 15 and 26.10.1953, Watt's plough, cultivator plough and desi plough. (b) Through seed drill. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 45 md . of well decayed F.Y.M. or compost to be applied 2-3 weeks before sowing all over the field. (2) 1.25 md. of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field, a couple of days before sowing (vi) Wheat Pb. 591 and mustard T.101. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nii. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.4.1954-
2. TREATMENIS:
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate Proportion } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seedrate in chk./plot. } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) & Mustard & Wheat & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & Mustard \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 0 & \(:\) & 13.2 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 4.4 & \(:\) & 10.6 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 8.8 & \(:\) & 7.9 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 11.0 & \(:\) & 6.6 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 13.2 & \(:\) & 5.3 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 17.7 & \(:\) & 2.6 \\
& & & & 22.1 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(43^{\circ} \times 28^{\circ}\). (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Block partition \(\mathbf{3 '}^{\prime}\) serves as irrigation channel also.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bahraich, and Raya (Mathura). (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 977 lb./ac.
(ii) \(234.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in 1 lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 563 \\
2. & 602 \\
3. & 989 \\
4. & 809 \\
5. & 1001 \\
6. & 1318 \\
7. & 1554 \\
S.E./mean & \(=117.5 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Barley and Pea (Rabi).
> Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

Ref:- U.P. 52(87).
Type :- ‘X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed, on yield and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{l. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Heavy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11 .1952 . (iv) (a) 3 ploughings with Watt's plough, 1 ploughing with desi plough and 2 ploughings with cultivator. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) NiI. (vi) Barley NP. 21 and pea T. 163 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 15.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed required in chk./gross plot.} \\
\hline Barley & : & Pea & Barley & : & Pea \\
\hline 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & : & 20.0 \\
\hline 20 & : & 80 & 5.0 & : & 16.0 \\
\hline 40 & : & 60 & 10.0 & : & 12.0 \\
\hline 50 & : & \(\leq 0\) & 12.5 & : & 10.0 \\
\hline 60 & : & 40 & 15.0 & : & 8.0 \\
\hline 80 & : & 20 & 20.0 & : & 4.0 \\
\hline 100 & : & 0 & 25.0 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround and plot border \(=1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}{ }^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) \(2 \%\) barley attacked by smut. (iii) Grain and strạw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Faizabad, Kanpur, Hardoi, Aligarh and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (viii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1494 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(287.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1373 \\
2. & 1507 \\
3. & 1551 \\
4. & 1484 \\
5. & 1508 \\
6. & 1541 \\
7. & 1497 \\
S.E./mean, & \(=143.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{/ac}\)
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Barley and Pea (Rabi). \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.
}

Ref:-U.P. 53(106).
Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the effects of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed on yield and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10 .1953 . (iv) (a) 9 ploughings and harrowings by Watt's plough, cultivator and desi plough. (b) Sown behind the plough, barley in eastwest direction and then pea in north-south direction (c) As per treatments. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) (1) 45 mds. of well decayed F.Y.M. or compost be supplied all over the field 2-3 weeks before sowing and (2) 1.25 md. of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the: field a couple of days before sowing on 28.10 .1953 . (ivi) Barley C. 251. and pea T. 163. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in chk./plot} \\
\hline & Barley & : & Pea & Barley & : & Pea \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 20.0 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 5.0 & : & 16.0 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 10.0 & : & 12.0 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 12.5 & : & 10.0 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 15.0 & : & 8.0 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 25.0 & : & 4.0 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 25.0 & : & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Plot bordor \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround ; block partition \(3^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight attack of cut worm in pea. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Kanpur, Banda, Aligarh and Hardoi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1636 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(218.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in ton/ac.

Treatment Av. yield
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
eatment & Av. yeld \\
1. & 1245 \\
2. & 1538 \\
3. & 1785 \\
4. & 1589 \\
5. & 1608 \\
6. & 1747 \\
7. & 1941 \\
S.E./mean & \(=109.5\) lb./ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Etawah.

Ref :-U.P. 51(69).
Type :-‘X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed on yield and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Ni. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) Ploughings by desi plough and seed covered by planking. (b) Broadcast after mixing both seeds in the given proportions. (c) Wheat seed rate \(40-50\) seers/ac. and gram seed rate 30 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Green manure at \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N . (vi) Wheat-Pb. 591 (medium late) and gram-local (late). (vii) and (viii" N.A. (ix) \(1.10^{\circ}\) ( (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rates proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed required in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & - & Gram & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 11.5 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 3.8 & : & 9.2 \\
\hline 3. & & . & 60 & 7.6 & : & 6.9 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 9.5 & : & 5.8 \\
\hline 5. & 60 . & : & 40 & 11.4 & : & 4.6 \\
\hline . 6. & 80 & & 20 & 15.2 & : & 2.3 \\
\hline - 7. & 100 & - & - 0 & 19.0 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(24^{\prime} \times 43^{\prime}\). (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(=11^{\prime}\) alround field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround and sown space left between blocks \(=6^{\circ}\)-also to be used as irrigation channe.. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Not good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1951 to 1954 (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Pratapgarh, Kanpur and Bahraich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1061 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(178.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.

1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai. (c) No. (ii) (a) Loam inclined to heavy loam. (b) N.A: (iii) 3.11.1952. (iv) (a) Turning of sanai with victory plough on 16.8.1952, 2 ploughings with Watt's plough on 6.9.1952, 2 ploughings with cultivator on 20.9.1952. 2 ploughings with desi plough on 1.11.1952. (b) N.A. (e) Wheat 50 srs./ac. and Gram 30 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 1.3 cart loads ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied 2-3 weeks before sowing all over the field. \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) md. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough over the field 2 days before sowing. (vi) Wheat-Pb. 591 and gram-T: 87. (vi) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 13.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rateproportion -} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed required in chk./plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Gram & - Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 13.2 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 4.4 & : & 10.6 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 8.8 & : & 7.9 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 11.0 & : & 6.6 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 13.2 & : & 5.3 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 17.7 & : 2 & 2.6 . \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 22.1 & : & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(43^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alroumd. Plot border \(=1{ }^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1952. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Varanasi, Kanpur, Bahraich, Pratapgarh, Aligarh, Banda and Jhansi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1092 Ib./ac.
(ii) 160.5 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 713 \\
2. & 1040 \\
3. & 1053 \\
4. & 1096 \\
5. & 1204 \\
6. & 1269 \\
7. & 1267 \\
S.E./mean & \(=80.3 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

Ref :-U.P. 53(111).

Object :-To study the eff \(\mathcal{t} t\) of different seed-rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed on yield and residual effect on the succeeding \(k\) harif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) NiL (b) N.A. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 2.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) 7 ploughings and harrowings by Watt's plough cultivator and desi plough. (b) Wheat sown first (east-west in lines) and gram across (north-south) wheat lines behind the plough. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 45 md . of well decayed F.Y.M. or compost to be applied 2-3 weeks before sowing all over the field. 1.25 md. of Super to be placed at depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field a couple of days before sowing (vi) Wheat Pb. 591 (late). Gram T. 87. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 22.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in chk./plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Gram & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 13.2 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 4.4 & : & 10.6 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 8.8 & : & 79 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 11.0 & : & 6.6 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 13.2 & : & 5.3 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 30 & 17.7 & : & 2.6 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 22.1 & : & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(43^{\circ} \times 28^{\prime}\). (b) \(40^{\circ} \times 25^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround, irrigation channel between blocks \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield of both crops separately. (iv) (a) 1951-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Pratapgarh, Kanpur, Banda, Bahraich, Jhansi and Aligarh. (vi) Nil. (vii) The exptwas conducted by C.P.(R).
3. RESULTS:
(i) \(1439 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(252.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 672 \\
2. & 1253 \\
3. & 1568 \\
4. & 1437 \\
5. & 1575 \\
6. & 1782 \\
7. & 1785 \\
S.e./mean & \(=126.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Barley and Pea. \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad. \\ Ref :- U.P. 53(64). \\ Type:- 'X'.
}

Object :-To study the effect of different seed-rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed, on yield and residual effect on succeeding Kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 16.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing with praja and desi plough on 17.10 .1953 and 13.1 1.1953. (b) Barley to be sown first east-west in lines behind the plough and subsequently pea to be sown north-south. (c) Barley at 60 srs./ac. and pea at \(40 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) Compost at \(45 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{a}\). applied all over the field on 26.10 .1953 and (2) Super to be placed \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in soil behind the plough furrows at \(1.5 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (applied on 9.11 .1953 ). (vi) Barley K-3 and pea T-163. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing are common in practice at the proper time. (ix) N.A. (x) 24.3.1954.

\section*{1153}
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in lb./plot.} \\
\hline & Barley & : & Pea & Barley & & Pea \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 2,66 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 0.80 & : & 2.13 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 1.60 & : & 1.59 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 1.99 & : & 1.32 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 2.40 & : & 1.06 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 3.20 & : & 0.53 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 4.00 & : & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(47^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (b) \(44^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (v) Plot bọrder \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border 3' alround and block partition \(3^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) About \(10 \%\) smut attack on barley crop. (iii) Yield of mixed grain. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Kanpur, Banda. Aligarh, Etawah and, Hardoi. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R)
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(627.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(86.39 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 95.5 \\
2. & 609.4 \\
3. & 713.1 \\
4. & 728.4 \\
5. & 648.3 \\
6. & 772.0 \\
7. & -825.1 \\
S.E./mean & \(=43.20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Barley and Pea.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Faizabad.
Object:-To study the effect of different seed-rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed, on yield and residual effect on the succeeding Kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1952. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings by praja and desi ploughs. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e). N.A. (v) Compost applied all over the field on 23.10.1952, Super \(1 \pm\) mid. placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrow behind the plough, all over the field on 26.10.1952. (vi) Pea T-163 and barley T-2I. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 6 to 8.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{lcrr}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } \\
& Barley & \(:\) & Pea \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}

Seeds used in chk./gross plot
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Barley & : & Pea \\
0.0 & \(:\) & 20.7 \\
6.2 & \(:\) & 16.6 \\
12.4 & : & 12.4 \\
15.5 & : & 10.3 \\
18.7 & : & 8.3 \\
24.9 & : & 4.1 \\
31.4 & : & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(47^{\prime} \times 30^{\circ}\). (b) \(44^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\) : (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround and plot border \(=1\}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Attack of smut on ears in barley and pest in pea. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Etawah, Kanpur, Hardoi, Aligarh and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1486 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(121.0 \mathrm{lb} /\) /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yiel \\
1. & 787 \\
2. & 1357
\end{tabular}
3. 1492
4. 1603
5. . 1485
6. \(\quad 1931\)
7. . 1749
S.E./mean \(\quad=60.48 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat and Barley.
Site :- Regional Res. Stn., Hardoi.

Ref :-U.P. 52(92).
Type :- 'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Barley grown mixed, on yield and residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil.' (b) Fallow. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11.1952. (iv) (a) 12 ploughings (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) F.Y.M. applied to entire field on 12.10.1952 and Super applied on 28.10.1952. (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. (2) 1 md . of Super placed at \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) depth in furrows behind the plough all over the field. (vi) Barley C. 251 (medium) and wheat C. 13 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 28 and 31.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed required in chk./plot. } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) & Barley & & Wheat & \(:\) \\
Barley \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & \(:\) & 26.3 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & & 0.3 & \(:\) & 21.0 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 8.7 & \(:\) & 15.7 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 10.9 & \(:\) & 13.1 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 13.1 & \(:\) & 10.5 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & & 17.5 & \(:\) & 5.2 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 21.9 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) \(35^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (b) \(32^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround and plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Damage to barley upto \(20 \%\). (ii) Attack of orange rust in barley upto \(80 \%\), leaves especially attacked.
(iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bahraich and Pratapgarh.
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2311 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(197.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2334 \\
2. & 2346 \\
3. & 2521 \\
4. & 2411 \\
5. & 2332 \\
6. & 2428 \\
7. & 1807 \\
S.E./mean & \(=98.6 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat and Barley (Rabi).
- Site:- Regional Res. Stn., Hardoi.

Ref :- U.P. 53(59).
Type :-‘X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Barley grown mixed on yiels and residual effect on succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong T.1. (c) Nii. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing ot 21 and 30.10 .1953 and \(1,2,8\) and 12.11 .1953 . (b) Wheat to be sown 1 st in lines east-west behind des plough and similarly barley across wheat limes. (c) Wheat 50 srs./ac. and barley 60 srs./ac. (d) and (e N.A. (v) (1) Compost on F.Y.M. at 45 md./ac. (2) Super to be placed \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{n}\) deep in soil in furrows behind the plough. at \(1.5 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 5.11 .1953 . (vi) Wheat C .13 (early) and barley K.12. (vii) Irrigatéd.) (vii) Weeding and hoeing at the proper time are common in practice. (ix) Not recorded. (x) 26.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Seedrate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in lb ./plot.} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Barley & & Wheat & : & Barley \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & & 0 & : & 3.38 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & & 0.55 & & 2.70 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & , & 1.12 & & 2.02 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & & 1.40 & & 1.68 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & & 1.68 & & 1.35 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & & 2.25 & & 0.67 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & & 2.82 & - & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. :ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(35^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (b) \(32^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround and block partition \(4^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Attack of yellow rust in barley. (iii) Grain and straw yield of each crop. (iv) (a) 1952-1953.
(b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Bahraich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1452 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(283.3 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly sigaificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1818 \\
2. & 1411 \\
3. & 1547 \\
4 & 1603 \\
5. & 1735 \\
6. & 1479 \\
7. & 570 \\
S.E./mean & -141.6 lb .ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley and Pea.
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Hardoi.

Ref:-U.P. 52(93).
Type : ' X '.

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding khar if crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.f1.1952. (iv)'(a)' 11 ploughings (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (i) 45 md of well decayed F.Y.M. applied all over the field on 12.10 .1952 . (2) \(1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{md}\). of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough on 28.10.1953 all over the field. (vi) Barley C251 (medium) pea improved (local). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A.' (ix) N.A. (x) 28.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} \\
\hline & Bar & Pea \\
\hline 1. & \(0{ }^{1}\) & 100 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & 80 \\
\hline 3. & . 40 & 60 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & 50 \\
\hline & 60 & 40 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & 20 \\
\hline & & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Seed required in chk./gross plot \\
Barley & \(:\) & Pea \\
0.0 & \(:\) & 19.0 \\
4.7 & \(:\) & 15.2 \\
9.5 & \(:\) & 11.4 \\
11.9 & \(:\) & 9.5 \\
14.2 & \(:\) & 7.6 \\
19.0 & \(:\) & 3.9 \\
23.8 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border \(=1 \frac{1{ }^{\prime}}{}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Damage to barley \(20 \%\). (ii) There was an attack of orange rust on barley crop upto \(80 \%\). The leaves were especially attacked. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Faizabad, Etawah, Kanpur, Aligarh and Banda. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. , RESULTS :
(i) \(2123 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(165.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & & Av. yield \\
1. & 1716 \\
2. & 2217 \\
3. & & 2186 \\
4. & & 2142 \\
5. & & 2327 \\
6. & 2193 \\
7. & 2080 \\
S.E./mean & \(=82.64 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley and Pea.
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Hardoi.

Ref:-U.P. 53(58).
Type :-‘X'.

Object :-To study the effect of differant seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 11.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing on 21, 30.10.1953, 1, 2, 8, 11.11.1953. (b) Barley sown 1st in lines in east-west direction and similarly pea to be sown across barley line. (c) Barley at 50 seer/ac. and pea at 40 seer/ac. (v) (1) Compost or F.Y.M. at \(45 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (2) Super to be placed \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep in soil in furrows behind the plough at \(1.5 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 4.11.1953. (vi) Barley K. 12 and pea T.163. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing.l (ix) N.A. (x) 25, 26.3.1954.

\section*{1157}
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in lb ./plot} \\
\hline & Barley & : & Pea & Barley & : & Pea \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & : & 2.47 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 0.61 & : & 1.95 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 1.22 & : & 1.46 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 1.53 & : & 1.22 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 1.83 & : & 0.98 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 2.44 & : & 0.50 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 3.06 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) \(36^{\prime} \times 36^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Block partition \(3^{\prime}\) serves as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.'
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Yellow rust and smut in barley crop and powdery milder in traces in pea. Damage 8-10 \% in barley and 3-4\% in pea. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Kanpur, Banda, Aligarh and Etawah. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1910 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(267.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1337 \\
2. & 1749 \\
3. & 1831 \\
4. & 2067 \\
5. & 2175 \\
6. & 2242 \\
7. & 1970 \\
S.E./mean & \(=133.9 \mathrm{lb} . / a c\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref :_U̇.P. 52(89).
Type :-‘X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Guar fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with gurjar plough on 26.10 .1952 ploughing with desi plough on 27.10.1952. Harrowing twice and ploughing with desi plough 3, 4.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied 2 weeks before sowing all over the field. (2) \(1 \frac{\mathrm{md}}{\mathrm{m}}\). of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field 2 days before sowing. (vi) Wheat-Pb. 591 Gram-T.87. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 7.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{5}{|c|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Gram & & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & & 0.0 & : & 15.2 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & & 5.0 & : & 12.2 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & & 10.1 & : & 9.1 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & & 12.7 & ; & 7.6 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & & 15.2 & : & 6.1 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & & 20.3 & : & 3.0 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & & 25.4 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\circ} \times 33^{\circ}\). (b) \(39^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border \(1 \frac{1}{2}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Varanasi, Kanpur, Baharaich, Partapgarh, Banda, Etawah, Jhansi and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(541.1 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(95.19 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 258.5 \\
2. & 679.7 \\
3. & 570.8 \\
4. & 600.7 \\
5. & 584.0 \\
6. & 610.3 \\
7. & 483.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=47.60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Fram (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref :-U.P. 53(100).
Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a' Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 21.10.1953. (iv) (a) Palewa on 17.9.1953, 6 ploughings and harrowings. (b) Main crop wheat is sown first in lines east-west behind the plough and subsequently gram is sown across wheat lines i.e, north-south. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) (1) \(45 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). of compost to be applied 2-3 weeks before sowing all over the field (2) 1.25 md./ac. of Super to be placed \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) deep.in furrows behind the plough all over the field a couple of days before sowing (vi) Wheat-Pb. 591 ; Gram-T.87. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) 9.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{cccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & Gram \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 100 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 80 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\multicolumn{4}{l}{ Seed used in terms of chk./plot } \\
Wheat & \(:\) & Gram \\
0 & \(:\) & 15.2 \\
5.0 & \(:\) & 12.2 \\
10.1 & \(:\) & 9.1 \\
12.7 & \(:\) & 7.6 \\
15.2 & \(:\) & 6.1 \\
20.3 & \(:\) & 3.0 \\
25.4 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.

4, GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) NiJ. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1955. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Etawah, Kalyanpur, (Kanpur) Atarra, (Banda) Baharaich and Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(576.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(79.70 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cl} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 275 \\
2. & 697 \\
3. & 609 \\
4. & 585 \\
S. & 651 \\
6. & 603 \\
7. & 616 \\
S.E./mean & \(=39.85, \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley and Pea (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Kalai.

Ref :-U.P. 52(91).
Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Jowar for fodder. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N,A. (iii) 7.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with gorja plough, ploughing with desi plough and harrowing with spring tin harrows (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Date of manuring 4.11.1952. (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied all over the field 2-3 weeks before sowing and (2) \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) md. of Super placed at a depth \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field. '(vi) Barley-K 12. and Pea-NP. 163. (vii) Irrigated, (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 14.3.1953.

TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{rcrrrrr}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed used in chk./gross plot } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Barley } & \(:\) & Pea & Barley & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & Pea \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 5.0 & 20.3 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 10.1 & \(:\) & 16.3 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 12.7 & \(:\) & 10.1 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 15.2 & \(:\) & 8.1 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 20.3 & \(:\) & 4.0 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 25.4 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\circ} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{1}^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) \(1952-1954\). (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Lucknow, Faizabad, Etawah, Kanpur, Hardoi and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS
(i) \(916 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(200.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain io lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 560 \\
2. & 1132 \\
3. & 1000 \\
4. & 1061 \\
5. & 888 \\
6. & 884 \\
7. & 890 \\
S.E./mean & \(-100.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\title{
Crop ：－Barley and Pea（Rabi）．
}

Ref ：－U．P．53（99）．

\author{
Site ：－Govt．Agri．Farm，Kalai．
}

Type ：－＇X＇．
Object ：－To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed on yield and end its residual affect on succeeding kharlf crop．

1．BASAL CONDITIONS：
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{（i）（a）Nil．（b）Fallow．（c）Nil．（ii）（a）Loam．（b）N．A．（iii）21．10．1953．（iv）（a）Ploughing and} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{harrowing on 18，23．9．1953， 16 and 20．10．1953．（b）Barley to be sown first in lines and in east－west} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{pea 40 seers／ac．（d）and（e）N．A．（v）（1） 45 md．of well decayed compost supplied all over the field on 15.10 .1953 and（2） 1.25 md ．of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough}} \\
\hline & & & & & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{on 19．10．1953．（vi）Barley－K． 2 and pea－163．（vii）Irrigated．（viii）Nil．（ix）Not recorded．（x）} \\
\hline \multicolumn{7}{|l|}{TREATMENTS ：} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Seed used in chk．／plot} & & & \\
\hline Barley & Pea & Barley & Pea & & & \\
\hline 1． 0 & 100 & 0 & 20.3 & & & \\
\hline 2． 20 & 80 & 5.0 & 16.3 & & & \\
\hline 3． 40 & 60 & 10.1 & 12.2 & & & \\
\hline 5． 50 & 50 & 12.7 & 10.1 & & & \\
\hline 5． 60 & 40 & 15.2 & 8.1 & & & \\
\hline 6． 80 & 20 & 20.3 & 4.0 & & & \\
\hline 7． 100 & 0 & 25.4 & ： 0 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

3．DESIGN ：
（i）R．B．D．（ii）
（ii）
plot．（vi）Yes．

4．GENERAL：
（i）Good．（ii）Nil．（iii）Grain and straw yield．（iv）（a）1952－1954．（b）No．（c）N．A．（v）（a） Banaras，Faizabad，Etawah，Kalyanpur，Atarra and Lucknow．（b）N．A．（vi）Nil．（vii）The experiment was conducted by C．P．（R）．

5．RESULTS ：
（i） 1235 lb ／ac．
（ii） \(305.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) ．
（iii）Treatment differences are not significant．
（iv）Av．yield of grain in lb ．／ac．
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av．yield \\
1． & 1474 \\
2． & 1321 \\
3． & 895 \\
4． & 1484 \\
5． & 1431 \\
6． & 1168 \\
7. & 871 \\
S．P．／mean & \(=152.5 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop ：－Barley and Pea（Rabi）．
Ref ：－U．P．53（104）．
Site ：－Govt．Agri．Farm，Kalai．
Type ：－＇ X ＇．
Object ：－To study the physiological response of mixed crops to fertilizers．
1．BASAL CONDITIONS ：
（i）（a）Nil．（b）Fallow．（c）Nil．（ii）（a）Loam．（b）N．A．（iii）28．10．1953．（iv）（a）Ploughing and harrowing（b）Sown behind the plough and pea lines in between barley lines．（c）Barley at 30 srs．／ac．and pea at 8 srs．／ac．（d）and（e）N．A．（v）N．A．（vi）N．A．（vii）Irrigated．（viii）Nil．（ix）Not recorded心かく2105A

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 2 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of N .
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul.: \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\).
(4) 2 levels of CaO as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of CaO .

Manuring on 26.10.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{4}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 ( 2 flanks of 8 plots each). (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(22^{\circ} \times 37^{\circ}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) ' ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-1954. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Bahraich, Hardoi, Rayà, Mathura and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESUUTS :
(i) 3678 Jb./ac.
(ii) \(342.7 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[b]{2}{*}{Av. Response}} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{N} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{P} & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{K} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{C} \\
\hline & & Absence & Presence & Absence & Presence & Absence & Presence & Absence & Presence \\
\hline N & 40.46 & - & - & 39.74 & 41.18 & 21.67 & 59.24 & -7.95 & 88.87 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}\) & 96.09 & 95.37 & 96.81 & - & - & 140.16 & 5202 & 98.98 & 93.20 \\
\hline K & -4.33 & -23.12 & 14.45 & 39.74 & -48.40 & - & - & 96.09 & -104.75 : \\
\hline C & -0.73 & -49.13 & 47.69 & 2.16 & -3.62 & 99.70 & -101.14 & - & - \\
\hline \multicolumn{10}{|c|}{S.E of average response \(=98.9 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac}\). S.E of differential response \(=139.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Wheat and Gram.(Rabi) & Ref :- U.P. 49(106). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. & Type:- 'X'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of varying seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram on the yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Udid. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 14.11.1949. (iv) (a) One ploughing by Watt's plough, one harrowing by tractor and planking, fine ploughing by cultivator and pata. (b) Broadcast after mixing the seed in the given proportions, ploughing by desi plough and subsequently covered by, planking. (c) Wheat at 50 seers /ac. and gram at \(30 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}\). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N, no other information is available (vi) Wheat-C-13 (early) and gram-local. (vii) N.A. (viii) Interculture by palent junior on 15.12.1949. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed required in chk./plot } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) & Gram & Wheat & Gram \\
1. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 4 & \(:\) & 9.6 \\
2. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 8 & \(:\) & 7.2 \\
3. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 10 & \(:\) & 6.0 \\
4. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 12 & \(:\) & 4.8 \\
5. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & & 16 & \(:\) \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) \(32^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (b) \(28^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) \(2^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of mixture of grain and bhusa. (iv) (a), (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.

\section*{RESULTS :}
(i) \(1490 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(106.1 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac. Treatment Av. yield
1. . 1131
2. 1459
3. 1515
4. 1590
5. , 1755
S.E./mean \(\quad=47.45 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

\author{
Crop :wheat and Gram. \\ Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
}

Ref :wU.P. 51(55)

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) kakun. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10.1951. (iv) (d) 8-10 ploughings
(b) Wheat to be sown first in lines east-west behind the plough, Subsequently gram to be sown similarly north-south across the wheat lines. (c) 40-50 seer/ac. for wheat 30 seer/ac. for gram. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. or compost to be placed \(2-3\) weeks before sowing. (2) 14 md , of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{*}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field, a couple of days before sowing. (vi) Wheat-C. 13 (early) gram-local (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) \(1.07^{\circ}\). (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Gram & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & : & 10.0 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 3.2 & : & 8.0 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 6.4 & : & 6.0 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 8.0 & : & 5.0 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 9.6 & : & 4.0 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 12.8 & : & 2.0 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 16.0 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
7. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yleld. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Pratapgarh, Etawah and Bahralch. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1424 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(222.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1576 \\
2. & 1628 \\
3. & 1374 \\
4. & 1691 \\
5. & 1551 \\
6. & 1112 \\
7. & 1030 \\
S.E./mean & \(=111.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Ref:-U.P. 52(75).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.
Type :-'X'.
Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) - wheat and gram mixture. (b) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\), (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A.. (iii) 28.10.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing with Watt's plough on 21.9.1952. Spiral harrrow and pata on 22.9.1952. Ploughing with cultivator and pata on 6, 16.10.1952. Palewa on 8, 9.10.1952. Pata' on 15.10.1952. Ploughing with desi plough and pata on 24, 25 and 27.10.1952.' (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) Castor cake applied all over the field on 20.10.1952. (2) 11 md. of Super applied in furrows at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{4}\) behind the plough all over the field on 25.10 .1952 . (vi) Wheat-C. 13. GramT 87. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (ix) 18.4.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion. } & & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed in chk./gross plot } \\
& Wheat & \(:\) & Grama & & Wheat & \(:\) & Gram \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & & 0.0 & \(:\) & 8.0 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & & 2.5 & \(:\) & 6.4 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & & 5.1 & \(:\) & 4.8 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & & 6.4 & \(:\) & 4.0 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & & 7.6 & \(:\) & 3.2 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & & 10.2 & \(:\) & 1.6 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & & 12.8 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(25^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Lucknow Varanasi, Baharaich, Pratapgarh, Aligarh, Banda, Etawah and Jhansi. (b) N,A, (vi) Nil. (vi). The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1352 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(166.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 979 \\
2. & 1372 \\
3. & 1484 \\
4. & 1321 \\
5. & 1341 \\
6. & 1380 \\
7. & 1587 \\
S.E./mean & \(=83.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

1 Ref:-U P. 53(161). Type:-'X'.

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on succeeding \(k\) harif crop.
1. RASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Legume-cereal. (b) Lobia and Moong T1. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.12.1953. (iv )(a) 8 ploughings and fata. (b) Wheat to te sown first in east-west lines behind desi plough and subsequently gram across wheat lines. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Moong and Lobia turned in. Application of F Y.M. at \(45 \mathrm{md} . / a \mathrm{c}\). on 14.10 .1953 and Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough on 25.10.1953. (vi) Wheat C-13 ; Gram T-87. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing are common in practice after irrigation. (ix) N.A. (x) 19.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in chk./plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Gram & & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & & 0 & : & 8.0 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & & 2.5 & : & 6.4 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & & 5.1 & : & 4.8 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & & 6.4 & : & 4.0 \\
\hline 5 & 60 & : & 40 & & 7.6 & : & 3.2 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & & 20 & & 10.2 & & 1.6 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & & 12.8 & : & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(25^{\circ} \times 35^{\circ}\). (b) \(22^{\prime} \times 32^{\prime}\) (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination per square yard, grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Etawah, Atarra, Banda, Baharaich, Kalai, Aligarh and Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1043 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(277.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly sigàificant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 810 \\
2. & 698 \\
3. & 911 \\
4. & 857 \\
5. & 1084 \\
6. & 1353 \\
7. & 1591 \\
S.E /mean & \(=138.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Barley and Pea (Rabi). & Ref :- U.P 52(86). \\
Site :- Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur. & Type :~'X'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) - (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.11.1952. (iv) (a) Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) ploughed in on 23.8.1952. ploughing with Watt's plough and pata 19, 20.9.1952, ploughing with cultivator + pata on 9,10.10.1952, 3.11.1952 palewa on 20.10.1952 ploughing with desi plough and pata on 30,31.10.1952, 4.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) (i) Castor cake applied on 25.10 .1952 all over field. (2) it md. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field on 1.11,1952 (vi) Barley C-251 (medium) Pea T-163 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 26.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{cccccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & & \multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed used in chk./gross plot } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Barley } & \(:\) & Pea & & Barley & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & & 0.0 & Pea \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & & 2.6 & \(:\) & 7.5 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & & 5.3 & \(:\) & 5.7 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & & 6.7 & \(:\) & 4.7 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & & 8.0 & \(:\) & 3.8 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & & 10.7 & \(:\) & 1.9 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & & 13.4 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) No. (c) N.A. \({ }^{\circ}\) (v) (a) Lucknow Faizabad, Etawah, Hardoi, Aligarh and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2338 \quad\) lb./ac.
(ii) \(299.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1818 \\
2. & 2229 \\
3. & 2126 \\
4. & 2418 \\
5. & 2503 \\
6. & 2609 \\
7. & 2665 \\
S.E./mean & \(=149.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Barley and Pea (Rabi).
Site :-Govt. Agri. Res. Farm, Kalyanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(147).
Type - \(\mathbf{X X}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Legume-Cereal. (b) Moong and lobia. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1953. (iv) (a) 7 ploughings and pata. (b) Barley to be sown first in lines east-west behind the plough and pea across. barley lines north-south. Moong and lobia turned in. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) \(45 \mathrm{md} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of well decayed F.Y.M. be supplied all over the field \(2-3\) weeks before sowing.: (2) 14 md. of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field a couple of days before sowing. (vi) Barley T. 251 (medium) and pea T. 163 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) (N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 4.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate proporticns} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in chk./plot.} \\
\hline Barley & : & Pea & Barley & : & Pea \\
\hline 1. 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 9.5 \\
\hline 2. 20 & : & 80 & 2.6 & : & 7.6 \\
\hline 3. 40 & : & 60 & 5.3 & : & 5.7 \\
\hline 4. 50 & : & 50 & 6.7 & : & 4.7 \\
\hline 5. 60 & : & 40 & 8.0 & : & 3.8 \\
\hline 6. 80 & : & 20 & 10.7 & : & 1.9 \\
\hline 7. 100 & : & 0 & 13.4 & : & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) T. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(36^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}\). (b) \(33^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Nil. (ii) Nil. (iii) Germination per square yard. and grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953.
(b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) Varanasi, Faizabad, Etawah, Kalai (Aligarb), Atarra (Banda) and Lucknow.
(b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1713 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 158.3 lb /ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are not sigaficant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Av. yeatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1531 \\
2. & 1738 \\
3. & 1708 \\
4. & 1859 \\
S. & 1697 \\
6. & 1713 \\
7. & 1743 \\
S.E./mean & \(-79.16 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Site :- Student's Instructional Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(191).
Type :- 'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of mixed cropping of Wheat and Gram on yield under irrigated and unirrigated conditions.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.10.1952. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) and
(c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Wheat C. 13 (early) and Gram T. 87 (late). (vii)

Partly irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 25 and 26.3.1953.
3. TREATMENTS :
1. ' Sown cross-wise-seed rate wheat at \(40 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac} .+\mathrm{gram}\) at \(40 \mathrm{sr} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Along same line-seed rate wheat at 40 srs ./ac. + gram at 40 sr ./ac.
3. Sown crosswise-seed rate wheat at \(20 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac} .+\mathrm{gram}\) at \(20 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. Along same line-seed rate wheat at 20 srs./ac. + gram at 20 srs./ac.
5. Wheat pure- 40 srs./ac.
6. Gram pure- 40 srs./ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. In each irrigated and unirrigated portion of expt. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Wheat and gram yield. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by P.A.C. Plotwise data not available at the station.
5. RESULTS :

Irrigated conditions
(i) \(1747 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(133.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1895 \\
2. & 1883 \\
3. & 1772 \\
4. & 1721 \\
5. & 1566 \\
6. & 1646 \\
S.E./mean & \(=66.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Unirrigated conditions
(i) \(1418 \quad \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(251.2 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
-(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1874 \\
2. & 1741 \\
3. & 1439 \\
4. & 1283 \\
5. & 198 \\
6. & 1970
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(=125.6 \mathrm{bb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Jowar and Guar.
Site :m Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 52(247).
Type:- ' X '.

Object :-A study of Jowar and Kharif mixture for fodder at different levels of \(\mathbf{N}\) and their residual effect on Barley.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanal G.M. followed by Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) NA. (iii) 6.7.1952.
(iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation was done' in the field after the harvest. Preceding wheat crop, after monsoon field was planked twice on July 5, after that a cultivator was used to incorporate the cake and seed into soil, the field was then lightly planked and suitable ridges thrown up to demarcate plots. (b) to (e) NA. (v) N.A. (vi) Local variety of jowar and guar. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) No in terculture. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments :
4 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=\) control, \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} ., \mathrm{N}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=90 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
Sub-plot treatments :
- Seed rate of Jowar + guar in lb./ac. : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=40+0, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=30+10, \mathbf{R}_{3}=20+20, \mathbf{R}_{4}=10+30\) and \(\mathbf{R}_{5}=0+40\). \(\mathbf{N}\) applied as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+\) castor cake in equal proportion. Manures broadcast separately.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot.
(ii) (a) 4 main-plots/replication and 5 sub-plots/main-plot.
(iii)
\(54.5^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
(iv)
4. GENERAL .
(i) Germination of jowar \(82.00 \%\) and guar \(90.60 \%\). (ii) Light attack of jowar stem torer at the beginning of August and a very moderate incidence of zonate leaf-spot disease during the 2nd and 3rd neeks of September, no measures being taken for control. (iii) Yield of jowar + guar (green fodder) in lb./ac. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C. (K). Original data was not available.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(31457 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(1623.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(919.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(N, \mathbf{R}\) and interaction \(\mathrm{N} \times \mathbf{R}\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e j n}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 20743 & 29973 & 40759 & 45945 & 34355 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 25306 & 31529 & 35856 & 43456 & 34037 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 25634 & 32774 & 41043 & 42004 & 35364 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & 25980 & 32359 & 38374 & 42834 & 34887 \\
\(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & 17113 & 19498 & 19395 & 18564 & 18642 \\
\hline Mean & 22955 & 29227 & 35085 & 38561 & 31457
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(\mathbf{N}\). \(=513.4 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
2. marginal means of \(R \quad=324.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
3. R means at the same level of \(\mathrm{N} \quad=649.9 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
4. N means at the same level of \(\mathrm{R} \quad=775.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat and Mustard (Rabi).
Site :- Students' Instructional Farm, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(128).
Type 'X'。

Object :-To study the mixed cropping of Wheat and Mustard.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Sarial (G.M.)—wheat. (b) Sanai for G.M. (c) No manuring. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 5.11.1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (d) As per treatments. (c) N.A. (v) The field was green manured with Sanal, sanai was sown on 8.7.1953 at one md./ac. and was ploughed in on 18.8.1953. (vi) Wheat C-13 and Laha T-01. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Wheat with mustard at \(6^{\prime}\) distance.
2. Wheat with mustard at \(9^{\prime}\) distance.
3. Wheat with mustard at \(12^{\prime}\) distance.
4. Wheat alone.
5. Mustard alone at \(2^{\prime}\) distance.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) \(40^{\prime} \times 27^{\prime}\). (b) \(38^{\prime} \times 15^{\prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Yield of mixed grain and bhusa of wheat. (iv) (a) and (b) No. (c) N.A. (v) (a) No. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.A.C.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(1313 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(256.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1634 \\
2. & 1595 \\
3. & 1500 \\
4. & 1471 \\
5. & 364 \\
S.E./mean \(:\) & \(=104.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Paddy, Kodon, Arhar and Maize. \\ Site :-Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat. \\ Ref:-U.P. 52(310). \\ Type:-'X'.
}

Object :-To study the mixed cropping pattern for early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Arhar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.6.1952. (iv) (a) One ploughing by Punjab plough and 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Broadcast (paddy) and no information about other crops. (c) Paddy at 37 seers/ac., kodon at 2 seers/ac., arhar at 3 seers/ac. and maize at 4 seers/ac. (d) Arhar at a distance of \(3^{\prime}\). (e) N.A. (v) A/S at \(61.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 9.8 .1952 as top dressing by broadcast. (vi) Paddy N. 22 (early). Other crops are all sown with local varieties. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding on 3.8.1952. (ix) 31.42'. (x) 22.9.1952 and 2.10.1952, arhar on 27.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Paddy.
2. Paddy+arhar.
3. Paddy+maize.
4. Paddy + kodon.
5. Paddy + arhar + maize + kodon.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5 . (iv) (a) \(29^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime} .4^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime \prime}\) alround the net plot left as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good and uniform growth. Lodging on 18.9.1952. Arhar crop was severly damaged by the hailstorm on 16.1.1953, when the crop was totally flowered. (ii) Grass hoppers were very common during the first fortnight of August. Arhar catter-pillar and gundhi bug were two other pests which were observed In arhar and paddy crop. Efforts made to control by dusting gammexane. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of components of the mixture. (iv) (a) 1952 to 1954. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist, (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., - Nagina. Rates of the different crops for the year 1952 as supplied by the station have been used.
5. RESUI TS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean value of \\
\(\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Rs./ac. \\
(transformed \\
back values)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Rs./ac. \\
(by direct \\
calculations
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 1.3861 & 94.23 & 98.26 \\
2. & 2.0319 & 240.58 & 242.13 \\
3. & 1.7326 & 165.88 & 167.48 \\
4. & 1.8761 & 200.22 & 200.50 \\
S. & 2.1300 & 267.65 & 269.18 \\
G.M. & 1.8313 & 193.71 & 195.51 \\
S.E./mean & 0.0693 & &
\end{tabular}
\(x=\) value of the produce in Rs./plot.
- Treatment differences are higly significant.

\title{
Crop :-Paddy, Arhar, Kodon and Maize (Kharif). \\ Site ;-Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
}

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 53(314).}

Type:-‘'X'

Object:-To find out the economics of mixed cropping for early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) As per treatments. (c) A/S at \(61.72 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). on 9.8 .1952 as top dressing to previous crop. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 25.6.1953. (iv) (a) 3 ploughings. (b) Paddy broadcast. No information about other crops. (c) Paddy at 37 seers/ac., arhar at 3 seers/ac., maize at 4 seers/ac. and kodon at 2 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Village compost at 10 C.L./ac. giving about \(40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. A/S at 20 seers/ac. as top dressing. (vi) Paddy - N. 22 (early). All other crops sown were of local varieties. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding on 7.7.1953. (ix) 47.09". (x) 25 and 26.9.1953, and arhar on 27.3.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Paddy.
2. Paddy+arhar.
3. Paddy+maize.
4. Paddy+kodon.
5. Paddy +arhar+maize+kodon.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) S. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(29^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) left alround the net plot as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Growth not good due to excessive weeds and low fertility of soil. The growth of arhar and maize is affected due to the continuous and heavy rains during July. Maize crop totally failed. No yield in any plot at all. No lodging. (ii) Only slight attack of leafspot disease at a later stage of the crop. Gundhi bug which was observed in early stages of the crop was controlled by dusting gammexane. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of the components of the mixture. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., Nagina. Rates of different crops for the year 1953, as supplied by the station have been used.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean value of \\
\(\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{8}} /\) plot
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Rs./ac. \\
(transformed \\
back values)
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Rs./ac. \\
(by direct \\
calculation)
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 1.3091 & 80.47 & 81.42 \\
2. & 1.7181 & 162.56 & 166.15 \\
3. & 1.3114 & 80.87 & 81.02 \\
4. & 1.2798 & 75.44 & 76.11 \\
5. & 1.6577 & 149.05 & 149.97 \\
G.M. & 1.4552 & 109.68 & 110.93
\end{tabular}
\(x\) is the value of produce in Rs./plot.
Treatment differences are highly significant.

\author{
Crop:- Paddy, Til, Kodon and Arhar (Kharif). \\ Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.
}

Ref:- U.P. 49(232).
Type :- 'X'.

Object:-To find out the economics of mixed cropping for early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
> (i) (a) Paddy-gram. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.6.1949. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by victory plougíh and 3 ploughings by desi plough. (b) Kodon, paddy and zil broadcast. Arhar-dibbling. (c) Paddy at 36 srs./ac., kodon at 2 srs./ac., til at 2 chk./ac. and arhar at 3 srs./ac. (d) Arhar \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) Arhar -1 seed ling/hole. (v) Village compost at 10 C.L./ac. giving about \(40 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N. (vi) Paddy N. 22 (early). All the other crops were sown with local varieties. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding on 7.8.1949 and 4.9.1949. (ix) 49.16". (x) 7.10.1949 and arhar 13.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Paddy.
2. Padd \(\dot{y}+\) arhar.
3. Paddy \(+t i l\).
4. Paddy+kodon.
5. Paddy + arhar + til+koidon.

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(29^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) left alround the net plot as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) With the exception of two treatments in which \(t i l\) and arhar are sown as mixed crop, the rest of the crop is very good. (ii) There is no incidence of disease. In certain plots where the growth is very vigorous kharif grass hoppers are found in very minute number. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of crop for different components. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botainst (Paddy) to Govt.. U.P., Nagina. The rates of the various crops for the year 1949, as supplied by the station have been used.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\(\left.\begin{array}{cccc}\text { Treatment } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Mean value of } \\ \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} / \text { plot }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Rs./ac. } \\ \text { (Transformed }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Rs./ac. } \\ \text { (By direct }\end{array} \\ \text { calculations value) }\end{array}\right)\)

Crop:- Paddy; Til, Kodon and Arhar (Kharif).
Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

> Ref :- U.P. \(50(280)\).
> Type :- ‘X'.

Object:-To study the economics of mixed cropping of early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Paddy-gram. (b) Gram. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 15.6.1950. (iv) (a) 1 ploughing by victory plough and 3 by desi plough. (b) Paddy, til, kodon by broadcast and arhar by ditbling. (c) Paddy-37.srs/ac., kodon-2 srs./ac., til-2 chk/ac. and arhar-3 srs./ac. (d) Arhar \(3^{\prime}\) apart. (e) Arhar-1 seedling hole. (v) Tank silt (manure). Dose and method of application-N.A. (vi) Paddy N. 22 (early). All the other varieties are local varieties. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weedings on 28.6.1950 and 12.7.1950. (ix) \(41.66^{\prime \prime}\). (x) 24 to 26.9.1950 and arhar on 3.4.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Paddy.
2. Paddy + arhar.
3. Paddy + til.
4. Paddy+kodon:
5. Paddy+arhar+til+kodon.
3. DESIGN :
(i) L. Sq. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(29^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime} 4^{\prime \prime}\). (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime \prime} 4^{\prime \prime}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot left as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good and uniform growth. (ii) Grass hopper was very common during July. Til bug and arhar cater-piller were two other pests which totally ruined the til crop. A very early action was taken to kill the til bug but the crop could not survive. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of components of the mixture (iv) (a) 1949 to 1951. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by-Assistant Economic Botainst (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., Nagina. Rates of the various crops for the year 1950 as supplied by the station have been used.
5. 'RESULTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline (i) to (iv) Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2} / p l o t}\) & Rs./ac.
(Transformed
back value) & \begin{tabular}{l}
Rs./ac. \\
(By direct calculation)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 1. & 1.9754 & 225.57 & 225.96 \\
\hline 2. & 1.8784 & 200.79 & 201.56 \\
\hline 3. & 1.5965 & 135.84 & 140.03 \\
\hline 4. & 1.5939 & 135.29 & 137.11 \\
\hline 5. & 1.5510 & 126.34 & 127.56 \\
\hline G.M. & 1.7190 & 164.77 & 166.44 \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=0.0629\) & & \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(x=\) value of the produce in Rs./plot
Treatment differences are highly significant.}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Paddy, Til, Kodon and Arhar (Kharif). Site :- Rice Res. Sub-Stn., Kunraghat.

Ref:-U.P. 51(267). Type :n' \(\mathbf{X}\) '。

Object :-To study the economics of mixed cropping for early Paddy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram. (c) No. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.6.1951. (iv) (a) One ploughing by Punjab plough and two ploughings by desi plough. (b) Paddy, Kodon, til as broadcast arhar by dibbling. (c) Paddy 37 seers/ac., kodon 2 seers/ac., til 2 chk./ac. and arhar 3 seers/ac. (d) Arhar 3' apart. (e) 1 seedling per hole. (v) Nil. (vi) Paddy N-22 (early) Rest of the verieties are all local. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weedings on 12.7.1951, 23.7.1951 and 19.8.1951. (ix) -29.01". (x) 30.9.1951 and 1.10.1951 For arhar-N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Paddy.
2. Paddy +arhar.
3. Paddy + til.
4. Paddy + kodon.
5. Paddy +arhar + til + kodon.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) \(29^{\circ} \times 26^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\). (b) \(27^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}-4^{\circ}\). (v) \(1^{\prime}\) alround the net plot left as non experimental area. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory growth. (ii) Grass hoppers were observed in the 1st week of August. Til bugs and Arhar-cater-pillers were two other pests which were observed in Til and Arhar crops. A very early action was taken to remove them. (iii) Height, tillering and yield of different components of the mixture. (iv) (a) 1949-1951. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Lower yields were obtained due to the shortage of water and less rains during the crop season. Til crop completely failed. (vii) Rates of the various crops for the year 1951, as supplied by the station have been used. Experiment conducted by Assistant Economic Botanist (Paddy) to Govt., U.P., Nagina.
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
(i) to (iv) & & Transformed back value & By direct calculation \\
Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{ } x+\frac{1}{2} /\) plot & 101.61 & 103.43 \\
1. & 1.4257 & 228.73 & 233.91 \\
2. & 1.9874 & 110.88 & 111.12 \\
3. & 1.4739 & 202.91 & 203.94 \\
4. & 1.8869 & 242.04 & 243.99 \\
5. & 2.0373 & 177.23 & 179.28 \\
G.M. & 1.7622 & & \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.0880\) lb./ac. & & \\
\(x=\) value of produce in \(\mathrm{Re} /\) plot. & & \\
Treatment differences are highly significant. & &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :-Gram and Linseed. \\ Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
}

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 52(149).}

Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and Linseed grown mixed, on the yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 12.10.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) Gram 40 seers/ac. Linseed 12 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Date of application of fertilizers 11.10.1952., T.C. \(8 \mathrm{C} . \mathrm{L} . / \mathrm{ac}\). Super at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum at 10 lb ./ac. of Cao. (vi) Gram T-87 (late), Linseed T-1193 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(19^{\prime} \times 29^{\prime}\). (b) \(14^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2 \frac{1^{\prime}}{}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Bahraich, Hamirpur and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(548.8 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 42.56 lb ./ac.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 658.6 \\
2. & 683.2 \\
3. & 574.6 \\
4. & 499.5 \\
5. & 491.7 \\
6. & 483.8 \\
7. & 450.2 \\
S.E./mean & \(=21.28 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Gram and Linseed.
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn. Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 53(137)
Type :-'X'.

Object :-Te study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and,Linseed, grown mixed, on growth and yield and the residual effects on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Jowar + guar-gram+linseed. (b) Jowar and guar. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 18.10.1953. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by mould board plough on 1.10.1953. Cultivator and planking twice on 6.10.1953. (b) Linseed sown by broadcast and gram behind the plough in lines. (c) to (e) N.A. (v) Application of town compost on 14.10 .1953 at 84 md ./ac., Super at 50 srs ./ac. on 17.10 .1953 applied at \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in soil through drill. (vi) Gram T. 87 (medium) and linseed T. 1193 (medium). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) 5.78". (x) 27.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{ccccccc} 
& \multicolumn{7}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } & & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed used in gms./plot. } \\
Gram & Linseed & Gram & Linseed \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0 & \(:\) & 106.0 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 84.4 & \(:\) & 84.8 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 168.8 & \(:\) & 63.6 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 211.0 & \(:\) & 53.0 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 253.2 & \(:\) & 42.4 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 337.6 & \(:\) & 21.2 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 422.0 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 2. (iv) (a) \(13^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). (b) \(9^{\prime} \times 35^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2^{\prime}\) and field border \(1^{\prime}\) alround and block partition \(5^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Atarra (Banda), Bahraich and Belatal. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(881.1 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(67.56 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 648.5 \\
2. & 781.8 \\
3. & 941.9 \\
4. & 889.3 \\
5. & 950.9 \\
6. & 995.7 \\
7. & 959.8 \\
S.E./mean & \(=47.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat and Gram.
Site :- Crop Physiolgical Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Ref:- U.P. 49(105).
Type:- 'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of varying seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.11.1949. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowings etc. on 6,7 and 1010.1949 . (b) to (e) N.A. (v) T.C. on 21.10 .1949 . (vi) NP.125 wheat (medium) and Banda gram. (N.A.). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weediag and hoeing on 16.11.1949. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 3.4.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{lrll}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & Gram \\
1. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
2. & 40 & \(\because\) & 60 \\
3. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
4. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
5. & 80 & \(:\) & 20
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Weight of grain per ear, length of shoots, Jength and breadth of leaf, no. of tillers and grain yield. (iv) (a) 1949-1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(505 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(269.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 525 \\
2. & 679 \\
3. & 560 \\
4. & 497 \\
5. & 266 \\
S.E./mean & \(=134.5 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Ref:- U.P. 50(210).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Type :- 'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of varying seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed on yield.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17.10.1950. (iv) (a) Two ploughings by mould board plough, four ploughings by desi plough. (b) Broadcasting. (c) Wheat-50 seers./ac. and gram-30 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) \(75 \mathrm{mds} / \mathrm{ac}\). stable manure on 2.10 .1950 . (vi) N.A. (vii) No. (viii) Interculture on 5.1.1951 and 25.1.1951, weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) Wheat 7.4.1951 and gram 22.3.1951.
2. TREATMENTS .
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed required in chk./gross plot.} \\
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Wheat} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{Gram} & Wheat & & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 9.0 \\
\hline 2 & 20 & : & 80 & 3 & : & 7.2 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60. & 6 & : & 5.4 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 71 & : & 4.5 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 9 & : & 3.6 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 12 & : & 1.8 \\
\hline & 100 & : & 0 & 15 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(17^{\prime} \times 43^{\prime}\). (b) \(13^{\prime} \times 39^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=2^{\circ}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Rain did not come in time and hence germination was poor. Land was sloping. (ii) N.A. (iii) Length of root, height of shoot, length and breadth of leaf and yield of crop. (iv) (a) 1950-1952. (b) No. (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) Lucknow, Atarra, Bahraich and Pratapgarh. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment was conducted by. CP.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(157.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(81.54 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 44 \\
2. & 113 \\
3. & 155 \\
4. & 122 \\
5. & 229 \\
6. & 180 \\
7. & 260 \\
S.E./mean & \(=40.77 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{lac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat and Gram.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref:- U.P. 52(151).
Type: © 'X'. .

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding Kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 29.10.1952. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) Wheat at 50 srs./ac. and gram at 40 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Date of manuring on 22.10 .1952 and manures used 1. T.C., 2. Super at \(20 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and gypsum at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO . (vi) Wheat \(\mathrm{Pb}-591\) (medium-late) and gram T-87 (late'. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
\multicolumn{3}{l}{\begin{tabular}{l} 
Seed rate proportions \\
Wheat
\end{tabular}} & \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Gram } \\
1. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 \\
2. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
3. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
6. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
7. & 0 & \(:\) & 100
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(20^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 15^{\circ}\). (v) Plot border \(=2 \frac{1}{}^{\prime}\) alround and field border \(=3\) ' alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1952\). (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Kanpur Bahraich, Pratapgarh, Aligarh, Banda, Etawah and Jhansi. (vi) NiI. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(742.3 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(92.96 \mathrm{~b} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 762.7 \\
2. & 840.0 \\
3. & 855.7 \\
4. & 731.4 \\
5. & 700.0 \\
6. & 653.0 \\
7. & 653.0 \\
S.E./mean & \(=53.67 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., I.ucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 53(194).
Type :n'X'.

Object :-To study the manurial requirement of mixed crop Wheat and Gram.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Paddy. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clayey loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 28.10 .1953 . (iv) (a) 7 ploughings. (b) Sown behind the plough in alternate lines. (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) T.C. at \(84 \mathrm{md} / \mathrm{ac}\). (vi) Wheat C. 13 (early). Gram T87 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 27 and 28.11.1953. (ix) 5.78. (x) 13.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
1. 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
2. 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
3. 2 levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul. : \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}=0\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{1}}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
4. 2 levels of CaO as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{G}_{\mathbf{0}}=0\) and \(\mathrm{G}_{1}=60 \mathrm{Jb}\) 。/ac.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{4}\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(14^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(10^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Block partition \(5^{\prime}\) and irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Gram damaged by shade of wheat. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) (a) Raya Hardoi, Kalai and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by C.P.
5.. RESULTS :
(i) \(1252^{\circ} \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) 170.4 lb /ac.
(iii) Main effects of N and K are highly significant. Other effects and interactions are not signiffcant.
(iv) Av, yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline ! & \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{C}_{0}\) & \(C_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 1088 & 1281 & 1185 & 1154 & 1216 & 1198 & 1171 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{N}_{1}\) & 1255 & 1384 & 1320 & 1271 & 1368 & 1290 & 1349 \\
\hline Mean & 1172 & 1333 & 1252 & 1212 & 1292 & 1244 & 1260 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 1131 & 1294 & & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 1212. & 1372 & ! & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{0}\) & 1147 & 1341 & & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{C}_{1}\) & 1196 & 1324 & & & & & \\
\hline & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{S.E. of any marginal mean S.E. of body of table} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =30.12 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} \\
& =42.59 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}
\end{aligned}
\]} & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Gram and Mustard.
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lu cknow.
Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and Mustard grown mixed, on the yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.10.1952. (iv) (a) to (e) N.A. (v) Date of application of fertilizers 11.10 .1952 . T.C. at 8 cwt ./ac. Super at 20 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO . (vi) Gram T 87 (late) and Mustrerd RT. 11 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
& \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } \\
& Gram & \(:\) & Mustard \\
1. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 \\
2. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
3. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
6. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
7. & 0 & \(:\) & 100
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. but the effective number of treatments is 7 only, as the 8 th tre atment is fallow. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(19, \times 29^{\prime}\). (b) \(14^{\prime} \times 24^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2 \mathbf{y}^{\prime}\) alround. Block space \(4^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 588.0 lb .7 ac .
(ii) \(45.92 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}:\) :
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in le./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 700.0 \\
2. & 724.6 \\
3. & 666.4 \\
4. & 591.4 \\
5. & 542.1 \\
6. & 508.5 \\
7. & 383.0 \\
S.E./mean & \(=22.96 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Barley and Pea.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn.; Lucknow.

Ref : - U.P. 52(152). Type :- 'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and. Pea grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the suzceeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (il) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1, 2.11.1952. (iv). (a) to (e) N.A. (v).(1) T,C at 160 md./ac. (2) Super at 20 lb ./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and (3) Gypsum at \(10 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of CaO . (vi)! Barley C-251 (medium) Pea-163 (early). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{cccc}
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } \\
& Barly & \(:\) & Pea \\
1. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 \\
2. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
3. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
6. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
7. & 0 & \(:\) & 100
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(16 \frac{1}{\prime}^{\prime} \times 21^{\prime}\). (b) \(111^{\prime} \times 16^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2 \underline{l}^{\prime}\) alround, field border 3: (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Etawah, Kanpur, Hardoi, Aligarh and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(957 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(78.40 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1015 \\
2. & 1137 \\
3. & 1055 \\
4. & 995 \\
5. & 872 \\
6. & 852 \\
7. & 771 \\
S.e./mean & \(=45.26 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Wheat and Pea (Rabi). . Ref :- U.P. 50(211).
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow. Type :-'X'.

```

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 19.10.1950. (iv) (a) Five ploughings by desi plough. Two ploughings by mould board plough. One ploughing by desi plough to mix stable manure. (b) Broadcasting. (c) Wheat 50 seers/ac. Pea 25 seers/ac. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) 50 md . of stable manure in the field. (vi) Wheat C-46 (medium) Pea K.W. (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Interculture and weeding (ix) N.A. (x) Wheat 10.4.1951, Pea 17.3.1951.
2. TREATMENIS :
\begin{tabular}{cccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & Pea \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 100 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\multicolumn{3}{l}{ Seed rate in chl./gross plot } \\
Wheat : & Pea \\
0 & \(:\) & 4.70 \\
1.86 & \(:\) & 3.76 \\
3.72 & \(:\) & 2.82 \\
4.65 & \(:\) & 2.35 \\
5.58 & \(:\) & 1.88 \\
7.44 & \(:\) & 0.94 \\
9.30 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 12^{\prime}\). (b) \(40^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(2^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border 1 ' alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Height of shoot, length of leaf, breadth of leaf, length of root and shoot, and grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(226.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(99.79 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 157.5 \\
2. & 253.8 \\
3. & 262.5 \\
4. & 245.0 \\
5. & 197.8 \\
6. & 171.5 \\
7. & 294.0 \\
S.E./mean & \(=49.89 \mathrm{lb} / / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Linseed (Rabi).
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 50(209).
Type:- \({ }^{\prime}\) '.

Object :-To study the effect of different seedrate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Sanai. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) (a) 4 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) No. (viii) Weeding. (ix) and (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Seedrate proportions} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Wheat : Linseed} & Wheat : Lins & & \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 2.6 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 2.8 & : & 20 \\
\hline -3. & 40 & : & 60 & 5.6 & : & 1.5 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 7.0 & : & 1.3 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 8.4 & & 1.0 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 11.2 & - & 0.5 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 14.0 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.p. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) and (b) \(17^{\prime} \times 43^{\prime}\) '(v) Field border \(=2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) Nil. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 313.6 lb /ac.
(ii) \(146.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 241.3 \\
2. & 325.6 \\
3. & 279.6. \\
4. & 425.2 \\
5. & 306.5 \\
6. & 289.2 \\
7. & 327.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=73.04 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Jowar and Guar .
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :-U.P. 53(215).
Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different doses of Nitrogen in the form of A/S and A.S.N. on growth and fodder yield of Jowar and Guar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil (b) Wheat+Gram. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 27.6.1953.
(iv) (a) Ploughing on 18.6.1953. (b) to (e) N.A. (v) One truck load of T.C. i.e. \(150 \mathrm{cu} . \mathrm{ft}\). or 84 md , on 22 and 23.6 1953. (vi) and (vii) N.A. (viii) Weeding and hoeing on 31.7.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) 11.9.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control
(1) 2 sources of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{S}_{1}=A / S\) and \(S_{2}=\) A.S.N.
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{2}=30, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=50\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{3}=90 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

Manures applied on 27.6.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N. A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(25^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) and (ii) N.A. (iii) Fodder yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
. (i) \(42499 \quad \mathrm{mb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(2326 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Control vs others and main effect of N are highly significant. Main effect of S and interaction \(\mathrm{S} \times \mathrm{N}\) are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Controle \(27778 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\),
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{N}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 40622 & 46894 & 48388 & 45301 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 38830 & 45700 & 49284 & 44605 \\
\hline Mean & 39726 & 46297. & 48836 & 44953 \\
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{S.E. of marginal mean of N S.E. of marginal mear of \(S\) S.E. of body of table}} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& =950 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac.} . \\
& =776 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac} . \\
& =\mathrm{i} 343 \mathrm{lb} . \mathrm{ac.} .
\end{aligned}
\]}} \\
\hline & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Maize and Moong.
Ref :-U.P. 50(97).
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.
Type :-'X'.
Object :-To study the effect of \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) and Gypsum on the mixed crop of Maize and Moong.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 4.7.1950. (iv) (a) Hot weather cultivation ; 1 ploughing by mould board plough ; 1 by palent junior horse cultivator ; cross wise ploughing by desi plough. (b) Dibbling. (c) Maize-7 srs./ac. moong-3i srs./ac. (d). Distance for maize line to line \(2^{\prime}\) apart ; seed to seed \(1^{\prime}\) apart. Distance for Moong-ling to line \(2^{\prime}\) apart, seed to seed \(9^{\prime \prime}\) apart. Moong seeds were sown between two rows of Maize. (v) 80 md . stable manures mixed for the crop on 4.7.1950. (vi) Maize - Jaunpuri (medium). Moong \(\mathrm{T}_{1}\) (medium). (vii) N.A. (viii) Hoeing 14.7.1950, weeding 4.8.1950 and earthing up on 7.8 .1950 (Maize plants). (ix) N.A. (x) Picking of Moong on 24 and 31.8.1950. Harvest of Maize on 16.9.1950.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
1. 2 levels of CaO as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. 3 applications of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}: \mathrm{P}_{6}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. double Super and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}^{\prime}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. as Ammo. Phos.

Manuring on 4.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(30^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1352 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(68.32 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of C and P and interaction \(\mathrm{C} \times \mathrm{P}\) are significant.
(iv) Av. yi ld of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \(P_{0}\) & \(P_{1}\) & \(P_{1}^{\prime}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(C_{0}\) & 1114 & & 1223 & 1456 \\
\(C_{1}\) & 1257 & 1468 & 1596 & 1264 \\
\hline Mean & 1185 & 1346 & 1526 & 1352
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(\mathbf{C}\) S.E. of marginal mean of \(P\) S.E. of body of table
\(=22.77 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=27.90 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\(=39.44 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:-Wheat and Barley (Rabi).
Site :-Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref:-U.P. 53(140).
Type:- \({ }^{-X}\).

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Barley grown mixed, on yield and its residul effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Dhaincha (G.M.) (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 26.10.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings
(b) Wheat and Barley sown mixed in lines behind plough through funnel. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Barley C 251. Wheat Pb. 591. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Nil. (ix) \(5.48^{\circ}\). (x) 11.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in gm./plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & : & Barley & Wheat & : & Barley \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0 & : & 542.0 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & & 80 & 108.4 & : & 433.6 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & & 60 & 216.8 & : & 325.2 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 271.0 & : & 271.0 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 325.2 & : & 216.4 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 433.6 & : & 108.4 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 542.0 & : & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(20^{\prime} \times 26^{\prime}\). (b) \(16^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(2^{\prime}\) and field border \(4^{\prime}\) alround ; Block partition \(5^{\prime}\); Irrigation channel \(2^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. Slight lodging of barley. (ii) Smut incidence on barley \(1 \%\) approximatly. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1288 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(163.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in !b/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1464 \\
2. & 1347 \\
3. & 1369 \\
4. & 1336 \\
5. & 1193 \\
6. & 1167 \\
7. & 1142 \\
S.E./mean & \(=81.7 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Jowar, Guar, Lobia, Til and Urd.
Site :- Crop Physiological Res. Stn., Lucknow.

Ref :- U.P. 50(129).
Type :- ' X '.

Object :-To study the effect of .. and \(P\) on Jowar and legume mixture.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram+mustard. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 8.7.1950. (iv) (a) 2 ploughings by mould board plough, 2 by desi, 1 by cultivator and 4 planking etc. (b) N.A. (c) jowar- 12 srs./ac., guar-12 srs./ac., lobia-10 srs./ac., til-6 srs./ac. and urd-12 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Jowar-T.86, lobia-Jhansli and \(t i\)-T.10. (vii) to (ix) N.A. (x) 11 to 15.10.1950.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 levels of manure : \(M_{0}=n 0\) manure, \(M_{1}=80 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{N}(33.5 \% \mathrm{~N})\) and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=60 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as double Super \(\left(40 \% \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\right)\).

\section*{Sab-plot treatments :}

6 ratios of crop mixture : \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=\) jowar alone, \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=\) jowar + guoar in the ratio of \(66: 33, \mathrm{C}_{3}=\) jowar + lobia in the ratio of \(66: 33, \mathrm{C}_{4}=\) jowar + ril in the ratio of \(66: 33, \mathrm{C}_{5}=\) jowar + urd in the ratio of \(66: 33\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{6}=\) jowar \(+8 u c r+\) lobia + til + urd in the ratio of \(40: 15: 15: 15: 15\).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/block and 6 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) and (b) \(21^{\prime} \times 46^{\prime}\), main-plot- \(126^{\prime} \times 46^{\prime}\). (v) No (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) and (ii) N A. (iii) Dry fodder yield: (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) N.A. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(2922 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) (a) \(882.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(b) \(428.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effects of \(M\) and \(C\) and interaction \(M \times C\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fodder in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{l|llllll|l} 
& \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{5}}\) & \(\mathbf{C}_{\mathbf{6}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{0}\) & 3833 & 1338 & 1804 & 1428 & 1879 & 1518 & 1967 \\
\(M_{1}\) & 8267 & 2901 & 3983 & 3382 & 3818 & 3457 & 4301 \\
\(M_{2}\) & 4945 & 1834 & 2300 & 1864 & 2270 & 1774 & 2498 \\
\hline Mean & 5682 & 2024 & 2696 & 2225 & 2656 & 2250 & 2922
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of \(t w o\)
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. marginal means of \(M\) & & \(=294.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\) \\
2. marginal means of \(C\) & & \(=201.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
3. \(C\) means at a level of \(M\) & & \(=347.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
4. \(M\) means at a level of \(C\) & & \(=434.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat, Gram and Mustard (Rabi).
Site :- National Botanical Gardens, Lucknow.

Ref :- U.P. 48(80).
Type :- ' X '.

Object :-To study the effect of mixed cropping on growth and yield of Wheat, Gram and Mustard with and without applications of N .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nit. (b) Three years old guava. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 17 and 18.111948 . (iv) (a) 2 disc ploughings by tractor on 23.10.1948, ploughing by desi plough on 10 and 11.11 .1948 and 1 dise ploughing by tractor on 13.10.1948. (b) N.A. (c) Wheat - \(50 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac}\). , gram- 30 srs./ac. and mustard-3 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 2 trucks of M.C. on 16.11.1948 in field of 1.3. ac. (vi) Mustard-rape local, wheat -C. 13 (early) and gram-local. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 12.4.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{N}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 7 crop mixtures: \(C_{1}=\) wheat alone, \(C_{8}=\) gram alone, \(C_{3}=\) mustard alone, \(C_{4}=\) wheat + gram as \(50: 50, \mathrm{C}_{5}=\) wheat + mustard as \(50: 50, \dot{\mathrm{C}}_{6}=\) wheat + gram + mustard as \(33: 33\) : 33 and \(\mathrm{C}_{7} \approx\) fallow.
Seed sown/plot :
Wheat alone- 16 srs , Wheat \(50 \%-8\) srs. and wheat \(33 \%-5 \frac{1}{2}\) srs.
Gram alone- 12 srs., Gram 50\%-6 srs. and gram \(33 \%-4\) sis.
Mustard alone-1 chk., mustard \(50 \%-\frac{1}{2}\) chk. and mustard \(33 \%-\frac{1}{d}\) chk.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii)
(ii) (a) 14
(b) N.A. (iii) 4
(iv) (a) \(20^{\prime} \times 45^{\prime}\).
(b) \(15^{\circ} \times 40^{\circ}\). (v) \(2 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Rain and slight hail storm on \(3,4,5\) Jan. 1949. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Data for wheat and gram was available but for mustard data was not available. Hence analysis could not be done in the absence of any information about the mustard yield. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 17 (iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Av. yield of wheat in lb./ac.} & & \multicolumn{2}{|l|}{Av. yield of gram in lb ./ac.} \\
\hline Treatment & Av. yield & & Treatment & Av. yield \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{1}\) & 531.6 & & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{2}\) & 1686.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{6}\) & 456.7 & - & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{4}\) & 436.1 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{6}\) & 555.4 & & \(\mathrm{N}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{6}\) & 566.9 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{1}\) & 690.4 & & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{2}\) & 1143.8 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{4}\) & 562.8 & & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{4}{ }^{\text {- }}\) & 592.5 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2} \mathrm{C}_{6}\) & 560.4 & & \(\mathrm{N}_{1} \mathrm{C}_{6}\) & 422.9 \\
\hline G.M. & 559.6 & & G,M. & 808.2 \\
\hline S.E./mean & N.A. & & S.E./mean & N.A. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Wheat and Gram.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Partapgarh.

Ref :- U.P. 51(70).
Type:- ' X '.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Sanal-Wheat. (b) Sanai for fibre. (c) No. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii). N.A. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) Seeds broadcast after mixing them in the given proportions, ploughing by desi plough and subsequently covered by planking. (c) Wheat at \(40-50\) seers./ac. and gram at 30 seers./ac. (d) and (c) N.A. (v) G.M. at 40 lb ./ac. of N. (vi) Wheat-NP-52 (medium early) and gram-local (late). :(vii) N.A. (viii) N.A, (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 31\). (b) \(25^{\prime} \times 28^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround the plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) Poor stand, no lodging. (iii) Yield of wheat and gram grain. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. The experiment was cancelled in 1950. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Etawah and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(154.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(63.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). Treatment Av. yield
1. 114.2
2.147 .8
3.137 .8
4. 144.5
\(5 . \quad 163.5\)
\(6 . \quad 165.8\)
\(7 . \quad 206.1\)
S.B./mean \(=31.92 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Wheat and Gram.
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Partapgarh.

Ref :- U.P. 52(78).
Type :- ' X '.

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram, grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Maize. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) L aam. (b) N.A. (iii) 31.10.1952. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings from 1 to 24.10.1952 and Patewa on 22.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 3 cart loads ( 45 mds .) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied all over the field and \(1 \ddagger\) mds. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field on 30. 10.1951. (vi) Wheat C-13 (medium) and gram T-87 (late).(vii) İrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 3.4.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{ccccc} 
Seed rateproportions & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate in chk./gros } \\
Wheat \(:\) & Gram & Wheat \(:\) & Gram \\
1. 0 & \(=100\) & 0 & \(:\) & 9.6 \\
2. 20 & \(: 80\) & 3.2 & \(:\) & 7.6 \\
3. 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 6.4 & 5.7 \\
4. 50 & \(: 50\) & 8.0 & \(:\) & 4.8 \\
5. 60 & \(: 40\) & 9.6 & \(:\) & 3.8 \\
6. 80 & \(: 20\) & 12.8 & \(:\) & 1.9 \\
7. 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 16.0 & \(:\) \\
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(28^{\prime} \times 31^{\prime}\). (b) \(25^{\prime} \times 28^{\circ}\). (v) \(11^{\prime}\). all round the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i). Damage about \(10 \%\). (ii) Rust on wheat. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1954. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Varanasi, Kanpur, Baharaich, Aligarh, Banda, Etawah, Jhansi and Lu:know. (b) N.A. (vi) Nii. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 2271 lb./ac.
(ii) \(160.2 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 2196 \\
2. & 2174 \\
3. & 2135 \\
4. & 2369 \\
5. & 2104 \\
6. & 2502 \\
7. & 2420 \\
S.E./mean & \(=80.1 \mathrm{lb}\) /ac.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Partapgarh.

Ref:-U.P. 53(55).
Type :- 'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11.1953. (iv) (a) 6 ploughings and harrowings. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) 3 C.L. ( \(45 \mathrm{mds} . / a \mathrm{c}\).) of well decayed F.Y.M. to be applied 2-3 weeks before fsowing all over the field. 1.25 mds./ac. of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough on 22.10.1953. (vi) Wheat C-13 (early) Gram T-87 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) One weeding. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Seed rate proportions} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in chk./plot} \\
\hline & Wheat & Gram & Wheat & : & Gram \\
\hline 1. & 0 & 100 & 0.0 & : & 9.0 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & 80 & 3.0 & : & 7.2 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & 60 & 6.0 & : & 5.4 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & 50 & 7.5 & : & 4.5 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & 40 & 9.0 & : & 3.6 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & 20 & 12.0 & : & 1.8 \\
\hline & 10J & 0 & 15.1 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(33^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime}\). (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) all round the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) \(1950-1953\). (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Kanpur, Atarra, Baharaich, Bharari, Kalai, Etawah aad Varanasi. (b) N.A. (vi) The grain fyield of gram in the proportion \(W: G: \mathbf{~} \mathbf{2 0 : 8 0}\) was totally destroyed. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1415 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(97.02 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1274 \\
2. & 1086 \\
3. & 1827 \\
4. & 1656 \\
S. & 1627 \\
6. & 1434 \\
7. & 1001 \\
S.E./mean & \(=48.51 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\author{
- Crop :-Wheat and Barley. \\ Site :- Govt. Agri. Farm, Partapgarh.
}

Ref :-U.P. 52(77).
Type :-‘X'.

Object: :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Barley grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Sanai for green manure. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 30.10.1952. (iv) (a) 5 ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 mds.) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied equally all over the field 2 to 3 weeks before sowing. (2) \(1 \nmid \frac{1}{2}\) mds. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field an 29.10.1952. (vi) Wheat C-13, Barley C-251. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 30.3.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{Seed rate proportions} & \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate in chk./gross plot} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Wheat : Barley} & \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Wheat : Barley} \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & ' & 0.0 & : & 25.4 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & & 4.1 & : & 20.3 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & & 8.2 & : & 15.2 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & & 10.1 & : & 12.7 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & & 12.3 & : & 10.0 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & & 16.4 & : & 5.0 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & & 20.2 & ; & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
- (i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border 12 \({ }^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. Damage is about \(10 \%\). (ii) Rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Hardoi and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(637.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(104.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
: Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 728.0 \\
2. & 579.0 \\
3. & 607.0 \\
4. & 612.6 \\
5. & 662.2 \\
6. & 749.3 \\
7. & \(=52.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Barley.
Site :-Govt Agri. Farm, Partapgarh.

Ref :-U.P. 53(54).
Type :-‘X’.
' Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Barley grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 1.11 .1953 . (iv) (a) 5 ploughings and harrowings. (b) Main crop (wheat) to be sown first in lines east-west through seed drill; subsequently barley to be similarly sown north-south across wheat lines. (c) Wheat at 40 seers/ac. and barley at 50 seers/ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 45 mds./ac. of well decayed F.Y.M. 2-3 weeks before sowing on 12.10.1953 and (2) 1.25 md ./ac. of Super to be placed \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in soil in furrows behind the plough a couple of days before sowing. (vi) Wheat C. 13 (early) and barley C. 251 (N.A.) (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding on 25.12.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) 28.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc} 
& Seed rate proportions & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate in lb./plot } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat : Barley } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat : Barley } \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & \(:\) & 1.94 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 0.31 & \(:\) & 1.54 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 & 0.62 & \(:\) & 1.16 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 0.78 & \(:\) & 0.96 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 0.93 & \(:\) & 0.77 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 & 1.24 & \(:\) & 0.38 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 1.56 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(33^{\prime} \times 25^{\prime} \cdot\) (b) \(30^{\prime} \times 22^{\prime}\), (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(3^{\prime \prime}\). alround. Block partition \(\mathbf{3}^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Rust attack on both crops. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and.
(c) No. (v) (a) Baharaich and Hardoi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1165 \quad \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(94.38 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1428 \\
2. & 1230 \\
3. & 1291 \\
4. & 1210 \\
5. & 1014 \\
6. & 1011 \\
7. & 968 \\
S.E./mean & \(=47.19 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Jowar and Lobia (Kharif). & Ref :-U.P. 53(35): \\
'Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Partapgarh. & Type :-‘X'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of different seei rate proportions of Jowar and Lobia grown mixed, on growth : and yield and its residual effect on the succeeding rabi crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 13.7.1953. (v) (a) Ploughing on 7.7.1953, preparation of land on 13.7.1953. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c) Jowar 8 srs./ac. and lobia 4 srs./ac. (alternate line of each). (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) Well decayed F.Y.M. at 150-200 mds /ac. all over the fileld 2-3 weeks before sowing, (2) Super is placed at \(30 \mathrm{srs} . / \mathrm{ac} .3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) deep in the. soil behind the plough 4-5 days before sowing and (3) gypsum applied as surface dressing. (vi) Jowar 88 and Lobia T. 2. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing on 9.8.1953. (ix) N.A. (x) 7 and. 8.12.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{lrrr}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Jowar } & \(:\) \\
Lobia \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\circ}\). (b) \(39^{\circ} \times 30^{\circ}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\circ}\) and fiel border \(3^{\prime}\) alround; block partition \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield of each crop. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(110.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(il) \(10.42 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 57.1 \\
2. & 106.4 \\
3. & 112.0 \\
4. & 119.8 \\
5. & 125.4 \\
6. & 129.9 \\
7. & 123.2 \\
S.E./mean & \(=5.21 \mathrm{Jb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Jowar and Arhar.
Site :-Govt. Agri. Farm, Partapgarh.
Ref:-U.P. 53(213). Type :-'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Jowar and Arhar grown mixed, on growth and yield and its residual effect on the succeeding rabi crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Wheat and Barley. (c) Green manuring. (ii) (a) Light loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 6.7.1953 (iv) (a) Ploughing and preparation on 5 and 6.7.1953. (b) Sown behind the plough. (c), (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Date of Manuring 5.7.1953. F.Y.M. or ghura 150-200 mds./ac. all over the field 2-3 weeks before sowing Super \(30 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} 3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) deep in soil behind the plough, \(4-5\) days before sowing apply gypsum 20 srs./ac. as surface dressing. Apply 15 srs./ac. of A/S as top dressing about a fortnight after germination following a light shower of rain. (vi) Jowar 8B and Arhar 66 (early). (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) Weeding on 12 and 15.8.1953. (ix) N.A. ( \(x\) ) 7 and 8.12.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate peoportions } \\
& Jowar & :
\end{tabular} Arhar
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 23^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\circ} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) \(1 \frac{1}{3}^{\prime}\) ring round the net plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) The crop of jowar was almost wiped out by heavy rains. (ii) No. (iii) Grain yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No, (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) The yield of arhar in treatment 1 is not available. (vii) The experiment was conducted by C.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(70.26 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(10.35 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & - \\
2. & 30.80 \\
3. & 43.06 \\
4. & 62.19 \\
5. & 75.65 \\
6. & 89.40 \\
7. & 120.50 \\
S.E./mean & \(=5.18 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Cotton and Groundnut. \\ Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.}
Ref :-U.P. 48(32), Type:-'X'.

Object:-To study the effect of inter cropping Groundnut with Cotton.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Gram. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 5.6.1948. (iv) (a) Ploughings with desi twice 4.6.1948. (b) Sown behind dest plough. (c) 20 lb ./ac. (d) 8 rows 2' apart per plot and plants \(1 \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\prime}\) apart, (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Cotton C 520 (medium). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Harrow.ng on 6.6.1948, 1.7.1948. Weedings on 2,11 and 26.8 .1948 and 28 and 29.9.1948. Thinning on 24.7.1948. (ix) 27.76 . (x) 15 and 23.10.1948 and 7.11.1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Cotton \(100 \%\).
2. Cotton \(75 \%+\) Groundnut \(25 \%\).
3. Cotton \(50 \%+\) Groundnut \(50 \%\).
4. Cotton \(25 \%+\) Groundnut \(75 \%\).
5. Groundnut \(100 \%\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) \(78^{\circ} \times 16^{\circ}\). (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) No. (iii) Cotton and Groundnut yield. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conJucted by E.B.(C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 139.2 Rs./ac.
(ii) \(29.29 \mathrm{Rs} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. value of produce in Rs. /ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. value \\
1. & 88.3 \\
2. & 121.4 \\
3. & 144.3 \\
4. & 160.8 \\
5. & 181.4 \\
S.E./mean & \(=11.96\) Rs \(/ \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Wheat and Mustard.
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya.

Ref :- U.P. 52(80).
Type:- 'X'.

Object :-To study the effect of diferent seed rate proportions of Wheat and Mustard grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

1 BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i. (a Nil. (b) Moong. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 1.11.1952. (iv) (a) 1 desi ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. compost applied all over the field 2.3 weeks before sowing and (2) it mds. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\circ}\) behind the plough all over the field 2 days before sowing. (vi) Wheat Pb .591 (medium-late) and mustard-yellow. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Musrtard 13.3.1953 and wheat 16.3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{Seed rate proportions
Wheat : Mustard}} \\
\hline & & & \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 \\
\hline & 50 & : & 50 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{100} \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
& \multicolumn{2}{c}{ Seed rate required in chk./gros } \\
Wheat & \(:\) & Mustard \\
0.0 & \(:\) & 1.5 \\
5.0 & \(:\) & 1.2 \\
10.1 & \(:\) & 0.9 \\
12.7 & \(:\) & 0.7 \\
15.2 & \(:\) & 0.6 \\
20.3 & \(:\) & 0.3 \\
25.4 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{2}^{\prime}\) alround and field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Normal. (ii) Some plants of mustard were attacked by aphis. (iii) Grain and straw yield. '(iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Baharaich and Etawah. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1194 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(222.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb ./ac. Treatment Av. yield
\(1 . \quad 55\)
3. 1102
4.1307
\(5 . \quad 1429\)
\(6 . \quad 1410\)
7. \(\quad 1724\)
S.E./mean \(=111.4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop :- Wheat and Mustard.
Site :- Govt. Cotton Res. Sub.Stn., Raya.

Ref :- U.P. 53(65).
Type :- ' \(\mathbf{X}\) '.

Object:-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Mustard grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Moong. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 16.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing with desi plough on \(25,26.10 .1953\) and with cultivator on 18.10.1953. (b) Sown behind plough in alternate lines. (c) Wheat at 50 srs./ac. and mustard at 3 srs./ac. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 45 mds./ac. well desayed F.Y.M. 2-3 weeks before sowing and (2) \(1.25 \mathrm{mds} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\) as (Super to be placed \(3^{r}-4^{\text {e }}\) deep in soil in furrows behind the plough a couple of days before sowing. (vi) Wheat Pb .591 and mustard-yellow. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Weeding and hoeing. (ix) N.A. (x) Mustard on 23.3.1954 and wheat on 8.4.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
& \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate proportions } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & Mustard \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 100 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 60 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 \\
6. & 80 & \(:\) & 20 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0
\end{tabular}

Seed rate required in chk./gross plot
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Wheat & \(:\) & Mustard \\
0 & \(:\) & 0.19 \\
0.64 & \(:\) & 0.15 \\
1.29 & \(:\) & 0.12 \\
1.63 & \(:\) & 0.08 \\
1.95 & : & 0.07 \\
2.61 & \(:\) & 0.04 \\
3.26 & : & 0
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border 1.5 'and field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround ; block partition \(3^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah and Baharaich. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P. (R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1565 \quad \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(152.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in Ib./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 665 \\
2. & 1208 \\
3. & 1626 \\
4. & 1689 \\
5. & 1959 \\
6. & 1762 \\
7. & 2048 \\
S.E./mean & \(=76.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Crop:-Barley and Pea (Rabi). } \quad \text { Ref :-U.P. 53(69). } \\
& \text { Site :-Govt. Cotton Res. Sub-Stn., Raya. } \quad \text { Type:- 'X'. }
\end{aligned}
\]

Object :-To study the physiological response of mixed cropping to application of \(\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}\) and CaO .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Raya. (iii) 2.12.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughing with victory plough on 14.9.1953 and with desi plough on 27.9.1953, 29.9.1953 15.10.1953 and 16.11.1953. (b) Sown behind the plough in alternate lines. (c) Barley 30 seers/ac. ( 1.56 lb ./plot) and Pea 8 seers/ac. ( \(10.32 \mathrm{lb} . /\) plot.) (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Barley C-54, Pea T-63. (vii) Irrigated. (vii) Weeding and hoeing at the proper time are common in practice. (ix) N.A. (x) Pea 25.3 .1954 and Barley 4.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) Two levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) Two levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=50 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(3) Two levels of \(\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}\) as Pot. Sul : \(\mathrm{K}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{2}=40 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(4) Two levels of CaO as Gypsum : \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.

A/S applied on 5.1.1954; Super on 1.12.1953, Pot. Sul. on 4.1.1953 and Gypsum on 4.i.1954.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 16 . (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) \(22^{\prime} \times 37^{\prime}\). (b) \(19^{\prime} \times 34^{\prime}\). (v) Plot border \(1.5^{\prime}\) and field border \(2^{\prime}\) alround. Block partition \(3^{\prime}\) to serve as irrigation channel. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Slight damage caused by incidence of Japhids, (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1953-continued. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Baharaich, Kalai, Aligarh and Lucknow. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(1962 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(260.5 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Main effect of \(K\) and interactions \(N \times K, K \times C, N \times K \times C\) are alı significant. Main effect of \(C\) is highly significant. Other main effects and interactions are not significant.
(iv) Table of mean and differential response in lb ./ac.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{\[
\underset{\text { Mesponse }}{\substack{\text { Mean }}}
\]} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{N} & \multicolumn{2}{|c|}{P} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{K} & \multicolumn{2}{|r|}{C} \\
\hline & & Absence & Presence & Absence & Presence & Absence & Presence & Absence & Presence \\
\hline N & -15.54 & - & - & 58.51 & -89.59 & -213.85 & 182.78 & 89.58 & -12065 \\
\hline P & -72.61 & 1.44 & -146.66. & - & - & -170.50 & 25.28 & 24.56 & -169.78 \\
\hline K & 169.42 & -28.90 & 367.73 & 71.53 & 267.31 & - & - & -26.01 & 364.84 \\
\hline c & 247.44 & 352.56 & 142.33 & 344.61 & 150.27 & 52.02 & 442.87 & - & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of mean response \(=75.19 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
S.E. of differential response \(=106.34 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Crop:- Barley and Pea.
Site :-Govt. Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- U.P.53(160).
Type: -‘X'

Object :-To study the effect of differing seed rate proportions of Barley and Pea grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Paddy-Pea, Fallow-Barley and Paddy-Fallow. (b) Paddy. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 29.11.1953. (iv) (a) palewa 20.11.1953, ploughings 28, 29.11.1953. (b) Sown behind the plough ; main crop barley sown first in lines east-west behind the plough; subsequently Pea similarly sown north-south ; i.e. across the barley lines. (c) As per treatments. (d) N.A. (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M. or compost supplied all over the field \(2-3\) weeks before sowing. (2) \(1 \ddagger \mathrm{md}\). of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough al! over the field a couple of days before sowing. (vi) Barley and Pea (Improved). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) 12.4.1954.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Seed rate in chk./plot} \\
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|c|}{Barley : Pea} & \multicolumn{3}{|r|}{Barley : Pea} \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & : & 20.3 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 5.0 & : & 16.3 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 10.1 & & 12.2 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 12.7 & & 10.0 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 15.2 & : & 8.1 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 20.3 & & 4.0 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 25.4 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\) alround. Plot border \(1 \frac{1}{\delta^{\prime}}\). Irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attacked by rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-contd. (b) No. (c) No. (v) (a) Faizabad, Kalyanpur, Atarra, Kalai, Etawah and Kanpur. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(887.9 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(94.73 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb}, / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 995.6 \\
2. & 923.8 \\
3. & 954.9 \\
4. & 904.7 \\
5. & 789.8 \\
6. & 804.2 \\
7. & 842.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=47.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Gram and Linseed.
.Site :-Regional Res. Stn,, Varanasi.

Ref :-U.P. 52(79):
Type : \(\mathbf{n}^{\mathbf{\prime}} \mathbf{X}\).

Object :-To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Gram and Linseed grcwn mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 1 and 2.11.1952. (iv) (a) Ploughing and harrowing on 11, 27.9.1952; 1, 18, 31.10.1952 and 1.11.1952. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) Date of manuring 15.10.1952. (1) 3 C.L. of well decayed F.Y.M. applied equally all over the field and (2) 14 md . of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows \({ }^{\text {" }}\) behind the plough all over the field. (vi) Gram T. 87 (late) and linseed lccal. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) and (ix) N.A. (x) 28 3.1953.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion Gram : Linseed} & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed rate in chk./gross plot Gram : Linseed} \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & 0.0 & : & 6.1 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & 4.0 & : & 4.8 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & 8.1 & & 3.6 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & 10.1 & & 3.0 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & : & 40 & 12.2 & : & 2.4 \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & 16.3 & : & 1.2 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & 20.3 & : & 0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround and plot border \(=1 \not{ }^{\prime}\).' (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Poor. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. The experiment failed in 1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Baharaich, Hamirpur and Banda. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(464.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(139.3 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatmer \(t\) differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 177.1 \\
2. & 351.8 \\
3. & 451.1 \\
4. & 473.9 \\
5. & 521.8 \\
6. & 607.9 \\
7. & 665.4 \\
S.E.jmean & \(=69.63 \mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

\title{
Crop :-Wheat and Gram.
}

Ref :-U.P. 52(95).
Site :-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.
Type :-‘X'.
Object : To study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed, on yield and its residual effect on the sućceeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) (a) Nil. (b) Fallow. (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 15.11.1952. (iv) (a) 7 Ploughings. (b) N.A. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) (1) 3 C.L. ( 45 md.) of well decayed F.Y.M. applied all over the field on 30.10 .1952 and (1) 14 md. of Super placed at a depth of \(3^{\circ}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field on 14.11.1952. (vi) Wheat-NP. 52 (medium early) and gram T. 87 (late). (vii) Irrigated. (viii) to (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|r|}{Seed rate proportion Wheat: Gram .} & & \multicolumn{3}{|l|}{Seed used in chk-/gross plot Wheat : Gram} \\
\hline 1. & 0 & : & 100 & & 0.0 & : & 20.3 \\
\hline 2. & 20 & : & 80 & & 6.1 & : & 16.3 \\
\hline 3. & 40 & : & 60 & & 12.2 & : & 12.2 \\
\hline 4. & 50 & : & 50 & & 15.2 & : & 10.1 \\
\hline 5. & 60 & - & 40 & & 18.3 & : & 8.1 - \\
\hline 6. & 80 & : & 20 & & 24.4 & : & 4.0 \\
\hline 7. & 100 & : & 0 & & 30.5 & : & 0.0 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(=3^{\prime}\) alround and plot border \(=1 \frac{1}{8}^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Normal. (ii) Nil. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Lucknow, Kanpur, Baharaich, Pratapgarh, Aligarh, Banda, Etawah and Jhansi. (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by C.P.(R).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 1046 lb./ac.
(ii) \(171.6 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Av. yield & \\
1. & 232 & \\
2. & 795 & \\
3. & 1180 & \\
4. & 1230 & \\
5. & 1231 & \\
6. & 1259 & \\
7. & 1393 & \\
S.E./mean & \(=85.8 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). & \\
& &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram.
Site .-Regional Res. Stn., Varanasi.

Ref :- 53(152)
Type:-'X'.

Object:-T'o study the effect of different seed rate proportions of Wheat and Gram grown mixed on yield and its residual effect on the succeeding kharif crop.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) Sugarcane-Sugarcane, Fallow-Wheat, Sanai-Wheat. (b) Sanai (c) Nil. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, Varanasi. (iii) 16.11.1953. (iv) (a) Ploughings on 10 and 31.10.1953, 12 and 1411.1953. (b) Sown behind the plough, main crop wheat sown first in lines east-west behind the plough, subsequently gram sown north-south i.e across the wheat lines. (c) As per treatments. (d) and (e) N.A. (v) 3 C.L. ( 45 md .) of well decayed F.Y.M or compost to be applied 2-3 weeks before sowing all over the field. (ii) \(1 \Varangle \mathrm{md}\). of Super to be placed at a depth of \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\prime \prime}\) in furrows behind the plough all over the field, a couple of days before sowing. Date of manuring 31.10.1953. (vi) Wheat NP. 52 and Gram T 87 (vii) Irrigated. (viii) Not recorded. (ix) N.A. (x) 27.3.1954.
2. TREATMENTS :
\begin{tabular}{lcccccc}
\multicolumn{4}{c}{ Seed rate proportion } & \multicolumn{3}{c}{ Seed rate in chk/plot } \\
\multicolumn{3}{c}{ Wheat } & \(:\) & Gram & Wheat & \(:\) \\
1. & 0 & \(:\) & 100 & 0.0 & Gram \\
2. & 20 & \(:\) & 80 & 6.1 & \(:\) & 16.3 \\
3. & 40 & \(:\) & 63 & 12.2 & \(:\) & 12.2 \\
4. & 50 & \(:\) & 50 & 15.2 & \(:\) & 10.1 \\
5. & 60 & \(:\) & 40 & 18.3 & \(:\) & 8.1 \\
6. & 80 & - & 20 & 24.4 & \(:\) & 4.0 \\
7. & 100 & \(:\) & 0 & 30.5 & \(:\) & 0.0
\end{tabular}
5. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4 . (iv) (a) \(42^{\prime} \times 33^{\prime}\). (b) \(39^{\prime} \times 30^{\prime}\). (v) Field border \(3^{\prime}\); plot border \(11^{\prime}\); irrigation channel \(3^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) Attacked by rust. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) 1952-1956. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) Etawah, Kalyanpur (Kanpur), Atarra, Baharaich, Kalai (Aligarh). (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by C.P.(R),
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(1167 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(171.2 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yieid of grain in \(\mathrm{Ib} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 890 \\
2. & 1264 \\
3. & 1109 \\
4. & 1215 \\
5. & 1270 \\
6. & 1230 \\
7. & 1188 \\
S.E./mean & \(=85.6 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Wheat and Gram (Rabi).
Zone :-Orrai (Jalaun).

Ref :-U.P. 52(253).
Type :-'X'.

Object :-To draw out a suitable fertilizer schedule for the agriculturally important soil types.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) 10 (c) N.A. (ii) Bundelkhand Type 2 and 3 (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) After application of manure, the field was levelled by drawing a para. (b) Sown in lines parallel to the fertilizer line. (c) N.A. (d) \(1^{\circ}\) to \(2^{\circ}\) away from the fertilizer line. (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control (no manure).
2. 50 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. 30 lb ./ac. of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+60 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac. of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
\(A / S\) added to surface at sowing time super is placed at a depth of about \(3^{\prime \prime}-4^{\circ}\) at the sole of the furrow and in the side of the seed row made by either an iron plough or two desi ploughs one behind the other in the same furrow.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) Villages selected in the district and unreplicated experiment laid out. 18 trials. (iii) (a) N.A. (b) 1/40 ac. (iv) N.A.

GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Grain and straw yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by A.C. on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:

I Crop: Wheat
(i) \(1338 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(ii) \(165.8 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain lb./ac.
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 1091 \\
2. & 1393 \\
3. & 1529 \\
S.E./mean & \(=39.1 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Arhar and Jowar (Kharif.)
Zone:- In 5 tahsils of Kanpur.

II Crop: Gram
\(\begin{array}{lll}\text { (i) } 252 & \text { lb./ac. }\end{array}\)
(ii) \(39.70 \mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in \(\mathrm{lb} / \mathrm{ac}\). Treatment Av. yield
1. 216
2. 252
\(3 . \quad 288\)
S.E./mean \(\quad=9.36 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).

Object :-To draw out a fertilizar schedule for agriculturally important soil type.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A.
(ii) N.A. (iii) N.A.
(iv) Improved
(v) (a) to (e) N.A.
(vi) July 1950. (vii)
N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) November 1950.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
3. \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\), of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}+\mathbf{3 0} \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\). of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. in which villages have been taken as replications (no. of villages \(=17\) ) and field selected randomly in a randomly selected village. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Satisfactory. (ii) N.A. (iii) Yield of arhar and jowar. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) (a) and (b) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by A.C.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 567 lb./ac.
(ii) \(61.84 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of grain in-lb,/ac.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 454 \\
2. & 573 \\
3. & 673 \\
S.E./mean & \(=15.00\) lb./ac.
\end{tabular}

\footnotetext{
Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.
}
Ref :- U.P. 48(110).
Type :- ‘M'.

Object :-To find out the residual effect of manures on the growth and bearing of Apple.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Under orchard. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Delicious. (v) Last week of November 1939 and spacing: \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) About 2 years. (vii) Application of lime according to the requirements of soil, by spreading and mixing. in the soil, given at the time of planting and also in 1951 . (viii) Grass is turned in the soil and not removed. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) Nil. (xii) From August to September.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{g}=0\) and \(N_{1}=4.4 \mathrm{oz}\)./tree.
(2) 2 levels of \(K: K_{0}=0\) and \(K_{1}=2.4 \mathrm{oz}\)./tree.
(3) 2 lavels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=6.9 \mathrm{oz} /\) /tree.
(4) 4 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Malling type XIII, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Malling type II, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}=\) Meston-779 and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{6}}=\) Meston-793.

Treatments applied in 1939.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{3} \times 4\) confounded Fact. in R.B.D., \(R \times N \times P \times K\), interaction is totally confounded. (b) 16 plots/block and 2 blocks/replication. (iii) 1. (iv) 6. (v) A row of trees left alround the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
- (i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown and apple root borer ; mechanical control methods used like pruning etc. (ii) Measurement of girth and yield of fruit. (iv) (a) 1939 -contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A.- (vi) Nil. (vii) 'The experiment was conducted by Hort (C). It appears that the manures were applied in 1939 and continued upto 1944, but in the original records or files, it is no where clearly mentioned that the manures were applied each year from 1939 to 1944, from 1945 no manures were applied but again the manures were applied in 1950, but it is not known when manuring was stopped.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(20.49 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(ii) 10.50 lb ./tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of apple in lb./tree.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{4}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 14.48 & 22.60 & 20.06 & 22.45 & 20.12 & 21.88 & 18.37 & 18.13 & 22.12 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 24.40 & 30.00 & 18.35 & 10.71 & 20.86 & 22.05 & 19.68 & 18.78 & 22.95 \\
\hline Mean & 19.44 & 26.30 & 19.66 & 16.58 & 20.49 & 21.96 & 19.02 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 14.26 & 28.93 & 11.09 & 19.54 & 18.46 & 17.71 & 19.20 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 24.62 & 23.67 & 28.23 & 13.62 & 22.53 & 26.22 & 18.84 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & 22.03 & 26.60 & 20.25 & 19.00 & \multicolumn{5}{|l|}{\multirow[t]{2}{*}{}} \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 16.86 & 26.00 & 19.07 & 14.17 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal means of \(N, P\) or \(K\) & \(=2.62 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) & \(=3.71 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of body of \(R \times K, R \times N\) or \(R \times P\) table & \(=5.25 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of body of \(N \times P, N \times K\) or \(P \times K\) table & \(=3.71 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Apple.}

Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res, Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 49(219).
Type :-'M'.

Object: - To find out the residual effect of manures on the growth and bearing of Apple.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Under orchard. (b) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Delicious. (v) Last week of Nov. 1939 and spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (vi) About 2 years. (vii) Application of lime according to the requirements of soil by spreading and mixing in the soil at the time of planting and also in 1951. (viii) Grass is turned in the soil and not removed from the soil. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{2}=4.4\) oz/tree.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{K}: \mathrm{K}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{K}_{1}=2.4 \mathrm{oz} /\) tree.
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=6.9 \mathrm{oz} /\) tree.
(4) 4 root stocks : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Malling type XIII, \(\mathbf{R}_{2}=\) Malling type II, \(\mathbf{R}_{3}=\) Meston 779 and \(\mathbf{R}_{4}=\) Meston 793.

Treatments applied in 1939.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{3} \times 4\) (confounded Fact. in R.B.D., \(R \times N \times P \times K\) interaction is totally confounded. (ii) (a) 16 plots/ block and 2 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) 6. (v) All round each plot a row of tree left. (vi, Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown and apple root borer ; mechanical control method like pruning etc. (iii) Girth measurements and fruit yield. (iv) (a) 1939-contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C). It appears that the manures were applied in 1939 and continued upto 1944, but in the original records or files, it is no where clear that the manures were applied each year from 1939 to 1944. From 1945 no manures were applied but again the manures were applied in 1950, but it is not known when manuring was stopped.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 41.88 lb ./tree.
(ii) \(16.99 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) \(\mathbf{R}\) effect is highly significant and interaction \(\mathbf{R} \times \mathbf{P}\) is significant. Others are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of apple in lb./tree.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R a}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{4}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 29.07 & 60.50 & 38.44 & 46.22 & 43.56 & 47.03 & 40.09 & 40.01 & 47.11 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 30.50 & 47.62 & 33.65 & 22.00 & 40.19 & 41.99 & 38.39 & 45.51 & 34.87 \\
\hline Mean & 29.78 & 67.56 & 36.04 & 34.11 & 41.88 & 44.51 & 39.24 & 2.764 & 40.99 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{0}\) & 27.04 & 86.21 & 23.30 & 34.48 & 42.76 & 49.46 & 36.06 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 32.52 & 48.90 & 48.79 & 33.74 & 40.99 & 39.56 & 42.42 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & 29.18 & 75.16 & 33.88 & 39.82 & & & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 30.38 & 59.96 & 38.21 & 28.41 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(N, P\) or \(K\)
S.E. of marginal means of \(R\)
S.E. of body of \(R \times K, R \times N\) or \(R \times P\) tables
S.E. of body of \(N \times P, P \times K\) or \(N \times K\) tables
\(=4.25 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\(=6.01 \mathrm{lb}\). \(/\) tree .
\(=8.50 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.
\(=6.01 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree .
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Apple. . } & \text { Ref:- U.P. 50(276). } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia. } & \text { Type :- 'M'. }
\end{array}
\]
- Object :-To ind out the residual effects of manures on the growth and bearing of Apple.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Under orchard. (ii) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Delicious. (v) Last week of Nov., 1939. Spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) About two years. (vii) Application of lime according to the requirements of soil, by spreading and mixing in the soil at the time of planting and also in 1951. (viii) Grass is turned in the soil and not removed from the land. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) A ugust to September.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=4.4 \mathrm{oz} /\) tree.
(2) 2 levels of \(K: K_{1}=0\) and \(K_{1}=\mathbf{2 . 4} \mathrm{oz} /\) tree.
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=6.9\) oz/tree.
(4) 4 root stocks : \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Malling type XIII, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Malling type II, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}} \doteq\) Meston-779 and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{f}}=\) Meston-793. Treatments applied in 1939.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2^{3} \times 4\) confounded fact. in R.B.D. \(R \times N \times P \times K\) interaction totally confoundel. (ii) (a) 16 plots/ block and 2 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) 6. (v) Allround each plot one row of tree left.(vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown and apple root borer-mechanical methods like pruning etc. applied. (iii) Girth measurement and fruit yield. (iv) (a) \(1939-c o n t d\). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil: - (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C). It appears that the manures were applied in 1939 and continued upto 1944, but in the original records or files it is no where clearly mentioned that the manures were applied each year from 1939 to 1944. From 1945 no manures were applied but again the manures were applied in 1950, but is not known when manuring was stopped.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(45.70 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(ii) 3550 lb ./tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruit in lb./tree.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{4}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(P_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 24.63 & 47.66 & 37.27 & 41.93 & 37.87 & 45.40 & 30.34 & 25.82 & - 49.92 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 47.21 & 81.25 & 46.79 & 38.88 & 53.54 & 58.44 & 48.63 & 56.66 & 50.41 \\
\hline Mean & 35.92 & 64.46 & 42.03 & 40.40 & 45.70 & 51.92 & 39.48 & & \\
\hline \(P_{0}\) & 30.22 & 66.55 & 25.16 & 43.03 & 41.24 & 51.36 & 31.12 & & , \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 41.62 & 62.36 & 58.90 & 37.78 & 50.16 & 52.48 & 47.85 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & 43.43 & 86.17 & 34.70 & 43.38 & 51.92 & & - & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & 28.41 & 42.74 & 49.36 & 37.42 & 39.48 & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of \(N, P\) or \(K\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\)
S.E. of body of \(R \times K, R \times N\) or \(R \times P\) table
S.E. of body of \(N \times P, P \times K\) or \(N \times K\) table
\(=8.88 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\(=12.55 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\(=17.75 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\(=12.55 \mathrm{lb} /\) tree.

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 51(260).
Type:- ' \(\mathbf{M}^{\prime}\).

Object :-To find out the residual effect of manures on the growth and bearing of Apple.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) Under orchard. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Delicious. (v) Last week of Nov. 1939. Spacings \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) About 2 years. (vii) Application of lime according to the requirements of soil by spreading and mixing in the soil, at the time of planting and also in 1951. (viii) Grass is turned in the soil and is not removed from the land. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) From August to September 1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=4.4 \mathrm{cz}\).jiree.
(2) 2 levels of \(K: K_{0}=0\) and \(K_{1}=2.4 \mathrm{oz}\)./tree.
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1} \doteq 6.9\) oz./tree.
(4) 4 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{I}}=\) Malling type XIII, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Malling type II, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) Meston 779 and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{a}}=\) Meston 793. Treatments applied in 1939.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{3} \times 4\) confounded fact. in R.B.D. \(R \times N \times P \times K\) interaction is totally confounded. (ii) (a) 16 plotśs/block, 2 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) 6. (v) One row of trea left all round each plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) A.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem block, stem brown and apple root borer. Mechanical methods like pruning etc. applied. (iii) Girth measurement and yield of fruit. (iv) (a) 1939-contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C). It appears that the manures were applied in 1939 and continued up to 1944, but in the original records or files it is no where clearly mentioned that the manures were applied each year from 1939 to 1944. From 1945 no manures were applied but again the manures were applied in 1950, but it is not known when manuring stopped.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(48.53 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(ii) \(24.10 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruits in Ib./tree.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{3}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}\) & Mean & \(\mathrm{K}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{0}\) & 38.50 & 45.32 & 50.57 & 62.66 & 49.26 & 47.18 & 51.34 & 47.18 & 51.35 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 46.30 & 63.64 & 53.46 & 27.76 & 47.79 & 54.67 & 40.91 & 48.05 & 47.53 \\
\hline Mean & 42.40 & 54.48 & 52.02 & 45.21 & 48.53 & 50.93 & 46.12 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{0}\) & 30.64 & 66.66 & 47.49 & 45.68 & 47.62 & 53.90 & 41.33 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 54.16 & 42.31 & 56.54 & 44.78 & 49.44 & 47.96 & 50.92 & & \\
\hline \(\mathbf{K}_{0}\) & 49.44 & 56.52 & 48.14 & 49.61 & & & , & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 35.36 & 52.45 & 55.89 & 40.80 & & & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline S.E. of marginal means of \(N, P\) or \(K\) & \(=6.03 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree \\
\hline S.E. of marginal means of \(R\) & - \(8.52 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{tree}\) \\
\hline S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{K}, \mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{N}\) or \(\mathrm{R} \times \mathrm{P}\) tables & \(=12.05 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{tree}\) \\
\hline S.E. of body of \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathbf{P}, \mathbf{P} \times \mathrm{K}\) or \(\mathbf{N} \times \mathrm{K}\) tables & \(=8.52 \mathrm{lb} /\) /tree \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :-U.P. 52(301). Type: : 'Mr.

Object:-To find out the residual effects of manures on the growth and bearing of Apple.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Under orchard. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By budding. (iv) Delicious. (v) Last week of November 1939 ; spacing \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) About 2 years. (vii) Application of lime according to the requirements of soil, by spreading and mixing in the soil, given at the time of planting and also in 1951. (viii) Grass is turned in the soil and is not removed from the soil. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS}

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 2 levels of \(N\) as \(A / S: N_{0}=0\) and \(N_{1}=4.4 \mathrm{oz}\)./tree.
(2) 2 levels of \(K: K_{0}=0\) and \(K_{1}=2.4 \mathrm{oz} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=6.9 \mathrm{oz}\)./tree.
(4). 4 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Malling type XIII, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Malling type II, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) Meston 779 and \(\mathbf{R}_{4}=\) Meston 793. Treatments applied in 1939.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(2^{3} \times 4\) confounded Fact. in R.B.D \(R \times N \times P \times K\) interaction is totally confounded. (ii) (a) 16 plots/block and 2 blocks/replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) 6. (v) A row of tree left alround the plot. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown and apple roọt borer-mechanical control methods like pruning etc. (iii) Girth measurement and yield. (iv) (a) 1939-contd. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expériment was conducted by Hort (C). It appears that the manures were applied in 1939 and continued upto 1944, but in the original records or files it is no where clear that the manures were applied each year from 1939 to 1944. From 1945 no manures were applied but again the manures were applied in 1950, but it is not known when manuring was stopped.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(106.0 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{tree}\).
(ii) \(\quad 50.69 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruit in lb./tree.

\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal means of \(N, P\) or \(K\) & \(=12.67 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) & \(=17.92 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of body of \(R \times K, R \times N\), or \(R \times P\) tables & \(=25.34 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of body of \(N \times P, P \times K\) or \(N \times K\) tables & \(=17.92 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Apple.}

Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :-U.P. 53(82).
Type :-'M'.

Object:-To find out the residual effect of manures upon the growth and bearing of Apple.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) Under forest. iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Delicious. (v) Last week of Nov. 1939. Spacing : \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) (vi) About 2 years. (vii) Application of lime according to the requirment of "soil by spreading and mixing in the soil, given at the time of planting and also in 1951. (viii) N.A. (ix) Nil. ( \(x\) ) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1), (2), (3) and (4)
(1) 2 levels of N as \(\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=4.4 \mathrm{oz} . /\) tree and \(\mathrm{N}_{2}=1.0 \mathrm{lb}\)./ac.
(2) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{K}: \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{I}}=6.9 \mathrm{oz}\)./tree and \(\mathrm{K}_{\mathbf{2}}=2.7 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.
(3) 2 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{1}=2.4 \mathrm{oz} . /\) tree and \(\mathrm{P}_{2}=0.3 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.
(4) 4 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{1}=\) Malling type XIII, \(\mathbf{R}_{2}=\) Malling type II, \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{4}}=\) Meston 779 and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{5}}=\) Meston 794.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(2^{3} \times 4\) confounded Fact. in R.B.D. \(\mathbf{R} \times \mathrm{N} \times P \times \mathrm{K}\) is totally confounded. (ii) (a) 16 plots/block; 2 blocks/ replication. (b) N.A. (iii) 1. (iv) 6. (v) A row of other trees kept around each plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis-D.D.T. sprayed. Stem black, stem brown and apple root borers-mechanical control applied. (iii) Measurement of girth and yield. (iv) (a) 1939 -contd. (Remodelled in 1953). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Hort. (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 76.37 lb ./tree.
(ii) 30.53 lb ./tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruits in \(\mathbf{l b} . / t r e e\).
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{2}\) & \(\mathbf{R s}_{3}\) & R4 & Mean & \(\mathbf{K}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{K}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & \(P_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 76.68 & 67.42 & 92.96 & 96.05 & 83.28 & 87.66 & 78.90 & 76.23 & 90.33 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{2}\) & 70.10 & 74.56 & 81.60 & 51.60 & 69.49 & 74.78 & 64.16 & 65.01 & 73.91 \\
\hline Mean & 73.39 & 70.99 & 87.28 & 73.82 & 76.37 & 81.22 & 71.53 & & \\
\hline \(P_{1}\) & 49.24 & 85.57 & 85.03 & 62.62 & 70.62 & 79.18 & 62.06 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 97.54 & 56.42 & 89.53 & 85.03 & 82.13 & 83.26 & 81.00 & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{1}\) & 84.81 & 67.54 & 84.73 & 87.81 & & \(\cdot\) & & & ' \\
\hline \(\mathrm{K}_{2}\) & 61.98 & 74.46 & 89.84 & 59.84 & & & . & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal means of \(N, P\) or \(K\) & \(=7.63 \mathrm{lb} . / t r e e\). \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(R\) & \(=10.79 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of body of \(R \times K, R \times N\) or \(R \times P\) tables & \(=15.26 \mathrm{lb} . / t r e e\). \\
S.E. of body of \(N \times P, P \times K\) or \(N \times K\) tables & \(=10.79 \mathrm{lb} . / t r e e\).
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Apple:
Site s-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :-U.P. 51(249). Type :-'M'.

Object :-To find out a suitable depth for applying \(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{O}_{\mathbf{5}}\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) The trees were under catch crop trial before bearing. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Grafted. (iv) Apple Delicious-grown on Root stock MT II. (v) 1st. week of December, 1939. Spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (vi) One year after grafting. (vii) Lime was applied according to requirements before starting the experiment in 1951. (viii) N.A. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1951.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super: \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, P_{1}=4\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{8}=6 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.
(2) 2 depths of application : \(D_{1}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{2}=18^{\prime \prime}\).

Super sprinkled in the bottom of trenches, dug \(9^{\circ}\) or \(18^{\circ}\) deep around the tree, just telow the drip of the tree, which is filled afterwards. Date of application : early March 1951.
3. DESIGN:
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 9. (iv) One. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown, and apple root borer-mechanical method of controlling applied. (iii) Girth measurement and apple yield. (iv) (a) 1951 -contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) \(P_{1} D_{2}\) yield is estimated in replication VIII. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(26.08 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{trec}\)
(ii) 26.04 lb /tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(i) Av. yield of fruits in lb./tree.
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|} 
& Control \(=\mathbf{2 3 . 1 2}\) & \\
& \(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & \(D_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{P}_{1}\) & 35.66 & 29.24 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 22.98 & 22.37 \\
\hline Mean & 29.32 & 25.80 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
S.E. of \(D_{1}\) or \(P_{\mathbf{2}}\) marginal mean & & \(=4.72 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree \\
S.E. of control mean & & \(=4.72 \mathrm{lb} . /\) trce. \\
S.E. of \(P_{1} D_{\mathbf{2}}\) mean & & \(=7.16 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of any mean in the body of table except \(P_{1} D_{\mathbf{2}}\) mean & \(=6.68 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Apple.}

Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 52(296).
Type :- ' M '.

Object :-To find out a suitable depth for applying \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\).

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) The trees were under catch crop trial before bearing. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Grafted. (iv) Apple delicious grown on root stock MTII. (v) 1st week of December, 1939 and spacings \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) One year after grafting. (vii) Lime was applied according to the requirement before starting the experiment in 1951. (viii) Digging, preparation of thalas and prunings. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1952.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{8} O_{5}\) as Super : \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=4\) and \(P_{2}=6 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.
(2) 2 depths of application : \(D_{1}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(D_{2}=18^{\prime \prime}\).

Super sprinkled in the bottom of trenches, dug \(9^{\prime \prime}\) or \(18^{\prime \prime}\) deep around the tree, just below the drip of the tree, which is filled afterwards. Date of application : early March, 1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 9. (iv) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown and apple root borer-mechanical methods for controlling adopted. (iii) Girth measurement and yield of fruits. (iv) (a) 1951-contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Control yield was estimate I for replication II, III and \(P_{1} D_{2}\) yield for replication no. VIII ( \(v\) i) Experiment conducted by Hort. (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 74.07 lb ./tree.
(ii) 31.22 lb ./tree.
(iii) Only effect of D is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruit in lb./tree.

Control \(=63.46\)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 87.46 & 72.34 & 79.90 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) & 94.23 & 63.46 & 78.84 \\
\hline Mean & 90.84 & 67.90 & 79.37 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{llrl} 
S.E. of \(P_{2}\) or \(D_{1}\) marginal mean & \(=7.36\) & \(\mathrm{lb} . /\) /tree \\
S.E. of control mean & & \(=7.36\) & \(\mathrm{lb} . /\) /tree
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref:~ U P. 53(80)
Type :- 'M'.

Object : -To find out a suitable depth for \(a_{-}\)plying \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{6}\).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) The trees were under çatch crop trial before bearing. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Grafted. (iv) Apple delicious. (v) 1st week of December, 1939. Spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (vi) One year after grafting. (vii) Lime was applied according to requirement before starting the experiment. (viii) Digging, preparation of thalas. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) 42.84". (xii) 22.8.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 3 levels of \(P_{2} O_{5}\) as Super: \(P_{0}=0, P_{1}=4\) and \(P_{2}=6 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.
(2) 2 depths of application: \(\mathrm{D}_{1}=9^{\prime \prime}\) and \(\mathrm{D}_{2}=18^{\prime \prime}\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(3 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 9. (iv) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown and apple root borer-mechanical control. (iii) Girth and yield (iv) (a) 1951-contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Control yield in replication II and III and treatment \(P_{1} D_{2}\) in replication VIII were estimated as these were missing. (vii) The experiment was concucted by Hort (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(116.1 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(ii) \(65.05 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) Only effect of D is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruit in \(\mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\[
\text { Control }=106.5
\]
\begin{tabular}{l|l|l|l} 
& \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{P}_{1}\) & 159.5 & 105.4 & \begin{tabular}{l}
132.4 \\
\(\mathrm{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\)
\end{tabular} \\
\hline Mean & 139.2 & 79.4 & 109.3 \\
\hline 149.3 & 92.4 & 120.9
\end{tabular}
S.E. of \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) or \(\mathrm{P}_{2}\) marginal mean
\(=15.33 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
S.E. of control mean
\(=15.33 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.
S.E. of \(\mathrm{P}_{1} \mathrm{D}_{2}\) mean
\(=23.25 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree .
S.E. of any mean in body of table except \(P_{1} D_{2}\) mean
\(=21.68 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree .
```

Crop: Apple.
Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

```

\section*{Ref:-U.P. 53(298). \\ Type:-'M'.}

Object :-To evolve methods for the improvement of spent up land in Kumaon Hills.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) After deforestation in 1948 potato crop was taken, aftet which Belladona was planted. In 1920-1921 apple and cherries were planted. For the last ten years it was covered by granince grasses, wild rose and other bushes. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By budding. (iv) (a) Cox's orange. Pippin on Meston 779. (v) Terracing of about an acre of land done. The pits \(4^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}\) and \(20^{\prime}\) apart dug and apple plants planted. One replication planted in 1951, two in 1952 and one in 1953. (vi) 2 years. (vii) 3 lb . of A/S and 0.65 mds. of compost every year per tree in March by spreading round the tree and then digging it in. (viii) Pruning, digging, sowing of soyabeans and turning it in. ( \(x\) ) Soyabeans planted during the rains and buried in the soil just before flowering. ( \(x\) ) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) No yield of fruits.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 doses of lime : \(L_{1}=\) single and \(L_{2}=\) double.
(2) 4 doses of \(\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}\) as Super : \(\mathrm{P}_{0}=0, \mathrm{P}_{1}=1 \frac{1}{2}, \mathrm{P}_{2}=3\) and \(\mathrm{P}_{3}=4 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.

Actual doses of lime N.A. Lime spread in September every year during turning in of soyabean. Super in March, by spreading round the tree and then cigging in.
3. DESIGN :
(i) \(4 \times 2\) Fact. in R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) One row of apple trees arcund the field. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Stem borer-application of chloroform. Root borers-Mechanical methods of removing it. Test catterpiller-spreading of \(\mathbf{2 5 \%}\) D.D.T. (iii) Girth measurement taken on 27.2.1953. (iv) (a) 1952continued. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by S.C.(C).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(3.17 \mathrm{~cm} . /\) tree.
(ii) \(0.18 \mathrm{~cm} . /\) tree.
(iii) Only \(\mathbf{P}\) effect is significant.
(iv) Av. girth of tree in cm.
\begin{tabular}{l|llll} 
& \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{0}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{3}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 3.22 & 3.32 & 3.08 & 3.11 \\
\(\mathbf{L}_{\mathbf{a}}\) & 3.14 & 3.42 & 2.97 & 3.13 \\
Mean & 3.18 & 3.37 & 3.02 & 3.12 \\
3.18 \\
3.16 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E of L means & \(=0.05 \mathrm{~cm} /\) tree. \\
S.E. of \(P\) means & \(=0.07 \mathrm{~cm} /\) tree.
\end{tabular}
S.E. of body of table \(\quad=0.10 \mathrm{~cm} /\) tree .

Crop:-Apple.
Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :-U.P. (4896).
Type :-‘C'.

Object :-To find out the effect of mulching on the growth and bearing of Apple trees raised on deep and shallow rooted stocks and also to determine if by training trees into different shapes the extent of hailstorm damage can be reduced materially.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Under forest. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Scion variety Delicious. (v) 2nd week of December, 1959. Spacing \(=20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) One year after budding. (vii) N.A. (viii) Pruning digging below the trees and preparation of thalas. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 mulchings: \(M_{1}=\) pine needles, \(M_{2}=\) oak needles and \(M_{2}=\) no mulching (control).
Sub-plof treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 shapes of trees: \(S_{1}=\) Pyramid and \(S_{2}=\) Vase.
(2) 2 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{1}}=\) Crab \(C\) (deep rooted) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Malling type II (shallow rooted).

\section*{3. DESIGN:}
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black and stem brown-mechanical methods of controlling. (iii) Yield and girth measurement. (iv) (a) 1939-N.A. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort(C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(16.69 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(ii) (a) \(15.40 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(b) \(7.83 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruits in lb./tree.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{2}{ }^{-}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{L}}\) & 11.16 & 16.08 & 13.62 & 14.27 & 1298 \\
\hline M \({ }^{\text {a }}\) & 16.92 & 16.91 & 16.92 & 19.51 & 14.32 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & 19.95 & 19.10 & 19.52 & 24.15 & 14.90 \\
\hline Mean & 16.01 & 17.36 & 16.69 & 19.31 & 14.07 \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 19.59 & 19.02 & & & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 12.43 & 15.70. & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. \(M\) marginal means & \(=6.29 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
2. \(S\) or \(R\) marginal means & \(=2.61 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
3. \(S\) or \(R\) means at a level of \(M\) & \\
4. \(M\) means at a level of \(S\) & \\
S.E. of body of \(S \times R\) table & \\
S. & \(=7.05 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
&
\end{tabular}

Crop: Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 49(199).
Type: © 'C'.

Object :-To find out the effect of mulching upon the growth and bearing of Apple trees raised on deep rooted and shallow rooted stocks and also to determine if by training trees into different shapes the extent of hailstorm damage can be reduced materially.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Under forest. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Scion variety Delicious. (v) 2nd week of December, 1939 and spacing \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) 1 year after budding. (vii) N.A. (viii) Pruning, digging below the trees and preparation of thalas. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 mulchings: \(M_{1}=\) pine needles, \(M_{2}=0 a k\) needles and \(M_{3}=n 0\) mulching (control).
Sob-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 shapes of trees: \(S_{1}=\) Pyramid and \(S_{2}=\) Vase.
(2) 2 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{1}=\) Crab C (deep rooted) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Malling type II (shallow rooted).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
- (i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem block and stem brown-mechanical method of controlling. (iii) Girth measurement and yield. (iv) (a) 1939-N.A. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 41.84 lb ./tree.
(ii) (a) \(36.36 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(b) 20.23 mb /tree.
(iii) Only S effect is highly significant.
(iv) Ay. yield of fruit in lb./tree.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean & \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{8}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{1}\) & 36.68 & 38.63 & 37.66 & 50.17 & 25.14 \\
\hline - \(\mathbf{M z}_{\mathbf{z}}\) & 41.51 & 56.33 & 48.92 & 68.00 & 29.85 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & 35.59 & 42.30 & 38.94 & 45.79 & 32.10 \\
\hline Mean & 37.93 & 45.75 & 41.84 & 54.65 & 29.03 \\
\hline \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & 55.70 & 53.60 & & & \\
\hline Ss & 20.15 & 37.90 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. \(M\) marginal means & \(=14.84 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
2. \(S\) or \(R\) marginal means & \(=6.74 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
3. \(S\) or \(R\) means at a level of \(M\) & \(=11.68 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
4. \(M\) means at a level of \(S\) or \(R\) & \(=16.99 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of body of \(S \times R\) table. & \(=6.74 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. \(\mathbf{5 0 ( 2 6 0 ) .}\)
Type: : \({ }^{6}\) C'.

Object :-To find out the effect of mulching on the growth and bearing of Apple trees raised on deep rooted and shallow rooted stocks and also to determine if by training trees into different shapes the extent of hailstorm damage can be reduced materially.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Under forest. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N. A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Scion variety Delicious. (v) 2nd week of December, 1939 and spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) One year after budding. (vii) N.A. (viii) Pruning, digging below the trees and preparation of thalar. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 mulching: \(\mathbf{M}_{1}=\) pine needles, \(M_{2}=0 a k\) needles and \(M_{3}=\) no mulching (control).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 shapes of trees: \(S_{1}=\) Pyramid and \(S_{2}=\) Vase.
(2) 2 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{1}=\) Crab \(C\) (deep rooted) and \(\mathbf{R}_{2}=\) Malling type II (shallow rooted).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) No. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black and stem brown-mechanical methods of controlling. (iii) Girth measurement and yield. (iv) (a) 1939-N.A. (b) N.A. (v) N.A.' (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(39.55 \mathrm{Ib} . /\) tree.
(ii) (a) \(44.16 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(b) \(18.04 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) Only \(S\) effect and interaction \(S \times R\) are highly significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruit in lb./tree.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{R}_{2}\) & Mean & \(S_{1}\) & \(S_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & 39.59 & 39.98 & 39.78 & 48.56 & 31.01 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & 37.77 & 39.02 & 38.40 & 47.63 & 29.16 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & 41.23 & 39.72 & 40.48 & 48.65 & 32.31 \\
\hline Mean & 39.53 & 39.57 & 39.55 & 48.28 & 30.83 \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 57.39 & 39.17 & & & \\
\hline \(S_{2}\) & 21.67 & 39.98 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. \(M\) marginal means & \(=18.03 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
2. \(S\) or \(R\) marginal means & \(=6.01 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
3. \(S\) or \(R\) means at a level of \(M\) & \\
4. \(M\) means at a level of \(S\) or \(R\) & \(=10.42 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. of body of \(S \times R\) table & \(=6.48 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Apple.
Site : Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

\section*{Ref:U.P. 51(247). \\ Type :-‘'}

Object :-To find out the effect of mulching on the growth and bearing of apple trees raised on deep rooted and shallow rooted stocks and also to determine if by training trees linto different shapes the extent of hailstorm damage can be reduced materially.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) Under forest. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Scion variety Delicious. (v) 2nd week of December, 1939. Spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (vi) One year after budding. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1951.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 mulchings: \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\) pine needle, \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\) oak needles and \(\mathrm{M}_{3}=\) no mulching (control).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinationslof (1) and (2)
(1) 2 shapes of trees : \(S_{1}=\) Pyramid and \(S_{2}=\) Vase.
(2) 2 root stocks : \(\mathrm{R}_{1}=\) Crab \(C\) (deep rooted) and \(R_{2}=\) Malling type II (shallow rooted).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split.plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replicat:on and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black and stem brown-mechanical methods of controlling. (iii) Yield and girth measurement. (iv) (a) 1939-N.A. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(10.92 \mathrm{lb} . /\) trce.
(ii) (a) \(18.48 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(b) \(8.78 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruits in lb./tree.

S.E. of difference of two
1. \(M\) marginal means
\(=7.54 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
2. \(S\) or \(R\) marginal means
3. \(S\) or \(R\) means at a level \(c f M\)
\(=2.93 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
4. \(M\) means at a level of \(S\) or \(R\)
S.E. of body of \(S \times R\) table
\(=5.07 \mathrm{lb} .7\) tree.
\(=8.35 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.
\(=2.93 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.

\section*{Crop :-Apple.}
, Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :-U.P. 52(295).
Type :-'C'.

Object :-To find out the effect of mulching on the growth and bearing of Apple trees raised on deep rooted and shallow rooted stocks and also to determine if by training trees into different shapes the extent of hailstorm damage can be reduced materially.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Under forest. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Scion variety Delicious. (v) 2ad week of December, 1939. Spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (vi) One year after budding. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1952.
2. TREATMENTS:

Main-plot treatments:
3 mulchings: \(M_{1}=\) pine needles, \(M_{\mathbf{2}}=\) oak needles and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) no mulching (control).

\section*{Sub-plot treatments :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 shapes of trees : \(S_{1}=\) Pyramid and \(S_{2}=\) Vase.
(2) 2 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathbf{C r a b} \mathbf{C}\) (deep rooted) and \(\mathrm{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Malling type II (shallow rooted).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) No. (vi) Yes.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black and stem brown-mechanical methods of controlling. (iii) Yield and girth measurement. (iv) (a) 1939-N.A. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(\quad 40.74 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ree}\).
(ii) (a) \(42.67 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(b) \(22.48 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruits in lb ./tree.

S.E. of difference of two
1. \(M\) marginal means
\(=17.42 \mathrm{lb} /\) /tree.
2. \(S\) or \(R\) marginal means
3. \(S\) or \(R\) means at a level of \(M\)
\(=7.49 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{tree}\).
4. \(M\) means at a level of \(S\) or \(R\)
\(=12.98 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{tree}\).
S.E. of body of \(S \times R\) table
\(=19.69 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
.
\(=7.49 \mathrm{lb} /\) tree .

Crop:- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 53(81).
Type:- ‘C'.

Object :-To find out the effect of mulching on the growth and bearing of Apple trees raised on deep rooted and shallow rooted stocks and also to determine if by training trees into different shapes the extent of hailstorm damage can be reduced materially.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) Under forest. (ii) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Scion variety Delicious. (v) 2nd week of December 1939. Spacing \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\) (vi) One year after budding. (vii). Nil. (viii) Prunning, digging below the trees and preparation of thalas. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) 42.84. (xii) 3.9.1953 to 7.9.1953.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}

Main-plot treatments :
3 mulchings: \(\mathbf{M}_{1}=\) pine needies, \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{g}}=\) oak needles and \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{3}}=\mathbf{n o}\) mulching (control).
Sub-plot treatments:
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 shapes of trees : \(S_{1}=\) Pyramid and \(S_{2}=\) Vase.
(2) 2 root stocks: \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Crab C (deep rooted) and \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Malling type II (shallow rooted).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stëm brown and apple root borer-mechanical control adopted. (iii) Yield and girth measurement. (iv). (a) 1939-N.A. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Hail storm did not occur during the period under report, the damage due to it was not recorded. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(75.53 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(ii) (a) 72.55 lb ./tree.
(b) \(56.27 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) None of the effects is significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruit in lb./tree.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathbf{R}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & Mean & \(S_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) \\
\hline \(\mathbf{M}_{1}\) & 121.60 & 62.56 & 92.08 & 111.28 & 72.87 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & 94.82 & 71.11 & 82.97 & 102.54 & 63.40 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{3}\) & 55.08 & 48.02 & 51.55 & 63.52 & 39.58 \\
\hline Mean & 90.50 & 60.56 & 75.53 & 92.45 & 58.62 \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 125.39 & 59.50 & & . & \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{2}\) & 55.61 & 61.62 & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. \(M\) marginal means & \(=29.62 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
2. \(S\) or \(R\) marginal means & \(=18.76 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
3. \(S\) or \(R\) means at a level of \(M\) & \\
4. \(M\) means at a level of \(S\) or \(R\) & \(=32.49 \mathrm{lb} . / t r e\). \\
S.E. of body of \(S \times R\) table & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref: :- U.P. 51(248).
Type:- 'C'.

Object:-To find out the comprative value of Kudzu Vine, local variety of soyabeans and common grass grown in the orchard in influencing the vigour and productivity of Apple.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Uoder orchard-experiment laid out in buffer trees of NPK manurial trial. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Jonathan. (v) Last week of November f1939. Spacing \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) About 2 years. (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Kudzu growings.
2. Local soyabeans.
3. Control-common cultural methods.

Kudzu was planted in 1951 and soyabean was sown in the 3rd week of June 1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 30. (iv) 1. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Girth measurement and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(30.11 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(ii) \(32.31 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{tree}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of fruits in lb ./tree.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Av. yield \\
1. & 23.98 \\
2. & 40.83 \\
3. & 25.51 \\
S.E./mean & \(=5.90 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\end{tabular}

Crop:-A pple.
Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :-U.P. 50(262).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To find out a suitable insecticidal control measure against defoliating bectles.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By grafting. (iv) Delicious. (v) Planting during February at a space of \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) in pits filled during January. (Pits were dug \(4^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime} \times 4^{\prime}\) ). (vi) 2 years. (vii) Nil. (viii) Pruning during winter and ringing around the base of trees during Februa'y. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) Plucking fruits from July and August 1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
2. Lead chromate at \(\mathbf{6} \mathrm{lbs}\). in \(\mathbf{1 0 0}\) gallons of water.
3. D.D.T. wettable powder \(0.125 \%\).
4. Paris green at \(\mathbf{6} \mathrm{lbs}\). in \(\mathbf{1 0 0}\) gallons of water.
5. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) S. (iv) One tree. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Defoliating leaves, controled by spraying. (iii) \% area of damaged leaves a few days after treatments. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi No plot wise yield data is available. The results have been taken from the report. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento(C). Paris green and D.D.T. wet powder had a phytocidal effect on the leaves. No data could, therefore, be obtarned on these two treatments.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 25.85 percent.
(ii) 6.2930 percent.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. percent of damaged area/plot.
Treatment Av. percent
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 11.67 \\
2. & 21.81 \\
3. & - \\
4. & - \\
5. & 44.08 \\
S./mean & \(=2.8143\) percent.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 48(104).
Type :- 'D'.

Object:-To study the effect of growing different catci. crops on the incidence of stem black disease of different varieties of Apple.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Under orchard. (ii) (a) Clay Loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By grafting. (iv) As per treatments. (v) Planted in 1939. (vi) About 2 years. (vii, N.A. (viii) Prunings, digging below the trees etc. (ix) As per treatments. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) From August to September 1948.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

5 catch crops : \(C_{2}=\) Potatoes, \(C_{2}=\) Soyabeans, \(C_{3}=\) Maduwa, \(D_{4}=\) Sawan and raddish. and \(C_{5}=\) Control (No catch crops.)
Sub-plot treatments:
3 varieties of apple : \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Delicious (on root stock Malling Type II), \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Beauty of Bath (on root stock Malling Type II). and \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) Peach Alexander (on Prunus dirvaricata root stock).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 5 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) 6. (v) Apple trees between main-plot treatments. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study and stem brown. (iii) Girth measurement, yield and no. of twigs affected with the stem black disease. (iv) (a) 1945-1949. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt.. was conducted by Myco (C), \(x=n o\). of effected twigs/plot.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(0.74 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
(ii) (a) \(0.5213 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
(b) \(0.6488 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
(iii) Main effect of \(C\) is not significant. Main effect of \(V\) is highly significant. Interaction is not significant. (iv) Twigs affected/plot
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & mean value of \(\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plots. \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1.50 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 0.70 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 0.01 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.1451 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :- Apple. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 49(204): } \\ \text { Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia. } & \text { Type :- 'D'. }\end{array}\)
Object :-To study the effect of growing different catch crops on the incidence of stem black disease of different varieties of Apple.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) Under orchard. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By grafting. (iv) As per treatments: (v) Planted in 1939. (vi) About 2 years. (vii) N.A. (viii) Prunings and diggings below the trees etc. (ix) As per treatments. (x) Unirrigated, (xi) N.A. (xii) August to September 1949.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Main-plot treatments :
5 catch crops : \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=\) Potatoes, \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=\) Soyabeans, \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=\) Maduwa, \(\mathrm{C}_{4}=\) Sawan and'raddish and \(\mathrm{C}_{5}=\) con- . trcl (no catch crop).

Sub-plot treatments:
3 varieties : \(\mathbf{V}_{1}=\) Delicious (on root stock Malling type II), \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Beauty of Bath (on root stock Malling type II) and \(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}=\) Peach Alexander (on prunus dirvaricate root stock).
3. DESIGN:
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 5 main-plots/replication and 3 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) 6. (v) Apple trees between main-plot treatments. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study and stem brown. (iii) Girth measurment, yield and the number of twigs affected with the stem black disease. (iv) (a) 1945-1949. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C). \(\mathrm{x}=\mathrm{no}\). of affected twigs/plot.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1.62 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
(ii) (a) \(0.6122 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
(b) \(0.5852 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
(iii) Main effect of \(\mathbf{C}\) is not significant. Main effect of \(\mathbf{V}\) is highly significant.. Interaction \(C \times V\) is not significant.
(iv) Twigs affected/plot.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & mean value of \(\overline{\sqrt{x}+1} /\) plot. \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 2.30 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{2}\) & 1.84 \\
\(\mathbf{V}_{\mathbf{3}}\) & 0.71 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.1309 \sqrt{x+1} /\) plot
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

```

Ref :- U.P. 48(103).
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To study the correlation of the stem black disease with different types of pruning and mulching operations.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Under forest. (ii) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By budding, (iv) Delicious. (v) 2nd week of Dec. 1939 and spacings \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) Planted in 1939, , one year after budding. (vii) N.A. (viii) Pruning and digging below the trees and preparation of thalas. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (x) August to September 1948.
2. TREATMENTS :

Main-plot treatments :
3 mulchings : \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\) Pine needles, \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{8}}=\mathrm{Oak}\) leaves and \(\mathrm{M}_{3}=\mathrm{No}\) mulching (control).
Sub-plot treatments :
All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 prunings : \(\mathbf{P}_{1}=\) Pyramid shaped and \(\mathbf{P}_{2}=\) Vase shaped.
(2) 2 root stocks : \(S_{1}=\) Crab \(C\) (deep rooted) and \(S_{1}=\) Malling type II (shallow rooted)
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study and stem brown. (iii) Girth measurement, yield of fruits, no. of twigs affected with the disease. (iv) (a) 1945 to 1949 . (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Original records are not available. Results. taken from reports. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Myco (C). x=number of affected twigs/tree.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(0.82 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) tree.
(ii) (a) \(8.5718 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) tree.
(b) \(0.3602 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{8}} /\) tree.
(iii) Only P effect is highly significant.
(iv) Twigs affected/plot.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{\bar{x}+\frac{1}{8}} /\) tree. \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 0.40 \\
\(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 1.23 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.0849 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
\end{tabular}


\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Under forest. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By budding. (iv) Delicious (v) 2ad week of December, 1939. Spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) Planted in 1939, one year after budding. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) From August to September 1949.
2. TREATMENTS:

\section*{Main-plot treatments :}

3 mulchings: \(\mathrm{M}_{1}=\) Pine needles, \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{2}}=\mathrm{Oak}\) leaves and \(\mathrm{M}_{3}=\) No mulching (control). Sub-plot treatments : All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 prunings: \(P_{1}=\) Pyramid shaped and \(P_{2}=\) Vase shaped.
(2) 2 root stocks : \(S_{1}=\) Crab \(C\) (deep rooted) and \(S_{2}=\) Malling type II (shallow rooted).
3. DESIGN :
(i) Split-plot. (ii) (a) 3 main-plots/replication and 4 sub-plots/main-plot. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 6. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study and stem brown. (iii) Girth measurement, fruit yield and no. of twigs affected with the disease. (iv) (a) 1945-1949. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. conducted by Myco. (C). \(\mathrm{x}=\mathrm{no}\). of affected twigs/plot.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1.69 \quad \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
(ii) (a) \(0.7062 \sqrt{x+1} /\) plot.
(b) \(0.5220 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} /\) plot.
(iii) Main affects of \(M\) and \(S\) are not significant. Main effect of \(P\) is highly significant. Interactions \(M \times P\) and \(M \times S\) are significant.
(iv) Av. value of \(\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2} / \mathrm{plot}}\).
\begin{tabular}{l|ll|l|ll|} 
& \(\mathbf{S}_{1}\) & \(\mathbf{S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(\mathbf{M e a n}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{P}_{\mathbf{2}}\) \\
\hline \(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1.90 & 1.44 & 1.67 & 0.94 & 2.40 \\
\(\mathrm{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 1.36 & 2.00 & 1.68 & 1.62 & 1.75 \\
\(\mathrm{M}_{2}\) & 2.00 & 1.45 & 1.73 & 1.56 & 1.90 \\
\hline Mean & 1.75 & 1.63 & 1.69 & 1.37 & 2.01 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
1. marginal means of \(M\)
\(=0.2883 \sqrt{\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}} / \text { plot }}\).
2. marginal means of \(P\) or \(S\)
\(=0.1740 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2} / p l o t}\).
3. \(P\) or \(S\) means at a level of \(M\)
\(=0.3014 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2} / \text { plot }}\).
4. \(M\) means at a level of \(P\) or \(S\)
\(=0.3585 \sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2} / \text { plot }}\).

Crop :-Apple.
Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :-U.P. 49(202).
Type :-‘D'.

Object :-A Geld trial on the efficacy of Perenox and Bordeaux against Jatent infection.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) Under orchard. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By grafting. (iv) Delicious. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Njl. (viii) N.A. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.'
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Bordeaux mixture ( \(\mathbf{2}: 10: 40\) )
3. Perenox \(0.125 \%\).
4. Perenox \(0.25 \%\).
5. Perenox \(0.125 \%\) +Albolinium 2 at 4 ozs./100 gallons of spray.

These were used in April 1949 and observations taken during 5 weeks beginning from the first week of September.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) One. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of latent infection. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The plotwise yield data is not available. The results are taken from the seport. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(29.2 \%\) of latent infection.
(ii) \(7.7470 \%\) of latent infection.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. \% of latent infection.
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & \% of latent infection \\
1. & 41.3 \\
2. & 25.0 \\
3. & 34.0 \\
4. & 23.0 \\
5. & 22.5 \\
S.E./mean & \(=3.4646 \%\) of latent infection
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Apple.
Site- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 49(201).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-A field trial on the efficacy of Perenox and Bordeaux against storage rot of Apple fruit.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Delicious. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.

2 TREATMENTS:
1. Control.
2. Bordeaux mixture ( \(2: 10: 40\) ).
3. Perenox \(0.125 \%\).
4. Perenox 0.25\%.
5. Perenox \(0.125 \%\) +Albolinium 2 at 4 ozs./ 100 gallons of spray.

Spraying done in April 1949 at the petal fall stage.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5." (iv) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of storage rot. (iv) (a) \(1948-1949\). (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The plotwise yield data is N.A. The results have been taken from the reports. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(33 \%\) of storage rot.
(ii) \(8.94 \%\) of storage rot.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. \% of storage rot.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & \% of storage rot \\
1. & 49 \\
2. & 30 \\
3. & 31 \\
4. & 24 \\
5. & 31 \\
S.E./mean & \(=4.00 \%\) of storage rot.
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Apple. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 48(99), } \\
\text { Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia. } & \text { Type :- 'D'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object:-A field trial on the efficacy of Perenox and Bordeaux mixture against leaf spot disease.
!
- BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Uader orchard. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Grafting. (iv) Delicious. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.


\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Control.
2. Bordeaux mixture ( \(\mathbf{2}: 10: 40\) ).
3. Perenox \(0.125 \%\).
4. Perenox \(0.25 \%\).
5. Perenox \(0.125 \%+\) Albolinium at 4 ozs./ 100 gallons.

Spraying was done on 3rd April 1948 at petal fall stage, observations taken in August.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of leaf spot disease. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) N.A, (v) N.A. (vi) The plot wise yield data is N.A. The results have been taken from the report. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) - 1.81 \% of leaf spot disease.
(ii) \(0.3191 \%\) of leaf spot disease.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Av. \% of leaf spot disease.
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & \% of leaf spot disease \\
1. & 2.82 \\
2. & 1.46 \\
3. & 1.84 \\
4. & 1.38 \\
5. & 1.56 \\
S.E./mean & \(=0.1427 \%\) of leaf spot disease.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Apple. & Ref:- U.P. 49(200). \\
Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia. & Type :^'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-A field trial on the efficacy of Perenox and Bordeaux mixture to control leaf spot disease.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) Under orchard. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A (iii) By grafting. (iv) Delicious. (v) and (vi) N.A. (vii) No. (viii) N.A. (ix) and (x) No. (xi) and (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Control.
2. Bordeaux mixture \((2: 10: 40)\).
3. Perenox \(0.125 \%\).
4. Perenox 0.25\%.
5. Perenox \(0.125 \%+\) Albolinium 2 at \(4 \mathrm{oz} / 100\) gallons of spray.

Spraying was done at the petal fall stage and observations were taken in August for leaf spot disease.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5 (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) 1. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of infection of leaf spot disease. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The plot wise data is not available. The results are taken from report. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1.133 \%\) of leaf spot.
(ii) \(0.2179 \%\) of leaf spot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment \% of leaf spot infection
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
1. & 2.394 \\
2. & 0.636 \\
3. & 1.083 \\
4. & 0.758 \\
S. & 0.794 \\
S.E./mean & \(-0.974 \%\) of leaf spot.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 50(261).
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-To control the pre-harvest fruit drop of Apple by means of harmones.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Buffer trees in stock \(\times\) manure trial. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A.' (iii) By budding. (iv) Jonathan. (v) Last week of Nov. 1939 and spacing \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) Planted in 1939 one year after budding. (viii) Nil. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) 5.7.1950 to 26.9.1950.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

Sprayings of :
1. 10 p.p.m. of 2,4 -Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
2. 15 p.p.m. of 2, 4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
3. 20 p.p.m. of 2,4 -Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
4. 10 p.p.m. of L-Napthaleneacetic acid (commercial chemical used \(=\) Planofex).
5. 15 p.p.m. of L-Napthaleneacetic acid.
6. 20 p.p.m. of \(\mathrm{L}-\) Napthaleneacetic acid.
7. Control

Spraying done on 8.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) 2. (v) Generally one or two nows of trees on either side of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL : -
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown and apple root borer-mechanical methods of control adopted. (iii) Record of no. fruits present on the trees on the day of spraying, no. of fruits shed at weekly intervals and then finally the no. of fruits harvested. Analysis is done of \% of fruits dropped. (iv) (a) 1950 to 1953. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data was converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p and then analysed where \(\mathrm{p}=\) percent of fruits dropped. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.63 degrees.
(ii) 6.037 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
& & (transformed back) \\
1. & 22.52 & 15.05 \\
2. & 29.97 & 15.25 \\
3. & 22.98 & 15.55 \\
4. & 26.62 & 20.40 \\
5. & 18.97 & 10.99 \\
6. & 22.93 & 15.55 \\
7. & 28.43 & 22.97 \\
S.E./mean & 2.464 degrees. &
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia. \(\quad\) Type :- 'D'.

Object : -To control the pre-harvest fruit drop of Apple by means of harmones.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Buffer trees in stock \(\times\) manure trial. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By budding. (iv) Jonathan. (v) Last week of November 1939 and spacings \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (vi) Planted in 1939, one year after budding. (vii) Nil. (viii) No. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) 27.6.1951 to 28.8.1951.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. 10 p.p.m. of 2,4 -Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
2. 15 p.p.m. of 2,4 -Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
3. 20 p.p.m. of 2,4 -Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
4. \(10 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{p} \mathrm{m}\). of \(\mathrm{L}-\) Napthaleneacetic acid (commercial chemical used = Planofex)
5. 15 p.p.m. of L-Napthaleneacetic acid.
6. 20 p.p.m. of \(L-N a p t h a l e n e a c e t i c ~ a c i d . ~\)
7. Control.

Spraying done on 20.6.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) 2. (v) Generally 1 or 2 rows of trees on either side of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stëm black, stem brown and apple root-borer-mechanical methods of control adopted. (iii) Fruits dropped and the total no. of fruits including those finally harvested. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed where \(\mathrm{p}=\) percentage of fruits dropped. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) - 29.64 degrees.
(ii) 8.649 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle Av. \% drop of fruits (transformed back)


Crop :- Apple.
Ref :- U.P. 52(297).
Site :- Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia. Type: ' \(D\) '.

Object :-To control the pre-harvest fruit drop of Apple by means of harmones.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS:}
(i) Buffer trees in stock \(\times\) manure trial. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By budding. (iv) Jonathan. (v) Last week of November 1939 and spacings \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\circ}\). (vi) Planted in 1939, one year after budding. (vii) Nil. (viii) No. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) 31.7.1952 to 25.8.1952.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. 10 p.p.m. 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
2. 15 p.p.m. 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
3. 20 p.p.m. 2,4-Dichlorophenoxyacetic acid.
4. 10 p.p.m. L - Napthaleneacetic acid (commercial chemical used \(=\) Planofex).
5. 15 p.p.m. L-Napthaleqeacetic acid.
6. 20 p.p.m. L-Napthaleneacetic acid.
7. Control.

Spraying on 2.8.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) 2. (v) Generally 1 or 2 rows of trees on either side of the plot. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Wooly aphis, stem black, stem brown, apple root fborer-mechanical methods adopted for controlling. (iii) \% of fruits dropped. (iv) (a) 1950-1953. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has beea converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) and then analysed where \(p=\) persent of fruits dropped. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Hort (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 38.32 degrecs
(ii) 6.1257 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Treatmént Mean angles
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline mèn & Mean angles & 37.92 \\
\hline 1. & 37.94 & 37.92 \\
\hline 2. & 43.03 & 46.63 \\
\hline 3. & 41.38 & 43.75 \\
\hline 4. & 40.03 & 41.49 \\
\hline 5. & 35.85 & 34.46 \\
\hline 6. & 31.94 & 28.22 \\
\hline 7. & 38.08 & 38.12 \\
\hline & S.E./mean & - 2.5008 degrees. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Apple
Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 53(79)
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To control the pre-harvest drop of Apple.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Buffer tress in stock \(\times\) manure trial. (ii) N.A. (iii) Budding. (iv) Jonathan (v) Last week of Nov. 1939 and spacing \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\). (vi) Planted in 1939 -one year after budding. (vii) Nil. (viii) No. (ix) No. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) 42.84*. (xii) 25.8.1953.
2. TREATMENTS :

Two frequencies of spray viz. one spraying and two sprayings at an interval of 10 days with 3 concentrations as follows :-
1. 10 p.p.m.
5. 15 p.p.m.
2. 15 p.p.m.
6. 20 p.p.m.
3. 20 p.p.m.
7. Control.
4. 10 p.p.m.

Trestments 1,2,3 given on 24.7.1953 and treatments 4, 5, 6 on 3.8.1953. Name of the chemical sprayed -N.A.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) 1. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good (ii) Wooly Aphis-D.D.T. sprayed. Stem black, stem brown, apple root borers-mechanical control. (ii) No. of fruits dropping at weekly interval and total no. of fruits harvested. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Hort (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 26.71 degrees/tree.
(ii) 6.31 degrees/tree.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant,
(iv) Mean no. of fruits dropped per tree [converted to \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) when \(p\) is \(\%\) drop of fruit).
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Mean \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\). \\
1. & 26.46 \\
2. & 25.10 \\
3. & 26.28 \\
4. & 27.94 \\
5. & 25.84 \\
6. & 24.00 \\
7. & 31.34 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.8250\) degrees.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :-Apple.
Ref :-U.P. 48(44).
Site :-Ranikhet (Almora).
Type :-'D'.

```

Object :-A trial on the efficacy of stomach poisons against defoliating beetles.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lead Arsenate-lime mixture (Lead arsenate 1 oz , lime 2 ozs , and water 3 gallons).
2. Lead nitrate-Potassium bicromate mixture (Lead nitrate 2 ozs , pot. bichro. 1 oz. and water 4 gallons).
3. Paris green-lime mixture (P. green \(\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}} \mathrm{oz}\). lime \(1 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{ozs}\). and water 4 gallons).
4. Control.

Chemicals sprayed in June (a little before the start of monsoon).
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with six replications. (iii) one tree as a unit of plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Assessment of the effect was made on the \(\%\) of defoliation recorded in five degrees of perforation (slight, quarter \({ }_{\xi} \frac{1}{2}\), \(\frac{3}{4}\) th and totally damaged) and converting them in terms of total defoliation. (iv) (a) 1948-49. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was couducted by Ento (C). The plotwise yield data is not available. The results have been taken from the report.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(\mathbf{2 0 . 9} \%\) of attacked leaves/plot (in terms of total defoliation).
(ii) \(11.02 \%\) of attacked leaves/plot (in terms of total defoliation).
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Treatment

Mean \% of attcked leaves per plot in terms of complete defoliation
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
& \\
1. & \(19 \cdot 9\) \\
2. & 11.2 \\
3. & 27.7 \\
4. & 24.9 \\
S.E./mean & \(=4.50 \%\) of at acked leaves/plot.
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Ranikhet (Almora).

> Ref :- U.P. 49 (104).
> Type :- 'D'.

Object :-A trial on the efficacy of stomach poisons against defoliating beetles.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A
(iii) N.A.
(iv) N.A.
(v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Lead arsenate-lime spray (Lead arsenate one ozs., quick lime 3 ozs , and water 3 gallons).
2. Lead chromate spray (Lead acetate 2 ozs . and potassuim bichromate 1 oz , water 3 gallons).
3. Paris green-lime spray (Paris green 2 ozs , Lime 3 ozs , and water 3 gallons).
4. Control.

The trees received one spraying in the first week of July, 1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) one tree/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) The estimation of damage was made in October, when the attack of the beetles was completely over. (iv) (a) 1948-1949. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C). The plotwise yield cata is not available and the results have been taken from report.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(18.95 \%\) of damaged leaves/plot (in terms of complete defoliation).
(ii) \(4.85 \%\) of damaged leaves/plot (in terms of complete defoliation).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) & Treatments & \% of damaged leaves/plot \\
& 1. & 15.2 \\
& 2. & 9.3 \\
& 3. & 17.1 \\
& 4. & 34.2 \\
& S.E./mean & 1.98
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Apple: & Ref :-U.P. 51(40). \\
Site :-Ramgarh (Nainital). & Type :-'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the efficacy of stomach poisons against defoliating beetles.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Apple. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the tree and pruning during winter. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
2. Lead chromate.
3. Control.

Spraying on 18.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) Surveying at the spot. (ii) 7 replications in R.B.D. (iii) \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) ( 1 tree per plot). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Under study. (iii) Percentage damage to the leaves of apple trees. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Ento (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatments & Mean Angle (in degrees) & Transformed back mean percentage \\
1. & 18.16 & 10.11 \\
2. & 28.60 & 23.18 \\
3. & 32.34 & 28.82 \\
G.M. & 26.37 & \\
S.E./mean & 1.3452 & \\
Significance & Highly significant. &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Apple.
Site :- Jilling Estate (Nainital).
Ref:- U.P. 52(101).
Type :- 'D'.
Object : -To study the effects of insecticides against San Jose scale.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Apple. (c) Nil. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the base of tree and pruning during winter every year. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Diesel oil emalsion 4\%.
2. D.D.T. emulsion 0.5\%.
3. Sandolin A+Euphyton \(2 \%\).
4. Lime Sulphur (S. gr. 1.3, 1 in 10).
5. Control.

Date of spraying 8/9.2.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) By surveying. (ii) 5 replications in R.B.D. (iii) (a) and (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) ( 1 apple tree/plot). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) San Jose scale-as per treatments. (iii) Counting dead and live scales-two months after the spray. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).
5. Results :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Mean angle (in degrees) \\
1. & 62.71 \\
2. & 75.97 \\
3. & 73.41 \\
4. & 64.08 \\
S. & 26.08 \\
G.M. & 60.45 \\
S.E./mean & 1.8584 \\
Significance & Highly significant
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site : Ramgarh (Nainital).

Ref :- U.P. 52(104).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of stomach poisons against defoliating beetles during rainy season.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Apple. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Leaf mould and cowdung. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Pruning and ringing round the tree. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lead arsenate \(4 \mathrm{lbs} . / 100\) gallons.
2. Calcium arsenate \(2 \mathrm{lbs} . / 100\) gallons.
3. Lead chromate \(6 \mathrm{lbs} . / 100\) gallons.
4. Paris green \(2 \mathrm{lbs} . / 100\) gallons.
5. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\) -
6. Control.

Spraying on 2, 3.7.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) By survey. (ii) 5 replicatıons in R.B.D. (iii) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\) ( 1 apple tree/plot). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Defoliating beetles-as per treatments. (iii) Percentage leaf area eaten appay by the beetles. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 10 (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Trearment & Mean angle (in degrees) & Transformed back mean percentage \\
1. & 17.47 \\
2. & 20.24 & 9.42 \\
3. & 19.93 & 12.33 \\
4. & 19.04 & 11.33 \\
S. & 12.50 & 11.03 \\
6. & 31.74 & 5.14 \\
G.M. & 20.15 & 27.90 \\
S.E./mean & 1.7304 & \\
Significance & Highly significan &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Apple.
Site :- Jeolikote (Nainital).
Ref :- U.P. 53(70).
Type:- 'D'.
Object:-To study different control measures of the chrysomelid teetle.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. D.D.T. emlusion \(0.25 \%\).
2. Parathion emulsion \(0.05 \%\).
3. Lead Arsenate 2 lbs . in 100 gallons of water.
4. Lead Chromate \(4 \mathrm{lbs} . \mathrm{in} \cdot 100\) gallons of water.
5. Lime Sulphur (sp. gr. 1.3) 1 in 30 parts of water.
6. Soft Soap Nicotine Sulphate (nicotine sulphate, \(40 \%, 1\) in 800 water).
7. Control.

Spraying on 24.2.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 4 replications in R.B.D. (iii) (a) and (b) \(10^{\circ} \times 10^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Percentage area of leaves damaged by grubs and adults. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle (in degrees) & Transformed back mean percentage \\
1. & 6.63 & 1.82 \\
2. & 8.15 & 2.49 \\
3. & 8.87 & 2.87 \\
4. & 8.94 & 2.90 \\
5. & 9.34 & 3.10 \\
6. & 10.07 & 3.53 \\
7. & 16.23 & 8.23 \\
G.M. & 9.75 & \\
S.E./mean & 0.5010 & \\
Significance & Highly significant & \\
& &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Citrus (Mosambi). & Ref :- U.P. 51(290). \\
Site :- Castle Grant Orchard, B.R. College, Agra. & Type :- ‘M’.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of Nitrogen obtained from different sources on the performance of Mosambi.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) In young age upto 6 years the plants received 20 seers of compost/tree in every year with frequent addition of fish manure or bone meal every third year till the age of 9 years. Manuring only then in the last two years by 40 seers of compost per tree annually. Irrigation and weeding according to needs. (ii) (a) Loam. (b) Refer soil analysis, B.R. College, Agra. (iii) Budded on khatta stock. (iv) N.A. (v) Planted in 1934 at \(29^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) in pits \(3^{\prime} \times 3^{\prime}\) filled with 4 mds. of F.Y.M. and soil mixed together. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (vịi) Two weedings (ix) Nil. (x) Irrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2) + a control.
(1) Forms of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{M}_{1}=\) compost and \(\mathrm{M}_{2}=\mathrm{A} / \mathrm{S}\).
(2) 3 levels of \(\mathrm{N}: \mathrm{N}_{1}=1, \mathrm{~N}_{2}=2, \mathrm{~N}_{3}=3 \mathrm{lb}\)./tree.

A/S as uniform texture mixed with equal amount of dry powdered soil broadcast evenly in the assigned basin and thoroughly incorporated in the soil by a light hoeing followed by light irrigation, same method for compost (not mixed with soil). Applied on 9.1.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) (a) 1. (b) N.A. (v) \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Girth measurement, length of shoot, no. of leaves, size of leaves, fruit set, fruit drop, fruit size and yield. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) The experiment was conducted by B.R.C. No plot wise yield data were available in the thesis.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(19.68 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(ii) \(8.34 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
(iii) Effect of \(N\) and interaction \(M \times N\) are significant, effect of \(M\) is not significant.
(iv) Av. yield of mosambi in lb./tree.

Control= 13.42
\begin{tabular}{c|cc|c} 
& \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & \(\mathbf{M}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{N}_{1}\) & 12.58 & 11.47 & 12.03 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & 31.47 & 12.13 & 21.80 \\
\(\mathrm{~N}_{3}\) & 23.50 & 33.22 & 28.30 \\
\hline Mean & 2252 & 18.94 & 20.73
\end{tabular}
S.E. of difference of two
\begin{tabular}{lrl} 
1. marginal means of N & & \(=4.81 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
2. marginal means of M & & \(=3.93^{\mathrm{l}} \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
3. means of body of \(\mathrm{M} \times \mathrm{N}\) table & & \(=6.81 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree. \\
S.E. for the control mean & & \(=4.81 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Citrus (Grape fruit)
Site :- Govt. Nursery, Bageswar.
Ref :-U. P. 52 (71).
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To study the effect of various fungicides against fruit spot disease of Grape fruit variety.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N. A. (iii) N. A. (iv) Mixed. (v) N. A. (vi) More than 8 years (vii) Nil. (viii) Nil. (ix) Nil. (x) Irrigated. (xi) N. A. (xii) N. A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Perenox 0.3\%.
2. Lime sulphur \(1: \mathbf{2 0}\), sp. gr. 1.3.
3. Thiovit \(0.3 \%\).
4. Sandolin.
5. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) S. (b) N. A. (iii) 6. (iv) One. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N. A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Percentage of infection. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N. Ar (vi) N. A. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean angle (in degrees) & Transformed back mean percentages.' \\
1. & 31.00 & 26.76 \\
2. & 35.44 & 33.77 \\
3. & 25.45 & 18.78 \\
4. & 28.60 & 23.18 \\
5. & 34.36 & 32.03 \\
G. M. & 30.97 & \\
S.E./mean & 2.5068 & \\
Significance & N.S. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Citrus (Lemon Seedlings). \\ Site :- Govt. Nursury, Bageswar.}

Ref :- U.P: 52(70)
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To study the effect of various fungicides against leaf scab disease of citrus.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) Nil. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By seed. (iv) Lemon local. (v) N A. (vi) 2 years. (vii) Nil. (viii) Nil. (ix) No. (x) Irrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Lime sulphur ( \(1: 20\). sp. grovity 1.13 )
2. Thiovit \(0.25 \%\).
3. Perenox \(0.25 \%\).
4. Sandolin \(0.25 \%\).
5. Ultra sulghur \(0.25 \%\).
6. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.(ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) S. (iv) One row of seedlings ( \(3^{\prime}\) high). 30 ft . in lengths with adequate buffer rows. (v) Two rows. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study, (iii) Percentage of infection on 5 and 6 December 1952. [(iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS:
\begin{tabular}{ccc}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
(i) to (iv) & \\
Treatment & Mean angle (in degrees)
\end{tabular} & Transformed back mean percentage. \\
1. & 36.83 & 36.07 \\
2. & 45.69 & 51.19 \\
3. & 49.81 & 58.27 \\
4. & 42.12 & 45.04 \\
5. & 46.26 & 52.18 \\
6. & 55.50 & 67.81 \\
G. M. & 46.04 & \\
S.E./mean & 1.2226 & \\
Significance & Highly significant &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Citrus (Grape Fruit). \\ Site :- Govt. Hort. Farm, Jeolikote.
}

Ref :- U.P. 53(189).
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To study the control measures of fruit spot disease of Citrus (grape fruit).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) Orchard. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Grafted plants. (iv) Grape Fruit. (v) The experiment was laid out on 20.9.1953. (vi) More than 10 years. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) Nil. (x) Irrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lime Sulphur 1 : 30 (Sp. gravity 1.33)
5. Sandolin \(0.3 \%\)
2. Perenox \(0.3 \%\).
6. Dithane Z.78 0.3\%.
3. Coppesan \(0.3 \%\).
7. Ultra Sulphur \(0.3 \%\).
4. Thiovit 0.3\%.
8. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) 8. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Percentage of infection on January 13, 1954. (iv) (a) 1953-54. (b) N.A. (v) N.A (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) at Bageswar (Almora).
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle (in degrees) & Transformed back mean percentage \\
1. & 43.35 & 47.14 \\
2. & 37.54 & 37.26 \\
3. & 42.60 & 45.85 \\
4. & 40.35 & 41.99 \\
5. & 42.31 & 45.36 \\
6. & 45.58 & 51.00 \\
7. & 46.54 & 52.66 \\
8. & 51.19 & 60.60 \\
G.M. & 43.68 & \\
S.E./mean & 1.4650 & \\
Significance & Highly significant & \\
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Citrus (Lemon Seedlings).
Site :- Govt. Hort. Farm, Jeolikote.

Ref:- U.P. 53(187)
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the efficacy of different insecticides against Leaf scab disease.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) Nursury plots. (ii) (a) Sandy loam. (b) N.A. (iii) By seed. (iv) Lemon (Local). '(v) 4 rows of \(14{ }^{\prime}\) each ( \(16-18\) plants/row) at a distance \(1^{\prime}\) apart. (vi) 2 years old. ( \(2.55^{\prime}-3.5^{\prime}\) in height).' (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) Nil. (x) Irrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lime Sulphor \(1: 30\) (Sp. gravity 1.33).
5. Dithane Z. \(780.25 \%\).
2. Perenox \(0.25 \%\).
6. Ultra Sulphur \(0.25 \%\).
3. Coppesan \(0.25 \%\).
7. Sandolin \(0.25 \%\).
4. Thiovit 0.25\%.
8. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8 . (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) 64-72 plants/plot. (v) \(3^{\circ}\) between plots." (vi) Yes, :
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Percentage infection/plot on 5.12 .1953 . . (iv) (a) 1953-contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) at Bageswar (Almora).
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean angles (in degrees) & Transformed back mean percentage \\
\hline 1. & 33.42 & 30.53 \\
\hline 2. & 47.76 & 54.76 \\
\hline 3. & 36.48 & . \(\quad 33.50\) \\
\hline 4. & 46.15 & 51.98 \\
\hline 5. & 45,35 & 50.60 \\
\hline 6. & 43.96 & 48.21 \\
\hline 7. & 41.55 & 44.06 \\
\hline 8. & 57.33 & 70.60 \\
\hline G.M. & 44.00 & \\
\hline S.E./mean & 1.0901 & \\
\hline Significance & Highly significant. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Citrus (Malta).
Ref:- U.P. 53(74).
Site :- Govt. Hort. Farm, Jeolikote.
Type :- 'D'.

```

Object:-To study the effectiveness of ovicides on eggs of Citrus white fly.
1. BASAL CÓNDITIONS:
(i) Experiments were conducted on Malta to which G.M. (soyabeam) and N were given. (ii) (a) Gravelly soil. (b) N.A. (iii) By budding. (iv) Malta. (v) N.A. (vi) One year old. (vii) Pine leaf compost. (viii) Hoeing. (ix) Wheat during winter. (x) Irrigated. (xi) \(69.49^{\prime \prime}\). (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lime Sulphur (sp. gr. 1.3) \(5 \%\).
2. D.D.T. emulsion \(\mathbf{0 . 2 5 \%}\).
3. Control.

Sprayed on 31.7.1953 at 2 gallons/tree.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 7. (iv) 1. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Medium. (ii) Under study. (iii) No. of living nymphs and no. of eggs from which they hatched. (iv) (a) 1953-contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C). The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed where \(p\) is \(\%\) no. eggs to no. of hatched nymphs.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(\mathbf{t o}\) (iv)
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Treatment & Mean emergence of nymphs per tree in \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) \\
1. & 14.01 \\
2. & 21.90 \\
3. & 56.83 \\
G.M. & 30.92 \\
S.E./mean & 1.50 \\
Significance & Highly significant
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Citrus (Malta). \\ Site :- Govt. Hort. Farm, Jeolikote. \\ Ref:- U.P. 53(71). \\ Type :- ‘D'.
}

Object :-To study the effectiveness of ovicides on eggs of Citrus white fly.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Experiment were conducted on Malta to which G.M. (soyabeam) and NJwere given. (ii) (a) Gravelly soil. (b) N.A. (iii) By budding. (iv) Malia. (v) N.A. (vi) One year old. (vii) Pine leaf compost. (viii) Hoeing. : (ix) Wheat during winter. (x) Irrigated. (xi) 69.49'. (xii) November.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T.emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
6. Lime Sulphur \(5 \%\).
2. B.H.C. wettable powder \(0.01 \%\).
7. Fresh oil rosin soap \(2.5 \%\).
3. Toxaphene emulsion \(0.125 \%\).
8. Kerosene oil emulsion \(4 \%\).
4. Chlordane emulsion \(0.125 \%\).
9. Control (no treatment).
5. Parathion emulsion \(0.05 \%\).
Sprayed on 30.3.1953 at \(1 \frac{1}{8}\) gallons per tree.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 9. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) 1. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Medium. (ii) Under study. (iii) The no. of living nymphs and no. of eggs from which they hatched on 30.4.1953. (iv) (a) 1953-contd. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \multicolumn{4}{|l|}{(i) to (iv)} \\
\hline Treatment & Mean emergence of nymphs per tree in \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) & Treatment & Mean emergence of nymphs per tree in \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) \\
\hline 1. & 16.70 & 6. & 17.04 \\
\hline 2. & 21.90 & 7. & 37.24 \\
\hline 3. & 20.30 & 8. & 36.52 \\
\hline 4. & 22.44 & 9. & 40.24 \\
\hline 5. & 19.46 & & \\
\hline G.M. & 25.76 & & \\
\hline S.E./mean & 1.78 & & \\
\hline Significance & Highly significant & & - \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Crop :-Citrus.
Site :-Govt. Hort. Farm, Jeolikote.

Ref :-U.P. 52(106).
Type :-'D'.
Object :-To study the efficacy of different insecticides against Citrus leaf miner.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) Budding and inarching. (vi) N.A. (vii) Compost at \(1 \mathrm{md} /\) pit. (viii) Nil. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) Nil.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%(1: 50)\)
2. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\) ( \(1: 100\) )
3. Fish oil rosin soap 2 lbs in 4 gallons .
4. Soft soap nicotine sulphate (soap 4.2, nicotine 102 and water 2.5 gallons.)
5. Parathion \(0.1 \%(1: 200)\).
6. Parathion \(0.5 \%(1: 400)\).
7. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 7.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 5 . (iv) 1 .
(v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Stunted. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% mortality. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle (in degrees) & Transformed back mean percentage \\
1. & 55.31 & 67.43 \\
2. & 31.63 & 27.72 \\
3. & 28.22 & 22.64 \\
4. & 27.84 & 22.09 \\
5. & 41.39 & 43.77 \\
6. & 41.93 & 44.70 \\
7. & 27.08 & 21.02 \\
G.M. & 36.20 & \\
S.E./mean & 2.4658 & \\
Significance & Highly significant. &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Citrus. & Ref :-U.P. 50(272). \\
Site :-Govt. Bot. Gardens, Kanpur. & Type :-'D'.
\end{tabular}

Site :-Govt. Bot. Gardens, Kanpur.
Type :-'D'.
Object :-To study the effect of insecticides on immature Citrus leaf miner.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) and (c) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix), N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Spraying with 0.25 D.D.T. emulsion.
2. Spraying with 0.60 D.D.T. emulsion.
3. Nicotine in \(2 \%\) kerosene oil was sprayed.
4. Nicotine in \(3 \%\) kerosene oil was sprayed.
5. Spraying with nicotine sulphate soap emulsion.
6. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Population and mortality of larvae and pupea. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS :
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(i) to (iv) & Mean angle & Transformed back mean percentage \\
Treatment & 19.03 & 10.99 \\
1. & 16.97 & 8.91 \\
2. & 15.49 & 7.53 \\
3. & 14.65 & 6.84 \\
4. & 14.11 & 6.38 \\
5. & 0.00 & 0.50 \\
6. & 13.38 & \\
G.M. & 1.4931 & \\
S.E./mean & Highly significant. & \\
Significance & &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Citrus.
Ref :- U.P. 52(308).
Site :- National Bot. Gardens, Lucknow.
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of insecticides on immature Citrus leaf miner.
-
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.!
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Parathion spray \(0.025 \%\).
2. Parathion spray \(0.05 \%\).
3. B.H.C. water suspension spray \(0.25 \%\).
4. B.H.C. (Hexyclan M.O.) emulsion spray \(0.25 \%\).
5. D.D.T. emulsion spray \(0.25 \%\).
6. Lead Arsenate spray (Lead Arsenate powder 1 part, lime \(1 \frac{1}{2}\) part, Gur 3 parts water 320 parts).
7. Control (No treatment).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) 8 plants in one set, each set having two plots. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Population and mortality of larvae and pupea. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The expt. was conducted by Ento (K).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) to (iv).

\[
\begin{array}{lc}
\text { Crop :- Cirtus. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. } 52 \text { (303). } \\
\text { Site :- National Bot. Gardens, Lucknow. } & \text { Type :- 'D'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the effect of insecticides on the mortality of immature Citrus leaf miner.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A.- (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying with \(0.05 \%\) parathion emulsion.
2. Spraying with \(0.1 \%\) parathion emulsion.
3. Spraying with Nicotine sulphate ( \(4 \%\) ) \(+50 \%\) D.D.T. soap+water ( \(1: 4: 800\) by weight) spray.
4. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) B.H.C. suspension.
5. Control
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) one. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Population and mortality of larvae and pupea.. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NA. (vii) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) and then analysed. Transformed back mean percentages are given after applying bias correction. The expt. was conducte d by Ento (K.)
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv).
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatments & Mean angle & Transformed back mean percentage \\
1. & 64.20 & 80.75 & \\
2. & 72.05 & 90.10 & \\
3. & 57.24 & 70.58 & \\
4. & 38.82 & 39.41 & \\
5. & 0.00 & 0.50 & \\
G.M. & 46.46 & & \\
S.E./mean & 2.2006 & & \\
Significance & Highly significant & &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Citrus. & Ref :- U.P. 51(254). \\
Site :- National Bot. Gardens, Lucknow. & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To study the effect of insecticides on immature Citrus leaf miner.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Spraying with \(\mathbf{0 . 2 5 \%}\) D.D.T. emulsion.
2. Spraying with 0.5\% D.D.T. emulsion.
3. Spraying with Nicotine sulphate, soap and Guesrol 550.
4. Spraying with Nicotine sulphate and soap emulsion.
5. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Population and mortality of larvae and pupea. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A.
(v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento(K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{lccc} 
Treatments & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean value of \\
concomitant variate
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean value of \\
Unadjusted
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Adjusted
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 1.80 & 1.2504 & 1.2450 \\
2. & 1.20 & 1.1602 & 1.2473 \\
3. & 1.60 & 1.3718 & 1.4045 \\
4. & 1.40 & 1.0177 & 1.0776 \\
5. & 3.20 & 0.7071 & 0.5220 \\
G.M. & 1.84 & 1.1014 & \\
Error mean square & 2.8650 & & \\
S.E./mean & 0.1095 & & \\
Significance & Highly significant & &
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :- Citrus. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 51(255). } \\ \text { Site :- National Bot. Gardens, Lucknow. } & \text { Type :- 'D'. }\end{array}\)
Object: :-To study the effect of insecticides on immature Citrus leaf miner.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion.
2. Spraying with \(0.5 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion.
3. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) Hexyclan M.O. spray.
4. Spraying with Nicotine sulphate, soap and Guesrol 550.
.5. Spraying with \(0.05 \%\) Ekatox.
.6. Spraying with \(0.1 \%\) Ekatox.
7. Control (No treatment).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N.A. (iii) 4. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Population and mortality of larvae and pupea. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{ } \mathbf{x}+\mathbf{0 . 5}\) & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back \\
mortality counts
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 1.0550 & 0.61 \\
2. & 1.6995 & 2.38 \\
3. & 0.9659 & 0.43 \\
4. & 1.3862 & 1.42 \\
5. & 1.4183 & 1.51 \\
6. & 1.0550 & 0.61 \\
7. & 0.7071 & 0.00 \\
G.M. & 1.1839 & \\
S.E./mean & 0.1552 & \\
Significance & N.A. & \\
& &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Citrus.
Site :- Jeolikote (Nainital).

Ref :- U.P. 51(43).
Type : \({ }^{\text {© }} \mathbf{D}\) '.

Object :-To find out insecticidal control measures against Citrus green bug.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i (a) Nil. (b) Citrus. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the base of tree. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
2. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\) -
3. D.D.T. guesrol \(550,0.25 \%\).
4. D.D.T. guesrol 550, 0.25\%.
5. Control

Spraying on 10 and 19.9.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\) ( 1 tree/plot). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \% of fruit fall. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (v) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (c):
5. RESULTS :
(i) 34.69 degree.
(ii) 2.9669 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatments Mean angle (in degree) corresponding to

Tranformed back mean percentage after applying bias correction. 14.44 23.16
1.
\(2 . \quad 22.04\) 23.16 25.78 19.22 38.32 38.57 42.98 . . 46.52
\begin{tabular}{llr}
5. & 42.98 & .46 .52 \\
6. & 50.45 & 59.36.
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean
1.4834

Crop:- Citrus
Site :a Joelikote (Nainital).

Ref :- U.P 51(42)
Type :- ' X '.

Object :-To find out insecticidal cọntrol measures against Citrus leaf miner.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Citrus. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the tre3. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
2. D.D T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
3. Guesrol \(550 \quad 0.5 \%\).
4. Guesrol \(550 \quad 0.25 \%\).
5. Fish oil rosin soap.
6. Control.

Spraying on 59.51 .
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 Replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\) (one tree/plot). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Stunted. (ii) Control measures as per treatments, (iii) \% mortality. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) NiI. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 54.41 degree.
(ii) 2.5502 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degrees) corresponding to \(\%\) mortality of citrus leaf miner.
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
1. & 64.10 & 80.61 \\
2. & 57.98 & 71.67 \\
3. & 65.16 & 82.03 \\
4. & 56.90 & 69.99 \\
5. & 54.91 & 66.78 \\
6. & 27.39 & 21.45
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Citrus.}

Site := Jeolikote (Nainital).
Ref :- U.P. 51(41).
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To find out the insecticidal control measures against Citrus green bug.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Citrus. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the base of tree. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
2. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
3. D D.T. 550 0.5\%.
4. D.D.T. 550 0.25\%-
5. Fish oil rosin soap 1 lb . in 4 gallons of pater.
6. Control.

Spraying on 28.81.951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 2 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) (1 tree/plot.) (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \% of fruit fall. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 36.40 degree.
(ii) 5.5453 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degrees) corresponding Transformed back mean \% after to \% fall of fruit applying bias correction
24.64
31.17
28.06
39.92
45.40
4922
S.E./mean \(\quad=3.921\)
17.72
27.02
22.41
41.28
50.69
57.28

\section*{Crop :- Citrus.}

Ref:..U.P. 52(105).
Site :- Jeolikote (Nainital).
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To find out the effect of different ovicides sprayed over the eggs of Citrus white fly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Citrus. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay. (iii) Compost at 1 md./pit. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the base of stem. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) Perennial crop. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A.
(x) N.A. .
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Kercsene oil emulsion 4\%.
2. D.D.T. \(0.25 \%\).
3. Fish oil rosin soap 1 lb . in 4 gallons of water.
4. Lime sulphur 1 in 20 (sp. gr. 1.3).
5. Control.

Date of spray 25.7-1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\) ( 1 tree/plot). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Population of eggs before and after treatments. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 23.26 degree.
(ii) 3.435 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degree) corresponding Transformed back mean percentage to \% nymphs after applying bias corsection 12.25
1. . 20.15
2. 11.23 4.25 \(3 . \quad 25.78\) 19.22
\begin{tabular}{lrr}
4. & 8.62 & 2.73. \\
5. & 50.50 & 59.44
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Citrus.
Ref:-U.P. 52(108),
Site :-Majhkoli (Nainital).
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To find out suitable insecticides for the pupae of Citrus white fly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Citrus. (c) Nil. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Pine leaf compost. (iv) Malta (Mosambi). (v)
(a) Ringing round the base of tree for application of compost. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) Perennial crop. (vii)

Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Perennial crop.
2. TREATMENIS:
1. D.D.T. \(0.5 \%\).
2. D.D.T. \(0.25 \%\).
3. Parathion (l.c.c. in 800 c.c. of water).
4. Fish oil rosin soap 1 lb . in 4 gallons of water.
5. Sandolin \(0.5 \%\) +Ephyton \(2 \%\).
6. Lime sulphur \(1: 20\).
7. Control.

Date of experiment 17 and 18.12.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\prime}\) (1 tree/plot). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Stunted. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Number of eggs and the number of nymphs. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 53.88 degree.
(ii) 2.961 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degree) corresponding to \% kill

Transformed back mean percentage after
\begin{tabular}{lclc} 
& corresponding to \(\%\) kill & applying bias correction \\
1. & 72.88 & 90.93 \\
2. & 65.93 & 83.03 \\
3. & 60.79 & & 75.93 \\
4. & 45.38 & 50.66 \\
5. & 63.23 & 79.41 \\
6. & 49.20 & 57.23 \\
7. & 19.77 & & 11.83 \\
& S.E./mean & \(=1.324\) &
\end{tabular}

Crop :-Citrus.
Site : \(\quad\) Jeolikote (Nainital).

Ref :-U.P. 52 (103).
Type :-‘D’.

Object:-To find out the effect of different ovicides sprayed over the eggs of Citrus white fly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Citrus. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing round the tree. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) Perennial crop. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Gaevenalin 5 c.c. in one gallon of water.
2. Lime sulphur 1 in 20.
3. D.D.T. 0.25\%.
4. Fish oil rosin soap 1 lb . in 4 gallons of water.
5. Kerosene oil emulsion \(4 \%\) : stock sol. \(33.3 \%\).
6. Control.

Date of spray 15.4.1952.
3. DESIGN ;
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) \(20^{\circ} \times 20^{\circ}\) (1 tree/plot). (iv) N.A.
1. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Number of eggs and number of nymphs. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields.
3. RESULTS :
(i) 31.97 degree.
(ii) 4.024 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degree) transformed back mean \% after applying corresponding \% hatched nymphs bias correction
\begin{tabular}{rr}
1.90 & 44.65 \\
5.60 & 1.44 \\
10.50 & 3.79 \\
45.84 & 51.46 \\
42.52 & 45.73 \\
65.48 & 82.45
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean \(=1.799\)
```

Crop:-Citrus.
Ref :- U.P. 53(76).
Site :- Bhimtal (Nainital).
Type : ' $\mathbf{D}$ '.

```

Object :-To find the effect of nymphicides against the nymphs of Citrus white fy.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
2. Sandolin \(0.5 \%\).
3. Sandolin+Enphyton 2\%.
4. , .D.T. Suspension 0.5\%.
5. Control.

Date of spraying 30.8 -1953 sprayed 2 gallons per tree with the help of sprayer.
3. DESIGN :
(i) to (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 2 citrus trees. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) Population of nymphs and \% of kill. (iv) (a) \(1953-\) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data was converted to \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento. (C) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 48.95 for \(\mathbf{2}\) sq. inch leaf area.
(ii) 6.26 for 2 sq. inch leaf area.
(iii). Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean \% of reduction in \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\)
\begin{tabular}{lc}
1. & 57.95 \\
2. & 56.38 \\
3. & 52.45 \\
4. & 47.02 \\
5. & 30.95 \\
& S.E./mean \(=3.13\)
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Citrus.
Site :- Jeolikote (Nainital).
Object:-To find out suitable control measures against the Citrus green bug, Rhynchocories humeralis causing premature drop of Citrus fruit.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e; N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS ;
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
2. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
3. D.D.T. suspension \(0.5 \%\).
4. B.H.C. suspension \(0.5 \%\).
5. Control.

Date of treatments 4.8.1953. Quantity of spray used- \(\frac{1}{2}\) gallons per tree. Malta and Orange trees of varying height bearing 5-107 fruits and fruit has started falling ; sprayer used.
3. DESIGN :
(i) to (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 2 citrus trees. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL:}
(i) \% of fall was varying. (ii) N.A. (iii) Pupae of Citrus green bug and number of fruits examined i.e. Citrus green bugs per 100 fruits. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields. \(x=\) population of Citrus green bug per 100 fruits.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(257 \sqrt{x+0.5 / p l o t .}\)
(ii) \(0.3678 \sqrt{\sqrt{x+0 .}} 5 / \mathrm{plot}\).
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment

Mean value of \(\sqrt{ } \mathrm{x}+0.5 / \mathrm{plot}\)
Population of Citrus green bug per 100 fruits/plot (Transformed back) 5.21 2.70
6.16 5.50 12.75
S.E./mean \(\quad .=0.184 \sqrt{x+0.5} /\) plot

\author{
Crop :- Citrus. \\ Site :- Ranikhet (Almora).
}

Ref:- U.P. 49(102).
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To find out suitable insecticides for Citrus white fly eggs.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A.
(ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Soft soap Nicotine sulphate (Nicotine sulphate \(40 \%, 1\) in 800 parts of water).
2. Kerosene oil emulsion \(3 \%\).
3. Fish oil rosin ( 1 lb . in 4 gallons of water).
4. Lime sulphur (sp. gravity 1.17, dilution 1 in 15 parts of water).
5. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\) (Gladstone Marshall).
6. Control.

Treatments used in August 1949 as ovicides. Treatments used in October 1949 as nymphicides.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. (iii) (a) and (b) One tree/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures part of treatments. (iii) Counts of living and dead insects. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & \% of hatching of eggs after treatments & \% of kill of white Nymphs \\
1. & 51.7 & 22.1 \\
2. & 45.4 & 38.9 \\
3. & 43.7 & 69.6 \\
4. & 9.8 & 74.7 \\
5. & 11.8 & 94.7 \\
6. & 67.3 & 14.3 \\
S.E./mean & \(=3.96\) &
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Citrus.
Site :- Majkholi (Almora).

Ref:- U.P. 51(38).
Type :- 'D'.

Object:-To find out a suitable insecticidal control measure against Citrus white fly.
1. BASAL CONOATIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Citrus. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing round the base of tree. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
2. Rosin soap 1 tb . in 4 gallons of water.
3. Lime Sulphur \(1: 30\).
4. Control.

Spraying during February 1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) ( 1 malta tree/plot).(b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Fair. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \(\%\) mortality of nymphs of white fly after spraying. (iv) (a) Yes. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 39.96 degree.
(ii) 5.405 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degree) corresponding Transformed back imean \% tu \% mortality of Nymphs after applying bias correction
\begin{tabular}{clll}
1. & 67.21 & & 84.65 \\
2. & 43.07 & & 46.66 \\
3. & 35.30 & & 33.57 \\
4. & 14.25 & & \(6.50^{\circ}\) \\
& S.E./mean & \(=2.207\) & \\
& & & \\
& & &
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Citrus
Site :- Majkholi (Almora).
Ref:- U.P. 51(44)
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To find out a suitable insecticidal control measure against Citrus white fly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Citrus. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the main base of of tree. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
2. D.D.T. emulsion \(5 \%\).
3. Lime sulpher \(1: 10\).
4. Linseed oil rosin soap 1 lb . in 4 gallons of water.
5. Sandolin \(0.5 \%\) + Enphyton 2\%.
6. Control.

Spraying during Dec. 1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}\) (1 tree/plot). (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) good. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \% mortality in pupae 2 months after treatment during 1st. week of Feb. 1951. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment


\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 52.72 degree.
(ii) 2.675 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle Transformed back mean percentage after applying bias correction
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
& Meatment & 65.16 \\
1. & 73.53 & 82.03 \\
2. & 50.00 & 91.56 \\
3. & 49.73 & 58.60 \\
4. & 59.36 & 58.13 \\
5. & 18.52 & 73.79 \\
6. & \(=1.3375\) & 10.49 \\
S.E./mean & &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Citrus. & R ef :- U.P. 53(77). \\
Site :- Majkholi (Almora). & Type :- ‘D'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To find out suitable insectides against the pupae of Citrus white fly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. emulsin \(0.5 \%\).
2. D.D.T. emulsion 0.25\%.
3. Lime sulphur ( \(33^{\circ} \mathrm{B}\) ) \(1: 20\).
4. Parathion emulsion \(0.05 \%\).
5. Sandolin A \(0.5 \%\) + Albolinium at \(40 z\). per 100 gallons.
6. Sandolin A \(\mathbf{0 . 2 5 \%}+\) Albolinium at 4 oz . per 100 gallons.
7. No treatment.

Date of treatment 13.12.53. Av. quantity of spray \(5 \mathbf{l b} . / t r e=\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) to (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 2 citrus trees/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \% reduction in pupae. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 58.38 degree.
(ii) 11.1034 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degree) corresponding \% Transformed back mean \% reduction in population of pupae . after applying bias correction
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
1. & 67.63 & 85.15 \\
2. & 59.99 & 74.74 \\
3. & 56.70 & 69.66 \\
4. & 57.39 & 70.75 \\
5. & 63.52 & 79.81 \\
6. & 57.06 & 70.23 \\
7. & 46.34 & 52.31 \\
S.E./mean & 5.552 degree. &
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Citrus (Malta).
Ref :- U.P. 49(205).
Site :- Ranikhet (Almora).
Type:- 'D'.

```

Object :-To find out suitable control measures for Citrus sooty mould disease.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Under orchard. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam, (iii) Nil. (iv) Malta. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Control.
2. Lime sulphur ( \(1: 10\) ).
3. Lime sulphur ( \(1: 15\) ).
4. Bordeaux mixture ( \(2: 10: 40\) ).
5. Perenox ( \(0.125 \%\) with albolinium at 4 oz . per \(\mathbf{1 0 0}\) gallons).
.Spraying was done on 20, 21.4.1949 Sp. gravity of lime sulphur=1.17.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications, one branch of tree as one unit i.e. plot. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \(\%\) infection on 100 leaves in each unit plot was recorded. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data was converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed, transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(34.90 \quad \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) \(13.3007 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treaiment Mean value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p per plot \(\%\) infection/plot (transformed back)
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. & 60.35 & 75.27 \\
2. & 26.62 & 20.38 \\
3. & 21.23 & 13.37 \\
4. & 33.37 & 30.45 \\
5. & 32.94 & 29.77
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Crop :- Citrus iMalta). } \\
& \text { Site :- Ranikhet (Almora). }
\end{aligned}
\]

Ref: \(:\) U.P. 50(265).
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To find out suitable fungicidal and insecticidal spray fluids against sooty mould disease of Citrus.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Under orchard. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) No. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Perenox ( \(0.2 \%\) with Albolinium at 4 oz . per 100 gallons).
2. Dithane \(\mathrm{Z}-78\) ( \(0.2 \%\) with Triton at 4 oz . in 100 gallons).
3. Lime Sulphur ( \(1: 30\), \(\mathbf{s p}\). gravity 1.25 ).
4. Fish oil rosin soap 1 lb . in 4 gallons of water.
5. D.D.T. emulsion ( \(0.25 \%\) ).
6. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications and one tree as a unit of a plot. (iii) (a) and (b) Nil. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) The disease was very severe during February, control measures as per treatments. (iii) Two hundred leaves were picked at random from each plant and the \(\%\) infection was determined. (iv) (a)

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(50.22 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) plot.
(ii) \(6.140 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) per plot
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
1. & 52.95 & 63.56 \\
2. & 53.16 & 63.91 \\
3. & 33.28 & 30.31 \\
4. & 59.10 & 73.39 \\
5. & 34.11 & 31.64 \\
6. & 68.73 & 86.47 \\
SE/mean & 2.507 &
\end{tabular}
S.E./mean
2.507

\author{
Crop :- Citrus (Malta). \\ Site :- Majkholi Almora.
}

> Ref :- U.P. 5i(37).

Type: ' \(D\) '.
Object :-To find out suitable insecticides and fungicides against Citrus sooty mould disease.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Mixed. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. D.D.T. \(0.25 \%\).
5. Spersul \(05 \%\).
2. D D.T. 0.5\%.
6. Sandolin A \(0.5 \%+\) Enphyton ton \(\mathrm{W}-0.2 \%\).
3. Lime sulphur \(1: 10\left(14^{\circ}\right.\) Banne).
7. Thiovit \(0.5 \%\).
4. Home made oil rosin soap 1 lb . in 4 gallons.
8. Thiovit 0.1\%.
9. Control.

The experiment was laid out on \(\mathbf{1} \mathbf{0} \mathbf{1 2}\).1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) One tree of malta. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control of citrus sooty mould disease as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of infection. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 39.33 degree.
(ii) 5.031 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean angle (in degree) corresponding \\
to \(\%\) infection
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back mean \% after \\
applying bias correction
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 42.25 & 45.25 \\
2. & 38.74 & 39.38 \\
3. & 41.24 & 43.52 \\
4. & 34.90 & 32.90 \\
5. & 47.05 & 53.55 \\
6. & 17.25 & 9.20 \\
7. & 38.14 & 38.26 \\
8. & 40.90 & 42.92 \\
9. & 53.48 & 64.44
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:- Citrus (Malta).
Site :- Majkholi (Almora).

```

Ref:- U.P. 52(72)
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-To find out suitable control measures of sooty mould disease of Citrus.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Mixed. (v) (a) to (c) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. \(05 \%\).
5. Sandolin 0.5\% + Enphyton
2. D.D.T. \(0.25 \%\).
6. Thiovit 0.25\%.
3. Parathion \(1: 300\).
7. Lime Sulphur 1:25.
4. Fish oil rosin soap 1 lb . in 4 gallons.
8. Control. The treatments were on 17.12.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) 5 replications in R.B.D. (iii) (a) and (b) One tree of malta orange. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii` Control of citrus sooty mould as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of infection as determised on 1st March, 1953. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivator's field.
5. RESULTS:
(i: 40.53 degree.
(ii) 5.901 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment

Mean angle (in degree) corresponding
to \% infection 26.50
35.20
48.60
49.48
12.45 5.10
40.50 42.27
40.92 42.97
70.59 - 88.57
S.E./mean \(=\mathbf{2 . 6 3 9 1}\).

Transformed back mean fercentage after applying bias correction

\subsection*{20.21}
33.40
56.21
57.71
5.10

Crop:- Citrus (Malta).
Site :- Majkholi (Almora).

Ref:- U.P. 53(190).
Type : ' \(D\) '.

Object:-To find out suitable control measures of sooty mould disease of Citrus.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. D.D.T \(0.5 \%\).
2. D.D.T. \(0.25 \%\).
3. Lime sulphur 1:20. Sp. gravity \(1: 33\).
4. Parathion \(0.5 \%\)
5. Sandolin \(0.50 \%\).
6. Sandolin \(0.25 \%\).
7. Control.

Experiment was conducted on 13.12 .53 and was laid out before onset of disease.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) 1 tree per plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control of citrus sooty mould disease as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of infection on 14.1.54. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 43.85 degree.
(ii) 2.2772 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degrees) corresponding to \% infection

Transformed back mean percentage after applying bias correction
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
1. & 39.81 \\
2. & 47.30 \\
3. & 51.24 \\
4. & 20.76 \\
S. & 42.83 \\
6. & 36.55 \\
7. & 68.45 \\
S.E./mean & 1.1386 degree.
\end{tabular}
41.08 53.97 6069 12.94 46.25 35.62 8614
S.E./mean
1.1386 degree.

Ref :- U.P. 5: \({ }^{\text {(122) }}\).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of soil amendment on the control of Guava wilt.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS
(i) 12-15 years old orchard having poor facilities of irrigation. (ii) pH. 7.9 (alkaline). (iii) Seed plants. (iv) Different varieties of guava. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) Hoeing of basins done once. (ix) Nil.
(x) Irrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) Nil.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Molases at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
2. Lime at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{tree}\).
3. Sulphur at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
4. Control-no chemical was applied.

The chemicals were applied after exposing the roots to a depth of six inches. Date of application November, 1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) C.R.D. (ii) (a) 4 [Each treatment has been applied on 4 trees and there are 4 treatments/replicaticn. Each tree is considered as a unit]. (b) N.A. (iii) 7. (iv) 4 (apparently healthy trees). (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Favourable. (ii) Incidence of the disease on the trees is under experiment and record of soil samples are collected periodically for each treatment. (iii) Soil reaction pH. at different intervals. (iv) (a) 1953 to 1956. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(1.334 \sqrt{\mathrm{x} \mp 05}\)
(ii) \(0.468 \sqrt{x+0.5 .}\),
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean value of \(\sqrt{x+0.5}\) where \(x\) is the number of trees killed

Transformed back no. of 1. 2. 1.642 trees killed \(1.021 \quad 0.54\)
1.325
3. 1.325 1.26
4. 1.348 . 1.32
S.E./mean \(\quad=0.1768 \sqrt{x}+0.5\)

Crop :- Guava
Site :- Govt. Horticulture Farm, Jeolikote . Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To find out the efficacy of various fungicides for controlling leaf blight of Guava.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) By seed. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) 3 years. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) No. (x) Irrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Perenox \(0.5 \%\).
2. Dithane Z-78 \(0.3 \%\).
3. Thiovit \(0.5 \%\).
4. Lime Sulphur \(1: 15\). Sp. gravity \(1: 13\).
5. Copper sandoz. \(0.5 \%\).
6. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) One row of \(16^{\circ}\) accommodating 35 to 40 seedlings. (v) Two rous ( \(3^{\prime}\) distance per treatment). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control of leaf blight disease of guava. (iii) Percentage infection. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 39.93 degree.
(ii) 2.740 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degrees) corresponding to \% infection Transformed back mean percentages
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) & 38.62 & 39.06 \\
1. & 38.15 & 38.28 \\
2. & 36.00 & 34.70 \\
3. & 38.98 & 39.67 \\
4. & 38.76 & 39.11 \\
5. & 49.05 & 57.12 \\
6. & 1.225 degrees. & -
\end{tabular}

Ref:- U.P. 53(123).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of soil amendment on the control of Guava wilt.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) 10-12 years old orchard having good irrigation facilities. (ii) pH. 7.7 (alkaline). (iii) Seed plants. (iv) Different varieties of guava. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) Hoeing of basins done once. (ix) Nil. (x) Irrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) Nil.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Molasses at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
2. Lime at 4 lb ./tree.
3. Sulphur at \(4 \mathrm{lb} . /\) tree.
4. Control-No chemical.

Chemicals were applied after exposing the roots to a depth of \(6^{\circ}\) in October 1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) C.R.D. (ii) (a) 16 [Each treatment has been applied on 4 trees and there are 4 treatments/replication. Each tree has been considered as a unit]. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) 4. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Favourable. (ii) Incidence of the disease on the trees is under expt. and record of soil samples are collected periodically for each treatnent. (iii) Soil reaction (pH) at different intervals. (iv) (a) 1953 to
1956. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil, (vii) The experiment was conducted by P.P. Guava trees were dying from year to year at a fairly rapid rate on the orchard selected for this experiment.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(0.984 \sqrt{\sqrt{x+0.5}}\).
(ii) \(0.471 \sqrt{\sqrt{x+0.5}}\).
(iii) Treatments differences are not significant.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline (iv) & Treatment & Mean value of \(\sqrt{x+0.5}\) where \(x\) is number of trees killed & Transformed back av. no. of trees killed \\
\hline & 1. & 1.2016 & 0.94 \\
\hline & 2. & 0.8528 & 0.23 \\
\hline & 3. & 0.9428 & 0.38 \\
\hline & 4. S.E./Mean & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 0.9390 \\
& 0.192
\end{aligned}
\] & 0.38 , \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Guava.
Site :- Nainital (Nainital).
Ref:- U.P. 51(251).
Type:- 'D'.

```

Object :-To find out suitable control measures for fruit scab of Guava.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Mixed (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 sprays : \(S_{1}=\) Perenox \(0.25 \%\) and \(S_{2}=\) Lime sulphur \(1: 20\) ( \(21^{\circ}\) Baume).
(2) 6 spray schedules: \(D_{1}=\) Bud stage, \(D_{2}=\) Petal fall, \(D_{3}=\) Guaval fruit, \(D_{4}=\) Bud+petal fall, \(D_{5}=\) Bud + petal fall + green fruit and \(D_{6}=\) Control .
Dates of sprays: (1) Bud stage-on 30th April and Ist May, (2) Petal fall-on 6-7 June and (3) Green fruit-13 and 14 July.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications; one tree of guava/plot. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL .
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures-as per treatments. (iii) The no. of diseased and healthy fruits and the number of fruit spot per tree were recorded. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{p}\) and then analysed. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(37.27 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) \(10.642 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Only treated \(\nu s\) control is highly significant.
(iv)

Control \(=56.65\) (69.58)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{1}}\) & 28.41 (22.91) & 29.21 (24.07) & 28.81 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{\mathbf{8}}\) & 42.68 (45.99) & 26.29 (19.91) & 34.48 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 35.02 (33.10) & 31.27 (27.17) & 33.14 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{4}\) & 38.03 (38.07) & 29.69 (24 78) & 33.86 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{5}\) & 29.28 (24.18) & 32.01 (28.32) & 30.64 \\
\hline Mean & 34.68 & 29.69 & 32.19 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
(Figures in brackets are the average \% of diseased fruits)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of sprays & \(=1.943 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/piot. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of spray schedule & \(=3.072 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=4.344 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p.plot. \\
S.E. of control mean & \(=3.072 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Guava.
Site :- Nainital (Nainital).
Ref:~ U.P. 52(300).
Type :m 'D'.

```

Object :-To find out suitable control measures for Guava fruit rot.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A.
(b) Under orchard. (c) Nil.
(ii) Sandy loam. (iii)
ii) No. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 sprays : \(S_{1}=\) Perenox \(0.3 \%\) and \(S_{2}=\) Lime sulphur 1 in 30.
(2) 4 times of spacing: \(T_{1}=\) Pre-blossom stage (25 3.1952), \(T_{2}=\) Pre-blossom stage + green fruit stage, - \(\mathbf{T}_{3}=\) Green fruit stage (5.7.1952) and \(\mathrm{T}_{4}=\) Control-no spray.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications (iii) One tree of guava/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures-as per treatments. (iii) \%infection. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) No. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(19.73 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) \(2.733 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } /\) plot.
(iii) Effect of T and interaction \(\mathrm{T} \times \mathrm{S}\) are significant. Others are not significant.
(iv)
\[
\mathrm{T}_{4}=20.64(12.80) \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} / \text { plot }
\]
\begin{tabular}{l|lll|l} 
& \multicolumn{1}{c}{\(\mathrm{T}_{1}\)} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{\(\mathrm{~T}_{\mathbf{2}}\)} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{\(\mathrm{T}_{8}\)} & \multicolumn{1}{c}{ Mean } \\
\hline \(\mathrm{S}_{1}\) & \(17.07(9.03)\) & \(20.64(12.80)\) & \(22.01(14.40)\) & 19.91 \\
\(\mathrm{~S}_{\mathbf{2}}\) & \(19.60(11.65)\) & \(16.20(8.20)\) & \(21.08(13.31)\) & 18.96 \\
\hline Mean & 18.34 & 18.42 & \(\ddots 21.54\) & 19.43
\end{tabular}
(Figures in the brackets are the average \% of diseased fruits)
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of \(S\) margina mean & \(=0.706 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot. \\
S.E. of T marginal mean & \(=0.864 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p} /\) plot. \\
S.E. of body of table & \(=1.222 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } /\) plot. \\
S.E. of control mean &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Guava.
Ref :- U.P. 52(298).
Site :- Jeolikote (Nainital).
Type :- ‘D'.
Object :-To find out suitable control measures against Guava fruit spot.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Mixed. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2 TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 2 sprays : \(S_{2}=\) Perenox. ( \(0.3 \%\) ) and \(S_{2}=\) Lime sulphur ( \(1: 15\),sp.gr \(=1.13\) ).
(2) 4 times of spraying: \(\mathrm{T}_{1}=\) Pre-blossom stage (on 25.3.1952), \(\mathrm{T}_{8}=\) Green fruit stage (on 5.7.1952) + pre-blossom stage (on 25 3.1952), \(T_{3}=\) Green fruit stage (on 5.7.1952) and \(T_{4}=\) Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications; one tree/plot. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per reatments. (iii) On 1 th and 14th September the number of diseased and healthy fruits were counted. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) \(36.69 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.
(ii) \(4.399 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Only treated \(v s\) control is highly significant.
(iv)

Control \(=51.74(61.53) \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & T 1 & T2 & T3 & Mean \\
\hline \(S_{1}\) & 31.86 (28.09) & 31.34 (27.28) & 34.20 (31.78) & 32.47 \\
\hline \(S_{8}\) & 31.44 (27.43) & 32.69 (29.38) & 28.47 (23.00) & 30.87 \\
\hline Mean & 31.65 & 32.02 & 31.34 & 31.67 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
(The figures in the brakets are average \% of diseased fruit)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(S\)
S.E. of marginal mean of T
S.E. of body of table
S.E. of control mean
\(=1.136 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
\(=1.391 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
\(=1.967 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.
\(=1.371 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.

Crop:- Guava.
Site:- Jeolikote (Nainital).

Ref :- U.P. 53(186).
Type :- 'D'.

Object:-To find out the efficacy of various fungicides for the control of Guava fruit scab disease.
1. BASAL CONDIIIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Not required. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Coppesan \(\overline{0} 0.3 \%\) 5. Lime sulphur \(0.3 \%\)
2. Dithane 2.78 .
6. Sandolin
3. Dithane 0.14 .
7. Thiovit
4. Perenox 0.3\%
8. Control
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replicatipns. (iii) 2 trees/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Damage of fruit. (vii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of spotted fruits determined during \(18-23\) rd August 1953. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 27.93 degrees.
(ii) 2.952 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean angle (in degrees) corresponding \\
to \(\%\) infection
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back \% after \\
applying bias correction
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 16.59 & 8.57 \\
2. & 22.04 & 14.44 \\
3. & 30.46 & 25.94 \\
4. & 28.18 & 22.58 \\
5. & 26.93 & 20.80 \\
6. & 28.46 & 22.98 \\
7. & 34.68 & 32.55 \\
8. & 36.07 & 34.82 \\
S.E./mean & 1.476 degrees. &
\end{tabular}

> Crop :- Guava.
> Site :- Nainital (Nainital).

Ref:- U.P. 51(135).
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To find out suitable control measures against scale insect of Guava.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. D.D.T. emulsion (0.25\%).
2. Lime sulphur (sp. gravity \(1.25-\) One part in 20 parts of water).
3. Rosic soap ( 1 lb . in 4 gallons of water).
4. Control.

Sprayed in January 1951.
2. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications and 4 plotsjblock, (iii) (a) and (b) One tree/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \(\%\) of mortality of the scaleinsect recorded a week after spray. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The plot wise yield data is N.A. Results are taken from report. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).on cutivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(65.90 \%\) mortality.
(ii) \(5.16 \%\) mortality.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Treatment - \% of mortality/plot
\begin{tabular}{lr}
1. & 97.5 \\
2. & 78.3 \\
3. & 79.6 \\
4. & 8.2 \\
& S.E./mean \(=2.31\)
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Guava. & Ref:- U.P. 53(302) \\
Site :- Varanasi (Varanasi). & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find suitable control measures against mealy bugs of Guava.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (vii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Parathion emulsion \(0.04 \%\) ( 2 ozs . Ekatox 20 in \(6 t\) gallons of water).
2. Parathion emulsion \(0.02 \%\) ( 1 oz . Ekatox 20 in \(6 \frac{1}{2}\) gallons of water).
3. Fish oil rosin soap-4\%.
4. Control (with water only).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replication, 4 treatments/block. (iii) (a) and (b) 5 trees/plot. (iv) N.A.
-4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Population of bugs. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) ?and then analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
-5. RESULTS:
(i) 29.52 degree.
(ii) 4.9240 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle Transformed back mean percentages of survivals 72 hours after spraying.
\begin{tabular}{lcr} 
1. & 16.07 & 8.08 \\
2. & 30.46 & 25.94 \\
3. & 23.62 & 16.39 \\
4. & 47.91 & 55.12 \\
S.E/mean & \(=2.202\) degrees. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Kharbooza.
Site :- Govt. Potato Res. Farm, Farukhabad.
Ref:- U.P. 53(306). Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To find out control measures against Hulacophira Poveicollis Lue pest of Kharbooza.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Dusting with 3\% D.D.T. dust at \(15 \mathrm{lb} . / \mathrm{ac}\).
2. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. suspension at 30 to 50 gallons/ac.
3. Spraying with lead arsenate.
4. Spraying with \(.006 \%\) parathion emulsion at \(\mathbf{3 0}\) to 50 gallon/ac.
5. No treatment (control).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 5.
(b) N.A. (iii) 5 .
(iv) (a) N.A.
(b) \(16^{\circ} \times 28^{\circ}\).
(v) \(2^{\prime}\) alround. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Hulacophira Poveicollis Lue -control measures as per treatments. (iii) Number of adults before and after the application of treatments. (iv) (a) to (c) No. (v) No. (vi) The data has been converted in \(\sqrt{x+\frac{1}{2}}\) (where \(x=n o\). of adult survivor) and then analysed. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv) Number of adults 15 days after 2nd application of treatment.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean of \(\overline{\sqrt{x+0.5}}\) & Transformed back mean \\
1. & 2.18 & 4.25 \\
2. & 3.08 & 8.99 \\
3. & 3.60 & 12.46 \\
4. & 3.44 & 11.33 \\
5. & 4.92 & 23.71 \\
G.M. & 3.44 & \\
S.E./mean & 0.1351 & \\
Significance & Highly significant &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Lokat. \\ Ref:- U.P. 53(185).}

Site :- Govt. Valley Fruit Res. Stn., Jeolikote.
Type :- 'D'.
Object :-To study the the effect of different control measures against die-back disease of Lokat;

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) Orchard. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) More than 15 year old trees. Experiment. Was : conducted on 24.4.1953. (vi) N.A. (vii) Nil. (viii) Nil. (ix) No. (x) Irrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Chaubattia paste (Copper carbonate+red lead+lanolin 2:2:21).
2. Copper oxychloride paste (prepared by mixing 2 oz . coppesan with \(2 \frac{1}{2} \mathrm{oz}\). lanolin).
3. Chevastlon solution (prepared by mixing \(6 \%\) solution of copper sulphate and potassium dichromate).
4. Control.
3. DESIGN:
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 12. (iv) 1. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Nil. (ii) Incidence of lokat die-back disease-control measures as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of infection after the application of treatments. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment : was conducted by Myco (C) at Haldwani.
5. RESULTS:
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) & Mean angle in degree & Mean percentage (transformed back) \\
Treatment & \(\mathbf{4 8 . 7 5}\) & 56.42 \\
1. & 63.59 & 79.91 \\
2. & 46.27 & 52.19 \\
3. & 69.09 & 86.89 \\
4. & 56.92 & \\
G.M. & 2.1688 & \\
S.E./mean & Highly significant &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Lokat.
Site :- Haldwani (Nainital).

Ref:- U.P. 52(69). .
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study the effect of different control measures against die-back disease of Lokat.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Nil. (c) N.A. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Mixed. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) Nil.:(vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Perenox paste ( 1 lb . in \(220 \mathrm{c} . \mathrm{c}\) of linseed oil).
2. Chaubattia paste ( 2 ozs . of copper carbonate, 2 ozs. of red lead in \(2 \frac{1}{2}\) ozs. of lanolin).
3. Chevastlon solution (prepared by mixing cold solution of \(6 \% \mathrm{~K}_{2} \mathrm{Cr}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{7}\) ).
4. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 12 repiication. (iii) 2 trees. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of lokat die back disease-control measures as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of twigs showing callus formation as determined on 12.6 .1952 . (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) -. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' Gields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle.in degrees & Mean \% (transformed back) \\
1. & 46.43 & 52.47 \\
2. & 36.86 & 36.12 \\
3. & 28.48 & 23.01 \\
4. & 51.11 & 60.47 \\
G.M. & 40.70 & \\
S.E./mean & 2.7454 & \\
Significance & Highly significant &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Mango.
Site :- Govt. Botanical Gardens, Kanpur.

Ref:- U.P. 53(301).
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-To study the control measure of the Mango gall fly Amradiplosis viridi galbcola (Mani) by spraying the galled leaves with parathion and D.D.T. emulsions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying the galls with \(0.1 \%\) parathion emulsion.
2. Spraying the galls with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion.
3. Spraying the galls with \(0.05 \%\) parathion emulsion.
4. Spraying the galls with \(0.1 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion.
5. Control-no spraying.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) One bunch/plot. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Total no. of galls and number of galls for which emergence of pest did not take place. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. (vii The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 63.04 degrees.
(ii) 12.12 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle Transformed back mean percentages showing no emergence of pest
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
1. & 78.91 & 95.84 \\
2. & 86.82 & 99.19 \\
3. & 74.66 & 92.57 \\
4. & 49.32 & 57.43 \\
5. & 25.51 & 18.84 \\
S.E./mean & 4.9467 &
\end{tabular}

Crop: Mango.
Ref :~U.P. 53(300)
Site :- Govt. Botanical Gardens, Kanpur.

Object :-A study on the control of the mango gall fly (Procontarinia mattcians kieff) by spraying the galled leaves with parathion and D.D.T. emulsions.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vij) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Spraying parathion emulsion \(0.05 \%\).
2. Spraying parathion emulsion \(0.1 \%\).
3. Spraying D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
4. Spraying D.D.T. emulsion \(1.00 \%\).
5. Control (no spraying).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 5. (b) N.A.
(iii) 5. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Total number of galls and number of galls for which emergence did not take place. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K). 5. RESULTS :
(i) 58.63 degree.
(ii) 15.15 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean Angle Transformed back mean percentages of galls for which emergence did not take place.


Crop: Mango.
Site :- Govt. Botanical Gardens, Kanpur.

Ref :- U.P. 53(305)
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To test the efficacy of Isopestox Capstics as a system of insecticide against mango bugs Drosicha Stelibingi gree on Mango trees.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) N.A. (b) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii)N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMEVTS :}
1. Applying 4 Isopestox capsticks on one tree.
2. Applying 2 Isopestox capsticks on one tree.
3. Control (No treatment).

Method and plan:-Thalas, round the mango trunk to be watered so as to make the soil completely wet. The Isopestox capsticks would then be inserted in the soil near the base of the stem before the mealy bugs start hatching and ascending the tree with the view that the insecticide after being taken by the roots may come in the plant sap and act on the mealy bug nymphs when they emerge and live on the trees in large number.
Observation :-Treatments to be applied when the buss had not appeared. Regular observations taken when bugs started hatching. The number of mealy bugs surviving after one and two months after the application of treatments noted.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 3. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) No. of bugs conected on 10 infloroscene branches on twigs around mango tree after one months and also after two months. (iv) (a) and (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(4.8588 \quad \sqrt{\prime} \mathrm{x}\).
(ii) \(0.8042 \sqrt{ } \mathrm{x}\).
(ii) Treatment differences are not significant.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) Treatment & Mean value \(\sqrt{ } \times\) where x is number of bugs. & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Transformed back mean \\
number of bugs.
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 5.2184 & 27.23 \\
2. & 4.4317 & 19.64 \\
3. & 4.9263 & 24.27 \\
S.E. mean & \(0.4643 \sqrt{x}\) &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{cc} 
Crop :- Mango. & Ref :- U.P. 49(214). \\
Site :- National Botanical Gardens, Lucknow. & Type :- 'D'. \\
Object :-To find out suitable control measures for Mango hoppers. &.
\end{tabular}
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iii) Grafted trees. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.(xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. suspension (guesarol 550).
2. \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. emulsion ( \(16 \%\) bugges D.D.T. emulsion).
3. \(0.25 \%\) B.H.C. suspension.
4. 5\% D.D.T. dust (guesarol 405).
5. Dusting with hexyclan (mango special).
6. No treatment (control).
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) 1. (v) N.A. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Population of nymphs on inflorence (per 10 inflorance per tree) before and after application. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 65.48 degree
(ii) 9.9343 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle Transformed back mean percentages of reduction in population of Nymphs 24 hours after the application of treatment
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 77.78 \\
2. & 88.66 \\
3. & 6934 \\
4. & 85.05 \\
5. & 68.15 \\
6. & 3.92 \\
S.E./mean & 4.0557 degrees.
\end{tabular}
Crop:- Mango.
Ref :- U.P. 51(253).
Site :- Nainital (Nainital).
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-A study on the efficacy of various fungicides against powdery mildew of Mango.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Under orchard. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) No. (iv) Mixed variety. (v) (a) to (e) N.A.
(vi) Nil. (vii) Unirrigated, (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Nil.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Perenox ( \(0.25 \%\) with alboleum at 4 ozs. per 100 gallons).
2. Lime Sulphur ( \(21^{\circ}\) baume, \(1: 20\) ).
3. Spersul (I.C.I.) \(0.3 \%\).
4. Control.

The spraying was conducted on 3.5.1951 and observations recorded on 4.7.1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) Nil. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) Three hundred leaves were fcollected at random and \% infection was determined. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C), U.P. on cultivators' fields
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(56.69: \mathrm{in}^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) \(5.8444 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot \(\quad \%\) infection (transformed back)
\begin{tabular}{llll}
1. & 64.70 & 81.42 & 36.68 \\
2. & 37.20 & 64.08 \\
3. & 53.26 & 89.64 \\
4. & \(71.60-\) & \\
S.E./mean & 2.6137 & &
\end{tabular}
\[
\begin{array}{ll}
\text { Crop :- Mango. } & \text { Ref :- U.P. 52(73). } \\
\text { Site : - Jeolikote (Nainital). } & \text { Type :- 'D'. }
\end{array}
\]

Object :-To study the efficacy of various fungicides against powdery mildew of Mango.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A.
(b) Under orchard.
(c) Nil.
(ii) Sandy loam. (ii
(iii) Ni Nil. (iv) ) Mixe (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) Nil. (x) Nil.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lime Sulphur \(1: 15\) ( 1.13 sp . gr.).
2. Spersul \(0.3 \%\).
3. Thiovit \(0.3 \%\).
4. Sandolin \(0.3 \%\) -
5. No treatment (control).

The experiment was laid out at Jeolikote on 3.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) One mango tree (8 year old) as unit of plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii)Control of powdery mildew of mango. (iii) Percentage of infection determined. (iv) (a) 1952-1954. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 39.64 degree.
(ii) 6.7401 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle (in degree) Transformed back mean \%
\begin{tabular}{lcr} 
1. & 41.31 & -43.65 \\
2. & 41.14 & 43.36 \\
3. & 34.15 & 31.69 \\
4. & 29.04 & 23.83 \\
5. & 52.56 & 62.92 \\
S.E_mean & 3.0143 degrees. &
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Mango,
Site :- Jeolikote (Nainital).
Ref:- U.P. 53(183).
Type :- 'D'.

```

Object :-To study the efficacy of various fungicides for the control of Mango mildew.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Under orchard. (c) Nil. (ii) Loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved and local mixed. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Nil. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Ni.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Lime Sulphur \(1: 50\) (sp. gravity 1.13).
2. Thiovit \(0.3 \%\).
3. Sandolin 0.3\%.
4. Ultra Sulphur \(0.3 \%\).
5. Dithane 2.78-0.3\%.
6. Control.

The experiment was conducted during 1953 at Jeolikote.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 1 mango tree/plot (6 years old). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control of mango mildew disease. (iii) Percentage of infection on 26.3.1953. (iv) (a) 19521954. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 46.46 degree.
(ii) 3.660 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean angle (in degree) corresponding \\
to percentage infection
\end{tabular} & Transformed back mean \% \\
1. & 42.03 & \\
2. & 46.26 & 44.96 \\
3. & 41.53 & 52.18 \\
4. & 49.16 & 44.02 \\
5. & 43.73 & 57.16 \\
6. & 56.97 & 47.81 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.637\) degrees. & 70.09
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Mango. & Ref:- U.P. 52(107). \\
Site :- Haldwani (Nainital). & Type :- ‘D’.
\end{tabular}

Object :-To find out a suitable insecticidal control measure aganist the mango shoot cane psyllids.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Mango. (c) No manuring. (ii) Sandy Loam. (iii) N.A. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Nil.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T.
2. Lime Sulphur.
3. Fish oil rosin soap.
4. Control.

Date of spray 9.10.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (a) R.B.D. with 5 replications; 1 tree/plot. (iii) \(40^{\prime} \times 40^{\prime}\). (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Fair. (ii) Under study. (iii) No. of galls formed and number of psyllids before and after sprying was recorded. \% reduction was noticed. (iv) (a) to (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 36.34 degree.
(ii) 7.984 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)

Treatment Mean angle (in degrees corresponding
to \% shoot canes
\(\begin{array}{ll}52.62 & 63.02 \\ 37.98 & 37.99\end{array}\)
31.75 27.91
23.03 - 15.64
\(=3.570\)

Crop :- Peach.
Site :- Govt. Hill fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia.

Ref :- U.P. 52(100).
Type :- ' D '.

Object :-To campare the effectiveness of an ovicide over that of a nymphicide against Peach leaf curling aphis.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) N.A. (ii) Clay Loam. (iii) Budding and grafting, both and tranplanting. (iv) Alexander. (v) December. 1952. (vi) 1 year. (vii) Nil. (viii) Rings' around the trees. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Disel oil emulsion \(4 \%\).
2. Lime sulphur ( \(\mathrm{sp} . \mathrm{gr}=1.3\) ) 1 in 20 parts of water.
. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
4. Lindane wettable powder \(0.02 \% 1 \mathrm{lb}(6.5 \%)\) in 32.5 gallons of water.
5. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\)
6. Lindane wettable powder \(0.01 \% 1 \mathrm{lb}(6.5 \%)\) in 32.5 gallons water.
7. Parathion emulsifiable concentrat \(0.25-I . C . C\). Ekatox +800 C.C. water.
8. Soft soap 2.5. chk. + Nicotine sulphate (4\%) 1 oz .
9. Control

Treatments 1 to 4 sprayed on 20,21.1952 and 5 to 8 on 7, 8.3.1953.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (i)
(iii) 5
(iv) One peach tree.
(v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Attacked by peach leaf curling aphis. (iii) Percentage of infection on 18,19.5.1962. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento(C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.74 degrees.
(ii) 5.123 degrees.
(ii) Taeatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)

Treatments
1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
S.E./mean

Mean angle in degrees corresponding to \% curled leaves 35.52 30.64 \(\begin{array}{ll}35.52 & 26.31\end{array}\) 3.03 0.78 18.69 10.67 13.89 14.16 14.16 \(\begin{array}{ll}29.81 & 24.96 \\ 62.74 & 79.74\end{array}\)
\(=2.291\) degrees.
6.21 - 6.43 \(\square 6.4\)

Transformed back mean percentages after applying bias correction 33.91 0.78 24.96
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :-Peach. & Ref:-U.P. 52(99). \\
Site :-Govt. Hill Fruit Res. Stn., Chaubattia. & Type :-'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object:-To compare the efficiency of an ovicide over a nymphicide against Peach leaf curling aphis.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) Budding, grafting and transplanting. (iv) Alexander. (v) Dec. 1952. (vi) 1 vear. (vii) Nil. (viii) Ring around the trees. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) Nil.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 5 ovicide sprays: \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=\) No spray, \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=\) Diesel oil emulsion \(4 \%, \mathrm{C}_{2}=\) Lime sulphur, \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=\) D.D.T. \(0.5 \%\) and \(C_{4}=\) D.D.T. \(0.25 \%\).
(2) 4 nymphicide sprays : \(D_{0}=\) No spray, \(D_{1}=\) Soft soap nicotine, \(D_{2}=\) D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\) and \(D_{3}=\) D.D.T. emulsion 0.25\%.
Oricides applied on 2.1.1952 and nymphicides on 18, 19.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 20. (b) N.A. (iii) 3. (iv) One peach tree. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) Good. (ii) Attacked by leaf curling aphis. (iii) Percentage of infection on 18, 19.5.1952. (iv) (a) No. (b) N A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) at Ramgarh (Nainital).

\section*{5. RESULTS:}
(i) 21.53 degrees.
(ii) 12.82 degrees.
(iii) Main affect of \(C\) and interaction \(C \times D\) are highly significant while \(D\) effect is significant.
(iv) (a) Mean angle (in degrees) corresponding to \% of curled leaves.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & \(\mathrm{C}_{0}\) & \(C_{1}\) & \(\mathrm{C}_{3}\) & C3 & \(\mathrm{C}_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{0}\) & 67.29 & 46.39 & 29.03 & 2.35 & 11.89 & 31.53 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 31.71 & 52.77 & 43.08 & 0.00 & 6.60 & 26.83 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 4.69 & 20.19 & 17.80 & 4.55 & 0.03 & 9.45 \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 10.39 & 30.04 & 35.65 & 9.66 & 5.88 & 18.32 \\
\hline Mean & 28.70 & 37.35 & 31.39 & 4.14 & 6.09 & 21.53 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
S.E. of marginal mean of C & \(=3.70\) degrees. \\
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) & \(=3.31\) degrees. \\
S.E. of body of table &
\end{tabular}
(b) Transformed back mean \% after applying bias correction.
\begin{tabular}{l|rrrrr|r} 
& \multicolumn{1}{|c}{\(C_{0}\)} & \(C_{1}\) & \(C_{2}\) & \(C_{3}\) & \(C_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline \(\mathrm{D}_{0}\) & 85.60 & 52.39 & 23.81 & 0.67 & 4.70 & 33.43 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{1}\) & 27.85 & 63.27 & 46.68 & 0.50 & 1.81 & 28.02 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{2}\) & 1.16 & 12.29 & 9.75 & 1.12 & 0.50 & 4.96 \\
\(\mathrm{D}_{3}\) & 3.72 & 25.31 & 34.13 & 3.29 & 1.54 & 13.60 \\
\hline Mean & 29.58 & 38.32 & 28.59 & 1.40 & 2.14 & 20.00
\end{tabular}
\(\begin{array}{ll}\text { Crop :-Peach. } & \text { Ref :-U.P. 51(134). } \\ \text { Site :-Nainital (Nainital). } & \text { Type :^'D'. }\end{array}\)
Object :-To compare the effectiveness of an ovicide over that of a nymphicide against Peach leaf curling aphis.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(1) 5 ovicide sprays in early January 1951: \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=\) No spray, \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=\) Diesel oil emulsion 4\%, \(\mathrm{C}_{2}=\) Lime sulphur ( \(\mathrm{sp} . \mathrm{gr}=1.25\) ) one in 20 parts of water, \(\mathrm{C}_{3}=\) D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\) and \(C_{4}=\) D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
(2) 4 nymphicide sprays in mid-March \(1951: D_{0}=\) No spray, \(D_{1}=\) Soft soap \(5 \%+\) nicotine sulphate (4\%) 1 oz . in 5 gallons of water, \(\mathrm{D}_{2}=\) D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\) and \(D_{3}=\) D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 2 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) One tree/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of curled leaves. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Plot wise yield-N.A. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ent.) (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(2.38 \%\) curled leaves/plot.
(ii) \(\mathbf{3 . 8 3 \%}\) curled leaves/plot.
(iii) Main effect of C is highly significant and interaction \(\mathrm{C} \times \mathrm{D}\) is significant.
(iv) Mean \% of curled leaves/plot.
\begin{tabular}{l|lllll|l} 
& \(C_{0}\) & \(C_{1}\) & \(C_{2}\) & \(C_{8}\) & \(C_{4}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(D_{0}\) & 19.7 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 00 & 3.9 \\
\(D_{1}\) & 13.5 & 0.0 & 4.1 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 3.5 \\
\(D_{2}\) & 0.0 & 0.0 & 6.3 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 1.3 \\
\(D_{3}\) & 2.9 & 1.1 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 0.0 & 08 \\
\hline Mean & 9.0 & 0.3 & 2.6 & 0.0 & -0.0 & 2.4
\end{tabular}.
S.E. of marginal mean of \(C\)
S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\)
S.E. of body of table
\(=1.35 \%\) curled leaves/plot. \(=1.21 \%\) curled leaves/plot. \(=2.71 \%\) curled leaves/plot.

Crop:- Peach.
Site :- Ranikhet (Almora).

Ref:- U.P. 48(97).
Type :- 'D'.

Object: To compare the effectiveness of an ovicide over that of a nymphicide against Peach leaf curling aphis.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Diesel oil emulsion as ovicide sprayed in January.
2. Soft soap Nicotine emulsion as nymphicide sprayed in the middle of March.
3. \(1+2\) abo:c.
4. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 7 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) One tree served as a block baving all the treatments applied to the four different branches of a tree. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of curled leaves. (iv) (a) N.A. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) Transforming back has been done after applying bias correction. The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(27.78 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.
(ii) \(4.040 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot & \% of curled leaves transformed back \\
1. & 24.79 & 17.91 \\
2. & 27.44 & 21.52 \\
3. & 25.48 & 18.81 \\
4. & 33.39 & 30.48 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.527 \sin ^{-2} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p} /\) plot. &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop:- Peach. \\ Site :- Ranikhet (Almora).
}

Ref:- U.P. 48(98).
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To compare the effectiveness of an ovicide and nymphicide against Peach leaf curling aphis.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Diesel oil emulsion (2\%).
2. Lime Sulphur solution (sp. gr. 1.10, diluted ten times in water).
3. Soft soap Nicotine emulsion.
4. 1 and 3 above.
5. 2 and 3 above.
6. Control.

Ovicides sprayed in December and nymphicides in 3rd week of February 1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) One tree as a unit of plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \(\%\) of curled leaves ( 1000 leaves were picked up at random from 10 different branches in a tree). (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(32.73 \quad \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(ii) \(4.643 \mathrm{sin}^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot & \% of curled leaves transformed back \\
1. & 31.03 & 26.80 \\
2. & 26.67 & 20.44 \\
3. & 27.93 & 22.22 \\
4. & 25.58 & 18.95 \\
5. & 21.57 & 13.88 \\
6. & 63.58 & 79.90 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.076 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot. &
\end{tabular}

Crop:-Peach.
Site :-Ranikhet (Almora).

Ref :-U.P. 50(123).
Type :-'D'.

Object :-To compare the effectiveness of an ovicide over that of an nymphicide against Peach leaf curling aphis.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :

All combinations of (1) and (2)
(i) 6 ovicide sprays in first week of January 1950: \(\mathrm{C}_{0}=\) No spray, \(\mathrm{C}_{1}=\) Diesel oil emulsion \(2 \%, \mathrm{C}_{\mathbf{2}}=\) Diesel oil emulsion \(4 \%, \mathrm{C}_{3}=\) Crensote oil emulsion \(2.5 \%, \mathrm{C}_{4}=\) Lime sulphur (sp. gr. 1.25) 1 in 20 parts of "water and \(C_{5}=\) D.D.T. emulsion.
(2) 3 nymphicide sprays in March \(1950: D_{0}=\) No spray, \(D_{1}=\) Soft soap+nicotine emulsion \(4 \% 1\) in 800 parts of water.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 3 replications scattered over several orchards. (iii) (a) and (b) One tree/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Under study. (iii) \% of curled leaves. (iv) (a) 1950-N.A. This experiment is conducted every year with altogether different treatments. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The plot wise yield data is N.A. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).

\section*{5, RESULTS:}
(i) \(\mathbf{2 7 . 1 2 \%}\) curled leaves/plot.
(ii) \(13.30 \%\) curled leaves/plot.
(iii) Main effects of \(\mathbf{C}\) and \(\mathbf{D}\) are significant while interaction \(\mathbf{C \times D}\) is highly significant.
(iv) Mean \% of curled leaves/plot.
\begin{tabular}{l|cccccc|c} 
& \(C_{0}\) & \(C_{1}\) & \(C_{2}\) & \(C_{3}\) & \(C_{1}\) & \(C_{5}\) & Mean \\
\hline\(D_{0}\) & 87.3 & 40.7 & 37.0 & 51.8 & 17.1 & 2.9 & 39.5 \\
\(D_{1}\) & 74.8 & 41.9 & 49.3 & 19.3 & 13.3 & 5.7 & 34.0 \\
\(D_{1}\) & 2.7 & 14.9 & 4.8 & 10.8 & 11.3 & 2.6 & 7.8 \\
\hline Mean & 54.9 & 32.5 & 30.4 & 27.3 & 13.9 & 3.7 & 27.1
\end{tabular}
S.E. of marginal mean of C S.E. of marginal mean of \(D\) S.E. of body of table

F4.43 \% curled leaves/plot. \(=3.13 \%\) curled leaves/plot. \(=7.68 \%\) curled leaves/plot.

\section*{Crop :-Strawberry.}

Site :-Govt. Horticulture Farm, Jeolikote.

\section*{Ref :-U.P. 51(36).}

Type :-'D'.

Object :- To study the effect of various fungicides against leaf spot disease of Strawberry. .
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Soyabean. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Loam. (b; N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A:. (v) Nil. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Perenox \(0.25 \%\).
2. Lime sulphure \(1: 20\) ( \(21^{\circ}\) Baume).
3. Dithane 278-0.25\%.
4. Control (no treatment).

Treatments sprayed on 4.7.1951.
3. DESIGN
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 4. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) 4 rows of \(10^{\circ}\) each at equal distance. (v) No. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Leaf spot disease-as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of infection on 17.8.1951. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) Nil. (vi) Nil. (vi) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
(iv) \\
Treatment
\end{tabular} & Mean angle in degrees corresponding to \% infection & Transformed back mean percentage after applying bias correction \\
\hline 1. & 38.35 & 38.62 \\
\hline 2. & 37.35 & 36.93 \\
\hline 3. & 38.33 & 38.59 \\
\hline 4. & 46.43 & 52.48 \\
\hline G.M. & 40.12 & \\
\hline S.E./mean & \(=0.7896\) & \\
\hline Significance & highly significant. & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
```

Crop :- Strawberry.
Ref :- U.P. 52(68).
Site:- Govt. Horticulture Farm, Jeolikote.
Type :- 'D'.

```

Object :-To study the effect of various fungicides against leaf spot disease of Strawberry.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) and (b) Soyabean. (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Mixed medium. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lime Sulphur 1 : 15 (sp. gr. 1.13).
2. Dithane \(7.78,0.5 \%\).
3. Perenox 0.5\%.
4. Yellow cuprocides \(\mathbf{0 . 5 \%}\).
5. Copper Sandoz 0.5\%.
6. Control (no treatment).

Applied on 19.3.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 6. (b) N.A. (iii) 6. (iv) (a) and (b) 4 rows of \(9^{\circ}\). (v) Adequate buffer rows between randomised plot were left. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control of leaf spot disease of strawberry. (iii) Percentage of infection on 14.7.1952. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) At the time of spraying the initial infection was negligible. (vii) Experiment conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)

Treatment Mean angle in degrees corresponding to Transformed back mean
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
& percentage infection & percentage after applying bias correction \\
1. & 35.26 & 33.50 \\
2. & 35.44 & 33.78 \\
3. & 35.60 & 34.04 \\
4. & 33.26 & 30.28 \\
5. & 34.11 & 31.64 \\
6. & 40.87 & 42.89 \\
G.M. & 35.76 & \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.006\) degree. & \\
Significance & Highly significant &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Strawberry.
Site :- Valley Fruit Res. Stn., Jeolikote.

Ref :- U.P. 53(184).
Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To study different control measures against leaf spot fungi of Strawberry.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) Strawberry leguminious crop. (b) and (c) N.A. (ii) (a) Clay loam. (b) N.A. (iii) 10.4.1953. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Irrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Coppesan \(0.3 \%\).
5. Dithane D. \(14,0.45 \%\) with Zinc Sulphate
2. Copper Sandoz.
6. Thiovit 0.3\%
3. Lime Sulphur \(1: 50\), sp. gravity 33.13.
7. Sandolin \(0.3 \%\)
4. Dithane 7.78, \(0.3 \%\).
8. No treatment (control)
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 8. (b) N.A. (iii) 5. (iv) (a) and (b) \(80-100\) plants/plot. (v) 4 rows. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Leaf spot disease-as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of infection/plot on 3/4.8.1953. (iv) (a) 1951-1953. (b) and (c) No. (v) (a) and (b) No. (vi) Nil. (vii) Experiment conducted by Myco (C).
5. RESULTS :
(i) to (iv)
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Treatment & Mean angle in degrees corresponding to \% infection & Transformed & back mean percentage \\
\hline 1. & 34.42 & & 32.13 \\
\hline 2. & 32.53 & & 29.27 \\
\hline 3. & 35.39 & & 33.69 \\
\hline 4. & 36.36 & \(\therefore\) & 35.30 : \(\because \quad i\) \\
\hline 5. & 36.34 & & 35.27 : , \(\quad\) ¢ \({ }^{\text {s }}\) \\
\hline 6. & 36.38 & - & 35.33 \\
\hline 7. & 34.02 & & 31.49 . \\
\hline 8. & 39.57 & & 40.67 \\
\hline G.M. & 35.63 & & F \\
\hline S.E./mean & - 1.139 degree. & . & - \(\quad\) - \\
\hline Signficance & Highly significant & & ¢ \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Temperate Fruit.
Site :- Govt. Garden, Chaubattia.

Ref:- U.P. 53(182).
Type :- 'D'.

Object "-To find suitable control measures for Linchen on temperate fruit plants.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. '(viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A. (xi) N.A. (xii) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Fernoxone \(0.2 \%\).
2. Fernoxone \(0.1 \%\).
3. Fernoxone \(0.5 \%\) -
4. Dicotax 50 c.c. in 5000 c.c. of water.
S. Dicotax 25 c.c. in 5000 c.c. of water.
6. Dicotax 12.5 c.c. in 5000 c.c. of water.
7. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D.
(ii) (a) 7.
(b) N.A.
(iii) 4.
(iv) 1. (v) Nil (distance between trees \(15^{\prime}\) to \(\mathbf{1 8}^{\prime}\) ). (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Attack of Linchen. Control measures-as per treatments. (iii) Percentage infection. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 50.33 degrees,
(ii) 6.088 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)

Treatment Mean angle in degrees corresponding Transformed back mean percentage to \% infection after applying bias correction


Crop :- Pomegranate.
Site :- Ranikhet (Almora).
Ref:- U.P. 50(263).
Type:- 'D'.
Object :-To find out a suitable control measure against Anar borer.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pomegranate. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the trees. (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Lead Chromate at \(\mathbf{6} \mathbf{~ l b}\). in 100 gallons of water.
2. Lead Arsenate at 6 lb . in \(\mathbf{1 0 0}\) gallons of water.
3. Paris green at \(6 \mathbf{l b}\). in \(\mathbf{1 0 0}\) gallons of water.
4. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
5. Control.

Only one spray during summer at the time of fruit formation could be applied.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications, unit of block one pomegranate tree. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Control measures-as per treatments. (iii) \% of bored fruits during rainy season. (iv) (a) 1952-No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was consulted by Ento (C). No original plotwise data available.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(40.00 \%\) of bored fruits.
(ii) \(14 . \mathrm{C} 6 \%\) of bored fruits.
(iii) N.A.
(iv)

Treatment \(\quad\) \% of bored fruits
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
1. & 42.1 \\
2. & 39.5 \\
3. & 38.8 \\
4. & 22.9 \\
5. & 56.6 \\
G.M. & 40.00 \\
S.E./mean & \(-7.029 \%\) of bored fruits.
\end{tabular}
```

Crop:-Pomegranate.
Site :-Ranikhet (Almora).
Ref :-U.P. 50(264).
Type :-'D'.

```

Object :-Field trial of various insecticides and fungicides seperately and in combination against fruit rot of Anar.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Under orchard. (c) No. (ii) Clay loam. (iii) No. (iv) Local (called darim). (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) No. (viii) N.A. (ix) and (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Lead chromate (lead chromate 6 lb ., Potassium bichromate 2 lb . and water 100 gallons).
2. Lead Arsenate (lead arsenate 6 lb ., quick lime 9 lb . and water 100 gallons).
3. Paris green (Paris green 6 lb ., quick lime. 9 lb . and water 100 gallons).
4. D.D.T. \(0.5 \%\) emulsion.
5. Perenox 0.25\%
6. Bordeaux mixture \(4: 4: 50\).
7. \(\cdot T+5\). 12. \(2+6\).
8. \(2+5\)
13. \(2+6\).
9. \(3+5\).
14. \(4+6\).
10. \(4+5\).
15. Control.
11. \(4+6\).

Treatments applied on 25, 26.7.1950.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \% of rotted, bored and sound fruits were determined after two months of spray. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C). No original plot-wise data is available. The summary of results are taken from the records. 8 values have been estimated, but it is not given which one are estimated.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(37.5 \%\) of bored fruits/tree.
(ii) \(12.41 \%\) of bored fruits/tree.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant.
(iv) Av. \% of tored fruits/tree.
(i) \(54.5 \%\) of sound fruits/tree.
(ii) \(14.06 \%\) of sound fruits/tree.
(iii) Treatment differences are significant .
(iv) Av. \% of sound fruits/tree.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
Treatments & Av. \% & Treatments & Av. \% \\
1. & 39.9 & 8. & 54.7 \\
2. & 41.9 & 9. & 43.6 \\
3. & 58.9 & 10. & 71.1 \\
4. & 71.7 & 11. & 48.8 \\
5. & 59.5 & 12. & 52.3 \\
6. & 56.9 & 13. & 56.2 \\
7. & 59.4 & 14. & 68.1 \\
& & 15. & 34.6 \\
S.E./mean & \(=7.03\) & &
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{ll} 
Crop :- Pomegranate. & Ref :-'U.P. 50(č73). \\
Site :- Bulandshahr. & Type :- 'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object :-Control of Pomegranate butterfly Irraehola isocrate fab. by spraying the fruits with D.D.T. sodium fluoslicate, lead arsenate and B.H.C suspension (Agrocide).
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. water suspension.
2. Spraying with \(0.25 \%\) B.H.C. water suspension.
3. Spraying with lead Arsenate suspension.
4. Spiaying with \(1.4 \%\) sodium fluosilicate suspension.
5. Control (no spraying).

\section*{3. DESIGN :}
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 1 tree/plot. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatment. (iii) Number of bored and sound or otherwise damaged fruits. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed ; transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K).
5. RESULTS:
(i) 9.43 degree.
(ii) 4.702 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) & Treatment & Mean angle \\
1. & 5.73 & Transformed back mean \% of bored fruits \\
2. & 10.47 & 1.48 \\
3. & 5.89 & 3.77 \\
4. & 10.30 & 1.54 \\
5. & 14.76 & -3.67 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.351\) degree. & 6.93 \\
& &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :-Pomegranate.}

Ref :-U.P. 52(102).
Site :-Govt. Valley Fruit Res. Stn., Jeolikote (Nainital). Type :-‘D'.

Object:-To test the efficacy of different insecticides against Anar butterfly.

\section*{1. BASAL CONDITIONS :}
(i) N.A. (ii) Clay. (iii) Planting suckers. (iv) Improved. (v) Rainy season, transplanted, (vi) 2 years. (vii) Nil. (viii) Nil. (ix) Nil. (x) Unirrigated. (xi) N.A. (xii) Nil.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Lead chromate 6 lb . in 100 gallons of water.
2. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
3. Gammalin (a B.H.C. product containing \(10 \%\) Gammexane B.H.C. a pt. in 100 gallons as recommended by the Plant Protection Ltd., England.
4. Lime sulphur (sp. gravity 1.3).
5. Lead arsenate 2 lb . in 100 gallons of water.
6. Calcium arsenate ( 2 lb . in 100 gallons of water with 6 lb . lime t? prevent burning due to high acid contents).
7. Control.

Dates of spray : (i) 26.4.1952 to 2.5.1952. (ii) 3 to 10.6 .1952 and (iii) 9 to 15.7.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) R.B.D. (ii) (a) 7. (b) N,A. (iii) 5. (iv) 3 trees/plot. (v) Nil. (vi) Yes.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \% of bored fruits was recorded before and after each application of treatment ; efficacy of insecticides is based on \(\%\) of bored fruit 3 months after treatment. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C).

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) 30.84 degree.
(ii) 2.69 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)

Treatment
Mean angle in degrees corresponding to \% bored fruits after final spray.
\begin{tabular}{lcl} 
1. & 32.18 & 28.59 \\
2. & 26.47 & 20.17 \\
3. & 27.22 & 21.21 \\
4. & 31.39 & 27.36 \\
5. & 30.07 & 25.35 \\
6. & 29.70 & 24.80 \\
7. & 38.82 & 39.41 \\
S.E./mean & \(=1.205\) degree. &
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Pomegranate.
Ref :- U.P. 49(207).
Site :- Kanpur (Kanpur).

Transformed back mean percentage after applying bias correction 28.59 20.17 21.21 27.36 25.35 39.41

Object:-To find out suitable control measure for pomegranate butterfly by spraying the fruits with D.D.T and sodium fluosilicate.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A.
(ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Spraying with D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
2. Spraying with D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
3. Spraying with sodium fluosilicate.
4. Control.

Spraying started on 27.4.1949 and contioued up to 28.6.1949.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 2 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 2 trees/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) The number of bored and sound or otherwise damaged fruits recorded before each spraying and finally at the time of plucking. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 38.76 degree.
(ii) 4.213 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean angle \\
in degrees.
\end{tabular} & Transformed back mean percentage of \\
sound fruits
\end{tabular}

Crop:- Pomegranate.
Site :- Kanpur (Kanpur).

Ref:- U.P. 49(206).
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-The control of Pomegranate butterfly by removal of eggs from the fruit surface.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. iii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. Removal of eggs from the fruits by hand.
2. No removal (control).

Every 5th day from the middle of April to the beginning of July, the eggs have been removed.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. ; each of the treatments tried on one tree each at 3 places. Three replications. Replication III was rejected as many of the fruits found were not bored. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Number of bored and sound fruits recorded at the time of each operation and finally at the picking time. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) and then analysed. Transformed back means bave been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 24.53 degrees.
(ii) 8.855 degrees.
(iii) Treatment difference is highly significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back percentages of bored \\
in degrees & fruits \\
1. & 23.10 & \\
2. & 25.96 & 15.75 \\
S.E./mean & \(=6.261\) degrees & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Pomegranate. \(\quad\) Ref :- U.P. 49(208).
Site :- Meerut (Meerut). \(\quad\) Type :- 'D'.

Object :-To find out the suitable measure for control of the Pomegranate butterfly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix ) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. Spraying with D.D.T. emulsion \(0.50 \%\).
2. Spraying with D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\) -
3. Spraying with Sodium fluosilicate \(\mathbf{0 . 7 \%}\).
4. Control (no treatment).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) One tree/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Percentages of bored and sound fruits. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K) on cultivators' fields.

\section*{5. RESULTS :}
(i) \(38 . \mathrm{CO}\) degrees.
(ii) 10.52 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back mean percentages of sound fruits \\
1. & 37.41 & 37.03 \\
2. & 42.30 & 45.35 \\
3. & 35.63 & 34.06 \\
4. & 36.66 & 35.79 \\
S.E./mean & \(=4.70\) degrees. &
\end{tabular}
Crop :- Pomegranate.
Site:- Meerut (Meerut).
Ref:- U.P. \(50(274)\).
Type :- 'D'.

Object: To find suitable control measures of the Pomegranate butterfly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying the fruits with D.D.T. emulsion \(0.25 \%\).
2. Spraying the fruits with Agrocide suspension 0.5\%.
3. Spraying the fruits with Lead Arsenate \(0.4 \%\).
4. Spraying the fruits with Sodium fluosilicate \(1.4 \%\).
5. Control (no spraying).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 6 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 1 tree/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (i) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Total number of fruits and number of sound fruits. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) and then analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento ( K ) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 26.65 degrees.
(ii) 5.714 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Tran:formed back mean percentage of bored fruits. \\
1. & 27.55 & 21.69 \\
2. & 25.20 & 18.42 \\
3. & 26.49 & 20.19 \\
4. & 28.49 & 23.07 \\
5. & 25.51 & 18.81 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.333\) degrees. &
\end{tabular}

Crop :- Pomegranate.
Site :- Meerut (Meerut).

Ref:- U.P. 51(256).
Type:- 'D'.

Object :-To find suitable control measure of the Anar butterfly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A: (vi) N.A (ix) N.A. (a) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Spraying the fruits with Ekatox (parathion \(0.02 \%\) ).
2. Spraying the fruits with Hexyclan mescible oil (B.H.C. 0.25\%).
3. Spraying the fruits with Lime Sulphur (Lime 1 lb ., Sulphur-2 lb ., water 1 gallon).
4. Spraying the fruits with \(0.25 \%\) D.D.T. water suspension.
5. Control (no spraying),

Spraying at fortnightly interval from beginning of May to the end of July.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 1 tree/plot (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Percentage of bored and sound fruits. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\) and analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 38.65 degrees.
(ii) 8.385 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Treatment Mean angle Transformed back mean percentage of bored fruits
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. & 37.68 & 57.53 \\
2. & 46.24 & 52.18 \\
3. & 31.44 & 27.43 \\
4. & 35.34 & 33.61 \\
5. & 42.56 & 45.79 \\
S.E./mean & \(=3.75\) degrees. &
\end{tabular}

\author{
Crop :- Pomegranate. \\ Site :- Meerut (Meerut). \\ Ref :- U.P. 52(304). \\ Type :- 'D'.
}

Object :-To find out suitable control measures of Anar butterfly.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii)
N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. Spraying the fruits with \(2.5 \%\) ovicide (strength reduced to \(1.5 \%\) from 3 rd spraying).
2. Spraying the fruits with Lime Sulphur (Lime 1 lb ., Sulphur 2 lb ., water 1 gallon then diluted with fifteen gallons of water).
3. Spraying the fruits with \(1 \%\) parathion (Ekatox \(20^{\prime}\) ).
4. Spraying the fruits \(\mathbf{0 . 2 5 \%}\) D.D.T. wettable powder.
5. Control (no treatment).
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 5 replicatigns; 5 plots/replication. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures-as per treatments. (iii) \(\%\) of bored fruits. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A.
(v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } p\) and then analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (K) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) 22.93 degree.
(ii) 6.494 degree.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv)
\begin{tabular}{lcc} 
Treatment & Mean angle & Transformed back mean percentage of bored fruits \\
1. & 19.41 & 11.43 \\
2. & 25.65 & 19.05 \\
3. & 20.15 & 12.25 \\
4. & 23.62 & 16.39 \\
5. & 25.83 & 19.31 \\
S.E./mean & \(=2.904\) degrees. &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Pomegranate. \\ Site :- Hapur (Meerut).}

Ref:- U.P. 48(108).
Type :- ' \(D\) '.
Object :-To find out suitable control measures against Pomegranate butterfly.
1. BASAL CONDITJONS:
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) N.A. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) N.A. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. Bagging the fruits with cloth bags.
2. Spraying with D.D.T. \(0.5 \%\) emulsion.
3. Spraying with sodium fluosilicate.
4. Control (no treatment).

Treatment No. 2 : 10\% ready made D.D.T. emulsion (Jopeos) diluted to make \(0.5 \%\) spray. Treatment No. 3: Sodium fluosilicate spray was used as follows:-Sodium fluosilicate : 125 grams, Lime : 140 grams, Flour : \(\mathbf{2 5}\) grams, Tale : \(\mathbf{4 0 0}\) grams and Water: \(\mathbf{4}\) gallons.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D.with 3 replications (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
A. GENERAL:
(i) N.A. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) Total number of bored or otherwise damaged and sound fruits will be noticed before each application of treatments. The total number of bored and sound - fruits at the time of plucking of fruits. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{p}\) and then analysed. (vii) 0.50 percent corresponds to 0.00 angle. The experiment was conducted by Ento (K). on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 4.56 degrees.
(ii) 5.16 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
(iv) Treatment
1.
2.
3.
4.
S.E /mean
S.E/mean

Mean angle
in degrees 0.00 7.48
3.82
6.95
\(=2.979\) degrees

Transformed bäck mean percentage of bored fruits
0.50

218
0.94
2.00
```

Crop :- Pomegranate.
Ref :- U.P. 51(252).
Site :- Nainital (Nainital).
Type :- 'D'.

```

Object :-To find suitable cuntrol measure for Anar fruit rot.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Anar. (c) Nil. (ii) Sandy loam. (iii) Nil. (iv) Local Darimi. (v) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS:}
1. D.D.T. emulsion 0.5\%.
2. Lime sulphur \(1.15\left(21^{\circ}\right.\) Baume \()\).
3. Lead chromate 6 lbs . in 100 gallons.
4. Perenox \(0.50 \%\).
5. Control.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications, ; site selected by surveying method. (iii) (a) and (b) 4 trees/plot (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Stunted. (ii) Control of Anar fruit rot - as per treatments. (iii) The \% of affected and sound fruits. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p and then analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conduct:d by Myco (C) on cultivators' field.
5. RESULTS :
(i) \(46.72 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.
(ii) \(4.358 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treaiment differences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) \begin{tabular}{cc} 
Treatment & Mean value in \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot
\end{tabular} & No. of healthy fruits \\
1. & 58.64 & 72.69 \\
2. & 51.55 & 61.22 \\
3. & 48.20 & 55.51 \\
4. & 40.09 & 41.55 \\
5. & 35.10 & 33.24 \\
& & \\
& S.E. \(/\) mean & \(=2.179 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{lc} 
Crop :- Pomegranate. & Ref:- U.P. 52(299). \\
Site :- Nainital (Nainital). & Type :-'D'.
\end{tabular}

Object : - To find out suitable control measure for Anar fruit rot.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) N.A. (iii) N.A. (iv) Local Darimi. (v) (a) to (e) N.A. (vi) N.A. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS:
1. D.D.T. \(0.5 \%\).
2. Lime Sulphur 1:30.
3. Gammalin \(1 \%\).
4. Lead Arsenate at \(2 \mathbf{l b}\). in 100 gallons.
5. Lead Chormate.
6. Calcium Arsenate at \(2 \mathbf{l b}\). in 100 gallons.
7. Control (no spray).

Sprayings on 26.4.1252 and 5.5.1952.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B D. with 5 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.

\section*{4. GENERAL :}
(i) Stunted. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) On 9.7.1952 the number of healthy and infected fruits were counted. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) The data has been converted into \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p}\) and then analysed. Transformed back means have been presented after applying bias correction. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Myco (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS:
(i) \(59.73 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot.
(ii) \(1.9606 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant. .
(iv) Treatment Mean value of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathrm{p} /\) plot \(\quad \%\) of healthy fruits (transformed back)
\begin{tabular}{lll} 
1. & 66.00 & 83.13 \\
2. & 60.91 & 76.10 \\
3. & 64.11 & 80.63 \\
4. & -56.34 & 69.09 \\
5. & 57.47 & 70.87 \\
6. & 59.88 & 74.57 \\
7. & 53.40 & 64.31 \\
& S.E. \(/\) mean & \(=0.877 \sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p/plot.
\end{tabular}
3.13
76.10
80.63
69.09
70.87
74.57
64.31

Crop :- Pomegranate.
Site :- Jeolikote (Nainital).

Ref :- U.P. 51(39).
Type :-'D'.

Object :- To find out a suitable insesticidal control measure against Pomegranate borer.
.. BASAL CONDITIONS:
(i) (a) N.A. (b) Pomegranate. (c) N.A. (ii) Clay. (iii) Nil. (iv) Improved. (v) (a) Ringing around the tree, (b) to (e) N.A. (vi) Not required. (vii) Unirrigated. (viii) N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) Not required.

\section*{2. TREATMENTS :}
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\).
2. Lime Sulphur (sp. gravity 1.1) \(1: 10\).
3. Lead Chrcmate at 6 lb . in 100 gallons water.
4. Perenox \(0.5 \%\).
5. Control.

Spraying during April 1951.
3. DESIGN :
(i) and (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) \(20^{\prime} \times 20^{\prime}(3\) trees/plot). (b) N.A. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) Good. (ii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \% bored fruits. (iv) (a) No. (b) and (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) Nil. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' fields.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 42.89 degrees.
(ii) 4.797 degrees.
(iii) Treatment differences are highly significant.
\begin{tabular}{ccc} 
(iv) \(\left.\begin{array}{cc}\text { Treatment } & \text { Mean Angle } \\
\text { 1. } & \text { Transformed back mean\% } \\
\text { 2. } & 39.36\end{array}\right] 24.30\) \\
3. & 41.81 & 38.57 \\
4. & 50.08 & 44.51 \\
5. & 54.90 & 58.72 \\
& & 66.76 \\
S.E./mean & 2.398 &
\end{tabular}

\section*{Crop :- Pomegranate. \\ Site :- Jeolikote (Nainital).}
Ref:- U.P. 53(72).
Type :- 'D'.

Object:-To find out suitable control measures for eggs and newly hatched cater pillers.
1. BASAL CONDITIONS :
(i) (a) to (c) N.A. (ii) \(N\)
N.A. (ix) N.A. (x) N.A.
2. TREATMENTS :
1. D.D.T. emulsion \(0.5 \%\) (To be diluted \(1: 50\) water).
2. B.H.C. W.P \(0.01 \%\) (Sindan \(6.5 \%\) W.P., 1 oz . in 4 gallons of water with 2 oz . soap).
3. Toxaphene emulsion \(0.25 \%\) (to be diluted. \(1: 100\) water).
4. Chlordane emulsion \(0.25 \%\) (to be diluted. \(1: 300\) water).
5. Parathion emulsion \(0.1 \%\) (to be diluted. \(1: 20\) water).
6. Lime sulphur 1.20 ( \(\mathrm{Sp} . \mathrm{gr} .1 .3\) ) (To be dil \(1: 20\) water).
7. Calcium arsenate \(4 \%\) ( 4 lb . in 100 gallons of water).
8. Lead arsenate \(0.4 \%\) ( 4 lb . in 100 gallons of water).
9. Lead chromate \(0.6 \%\) ( 4 lb . in 100 gallons of water).
10. No treatment (control).

Date of treatment 21.4.1953 and 1.7.1753.
3. DESIGN :
(i), (ii) R.B.D. with 4 replications. (iii) (a) and (b) 2 trees/plot. (iv) N.A.
4. GENERAL :
(i) N.A. iii) Control measures as per treatments. (iii) \% of bored fruits has been recorded after each spray. (iv) (a) No. (b) N.A. (c) N.A. (v) N.A. (vi) \% data converted to \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ }\) p where \(p\) is \(\%\) of bored fruits. (vii) The experiment was conducted by Ento (C) on cultivators' felds.
5. RESULTS :
(i) 51.31 per plot.
(ii) 11.04 per plot.
(iii) Treatment differences are not significant.
\begin{tabular}{cccc} 
(iv) Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean \% of bored fruits \\
in terms of \(\sin ^{-1} \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\)
\end{tabular} & Treatment & \begin{tabular}{c} 
Mean \% of bored fruits \\
in terms of \(\sin -1 \sqrt{ } \mathbf{p}\)
\end{tabular} \\
1. & 39.60 & 6. & 57.75 \\
2. & 47.18 & 7. & 50.48 \\
3. & 47.55 & 8. & 42.90 \\
4. & 58.35 & 9. & 50.45 \\
5. & 57.72 & 10. & 61.10
\end{tabular}```
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