



Effect of organic and inorganic nutrition in cashew

N. Yadukumar, R. Rejani* and S.L. Nandan

Directorate of Cashew Research, Puttur, D.K., Karnataka 574 202, India

(Manuscript Received: 19-09-11, Revised: 07-12-11, Accepted: 08-02-12)

Abstract

A study was conducted to find the effect of integration of different nutrient sources viz., organic, inorganic and biofertilizers on cashew yield and soil. The cashew yield in different nutrition treatments to meet 100% N requirement of cashew were on par (1.1 to 1.2 tonnes/ha/year) and was lowest (0.88 t/ha/year) in control without manure. An increase in yield over the years was observed in treatments T₉ (50% N through recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF) and remaining through poultry manure) followed by T₄ (biofertilizer *Azotobacter* with 100% N through organically recyclable biomass compost (ORBC)) and T₈ (25% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure) respectively. The higher nut weight of 10.12 g was observed in treatment T₈ and was low in control (8.9 g). After manure application, the N content (296.8 kg/ha) of the soil was more in treatment T₅ with 25% N through RDF and remaining through ORBC. The available P₂O₅ content was more in treatment T₈ (59.0 kg/ha) and available K₂O content was on par in many treatments. The nutrient content of the soil was less in control treatment (N – 98.3 kg/ha, P₂O₅ – 33.9 kg/ha and K₂O – 85.7 kg/ha). The net profit was worked out and the yield trend over the years showed that treatments T₉ with 50% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure is more suitable for cashew garden. The study also revealed that sustainable yield and profit can be achieved by the application of different fertilizers and manures or their combinations to meet 100% N requirement of cashew.

Keywords: Biofertilizers, cashew, inorganic fertilizers, organic manures

Introduction

It is estimated that about 28 Mt of primary plant nutrients (NPK) are removed annually by crops in India, while 18 Mt or even less are applied as fertilizer, leaving a net negative balance of about 10 Mt of primary plant nutrients (NAAS, 2006). The data available from centres under the Project Directorate of Cropping Systems Research (PDCSR), Modipuram indicate that inadequate and imbalanced fertilization is a major causative factor for low and declining crop response to fertilizers. Furthermore, the soils are getting continuously depleted of secondary plant nutrients and micronutrients. Thus, there is a need for integrated nutrient management including the use of organic sources such as farmyard manure, rural and urban compost, vermi-compost, green manures, inclusion of legumes in the crop rotations, bio-fertilizers etc.

for meeting a part of the plant nutrient needs of crops (NAAS, 2006).

Cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.), an important foreign exchange earning horticultural crop in India is generally grown as a neglected crop along the West Coast region of India. The average productivity of cashew in India is as low as 0.695 tonnes/ha against the target of 1.0 tonne/ha (DCCD, 2010). Though cashew is hardy and drought tolerant, it responds well to water and nutrients (Sawke, *et al.*, 1979; Veeraraghavan, *et al.*, 1985; Richards, 1993; Kumar *et al.*, 1993; Yadukumar and Mandal, 1994; Kumar *et al.*, 1995; Patrick *et al.*, 2002; Yadukumar, 2001; Yadukumar and Rejani, 2004; Yadukumar, *et al.*, 2009b; Rejani and Yadukumar, 2010). Therefore, the productivity of cashew can be increased significantly through the application of fertilizers/ manures (Yadukumar *et al.*, 2003).

*Corresponding Author: rrejani10@gmail.com

Richards (1993) studied the cashew yield, growth and macronutrient status as influenced by fertilizer applications. Kumar *et al.* (1993) observed positive effect of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium on growth and yield of cashew in coastal soils of Karnataka. Yadukumar (2007) reported that nutritional trials with organic, inorganic fertilizers and combination of both and found that recommended dose of fertilizers with 10 kg poultry manure per tree resulted in better cashew nut production. In India, although studies on fertilizer application was done, so far no study was conducted on integration of organic manures, inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers for increased cashew yield by maintaining soil fertility. Hence, the present study was taken up with the objective of developing a suitable combination of organic, inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers for increased cashew yield by ensuring the sustained maintenance of soil fertility.

Materials and Methods

The experiments were conducted during 2000 to 2006 as a part of National Agricultural Technology Project (NATP) on developing integrated production packages for enhancing productivity of cashew. The study area is characterized by seasonally wet, hot humid with dry season (January to May) during the fruiting period of cashew. The average annual rainfall is 3500 mm distributed from May to November every year. The soil is laterite and it is characterized by low water holding capacity (23% at field capacity) and texturally the soil is sandy clay loam (0-60 cm depth). The soil is acidic with a pH of 5.2 to 5.5, EC of 0.04 to 0.07 dS/m, organic carbon content low to medium (0.45 to 0.70 %), low to medium in N content (150- 250 kg/ha) and low in P_2O_5 (2 to 10 kg/ha) and low K_2O (40 to 80 kg/ha) contents.

The study was initiated in a four year old cashew garden with NRCC selection 2 variety (1996 planting) under normal planting density (7 m x 7 m). The cashew leaf litter, cashew apple waste and weed biomass (organically recyclable biomass) obtained from a matured cashew garden (>6 year old) under normal planting density (200 plants/ha) is around 4 to 5 tonnes/ha/year (Mini *et al.*, 2005). When the biomass is decomposed, the recovery is

65%. The decomposed biomass (40 kg reduced to 26 kg) contains 0.65% N, 0.41% P, 0.45% K, 0.22% Ca, 0.19% Mg, 369 ppm Fe, 14.6 ppm Cu, 16.5 ppm Zn and 283 ppm Mn (Yadukumar and Nandan, 2005). The recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF) for the normal planting density in cashew (200 trees/ha) is 500 g N, 125 g P_2O_5 , 125 g K_2O /plant/year. The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design with 9 nutrient treatments comprising of different combinations of organic, inorganic and biofertilizers and a control plot with three replications. The treatments are as follows:

- T₁ - No fertilizer application (control).
- T₂ - 100% N through recommended fertilizer dose (RDF).
- T₃ - Biofertilizer *Azospirillum* with 100% N through organically recyclable biomass compost (ORBC)
- T₄ - Biofertilizer *Azotobacter* with 100% N through ORBC.
- T₅ - 25% N through RDF and remaining through ORBC.
- T₆ - 50% N through RDF and remaining through ORBC.
- T₇ - 75% N through RDF and remaining through ORBC.
- T₈ - 25% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure.
- T₉ - 50% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure.
- T₁₀ - 75% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure.

The nutrient treatments were imposed at the end of rainy season (September) when sufficient moisture was available in the soil. The soil and leaf were collected before (May) and after fertilizer and manure application (November) and analyzed for nutrients. For the supply of 100% N through organically recyclable biomass compost (ORBC), approximately 33 kg of compost equivalent to 500 g N, 250 g P_2O_5 and 200 g K_2O /plant/year is required (Yadukumar *et al.*, 2009a). The yield data was recorded for a period of four years (2002-2006) and the economics was worked out.

Nut yield

Cashew nut yield was recorded year wise from eight trees in each treatment (Table 1). The collected nuts were counted and weighed. Fresh and dry weights of a sub sample of 100 nuts from each tree were determined. The dry weight was recorded after sun drying the nuts for six days. The weight per nut including shell was determined at 14 per cent moisture as per the industrial standard (Kuppelwieser, 1989). The nut yield/tree was calculated as follows:

Nut yield = Mean nut weight x total number of nuts/tree.

Shelling percent

The nuts of each tree were roasted, shelled and peeled as per the standard procedure (Kuppelwieser, 1989). Fresh and dry weight of the kernels were determined gravimetrically and the kernel yield was calculated on the basis of three per cent moisture. The shelling percent (kernel recovery rate) was calculated as the kernel weight in percentage of the weight of raw nuts (Kuppelwieser, 1989).

Nutrient analysis of soil and leaf

Nutrient content of the soil and leaf before fertilizer and manure application (May) and after fertilizer and manure application (November) were determined. The root activity of cashew was found to be high (72%) within 2 m radius around the plant and in the top soil (0-15cm). The soil samples at

three different depths (0 to 30, 31-60 and 61-90 cm depth) within 2 m radius of the plant were collected and were analyzed using standard procedure. The fourth or fifth index leaves from cashew plants were collected, oven dried at 70° C and powdered. Nitrogen was determined using Kjeltak Auto-Analyzer, phosphorus was estimated calorimetrically by vanado molybdo phosphate method (Singh *et al.*, 1999). K was estimated using flame photometer and Ca, Mg Fe, Zn, Mn and Cu were determined using atomic absorption spectrophotometer (AAS) by wet digest method with HNO₃ and HClO₄ in 10:4 ratio. The data were subjected to statistical analysis using AGRISTAT package.

Results and Discussion

Effect of manure on yield and nut characteristics of cashew

The cashew nut yield for four years (2002 to 2006), nut weight and shelling percent of cashew kernels from all the ten treatments are presented in Table 1. The higher cashew nut yields of 1.22, 1.17, 1.15 and 1.13 t/ha/year were obtained in four treatments with different levels of integration of the nutrient sources such as T₃ (biofertilizer *Azospirillum* with ORBC to meet 100% of N requirement), T₉ (50% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure), T₆ (50% N through RDF and remaining through ORBC) and T₄ (biofertilizer *Azotobacter* with ORBC to meet 100% of N requirement) respectively. The lowest yield of 0.88 t/ha/year was obtained in control (T₁) plot receiving no manure.

Table. 1. Yield and nut characteristics of cashew in different treatments

Treatment	2002-03	2003-04	Yield (t/ha/y) 2004-05	2005-06	Mean	Nut wt. (g)	Shelling %
T ₁	0.669	0.89 (+33)	0.79 (+18)	1.17 (+75)	0.88	8.9	29.84
T ₂	0.951	1.01 (+6)	0.90 (-5)	1.51 (+59)	1.09	9.43	29.33
T ₃	1.052	1.30 (+23)	0.87 (-17)	1.67 (+59)	1.22	10.04	27.39
T ₄	0.830	1.12 (+35)	0.91 (+9)	1.67 (+101)	1.13	9.33	27.68
T ₅	0.942	0.85 (-10)	0.92 (-2)	1.65 (+75)	1.09	9.44	27.8
T ₆	1.024	0.99 (-3)	1.00 (-2)	1.59 (+55)	1.15	9.88	28.79
T ₇	1.030	0.92 (-11)	0.97 (-6)	1.54 (+50)	1.12	9.08	28.63
T ₈	0.798	0.97 (+21)	0.87 (+9)	1.57 (+97)	1.05	10.12	28.92
T ₉	0.718	1.13 (+57)	1.07 (+49)	1.77 (+146)	1.17	9.22	28.73
T ₁₀	0.990	1.01 (+2)	0.81 (-18)	1.58 (+60)	1.10	9.32	30.05
SED	0.0511	0.1151	0.0635	0.0903	0.0445	0.412	0.692
CD (p=0.05)	0.1073	0.2418	0.1333	0.1896	0.0935	0.865	1.450

(Note: Values in parenthesis indicate the increase/decrease in yield w.r.t 6th year of planting or 2002-03)

An increase in yield over the years was observed in treatments T₉ (50% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure), followed by T₄ (biofertilizer *Azotobacter* with ORBC to meet 100% of N requirement) and T₈ (25% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure) respectively. There was a build up of nutrients due to the cashew biomass deposit and a general increase in yield over the years was noted in the control plot also. Compared to 6th year, the cashew yield during 9th year was 146% more in treatment T₉ followed by 101% and 97% in treatments T₄ and T₈ respectively. The nut weight was higher in treatments T₈ and T₃ (10.12 and 10.04 g) and was low in control (8.9 g). No significant difference in shelling percent was observed among treatments. The yield trend over the years shows that treatment T₉ with 50% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure is more suitable for cashew garden.

Yadukumar (2007) conducted nutritional trials with organic, inorganic fertilizers and combination of both and found that recommended dose of fertilizers with 10 kg poultry manure per tree resulted in cashew nut production of 1.2 t/ha compared to 0.56 t/ha in control treatment without any manure. Increased nut weight, nut yield and shelling percentage due to application of higher levels of NPK was reported by Ghosh and Bose (1986), Harishu Kumar and Sreedharan (1986), Ghosh (1990) and Kumar *et al.* (1995). Kamalakshi Amma *et al.* (2001) have recommended that

integrated and balanced nutrient management is essential for the growth and productivity of coconut palms. Sharma *et al.*, 2002 reported significant increase in yield of tea garden due to the positive Nitrogen x FYM and FYM x *Azotobacter* interactions.

Economics

Economics was worked out for a period of four years (2002-2006). The highest net profit of Rs.34446/ha/year was obtained from plots treated with biofertilizer *Azospirillum* with ORBC to meet 100% of N (T₃) requirement followed by Rs. 33074 and Rs. 32554/ha/year from plots treated with 50% N through RDF and remaining through ORBC (T₆) and 50% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure (T₉) respectively (Table 2). The lowest profit of Rs. 27246/ha/year was from control treatment. The B:C ratio was highest in absolute control due to fact that the cost of cultivation was relatively less since no manure application costs are involved. Depending on the availability of fertilizer and manures, one can apply fertilizers (RDF) or manures or their combinations to meet the 100% N requirement in cashew since the yield and net profits in different treatments were on par. Kumar *et al.* (1993) reported that increased levels of NPK increased the nut yield, shelling percentage and net returns. The application of 500:125:125 g NPK/plant/year produced higher nut yield of 6.23 to 7.8 kg/tree, highest shelling percentage of 33.07 and a net return of Rs. 21740/plant/year.

Table. 2. Economics of growing cashew under different treatments (mean of four years from 2002-2006)

Labour cost	T ₁	T ₂	T ₃	T ₄	T ₅	T ₆	T ₇	T ₈	T ₉	T ₁₀
Jungle clearance and weeding twice a year (Rs./ha/year)	1600	1600	1600	1600	1600	1600	1600	1600	1600	1600
Manuring (Rs./ha/year)		800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800	800
Plant protection measures (Rs./ha/year)	510	510	510	510	510	510	510	510	510	510
*Picking nuts (Rs./ha/year)	540	540	540	540	540	540	540	540	540	540
Total (Rs./ha/year)	2650	3450	3450	3450	3450	3450	3450	3450	3450	3450
Cost of materials										
Fertilizers and organic manures (Rs./ha/year)	-	2344	4000	4000	3180	2922	2632	5040	4142	3242
Plant protection Chemicals (Rs./ha/year)	804	804	804	804	804	804	804	804	804	804
Total cost of cultivation (Rs./ha/year)	3554	6598	8254	8254	7434	7176	6886	9294	8396	7496
Nut yield (kg/ha/year)	880	1090	1220	1130	1090	1150	1120	1050	1170	1100
**Income (Rs./ha/year)	30800	38150	42700	39550	38150	40250	39200	36750	40950	38500
Net profit (Rs./ha/year)	27246	31552	34446	31296	30716	33074	32314	27456	32554	31004
Benefit cost ratio	7.7	4.8	4.2	3.8	4.1	4.6	4.7	3.0	3.9	4.1

*Cost of picking nuts is @Rs.1.5/kg; **The rate of produce is @Rs.35/kg.

Effect of manures on nutrient content of soil and leaf

The nutrient content of the soil and leaf were determined before and after fertilizer and manure application and are presented in Table 3 to 6. Before manure application (pretreatment), the nutrient content of the soil is presented in Table 3. After manure application, the nutrient content of the soil increased significantly in all the treatments receiving 100% RDF either in the form of biofertilizer or organic manure or inorganic fertilizer or a combination of these compared to control treatment (Table 4). The N content of the soil was higher in treatments T₅, T₂ and T₄ (296.8, 229 and 194.7 kg/ha),

P₂O₅ was higher in T₈ and T₄ (59.0 and 54.4 kg/ha) and K₂O was higher in T₆, T₂, T₃ and T₄ (105.6, 104.8, 104.2 and 101.2 kg/ha) respectively and low in control (N – 98.3 kg/ha, P₂O₅ – 33.9 kg/ha and K₂O – 85.7 kg/ha). It was observed that the mean values of NPK in soil and leaf during pre and post treatments were on par in control plot receiving no manure at all. This may be due to replenishment of nutrients in the soil due to organic recycling of cashew biomass waste (cashew leaf litter, waste apple etc.) Increase in cashew yield due to N application was reported by Veeraraghavan *et al.* (1985) and Ghosh (1988). Positive effect of phosphorous on cashew yield was reported by

Table 3. Pretreatment nutrient contents in three different depths of soil

Treatments	Available N (kg/ha)				Available P ₂ O ₅ (kg/ha)				Available K ₂ O (kg/ha)			
	Depth (cm)				Depth (cm)				Depth (cm)			
	0-30	31-60	61-90	Mean	0-30	31-60	61-90	Mean	0-30	31-60	61-90	Mean
T ₁	180.8	74.1	40.4	98.4	43.0	37.6	17.9	32.8	111.1	92.9	63.2	89.1
T ₂	144.8	131.3	64.0	113.3	62.1	25.0	16.7	34.6	133.8	114.1	99.9	155.9
T ₃	117.9	101.0	47.1	88.7	51.9	21.5	11.3	28.2	134.4	116.2	94.5	115.0
T ₄	218.9	198.7	114.5	177.4	64.5	53.1	34.6	50.7	134.4	100.9	97.4	110.9
T ₅	330.1	205.5	141.5	225.7	32.7	31.7	23.8	29.4	122.4	92.9	80.1	98.5
T ₆	117.9	101.0	53.9	90.9	41.8	25.0	19.7	28.8	134.9	116.2	99.9	117.0
T ₇	266.1	151.6	80.8	166.1	64.5	39.4	26.8	43.6	115.9	93.1	65.6	91.5
T ₈	232.3	107.8	48.2	129.4	78.2	61.5	27.4	55.7	100.9	81.4	63.2	81.8
T ₉	131.3	114.5	81.9	109.2	53.7	52.7	31.6	46.0	116.0	98.8	69.1	94.6
T ₁₀	232.4	158.3	87.6	159.4	60.3	31.6	22.6	38.2	81.4	69.1	62.9	71.1
CD T				14.11				4.09				9.99
(p=0.05) D				7.73				2.24				5.47
T x D				24.45				7.09				17.30

(T - Treatment and D - Depth of soil)

Table 4. Post treatment nutrient contents in three different depths of soil

Treatments	Available N (kg/ha)				Available P ₂ O ₅ (kg/ha)				Available K ₂ O (kg/ha)			
	Depth (cm)				Depth (cm)				Depth (cm)			
	0-30	31-60	61-90	Mean	0-30	31-60	61-90	Mean	0-30	31-60	61-90	Mean
T ₁	133.4	84.2	68.5	98.26	48.5	39.2	14.0	33.9	101.4	88.5	67.3	85.73
T ₂	274.0	240.3	172.9	229.0	67.5	28.8	18.4	38.23	117.6	103.5	93.4	104.83
T ₃	215.6	170.7	62.8	149.7	62.9	28.0	14.2	35.03	118.0	105.1	89.6	104.23
T ₄	247.0	223.5	113.4	194.7	68.8	55.1	38.3	54.4	118.0	94.2	91.6	101.26
T ₅	408.7	296.4	185.3	296.8	38.4	31.7	23.8	31.3	109.5	88.5	79.3	92.43
T ₆	185.3	123.5	73.0	127.26	52.3	28.8	24.0	35.03	118.4	105.1	93.4	105.63
T ₇	297.6	147.1	83.1	175.9	74.9	43.1	29.3	49.1	104.8	88.6	68.9	87.43
T ₈	262.7	187.5	102.1	184.1	85.8	62.8	28.4	59.00	94.2	80.2	67.3	80.56
T ₉	184.1	163.9	99.9	149.3	64.6	56.1	35.3	52.0	104.9	92.6	71.5	89.66
T ₁₀	270.6	183.0	95.4	183.0	71.6	35.3	23.2	43.36	80.2	71.5	67.0	72.9
CD T				18.24				4.52				10.34
(p=0.05) D				9.99				2.47				5.66
T x D				31.60				7.84				17.91

(T - treatment and D - depth of soil)

Sawke *et al.* (1985). Significant positive effect of potassium on yield of cashew tree was reported by Ghosh (1988) and Ghosh (1990).

The pre and post treatment nutrient concentration of leaf samples in different treatments with integration of nutrients were presented in Table 5 and 6. After treatment, N ranged from 1.45 to 2.15%, P ranged from 0.13 to 0.18%, K ranged from 0.26 to 0.38%, Ca ranged from 0.20 to 0.48%, Mg ranged from 0.17 to 0.30%, Cu ranged from 6.25 to 13.89 ppm, Zn ranged from 3.48 to 8.96 ppm, Mn ranged from 16.38 to 43.44 ppm and Fe ranged from 34.85 to 110.23 ppm. The leaf nutrient content was also low in control plot (N – 1.37%, P – 0.13%, K – 0.22%, Ca – 0.15%, Mg – 0.15%, Cu – 7.52 ppm, Zn – 3.56 ppm, Mn – 15.63 ppm and Fe – 28.63 ppm) (Table 6). The results of the study indicated the possibility of complete substitution of inorganic fertilizers with organic manures and biofertilizers meeting the NPK requirement of the crop.

Table 5. Pretreatment nutrient concentrations of cashew leaf (%)

Treatments	N	P	K	Ca	Mg
T1	1.16	0.14	0.22	0.13	0.12
T2	1.52	0.15	0.27	0.19	0.15
T3	1.48	0.13	0.33	0.20	0.16
T4	1.27	0.14	0.34	0.20	0.18
T5	1.37	0.11	0.32	0.19	0.20
T6	1.87	0.15	0.20	0.45	0.21
T7	1.44	0.13	0.28	0.26	0.18
T8	1.91	0.14	0.25	0.30	0.24
T9	1.44	0.13	0.19	0.26	0.18
T10	1.67	0.13	0.36	0.30	0.24
CD (p=0.05)	0.068	0.047	0.045	0.047	0.047

Table 6. Post treatment nutrient concentration of cashew leaf

Treatments	N	P	K	Ca	Mg	Cu	Zn	Mn	Fe
	%					(ppm)			
T ₁	1.37	0.13	0.22	0.15	0.15	7.52	3.56	15.63	28.63
T ₂	1.56	0.16	0.28	0.20	0.17	6.25	4.52	16.38	35.63
T ₃	1.65	0.13	0.33	0.21	0.18	8.45	4.25	18.63	34.85
T ₄	1.45	0.15	0.35	0.22	0.21	9.86	4.86	25.56	52.23
T ₅	1.48	0.15	0.34	0.24	0.22	12.60	3.48	24.63	68.45
T ₆	2.02	0.17	0.22	0.48	0.24	6.86	5.26	28.00	71.35
T ₇	1.60	0.16	0.29	0.35	0.26	10.26	5.98	36.89	69.63
T ₈	2.15	0.14	0.26	0.38	0.25	13.45	6.85	45.65	79.63
T ₉	1.54	0.14	0.26	0.30	0.25	11.86	6.29	38.67	85.46
T ₁₀	1.84	0.18	0.38	0.34	0.30	13.89	8.96	43.44	110.23
CD (p=0.05)	0.062	0.043	0.058	0.032	0.041	0.055	1.166	5.932	8.651

Harishu kumar and Nagabushanam (1982) found that leaf nutrient content of cashew is influenced by different methods of fertilizer application. The need for balanced integration of nutrient sources with organic manures as essential component for sustainable yield in different plantation crops have been reported by several authors. Jacob (1999) reported that countries in Asia and Africa would be able to produce organic cashew in view of the growing global demand for organic products. Similarly, the findings of the present study also indicates the need for balanced and integrated nutrient management in cashew by combining the organic manures, organic manures with biofertilizers and inorganic fertilizers for sustainable agriculture with higher productivity of cashew like other perennial crops.

Conclusions

An increase in yield over the years was observed in treatments T₉ (50% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure), followed by T₄ (biofertilizer *Azotobacter* with ORBC to meet 100% of N requirement) and T₈ (25% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure) respectively. Compared to 6th year, the cashew yield during 9th year was 146% more in treatment T₉ followed by 101 and 97% in treatments T₄ and T₈ respectively. The nut weight was higher in treatments T₈ and T₃ (10.12 and 10.04 g) and low in control (8.9 g). The highest net profit of Rs. 34446/ha/year was obtained from plots treated with biofertilizer *Azospirillum* with ORBC to meet 100% of N requirement and the second highest profit of Rs.33074/ha/year was

from plots treated with 50% N through RDF and remaining through organically recyclable biomass compost. The lowest profit of Rs. 27246/ha/year was from control treatment. The trend of increase in yield over the years shows that treatments T₉ with 50% N through RDF and remaining through poultry manure is more suitable for cashew garden. The yield, net profit and soil and leaf nutrient content studies indicated that the nutrient requirement in cashew can be met from the biofertilizers with compost of organically recyclable biomass or organic manures or inorganic fertilizers or a combination of these to meet 100% of N requirement in cashew.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Dr. M. Gopalakrishna Bhat, Director, Directorate of Cashew Research, Puttur for providing facilities to conduct the experiment. The authors also express their sincere gratitude to National Agricultural Technology Project (NATP) for the finance they provided for the smooth conducting of the experiment.

References

- DCCD. 2010. Directorate of Cashew and Cocoa Development. Available online. <http://dacnet.nic.in/cashewcocoa/stat.htm#stat>.
- Ghosh, S.N. and Bose, T.K. 1986. Nutritional requirement of cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.) in lateritic tract of West Bengal. *Indian Cashew J.* **18**(1): 11-16.
- Ghosh, S. N. 1988. Effect of nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium on flowering duration, yield and shelling percentage of cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.). *Indian Cashew J.* **19**(1): 19-23.
- Ghosh, S. N. 1990. Studies on the NPK requirement of cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.) in lateritic tract of West Bengal. *The Cashew* **4**: 6-9.
- Harishu Kumar, P. and Nagabushanam, S. 1982. Leaf nutrient content of cashew as influenced by different methods of fertilizer application. *Indian Cashew J.* **13**(3): 9-11.
- Harishu Kumar, P. and Sreedharan, C. 1986. Nut characters as influenced by different levels of NPK in cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.). *Indian Cashew J.* **18**(2): 15-17.
- Jacob, B. 1999. Organic production of cashew. *Cashew Bulletin* **37**(5): 3-5.
- Kamalakshi Amma, P.G., Prema, D and Shanavas, M. 2001. Nutrition management in coconut. *Indian Coconut J.* **31** (10): 4-6.
- Kumar, D. P., Hegde, M. and Khan, M. M. 1993. Effect of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium on growth and yield of cashew in coastal soils of Karnataka. *Cashew Bulletin* **30**(12): 9-12.
- Kumar, D. P. Khan, M. M. and Venkataramu, M. N. 1995. Effect of NPK and growth regulators on harvesting, nut yield, shelling per cent and kernel grade of cashew. *J. of Plantn. Crops* **23**(2): 96-104.
- Kuppelwieser, W. 1989. Processing and analysis of cashews. *Technote No.63*, Dep. of Primary Industries and Fisheries, J.J., Australia. 2 pp.
- Mini, C., John, P.S. and Sushama, P.K. 2005. Vermicompost preparation from the organic wastes of cashew garden. *The Cashew* **19**(4): 15-19.
- NAAS. 2006. Low and Declining Crop Response to Fertilizers. *Policy Paper No. 35*, National Academy of Agricultural Sciences, NASC Complex, Dev Prakash Shastry Marg, Pusa Campus, New Delhi. 8 pp.
- Patrick O'Farrell, John Armour and David Reid. 2002. The effect of nitrogen on cashew in north Queensland 1995-99. *RIRDC Publication No W02/001*. RIRDC Project No DAQ-257A.
- Rejani, R. and Yadukumar, N. 2010. Soil and water conservation techniques in cashew grown along steep hill slopes. *Scientia Horticulturae* **126**: 371-378.
- Richards, N.K. 1993. Cashew Research in Northern Territory, Australia, 1987-1991. *Tech. Bull. No.202*. Govt. of Australia, pp: 65.
- Sawke, D. P., Gunjale, R. T., Limaye, V. P. 1979. Effect of N.P.K fertilization on growth and production of cashewnut. *Proc. Int. Cashew Symp., Cochin. In: Cashew Res. & Dev.* p. 95-99.
- Sawke, D. P., Gunjale, R. T., Limaye, V. P. 1985. Effect of Nitrogen, phosphorous and potash fertilization on growth and production of cashewnut. *Acta Horticulturae* **108**: 95-99.
- Sharma, K. L., Sharma, D. K. and Sharma, G. 2002. Long term response of integrated nutrition with bio-resources on the yield of China hybrid tea grown in North Western Himalayas. *In: Proc. 15th Plantation Crops Symposium, Mysore*, 10-12 Dec., p. 386-391.
- Veeraraghavan, P.G., Celine, V.A. and Balakrishnan, S. 1985. Study on the fertilizer requirements of cashew (*Anacardium occidentale* L.). *Cashew Causerie* **7**(2): 6-8.
- Yadukumar, N. and Mandal, R.C. 1994. Effect of supplementary irrigation on cashewnut yield. *Water Management for Plantation Crops - Problems and Prospects. Centre for Water Resource Development and Management, Calicut, Kerala.* pp. 79-84.
- Yadukumar, N. 2001. Soil test based indications of cashew crop response. *Proceedings of XV biennial workshop*

- on All India Coordinated research Project on Cashew held on 18-20 October, 2001 at National research Centre for Cashew, Puttur, DK, Karnataka, pp. 80-84.
- Yadukumar, N., Raviprasad, T.N., Nagaraja, K.V., Haldankar, P.M., Godase, S.K., Susanamma, K., Gajendran, G., Mahalingam, T., Lenka, P.C., Mohapatra, R.N., and Bandyopadhyay, B. 2003. National Agricultural Technology Project. *Final Report on developing integrated production packages for enhancing productivity of cashew*. National Research Centre for Cashew, Puttur, D.K., Karnataka. 95pp.
- Yadukumar, N. and Rejani, R. 2004. Evaluation of soil and water conservation techniques coupled with manuring in cashew grown under medium slope. *J. of Plantn. Crops* **32** (Suppl.): 190-195.
- Yadukumar, N. and S.L. Nandan, 2005. Recycling organic waste of cashew plantations by aerobic composting. *J. of Plantn. Crops* **33** (2): 99-102.
- Yadukumar, N. 2007. Organic farming in cashew. In: *Proceedings of the National seminar on Research, Development and Marketing of Cashew*, 20-21st November, Goa, pp. 36-46.
- Yadukumar, N., Nayak, M.G. and Bhat, M.G. 2009a. Organic production of cashew. *The Cashew* **1**(4): 11-19.
- Yadukumar, N., Rejani, R. and B. Prabhakar. 2009b. Fertigation for efficient water and nutrient management in high density cashew plantation. *J. of Plantn. Crops* **37**(2): 102-110.