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## PREFACE

On-Farm Research Division (OFRD) of Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute (BARI) is going to publish the reports of research of 2000-01 conducted at different farming systems research and development (FSRD) and multilocation testing (MLT) sites across the country. Major thrust during that period was given on the improvement of existing farming systems through introduction of improved varieties and management practices. Integrated farming and component technology studies were also conducted to improve the existing systems.

There has been a shift in the research approach for broadening the perspective of the cropping systems research towards a more comprehensive farming systems research by incorporating other farm components like homestead production systems, agroforestry and crop livestock interactions. However, these efforts were limited mainly to the understanding of the existing situations and constraints due to the lack of adequately trained human resources

We hope this report will be useful to the researchers and extension workers in the field.

Dr. Md. Shahidul Islam<br>Director (Research)<br>and<br>CSO (Additional charge)<br>OFRD, BARI, Gazipur

## Content

Page
Socio-economics of Farming Systems
Yield gap analysis of mungbean under different management packages at Barisal ..... 1
area
Labour utilization pattern and possibility of generating non-farm income at FSRD1
site, Goyeshpur, Pabna
Yield gap analysis of aman rice under different management practices at Hathazari2
area of Chittagong
Yield gap analysis of T.Aman, T.Aus and mustard under different management ..... 3
packages at Patuakhali area
Homestead fruits and vegetables production and utilization system at FSRD site, ..... 4
Jamalpur
Adoption status of improve technologies tested and recommended to FSRD site ..... 5
Palima, Tangail
Household organic materials and crop residue management in different areas of ..... 6
Bangladesh
Fertilizer management in major cropping patterns at different areas of Bangladesh ..... 8
Plant biodiversity in the homesteads of saline area at Noakhali ..... 12
Improvement of Crops and Cropping Pattern
Effect of trellis on potato yam, bottle gourd and snake gourd production ..... 19
Improvement of productivity of yam though intensification of spacing ..... 19
Performance of alternate cropping patters in Old Brahmaputra floodplain soil under ..... 20
AEZ 9
Effect of cutting stage on the forage and grain yield of barley ..... 20
Performance of alternate cropping pattern : T.aus-T.aman-Mustard against the ..... 21
farmers existing pattern T.Aus-T.Aman-Fallow
Effect of late transplanting on the yield and yield components of photo period ..... 21
sensitive Aman rice varieties
Performance of maize cultivation for fodder and grain purposes ..... 22
Screening of winter vegetables under irrigated condition ..... 23
Performance of alternate cropping pattern Wheat-Sesame-T.Aman under rainfed ..... 23
condition in young Jamuna floodplain soil
Performance of alternate cropping pattern Potato-Boro-T.Aman under irrigated ..... 23
condition at Palima, Tangail
Yield performance of mustard varieties in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern ..... 24
under farmer's field condition at Palima, Tangail
Feasibility of growing different crops as intercrop with Pineapple24
Effect of sowing time on the performance of bush bean at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail ..... 25
Screening of different rabi crops in saline area of Noakhali. ..... 25
Effect of mulching on potato in the saline soil of Noakhali ..... 26
Effect of mulching on tomato production in the saline soil at FSRD site, Atkapalia, ..... 26
Noakhali
Effect of mulching on cabbage production in the saline soil of FSRD site, Atkapalia, ..... 26
Noakhali
Mustard cultivation with minimum tillage in different salinity levels at FSRD site, ..... 27
Atkapalia, Noakhali
Effect of intercropping of maize with groundnut in saline soil under rainfed condition27
Effect of intercropping Maize (Barnali) with soybean (Shohagh) in saline soil under ..... 28
rainfed conditionPerformance of Maize (Barnali) in different soil salinity levels at FSRD site, Atkapalia,29
Noakhali
Effect of soil salinity and phosphorus levels on the growth and yield of wheat ..... 29
Sunflower cultivation in different levels of soil salinity at FSRD site, Atkapalia, ..... 29
Noakhali
Comparative performance of different vegetables as intercropped with sugarcane ..... 30
Screening of different rabi crops in saline area ..... 30
Intercropping Turmeric (Sinduri) with different vegetables ..... 31
Comparative performance of different flowers as a commercial crop ..... 31
Effect of irrigation on the growth and yield performance of different Chickpea ..... 32
varieties in the High Barind Tract
Evaluation of chickpea variety for intercropping with Mustard (Tori-7)32
Root traits potentiality of different crops under rainfed conditions in the High Barind ..... 33
Tract
Influence of rhizobium inoculation, soil moisture and applied phosphorus on ..... 34
biological nitrogen fixation and grain yield of Chickpea
Effect of time of sowing and harvesting on the yield and marketing of Radish ..... 34
(Tasakisan) at Narsinghdi
Effects of spacing and time of twig planting on seed yield of Kangkong ..... 35
Effect of sowing time on leaf miner infestation in String bean ..... 36
Performance of summer vegetables on the trellis followed by bottle gourd ..... 36
Effect of planting time on the performance of Bushbean at level Barind soil ..... 37
Seed priming at BARI Mung-5 ..... 37
Screening of different rabi crops in saline area ..... 38
Profitable crop screening after T.aman rice harvest ..... 38
Integrated Farming ..... 40
Integrated Soil Fertility and Fertilizer Management
Subproject: Cropping Pattern Based Fertilizer Management
Development of fertilizer recommendation for different cropping patterns ..... 41
under different environments
Integrated nutrient management for Potato-T.Aus-T.Aman rice cropping pattern ..... 72
Effects of rice straw on the performance of Boro-Fallow-T.Aman rice system ..... 73
Development of fertilizer recommendation for T.Aus (HYV)-T.Aman (HYV)-Fallow ..... 76
system under rainfed condition at Surma-Kushyara floodplain soil
Subproject: Crop Response to added Nutrients
Response of crops grown in different patterns and environment to added ..... 78
fertilizer nutrients
Subproject: Verification of Fertilizer Management Practices
Effect of urea super granule (USG) on the performance of upland vegetable ..... 116
cropsEffect of different levels and methods of nitrogen application on the growth and117
yield of CauliflowerVerification of fertilizer doses of pineapple at Madhupur Tract area (AEZ-28)117
Tangail
Multilocation verification of trial of promising cropping patterns ..... 118
Boron fertilization to Mustard ..... 119
Testing of NPKS multi-nutrient fertilizers under farmer's condition ..... 121
Agroforestry Systems
Performance of Dioscorea bulbifera and Dioscorea alata grown together on Ziga ..... 122
plant
Performance of potato yam grown on the existing homestead trees at Jamalpur123
Study on the feasibility of growing vegetables in home garden round the year ..... 124
Performance of yam grown on the existing homestead trees at Faridpur ..... 125
Performance of potato yam grown on the existing homestead trees at Sylhet ..... 126
Performance of potato yam grown on the existing homestead trees at Tangail ..... 126
Performance of potato yam grown on the existing homestead tree spices at Barind, ..... 127
Rajshahi
Performance of potato yam grown on different homestead trees at Rangpur ..... 127
On-Farm trials with Advance lines and Technology
On-Farm trial with phosphorus efficient genotypes of wheat ..... 129
On-Farm performance of promising groundnut varieties ..... 129
Evaluation of chickpea varieties for intercropping with mustard ..... 129
On-Farm adaptability trial of country bean varieties at Madhupur ..... 130
Advance yield trial of chickpea ..... 130
On-Farm verification of different levels of $n$-fertilizer for growing bushbean ..... 131
Preliminary yield trial of barely for saline areas ..... 131
On-Farm variety trial with some BINA released mustard varieties ..... 132
Adaptive trial of developed and advanced lines/varieties of rapeseed and mustard ..... 132
at farmers field
Adaptability trial of newly released potato varieties ..... 133
Effect of different management practices on the performance of late sown rapeseed ..... 133
mustard
Yield trial of Potato in saline area ..... 134
Performance of onion varieties in farmers field ..... 134
Validation trial of newly improved varieties of mukhikachu ..... 135
Performance of newly released wheat varieties ..... 135
Varietal trial of brinjal ..... 136
Superimposed trial of T.aman rice ..... 136
Superimposed variety trial of Jute ..... 136
On-Farm performance of promising sweet potato varieties ..... 137
Varietal trial of Tumeric in shady places in fruit orchard ..... 137
Yield performance of some newly released Boro rice varieties under farmers ..... 138
condition
Varietal performance of different tomato varieties at Tangail ..... 138
Adaptive trial of summer tomato in Patuakhali area ..... 139
On-farm adaptability of two summer tomato varieties ..... 139
Bread wheat adaptive lines trial at farmers field ..... 139
On-farm trial of off-season pineapple production using growth regulator (ethrel) ..... 140
Pilot production and Technology transfer
Pilot production141
Technology Transfer ..... 142

## Socio-economics of Farming Systems

## Yield and benefit gap of Mungbean under different management practices at Barisal area

The study was conducted at Babuganj Upazila of Barisal district during May-June 2001 to estimate the yield gap under different management packages and to identify the probable reasons for the gap. Two management practices i.e. recommended packages (Demonstration plot) and farmers practice (Farmers plot) were included in the study for data collection. A total of 25 farmers owing 25 plots and 5 demonstration plots were selected for collection of necessary primary information. The data collected from the sample farmers were edited, summarized and presented in tabular form. The study revealed that recommended package gave higher yield ( $982 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) than that of the farmers practice ( $388 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The yield gap was $594 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ (Table 1). Higher gross margin (Tk. 19025/ha) was also obtained from the recommended package and the gap in gross margin was Tk. 11238/ha (Table 2). This yield gap was due to non-use of fertilizer by the farmers and poor management practices to the farmer's plots.

Table 1. Production packages and yield of mungbean at Barisal during Khari-1, 2001

| Item | Recommended packages | Farmers practice |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Variety | BARI mungbean-2 | BARI Mungbean-2 | - |
| Planting time | February-12 | February 15-22 | - |
| Planting method | Line | Broadcast | - |
| Seed rate (kg/ha) | 30 | 40 | $(-) 10$ |
| Ploughing (no) | 4 | 1 | - |
| Weeding (no) | 1 | - | - |
| Insecticides use (no) | 2 | - | - |
| Yield (kg/ha) |  | 388 |  |
| $\quad$ Main product | 982 | 90040 | 594 |
| $\quad$ By-product | 14840 |  | 5800 |

Table 2. Input use, cost and returns of mungbean cultivation under different management packages at Barisal during Kharif-I, 2001

| Item | Recommended packages | Farmers practice | Gap |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Seed (kg/ha) | 30 | 40 | $(-) 10$ |
| Fertilizer (kg/ha) |  |  |  |
| $\quad$ Urea | 45 | - | 45 |
| TSP | 100 | - | 100 |
| MP | 58 | - | 58 |
| Total variable cost (Tk/ha) | 8035.00 | 4490.00 | 3545.00 |
| Gross margin (Tk/ha) | 19025.00 | 7787.00 | 11238.00 |
| BCR | 3.37 | 2.73 | 0.64 |

## Labour utilization pattern and possibility of generating non-farm income at FSRD site, Goyeshpur, Pabna

The study was carried out at FSRD site, Goyeshpur, Pabna during October 2000 to March 2001 to find out family labour availability and utilization pattern and to find out the possibility of utilizing under utilized labour resource for income generating activities. The study was based on primary data collected by participatory approach and survey method from 60 sample farmers of marginal, small and medium farm categories by stratified random sampling technique. The collected data were then
edited, summarized and analyzed to achieve the objectives of the study. It was found that unemployed labour of all farm categories had decreased with the increase of farm size (Table 3). Regarding the skillness of family members it was found that sewing (31\%) frying rice (20\%) and embroidery ( $15 \%$ ) could be the areas of work where the unemployed family members can work for generating income (Table 4).

Table 3. Unemployment level of family labour at FSRD site, Pabna during 2000-01

| Family member |  | Effective member (no/family) | Available labour (m-d/ week/family | Labour utilized |  | Unemployment level (m-d/ week/family) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Agril. activity |  | House hold \& non-Agril. |  |
| Marginal | Male |  | 2.75 | 16.84 | 4.92 | 1.79 | 11.13 |
|  | Female | 2.15 | 13.17 | 2.22 | 5.71 | 5.24 |
|  | Child | 2.0 | 12.25 | 0.66 | 2.54 | 9.35 |
| Small | Male | 2.25 | 12.79 | 4.37 | 1.16 | 7.26 |
|  | Female | 2.30 | 13.08 | 2.52 | 5.59 | 4.97 |
|  | Child | 2.10 | 11.94 | 0.73 | 3.10 | 8.11 |
| Medium | Male | 2.0 | 9.62 | 2.37 | 1.28 | 5.97 |
|  | Female | 2.38 | 11.45 | 1.66 | 4.98 | 4.81 |
|  | Child | 2.0 | 9.63 | 0.28 | 1.94 | 7.41 |

m-d = man-day

Table 4. Area of generating employment of the family members at FSRD site, Pabna

| Area | No. of family <br> member | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Sewing | 18 | 31 |
| Work with bamboo | 8 | 13 |
| Frying rice | 12 | 20 |
| Jute goods | 7 | 12 |
| Embroidery | 9 | 15 |
| Fruit processing | 4 | 6 |
| Weaving | 2 | 3 |

Yield and benefit gap of aman rice under different management practices at Hathazari area of Chittagong

The study was carried out at FSR site, Hathazari to find out the yield gap in aman rice under two management conditions i.e. recommended packages (Farmers experimental plot) and farmers' practice during Kharif-II, 2000 season. A total of 34 farmers, 17 involved in farmer's experimental plots and 17 concerned in
farmer's practice were interviewed by using a predesigned schedule. The collected data were edited, summarized and analyzed in order to achieve the objectives of the study. Cobb-Douglas production function was selected to quantify the relative contribution of different production factors to the yield gap between recommended package and farmers practice. The study revealed that recommended packages

Table 5. Yield, input use and economics of T.Aman rice cultivation at FSRD site, Hathazari during Kharif II, 2000

| Item | Recommended <br> package | Farmers <br> practice | Gap |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Human labour (m-d/ha) |  |  |  |
| Animal labour (P-d/ha) | 86 | 101 | -15 |
| Seed (kg/ha) | 35 | 27 | 8 |
| Fertilizer (Kg/ha) : | 35 | 51 | -16 |
| $\quad$ Urea | 186 | 141 | 45 |
| TSP | 37 | 56 | -19 |
| MP | 94 | 10 | 84 |
| Gypsum | 45 | 0 | 45 |
| Cowdung | 0 | 2193 | -2193 |
| Insecticides (Tk/ha) | 1615 | 810 | 805 |
| Production yield (kg/ha) | 4321 | 3490 | 831 |
| Total variable cost (Tk/ha) | 17861 | 17541 | 320 |
| Gross margin (Tk./ha) | 15843 | 9681 | 6162 |
| BCR | 1.89 | 1.56 | 0.33 |

gave higher yield ( $4321 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) than that of the farmer's practice ( $3490 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The yield gap was 831 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ (Table 5). Higher gross margin (Tk. 15843/ha) was also obtained from recommended packages and the gap in gross margin was Tk. 6162/ha. The yield gap was due to reduced and imbalance amount of fertilizer used by the farmers.

Yield and benefit gap of T.Aman, T.Aus and Mustard under different management packages at Patuakhali area

The study was undertaken at FSRD site, Lebukhali during Kharif-I and II seasons of 1998 to 2000 for T.Aus and T.Aman and Rabi seasons of 1999-2000 and 2000-2001 for mustard to estimate the yield gap between recommended and farmers practice and to identify the factors responsible for the gap. Three crops i.e. T.Aus, T.Aman and mustard were selected for the study. A total of 20 farmers owing 20 plots for each of the crops were selected randomly for monitoring farmers' practices. Five plots measured $20 \times 30 \mathrm{~m}$ was established with recommended packages to obtain necessary primary data. The collected information were edited, summarized and presented in tabular form. It was found that recommended packages gave higher yield than that of farmers' practices in all the three crops. The average yield with recommended management was $3980 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ for T.Aus, $4677 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ for T.Aman and $800 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ for mustard. Whereas the corresponding yield for farmers practice was $2765 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}, 3337$ $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $570 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ respectively (Table 6). Thus the yield gap per hectare was 1215 kg for T.Aus, 1340 kg for T.Aman and 230 kg for mustard. The gap in gross margin was Tk. 7055/ha for T.Aus, Tk. 4700/ha for T.Aman and Tk. 2227/ha for mustard respectively. The yield gap in T.Aus and T.Aman might be due to wider spacing, reduced and unbalanced fertilizer use. The yield gap in mustard was attributed to reduced and unbalanced fertilizer use.

Table 6. Production packages, yield and economics of T.Aus, T.Aman and Mustard at Lebukhali FSRD site, Patuakhali during 1998-2000

| Item | T.Aus rice |  | T.Aman rice |  | Mustard |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | RP | FP | RP | FP | RP | FP |
| Variety | BR-2 | BR-2 | BR-23 | BR-23 | Daulat | Daulat |
| Planting/sowing time | May 4-11 | May 7-26 | Sept. 3-10 | Aug. 28 | Dec.4-10 | Nov.25- |
|  |  |  |  | Sep. 20 | 7.5 | Dec. 12 |
| Seed rate (kg/ha) | 25 | 35 | 30 | 45 | - | 10 |
| Spacing (cm) | $25 \times 15$ | $30 \times 25$ | $25 \times 15$ | $30 \times 25$ | 142 | - |
| Plants/m2 | 24 | 12 | 24 | 15 |  | 131 |
| Fertilizer use (kg/ha): |  |  |  |  | 88 |  |
| Urea | 77 | 51 | 77 | 81 | 66 | 81 |
| TSP | 28 | - | 28 | - | 28 | - |
| MP | 30 | - | 30 | - | 800 | - |
| Yield (kg/ha) | 3980 | 2765 | 4677 | 3337 | 11060 | 570 |
| Total variable cost (Tk/ha) | 13657 | 12205 | 1500 | 14200 | 5000 | 9227 |
| Gross margin (Tk/ha) | 14205 | 7150 | 175000 | 12800 |  | 2773 |
| Gap in gross margin(Tk/ha) | 7055 |  | 4700 |  | 2227 |  |
| Yield gap (kg/ha) | 1215 |  | 1340 |  | 230 |  |

Homestead fruits and vegetables production and utilization system at FSRD site, Jamalpur

The study was carried out at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur during January-February 2001 to know the existing homestead fruits and vegetables production and utilization system as well as problems faced in homestead gardening. A total of 150 farmers ( 45 marginal, 60 small, 25 medium and 20 large) were selected randomly for primary data collection. It was found that average homestead area was 37.08 decimals and average family size was 6.24 persons. It was revealed from the study that a good amount of fruits and vegetable were produced in the homestead of FSRD site Narikeli, Jamalpur. From the total production of fruits ( $1307 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm/year), 56 percent was consumed by the family, 20 percent was sold and the rest was either distributed or rotten. Total leafy vegetable production was $248 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{farm} /$ year and 66 percent of the produce was consumed. Other than these leafy vegetables bottle gourd, Bean, Brinjal, Radish and Tomato were also produced at the homestead and the total amount was $1073 \mathrm{Kg} /$ farm/year. Fifty two percent of these vegetables were consumed, 35 percent were sold, 12 percent were distributed and the rest ( $7 \%$ ) were rotten (Table 7). The farmers of the area faced some problems to grow fruits and vegetables in the homestead. Insect pest infestation ( $72 \%$ ), lack of quality seed ( $48 \%$ ) and lack of technical know how ( $42 \%$ ) were the main problems mentioned by the farmers (Table 8).

Table 7. Homestead fruits and vegetables production and utilization at FSRD site, Jamalpur during 2000

| Kg/farm/year |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Items | Production | Consumption | Distribution | Sold | Rotten |
| Fruits : |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mango | 353 | 210 | 40 | 98 | 5 |
| Lemon | 15 | 6 | 2 | 6 | 1 |
| Jackfruit | 730 | 356 | 94 | 264 | 16 |
| Banana | 25 | 115 | 14 | 116 | 2 |
| Coconut | 113 | 25 | 10 | 71 | 7 |
| Blackberry | 1.04 | 0.5 | 0.3 | - | 0.3 |
| Guava | 70 | 38 | 9 | 17 | 6 |
| Total (Fruits) | 1307 (100) | 731(56) | 169(13) | 572(44) | 37(3) |
| Total leafy vegetables | 248(100) | 164(66) | 27(11) | 50(20) | 37(3) |
| Others vegetables : |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bottle gourd | 396 | 228 | 53 | 112 | 3 |
| Bean | 200 | 102 | 21 | 78 | - |
| Brinjal | 216 | 97 | 20 | 95 | 3 |
| Radish | 232 | 112 | 35 | 83 | 2 |
| Tomato | 29 | 15 | 5 | 9 | - |
| Total (Other vegetables) | 1073(100) | 554(52) | 134(12) | 377(35) | 8(7) |

Table 8. Problems faced by the farmers for homestead gardening

| Problem | Number | Percent |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Natural calamity | 49 | 33 |
| High price of seed | 54 | 36 |
| Small homestead area | 41 | 27 |
| Lack of proper management | 18 | 12 |
| Lack of quality seed | 72 | 48 |
| Lack of technical know how | 64 | 42 |
| Insect pest infestation | 108 | 72 |
| Water logging | 35 | 23 |
| Shortage of fencing materials | 17 | 11 |

## Adoption status of improve technologies tested and recommended to FSRD site Palima, Tangail

The study was conducted at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail during May-June 2001 to assess the adoption status of the improved technologies tested and recommended to FSRD site, Palima, Tangail. A total of 60 farmers were selected randomly for primary data collection. A pre-designed survey schedule was used and direct interview method was followed. The survey revealed that a lot of technologies were adopted by the farmers of the FSRD site. The adoption rate varied for different technologies for obvious reasons. Technology like homestead vegetable garden was adopted by cent percent of the farmers. On the other hand, some pattern-based technologies were adopted by $2-10 \%$ of the farmers (Table 9). Besides this some technologies were not found to adopt at the farm level. These are BARI Chula, Cabbage variety Protiva, Batishak, Maize, Rice cum Fish, etc.

Table 9. Adoption status of improved technologies tested at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail in 2001

| Name of the technology | Adoption status (\% farmer) | Economic advantage |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Broiler chick rearing | 10 | GM Tk. 2200/- from 100 broiler chick TVC=Tk. 7900.00 |
| Beef fattening with UMS diet | 20 | GM TK. 3540 with 4 months TVC = Tk.9110/- |
| Vaccination to poultry | 69 | Reduced mortality |
| Vaccination to cattle | 44 | Reduced mortality |
| Deworming of cattle | 15 | Increased body weight |
| Mustard-Boro-T.Aman instead of BoroT.Aman | 90 | GM=Tk. 40,000/ha/year <br> TVC=Tk. 39000/ha/year |
| Wheat-Jute-T.Aman instead of JuteT.Aman | 40 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GM }=\text { Tk. 16,000/ha/year } \\ & \text { TVC= Tk. 36500/ha/year } \end{aligned}$ |
| Wheat-Sesame-T.Aman instead of Wheat-Jute-T.Aman | 5 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GM = Tk. 35000/ha/year } \\ & \text { TVC=Tk. 37000/ha/year } \end{aligned}$ |
| Potato-Boro-T.Aman instead of Mustard-Boro-T.Aman | 2 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GM }=\text { Tk. 92000/ha/year } \\ & \text { TVC=Tk. 63000/ha/year } \end{aligned}$ |
| BRRI Dhan-29 as Boro rice variety instead of IR-8 \& BR-14 | 80 | GM = Tk. 16000/ha |
| BRRI Dhan-32 as T.Aman variety instead of BR-11 | 10 | 15 Days earlier than BR-11 |
| Tomato variety Ratan | 50 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GM }=\text { Tk. 150000/ha } \\ & \text { TVC }=21000 / \mathrm{ha} \end{aligned}$ |
| Seedless lemon | 50 | - |
| BARI Litchi-1 | 20 | - |
| Hopper control in Mango | 40 | Yield increased significantly |
| BARI Dherosh-1 | 80 | GM= Tk. 59000/ha, TVC= Tk. 27000/ha |
| BARI Lau-1 | 20 | GM = Tk. 88/pit, TVC= Tk. 25/pit |
| Kazipayara | 70 | GM = Tk. 800/plant |
| Homestead vegetable garden | 100 | GM = Tk. 60000/ha/year |
| Jute variety 0-7897 | 50 | GM =Tk. 23000/ha, TVC= Tk. 16000/ha |
| BARI Sarisha 8 \& 9 | 5 | GM = Tk. 140000/ha, TVC=Tk.8000/ha |

The survey was conducted at three locations namely Goyeshpur FSRD site, Pabna, Narikeli FSRD site, Jamalpur and Palima FSRD site, Tangail. A total of 270 farmers ( 150 from Jamalpur and 60 each from Pabna and Tangail) were selected using stratified random sampling technique for primary data collection. The survey was conducted with the help of a pre-designed schedule by direct interviewing the selected farmers during December 2000 to March 2001. The collected information was edited, summarized and local units and measurements were converted into standard ones. The results were presented in tabular form.

Farm size, cattle and poultry population: The average farm size of the sample farmers was 1.42 ha, with the largest average size at Pabna ( 2.14 ha ) followed by that in Tangail ( 1.20 ha ) and the smallest in Jamalpur ( 0.92 ha ). Highest number of cattle (6.2) and poultry (27) was found with the farmers at Jamalpur and Tangail respectively. The smallest number of cattle was found with Tangail (2.4) and that of poultry was reported in Pabna (8). It was revealed that cattle population was low in Tangail may be due to the mechanization (2.4) (Table 10).

Annual production of organic materials and their uses: Cowdung, cattle feed waste, kitchen waste, ash and poultry litter were the main organic materials available at the farm level. Availability of cowdung was the highest ( $3000 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm $/$ year) with the farmers of Jamalpur followed by those reported by the farmers of Pabna ( $2596 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm/year) and Tangail ( $2174 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{farm} / \mathrm{year}$ ). On an average the amount of cattle feed waste, kitchen waste, ash and poultry litter available with the farmers was $1280 \mathrm{~kg}, 253 \mathrm{~kg}, 420 \mathrm{~kg}$ and 208 kg per farm per year respectively (Table 11). It was revealed that the highest amount of cowdung was used as farm yard manure ( $76 \%$ ) followed by fuel (21\%). A small portion of the cowdung was also used as directly to the vegetable garden. Major portion of the cattle waste feed was used as FYM (64\%), a portion as domestic fuel (27\%). Most of the kitchen waste (47\%) was used as farm yard manure. A portion of the kitchen waste was used as cattle feed ( $25 \%$ ) and the rest amount ( $28 \%$ ) was dropped out without any meaningful use. In case of ash, the major amount ( $77 \%$ ) was used in farm yard manure and a portion (10\%) was used directly in the vegetable garden. The highest amount of poultry litter (49\%) was dropped out and a significant portion was used as FYM (43\%) (Table 12).

Annual production of crop residues and their uses: A number of crop residues were available at the farm level. The major crop residues were the straws of Aus, Aman, Boro rice and Wheat. Rice bran and Mustard/pulse stover were also available at farm level. Among the crop residues available, Aman rice straw was recorded to be the highest ( $3320 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm/year) followed by that of Boro rice (2637 $\mathrm{kg} /$ farm $/$ year) and Aus rice ( $497 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm/year). The amount of wheat straw ( $660 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm $/$ year) was very small compared to other straw because cultivation of wheat was limited at Jamalpur and Tangail. The amount of Mustard/pulses stover ( $427 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm/year) was also small for the same reason (Table 11). It was found that most of the straw of Aus (53\%), Aman (74\%) and Boro rice (68\%) was used as cattle feed. Thirty eight percent of rice bran and $32 \%$ of Mustard/pulse stover was also used as cattle feed (Table 5). On the other hand, most of the wheat straw (58\%), rice bran (53\%) and Mustard/pulses stover (64\%) were used as fuel. A portion of the Aus (33\%) Aman (14\%) and Boro rice straw (18\%) was also burnt as domestic fuel (Table 12).

A good amount of organic materials and crop residues are produced at the farm level. The out tern is different at the different locations. The reasons may be varied for obvious reasons. However farmers used the household organic materials mostly in making farm year manure, rice straw as cattle feed and mingled the crop residue mostly in the soil. This indicated a favourable condition to the organic recycling. But a considerable portion of the household organic materials were not used for any productive purpose specially those of poultry litter and kitchen waste were dropped out. It is suggested that effective propaganda be at the offing to take care of the organic materials produced at
the household and to process for recycling. This organic manure would be valuable input to improve soil fertility. Therefore preservation of organic materials at the household level be encouraged for improvement of potential soil organic matter content of the soil.

Table 10. Farm size, cattle and poultry population at different location

| Location | Farm size (ha) | Cattle (no.) | Poultry (no.) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pabna | 2.14 | 3.3 | 8 |
| Jamalpur | 0.92 | 6.2 | 14 |
| Tangail | 1.20 | 2.4 | 27 |
| All | 1.42 | 4.0 | 16 |

Table 11. Annual production of organic materials and crop residue at household level at different locations

| Items | $\mathrm{Kg} / \mathrm{farm} /$ year |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | Pabna | Jamalpur | Tongail | All |
| Organic materials: | ( |  |  |  |
| Cowdung | 2596 | 3000 |  |  |
| Cattle feed waste | 1248 | 1498 | 2174 | 2590 |
| Kitchen waste | 157 | 244 | 1095 | 1280 |
| Ash | 333 | 411 | 357 | 253 |
| Poultry litter | 156 | 221 | 516 | 420 |
| Crop residue: |  |  | 246 | 208 |
| Rice bran | 483 | 120 |  |  |
| Mustard/pulse stover | 379 | 400 | 625 | 409 |
| Aus straw | 290 | 1200 | 502 | 427 |
| Aman straw | 2101 | 4000 | 3860 | 497 |
| Boro straw | 1904 | 2500 | 3508 | 3320 |
| Wheat straw | 1353 | 100 | 527 | 2637 |

Table 12. Use of organic materials and crop residues available in households at different locations

| Items | Locations |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pabna | Jamalpur | Tangail | All |
| Organic materials |  |  |  |  |
| Cowdung (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Farmyard manure | 85 | 80 | 63 | 76 |
| Fuel | 12 | 15 | 36 | 21 |
| Vegetable garden | - | 5 | 2 | 2 |
| Others | 3 | - | - | 1 |
| Cattle waste feed (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Farmyard manure | 85 | 73 | 35 | 64 |
| Fuel | 5 | 23 | 53 | 27 |
| Vegetable garden | 10 | - | - | 3 |
| Others | - | 4 | 12 | 5 |
| Kitchen waste (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Farmyard manure | 55 | 36 | 49 | 47 |
| Cattle feed | 15 | 46 | 14 | 25 |
| Drop out | 30 | 18 | 37 | 28 |

Table 12. Contd.

| Items | Locations |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pabna | Jamalpur | Tangail | All |
| Ash (\%): |  |  |  |  |


| Farmyard manure | 95 | 74 | 61 | 77 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vegetable garden | 2 | 20 | 7 | 10 |
| Others | 3 | 6 | 32 | 14 |
| Poultry litter (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Farmyard manure | 76 | 40 | 13 | 43 |
| Vegetable garden | 4 | 10 | 10 | 8 |
| Drop out | 20 | 50 | 77 | 49 |
| Crop residue |  |  |  |  |
| Aus straw (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel | 23 | 50 | - | 37 |
| Cattle feed | 66 | 40 | - | 53 |
| Fencing | - | - | - | - |
| Others | 11 | 10 | - | 10 |
| Aman straw (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel | 7 | 20 | 15 | 14 |
| Cattle feed | 85 | 56 | 80 | 74 |
| Fencing | - | 20 | - | 7 |
| Others | 8 | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Boro straw (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel | 11 | 18 | 25 | 18 |
| Cattle feed | 69 | 62 | 72 | 68 |
| Fencing | 20 | - | - | 7 |
| Others | - | 20 | 3 | 8 |
| Wheat straw (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel | 70 | 80 | 25 | 58 |
| Cattle feed | - | - | 72 | 24 |
| Fencing | 25 | 20 | - | 15 |
| Others | 5 | - | 3 | 3 |
| Mustard/pulse stover (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel | 63 | 50 | 78 | 64 |
| Cattle feed | 30 | 50 | 16 | 32 |
| Others | 7 | - | 6 | 4 |
| Rice bran (\%): |  |  |  |  |
| Fuel | 56 | 60 | 42 | 53 |
| Cattle feed | 35 | 25 | 55 | 38 |
| Others | 9 | 15 | 3 | 9 |

## Fertilizer management in major cropping patterns at different areas of Bangladesh

The survey was conducted at three locations namely Goyeshpur FSRD site, Pabna, Nerikeli FSRD site, Jamalpur and Palima FSRD site, Tangail. A total of 270 farmers ( 150 from Jamalpur and 60 each from Pabna and Tangail) were selected using stratified random sampling technique for primary data collection. The survey was conducted with the help of a pre-designed schedule by direct interviewing the selected farmers during December 2000 to March 2001. The collected information was edited, summarized and local units and measurements were converted into standard ones. The results were presented in tabular form.

Major cropping patterns: The major cropping patterns, which were identified by using adoption index revealed that two of the three major cropping patterns at all the three locations were sequenced with three crops and one cropping pattern in each location was sequenced with two crops. This signified a high cropping intensity of more than $250 \%$. T.Aman rice was common in all the cropping patterns either it sequenced with two or three crops. At Jamalpur the major patterns were Boro-T.Aman,

Mustard-Boro-T.Aman and Wheat-Jute-T.Aman which adoption index was 4.36, 2.11 and 1.56 respectively. At Tangail major cropping patterns were Mustard-Boro-T.Aman, Wheat-Jute-T.Aman and Boro-T.Aman which adoption index were $3.61,2.37$ and 2.31 respectively. The major cropping patterns at Pabna were found Wheat based. The adoption indexes were 2.91, 2.30 and 2.27 for Wheat-T.Aman, Wheat-Jute-T.Aman and Wheat-Sesame-T.Aman respectively. Jute was found with one of the major cropping patterns at each of Pabna, Tangail and Jamalpur (Table 13).

Table 13. Major cropping pattern identified at Tangail, Jamalpur and Pabna during 2000-2001

| Location | Cropping pattern | Adoption index |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Tangail | Mustard-Boro-T.Aman | 3.61 |
|  | Wheat-Jute-T.Aman | 2.37 |
|  | Boro-T.Aman | 2.31 |
| Jamalpur | Boro-T.Aman | 4.36 |
|  | Mustard-Boro-T.Aman | 2.11 |
|  | Wheat-Jute-T.Aman | 1.56 |
| Pabna | Wheat-T.Aman | 2.91 |
|  | Wheat-Jute-T.Aman | 2.30 |
|  | Wheat-Sesame-T.Aman | 2.27 |

Adoption index $=\quad \begin{gathered}\text { \% farmer responded } X \text { \% area covered } \\ \text {-------------------------------------- }\end{gathered}$

## Fertilizer management and crop performance

Tangail: Organic manure like farm yard manure (FYM), poultry litter and ash was found to use in all major cropping patterns. FYM was applied in all the three first crops of the cropping patterns and the second crop of the pattern also receives FYM. T.Aman did not receive any kind of organic manure. Boro in both the cropping patterns received poultry litter and ash. On the other hand Jute received FYM @ $2958 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$, poultry litter @131 kg/ha and ash @ $987 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ in the Wheat-Jute-T.Aman cropping pattern. The inorganic (NPKSZn) dressing with mustard was 76-11-17-7-0.11 kg, that with Boro was 112-15-29-4-0.26 kg and T.Aman rice was 72-6-16-4-0.20 kg NPKSZn/ha respectively (Table 14). Farmers used higher amount of $N$ and $P$ but lower amount of other inorganic fertilizers. Farmers received satisfactory yield of all the three crops.

In the Wheat-Jute-T.Aman cropping pattern wheat received a small amount of FYM and poultry litter and Jute received FYM, poultry litter and Ash. Wheat and Jute received fertilization of NPKS @ 78-19-29-6 and 45-6-13-1 kg NPKS/ha, respectively. T.Aman in the pattern received NPKS @ 50-10-14-2 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$. In wheat and T.Aman, farmers used higher amount of $P$ but lower amount of NKSZn. But for Jute in the pattern, farmers' applied higher amount of N and lower amount of PKSZn than the recommended rate. The yield level of these three crops was lower than the expected yield level.

In Boro-T.Aman pattern Boro received NPKSZn @ 116-14-31-5-0.20 kg/ha and T.Aman received 51-10-24-2-0.15 NPKSZn kg/ha. In Boro, farmers applied higher amount of N and lower amount of other fertilizers. In T.Aman P was applied higher than recommended rate but other fertilizers were applied less than the recommended rate. The yield level was satisfactory for both the crops.

Jamalpur: All the crops of three cropping patterns received small to moderate amount of FYM and all the three first crops of the patterns received a good amount of Ash. T.Aman in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern and wheat in Wheat-Jute-T.Aman cropping pattern also received a small amount of poultry
litter. Farmers used 4-5 kinds of inorganic fertilizer for Boro, T.Aman, Mustard, Wheat and Jute. The rate of inorganic fertilizers however varied with the variation of cropping patterns. Farmer applied more amounts of N and P but less amount of $\mathrm{K}, \mathrm{S}$ and Zn for Boro in the first two cropping patterns. T.Aman on the other hand in all the three cropping patterns received more amounts of $N$ and fewer amounts of $P$ and other fertilizer except $P$ in the cropping pattern Mustard-Boro-T.Aman. In this pattern T.Aman received more amount of $P$ than that of the recommendation. In Wheat-Jute-T.Aman pattern wheat received more amount of $N$ and less amount of other fertilizer than that of the recommendation. All the crops produced moderate to good yield with all the cropping patterns.

Pabna: All the three wheat based patterns of Pabna received a moderate amount of FYM and a small amount of Ash. Farmers did not apply any FYM to T.Aman but Wheat, Jute and Sesame received 3.7 $5.4 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ FYM. Except sesame, all the crops in the three cropping patterns received higher amount of N than that of the recommendation. Farmers also applied less amount of $P$ in all the crops except T.Aman in Wheat-Jute-T.Aman and Wheat-Sesame-T.Aman cropping pattern. Except nitrogen, the variation in use of $P, K$ and $S$ fertilizers in farmers practice and recommendation was narrow. But the yield differences in farmers practice and recommendation was not narrow. This may be due to unbalanced use of fertilizers.

Trend of crop yield: Decreasing trend of crop yield was reported by the farmers at Tangail and Pabna, for not using or using less amount of organic manure and sub optimal amount of chemical fertilizer. Crop production status considering last 5 years was reported to be increasing at Jamalpur. Balance use of chemical fertilizer, use of organic manure and cultivation with new varieties of crop was reported to be the causes of increasing trend of crop yield. But considering the opinion of the farmers of three locations increasing trend of crop production was observed (Table 15).

Determination of fertilizer rates: Farmers resort to five sources to determine fertilizer rates for their crops. These are i) Farmers indigenous/local knowledge, ii) Advice from the neighbour, iii) Block supervisor, iv) Printed materials like booklet or leaflet and v) Dealer. Most of the farmers (49\%) are dependent on self-knowledge and a large portion of the farmers ( $25 \%$ ) took advice from the neighbour. Block supervisors and printed materials also helped farmers to determine fertilizer rate (Table 16).

Farmers do not apply recommended dose of fertilizer to their crop field. There was found no general trend for using inorganic fertilizer to the crops. The amount of fertilizers varied among the locations and crops but the recommendation was not followed in most of the cases. The unbalanced use of all the nutrient may lead to nutrient imbalance in soil plant systems and yield goal could not be achieved in most cases. Except a few crops and locations use of organic manure is negligible which may lead to a degradation of soil nutrient status. Leguminous or fibre crop is also included rarely in the cropping pattern at different locations, which is also enhancing the degradation of soil nutrient status. Strong extension service and result demonstration with recommended fertilizer application may be suggested.

Table 14. Application of organic manure, nutrient and yield obtained in different cropping patterns at Tangail, Jamalpur and Pabna

| Cropping pattern | FYM | Poultry litter | Ash | N | P | K | S | Zn | Yield |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tangail |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mustard | 1191 | 15 | 301 | 76 | 11 | 17 | 7 | 0.11 | 1170 |
| Boro | 401 | 96 | 8 | 112 | 15 | 29 | 4 | 0.26 | 6010 |
| T.Aman | - | - | - | 72 | 6 | 16 | 4 | 0.20 | 3690 |
| Wheat | 1135 | 577 | - | 78 | 19 | 29 | 6 | - | 2380 |
| Jute | 2958 | 131 | 987 | 45 | 6 | 13 | 1 | - | 2320 |
| T.Aman | - | - | - | 50 | 10 | 14 | 2 | - | 3400 |
| Boro | 465 | 29 | 155 | 116 | 14 | 31 | 5 | 0.2 | 5910 |
| T.Aman | - | - | - | 51 | 10 | 24 | 2 | 0.15 | 3640 |
| Jamalpur |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Boro | 5172 | - | 1358 | 112 | 19 | 32 | 5 | 0.4 | 4730 |
| T.Aman | 2565 | 166 | 881 | 84 | 6 | 12 | 2 | 0.3 | 3770 |
| Mustard | 4827 | - | 1965 | 39 | 12 | 16 | 3 | - | 910 |
| Boro | 1780 | - | - | 110 | 19 | 41 | 12 | 0.5 | 4610 |
| T.Aman | 1260 | - | - | 93 | 10 | 18 | 4 | - | 3290 |
| Wheat | 4904 | 270 | 1203 | 89 | 16 | 25 | 13 | - | 2370 |
| Jute | 3840 | - | - | 40 | 4 | 12 | - | - | 2370 |
| T.Aman | 1988 | - | - | 88 | 7 | 23 | 3 | - | 3450 |
| Pabna |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wheat | 4500 | 270 | 1965 | 114 | 17 | 30 | 9 | 4 | 2850 |
| T.Aman | - | - | - | 93 | 5 | 16 | 3 | 3 | 2940 |
| Wheat | 4850 | - | 1965 | 117 | 16 | 33 | 8 | 2 | 2270 |
| Jute | 5400 | - | - | 76 | 5 | 22 | 3 | - | 1860 |
| T.Aman | - | - | - | 108 | 9 | 19 | 3 | 3 | 3230 |
| Wheat | 6150 | - | - | 94 | 17 | 22 | 9 | 3 | 2100 |
| Sesame | 3675 | - | 225 | 38 | 14 | - | - | - | 1220 |
| T.Aman | - | - | - | 109 | 8 | 26 | 6 | 3 | 3220 |

FYM = Farm yard manure

Table 15. Trend of crop yield during last 5 years as reported by the farmers at different locations

| Location | Yield status | Farmer responded (\%) | Reasons |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tangail | Stable | 21 | Fertilizer use, regular intercultural operation |
|  | Increasing | 31 | Fertilizer use, regular intercultural operation, use of organic manure, maintaining crop rotation, new variety |
|  | Decreasing | 48 | No use of organic manure, insect pest infestation, lack of quality seed etc. |
| Jamalpur | Stable | 18 | Use of organic manure, irrigation etc. |
|  | Increasing | 70 | Balance use of chemical fertilizer \& use of organic manure and new variety |
|  | Decreasing | 12 | Use reduced amount of chemical fertilizer |
| Pabna | Stable | 16 | Fertilizer use, regular intercultural operation |
|  | Increasing | 24 | Fertilizer use, regular intercultural operation, use of organic manure, maintaining crop rotation |
|  | Decreasing | 60 | No use of organic manure, insect pest infestation, lack of quality seed etc. |

All locations: Stable 18\% Increasing 42\% Decreasing 37\%

Table 16. Amount and type of fertilizer determination for crops as reported by the farmers

| Location | Self, considering the <br> soil condition | Advice from other <br> farmers | Block supervision | Booklet/ <br> leaflet | Dealer |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tangail | 50 | 27 | 17 | 6 | - |
| Jamalpur | 45 | 18 | 14 | 11 | 12 |
| Pabna | 52 | 30 | 7 | 10 | 3 |
| All | 49 | 25 | 13 | 9 | 5 |

## Plant biodiversity in the homesteads of saline area at Noakhali

The study was conducted at FSRD site Noakhali, MLT sites Laxmipur and Feni of greater Noakhali district. Thirty selected homestead of each location were surveyed following two methods namely, formal survey and informal survey and focused group discussions. Data for plant biodiversity of the homesteads were collected using questionnaire. Each homestead was visited twice, in winter and in summer. Information was recorded through interviews of family members like head of the family, housewife and others. Data were collected mainly on name and number of the plant species and name and number of major morphotypes per species.

Almost all the homesteads had mixed vegetation with various annual and perennial trees and seasonal vegetables. The study revealed that a wide variety of plant species was found in the study areas. More than 62 useful species were identified in the homesteads of FSRD site, Atkapalia, MLT site Lakshipur and MLT site Feni. Among them $30.91 \%$ were fruit, (perennial and annual), $29.09 \%$ were timber, $34.54 \%$ were vegetables (summer and winter) and $5.45 \%$ were spices species (Table 17). The distribution pattern of the plant species was influenced by macro and micro environmental factors of the homesteads and needs of the family members.

Table 17. Species richness of different plant groups at greater Noakhali

| Region | Fruits tree | Timber thee | Vegetables | Spices | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FSRD site, Atkapalia | 18 | 17 | 18 | 5 | 58 |
| MLT site Lakshmipur | 17 | 7 | 18 | 2 | 44 |
| MLT site Feni | 21 | 17 | 20 | 4 | 62 |
| Average | 19.00 | 13.67 | 18.67 | 3.67 | 54.67 |
| All | 17 | 16 | 19 | 3 | 55 |
| Percent | $(30.9)$ | $(29.09)$ | $(34.54)$ | $(5.45)$ |  |

## Inter-species diversity

Species diversity index is a measure, which renders considerable ecological insight (Magurran, 1988). Simpson index (1949) of species diversity (D) varied among the different groups of plant species (Table 18). Diversity was found higher for vegetable species (0.879) in the homesteads of the study area ( 3 regions as a whole) followed by fruit ( 0.854 ), timber and spices.

Table 18. Inter species diversity of different plant groups at the homesteads in greater Noakhali

| Region | Fruits tree | Timber thee | Vegetables | Spices | Total |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FSRD site, Atkapalia | 0.822 | 0.817 | 0.910 | 0.690 | 0.809 |
| MLT site Lakshmipur | 0.899 | 0.733 | 0.740 | 0.650 | 0.756 |
| MLT site Feni | 0.866 | 0.871 | 0.894 | 0.717 | 0.837 |
| Average | 0.862 | 0.807 | 0.846 | 0.686 | 0.812 |
| All | 0.854 | 0.853 | 0.879 | 0.705 | 0.823 |

Fruit: It is observed from Table 19 that coconut was found in $98.63 \%$ household at Noakhali. While mango, banana, betel nut and date palm, were found at more than $60 \%$ homesteads of Noakhali.

Timber: Mahogani, badhi and neem was found at $50 \%$ homesteads of the study area. (Table 20).
Vegetables: Country bean was found at $81.96 \%$ homesteads of Noakhali. Whereas sweet gourd, brinjal were found at more than $50 \%$ homesteads of the study area (Table 21).

Spices: Among the spices chili was found at more then $54 \%$ homestead of the study area (Table 22).
Relative prevalence value of common species considering 90 households as a whole none of the species was found in every homestead of all the regions. Species found at least one homestead in each region were screened out. Only 17 fruit, 13 timber, 17 vegetables and 2 spices species were found common at all regions.

Table 19. Distribution of fruit species in the homesteads of greater Noakhali

| SI. no. | Species | \% homestead containing the species |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FSRD site, Atkapalia | MLT site Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| 1. | Mango (Mangifera indica) | 96.67 | 88.24 | 100 | 96.72 |
| 2. | Jujube (Zizyphus jujuba) | 86.67 | 70.59 | 100 | 86.88 |
| 3. | Coconut (Cocos nucifera) | 98.10 | 99.40 | 97.8 | 98.6 |
| 4. | Jackfruits (Artocarpus heterophyllus) | 60.00 | 41.18 | 100 | 65.57 |
| 5. | Wood apple (Aegle mermelos) | 20.00 | 17.65 | 13.33 | 18.03 |
| 6. | Star fruits (Averrhoa carambola) | 43.33 | 35.29 | 86.67 | 52.46 |
| 7. | Litchi (Litchi chinensis) | 16.67 | 23.53 | 20.0 | 19.67 |
| 8. | Velvet apple (Diospyros discolor) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 66.67 | 16.39 |
| 9. | Bullocks heart (Anona reticulata) | 60.00 | 41.18 | 0.00 | 40.98 |
| 10. | Palm (Borassus flabellifer) | 63.33 | 52.94 | 100 | 70.49 |
| 11. | Date palm (Phoenix sylvestris) | 90.00 | 41.18 | 100 | 80.32 |
| 12. | Banana (Musa spp.) | 93.33 | 70.58 | 100 | 90.16 |
| 13. | Timber nut | 50.00 | 5.88 | 0.00 | 26.22 |
| 14. | Amlaki (Phyllanthus embelica) | 30.00 | 17.64 | 0.00 | 19.67 |
| 15. | Guava (Psidium guajava) | 90.00 | 58.82 | 100 | 85.24 |
| 16. | Caranda (Carissa carandus) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 46.67 | 11.47 |
| 17. | Pomelo (Citrus grandis) | 43.33 | 0.00 | 86.67 | 42.62 |
| 18. | Papaya (Carica papaya) | 50.00 | 64.71 | 100 | 67.21 |
| 19. | Black berry (Eugenia jambolana) | 53.33 | 11.76 | 93.33 | 52.46 |
| 20. | Pineapple (Anonus comosus) | 10.00 | 5.88 | 13.33 | 9.84 |
| 21. | Water melon | 3.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 22. | Custard apple (Anona squamosa) | 40.00 | 0.00 | 86.67 | 22.95 |
| 23. | Hog plum (Spondias mangifera) | 16.67 | 5.88 | 20.00 | 26.23 |
| 24. | Pome granite (Punica granatum) | 0.00 | 5.88 | 86.67 | 31.14 |
| 25. | Cashew nut (Anacardium oxydentale) | 33.33 | 5.88 | 0.00 | 1.64 |
| 26. | Olive (Elaeocarpus floribundus) | 3.33 | 5.88 | 0.00 | 18.03 |
| 27. | Wax apple (Syzygium samarangense) | 10.00 | 5.88 | 20.00 | 1.64 |
| 28. | Rose apple (Eugenia javanica) | 0.00 | 5.88 | 6.67 | 11.48 |
| 29. | Betelnut (Areca catechu) | 45.00 | 82.36 | 100 | 93.44 |

Table 20. Distribution of timber species in the homesteads of greater Noakhali

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SI} \\ & \mathrm{no} \end{aligned}$ | Species | \% homestead containing the species |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FSRD site, Atkapalia | MLT site Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| 1 | Mahogani (Swietenia macrophylla) | 63.33 | 47.05 | 98.00 | 68.85 |
| 2 | Sissoo (Dalbergia sissoo) | 23.30 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 13.11 |
| 3 | Teak (Tectona grandis) | 26.66 | 11.76 | 60.00 | 31.14 |
| 4 | Akashmoni (Acacia auriculiformis) | 16.60 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 13.12 |
| 5 | Eucalyptus (Eucalyptus camaldulensis) | 16.66 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 9.84 |
| 6 | Minjiri (Cassia samea) | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| 7 | Chapalish (Artocarpus chaplasha) | 6.66 | 0.00 | 40.00 | 13.11 |
| 8 | Koroi (Albizia procera) | 85.00 | 7.59 | 96.00 | 93.44 |
| 9 | Neem (Azadirachta indica) | 63.33 | 11.76 | 86.67 | 55.73 |
| 10 | Tamarind (Tamarindus indica) | 53.33 | 0.00 | 93.33 | 49.18 |
| 11 | Garzan (Diplorocarpus turbinatus) | 3.33 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 3.28 |
| 12 | Shal (Shorea robusta) | 3.33 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.64 |
| 13 | Raintree (Samanea saman) | 40.00 | 23.52 | 40.00 | 36.07 |
| 14 | Ipil-Ipil (Leucaena leucocephala) | 26.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 13.11 |
| 15 | Krishnachura (Delonix regia) | 13.33 | 11.76 | 93.33 | 32.79 |
| 16 | Babla (Acacia nilotica) | 26.67 | 0.00 | 53.33 | 26.23 |
| 17 | Kadam (Anthocephalus cadamba) | 16.67 | 52.94 | 100.00 | 47.54 |
| 18 | Pithraj (Amoora rohitoca) | 3.33 | 5.88 | 40.00 | 13.11 |
| 19 | Silk cotton (Bombax malabaricum) | 26.67 | 23.53 | 40.00 | 29.51 |
| 20 | Palash (Butea monosperma) | 0.00 | 5.88 | 6.67 | 3.28 |
| 21 | Pain (Toona ciliata) | 6.67 | 0.00 | 66.67 | 19.67 |
| 22 | Sonalo | 20.00 | 29.41 | 93.33 | 40.98 |
| 23 | Mandar (Erythrina indica) | 46.67 | 11.76 | 93.33 | 49.18 |
| 24 | Domur (Ficus racemosa) | 10.00 | 0.00 | 73.33 | 22.95 |
| 25 | Badhi (Lannea coromandelica) | 53.33 | 41.17 | 93.33 | 60.65 |
| 26 | Jarul (Lagerstroemiaflos reginae) | 3.33 | 0.00 | 20.00 | 6.56 |
| 27 | Champa (Michelia champaca) | 3.33 | 0.00 | 13.33 | 4.92 |
| 28 | Debdaru (Polyalthia longifolia) | 3.33 | 0.00 | 26.67 | 9.84 |
| 29 | Gamar (Gmelina arborea) | 10.00 | 6.00 | 26.67 | 11.47 |

Table 21. Distribution of vegetable species in the homesteads of greater Noakhali

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Sl} . \\ & \text { no } \end{aligned}$ | Species | \% homestead containing the species |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FSRD site, Atkapalia | MLT site Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| 1 | Indian Spinach | 70.00 | 17.65 | 0 | 34.43 |
| 2 | Spinach | 60.00 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 19.67 |
| 3 | Red amaranth | 36.67 | 11.65 | 13.3 | 36.06 |
| 4 | Stem amaranth | 60.00 | 23.53 | 66.67 | 39.34 |
| 5 | Kang Kong | 33.33 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 14.75 |
| 6 | China copi | 30.00 | 0.00 | 13.33 | 6.56 |
| 7 | Mustard | 6.67 | 0.00 | 0 | 4.92 |
| 8 | Cauliflower | 10.00 | 5.88 | 60.0 | 19.67 |
| 9 | Cabbage | 6.67 | 0.00 | 60.0 | 18.03 |
| 10 | Olcopi | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 11 | Broccoli | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 12 | Sweet gourd | 80.00 | 70.59 | 100.0 | 83.61 |
| 13 | Cucumber | 30.00 | 35.29 | 40.0 | 34.43 |
| 14 | Ribbed gourd | 16.67 | 17.64 | 46.67 | 24.59 |
| 15 | Sponge gourd | 20.00 | 52.94 | 100.0 | 49.18 |

Table 21. Contd.

| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{SI} . \\ & \text { no } \end{aligned}$ | Species | \% homestead containing the species |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FSRD site, Atkapalia | MLT site Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| 16 | Ash gourd | 10.00 | 29.41 | 53.33 | 26.23 |
| 17 | Bitter gourd | 6.67 | 11.76 | 13.33 | 9.84 |
| 18 | Kakrol | 16.67 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 9.84 |
| 19 | Snake gourd | 23.33 | 17.64 | 46.66 | 27.87 |
| 20 | Pointed gourd | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 1.64 |
| 21 | Bottle gourd | 60.00 | 82.35 | 93.33 | 75.41 |
| 22 | Country bean | 66.67 | 88.24 | 100.0 | 81.96 |
| 23 | Yard long bean | 26.67 | 11.76 | 13.33 | 19.67 |
| 24 | Brinjal | 50.00 | 41.17 | 100.0 | 60.65 |
| 25 | Tomato | 63.33 | 5.88 | 100.0 | 57.38 |
| 26 | Okra | 30.00 | 5.88 | 6.67 | 18.03 |
| 27 | Potato | 16.67 | 5.88 | 46.67 | 21.31 |
| 28 | Sweet potato | 46.67 | 0.00 | 33.32 | 31.15 |
| 29 | Taro | 0.00 | 5.88 | 86.67 | 22.95 |
| 30 | Potato yam | 6.67 | 41.18 | 93.33 | 37.70 |
| 31 | Radish | 33.33 | 5.88 | 86.67 | 39.34 |
| 32 | Turnip | 3.33 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 1.64 |
| 33 | Carrot | 3.33 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 26.23 |
| 34 | Sugar bet | 6.67 | 0.00 | 0.0 | 24.59 |

Table 22. Distribution of spices species in the homesteads of greater Noakhali

| SI. <br> no | Species | \% homestead containing the species |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | FSRD site, Atkapalia | MLT site Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| 1 | Chilli | 96.00 | 23.53 | 80.0 | 54.09 |
| 2 | Onion | 90.00 | 2.94 | 66.67 | 19.67 |
| 3 | Garlic | 20.00 | 5.88 | 13.33 | 36.06 |
| 4 | Zinger | 36.67 | 0.00 | 40.0 | 1.64 |
| 5 | Turmeric | 10.67 | 5.88 | 66.67 | 8.19 |
| 6 | Coriander | 16.67 | 0.00 | 6.67 | 6.56 |

The RP values of common fruit, timber, vegetables and spices

Fruit: Among 17 fruit species, common at all regions, coconut was found most prevalent in the study area. On the basis of mean dominance, coconut, mango ranked top followed by jackfruit, guava and jujube.

Timber: Among the 18 timber species, common at all regions, Kori was found most prevalent at FSRD site Atkapalia and cadamba was at MLT site Lakshmipur and Feni population level (Table 25).

Vegetables: Out of 21 vegetable species, common at all regions, Sweet gourd was found most prevalent at FSRD site Atkapalia and country bean was at both MLT site Lakshmipur and Feni (Table 26). On the basis of mean dominance rank, country bean occupied top position followed by taro, sweet gourd, Indian spinach and bottle gourd. The least ranked vegetable species was kangkong.

Spices:In case of spices chilli, garlic and turmeric were found common in all the regions
Based on the present study it may be concluded that wide range of plant biodiversity existed in the homestead of the greater Noakhali. Among the plant species, inter species diversity of vegetables
species was the highest followed by fruit in the homesteads. Coconut in fruits group and Country bean in vegetable was most prevalent species in the homestead. Therefore, intensive research should be undertaken to improve the most prevalent vegetables, spices, fruits and timber species.

Table 23. Relative prevalence of common fruit species found in the homestead of the greater Noakhali

| SI. no. | Species | FSRD site, Atkapalia | MLT site Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mango | 2133.11 | 849.26 | 5173.33 | 2524.27 |
| 2 | Jujube | 257.11 | 101.47 | 526.67 | 272.05 |
| 3 | Coconut | 3183.33 | 1900.00 | 1633.33 | 2496.72 |
| 4 | Jackfruits | 290.0 | 72.06 | 900.0 | 331.09 |
| 5 | Wood apple | 18.00 | 3.31 | 4.44 | 10.35 |
| 6 | Star fruits | 49.11 | 22.06 | 150.22 | 60.19 |
| 7 | Litchi | 4.44 | 16.18 | 6.67 | 7.74 |
| 8 | Velvetapple | 0 | 0 | 84.4 | 5.11 |
| 9 | Bullocks heart | 150.0 | 23.16 | 0.0 | 56.44 |
| 10 | Plum | 183.66 | 92.65 | 946.67 | 296.99 |
| 11 | Date plum | 1449.0 | 48.89 | 920.0 | 842.78 |
| 12 | Banana | 5721.33 | 472.06 | 3186.67 | 3582.91 |
| 13 | Timber nut | 743.33 | 0.73 | 0.0 | 192.64 |
| 14 | Amlaki | 14.0 | 5.51 | 0.0 | 6.12 |
| 15 | Guava | 600.0 | 84.56 | 753.33 | 469.55 |
| 16 | Carandus | 0.0 | 0.0 | 28.0 | 1.69 |
| 17 | Pumelo | 95.33 | 0.0 | 190.67 | 69.17 |
| 18 | Papaya | 86.66 | 109.19 | 580.0 | 182.90 |
| 19 | Black berry | 165.33 | 6.62 | 1319.11 | 270.03 |
| 20 | Pineapple | 3.0 | 3.67 | 26.67 | 7.90 |
| 21 | Water melon | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 22 | Custard apple | 0.11 | 0 | 127.11 | 8.65 |
| 23 | Hog plum | 53.33 |  | 8.0 | 21.07 |
| 24 | Pome granite | 3.33 | 1.10 | 121.33 | 14.29 |
| 25 | Cashew nut | 0 | 0.36 | 0.0 | 0.11 |
| 26 | Olive | 13.33 | 1.47 | 0.0 | 4.43 |
| 27 | Wax apple | 0.33 | 1.10 | 10.67 | 1.08 |
| 28 | Rose apple | 1.66 | 0.73 | 1.33 | 2.82 |
| 29 | Betel nut | 6934.66 | 1750.0 | 1326.67 | 4240.15 |

Table 24. Relative prevalence of common timber species found in the homestead of the greater
Noakhali

| SI. <br> $\#$ | Species | FSRD site, <br> Atkapalia | MLT site <br> Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Mahogany | 1851.44 | 435.29 | 1660.00 | 1438.0 |
| 2 | Sissum | 87.11 | 0 | 0.89 | 24.51 |
| 3 | Segun | 31.11 | 7.35 | 304.0 | 61.78 |
| 4 | Akashmoni | 20.0 | 0 | 12.00 | 9.67 |
| 5 | Eucalyptus | 7.77 | 2.20 | 2.22 | 3.06 |
| 6 | Minjiri | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| 7 | Chapalish | 0.66 | 0 | 69.33 | 6.23 |
| 8 | Kori | 6130.0 | 811.76 | 3306.0 | 3858.72 |
| 9 | Neem | 179.44 | 0.94 | 0.67 | 112.39 |
| 10 | Tamarind | 8177.0 | 0 | 196.44 | 85.46 |
| 11 | Garzan | 0.77 | 0 | 373.33 | 0.59 |
| 12 | Shal | 0.22 |  | 1.78 | 0.05 |

Table 24. Contd.

| SI. <br> $\#$ | Species | FSRD site, <br> Atkapalia | MLT site <br> Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| ---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 13 | Rain tree | 734.66 | 26.47 | 0.0 | 357.69 |
| 14 | Ipil-lpil | 1496.00 | 0 | 96.0 | 361.84 |
| 15 | Krishnachura | 3.55 | 2.20 | 0.0 | 29.95 |
| 16 | Babla | 80.88 | 0 | 255.11 | 50.74 |
| 17 | Cadamba | 11.11 | 102.57 | 96.0 | 92.74 |
| 18 | Pithraj | 0.11 | 0.36 | 453.33 | 2.79 |
| 19 | Silk cotton | 35.55 | 5.88 | 29.33 | 26.12 |
| 20 | Palash | 0.00 | 1.47 | 26.67 | 0.26 |
| 21 | Pain | 4.0 | 0 | 0.44 | 18.06 |
| 22 | Sonalo | 18.0 | 12.87 | 168.89 | 102.12 |
| 23 | Mandar | 402.88 | 25.73 | 734.22 | 647.40 |
| 24 | Domur | 4.66 | 0 | 3167.11 | 43.27 |
| 25 | Badhi | 1245.77 | 82.35 | 493.78 | 1024.19 |
| 26 | Jarul | 0.44 | 0 | 1499.55 | 12.25 |
| 27 | Champa | 0.88 | 0 | 0.0 | 1.05 |
| 28 | Debdaru | 0.11 | 1.84 | 4.44 | 1.93 |
| 29 | Gamar | 17.66 |  | 10.67 | 12.42 |

Table 25. Relative prevalence of common vegetable species found in the homestead of the greater
Noakhali

| SI. \# | Species | FSRD site, Atkapalia | MLT site Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Indian Spinach | 4606.00 | 18.75 | 0.0 | 1309.33 |
| 2 | Spinach | 1772.22 | 0 | 66.67 | 515.99 |
| 3 | Red amaranth | 11690 | 1102.94 | 453.33 | 4644.18 |
| 4 | Stem amaranth | 1404.44 | 4411.76 | 1871.11 | 3021.77 |
| 5 | Kang Kong | 1147.00 | 0 | 0.0 | 277.42 |
| 6 | China copi | 166.66 | 0 | 71.11 | 89.22 |
| 7 | Mustard | 233.33 | 0 | 0.0 | 56.44 |
| 8 | Cauliflower | 21.11 | 367.65 | 1800.0 | 498.25 |
| 9 | Cabbage | 27.77 | 0 | 1980.0 | 183.28 |
| 10 | Olcopi | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00 |
| 11 | Broccoli | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00 |
| 12 | Sweet gourd | 1341.33 | 202.94 | 2666.67 | 1300.69 |
| 13 | Cucumber | 67.00 | 24.26 | 144.0 | 74.49 |
| 14 | Ribbed gourd | 11.11 | 5.51 | 388.89 | 60.47 |
| 15 | Sponge gourd | 24.00 | 92.64 | 1153.33 | 191.07 |
| 16 | Ash gourd | 5.33 | 14.70 | 103.11 | 22.79 |
| 17 | Bitter gourd | 1.33 | 6.62 | 22.22 | 6.45 |
| 18 | Kakrol | 66.11 | 0 | 4.44 | 20.80 |
| 19 | Snake gourd | 67.66 | 9.96 | 379.55 | 99.59 |
| 20 | Pointed gourd | 0 | 0 | 2.67 | 0.16 |
| 21 | Bottle gourd | 154.00 | 185.29 | 64711 | 168.26 |
| 22 | Country bean | 3337.78 | 843.75 | 4213.33 | 3073.09 |
| 23 | Yard long bean | 246.22 | 3.67 | 18.67 | 97.71 |
| 24 | Brinjal | 2441.67 | 156.98 | 4566.667 | 2198.52 |
| 25 | Tomato | 5826.67 | 73.53 | 5233.36 | 3522.57 |
| 26 | Okra | 1092.00 | 91.91 | 66.67 | 441.06 |
| 27 | Potato | 638.89 | 77.20 | 5444.44 | 1086.54 |
| 28 | Sweet potato | 3688.22 | 0 | 1266.667 | 1501.72 |
| 29 | Taro | 0 | 18.38 | 14300.0 | 950.01 |

Table 25. Conted.

| Sl. \# | Species | FSRD site, <br> Atkapalia | MLT site <br> Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30 | Potato yam | 100.00 | 61.76 | 404.44 | 333.16 |
| 31 | Radish | 2750.00 | 110.29 | 10920.0 | 3008.87 |
| 32 | Turnip | 16.11 | 0 | 0.0 | 3.89 |
| 33 | Carrot | 13.33 | 0 | 0.0 | 141.47 |
| 34 | Sugar bet | 0 | 0 | 0.0 | 0.00 |

Table 26. Relative prevalence of common spices species found in the homestead of the greater Noakhali

| Sl. <br> $\#$ | Species | FSRD site, Atkapalia | MLT site <br> Lakshmipur | MLT site Feni | All |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Chilli | 12684.0 | 451.47 | 21493.36 | 4376.65 |
| 2 | Onion | 793.33 | 0 | 9866.67 | 603.06 |
| 3 | Garlic | 1894.44 | 110.29 | 355.55 | 2453.64 |
| 4 | Zinger | 0 | 0 | 1813.33 | 4.03 |
| 5 | Turmeric | 468.89 | 0 | 10222.22 | 113.41 |
| 6 | Coriander | 186.67 | 0 | 66.67 | 45.15 |

## Improvement of Crops and Cropping Systems

## Growing potato yam, bottle gourd and snake gourd on the same trellis

The experiment was conducted at RARS, Jessore during 2000-01 to know the performance of Potato yam along with other vegetables on the same trellis with different plant population. The number of fruits and yield of all the vegetables studied increased gradually with the increase of population. The highest yield and gross returns from yard long bean and bottle gourd were obtained from 4 plants per trellis grown on 2 pits. While for snake gourd and potato yam the highest yield and gross return were obtained from 8 plants per trellis grown on 4 pits (Table 1).

Table 1. Performance of different vegetables on the same trellis at the RARS, Jessore during 2000-01

| Treatment |  | Number/ Trellis |  | Yield (kg/trellis) |  | Gross return (Tk/trellis) | Planting Time | Harvesting time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Yard long bean |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Pit 1 Plant | 67 |  |  | 0.91 | 86.85 |  |  |  |
| 1 Pit 2 Plants | 86 |  |  | 1.09 |  | 118.37 |  | 27-4-2000 |
| 2 Pits 3 Plants | 178 |  |  | 2.21 |  | 139.79 | 24-1-'00 | to |
| 2 Pits 4 Plants | 197 |  |  | 2.38 |  | 191.53 |  | 29-6-2000 |
| LSD (.05) | 44 |  |  | 0.49 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Snake gourd |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 Pits 2 Plants | 84 |  |  | 11.33 |  | 74.55 |  |  |
| 2 Pits 4 Plants | 137 |  |  | 18.88 |  | 124.23 |  | 4-5-2000 |
| 3 Pits 6 Plants | 159 |  |  | 23.44 |  | 154.23 | 27-2-'00 | to |
| 4 Pits 8 Plants | 163 |  |  | 25.62 |  | 168.58 |  | 14-8-2000 |
| LSD (.05) | 34 |  |  | 5.78 |  |  |  |  |
|  | Potato Yam |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | B | R | B | R | Tot. |  |  |  |
| 1 Pits 2 Plants | 52 | 1.8 | 7.6 | 0.39 | 8.0 | 64.00 |  |  |
| 2 Pits 4 Plants | 62 | 3.8 | 10.3 | 0.59 | 10.9 | 87.20 | 18-4-'00 | 22-2-2001 |
| 3 Pits 6 Plants | 70 | 5.8 | 12.0 | 0.86 | 12.9 | 103.20 | 18-4-00 | 22-2-2001 |
| 4 Pits 8 Plants | 93 | 7.8 | 16.2 | 1.42 | 17.6 | 140.80 |  |  |
| LSD (.05) | 8 | 0.69 | 2.8 | 1.25 | 2.6 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | Bott | Gourd |  |  |
| 1 Pit 1 Plant |  | 12 |  | 12.80 |  | 64.00 |  |  |
| 1 Pit 2 Plants |  | 18 |  | 18.63 |  | 93.15 |  | 19-10-2000 |
| 2 Pits 3 Plants |  | 24 |  | 25.74 |  | 128.70 | 10-8-'00 | to |
| 2 Pits 4 Plants |  | 30 |  | 32.04 |  | 160.20 |  | 24-1-2001 |
| LSD (.05) |  | 4.8 |  | 5.63 |  |  |  |  |

$B=$ Bulbil, $R=$ Rhizome
Price of vegetables (Tk./kg): Yard long bean= 9.75, Snake gourd= $=8.60$, Potato yam= 8.00
Bottle gourd= 5.00

## Improvement of productivity of yam though intensification of spacing

The experiment was carried out during 2000-01 at RARS, Jessore to find out the optimum spacing for growing potato yam. The highest total yield was obtained from $1 \times 1 \mathrm{~m}$ spacing. Probably there is scope of yield elevation with further reduction of spacing (Table 2).

Table 2. Effect of spacing on the performance of yam grown on the ground at RARS, Jessore during 2000-01

| Spacing (m) | Nodal rhizome |  | Main rhizome |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total yield } \\ & \text { (t/ha) } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number (No./ha) | Yield <br> (t/ha) | Number (No./ha) | Yield <br> (t/ha) |  |
| $3.0 \times 3.0$ | 14167 | 0.64 | 1111 | 2.59 | 3.22 |
| $1.5 \times 1.5$ | 31944 | 1.42 | 4444 | 7.08 | 8.50 |
| $1.0 \times 1.0$ | 73889 | 4.20 | 10000 | 9.47 | 13.67 |
| LSD (.05) | 10220 | 2.87 | - | 2.63 | 5.26 |

## Performance of alternate cropping patterns in old Brahmaputra floodplain soil under AEZ 9

To evaluate the productivity and profitability of four alternate cropping patterns the experiment was undertaken at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur, during 1999-2000. Potato-Sesame-T.Aman gave the highest gross margin and benefit cost ratio over three years mean (Table $3 \& 4$ ).

Table 3. Yield of different crops under different patterns at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur during 1999-2000

| Crops | Grain/fibre yield (kg/ha) | Straw/stick yield (kg/ha) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Potato (Diamont) | 24000 | - |
| Mustard (Tori-7) | 850 | 2450 |
| Lentil (L-5) | 810 | 1330 |
| Sunflower (Kironi) | 896 | 7060 |
| Sesame (T-6) | 991 | 2312 |
| Jute (0-9897) | 2706 | 4081 |
| T. Aman (BRRI Dhan-32) | 3760 | 6710 |

Table 4. Cost and return analysis of different cropping pattern at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur during 1999-2000

| Cropping pattern | GR (Tk/ha) | TVC (Tk/ha) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ (\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha}) \end{gathered}$ | Benefit cost ratio |  |  | Mean |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 1999-2000 | 1998-99 | 1997-98 |  |
| Potato-Sesame-T. Aman | 132230 | 47907 | 84323 | 2.76 | 2.81 | 3.10 | 2.89 |
| Mustard-Sesame-T. Aman | 45580 | 31657 | 13923 | 1.43 | 1.60 | 2.89 | 1.96 |
| Lentil-Sesame-T. Aman | 52430 | 28711 | 23719 | 1.82 | 1.99 | 2.53 | 2.11 |
| Sunflower-Jute-T. Aman | 52192 | 38917 | 13275 | 1.32 | 1.72 | 2.64 | 1.89 |

Price of input and output (Tk./kg): Potato=4.00; Mustard=11.00; T. Aman=7.00; Lentil = 20.00; Sunflower=10.00; Sesame=10.00; Jute=6.25; Urea=5.60; T.S.P.= 12.40; MP=9.40; Gypsum= 4.00; Zinc sulphate=. 25.00.

## Effect of cutting stage on the forage and grain yield of Barley

The study was conducted at RARS, Jamalpur during 2000-01 to find out the optimum cutting times for obtaining maximum forage besides grain yield. Four treatments viz. $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ no cutting (control), $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ cutting at 40 DAE and then grain production, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ cutting at 55 DAE and then grain production, $\mathrm{T}_{4}=$ cutting at 40 and 55 DAE and then grain production were studied on BARI barley -1 . Results showed that at 40 DAE cutting, though yield was $27 \%$ lower than control but subsequent green fodder ( $9.29 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) production was very substantial during the fodder scarcity period (Table 5).

Table 5. Fodder yield, dry matter and grain yield of barley as affected by different cutting stages

| Treatment | Fodder yield (t/ha) |  |  | Dry matter (t/ha) |  |  | Grain yield of Barley (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 40 DAE | 55 DAE | Total | 40 DAE | 55 DAE | Total |  |
| T1 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 2.45a |
| T2 | 9.29 | - | 9.29b | 1.16 | - | 1.16 b | 1.77b |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | - | 14.28 | 14.28a | - | 2.38 | 2.38a | 0.59c |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 8.58 | 1.62 | 10.20b | 1.11 | 0.26 | 1.37b | 0.63c |
| CV\% | - | - | 12.93 | - | - | 15.10 | 10.01 |

Performance of alternate cropping pattern T.Aus-T.Aman-Mustard against the farmers existing pattern T.Aus-T.Aman-Fallow

The experiment was carried out at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet during 1999-2000 and 2000-01. Results showed that alternate cropping pattern yielded on an average 4.72, 3.79 and $0.95 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ of T.aus, T.aman and mustard respectively against $2.27 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ of T.aus and $2.68 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ of T.aman in farmer's pattern. Alternate cropping pattern fetched more than double the gross margin over the existing pattern (Table 6) due to change of rice varieties and introduction of mustard.
Table 6. Yield and gross margin of the cropping pattern T.Aus-T.Aman-Mustard against the existing pattern T.Aus - T.Aman at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet

| Cropping pattern | Grain yield (t/ha) | Gross margin (Tk/ha |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Alternate cropping pattern |  |
| T.Aus (BRRI Dhan-26) | 4.72 | 49,341 |
| T.Aman (BRRI Dhan-32) | 3.79 | - |
| Mustard (Tori-7) | 0.95 | - |
|  | Existing cropping pattern |  |
| T.Aus (Purbachi) | 2.27 | 20,196 |
| T.Aman (Pajam) | 2.68 | - |

Effect of late transplanting on the yield and yield components of photo period sensitive Aman rice varieties

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet during 2001 to show the performance of photo period sensitive T.aman rice under late transplanting condition. There were three dates of planting such as, 20 and 30 September and 10 October and three varieties BR-22, Binashail and Moinasail were considered for the study. Seedling age was 30 days. Results revealed that none of the varieties produced any grain in October 10 transplanting. BR-22 gave the highest grain yield ( 1.48 $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) in September 30 planting but it was at par with Moinasail (Table 7).

Table 7. Effect of date of transplanting, variety and their interaction on yield and yield attributes of T. Aman at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet

| Factor | Plant height <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Fertile tillers/hill <br> $(\mathrm{no})$. | Grain yield <br> $(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Straw yield <br> $(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Date of transplanting |  |  |  |  |
| 20 September | 83.67 a | 5.37 a | 1.97 a | 3.87 a |
| 30 September | 69.67 b | 4.30 b | 1.34 b | 2.86 b |
| 10 October | 51.00 c | 0 c | 0 c | 0.59 c |

Table 7. Conted.

| Factor | Plant height (cm) | Fertile tillers/hill (no.) | Grain yield (t/ha) | Straw yield (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Variety |  |  |  |  |
| BR-22 | 64.67 b | 3.45 | 1.22 a | 2.32 |
| BINA Sail | 63.00 b | 3.19 | 1.08 ab | 2.37 |
| Moina Sail | 76.67 a | 3.03 | 1.01 b | 2.62 |
| Date of transplanting $\times$ Variety |  |  |  |  |
| 20 September |  |  |  |  |
| BR-22 | 81 b | 5.99 a | 2.19 a | 3.82 a |
| BINA Sail | 80 b | 5.49 b | 1.98 b | 3.73 a |
| Moina Sail | 90 a | 4.63 c | 1.74 c | 4.06 a |
| 30 September |  |  |  |  |
| BR-22 | 65 c | 4.37 cd | 1.48 d | 2.65 c |
| BINA Sail | 63 cd | 4.08 d | 1.25 e | 2.81 bc |
| Moina Sail | 81 b | 4.45 cd | 1.29 de | 3.12 b |
| 10 October |  |  |  |  |
| BR-22 | 48 e | 0 e | 0 f | 0.48 d |
| BINA Sail | 46 e | 0 e | 0 f | 0.58 d |
| Moina Sail | 59 d | 0 e | 0 f | 0.69 d |

## Performance of maize cultivation for fodder and grain purposes

The experiment was carried out at Sunamgonj MLT site during rabi seasons of 1999-2001 to know the potential of growing maize for grain and fodder purposes. The treatments were $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Maize as grain, $T_{2}=$ Maize as fodder, $T_{3}=$ Maize as grain + fodder (thinned as 2 plants/hill at 60 DAE), $T_{4}=T_{3}+$ removal of lower leaves benath the cob) at silking stage. From the results it was observed that thinning as 2 plants/hill at 60 days after emergence ( $T_{3}$ ) produced reasonable fodder yield without sacrificing grain yield of maize (Table 8). The same treatment also gave the highest gross margin (Table 8).

Table 8. Grain and fodder yield of maize (cv. Barnali) cultivation for fodder and grain purposes during 1999-2000 to 2000-01

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  | Fodder yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1999-2000$ | $2000-01$ | Average | $1999-2000$ | $2000-01$ | Average |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 5.12 | 5.19 | 5.16 | - | - | - |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | - | - | - | 16.69 | 17.04 | 16.87 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 4.98 | 5.01 | 5.00 | 12.38 | 12.09 | 12.23 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 4.81 | 4.87 | 4.84 | 13.82 | 13.16 | 13.49 |
| LSD $_{0.05}$ | NS | 0.20 | - | 0.74 | 0.73 | - |

Table 9. Cost and return analysis of maize (cv. Barnali) cultivation as fodder and grain purposes during 1999-2000 to 2000-01

| Treatment | Gross return <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha)}$ | Total variable cost <br> (Tk/ha) | Gross margin <br> (Tk./ha) | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 322119 | 9112 | 23106 | 3.54 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | 9275 | 3478 | 5797 | 2.67 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 37948 | 10222 | 27725 | 3.71 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 37669 | 10755 | 26914 | 3.50 |

Average price (Tk/kg): Maize (grain) $=6.25$, Fodder ( green) $=0.55$

Screening of winter vegetables under irrigated condition

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet and MLT site Sunamgonj during rabi seasons of 1998-2001 to know the yield and profitability of winter vegetables. Results revealed that the highest yield and gross margin were obtained from tomato at Golapgonj, whereas at Sunamgonj the highest yield and gross margin was obtained from cabbage (Table 10).

Table 10. Yield of different winter vegetables at FSRD site Golapgonj, Sylhet and MLT site Sunamgonj during 1998-99 to 2000-01

| Crop | FSRD Site, Golapgonj |  |  |  | MLT Site, Moulvibazar (t/ha) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} 1998- \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1999- \\ & 2000 \end{aligned}$ | 2000-01 | Mean | 1998-99 | $\begin{aligned} & 1999- \\ & 2000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2000- \\ 01 \end{gathered}$ | Mean |
| Cabbage | 25.10 | 27.43 | 26.76 | 26.43 | 88.90 | 82.45 | 87.54 | 86.30 |
| Cauliflower | 26.90 | 26.06 | 27.34 | 26.77 | 26.75 | 32.94 | 33.12 | 30.94 |
| Tomato | 24.05 | 48.62 | 50.16 | 40.94 | 27.50 | 35.43 | 38.76 | 33.90 |
| Carrot | 6.00 | 9.00 | 8.87 | 7.96 | 20.10 | 27.13 | 24.34 | 23.86 |
| Lalsak | 5.60 | 4.88 | 5.34 | 5.27 | 4.45 | 4.94 | 5.19 | 4.86 |
| Spinach | 5.15 | 4.31 | 6.23 | 5.23 | 5.40 | 5.75 | 5.57 | 5.57 |
| Radish | 34.65 | 27.22 | 36.42 | 32.76 | 57.55 | 38.96 | 56.42 | 50.98 |
| LSD (0.05) | 1.94 | 2.06 | 1.84 | - | 5.20 | 5.52 | 5.36 | - |

Performance of alternate cropping pattern Wheat-Sesame-T.Aman under rainfed condition in young Jamuna floodplain soil

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail under rainfed condition during 19982000. The tested cropping pattern was superior over farmers existing pattern in respect of yield, gross margin and MBCR (Table 11).
Table 11. Yield and gross margin of alternate cropping pattern against the existing at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail during 1998-2000

| Cropping pattern | Grain yield (t/ha) | Gross margin (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Alternate cropping pattern |  |  |  |
| Wheat (Kanchan) | 1.96 | - | - |
| Sesame (T-6) | 1.27 | 69712 | 1.96 |
| T.Aman (BRRI Dhan-33) | 3.67 | - | - |
|  | Existing cropping pattern |  |  |
| Wheat (Kanchan) | 1.59 | - | - |
| Jute (0-9897) | 2.05 | 62653 | 1.39 |
| T.Aman (BRRI Dhan-33) | 3.28 | - | - |

## Performance of alternate cropping pattern Potato-Boro-T.Aman under irrigated condition at Palima, Tangail

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site Palima, Tangail during 1998-2001 to know the performance of alternate cropping pattern Potato-Boro-T.aman against the existing pattern Mustard-Boro-T.aman. The tested cropping pattern was highly profitable over the existing pattern. The average gross margin obtained from the developed pattern was Tk.98950/ha, while gross margin of existing pattern was Tk. 50602 (Table 12).

Table 12. Yield and gross margin of the cropping pattern Potato-Boro-T.aman against the existing pattern Mustard-Boro-T.aman.

| Cropping pattern | Grain yield (t/ha) | Gross margin (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


|  | Alternate cropping pattern |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potato (Diamont) | 33.5 | - | - |
| Boro (BR-29) | 6.29 | $98,950.00$ | 2.55 |
| T.Aman (BRRI Dhan-32) | 4.55 | - | - |
|  | Existing cropping pattern |  |  |
| Mustard (Tori-7) | 0.93 | 50,602 | -4 |
| Boro (BR-29) | 5.27 | - | - |
| T.Aman (BRRI Dhan-32) | 4.42 | - | - |

Yield performance of mustard varieties in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern under farmer's field condition at Palima, Tangail

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Palima during rabi seasons of 1998-2001 to assess the yield performance of different mustard varieties in mustard based cropping pattern. From the results it was observed that BARI Sharisha-8 gave the highest yield ( $1.34 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) but its growth duration was 20 days longer than Tori-7 (Table 13). BARI Sharisha-8 could be fitted into the cropping pattern Mustard-Boro-T.aman provided short duration T.aman varieties like BRRI Dhan-32, BRRI Dhan-33 were grown

Table 13. Grain yield and growth duration of mustard varieties at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail during1998-2001

| Variety | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  |  | Mean <br> $(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1^{\text {st }}$ year | $2^{\text {nd }}$ year | $3^{\text {rd }}$ year | 0.85 |  |
| Tori-7 | 0.76 d | 0.75 c | 1.03 b | 72 c |  |
| BARI-6 | 1.43 a | 1.02 a | 1.34 a | 1.26 | 94 ab |
| BARI-7 | 1.32 ab | 1.01 a | 1.33 a | 1.23 | 94 ab |
| BARI-8 | 1.47 a | 1.06 a | 1.47 a | 1.34 | 92 b |
| Sampad | 1.0 | 0.91 b | 1.53 a | 1.17 | 93 b |
| SS-75 | 0.87 cd | 0.85 b | 1.07 b | 0.93 | 96 a |

## Feasibility of growing different crops as intercrop with Pineapple

The experiment was conducted at Modhupur (AEZ-28), Tangail during 1998-2000 to select suitable crop for intercropping with pineapple. The treatments were $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Pineapple + Mukhikachu, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Pineapple + Panchumukhi kachu, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Pineapple + Zinger, $\mathrm{T}_{4}=$ Pineapple + Turmeric, $\mathrm{T}_{5}=$ Pineapple (Sole). Results revealed that the highest gross margin was obtained from pineapple + Zinger $\left(T_{3}\right)$ followed by pineapple + Turmeric ( $T_{4}$ ) (Table 14).

Table 14. Yield, cost and return analysis of intercrop with pineapple at MLT site, Modhupur Tangail during 1998-

| 2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Treat <br> ment | Yield of <br> inter crop <br> (t/ha) | Pineapple <br> fruit (no.ha) | Gross return <br> of inter crop <br> (Tk./ha) | Gross return <br> of pineapple <br> (Tk./ha) | Total gross <br> return <br> (Tk./ha) | TVC <br> (Tk./ha) | Gross <br> margin <br> (Tk./ha) | MBCR |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 4.67 b | 30662 a | 19720 | 100171 | 119891 | 10750 | 109141 | 2.54 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | 5.48 ab | 29275 ab | 18188 | 95469 | 113656 | 13750 | 99906 | 1.53 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 3.16 c | 24850 b | 76578 | 82885 | 159463 | 23750 | 135713 | 2.82 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 5.70 a | 28250 ab | 56846 | 92031 | 148878 | 15000 | 133878 | 3.75 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | 0.00 | 28500 ab | 0.00 | 92573 | 92573 | 0.000 | 92573 | - |

Effect of sowing time on the performance of bush bean at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Palima during rabi season of 2000-01 to know the optimum time of sowing and planting distance. There were four sowing time such as: $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ November $10, T_{2}=$ November $20, T_{3}=$ November 30 and $T_{4}=$ December 10 and 3 spacing such as : $\mathrm{S}_{1}=30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$, $S_{2}=20 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{3}=25 \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$. Results showed that highest yield was obtained from November 10 sowing along with $25 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}$ spacing (Table 15).

Table 15. Interaction effect of sowing time and spacing on the performance of Bush bean at Tangail during 200001

| Sowing <br> time | Spacing | Plant height <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | No. of <br> pod/plant | Vegetable <br> vield (t/ha) | Gross return <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | TVC (Tk/ha) | Gross margin <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | BCR |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | 47.33 a | 11.80 b | 1.701 c | 17010.00 | 6485.00 | 10525.00 | 2.62 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | 45.69 ab | 13.33 a | 2.457 b | 24566.67 | 6485.00 | 18081.67 | 3.79 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~S}_{3}$ | 44.20 bc | 13.40 a | 2.875 a | 28746.67 | 6485.00 | 22261.67 | 4.43 |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | 39.33 d | 10.00 cd | 1.274 ef | 10189.33 | 6485.00 | 3704.33 | 1.57 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | 39.00 d | 10.67 bc | 1.654 cd | 13234.67 | 6485.00 | 6749.67 | 2.04 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~S}_{3}$ | 37.80 de | 11.27 bc | 1.728 c | 13821.33 | 6485.00 | 7336.33 | 2.13 |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | 37.83 de | 9.133 d | 1.117 f | 7063.00 | 6485.00 | 578.00 | 1.09 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | 35.73 ef | 10.60 bc | 1.493 cde | 8960.00 | 6485.00 | 2475.00 | 1.38 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~S}_{3}$ | 34.80 f | 11.33 bc | 1.721 c | 10324.00 | 6485.00 | 3839.00 | 1.59 |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | $\mathrm{~S}_{1}$ | 42.67 c | 9.993 cd | 1.321 ef | 6606.67 | 6485.00 | 121.67 | 1.02 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~S}_{2}$ | 39.93 d | 9.993 cd | 1.412 def | 7058.33 | 6485.00 | 573.33 | 1.09 |  |
|  | $\mathrm{~S}_{3}$ |  | 39.73 d | 11.00 bc | 1.705 c | 8525.00 | 6485.00 | 2040.00 | 1.32 |
| LSD |  | 2.018 | 1.331 | 0.2322 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{CV}(\%)$ |  | 2.89 | 6.97 | 7.78 |  |  |  |  |  |

## Screening of different rabi crops in saline area at Noakhali

The study was carried out in the saline area of Noakhali during 1997-2001 to find out saline tolerant crop varieties. Results revealed that among the vegetable crops tomato (Ratan) gave the highest yield while among the pulses, cowpea produced the highest yield. Among the cereal crops wheat (Kanchan) gave the highest yield (Table 16).

Table 16. Yield performance of different rabi crops in saline area at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during 1997-2001

| Crops | Yield (t/ha) |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { TVC } \\ \text { (Tk/ha) } \end{gathered}$ | GR | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1997-98 | 1998-99 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 |  | Average |  |  |  |
| Vegetable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tomato (Ratan) | 45.51 | 16.30 | 32.25 | 47.03 |  | 35.27 | 44120 | 158715 | 3.59 |
| Radish (Tasaki) | 15.59 | 22.13 | 26.22 | 27.33 |  | 22.82 | 29835 | 45634 | 1.52 |
| Chilli (Local) | 0.70 | 0.66 | 1.46 | 0.67 |  | 0.873 | 17609 | 43650 | 2.48 |
| Pulses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Grasspea (Local) | 0.77 | 0.52 | 1.15 | 1.06 |  | 0.875 | 6570 | 10500 | 1.59 |
| Lentil (BARI-2) | 0.20 | 0.60 | 0.49 | 0.70 |  | 0.498 | 6300 | 9960 | 1.58 |
| Chickpea (BARI-2) | 0.23 | 0.35 | 0.46 | 0.64 |  | 0.421 | 9600 | 9262 | 0.96 |
| Mungbean (BARI-2) | 0.22 | 0.26 | 0.39 | 0.76 |  | 0.408 | 8750 | 12240 | 1.39 |
| Cowpea (Local) | 1.10 | 0.58 | 0.88 | 1.04 |  | 0.900 | 7300 | 16200 | 2.21 |
| Cereals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Wheat(Kanchan) | 2.04 | 2.02 | 2.17 | 2.12 | 2.092 | 210100 |  |  | 1.75 |
| Maize (Barnali) | 2.40 | 1.95 | 2.29 | 1.60 | 2.010 | 7730 |  |  | 2.08 |
| Triticalli | 1.40 | 1.10 | 1.62 | 1.10 | 1.307 | 710100 |  |  | 1.03 |
| Barley (BARI-2) | 1.42 | 0.83 | 1.13 | 1.17 | 1.137 | 7500 |  |  | 1.06 |
| Millet (Titus) | 0.97 | 0.87 | 0.85 | 1.21 | 0.970 | - 8150 |  |  | 1.78 |
| Oil seed |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mustard (Tori 7) | 1.20 | 0.95 | 0.56 | 1.04 | 0.938 | 87000 |  |  | 2.28 |

TVC= Total variable cost, GR= Gross margin, BCR= Benefit cost ratio

## Effect of mulching on Potato in the saline soil of Noakhali

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during 1999-2001 to find out the effect of mulching on soil moisture conservation and minimization of salinity for potato production. There were four treatments viz. $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ control (no mulch), $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Wastage of rice straw, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Rice straw and $\mathrm{T}_{4}=$ Water hyacinth all were at the rate of $4 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$. Results revealed that rice straw mulch produced the highest tuber yield but it was at par with water hyacinth mulch (Table 17). Control treatment gave the lowest yield. The potato tuber yield enhancement by mulching was due to conservation of soil moisture and minimization of soil salinity.

Table 17. Effect of different mulches on the yield and yield parameters of potato (cv. Diamont) at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during the winter of 1999-2000

| Treatment | Plant ht. (cm) | No. of tuber/hill | Tuber wt./hill (gm) | Tuber yield (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 41.62 c | 6.33 c | 392.7 c | 11.32 c |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 45.37 b | 7.53 b | 420.7 b | 14.32 b |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 59.80 a | 10.07 a | 454.3 a | 17.23 a |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 59.02 a | 9.80 a | 448.8 a | 16.52 a |
| $\mathrm{CV} \%$ | 5.76 | 11.06 | 2.34 | 7.57 |

Effect of mulching on tomato production in the saline soil at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali
The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during 1999-2001 to show the effect of mulching on soil moisture conservation and minimization of soil salinity on tomato production. The treatments were $T_{1}=$ control (no mulch), $T_{2}=$ straw waste, $T_{3}=$ Rice straw, $T_{4}=$ Water hyacinth. Form the results it was observed that rice straw mulch gave the highest tomato fruit in both the years. However, rice straw waste and water hyacinth could also be used for better fruit yield of Tomato variety ratan (Table 18).

Table 18. Effect of mulching on tomato production at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during 1999-01

| Treatment | No. of <br> fruits/plant | Wt. of fruit/plant (g) | Each fruit <br> wt. $(\mathrm{g})$ | Fruit yield (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 28.68 c |  | $2000-01$ | 1999-2000 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 38.53 ab | 1448 b | 42.33 c | 50.21 c | 28.42 c |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 38.60 a | 1823 a | 44.83 bc | 60.97 b | 32.50 b |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 33.57 b | 1515 b | 48.83 a | 73.57 a | 42.24 ab |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 11.21 | 4.95 | 46.50 ab | 66.08 b | 37.03 ab |
| $\mathrm{CV}(\%)$ |  | 5.0 | 9.43 | 14.12 |  |

Effect of mulching on cabbage production in the saline soil of FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali
The experiment was carried out at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during 2000-01 to investigate the effect of mulching on soil moisture conservation and minimization of soil salinity for the production of cabbage. The treatments were $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Control, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Rice straw waste, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Rice straw and $\mathrm{T}_{4}=$ Water hyacinth. Results revealed that water hyacinth mulching produced the highest cabbage yield. However rice straw and wastage of rice straw mulch could also be used (Table 19).

Table 19. Effect of mulches on the yield and yield components of cabbage (cv. Atlas 70) in the FSRD site Atkapalia during 2000-01

| Treatment | Plant ht. (cm) | Head dia (cm) | Head wt (gm) | Yield (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control | 20.27 b | 16.10 b | 757.8 c | 23.63c |


| Wastage of rice straw | 21.43 a | 17.67 a | 918.3 b | 38.57 b |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rice Straw | 22.00 a | 18.50 a | 954.3 b | 42.15 b |
| Water hyacinth | 23.33 a | 18.60 a | 1101.0 a | 47.22 a |
| CV(\%) | 3.92 | 5.35 | 9.67 | 8.94 |

```
Mustard cultivation with minimum tilalge in
different salinity levels at FSRD site, Atkapalia,
Noakhali
```

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during 2000-01 to see the effect of different salinity levels on the performance of mustard. The mustard cultivar was Tori-7. Results showed that with the increase of salinity levels mustard yield reduced gradually (Figure1). However in high level of salinity ( $>10 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m}$ ) the yield of mustard ( $912 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was above national average (Table 20). The results suggested that salinity might not be a problem for mustard cultivation, if it is timely sown.


Figure 1. Yield of mustard in different salinity level

Table 20. Effect of different salinity level on the yield and yield contributing characters of mustard (cv. Tori-7) during rabi season of 2000-01

| Salinity level | Plant <br> height <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Total <br> branch/ <br> plant (no) | Capsule/ <br> plant (no.) | No of <br> plant/ $\mathrm{m}^{2}$ | 1000 seed <br> $\mathrm{wt}.(\mathrm{gm})$ | Seed yield <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Straw <br> yield <br> $(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha)}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $2-4 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m}$ | 88.50 a | 9.62 a | 146.0 a | 114.20 b | 2.68 a | 1103.0 a | 1.71 a |
| $4-6 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m}$ | 71.50 c | 6.15 bc | 100.03 bc | 101.0 a | 2.66 ab | 1090.0 ab | 1.29 bc |
| $6-8 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m}$ | 82.75 ab | 5.67 c | 99.25 bc | 109.5 a | 2.64 ab | 1055 ab | 1.38 b |
| $8-10 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m}$ | 78.50 bc | 7.80 ab | 81.53 c | 110.3 a | 2.63 ab | 990.0 bc | 1.37 b |
| $>10 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m}$ | 84.25 ab | 7.80 ab | 124.0 ab | 113.0 a | 2.59 b | 912.5 c | 1.10 c |
| $\mathrm{CV} \mathrm{( } \mathrm{\%)}$ | 6.97 | 18.13 |  | 8.44 | 9.96 | 6.89 |  |

## Effect of intercropping Maize with groundnut in saline soil under rainfed condition

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during 2000-01 to show the effect of intercropping of groundnut with maize in the saline soil under rainfed condition. There were five treatments namely, $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Sole groundnut $(25 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm})$, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Sole maize $(75 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}), \mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Groundnut ( 30 $\mathrm{cm} \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) + maize ( $100 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}$ ), $\mathrm{T}_{4}=$ Groundnut ( $30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) + maize ( $150 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}$ ), $\mathrm{T}_{5}=$ Groundnut $(30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm})+$ maize $(200 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm})$. The highest groundnut equivalent yield (GEY) and MRR were obtained from treatment $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ (Groundnut $30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) + maize ( $200 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}$ ) (Table 21 and 22).

Table 21. Seed yield, Groundnut equivalent yield and LER of Groundnut (cv. Dhaka-1) -Maize (cv. Barnali) intercropping system

| Treatment | Yield (kg/ha) |  | GEY (kg/ha) | LER |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Groundnut | Maize |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ |  | 1956 | - | 1956 |


|  | $T_{2}$ | - | 2640 | 1624.62 | 1 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $T_{3}$ | 1145 | 1936 | 2336.36 | 1.31 |
|  | $T_{4}$ | 1461 | 1664 | 2423.46 | 1.37 |
|  | $T_{5}$ | 1596 | 1207 | 2440.77 | 1.30 |
| LSD (0.05) | 144.5 | 217.9 |  |  |  |
| CV (\%) | 7.31 | 13.18 |  |  |  |

Table 22. Marginal analysis of undominated groundnut-maize intercropping system

| Gross margin <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Treatment | TVC <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | MGM <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | MVC <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | MRR <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 9770 | 11350 | - | - | - |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 13457 | 13927 | 4175 | 2107 | 198 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | 18277 | 14493 | 8507 | 3143 | 271 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 19009 | 14757 | 9239 | 3407 | 271 |

Effect of intercropping Maize (Barnali) with soybean (Shohagh) in saline soil under rainfed condition
The study was conducted at FSRD sites, Atkapalia, Noakhali during rabi season of 2000-01 to find out the effect of maize and soybean intercropping on total productivity and income. There were five treatments namely, $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Sole soybean $(25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}), \mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Sole maize $(75 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}), \mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Soybean $(25 \times 15$ $\mathrm{cm})+$ maize $(100 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}) \mathrm{T}_{4}=$ Soybean $(25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm})+$ maize $(150 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm})$ and $T_{5}=$ Soybean $(25 \times 15$ $\mathrm{cm})$ + maize ( $200 \times 25 \mathrm{~cm}$ ). The highest soybean equivalent yield (SEY) and MRR were obtained from $T_{5}$. The results indicate that comparatively lower population of maize increased the total productivity and income largely (Table 23 and 24).

Table 23. Seed yield, Soybean equivalent yield and LER of soybean-maize intercropping system

| Treatment | Yield (kg/ha) |  | SEY (kg/ha) | LER |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Soybean | Maize |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{1}$ | 1535 | - | 1535.00 | 1419.73 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | - | 2662 | 1787.93 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 869 | 1723 | 1789.07 | 1.21 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 1020 | 1442 | 2005 | 1.20 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | 1365 | 1200 |  | 1.34 |
| LSD (0.05) | 0.075 | 0.195 |  |  |
| CV (\%) | 8.770 | 8.0 |  |  |

Table 24. Marginal analysis of undominated soybean-maize intercropping system

| Gross margin <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Treatment | TVC <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | MGM <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | MVC <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | MRR <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 12690 | 10335 | - | - |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 19174 | 11050 | 6484 | 715 | 906.85 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 15671 | 11165 | 2981 | 830 | 359.16 |

## Performance of Maize (Barnali) in different soil salinity levels at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during rabi season of 2000-01 to know the effect of different levels of soil salinity on the performance of maize. Results revealed that with the increase of salinity levels maize yield gradually decreased. The highest yield was obtained from lowest salinity level ( $1.5 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m}$ ) (Table 25).

Table 25. Performance of maize (cv. Barnali) in different salinity level at FSRD site Atkapalia, Noakhali

| Salinity <br> $(\mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m})$ | Plant height <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | No. of cob <br> /plant | Cob length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Seed /cob | 1000 grain <br> weight $(\mathrm{g})$ | Yield (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1.5 | 160.0 a | 2.0 a | 22.27 a | 341.1 d | 298.3 a | 7.5 a |
| 3.1 | 154.8 b | 1.70 b | 13.30 c | 343.8 c | 255.3 c | 2.88 b |
| 3.9 | 152.0 c | 1.70 b | 15.60 b | 360.0 b | 252.3 cd | 2.76 bc |
| 4.5 | 125.1 f | 1.70 b | 15.60 b | 291.3 e | 259.0 b | 2.75 bc |
| 4.9 | 138.6 e | 1.70 b | 12.73 c | 228.3 f | 250.0 d | 2.54 c |
| 6.5 | 146.7 d | 1.66 b | 15.10 b | 472.3 a | 210.0 e | 1.94 d |
| LSD(0.5) | 1.894 | 0.2301 | 1.256 | 2.071 | 3.499 | 0.3355 |
| CV (\%) | 5.71 | 7.18 | 4.37 | 4.33 | 3.76 | 5.43 |

Effect of soil salinity and phosphorus levels on the growth and yield of Wheat
The experiment was conducted at MLT site, Lakshmipur, Noakhali during 2000-01 to show the effect of phosphorus fertilizer on the yield of wheat under different soil salinity levels. The study revealed that 50 kg P/ha gave the highest grain yield while zero phosphorus produced the lowest amount of grain. On the other hand with the increased soil salinity level wheat yield decreased gradually (Table 26). Probably timely sowing can further reduce the effect of soil salinity on wheat yield.

Table 26. Effect of salinity and phosphorous fertilizer on the yield and yield attributes of wheat (Kanchan)

| Treatments | $\begin{gathered} \text { Plant } \\ \text { height (cm) } \end{gathered}$ | No. of tiller/hill | Non effective tiller /hill | Panicle length (cm) | No. of panicle /m2 | 1000 Grain weight (g) | Grain yield (t/ha) | Straw yield <br> (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Salinity (ds/m) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.92 | 82.00 | 3.50 | 1.175 | 14.33 | 189.5a | 40.37a | 1.58a | 1.63a |
| 2.45 | 77.5 | 3.40 | 1.15 | 14.60 | 186.75ab | 39.62b | 1.55 ab | 1.60ab |
| 3.53 | 73.5 | 3.20 | 1.25 | 13.37 | 181.50b | 39.25b | 1.50 b | 1.54b |
| 4.03 | 74.00 | 3.33 | 1.50 | 13.87 | 179.75b | 39.75ab | 1.40 b | 1.48 b |
| 5.34 | 80.25 | 3.15 | 1.13 | 13.53 | 181.5b | 38.25 c | 1.26c | 1.40 b |
| LSD (0.05) |  |  |  | 0.6959 | 7.156 | 0.699 | 0.069 | 0.109 |
| P Level ( $\mathrm{Kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 66.80c | 3.22 | 1.24a | 11.50d | 169.8c | 37.4d | 0.73d | 1.02c |
| 40 | 75.00 b | 3.20 | 1.16 ab | 13.52c | 183.2b | 39.0c | 1.52c | 1.46c |
| 50 | 82.10a | 3.40 | 1.08 b | 15.98b | 192.8a | 41.2a | 1.70a | 1.60a |
| 60 | 85.60a | 3.44 | 1.05b | 15.76a | 189.4ab | 41.2a | 1.67b | 1.50b |
| LSD (0.05) | 3.27 | ns | 0.097 | 0.622 | 6.401 | 0.625 | 0.02 | 0.097 |
| CV (\%) | 3.01 | 8.5 | 5.79 | 3.24 | 2.53 | 1.15 | 4.01 | 5.72 |

Sunflower cultivation in different levels of soil salinity at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali
The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during the rabi season of 2000-01 to study the effect of various salinity levels on the performance of sunflower. The test variety was Kironi. Yield of sunflower decreased with the increase of soil salinity. The highest seed yield was found at the lowest salinity level (Table 27).

Table 1. Effect of saline soils on the yield and yield contributing characters of sunflower at FSRD site Atkapalia, Noakhali during rabi season of 2000-01

| Treatments | Plant ht $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Dia of head <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | No. of matured <br> seed | 1000 grain wt. <br> $(\mathrm{gm})$ | Seed yield <br> $(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ec $1: 1(<4 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m})$ | 137.6 | 15.0 | 488 | 60.6 | 2.15 |


| Ec 1:1(4-8 ds/m) | 130.8 | 14.8 | 412 | 58.0 | 1.57 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ec 1:1(>8ds/m) | 117.4 | 12.3 | 365 | 54.0 | 1.22 |
| CV (\%) | 6.78 | 12.06 | 3.45 | 6.79 | 8.06 |
| LSD $(0.05)$ | 15.09 | NS | 24.87 | 6.76 | 0.23 |

## Comparative performance of different vegetables as intercropped with Sugarcane

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Ishan Gopalpur, Faridpur during rabi seasons of 19982000 to study the performance of different vegetables as intercropped with sugarcane. The highest sugarcane equivalent yield, gross return, net return and benefit cost ratio were obtained from intercropping sugarcane with cabbage in two consecutive years (Table 28).

Table 28. Performance of different vegetables as intercropped with sugarcane (cv. ISD-21) at FSRD site, Ishan Gopalpur during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Yield (t/ha) |  |  |  | Sugarcane equivalent yield(t/ha) | Gross return <br> (Tk./ha) | Total variable cost (Tk./ha) | Net return (Tk./ha) | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sugarcane |  | Intercrop |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1998-99 | $\begin{aligned} & 1999- \\ & 2000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 1998- \\ 99 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 1999- \\ & 2000 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sugarcane sole | 79.48a | 95.65a | -- | -- | 95.65 e | 103302 | 50100 | 53202 | 1.92 |
| Sugarcane+Lalshak | 82.43a | 90.78 b | 6.75 | 6.70 | 128.00d | 138240 | 52580 | 85660 | 2.50 |
| Sugarcane+Tomato | 82.08a | 90.26b | 14.69 | 15.28 | 196.03b | 211712 | 72350 | 139362 | 2.78 |
| Sugarcane+Spinach | 81.58a | 91.59b | 8.60 | 7.98 | 143.31c | 154774 | 53500 | 101274 | 2.69 |
| Sugarcane+Cabbage | 77.75a | 87.57c | 34.67 | 30.51 | 228.82a | 247125 | 66570 | 180555 | 3.56 |
| Sugarcane+Turnip | 84.57a | 89.01bc | 7.11 | 6.91 | 140.17c | 151383 | 65400 | 85983 | 2.25 |
| Level of significance | NS | ** |  |  | ** |  |  |  |  |
| CV (\%) | 5.41 | 2.40 |  |  | 1.40 |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{*}$ Means significance at $1 \%$ level. Means followed by common letters are statistically similar
Price (Tk./ha): Sugarcane=1.08, Spinach=7.00, Cabbage=5.00, Turnip=8.00, Tomato=8.00, Lalshak= 6.00

## Screening of different rabi crops in saline area

The experiment was conducted at Paikgacha MLT site, Khulna during rabi season of 2000-01 to find out the salt tolerant crops. Results showed that among the eleven crops Wheat, Barley, Tritically, Grass pea, Knolkhol, Sugarbit and Tomato survived and yielded. Chilli, Mungbean and Blackgram died within two months of emergence. Chickpea failed to germinate. Knolkhol and sugarbit produced higher edible yields in comparison to other crops (Table 29).

Table 29. Performance of different crops tested at saline area of Paikgacha, MLT site during 2000-01

| Name of crops | Total emergence/transplanted <br> Plot size $(1 \mathrm{~m} \times 2 \mathrm{~m})$ | Seedlings <br> mortality | Yield/plot <br> $(\mathrm{Kg})$ | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wheat | 410 | -- | 0.30 |  |
| Barley | 375 | -- | 0.39 |  |
| Triticaly | 280 | - | 0.26 | Not germinated |
| Chickpea | -- | - | - | Poor growth |
| Grasspea | 690 | 240 | 0.10 |  |

Table 29. Contd.

| Name of crops | Total emergence/transplanted <br> Plot size $(1 \mathrm{~m} \times 2 \mathrm{~m})$ | Seedlings <br> mortality | Yield/plot <br> $(\mathrm{Kg})$ | Remarks |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Knolkhol | 35 | -- | 6.0 |  |
| Sugerbit | 35 | -- | 5.5 |  |
| Tomato | 15 | - | 1.7 |  |
| Chili | 30 | 30 | -- | Died |
| Mungbean | 225 | 225 | -- | Died |


| Blackgram | 508 | 508 | -- | Died |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

## Intercropping Turmeric (Sinduri) with different vegetables

The experiment was conducted at Daulatpur, Khulna during 1999-2000 from April to February to study the compatibility of different quick growing vegetables as intercropped with turmeric. The highest turmeric equivalent yield and net benefit were obtained from turmeric + Gimakalmi. Gimakalmi also gave the highest vegetable production under intercropped condition (Table 30 and 31).

Table 30. Effect of intercropping with different vegetables

| Treatments | Yield of turmeric $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |  | Yield of vegetables t/ha |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 2000 | 1999 | 2000 | 1999 |
| Turmeric sole (Sinduri) | 28.35 | 30.37 | -- | -- |
| Turmeric + Lalshak (L) | 26.08 | 28.12 | 5.33 | 4.81 |
| Turmeric + Danta (L) | 25.99 | 26.95 | 6.80 | 6.35 |
| Turmeric + Gheekanchan (L) | 25.42 | 27.78 | 3.25 | 4.99 |
| Turmeric + Gimakalmi (L) | 24.75 | 26.75 | 9.70 | 9.00 |

Table 31. Turmeric equivalent yield, cost and return of intercropping turmeric with vegetables

| Treatments | Turmeric <br> equivalent <br> yield (t/ha) | Gross <br> benefit <br> (Tk/ha) | Total variable <br> cost (Tk/ha) | Net benefit <br> (Tk/ha) | BCR |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 28.35 | 141750 | 27000 | 114750 | 5.25 | 5.70 |
| Turmeric sole | 31.41 | 157050 | 27400 | 129650 | 5.73 | 6.07 |
| Turmeric + Lalshak | 31.43 | 157150 | 27400 | 129750 | 5.73 | 5.90 |
| Turmeric + Danta | 29.32 | 146600 | 27400 | 119220 | 5.35 | 5.23 |
| Turmeric+ Gheekanchan | 34.54 | 172250 | 27700 | 145250 | 6.25 | 6.52 |
| Turmeric + Gimakalmi |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Price (Tk./ha): Turmeric (Fresh)=5, Lalshak=5, Danta=4, Gheekanchan=6, Gimakalmi= 5

## Comparative performance of different flowers as a commercial crop

The experiment was conducted at Agricultural Research Station, Pabna during rabi season of 2000-01 to test the feasibility of growing flowers as commercial crops and to select the suitable species and cultivar. Among the tested flowers and cultivar local variety of marigold gave the highest gross margin and benefit cost ratio (Table 1).

Table 32. Performance of flower species as commercial crop at ARS, Pabna during 2000-01

| Species <br> \&varieties | Flower <br> harvested <br> (\#/ha) | Gross <br> return <br> (Tk./ha) | Cost of <br> cultivation <br> (Tk./ha) | Gross <br> margin <br> (Tk/ha) | BCR <br> (Tk.// <br> Tk) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| Species <br> \&varieties Flower <br> harvested <br> (\#/ha) Gross <br> return <br> (Tk./ha) Cost of <br> cultivation <br> (Tk./ha) Gross <br> margin <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ BCR <br> (Tk./ <br> $\mathrm{Tk})$ |
| :--- |
| ii) Double <br> Rose <br> i) Hybrid Red <br> ii) Hybrid pink |

Effect of irrigation on the growth and yield performance of different Chickpea varieties in the High Barind Tract

The field experiment was carried out at FSRD site, Chabbishnagar, Barind during 1998-2001 to know the effect of irrigation on the growth and yield of chickpea. Four irrigation treatments were included in the study viz. $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ No irrigation, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Irrigation at 20 days after germination, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Irrigation at 40 days after germination, $\mathrm{T}_{4}=$ Irrigation at 20 and 40 days after germination. Results revealed that BARI Chola-5 along with one irrigation at 20 days after germination gave the highest yield (Table 33).

Table 33. Combined effects of varieties and Irrigation on the yield and yield attributes of Chickpea at FSRD site, Chabbishnagar during 2000-01 and yield of 1999-2000
$\left.\begin{array}{lc|c|c|c|c|c|ccc}\hline \text { Treatment } & \text { Population/m } & \begin{array}{c}100 \text { grain } \\ \text { wt.(g) }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Seed/ } \\ \text { pod }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Pod/ } \\ \text { plant }\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Grain yield } \\ (\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}) \\ 2000-01\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Straw yield } \\ (\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}) \\ 2000-01\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Grain yield } \\ (\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})\end{array} \\ 1999-2000\end{array}\right]$
$\mathrm{V}_{1}=$ BARI Chola $-3, \quad \mathrm{~V}_{2}=$ BARI Chola -5

## Evaluation of chickpea variety for intercropping with Mustard (Tori-7)

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Chabbisnagar, Barind during 2000-01 to find out the suitable intercropping combination of chickpea and mustard (cv. Tori-7). There were seven treatments namely, $\mathrm{T}_{1}=2$ rows of chickpea (cv. BARI Chola-2) alternate with 2 rows of mustard ( 50 cm ), $\mathrm{T}_{2}=4$ rows of chickpea cv . BARI chola 2) alternate with 2 rows of mustard ( $67 \mathrm{c}: 33 \mathrm{~m}$ ) $\mathrm{T}_{3}=2$ rows of chickpea (cv. BARI chola-5) alternate with 2 rows of mustard ( $50 \mathrm{c}: 50 \mathrm{~m}$ ), $\mathrm{T}_{4}=4$ rows of chickpea (cv. BARI chola 5) alternate with 2 rows of mustard ( $67 \mathrm{c}: 33 \mathrm{~m}$ ) $\mathrm{T}_{5}=$ Sole mustard (cv. Tori-7), $\mathrm{T}_{6}=$ Sole chickpea (cv. BARI chola-2), $\mathrm{T}_{7}=$ Sole chickpea (cv. BARI chola-5). Results showed that highest chickpea equivalent yield was obtained from treatment $T_{3}$, (2 rows of BARI chola 5 alternate with 2 rows of mustard) same treatment also gave the maximum gross return (Table 34).

Table 34. Equivalent yields, LER values and cost and return analysis of chickpea and mustard intercropping

| Treatments | Yield (t/ha) |  | Chickpea <br> equivalent <br> yield ( $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})$ | LER | Gross <br> returns <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | TVC <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | NR <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha)})$ | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0.94 | 0.15 | 1.07 | 1.00 | 21400 | 6110 | 15290 | 3.50 |


| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 1.06 | 0.14 | 1.18 | 1.07 | 23600 | 6270 | 17230 | 3.76 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 1.30 | 0.19 | 1.46 | 1.31 | 29200 | 6110 | 23090 | 4.77 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 1.27 | 0.160 | 1.40 | 1.20 | 28000 | 6270 | 21730 | 4.47 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | - | 0.47 | 0.40 | 1.0 | 7990 | 5680 | 2310 | 1.40 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{6}$ | 1.38 | - | 1.38 | 1.0 | 27600 | 6550 | 21050 | 4.21 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{7}$ | 1.43 | - | 1.43 | 1.0 | 28600 | 6550 | 22050 | 4.37 |

Root traits potentiality of different crops under rainfed conditions in the High Barind Tract
The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Chabbishnagar, Barind during rabi season of 2000-01 to quantify the root traits of different crops and thereby to select suitable alternative crops of chickpea for the High Barind Tract. Six crops were included in the study namely, Chickpea (cv. BARI chola-2), Wheat (cv. Kanchan), Brassica (cv. Dhali), Barely (cv. Local), Linseed (cv. Lina) and Lentil (cv. L-5). Results revealed that roots were found down to $90-105 \mathrm{~cm}$ depth for barley, Barssica and chickpea. Barely possessed the highest root length density (RLD) followed by chickpea and Brassica (Figure 2). Barley plants had the smallest root diameter while Brassica had the thickest coarse root. Barley and Brassica could be the possible alternatives of chickpea in terms of root systems and yield (Table 35).


Figure 2. Root length density (RLD) of different crops in the High Barind Tract, 2001

Table 35. Grain and hay yields of different crops in the High Barind Tract during 2000-01

| Crops |  | Grain yield (kg/ha) | Hay yield (kg/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chickpea (Barichola 2) |  | 1367 |  | 2133 |
| Wheat (Kanchan) | 850 |  | 1900 |  |
| Brassica (Dhali) |  | 934 |  | 3433 |
| Barley (Local) |  | 2000 |  | 3834 |
| Linseed (Nila) |  | 567 |  | 1800 |
| Lentil* (L-5) |  | 0 |  | 0 |

* All the lentil plants died at flowering to pod-setting stage


## Influence of rhizobium inoculation, soil moisture and applied phosphorus on biological nitrogen fixation and grain yield of Chickpea

The experiment was carried out at FSRD site, Chabbishnagar, Barind during 2000-01 to investigate the effect of inoculation, soil moisture and phosphorus fertilizer on the yield of chickpea. There were five treatments such as : $T_{1}=R 1$ (Rhiziboum inoculation) +lo (No irrigation) + Po (Phosphorus zero), $\mathrm{T}_{2}=\mathrm{RI}+\mathrm{I} 1$ (30-45 DAS) + Po, $T_{3}=$ R1+l1(30-45 DAT) + P20, $T_{4}=$ R1+lo+P20, $T_{5}=$ R1 (No inoculation) +11 (30-45 DAS)+P20. Chickpea cultivar was BARI Chola-2 and rhizobium source was BINA. Results showed that Rhizobium inoculation along with phosphorus fertilizer application at the rate of $20 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{ha}$ and one irrigation at vegetative stage of the crop apparently gave the highest grain yield (Table 36).

Table 36. Yield and yield attributes of chickpea as affected by different combinations of inoculant, phosphorus fertilizer and irrigation at High Barind Tract


Means followed by a common letter or no letter in a column are not significantly different at the $5 \%$ level by DMRT.

## Effect of time of sowing and harvesting on the yield and marketing of Radish (Tasakisan) at

 NarsinghdiThe experiment was conducted at MLT site, Shibpur, Narshingdhi during rabi seasons at 1999-2001 to find out appropriate time of sowing and harvest to obtain the highest market price. After two years of experimentation it was observed that sowing at October 30 and harvest at 50-60 days after sowing contributed to the highest economic return (Table 37 and 38).

Table 37. Effect of sowing dates on the yield and yield attributes of radish at MLT site, Narsinghdi during rabi 1999-2000 and rabi 2000-01

| Sowing date | Individual root weight (g) |  |  | Root yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1999-00$ | $2000-01$ | Mean | $1999-00$ | $2000-01$ | Mean |
| 30 October | 396.6 | 275.0 | 335.8 | 54.76 | 41.24 | 48.0 |
| 10 November | 341.7 | 238.0 | 289.9 | 46.90 | 36.04 | 41.47 |
| 20 November | 236.1 | 154.9 | 195.5 | 34.97 | 23.18 | 33.58 |


| LSD (.05) | 38.1 | 36.5 | 6.16 | 6.75 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CV (\%) | 6.6 | 6.6 | 7.6 | 8.1 |

Table 38. Effect of time of harvest on the yield and yield attributes of radish at MLT site, Narsinghdi during rabi 1999-2000 and rabi 2000-01

| Time of harvest | Individual root weight (g) |  |  | Root yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1999-00$ | $2000-01$ | Mean | $1999-00$ | $2000-01$ | Mean |
| 40 DAS | 146.9 | 124.4 | 135.7 | 20.19 | 18.92 | 19.56 |
| 50 DAS | 368.2 | 173.8 | 271.0 | 51.86 | 25.99 | 38.93 |
| 60 DAS | 459.2 | 369.7 | 414.5 | 64.58 | 55.54 | 60.06 |
| LSD (.05) | 38.1 | 36.5 | 6.16 | 6.75 |  |  |
| CV (\%) | 6.6 | 6.6 | 7.6 | 8.1 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Effects of spacing and time of twig planting on seed yield of Kangkong

The experiment was conducted at ARS, Rangpur during 1999-2001 to determine the optimum spacing and time of twig transplantation for maximum seed yield of Kangkong. Results showed that the highest seed yield was obtained from September 01 planting along with $30 \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$ planting spacing in 2000-01, but in previous year highest yield was found in August 16 planting (Table 39 and 40).

Table 39. Seed yield and yield attributes of Kangkong (cv. Gimakalmi) as influenced by spacing and time of twig plantation at ARS, Rangpur during 1999-2001

| Planting date/ planting spacing | Days of $50 \%$ flowering | No. of primary branch/ plant | Length of primary branch (cm) | No. of pods/ plant | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. of } \\ \text { seeds/ pod } \end{gathered}$ | 1000 seed wt. <br> (g) | Yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Seed |  | Bio mass |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1999-00 | 2000-01 |  |
| Planting Date |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| July 16 | 74 | 7.8 | 61.1 | 72 | 3.7 | 39.0 | 1.61 | 0.94 | 3.77 |
| August 01 | 64 | 6.2 | 48.1 | 68 | 3.8 | 39.0 | 1.58 | 1.12 | 3.02 |
| August 16 | 55 | 5.0 | 54.5 | 74 | 3.9 | 39.6 | 2.00 | 1.20 | 1.94 |
| Sept. 01 | 46 | 4.3 | 61.2 | 83 | 3.7 | 38.4 | 1.62 | 1.46 | 1.59 |
| Sept. 16 | 36 | 4.4 | 43.5 | 58 | 3.7 | 35.5 | 1.15 | 0.53 | 0.99 |
| LSD (0.05) | 0.92 | 0.32 | 2.55 | 1.86 | ns | 1.07 | - | 0.04 | 0.37 |
| CV (\%) | 2.4 | 8.5 | 6.9 | 4.6 | 6.4 | 4.1 | 9.6 | 6.4 | 23.7 |
| Planting spacing |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 54.8 | 5.5 | 56.3 | 74 | 3.7 | 38.4 | 1.50 | 1.12 | 2.33 |
| $30 \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 55.6 | 5.8 | 53.6 | 83 | 3.7 | 38.7 | 1.40 | 1.12 | 2.05 |
| $30 \times 10 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 55.3 | 5.2 | 53.0 | 62 | 3.8 | 38.9 | 1.49 | 0.92 | 2.32 |
| $25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 55.3 | 5.4 | 50.3 | 62 | 3.8 | 38.1 | 1.45 | 0.96 | 2.41 |
| $35 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 54.9 | 5.7 | 55.2 | 74 | 3.7 | 37.6 | 1.47 | 1.13 | 2.19 |
| LSD | ns | 0.45 | 1.80 | 1.73 | ns | ns | - | 0.05 | 0.21 |
| CV (\%) | 1.9 | 12.8 | 5.3 | 4.6 | 6.2 | 4.5 | 13.9 | 9.9 | 14.7 |

Table 40. Interaction effects of spacing and planting dates on the seed yield (t/ha) of Kangkong (cv. Gimakalmi)

| Spacing | Planting dates |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Jul 16 | Aug 01 | Aug 16 | Sep 01 | Sep 16 |
| $30 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 1.00 | 1.15 | 1.20 | 1.60 | 0.62 |
| $30 \times 20 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 0.95 | 1.16 | 1.27 | 1.67 | 0.53 |
| $30 \times 10 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 0.82 | 1.03 | 1.09 | 1.31 | 0.40 |
| $25 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 0.84 | 1.00 | 1.09 | 1.30 | 0.55 |
| $35 \times 15 \mathrm{~cm}$ | 1.09 | 1.21 | 1.34 | 1.48 | 0.52 |

CV (\%) = 9.9
LSD (0.05): 2 means of planting date $(P)$ at each Spacing $(S)=0.12,2-S$ mean a each $P=0.12, P \times S=0.423$

## Effect of sowing time on leaf miner infestation in String bean

The experiment was carried out at ARS, Rangpur for consecutive two years (1999 and 2000) to show the effects of sowing time on the leaf miner infestation in Stringbean. Leaf miner infestation (\%) increased with the increase in plant age irrespective of sowing time. Highest pod yield was obtained from February 01 planting in both the years (Table 41).

Table 41. Yield and yield attributes of stringbean as influenced by leaf miner infestation under different sowing times at ARS, Rangpur during 1999-2001

| Sowing date | Plant <br> pop. $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Pods/ <br> plant | Pod length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Pod yield (t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 5.4 b | 39.5 a | 54.8 c | $2000-01$ | $1999-2000$ |
| Feb 01 | 2.1 h | 24.0 c | 59.3 a | 6.49 e | 16.01 a |
| Feb 16 | 4.3 cd | 31.3 b | 60.0 a | 12.16 c | 13.32 ab |
| March 01 | 5.2 b | 31.0 b | 59.3 a | 19.88 b | 15.72 a |
| March 16 | 4.6 c | 16.0 d | 58.5 ab | 11.34 c | 9.34 cde |
| April 01 | 3.9 de | 11.5 ef | 55.8 bc | 10.54 d | 11.88 bc |
| April 16 | 5.7 a | 11.3 ef | 52.8 cd | 6.34 e | - |
| May 01 | 1.1 i | 4.8 h | 49.8 d | 2.88 f | 10.96 bcd |
| May 16 | 3.6 ef | 15.0 d | 45.5 e | 7.52 e | 3.33 g |
| June 01 | 2.9 g | 13.3 de | 38.8 f | 7.27 e | 6.45 efg |
| July 01 | 3.2 fg | 13.5 de | 35.8 f | 8.05 de | - |
| August 01 | 3.7 ef | 8.8 fg | 28.3 g | 3.48 f | - |
| August 16 | 3.4 f | 6.0 gh | 24.0 h | 1.77 f | - |
| Sept. 01 | 4.4 c | 3.5 h | 23.3 h | 0.89 f | - |
| Sept. 16 | 8.5 | 13.5 | 4.6 | 18.8 | $* *$ |

## Performance of summer vegetables on the trellis followed by bottle gourd

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Syedpur and MLT site, Polashbari, Lalmonirhat and Nilphamari during 1999-2000 to know the economic use of BARI Lau-1 trailee by growing different summer vegetables in the same trailee. Results revealed that BARI Lau-1 produced 75 and 94 number of fruits per decimal at the FSRD site and MLT site respectively. Among the summer vegetables ash gourd gave the highest yield of 117 kg and 174 kg per decimal respectively at FSRD site and MLT sites. The vegetable sequence of BARI Lau-1 and ash gourd gave highest gross return and benefit cost ratio (Table 42). The production system ensured continuous vegetable supply to farm families for certain period of time.

Table 42. Cost and return analysis of vegetable production from BARI Lau-1 and different summer vegetables on the same trellis during 1999-2000

| Vegetable sequence |  | Gross return <br> (Tk/dec.) | TVC <br> (Tk/dec.) | Gross margin <br> (Tk/dec.) | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Winter | Summer | 967 | 207 | 760 | 4.67 |
| Bottle gourd | Bitter gourd(L) | 957 | 206 | 751 | 4.64 |
| Bottle gourd | Snake gourd(L) | 991 | 203 | 788 | 4.88 |
| Bottle gourd | Ribbed gourd(L) | 1332 | 204 | 1128 | 6.53 |
| Bottle gourd | Ash gourd (L) |  |  |  |  |

## Effect of planting time on the performance of Bushbean at level Barind soil (AEZ 25)

The experiment was conducted at ARS, Bogra during 2000-01 to find out the optimum planting time for BARI Bushbean-1. The highest marketable (vegetable) pod yield was obtained from Nov. 16 sowing (Table 43). Yield of Bushbean reduced drastically from December 8 sowing.

Table 43. Performance of Bushbean cv. BARI Jharseem-1 at different sowing dates at level Barind soil of ARS, BARI, Bogra during rabi 2000-01

| Treatments <br> Sowing dates | Plant height at <br> last harvest <br> (cm) | No. of <br> pods/plant <br> (no.) | Wt. of <br> pods/plant (gm) | Pod size <br> length (cm) | Marketable yield <br> (fresh): (t/ha) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{D}_{1}=$ Nov.16,2000 | 41.7 a | 28.0 a | 0.26 a | 16.0 a | 20.12 a |
| $\mathrm{D}_{2}=$ Nov.22,2000 | 42.3 a | 27.0 a | 0.20 b | 14.3 ab | 17.11 b |
| $\mathrm{D}_{3}=$ Dec.1,2000 | 35.0 ab | 25.6 a | 0.19 b | 14.3 ab | 16.90 b |
| $\mathrm{D}_{4}=$ Dec.8,2000 | 30.3 a | 16.0 b | 0.11 cd | 12.6 bc | 8.63 c |
| $\mathrm{D}_{5}=$ Dec,15,2000 | 31.7 b | 16.6 b | 0.13 c | 13.3 bc | 9.17 c |
| $\mathrm{D}_{6}=$ Dec,22,2000 | 32.3 b | 16.0 b | 0.12 c | 13.0 bc | 8.78 c |
| $\mathrm{D}_{7}=$ Jan.1,2001 | 31.7 b | 14.3 b | 0.06 d | 12.6 bc | 5.74 d |
| $\mathrm{D}_{8}=$ Jan.8,2001 | 32.0 b | 14.6 b | 0.06 d | 12.3 c | 5.54 d |
| F-test | $* *$ | $* *$ | $* *$ | $* *$ | $* *$ |
| CV (\%) | 8.84 | 10.64 | 13.93 | 13.58 | 7.79 |

Similar letter in a column do not differ significantly

## Seed priming of BARI Mung-5

The study was conducted at FSRD site Lebukhali, Patuakhali during 1998 to 2001 to overcome the low seed germination of BARI Mung-5. Five seed priming treatments were included in the study namely $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Pre-sowing water soaking for 2 hours, $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ Presowing water soaking for 4 hours, $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Pre-sowing water soaking for 6 hours, $\mathrm{T}_{4}=$ Presowing water soaking for 8 hours, $\mathrm{T}_{5}=$ No seed soaking. Results revealed that seed priming for 2-8 hours incresed seed germination significantly in comparison to nonprimed seed. Seed priming for 4 hours gave the highest seed yield but it was at par with 2 and 6 hours seed priming, while nonprimed treatment gave the lowest yield (Table 44)

Table 44. Yield and yield attributes of BARI Mung-5 as affected by seed priming

| Treatment | Plant pop. $/ \mathrm{m}^{2}$ | Plant height <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Pod/ <br> plant | Seed/pod | 1000 seed <br> $\mathrm{wt}.(\mathrm{~g})$ | Seed yield <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 36.50 | 39.50 | 14.2 | 8.50 | 37.75 | 1657 c |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 37.70 | 40.00 | 14.75 | 8.77 | 38.50 | 1787 a |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 36.50 | 39.50 | 14.47 | 8.60 | 38.00 | 1720 b |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 37.62 | 39.50 | 13.25 | 8.67 | 37.20 | 1600 c |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 33.03 | 40.25 | 11.1 | 8.47 | 37.50 | 1140d |
| LSD (0.05) | 1.75 | - | 1.16 | - | - | 59.75 |
| CV (\%) | 3.2 | 3.9 | 5.5 | 4.1 | 1.4 | 2.5 |

Screening of different rabi crops in saline area
The experiment was conducted at MLT site Kalapara, Patuakhali during 1999-2001 to find out the suitable saline tolerant crops. The salinity range of the area was $6-14 \mathrm{ds} / \mathrm{m}$ during the dry period. Nine crops were tested viz. Chilli, Cowpea, Mungbean, sesame, sunflower, linseed Field pea, safflower, Bushbean. Among the tested crops first five crops were possible to grew. The highest yield was given by cowpea but from economic point of view chilli, mungbean and sun flower were found viable (Table 45 and 46).

Table 45. Yield and yield contributing characters of different rabi crops at Kalapara during rabi 200001

| Crops | Variety | Plant pop./m² <br> (final) | Plant <br> herght <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Capsule/pod/ <br> plant (diameter of <br> head) | Seed/ pod <br> wt. of <br> head | 1000 seed <br> $\mathrm{wt}.(\mathrm{~g})$ | Yield <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chilli | Local | 20 | 46 | 12 |  | 230 | 620 |
| Cowpea | Local | 21 | 53 | 8 | 13 | 131 | 1232 |
| Mungbean | Kanti | 31 | 38 | 5 | 8 | 35 | 442 |
| Sesame | T-6 | 30 | 85 | 38 | 50 | 2 | 1070 |
| Sunflower | Kironi | 6.33 | 111 | 9 | 30 | 56 | 1023 |
| Linseed | Nila | 124.4 | 37 | 11 | 8 | 4.25 | 741 |

Table 46. Cost and return of different rabi crops at Kalapara during Rabi 1999-01

| Crops | Yield <br> (kg/ha) | Gross return <br> (Tk./ha) | Variable cost <br> (Tk./ha) | Gross margin <br> (Tk./ha) | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cowpea | 1232 | 16016 | 10467 | 5555 | 1.53 |
| Chilli | 620 | 39000 | 23150 | 1650 | 1.68 |
| Mungbean | 442 | 24800 | 8629 | 1537 | 1.17 |
| Sesame | 1070 | 20460 | 12820 | 1400 | 1.10 |
| Sunflower | 1023 | 20460 | 17550 | 2910 | 1.16 |

## Profitable rabi crops screening for fallow land after T.Aman rice harvest

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Lebukhali, Patuakhali during rabi season of 2000-01 to identify crops which could be grown profitably after T.aman harvest. All the crops were sown/planted between January 11 to 25 . From the results it was found that potato, onion, chickpea and sweet potato were suitable for catena-I (Medium high land). While for catena-II (medium low land) onion, mungbean, chilli, and ground nut were suitable (Table 47 and 48).

Table 47. Yield and economic performance of different crops grown under medium high land (catena-
1)

| Crops | Yield (kg/ha) | Gross return | Variable cost | Gross margin | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potato (Diamont) | 20000 | 100000 | 42800 | 66200 | 2.5 |
| Sweet potato (Diamont) | 28000 | 84000 | 29000 | 55000 | 2.89 |
| Chickpea (L) | 1340 | 29480 | 5950 | 27550 | 4.95 |
| Onion (L) | 8710 | 87100 | 17600 | 69500 | 4.94 |
| G.nut (GR-2) | 1920 | 28800 | 23425 | 5375 | 1.22 |
| Sunflower(Kironi) | 3087 | 61740 | 18550 | 43190 | 3.3 |
| Chilli (L) | 924 | 36960 | 17500 | 12260 | 1.5 |
| Mungbean (Kanti) | 1422 | 35550 | 15225 | 20325 | 2.33 |

Table 48. Yield and economic performance of different crops grown under medium high land (catena2)

| Crops | Yield kg/ha | Gross return | Variable cost | Gross margin | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Chickpea | 860 | 19780 | 5950 | 13830 | 3.32 |
| Onion | 8388 | 83880 | 17600 | 66280 | 3.76 |
| G.nut | 1400 | 21000 | 23425 | - |  |
| Sunflower | 2300 | 46000 | 18550 | 27450 | 2.5 |
| Chilli | 960 | 38400 | 24700 | 13700 | 1.55 |


| Mungbean | 1260 | 31500 | 15225 | 16275 | 2.06 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cowpea | 630 | 12600 | 20950 | - |  |

Output (Tk./kg): Mungbean=25.00, Potato=5.00, Chickpea=23.00, Onion=10.00, G.nut $=15.00$, Sunflower=20.00, Cowpea= 20.00, Sweet potato $=3.00$, Chilli $=40.00$

## Integrated Farming

Unlike western farmers, a typical small and marginal farmer of Bangladesh obtains his livelihood by applying available technologies and inputs on his farm resources. He has a parcel of land to grow crops and vegetables, a homestead to reside and to use as the center of many activities, a pond/ditch for pisiculture and domestic uses, a variety of different farm implements and livestock to use in farm operations. The farmers manage all his available resources and integrate these in such a way that he can derive the best benefit out of this. But natural risk and hazard as well as other socio-economic factors also influence his production systems. Under such situation if the farmer is efficient to integrate his resources he can enjoy a progressive development.

The main objective of farming system research and development is to improve farming condition and livelihood by integrating available technologies to farm resources. The research system has developed a number of technologies but all are not used by the farmers for varied reasons. It is expected that if the technologies suitable for the resource base of a farmer is identified and applied in an integrated approach, a positive impact on the farm economy is likely to be obtained. But such a well-contented and widely conceived work procedure is lacking for study of an integrated approach to Farming System Research and Development. The present study aims at developing some action module for integrating technologies to farm resources in one hand and improving farm productivity and profitability on the other.

## Broad objective

- Improvement of productivity and profitability of farm resources sustainably by generating and applying effective technologies in an environment friendly approach.


## Specific objective

- To identify resources base of a farm
- To identify specific technologies that can maximize farm productivity and profitability
- To intervene the resources base of the farmer with the technologies
- To generate resources within the household production system
- To compare sectoral contribution to the farm productivity and profitability
- To identify scope of further improvement in the production system and household management

As stated earlier that a well contented and widely conceived work produce is lacking for such a study. The present procedure as used by the FSRD group in BARI is also a methodological research. It will offer scope for improvement and envisaged developing some modules for Integrated Approach to Farming System Research and Development at the end. However, the present procedure as laid down is as follows :

Step I- Accounting of pre-intervention status: Case studies were conducted on the selected farmers to assess their resources, assets and liabilities, potential for improvement, technology practiced, level of input use and output obtained, income and expenditure status, labour availability of the farm, etc

Step II- Selection of technologies for intervention: The scope for improvement identified in the case studies were discussed with the individual cooperator farmer. On the basis of the discussion the site team considered several alternatives of technologies to each of the resources available to the farm for intervention.

Step III- Motivation and final selection of technologies: In this step some motivational tools were used (like demonstration of results of candidate technologies) so that farmers could evaluate the costs, benefits, marketing and risk of the technologies. Finally numbers of options for technological interventions were formulated in participation with the farmers.

Step IV- Implementation of intervention: Before implementation of the intervention the cooperator farmers were trained on the production packages of the technologies. The technologies were then applied on the farm resources. Performances of the technologies were continuously monitored, relevant data and farmer reactions were recorded.

Step V- Data analysis and reporting: Data collected were edited, summarized and presented in tabular form for reporting.
Name of FSRD site $:$ Ishan Gopalpur, Faridpur
Number of farmer $: 2$ (two)
Farm category : Small1, Marginal 1.

At the FSRD site, Ishan Gopalpur, Faridpur two farmers, one small and one marginal were included in the study. The small farmer used 13 technologies before the intervention. In this study his resource base was intervened with 34 technologies in 1999-2000 and 37 technologies in 2000-01. Similarly the marginal farmer uses 8 technologies on his farm. His resource base was applied 24 technologies in 1999-2000 and 31 technologies in 2000-01 (Table 1). Before the intervention the farmer obtained a gross margin of Tk. 29224/-. The gross margin increased up to Tk. 56714/- after intervention with the technologies. For this benefit he had to increase his total variable cost from Tk. 29360/- to 41929/-. Similarly the marginal farmer was using 8 technologies on his farm. In the intervention process he used 31 technologies in 2000-01. Use of these technologies could improve the gross margin from Tk. 11693/- to Tk. 28872/-. For this purpose he had to increase his total variable cost from Tk. 6695/- to Tk. 21370/- (Table 2).

The relative sectoral contribution in terms of gross margin for the farmers production system in descending order was crop>livestock>homestead>fisheries. Marginal benefit cost ratio (MBCR) for both the farmers was the highest for homestead system. The individual contribution of technologies applied on resources of farmer-1 and 2 is shown in Table 3. The summary of income and expenditure statement of both the farmers are shown in Table 4. The impact of technologies also showed in Table 5.

Table 1. Number of technologies used at Ishan Gopalpur, Faridpur during 1998-1999, 1999-2000 and 2000-01

| Sector | Farmer1 |  |  | Farmer 2 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before intervention (1998-1999) | After intervention |  | Before intervention (1998-1999) | After intervention |  |
|  |  | 1999-00 | 2000-01 |  | 1999-00 | 2000-01 |
| Crop | 7 | 10 | 10 | 4 | 5 |  |
| Homestead | 5 | 20 | 22 | 17 | 21 | 3 |
| Livestock | -- | 3 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 5 |
| Fisheries | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | - |
| Total | 13 | 34 | 37 | 24 | 31 | 8 |

Table 2. Cost and benefit of integrated farmers at FSRD site, Ishan Gopalpur, Faridpur during 19981999, 1999-2000 and 2000-2001

| Sector | Before intervention(98-99) |  | After intervention |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | GM (Tk.) | TVC (Tk.) |  | GM (Tk.) |  | MBCR |  |
|  |  |  | 1999-00 | 2000-01 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 |
| Farmer-1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 22311 | 16789 | 35138 | 34445 | 35442 | 36842 | 2.45 | 2.65 |
| Homestead | 239 | 2421 | 869 | 934 | 6180 | 6602 | 6.96 | 7.02 |
| Livestock | 6200 | 9400 | 5480 | 5500 | 10650 | 10895 | -- | -- |
| Fisheries | 610 | 615 | 970 | 1050 | 1660 | 2375 | 3.90 | 5.00 |
| Total | 29360 | 29225 | 42457 | 41929 | 53932 | 56714 | 2.86 | 3.19 |
| Farmer 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 6505 | 8258 | 10480 | 11055 | 11530 | 14540 | 1.82 | 2.38 |
| Homestead | 190 | 1845 | 695 | 735 | 5632 | 6092 | 8.49 | 8.79 |
| Livestock | -- | 1590 | 3200 | 9230 | 3700 | 7590 | 1.66 | 1.65 |
| Fisheries | -- | -- | 480 | 350 | 970 | 650 | 3.02 | 2.86 |
| Total | 6695 | 11693 | 14855 | 21370 | 21832 | 28872 | 2.18 | 2.17 |

Table 3. Technologies used and return obtained from different sub system of integrated farmer at FSRD site, Ishan Gopalpur during 1998-99, 1999-2000 and 2000-01

Farmer-1

## A. Crop land

| Resource | Area | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (2000-2001) |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pattern used | Yield <br> (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TVC } \\ & \text { (Tk.) } \end{aligned}$ | Pattern used | Yield <br> (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TVC } \\ & \text { (Tk.) } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99-00 | 00-01 |
| MHL-1 | 30 d | $\begin{aligned} & \text { B. Aus (L) - } \\ & \text { Lentil (L) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 200 \\ & 105 \end{aligned}$ | 2700 | 1400 | Jute (0-9897) -Chickpea-5 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 230 \\ & 180 \end{aligned}$ | 3955 | 2455 | 3.00 | 2.19 |
| MHL-2 | 30 d | T. Aman (BR-11) Sweet gourd (L) | $\begin{aligned} & 360 \\ & 750 \end{aligned}$ | 1765 | 3710 | Jute (0-9897) - <br> T. Aman (BR-32) - <br> Wheat RF | 250 470 350 | 4560 | 4940 | 4.44 | 1.78 |
| MHL-3 | 60d* | Jute (L) - | 320 | 4615 | 9335 | Jute (0-9897) - | 480 | 8320 | 10300 | 4.58 | 4.84 |
|  |  | T. Aman (BR-11) - | 680 |  |  | T. Aman (BR-32) - | 870 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Wheat FP | 700 |  |  | Wheat RF | 700 |  |  |  |  |
| MHL-4 | 30 d | Jute (L) | 180 | 1990 | 2675 | Dherosh (BARI-1) - | 1000 | 4950 | 4900 | 2.57 | 2.33 |
|  |  | -- | -- |  |  | T.Aman (BR-32) - | 460 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Wheat (Kanchan) | 320 |  |  | Mustard ( BARI- 8) | 170 |  |  |  |  |
| MHL-5 |  | B. Aus (L) | 140 | 1065 |  | Jute (0-9897) - | 160 | 5990 |  |  |  |
|  | 20 d | -- | -- |  | 1675 | T. Aman (BR-32) - | 310 |  | 4250 | 1.85 | 2.91 |
|  |  | Wheat FP | 240 |  |  | Radish (BARI-1) | 4100 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Jute (L) | 170 |  |  | Jute (0-9897) - | 255 |  |  |  |  |
| MHL-6 | 30 d | -- | -- | 2570 | 1530 | Lentil 20 d - | 100 | 4640 | 2700 | 1.31 | 2.77 |
|  |  | Lentil (L) | 80 |  |  | Tomato (BARI-1) 10 d | 400 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | B. Aus (L) | $220+$ |  |  | B. Aus | 220 |  | 4900 |  |  |
| MHL-7 | 35 d | + B. Aman (L) - | 150 | 2084 | 1986 | B. Aman - | $200$ | 4427 |  | 1.86 | 1.80 |
|  |  | Kheshari (L) | 225 |  |  | Boro (Brridhan-29) | 865 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 235d | -- | -- | 16789 | 22311 | -- | -- | 36842 | 34445 | 2.45 | 2.65 |

*Rented in GM = Gross Margin, TVC = Total Variable Cost, L = Local, d= decimal, FP= Farmers practice, RF = Recommended fertilizer), MBCR = Marginal benefit cost ratio

## B. Homestead

| Resource | No. | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (2000-2001) |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Practice used | Yield $(\mathrm{kg})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TVC } \\ & \text { (Tk.) } \end{aligned}$ | Practice used | Yield (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TVC } \\ & \text { (Tk.) } \end{aligned}$ | 99-00 | 00-01 |
|  | 16 d | No cultivation | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Roof | 2 d | White gourd | 16 N | 60 | 20 | Sweet gourd + <br> White gourd | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \mathrm{~N} \\ & 25 \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | 340 | 60 | 7.14 | 8.00 |
| Traili | 1 d | Bottle gourd - <br> Sweet gourd | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \mathrm{~N} \\ & 10 \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ |  |  | Snake gourd Jhinga - | $\begin{aligned} & 15 \\ & 18 \end{aligned}$ | 229 | 170 | 4.00 | 1.60 |
|  |  |  |  | 101 | 219 | Shasha - <br> Korola - <br> Indian spinach | $\begin{gathered} 17 \mathrm{~N} \\ 10 \\ 20 \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| Open field | 5 d | No cultivation | -- | -- | -- | Homestead model | 80 | 350 | 100 | 3.12 | 4.50 |
| Partial shade | 2 d | No cultivation | -- |  |  | Turmeric (T-063) - | 15 | 318 | 74 |  | 5.30 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Zinger - | 1 |  |  | 5.12 |  |
|  |  |  |  | -- | -- | Mankachu - | 8 N |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Moulovikachu - | 3 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Elephant foot | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Waste land | 1 d | No cultivation | -- | -- | -- | Panikachu (Latiraj) | 20 | 80 | 20 | 4.50 | 5.00 |
| Pond | 1 d | No cultivation | -- | -- | -- | White gourd - | 20 N | 255 | 90 | 3.35 | 3.83 |
| Bank trail |  |  |  | -- | -- | Bottle gourd | 45 N |  |  |  |  |
| On support | 1 d | Not used | -- | -- | -- | BARI Shim-1 - | 30 | 195 | 40 | 18.00 | 5.88 |
|  |  |  |  | -- | -- | Potato yam | 10 |  |  |  |  |
| Sub Total | 29 d | -- | -- | 161 | 239 | -- | -- | 1767 | 554 | 4.55 | 6.10 |

C. Homestead trees

| Resource | Number of plant | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (1999-2000) |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Practice used | Yield (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | TVC <br> (Tk.) | Practice used | Yield (kg) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GM } \\ & \text { (Tk.) } \end{aligned}$ | TVC <br> (Tk.) | 99-00 | 00-01 |
| Coconut | 6 | Traditional | 200 N | 800 | -- | Fertilizer + <br> Water management | 310 N | 1320 | 130 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| Jujube | 1 | No Budding | -- | -- | -- | Budding | 10 | 75 | -- | -- | -- |
| c. Mango | 1 | No control of hopper | 28 | 100 | -- | Hopper Control + Fertilizer management | 200 | 2000 | 200 | 13.00 | 10.50 |
| Jackfruit | 3 | Traditional | 18 N | 360 | -- | Fertilizer management | 22 N | 390 | 50 | 6.00 | 1.60 |
| Bamboo orchard | 1 Orchard | Traditional | 20 N | 1000 | -- | Traditional | 20 N | 1000 | -- | -- | -- |
| -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | New plantation lemon | 30 N | 50 | -- | -- | -- |
|  |  | -- | -- | -- | -- | Guava | 2 | 50 | -- | -- | -- |
| Sub total |  | -- | -- | 2260 | -- | -- | -- | 4835 | 380 | 9.79 | 7.78 |
| Total (B+C) |  |  |  | 2421 | 239 | -- | -- | 6602 | 934 | 6.96 | 7.02 |

## D. Livestock

| Resource | No. | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Practice used | Yield $(\mathrm{kg})$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TVC } \\ & \text { (Tk.) } \end{aligned}$ | Practice used | Yield (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TVC } \\ & \text { (Tk.) } \end{aligned}$ | 99-00 | 00-01 |
| Duck | 8 | No vaccination | $\begin{gathered} \text { Egg-300 } \\ \mathrm{N} \end{gathered}$ | 900 | -- | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Vaccination + } \\ & \text { Feed } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Egg-600N } \\ \text { Meat-2 } \end{gathered}$ | 1620 | 300 | 1.76 | 3.40 |
| Hen | 15 | No vaccination | $\begin{gathered} \text { Egg-500 } \\ \mathrm{N} \end{gathered}$ | 1500 | -- | Vaccination + Feed | Egg-700N Meat-7.5 | 2325 | 300 | 1.76 | 3.75 |
| Milch cow | 2 | No vaccination No UMS diet | Milk-400 | 5600 | -- | Deworming + Vaccination + UMS diet | Milk-700 | 6000 | 4000 | 1.25 | 1.10 |
| Bullock | 2 | No vaccination No UMS diet | Meat- <br> 100 | 1400 | 6200 | Deworming + Vaccination + UMS diet | Meat-20 increase | 950 | 900 | 1.00 | 1.08 |
| Total | -- | -- | -- | 9400 | 6200 | -- | -- | 10895 | 5500 | -- | -- |
| Pond | 6 d | Seasonal traditional culture | 31 | 615 | 610 | Mixed fish culture | 80 | 2375 | 1050 | 3.90 | 5.0 |
| Off farm | 1 N | -- | -- | 1500 | 500 | -- | -- | 1500 | 500 | -- | -- |

Farmer-2

## A. Crop

| Resource | Area | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Pattern used | Yield (Kg) | GM (Tk.) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { TVC } \\ & \text { (Tk.) } \end{aligned}$ | Pattern used |  | Yield <br> (Kg) | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | TVC (Tk.) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99-00 | 00-01 |
| MHL-1 | 30 d | Jute (L) | 190 |  |  | Jute (0-9897) - |  | 220 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | -- | 3703 | 1520 | T. Aman (BR-32) - |  | 480 | 4150 | 4850 | 1.11 | 1.13 |
|  |  | lentil (L) | 110 |  |  | Wheat RF |  | 325 |  |  |  |  |
| MHL-2 | 20 d | Jute (L) | 100 |  |  | Jute (0-9897) | - | 160 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | -- | $\stackrel{--}{-}$ | 2260 | 2040 | T. Aman (BR-32) | - | 300 | 6190 | 4230 | 6.11 | 2.79 |
|  |  | Radish (L) | 1500 |  |  | Radish (BARI-1) |  | 4250 |  |  |  |  |
| MHL-3 | 30 d | B. Aus | 240 |  |  | B. Aus |  | 220 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | +B. Aman - | +150 | 2295 | 2945 | +B. Aman - |  | +135 | 4200 | 1975 | -- | -- |
|  |  | Wheat (K) | 350 |  |  | Lentil (BARI-4) |  | 145 |  |  |  |  |
| Total | 80 d | -- | -- | 8258 | 6505 | -- |  | -- | 14540 | 11055 | 1.82 | 2.38 |

## B. Homestead

| Resource | Area | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Practice used | Yield (kg) | GM (Tk.) | TVC <br> (Tk.) | Practice used | Yield (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | TVC <br> (Tk.) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99-00 | 00-01 |
| House + threshing floor | 8 d | No cultivation - | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Roof | 2 d | Shim | 15 N | 88 | 2 | Sweet gourd + <br> White gourd | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \mathrm{~N} \\ & 28 \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | 424 | 16 | 16.08 | 25 |
| Traili | 1 d | Bottle gourd. - <br> Sweet gourd | $\begin{aligned} & 20 \mathrm{~N} \\ & 14 \mathrm{~N} \end{aligned}$ | 107 | 188 | Snake gourd Jhinga - <br> Shasha - <br> Korola - <br> Indian spinach | $\begin{gathered} 20 \\ 16 \\ 20 \mathrm{~N} \\ 20 \\ 30 \end{gathered}$ | 396 | 150 | -10.15 | -6.6 |
| Open field | 4 d | No cultivation | -- | -- | -- | Homestead model | 120 | 560 | 130 | 3.57 | 5.31 |


| Resource | Area | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Practice used | Yield (kg) | GM (Tk.) | TVC <br> (Tk.) | Practice used | Yield (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{GM} \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | TVC <br> (Tk.) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99-00 | 00-01 |
| Partial shade | 1 d | No cultivation | - | -- | -- | Turmeric(T-063)- | 27 | 411 | 79 | 5.76 | 6.20 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Zinger - | 1 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Mankachu - | 8 N |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Moulovikachu - | 3 |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Elephant foot | 12 |  |  |  |  |
| Waste land | 1 d | No cultivation | -- | -- | -- | Panikachu (Latiraj) | 30 | 130 | 20 | 6.00 | 7.50 |
| Pond | 1 d | No cultivation | -- | -- | -- | White gourd - | 25 N | 275 | 100 | 3.25 | 3.75 |
| Bank trail |  |  |  |  |  | Bottle gourd | 48 N |  |  |  |  |
| On support | 2 d | Not used | -- | -- | -- | BARI Shim-1 - | 35 | 246 | 40 | 24.81 | 7.15 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Potato yam | 16 |  |  |  |  |
| Sub total | 20 d | -- | -- | 195 | 190 | -- | -- | 2442 | 535 | 7.05 | 7.51 |

## C. Homestead trees

| Resource | Number of plant | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (1999-2000) |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Practice used | Yield <br> (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | TVC <br> (Tk.) | Practice used | Yield (kg) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk.) } \end{gathered}$ | TVC <br> (Tk.) |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 99-00 | 00-01 |
| Coconut | 3 | Traditional | 30 N | 150 | -- | Fertilizer + <br> Water management | 58 N | 250 | 40 | 2.50 | 3.50 |
| Mango | 5 | No control of hopper | 40 | 400 | -- | Hopper Control + Fertilizer + Water management | 90 | 800 | 100 | 5.00 | 5.00 |
| Jackfruit | 4 | Traditional | 20 N | 400 | -- | Water + Fertilizer management | 41 N | 740 | 60 | 3.33 | 6.67 |
| Bamboo orchard | 1 Orchard | Traditional | 14 N | 700 | -- | Traditional | 30 N | 1800 | -- | -- | -- |
| -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | New plantation (Lemon) | 40 N | 60 | -- | -- | -- |
| Sub total |  | -- | -- | 1650 | -- | -- | -- | 3650 | 200 | 11.11 | 11.00 |
| Total (B+C) |  |  |  | 1845 | 190 | -- | -- | 6092 | 735 | 8.49 | 8.79 |

## D. Livestock

| Resource | No. | Before intervention (1998-1999) |  |  |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  |  |  | MBCR |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Practice used | Yield (kg) | GM <br> (Tk.) | TVC <br> (Tk.) | Practice used | Yield (kg) | GM <br> (Tk.) | TVC <br> (Tk.) | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 99- \\ & 00 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 00- \\ & 01 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| Duck | 5 | No vaccination | $\begin{gathered} \text { Egg-250 } \\ \mathrm{N} \end{gathered}$ | 840 | -- | Vaccination <br> + Feed | Egg-400N Meat-3 | 1180 | 230 | 3.00 | 2.48 |
| Hen | 7 | No vaccination | $\begin{gathered} \text { Egg-250 } \\ N \end{gathered}$ | 750 | -- | Vaccination <br> + Feed | Egg-500N Meat-4 | 1580 | 200 | 1.94 | 5.15 |
| Cattle | 1 | No vaccination No UMS diet | -- | -- | -- | Deworming + Vaccination + UMS diet | Meat <br> increase 70 | 2330 | 2800 | 1.62 | 1.83 |
| Milch cow | 1 |  |  |  |  | Deworming + Vaccination + UMS diet | Milk 300 | 2500 | 6000 |  | 1.42 |
| Total | -- | -- | -- | 1590 | -- | -- | -- | 7590 | 9230 | 1.66 | 1.65 |
| Pond | 5 d | No cultivation | -- | -- | -- | Rajputi | 25 | 650 | 350 | 3.02 | 2.86 |
| Off farm | -- | Day labour | -- | 11300 | -- | Day labour | -- | 11000 | -- | -- | -- |

[^0]Table 4. Income and expenditure statement of Farmer-1 and Farmer-2 under integrated Farming System during 1998-99, to 2000-01 at FSRD site, Ishan Gopalpur, Faridpur

| Source | Farmer-1 |  |  |  |  |  | Farmer-2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Before intervention } \\ 1998-1999 \end{gathered}$ |  | After intervention 1999-2000 |  | After intervention 2000-2001 |  | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Before intervention } \\ 1998-1999 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  | After intervention 1999-2000 |  | After intervention 2000-01 |  |
|  | Income (Tk.) | Expen. (Tk.) | Income (Tk.) | Expen. (Tk.) | Income (Tk.) | Expen. (Tk.) | Income (Tk.) | Expen. (Tk.) | Income (Tk.) | Expen. (Tk.) | Income (Tk.) | Expen. (Tk.) |
| Crop sub sector | 39100/- | 22311/- | 70580/- | 35138/- | 71287/- | 34445/- | 14763/- | 6505/- | 22010/- | 10480/- | 25595/- | 11055/- |
| Homestead sub sector | 2660/- | 239/- | 7049/- | 869/- | 7536/- | 934/- | 2035/- | 190/- | 6327/- | 695/- | 6827/- | 735/- |
| Livestock sub sector | 15600/- | 6200/- | 16130/- | 5480/- | 16395/- | 5500/- | 1590/- | -- | 6900/- | 3200/- | 16820/- | 9230/- |
| Fisheries sub sector | 1225/- | 610/- | 2630/- | 970/- | 3425/- | 1050/- | -- | -- | 1450/- | 480/- | 1000/- | 350/- |
| Off farm sub sector | 2000/- | 500/- | 2000/- | 500/- | 2000/- | 500/- | 11300/- | -- | 11000/- | -- | 11000/- | -- |
| Loan taken | -- | -- | -- | -- | 10000/- | -- | 382/- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Kacha Bazar | -- | 9125/- | -- | 10950/- | -- | 10000/- | -- | 5475/- | -- | 6200/- | -- | 5500/- |
| Foods | -- | 2800/- | -- | 2200/- | -- | 2200/- | -- | 11000/- | -- | 11000/- | -- | 11500/- |
| Cloths | -- | 2500/- | -- | 3000/- | -- | 3500/- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 2000/- |
| Education | -- | 1000/- | -- | 1500/- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 400/- | -- | 800/- | -- | 1000/- |
| Medical | -- | 2500/- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 1200/- | -- | 800/- | -- | 700/- |
| Repairing | -- | 2400/- | -- | 2500/- | -- | 1500/- | -- | 500/- | -- | 3600/- | -- | -- |
| Investment | -- | -- | -- | 3500/- | -- | 27000/- | -- | -- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 5000/- |
| Others | -- | 6400/- | -- | 6970/- | -- | 8000/- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 2000/- |
| Housing | -- | -- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 500/- | -- | -- | -- | 200/- | -- | 4500/- |
| Refreshment | -- | 1200/- | -- | 1500/- | -- | 2000/- | -- | 500/- | -- | 500/- | -- | 500/- |
| Distribution | -- | 500/- | -- | 800/- | -- | 1000/- | -- | 300/- | -- | 500/- | -- | 500/- |
| Balance | -- | 2300/- | -- | 20312/- | -- | 8514/- | -- | -- | -- | 3232/- | -- | 6672/- |
| Total | 60585 | 60585 | 98389 | 98389 | 110643 | 110643 | 30070 | 30070 | 47687 | 47687 | 61242 | 61242 |

Name of the FSRD site : Golapgonj, Sylhet
Number of Farmers : 3 (Three)
Farm category : Marginal 2, Landless 1
It was revealed that the cooperator farmers of Golapgonj, Sylhet used 5-7 technologies before intervention but during intervention, the number of technologies used increases up to 13-19 (Table 5). The gross margin of farmer 1 increased from Tk 16702 to Tk. 73434, that of the farmer 2 from Tk. 1488 to Tk. 12830 and farmer 3 from Tk. 13030 to Tk. 37850. The corresponding total variable cost (TVC) of farmer 1 was Tk. 6673 and Tk. 10195 that of farmer 2 was Tk. 690 and Tk. 3820 and farmer 3 Tk. 3210 and Tk. 7915. On an average the highest gross margin was obtained from homestead and as such the corresponding marginal benefit cost ratio (MBCR) was also highest in the same sector (Table 6).

Table 5. Number of technologies used at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet

| Sector | Before <br> intervention <br> $(1997-98)$ | After <br> intervention <br> $(2000-01)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| $\quad$ Farmer-1 | 2 |  |
| Crop | 7 |  |
| Homestead | 2 | 9 |
| Livestock | 1 | 1 |
| Fisheries | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 6 | 19 |
| $\quad$ Farmer-2 | 2 | 7 |
| Crop | 1 | 4 |
| Homestead | 1 | 1 |
| Livestock | 1 | 1 |
| Fisheries | 5 | 13 |
| Total |  |  |
| $\quad$ Farmer-3 | 4 | 5 |
| Crop | 1 | 4 |
| Homestead | 1 | 3 |
| Livestock | 1 | 1 |
| Fisheries | 7 | 13 |
| Total |  |  |

Table 6. Cost and benefit of integrated farmers at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet

| Sector | Before intervention (1997-98) |  |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TVC (Tk) | G.M.(Tk) | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | MBCR |
| Farmer-1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 1735 | 3500 | 1163 | 31200 | 3.80 |
| Homestead | 4358 | 11402 | 5772 | 30534 | 14.50 |
| Livestock | 250 | 600 | 1020 | 4000 | 5.40 |
| Fisheries | 350 | 1200 | 2240 | 7700 | 4.44 |
| Total | 6673 | 16702 | 10195 | 73434 | 5.06 |
| Farmer-2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 190 | 800 | 1700 | 6030 | 4.46 |
| Homestead | 200 | 400 | 500 | 2000 | 6.33 |
| Livestock | 180 | (-)62 | 720 | 1200 | 3.88 |
| Fisheries | 120 | 350 | 900 | 3600 | 5.17 |
| Total | 690 | 1488 | 3820 | 12830 | 4.62 |
| Farmer-3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 2850 | 12120 | 6285 | 32050 | 6.80 |
| Homestead | 30 | 200 | 500 | 2200 | 5.26 |
| Livestock | 130 | 10 | 430 | 600 | 2.97 |
| Fisheries | 200 | 700 | 700 | 3000 | 5.60 |
| Total | 3210 | 13030 | 7715 | 37850 | 6.27 |

Name of the FSRD site : Chabbishnagar, Barind, Rajshahi
Number of farmer : 3 (Three)
Farm category : Small -2, Marginal-1

It was observed that the cooperator farmers of Barind, Rajshahi used 10 to 15 technologies before intervention but the number of technologies used increases upto 34-36 during intervention (Table 7). The gross margin of farmer 1 increased from Tk 26855 to Tk 91880, that of farmer-2 from Tk 15885 to Tk 64482 and farmer 3 from Tk 6490 to Tk 54285. The corresponding TVC of farmer-1 was Tk 25298 and Tk 39250, that of farmer 2 was Tk 15320 and Tk 60810 and farmer 3 Tk 8605 and Tk 28440. On the average marginal cost benefit ratio (MBCR) from fisheries was found highest (Table 8).

Name of the FSRD site : Palima, Tangail
Number of farmers : 2 (Two)
Farm category : Small 2
The integrated approach of technology intervention resulted in the remarkable growth of farm income. The results indicated that the incomes from different sectors were increased with different rate.
On two farms average it was found that the highest gross margin recorded at Livestock sector followed by crop sector. On the contrary it was found that the highest MBCR recorded at fisheries followed by homestead sector. Farmers used 11-15 technologies before intervention but during
intervention it was increased upto 36-38 technologies (Table 9). The gross margin of farmer 1 increased from Tk 17794 to Tk 66344 and that of the farmer 2 from Tk. 22940 to Tk. 75300. The corresponding TVC of farmer 1 was Tk. 8145 and Tk. 23770 and that of farmer 2 was Tk. 9863 and Tk. 31400 (Table 10).

Table 9. Number of technologies used at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail

| Sector | Farmer-1 |  | Farmer-2 |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before intervention <br> $(1998-99)$ | After intervention <br> $(2000-01)$ | Before intervention <br> $(1998-99)$ | After intervention <br> $(2000-01)$ |
| Crop | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| Homestead | 9 | 24 | 6 | 24 |
| Livestock | - | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| Fisheries | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Total | 15 | 38 | 11 | 36 |

Table 10. Cost and benefit of integrated farmers at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail

| Sector | Before intervention (1998-99) |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TVC (Tk.) | GM (Tk.) | TVC (Tk.) | GM (Tk.) |  |
| Farmer-1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 7120 | 12276 | 6000 | 21550 | 7.28 |
| Homestead | 275 | 2410 | 470 | 4279 | 10.58 |
| Livestock | 100 | 2558 | 15300 | 27100 | 2.60 |
| Fisheries | 650 | 1550 | 2000 | 13415 | 9.79 |
| Total | 8145 | 17794 | 23770 | 66344 | 4.11 |
| Farmer-2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 8320 | 13000 | 12000 | 16200 | 1.87 |
| Homestead | 523 | 1285 | 2000 | 13200 | 9.07 |
| Livestock | 420 | 7455 | 16000 | 39000 | 3.02 |
| Fisheries | 600 | 1200 | 1400 | 6900 | 10.83 |
| Total | 9863 | 22940 | 31400 | 75300 | 5.65 |


| Name of the FSRD site | $:$ Goyeshpur, Pabna |
| :--- | :--- |
| Number of farmers | $: 15$ (Fifteen) |
| Farm category | $:$ Marginal 5, Small 5 and Medium 5. |

Marginal farmers (5) used 20 technologies before intervention but it was increased up to 97 technologies during intervention, that of small farmers (5) used 52 and 152 technologies and medium farmers (5) used 55 and 129 technologies before and after intervention, respectively (Table 11). From the record it was found that the highest number of technologies intervened at homestead followed by crop sector. Before the intervention the farmers obtained a gross margin of Tk. 13220 to Tk 101685. After intervention of technologies the gross margin increased from Tk. 17032 to Tk. 164716. For this purpose they had to increase their total variable cost from Tk. 11955 to Tk. 104571.

The relative sectoral contribution to build up gross margin in descending order was crop>livestock>fisheries>off farm>homestead. Marginal benefit cost ratio (MBCR) of the tested farmers was the highest for crop sector (Table 12).

Table: 11 Number of technologies used at FSRD site, Goyeshpur, Pabna during 2000-2001

| Farm er | Crop |  | Homestead |  | Livestock |  | Fisheries |  | Total |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Intervention |  | Intervention |  | Intervention |  | Intervention |  | Intervention |  |
|  | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After | Before | After |
| 1. | - | - | 4 | 24 | - | 1 | - | 1 | 4 | 26 |
| 2. | 2 | 3 | 5 | 20 | - | 3 | - | 2 | 7 | 28 |
| 3. | 3 | 4 | 3 | 17 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 6 | 24 |
| 4. | 4 | 4 | 4 | 18 | - | 2 | - | 2 | 8 | 26 |
| 5. | - | - | 3 | 17 | - | 2 | - | - | 3 | 19 |
| 6. | 12 | 11 | 3 | 10 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 15 | 24 |
| 7. | 9 | 6 | 1 | 14 | - | 2 | - | 2 | 10 | 24 |
| 8. | 2 | 2 |  | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
| 9. | 5 | 5 | - | 17 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 5 | 25 |
| 10. | 6 | 5 | 1 | 20 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 7 | 28 |
| 11. | 8 | 10 | 9 | 19 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 17 | 30 |
| 12. | 3 | 7 | 1 | 22 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 4 | 32 |
| 13. | 11 | 8 | 4 | 12 | - | 2 | - | - | 15 | 22 |
| 14. | 1 | 1 | 4 | 22 | 1 | 1 | - | - | 6 | 24 |
| 15. | 14 | 18 | 6 | 25 | - | 2 | - | 1 | 20 | 46 |

Table 12. Cost and benefit of integrated farmers at FSRD site Goyeshpur, Pabna

| Farmers no | Sector | Before intervention |  | After intervention |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | MBCR |
| 1 | Crop | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Homestead | 250 | 2356 | 935 | 6343 | 7.19 |
|  | Live stock | - | - | 61484 | 43686 | 1.71 |
|  | Fisheries | - | - | 540 | 335 | 1.62 |
|  | Off farm | 45575 | 26000 | 16925 | 19075 | -0.35 |
|  | Total | 45675 | 26225 | 79284 | 66809 | 0.63 |
| 2 | Crop | 12105 | 9263 | 12001 | 12427 | -29.42 |
|  | Homestead | 1370 | 14524 | 1515 | 24016 | 66.46 |
|  | Live stock | 1975 | 545 | 22790 | 16050 | 1.74 |
|  | Fisheries | 3635 | 4965 | 2165 | 7275 | -0.57 |
|  | Off farm | 82600 | 5180 | 66100 | 3350 | 1.11 |
|  | Total | 101685 | 34477 | 104571 | 63118 | 10.92 |
| 3 | Crop | 7986 | 18324 | 4315 | 12195 | 2.69 |
|  | Homestead | 220 | 2520 | 715 | 3976 | 3.94 |
|  | Live stock | 2550 | 4200 | 136760 | 17452 | 1.10 |
|  | Fisheries | 800 | 3115 | 2300 | 6290 | 3.12 |
|  |  | 20600 | 6500 | 415150 | 24550 | 18.05 |
|  | Total | 32156 | 34659 | 559240 | 64463 | 1.06 |
| 4 | Crop | 26498 | 26844 | 26711 | 46467 | 93.13 |
|  | Homestead | 141 | 3376 | 1204 | 5433 | 2.94 |
|  | Live stock | 800 | 1010 | 16741 | 4807 | 1.24 |
|  | Fisheries | 140 | 2000 | 1125 | 3965 | 2.99 |
|  | Total | 27579 | 33230 | 45779 | 60672 | 2.51 |
| 5 | Crop | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Homestead | 270 | 1579 | 716 | 2014 | 4.93 |
|  | Live stock | - | - | 12000 | 10500 | 1.88 |
|  | Fisheries | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Off farm | 12950 | 24000 | 17800 | 26000 | 1.41 |
|  | Total | 13220 | 25579 | 30516 | 38514 | 1.75 |


| Farmers <br> no | Sector | Before intervention |  | After intervention |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | MBCR |
| 6 | Crop | 48861 | 39589 | 50299 | 50231 | 8.40 |
|  | Homestead | 320 | 2405 | 707 | 3472 | 3.76 |
|  | Live stock | 1540 | 3155 | 6150 | 7090 | 1.85 |
|  | Fisheries | 1530 | 2200 | 1000 | 3000 | -0.53 |
|  | Total | 52251 | 47349 | 58129 | 39939 | -0.26 |
| 7 | Crop | 18480 | 48670 | 24757 | 35188 | -1.14 |
|  | Homestead | 50 | 4920 | 2307 | 12559 | 6.44 |
|  | Live stock | - | 2170 | 24345 | 9879 | 1.32 |
|  | Fisheries | - | 4000 | 3210 | 12270 | 4.82 |
|  | Off farm | 15300 | 21600 | - | - | - |
|  | Total | 33830 | 81360 | 54619 | 69896 | 0.45 |
| 8 | Crop | 3750 | 8720 | 4250 | 10145 | 3.85 |
|  | Homestead | 203 | 1656 | 819 | 5302 | 6.92 |
|  | Live stock | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Fisheries | - | 370 | 1300 | 4640 | 4.28 |
|  | Off farm | 21820 | 16775 | 28625 | 22500 | 1.84 |
|  | Total | 25773 | 27521 | 34994 | 42587 | 2.63 |
| 9 | Crop | 34905 | 24256 | 26244 | 45639 | -1.47 |
|  | Homestead | 195 | 1935 | 2543 | 11217 | 4.91 |
|  | Live stock | 1180 | 15000 | 16000 | 35360 | 2.4 |
|  | Fisheries | - | - | 12000 | 72500 | 7.04 |
|  | Total | 36280 | 41191 | 56793 | 164716 | 7.02 |
| 10 | Crop | 16388 | 6702 | 16419 | 8672 | 64.53 |
|  | Homestead | 190 | 1560 | 501 | 4406 | 10.15 |
|  | Live stock | 1020 | 1234 | 735 | 1854 | -1.18 |
|  | Fisheries | 800 | 400 | 1500 | 2100 | 3.43 |
|  | Total | 18398 | 9896 | 11955 | 17032 | 10.43 |
| 11 | Crop | 21480 | 46470 | 30310 | 79190 | 4.71 |
|  | Homestead | 265 | 3996 | 653 | 5575 | 5.07 |
|  | Live stock | 30 | 520 | 12620 | 17420 | 2.34 |
|  | Fisheries | 140 | 1450 | 280 | 9530 | 58.71 |
|  | Total | 21915 | 52436 | 43863 | 111715 | 3.70 |
| 12 | Crop | 1180 | 4897 | 12604 | 5517 | 1.44 |
|  | Homestead | 120 | 10045 | 1553 | 9617 | 0.70 |
|  | Live stock | 1385 | 1930 | 17601 | 11689 | 16.21 |
|  | Fisheries | 1225 | 1775 | 675 | 12857 | 9.98 |
|  | Off farm | 69021 | 65695 | 67851 | 65009 | 1.58 |
|  | Total | 72931 | 84342 | 100284 | 104689 | 1.74 |
| 13 | Crop | 42400 | 65288 | 48990 | 64880 | 0.94 |
|  | Homestead | 174 | 2891 | 615 | 5223 | 6.29 |
|  | Live stock | 2515 | 8185 | 2890 | 12870 | 13.49 |
|  | Fisheries | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Total | 45089 | 76364 | 52495 | 82973 | 1.89 |
| 14 | Crop | 9730 | 1500 | 10460 | 8520 | 10.61 |
|  | Homestead | 80 | 1170 | 503 | 4751 | 9.46 |
|  | Live stock | - | - | 10060 | 5940 | 1.59 |
|  | Fisheries | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Total | 9810 | 2670 | 21023 | 19211 | 2.48 |


| Farmers no | Sector | Before intervention |  | After intervention |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | MBCR |
| 15 | Crop | 17295 | 68300 | 32038 | 107171 | 3.64 |
|  | Homestead | 895 | 5315 | 870 | 8343 | 0.008 |
|  | Live stock | - | - | 11500 | 11120 | 1.97 |
|  | Fisheries | - | - | 600 | 1553 | 3.59 |
|  | Off farm | - | 6800 | - | 4000 | - |
| Name of the FSRD site |  | : Atkapalia, | Noakhali |  |  |  |
| Number o | armer | : 2 (two) |  |  |  |  |
| Farm cate |  | : Medium |  |  |  |  |

It was recorded that the cooperator farmers of Atkapalia, Noakhali used 7 technologies of different sectors before intervention. But during intervention, the number of technologies used increases upto 15-27 (Table 13). The gross margin of farmer 1 increased from Tk. 12755 to Tk. 66018 and that of the farmer 2 from Tk. 3482 to Tk. 11470. The corresponding TVC of farmer 1 was Tk. 8200 and Tk. 12184 and that of farmer 2 was Tk. 8345 and Tk. 12184 (Table 14). Among the two farmers, the highest gross margin was recorded at livestock sector (Tk. 50200).

Table 14. Cost and benefit of integrated
farmers at FSRD site, Atkapalia, Noakhali during 1998-99 and 2000-01

| Sector | Before intervention (1998-99) |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) |  |
| Farmer-1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 4200 | 3175 | 3798 | 7568 | 9.93 |
| Homestead | 1600 | 800 | 1800 | 1650 | 4.25 |
| Livestock | 2000 | 4280 | 349800* | 50200 | 1.13 |
| Fisheries | 400 | 4500 | 600 | 6600 | 11.5 |
| Total | 8200 | 12755 | 355998 | 66018 | 1.15 |
| Farmer-2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 7745 | 2050 | 11334 | 7700 | 2.57 |
| Homestead | 600 | 1432 | 850 | 3770 | 10.35 |
| Total | 8345 | 3482 | 12184 | 11470 | 3.11 |

* For broiler house making initial cost as well as TVC largely increased.

```
Name of the FSRD site : Narikeli, Jamalpur
Number of farmers : 10 (ten)
Farm category : Landless 4, Marginal 2 and Small 4.
```

It was recorded that the cooperator farmers of Narikeli, Jamalpur used 6-11 technologies before intervention. But the number of technologies used increases up to 22-34 during intervention (Table 15). The gross margin of intervened farmers increased from Tk 700 to Tk. 38000. The corresponding
total variable cost (TVC) ranged from Tk. 1100 to Tk. 39000 and that of marginal benefit cost ratio (MBCR) ranged from 1.35 to 11.0 (Table 16). On the average the highest gross margin was obtained from crop sector (Tk. 7020) followed by livestock (Tk. 3570) and lowest in fish sector (Tk. 870).

Table 15. Number of technologies used at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur 1999-2001

| Farmer | Sector | Before intervention (19992000) | After intervention (2000-01) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Farmer-1 | Crop | 6 | 10 |
|  | Homestead | 4 | 15 |
|  | Livestock | - | 3 |
|  | Fisheries | 1 | 2 |
|  | Total | 11 | 30 |
| Farmer-2 | Crop | 7 | 11 |
|  | Homestead | 2 | 15 |
|  | Livestock | - | 3 |
|  | Fisheries | 1 | 4 |
|  | Total | 10 | 33 |
| Farmer-3 | Crop | 6 | 12 |
|  | Homestead | 4 | 15 |
|  | Livestock | - | 3 |
|  | Fisheries | 1 | 4 |
|  | Total | 11 | 31 |
| Farmer-4 | Crop | 6 | 11 |
|  | Homestead | 3 | 14 |
|  | Livestock | - | 4 |
|  | Fisheries | - | 2 |
|  | Total | 9 | 34 |
| Farmer-5 | Crop | 4 | 11 |
|  | Homestead | 2 | 14 |
|  | Livestock | - | 4 |
|  | Fisheries | - | 2 |
|  | Total | 6 | 25 |
| Farmer-6 | Crop | 4 | 10 |
|  | Homestead | 5 | 10 |
|  | Livestock | - | 3 |
|  | Fisheries | - | 2 |
|  | Total | 9 | 25 |
| Farmer-7 | Crop | 5 | 10 |
|  | Homestead | 4 | 13 |
|  | Livestock | - | 3 |
|  | Fisheries | - | 4 |
|  | Total | 9 | 30 |
| Farmer-8 | Crop | 6 | 11 |
|  | Homestead | 4 | 10 |
|  | Livestock | - | 2 |
|  | Fisheries | - | 2 |
|  | Total | 10 | 25 |
| Farmer-9 | Crop | 4 | 7 |
|  | Homestead | 4 | 10 |
|  | Livestock | - | 2 |
|  | Fisheries | - | 3 |


| Farmer | Sector | Before intervention (19992000) | After intervention (2000-01) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | 8 | 22 |
| Farmer-10 | Crop | 5 | 11 |
|  | Homestead | 4 | 13 |
|  | Livestock | - | 3 |
|  | Fisheries | - | 5 |
|  | Total | 9 | 32 |

Table 16. Cost and benefit of integrated farmers at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur during 1999-2001

| Cooperator | Resource | Before intervention (1999-2000) |  | After intervention (2000-01) |  | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | GM(Tk) | TVC(Tk) | GM(Tk) | TVC(Tk) |  |
| Farmer-1 | Crop | 4000 | 9000 | 6000 | 10000 | 2.00 |
|  | Homestead | 2200 | 800 | 4500 | 1000 | 12.50 |
|  | Livestock | 700 | 300 | 1500 | 500 | 5.00 |
|  | Fisheries | 700 | 300 | 1000 | 500 | 2.50 |
|  | Total | 7600 | 9400 | 13000 | 12000 | 3.07 |
| Farmer-2 | Crop | 20600 | 3400 | 21500 | 3500 | 10.00 |
|  | Homestead | 300 | 400 | 2000 | 1000 | 3.83 |
|  | Livestock | 300 | 700 | 700 | 1000 | 2.33 |
|  | Fisheries | 4500 | 500 | 4400 | 600 |  |
|  | Total | 25700 | 5000 | 28600 | 6100 | 3.63 |
| Farmer-3 | Crop | 8000 | 8000 | 8000 | 10000 | 1.00 |
|  | Homestead | 100 | 200 | 200 | 300 | 2.00 |
|  | Livestock | 3000 | 5000 | 4000 | 6000 | 2.00 |
|  | Total | 11100 | 13200 | 12200 | 16300 | 1.35 |
| Farmer-4 | Crop | 1000 | 7000 | 2000 | 7000 | - |
|  | Homestead | 500 | 200 | 700 | 300 | 3.00 |
|  | Livestock | 1500- | 500- | 3300- | 700- | 10.00- |
|  | Total | 3000 | 7700 | 6000 | 8000 | 11.00 |
| Farmer-5 | Crop | 1000 | 3000 | 1500 | 3500 | 2.00 |
|  | Homestead | 3750 | 250 | 4700 | 300 | 20.00 |
|  | Livestock | 6000- | 2000 | 9000 | 3000 | 4.00 |
|  | Total | 10750 | 5250 | 15200 | 6800 | 3.80 |
| Farmer-6 | Crop | 20000 | 25000 | 20000 | 30000 | 1.00 |
|  | Homestead | 4500 | 1500 | 6000 | 2000 | 4.00 |
|  | Livestock | 6000 | 4000 | 9000 | 6000 | 2.25 |
|  | Fisheries | 2000 | 1000 | 3000 | 1000 | - |
|  | Total | 32500 | 31500 | 38000 | 39000 | 1.75 |
| Farmer-7 | Crop | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Homestead | 200 | 300 | 300 | 500 | 1.50 |
|  | Livestock | 300 | 400 | 400 | 600 | 1.50 |
|  | Total | 500 | 700 | 700 | 1100 | 1.50 |
| Farmer-8 | Crop | 7000 | 8000 | 10000 | 10000 | 2.50 |
|  | Homestead | 400 | 100 | 6000 | 1000 | 7.22 |
|  | Livestock | 1000 | 1000 | 4000 | 2000 | 4.00 |
|  | Fisheries | 200 | 200 | 300 | 400 | 1.50 |
|  | Total | 8600 | 9300 | 20300 | 13400 | 3.85 |
| Farmer-9 | Crop | 900 | 1100 | 1200 | 1200 | 4.00 |
|  | Homestead | 700 | 800 | 2000 | 1000 | 7.50 |
|  | Livestock | 3000 | 1000 | 3800 | 1200 | 5.00 |
|  | Fisheries | - |  | - | - | - |
|  | Total | 4600 | 2900 | 7000 | 3400 | 5.80 |
| Farmer-10 | Crop | - | - | - | - | - |
|  | Homestead | - | - | 400 | 200 | 3.00 |
|  | Livestock | - | - | -- | -- | -- |
|  | Total | - | - | 400 | 200 | 3.00 |

Name of the FSR site : Syedpur, Rangpur
Number of farmers : 3 (three)
Farmer category : Small 3
It was observed that three cooperator farmers of Syedpur, FSRD site, Rangpur used 9-15 technologies before intervention but the number of technologies used increases upto 22-36 during intervention (Table 17). The gross margin of farmer-1 increased from Tk. 36721 to Tk. 64720, that of farmer-2 from Tk. 67566 to Tk. 103328 and farmer - 3 Tk. 27481 to Tk 48697. The corresponding total variable cost
(TVC) of farmer - 1 was Tk. 28692 and Tk. 40618, that of farmer-2 was Tk. 38275 and Tk. 57940 and farmer-3 was Tk. 13513 and Tk. 22948. On an average the marginal benefit cost ratio (MBCR) from homestead was found highest (Table 18).

Table 17. Number of technologies used in three farms at FSRD site Syedpur, Rangpur

| Sector | Farmer 1: Mr. Md. Mohshin Ali ( Small Farmer ) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Before intervention (1998-99) | After intervention (2000-01) |
| Crop | 10 |  |
| Homestead | 5 |  |
| Livestocks | - | - |
| Fisheries | 15 | 4 |
| Total | Farmer 2: Mr. Md. Shamsul Haque ( Small Farmer) |  |
|  | 2 | 10 |
| Crop | 5 | 5 |
| Homestead | - | 5 |
| Livestocks | 2 | 24 |
| Fisheries | 9 |  |
| Total | Farmer 3: Sree Moti Shudha Rani (Small Farmer) | 7 |
|  | 5 | 12 |
| Crop | 7 | 3 |
| Homestead | - | - |
| Livestocks | - | 22 |
| Fisheries | 12 |  |
| Total |  |  |

Table 18. Cost and benefit of integrated technologies at FSRD site, Syedpur, Rangpur during 1998-99 and 2000-01

| Sector | Before intervention (1998-99) |  | After intervention(2000-01) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TVC (Tk) | GM (Tk) | TVC (Tk) | GM(Tk) | MBCR |
| Farmer-1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 21278 | 24304 | 26314 | 43227 | 4.76 |
| Homestead | 484 | 9997 | 2130 | 16747 | 5.10 |
| Livestocks | 6930 | 2420 | 12174 | 40808 | 1.46 |
| Total | 28692 | 36721 | 40618 | 64782 | 3.35 |
| Farmer-2 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 33670 | 51154 | 45739 | 63143 | 1.99 |
| Homestead | 480 | 5022 | 1517 | 12094 | 7.81 |
| Livestock | 1780 | 5500 | 8764 | 12231 | 1.96 |
| Fisheries | 2345 | 5890 | 1920 | 15860 | - |
| Total | 38275 | 67566 | 57940 | 103328 | 2.82 |
| Farmer-3 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Crop | 10999 | 12824 | 15639 | 21898 | 2.95 |
| Homestead | 634 | 6712 | 2074 | 10944 | 3.93 |
| Livestock | 1880 | 7945 | 5835 | 15855 | 3.00 |
| Total | 13513 | 27481 | 22948 | 48697 | 3.20 |

Table 19. Impact of integrated farming in FSRD sites

| SI.No. | Area | Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 01 | Family income | Net income increased <br> Used modern varieties <br> Used more area for cultivation/production |
| 02 | Nutrition | Consumption of vegetables, fruits and fish increased Changed consumption habit <br> Reduced disease infestation |
| 03 | Resource use | Intensive cropping <br> Introduced new fruit trees like mango, Jujubee, etc Homestead area utilized properly |
| 04 | Education and knowledge | Increased knowledge of family member Children's are educated by private tutor Male member involved in distributing knowledge among the neighbouring farmers. |
| 05 | Refreshment | Cost of refreshment increased in case of farmers 1 Purchase of new cloth increased in case of farmer 1 |
| 06 | Social status | Improved mental strength Increased acceptability to people |
| 07 | Environment | Household waste used for composting New plantation improve environment Irrigation to crop and trees improve environment |
| 08 | Others | More utilization of family labour Improve the cattle health |

## Conclusion and Recommendation

The integration of technology brought out slow and steady growth of the farm family as a whole. The gross margin from crop sector, homestead, livestock, fisheries were higher than the previous year. The family nutrition, resource use, knowledge, social status and microenvironment were improved considerably due to intervention. Though contribution from the homestead system was the highest but there is also enough scope for further improvement such as establishment of broiler farm, local and exotic poultry breeds under traditional rearing, improved breed of duck, pigeon rearing, introducing quick growing multipurpose tree species in homestead, commercial plant nursery etc. If the farmer accept these technologies as an enterprise, then it will provide maximum benefit and technology will be sustainable.

## Location: Narikeli, Jamalpur

Cropping pattern: Mustard-Boro-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000

In mustard, significantly higher and identical yield was recorded from $E D_{2}$, INM and FRG'97. In Boro and T.Aman rice similar trend was found. The control plot produced the lowest yield and the farmers' dose produced the intermediate yield. The highest gross margin was calculated from ED2 followed by FRG'97 and INM. Regarding the MBCR the highest value was found in FRG'97 followed by ED2. In INM treatment cost of mustard oil cake increase the fertilization cost and thereby reduced the gross margin and MBCR.

Table 3. Effect of different fertilizers on the agro-economics performance of Mustard-Boro-T.Aman rice cropping pattern at Narikeli during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  | VC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mustard | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ (ED2) | 1.0ab | 5.8 a | 4.05 a | 11504 | 79706 | 3.64 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ (INM) | 1.1a | 5.4 a | 3.90 a | 15560 | 74235 | 2.34 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ (FRG'97) | 1.0 ab | 5.4 a | 3.78 a | 9476 | 76511 | 4.08 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ (FP) | 0.8 b | 3.8 b | 2.32 b | 7581 | 55049 | 2.27 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ (Control) | 0.5c | 2.3 c | 1.76 c | 0 | 37845 | - |

Table 3.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& MOC t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mustard | Boro | T.Aman |
| ED2 | $77-14-28-14$ | $140-17-56-10$ | $98-12-35-6$ |
| INM | $52-5-23-14+0.5$ t/ha MOC | $140-17-56-10$ | $98-12-35-6$ |
| FRG'97 | $55-10-20-10$ | $100-12-40-7$ | $70-8-25-4$ |
| FP | $30-25-20$ | $58-25-31-0$ | $16-15-0-0$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

## Location: Narikeli, Jamalpur

Cropping pattern: Wheat-Jute-T.Aman

## Year of establishment: 1999-2000

No significant difference was observed among the different fertilizer doses in grain yield of wheat except with control. In case of Jute and T.Aman almost similar trend was observed. The yields were identical and differed only with FP and control treatment. However the soil of the experimental field was deficient with NPK but it was not reflected well in the yield of crops at all. From cost benefit analysis, it was found that the higher gross margin and MBCR were obtained from ED2 followed by present BARC fertilizer recommendation.

Table 4. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Wheat-Jute-T.Aman cropping pattern at Narikeli during 1999-00

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  | VC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | Jute | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| ED2 | 2.81 a | 2.4 a | 4.74 a | 8410 | 59875 | 1.79 |
| INM | 2.73 a | 2.3 a | 4.37 a | 13578 | 60069 | 3.20 |
| FRG'97 | 2.73 a | 2.0 a | 3.85 a | 7663 | 45892 | 1.50 |
| FP | 2.62 a | 1.4 bc | 3.59 b | 6863 |  |  |


| Control | 1.51 b | 1.0 c | 1.82 c | 0 | 35577 | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Table 4.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& MOC t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | Jute | T.Aman |
| ED2 | $84-21-35-12$ | $77-10-35-7$ | $98-12-35-6$ |
| INM | $59-12-30-12+0.5 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha} \mathrm{MOC}$ | $77-10-35-7$ | $98-12-35-6$ |
| FRG'97 | $60-15-25-8$ | $55-7-25-5$ | $70-8-25-4$ |
| FP | $30-22-28-0$ | $29-25-31-12$ | $58-3-31-0$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

## Location: Hathazari

## Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman <br> Year of establishment: 1999-2000

Significantly higher grain yield was obtained from $\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ and INM in Boro rice followed by FRG'97 and ED1. In T.Aman rice, grain yield did not vary significantly among the different treatment combinations except with FP and control. The higher gross margin values were obtained from ED2 and INM, respectively. But the highest MBCR was calculated from present BARC fertilizer recommendation followed by ED2 and ED1. Additional cost for cowdung ( $10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) in integrated nutrient management practice reduced the MBCR value.

Table 5. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economics performance of Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Hathazari during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  | TVC | GM | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman | (Tk/ha) |  |  |
| ED1 | 4.97 bc | 4.03 ab | 5.84 | 4.62 a | 26003 | 47053 | 3.71 |
| ED2 | 5.86 a | 4.33 a | 6.36 | 4.78 a | 28509 | 57842 | 3.88 |
| INM | 5.83 a | 4.38 a | 6.31 | 4.90 a | 33253 | 53474 | 2.37 |
| FRG'97 | 5.10 b | 4.03 ab | 5.09 | 4.53 a | 24632 | 47139 | 4.77 |
| FP | 4.53 c | 3.67 b | 4.76 | 4.76 a | 26284 | 40199 | 2.50 |
| Control | 3.16 | 2.62 c | 3.63 | 3.30 b | 19750 | 23832 | - |

Table 5.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $89-20-54-16$ | $61-7-38-4$ |
| ED2 | $126-28-75-23$ | $84-9-48-7$ |
| INM | $116-22-65-23+$ CD 10 t/ha | $84-9-48-7$ |
| FRG'97 | $100-10-40-5$ | $70-4-35-1$ |
| FP | $86-25-16-0$ | $75-26-17-0$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ |  |


| Location | : Satkanya, Chittagong |
| :--- | :--- |
| Cropping pattern | : Boro-T.Aman |
| Year of establishment | $: 1999-2000$ |

Significantly higher grain yield was obtained from $\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ and INM in Boro rice followed by FRG'97 and ED1. In T.Aman rice, almost similar trend was observed. The higher gross margin values were obtained from ED2 and INM, respectively. But the highest MBCR was calculated from present BARC fertilizer recommendation followed by FP and ED1. Additional cost for cowdung ( $10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) in integrated nutrient management practice reduced the MBCR value.

Table 6. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economics performance of Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Hathazari during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  | TVC <br> $(T k / h a)$ | GM <br> $(T k / h a)$ | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 5.29 b | 4.15 bc | 5.49 b | 4.76 b | 26758 | 52535 | 3.72 |
| ED2 | 5.60 a | 4.91 a | 6.20 a | 5.34 a | 29600 | 58127 | 3.22 |
| INM | 5.74 a | 4.72 a | 6.20 a | 5.28 ab | 33314 | 53958 | 2.03 |
| FRG'97 | 5.08 b | 4.33 b | 5.28 b | 5.22 ab | 25029 | 53770 | 5.18 |
| FP | 4.91 b | 4.03 c | 5.57 ab | 4.96 ab | 25209 | 50514 | 4.41 |
| Control | 2.94 c | 2.39 d | 3.42 c | 3.56 c | 19750 | 26431 | - |

Table 6.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $89-20-54-16$ | $61-7-38-4$ |
| ED2 | $126-28-75-23$ | $84-9-48-7$ |
| INM | $116-22-65-23+$ CD 10 t/ha | $84-9-48-7$ |
| FRG'97 | $100-10-40-5$ | $70-4-35-1$ |
| FP | $86-25-16-0$ | $75-26-17-0$ |

## Location: Palima, Tangail <br> Cropping pattern: Mustard-Jute-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000

Different doses of fertilizers failed to produce any significant difference in seed/fiber/grain yield of mustard, jute and T.Aman rice. The initial soil status of the experimental plots suggested that the soil was very deficient in $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}$ and K but no response of these nutrient elements were observed even in any crop of the pattern. More study needed to explain the phenomena. When the cost benefit analysis was done, it was found that the highest gross margin was calculated from ED2 followed by INM and FP. But regarding MBCR, the highest value was obtained from ED1 followed by ED2.

Table 7. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Mustard-Jute-T.Aman cropping pattern at Palima, Tangail during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  |  | TVC(Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mustard | Jute | T.Aman | Mustard | Jute | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 046a | 3.53a | 3.75 a | 0.83a | 7.50a | 4.33ab | 43095 | 39937 | 3.09 |
| ED2 | 048a | 3.17a | 4.25a | 0.78ab | 6.83ab | 4.75a | 45742 | 45310 | 2.80 |
| INM | 0.45a | 3.25a | 4.17a | $0.76 a b$ | 6.50ab | 4.33ab | 47358 | 42976 | 2.19 |
| FRG'97 | 0.45a | 3.00a | 3.58a | 0.74b | 6.17ab | 4.42ab | 45245 | 36584 | 1.99 |
| FP | 0.50a | 2.93a | 4.08a | 0.82a | 6.17ab | 4.58a | 45083 | 40844 | 2.50 |
| Control | 0.19b | 2.00b | 2.50b | 0.55c | 4.25b | 3.67b | 36155 | 18486 | - |

Table 7.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mustard | Jute | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $80-20-25-4$ | $90-18-40-4$ | $75-12-25-4$ |
| ED2 | $110-30-35-6$ | $125-25-60-6$ | $105-18-35-6$ |
| INM | $105-25-28-6+$ CD 10 t/ha | $125-25-60-6$ | $105-18-35-6$ |
| FRG'97 | $60-15-20-15$ | $55-7-25-5$ | $70-8-25-4$ |
| FP | $115-25-40-0$ | $55-20-20-8$ | $45-12-20-0$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

## Location: Palima, Tangail <br> Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman

## Year of establishment: 1999-2000

In Boro rice, grain yield did not differ due to different fertilizer doses. Even the FP also produced identical yield. There was no response of NPK was found however the soil was very deficient with these elements. Again, in T.Aman rice the responses of the nutrients were evident and the highest grain yield was obtained from INM and $E D_{2}$. Other fertilizer packages produced identical yield. But when cost benefit analysis was done the scenario was different. Highest gross margin and MBCR values were calculated from $E_{2}$ followed by FRG'97.

Table 8. Effect of different fertilizers on Agroeconomic performance of Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Palima during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  | TVC | GM | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman | (Tk/ha) |  |  |
| ED1 | 5.00 a | 3.08 b | 6.99 a | 4.32 b | 39510 | 29470 | 1.42 |
| ED2 | 5.45 a | 3.80 a | 7.66 a | 5.02 a | 41950 | 39370 | 2.07 |
| INM | 5.29 a | 3.72 a | 7.91 a | 4.50 ab | 43120 | 33230 | 1.19 |
| FRG'97 | 5.35 a | 3.30 b | 7.49 a | 4.38 b | 39910 | 34490 | 1.99 |
| FP | 5.10 a | 2.95 b | 7.14 a | 4.08 b | 37970 | 26520 | 1.27 |


| Control | 2.71 b | 2.01 c | 3.80 b | 3.42 c |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Table 8.1. Fertilizer doses |  | 32230 | 19220 |  |
| Treatment |  | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |  |
|  | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |
| ED1 | $90-20-50-0$ | $62-15-32-0$ |  |  |
| ED2 | $130-30-70-0$ | $87-20-45-0$ |  |  |
| INM | $123-55-57-0+$ CD 10 t/ha | $87-20-45-0$ |  |  |
| FRG'97 | $100-20-35-12$ | $70-8-25-4$ |  |  |
| FP | $110-10-20-0$ | $45-12-20-0$ |  |  |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |  |  |

## Location: Lebukhali, Patuakhali <br> Cropping pattern: Mungbean-T.Aus-T.Aman

## Year of establishment: 1999-2000

In Mungbean, ED2 and INM produced significantly higher grain yield followed by ED1 and FRG'97. But in T.Aus, different fertilizer packages produced identical yield except with FP and control. In T.Aman rice significantly higher yield was recorded from INM, ED2 and FRG'97. The highest gross margin was calculated from INM followed by ED2 and FRG'97. Similarly the MBCR was also higher in the same treatments.

Table 9. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Mungbean- T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Lebukhali during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  |  | TVC(Tk/ha) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk/ha) } \end{gathered}$ | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mungbean | T.Aus | T.Aman | Mungbean | T.Aus | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 800b | 4.12ab | 3.74b | 1850 | 4.04 | 3.64 | 45780 | 43240 | 1.88 |
| ED2 | 820ab | 4.32a | 4.28a | 1800 | 4.30 | 4.12 | 47189 | 47111 | 2.00 |
| INM | 850a | 4.68a | 4.48a | 1900 | 4.18 | 3.95 | 49184 | 50856 | 1.98 |
| FRG'97 | 800b | 4.30a | 4.04ab | 2000 | 4.52 | 4.43 | 45424 | 46556 | 2.36 |
| FP | 780bc | 3.43b | 3.20c | 1840 | 3.38 | 3.15 | 44000 | 35610 | 1.25 |
| Control | 750c | 2.38c | 2.88d | 1870 | 3.32 | 2.98 | 37200 | 27120 | - |

Table 9.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mungbean | T.Aus | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $12-14-20$ | $55-10-20$ | $55-10-20$ |
| ED2 | $12-14-20$ | $75-15-20$ | $75-15-20$ |
| INM | $10-13-20$ | $50-8-20$ | $50-8-20$ |
| FRG'97 | $20-21-20$ | $35-8-20$ | $35-8-20$ |
| FP | $0-0-0$ | $60-0-0$ | $50-0-0$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0$ | $0-0-0$ |

Location: Kendua, Kishoregonj
Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman
Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000
In Boro rice, gain yield did not vary significantly among the different treatments except with FP and control treatment. But in T.Aman rice significantly higher grain yield was recorded from INM and ED2. However, the identical yield was obtained from ED1, FRG'97 and FP. The highest gross margin was calculated from ED2 which was closely followed by INM, FRG'97 and ED1. But the highest MBCR was found in FRG'97 which was followed by FP and ED1.

Table 10. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Kendua during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw yield (t/ha) |  | VC <br> (Tk/ha) | GM <br> (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 5.06 ab | 3.78 b | 5.50 a | 4.51 a | 6652 | 57078 | 2.52 |
| ED2 | 5.41 a | 4.16 a | 5.67 a | 4.81 a | 9177 | 59695 | 2.11 |
| INM | 5.54 a | 4.34 a | 5.79 a | 4.45 a | 11421 | 57879 | 1.53 |
| FRG'97 | 4.99 ab | 3.77 b | 5.25 a | 4.65 a | 5361 | 58119 | 3.31 |
| FP | 4.79 b | 3.74 b | 4.00 ab | 4.82 a | 6142 | 55990 | 2.55 |
| Control | 3.12 c | 2.18 c | 3.31 b | 3.91 b | 0 | 40345 | - |

Table 10.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $100-15-40-10$ | $60-8-30-4$ |
| ED2 | $140-21-56-14$ | $84-11-42-6$ |
| INM | $130-15-46-14+$ CD 10 t/ha | $84-11-42-6$ |
| FRG'97 | $100-15-40-10$ | $60-6-30-4$ |
| FP | $100-10-35-18$ | $50-10-13-0$ |

Significantly higher grain yield was recorded from INM and ED2 in both Boro and T.Aman rice. The lowest yield was obtained from farmers' dose. Regarding BCR, the highest value was calculated ED1. In this trial there was no absolute control and the treatments were compared with farmers' dose. However, in INM the gross margin is highest but due to higher additional cost for cowdung the BCR is lowest.

## Location: Rangpur

Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000
The trial was conducted at Syedpur FSRD site, Nilphamari MLT site and Polashbari MLT site of Rangpur. The result showed that INM and $\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ produced the significantly higher yield of both the crops of the pattern irrespective of locations. Farmers' of Rangpur applied an additional 4-8 t/ha of cowdung along with chemical fertilizers as their traditional practice but the yield was comparatively low due to imbalance use of chemical fertilizers. Similarly highest gross margin was also obtained from the same treatments. But the highest $M B C R$ value was calculated from $E D_{1}$ followed by $E D_{2}$. Application of cowdung along with chemical fertilizers in INM and FP leads to increase the additional cost for fertilizer and thus reduced the respective MBCR.

Table 11. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at different locations of Rangpur during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw yield (t/ha) |  | VC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro |  |  |  |  |  | T.Aman |  |
|  |  | Syedpur FSRD site |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 5.19 b | 4.44 c | 6.82 b | 5.59 c |  |  | 24897 | 68348 |  |  |  |  |
| ED2 | 6.23 a | 4.96 ab | 7.93 a | 6.21 ab | 26474 | 70116 |  |  |  |  |
| INM | 6.31 a | 5.24 a | 7.92 a | 6.69 a | 28312 | 71393 |  |  |  |  |
| FRG'97 | 5.36 b | 4.62 bc | 6.75 b | 5.74 bc | 25266 | 60819 |  |  |  |  |
| FP | 5.45 b | 4.70 bc | 8.09 a | 6.02 bc | 27837 | 62018 |  |  |  |  |


| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw yield (t/ha) |  | VC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |
| Control | 2.04c | 1.72d | 3.11c | 2.72d | 19628 | 13367 |
| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw yield (t/ha) |  | VC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |
| Nilphamari MLT site |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 5.38 bc | 4.50b | 6.58b | 5.71bc | 25029 | 60156 |
| ED2 | 6.35 ab | 5.08a | 7.36a | 6.63a | 26758 | 71677 |
| INM | 6.74a | 5.28a | 7.61a | 6.73a | 28596 | 74734 |
| FRG'97 | 5.19c | 4.48b | 6.57b | 5.62c | 25003 | 58452 |
| FP | 5.85bc | 4.56b | 7.61a | 6.28ab | 27517 | 62708 |
| Control | 1.94d | 1.79c | 3.15c | 2.79d | 19417 | 13393 |
| Polashbari MLT site |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 6.05bc | 4.66b | 6.68b | 5.57bc | 26104 | 65701 |
| ED2 | 6.89a | 5.44a | 7.69a | 7.02a | 28176 | 77819 |
| INM | 6.92a | 5.50a | 7.89a | 7.02a | 30014 | 76801 |
| FRG'97 | 5.81c | 4.59b | 6.54b | 5.49c | 25144 | 64071 |
| FP | 6.47 ab | 4.94b | 7.98a | 6.13b | 28249 | 70086 |
| Control | 2.35d | 1.47c | 3.13c | 2.26d | 19558 | 16252 |

Table 11.1. Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& CD $10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) of different locations of Rangpur

| Treat. | Syedpur |  | Nilphamari |  | Polashbari |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $100-20-30-10$ | $55-10-20-2$ | $100-20-30-10$ | $86-6-29-2$ | $100-20-30-10$ | $86-10-30-4$ |
| ED2 | $140-28-42-14$ | $75-12-25-3$ | $140-28-42-14$ | $117-7-38-3$ | $140-28-42-14$ | $117-12-40-5$ |
| INM | $130-22-32-14+$ CD | $75-12-25-3$ | $130-22-32-14+$ CD | $117-7-38-3$ | $130-22-32-14+$ CD | $117-12-40-5$ |
|  | $10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |  | $10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |  | $10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |  |
| FRG'97 | $100-20-30-10$ | $65-7-20-3$ | $100-20-30-10$ | $65-7-20-3$ | $100-20-30-10$ | $65-7-20-3$ |
| FP | $155-18-33-8+$ CD | $97-18-28-0$ | $86-16-23-2+7.5$ | $86-17-24$ | $155-16-28-6+$ CD 8 | $86-16-25-2$ |
|  | $4 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |  | t/ha |  | t/ha |  |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

Location: Paba, Rajshahi
Cropping pattern: Wheat-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000
In wheat, significantly higher grain yield was recorded from INM and ED2 followed by ED1 and FRG'97. However, ED1 and FRG'97 produced identical yield which was statistically higher than FP. But in T.Aman rice different treatments produced identical yield only differ with FP and control treatment. In both the cases control treatment gave the lowest yield. Regarding cost and return analysis the highest gross margin was calculated from INM followed by ED2 but the MBCR was highest in ED1 followed by ED2 and FRG'97. Inclusion of cost of cowdung the fertilization cost increased in INM and therefore the MBCR decreased.

Table 12. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Wheat-T.Aman cropping pattern at Paba during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  | TVC | GM <br> (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | T.Aman | Wheat | T.Aman | MBCR |  |  |
| ED1 | 2.61 b | 3.95 ab | 3.25 | 5.51 | 6366 | 61051 | 4.43 |
| ED2 | 3.12 a | 4.35 a | 2.93 | 5.92 | 8767 | 62856 | 3.42 |


| INM | 3.57 a | 4.70 a | 3.92 | 6.11 | 10547 | 66853 | 3.22 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRG'97 | 2.94 b | 4.19 a | 3.20 | 4.48 | 7168 | 57470 | 3.43 |
| FP | 2.71 c | 3.72 b | 3.85 | 5.20 | 5470 | 49215 | 2.99 |
| Control | 0.89 d | 1.92 c | 1.17 | 3.71 | 0 | 32870 | - |

Table 12.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $89-17-43-15$ | $88-8-20-5$ |
| ED2 | $126-23-61-23$ | $120-10-25-7$ |
| INM | $116-17-51-23+$ CD 10 t/ha | $120-10-25-7$ |
| FRG'97 | $90-20-35-10$ | $70-6-20-4$ |
| FP | $67-22-26$ | $97-22-30$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

Location: Chabbishnagar, Barind, Rajshahi
Cropping pattern: Wheat-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000

In wheat, the yield did not differ significantly among the treatments except with FP and control. In T.Aman rice, the significantly higher yield was recorded from ED2 and INM followed by ED1 and FRG'97. The gross margin was higher in INM followed by ED2 and ED1. But the MBCR was the highest in ED1 followed by ED2. In INM, due to the inclusion of cost for cowdung reduced the incremental BCR.

Table 13. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Wheat-T.Aman cropping pattern at Barind during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw yield (t/ha) |  | VC <br> (Tk/ha) | GM <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | T.Aman | Wheat | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 2.93 a | 3.84 b | 3.23 | 5.54 | 6412 | 60553 | 4.32 |
| ED2 | 3.10 a | 4.38 a | 2.95 | 5.94 | 8769 | 62881 | 3.42 |
| INM | 3.22 a | 4.73 a | 3.91 | 6.17 | 10555 | 64855 | 3.03 |
| FRG'97 | 2.97 a | 4.15 b | 3.19 | 4.50 | 7173 | 57467 | 3.43 |
| FP | 2.09 b | 3.67 c | 2.83 | 5.27 | 5470 | 49210 | 2.98 |
| Control | 0.79c | 1.88 d | 1.13 | 3.68 | 0 | 32870 | - |

Table 13.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $105-30-21-13$ | $80-10-20-4$ |
| ED2 | $150-42-31-20$ | $105-12-25-5$ |
| INM | $140-36-21-20+$ CD 10 t/ha | $105-12-25-5$ |
| FRG'97 | $90-25-60-20$ | $75-12-40-5$ |
| FP | $62-25-15-8$ | $62-13-16-8$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

## Location: Atkapalia FSRD site, Noakhali

Cropping pattern: Fallow-Fallow-T.Aman Year of establishment: 2000

The trial was initiated with single crop based pattern and the crop was T.Aman. Most of the area of Noakhali is covered by only one crop T.Aman. In Atkapalia FSRD site the yield of rice was did not
differed significantly among the different levels of nutrients except farmers' dose (FP) and control. Regarding economics, the highest gross margin was calculated from ED2 and FRG'97. Similarly, the MBCR was also higher in FRG’97 followed by ED1.

Table 14. Effect of different fertilizers on grain yield and straw yield of Fallow-FallowT.Aman cropping pattern at Atkapalia FSR site during 2000

| Treatment (NPKS kg/ha \& CD t/ha) | Yield of T.Aman (t/ha) |  | TVC <br> (Tk/ha) | GM <br> (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grain | Straw |  |  |  |
| 103-21-13-0-1 (ED1) | 4.05 a | 4.88 c | 15643 | 21877 | 2.40 |
| 140-25-17-0-2 (ED2) | 4.40 a | 5.42 b | 16743 | 23947 | 2.28 |
| 130-19-5-0-2 + 10 t/ha CD (INM) | 4.46 a | 5.97 a | 20275 | 21877 | 1.01 |
| 65-20-40-10-1 (FRG'97) | 4.30 a | 4.82 c | 15566 | 23420 | 2.66 |
| 38-16-0-0 (FP) | 3.51 b | 4.14 d | 15292 | 17010 | 1.02 |
| 0-0-0-0 (Control) | 2.71 c | 3.62 c | 12000 | 13300 | - |

## Location: Munshiganj <br> Cropping pattern: Potato-Jute

## Year of establishment: 1999-00

Highest tuber yield was recorded from integrated nutrient management practice that was also identical to farmers' dose followed by ED2. ED1 and FRG'97 also produced identical yield. In Jute the higher and identical fiber yield was obtained from INM, ED2 and FP followed by ED1 and FRG'97. The highest gross margin was found in INM followed by ED2. The highest MBCR was calculated from ED2 followed by INM and ED1. Due to higher fertilization cost in FP as the farmers traditionally applied an extremely high fertilizer in potato, the gross margin and MBCR was least in FP.

Table 15. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Potato-Jute cropping pattern at Munshiganj during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Tuber/ Fiber yield (t/ha) |  | Stick yield <br> (t/ha) | TVC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Potato | Jute |  |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 26.9 c | 1.50 b | 2.67 b | 54086 | 104085 | 8.53 |
| ED2 | 33.5 b | 1.84 ab | 2.95 ab | 55806 | 138028 | 12.0 |
| INM | 34.5 a | 2.02 a | 3.58 a | 58362 | 142066 | 9.22 |
| FRG'97 | 27.5 c | 1.52 b | 2.70 b | 55832 | 105154 | 6.46 |
| FP | 33.8 ab | 1.97 a | 3.53 a | 68360 | 128143 | 3.98 |
| Control | 20.8 d | 1.05 c | 1.82 c | 50000 | 73309 | - |

Table 15.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Potato | Jute |
| ED1 | $90-8-35-10$ | $35-0-10-0$ |
| ED2 | $128-11-50-15$ | $50-0-15-0$ |
| INM | $118-6-40-15+$ CD 10 t/ha | $50-0-15-0$ |
| FRG'97 | $95-25-60-20$ | $35-4-20-3$ |
| FP | $400-150-400-0$ | $60-0-0-0$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

## Location: Goyeshpur FSRD site, Pabna <br> Cropping pattern: Wheat-Jute-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-00

No significant difference in grain yield of wheat was observed among the different treatments even
with farmers' dose. Similar trend was also observed in Jute. But in T.Aman rice the higher and identical yield was obtained from $E D_{2}$, $I N M$ and $F P$. $F R G ' 97$ and $E D_{1}$ produced similar yield. The highest gross margin was calculated from INM followed by $E D_{2}$ and $E D_{1}$. Regarding the MBCR the highest value was recorded from $E D_{1}$ which was closely followed by other treatment except Farmers' practice. Table 16. Effect of different fertilizers on the grain yield of crops in Wheat-Jute-T.Aman cropping pattern at Goyeshpur during 1999-00

| Treatment | Grain/Fiber yield |  |  | TVC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | Jute | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| $E D_{1}$ | 3.18a | 1.51ab | 3.50b | 45646 | 58214 | 2.42 |
| $\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ | 3.29a | 1.62ab | 4.34a | 47810 | 59605 | 2.14 |
| INM | 3.21a | 1.66a | 4.53a | 49405 | 65440 | 2.28 |
| FRG'97 | 3.10a | 1.50ab | 3.54b | 45455 | 57193 | 2.36 |
| FP | 2.89a | 1.27ab | 4.24a | 45866 | 51522 | 1.83 |
| Control | 1.61 b | 0.99b | 1.93c | 33295 | 28520 | - |

Table 16.1. The treatment combinations were as follows:

| Treatment | Wheat | Jute | T. Aman |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NPKS kg/ha | NPKS kg/ha | NPKS kg/ha |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=\mathrm{ED}_{1}$ | $75-26-17-20-2.5-0.3$ | $67-8-13-8$ | $59-13-12-5$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}=\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ | $107-35-24-29-3.5-0.5$ | $94-11-18-12$ | $81-15-16-7$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}=$ FM | $97-26-19-29-3.5-0.5$ | $94-11-18-12$ | $81-15-16-7$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}=$ FRG'97 | $90-20-35-10-2-0.5$ | $65-7-20-4$ | $70-6-20-4$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}=\mathrm{FP}$ | $64-26-17-0-0-0$ | $35-11-25-1.5$ | $75-16-29-4$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{0}=$ Control | $(0-0-0-0)$ | $(0-0-0-0)$ | $(0-0-0-0)$ |

Location: Chatmohor, Pabna
Cropping pattern: Wheat-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000
The highest grain yield of Wheat ( $2.91 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and T.Aman (4.8t/ha) was recorded from INM where cowdung @ 3t/ha was applied along with recommended fertilizer dose for HYG. However it was also identical to other treatments except with Farmers' practice ant control treatment. Similarly the gross margin was almost same in all the treatments except with Farmers' practice and Control. But the MBCR for fertilizer cost was highest (4.28) in FRG'97 followed by ED. In INM the additional cost for cowdung increased the fertilization cost which decrease the MBCR.

Table 17. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Wheat-T.Aman cropping pattern at Chatmohor during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  | TVC (Tk/ha) | GM <br> (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | T.Aman | Wheat | T.Aman |  | 289 |  |
| ED1 | 2.81 ab | 4.47 ab | 3.97 ab | 5.72 abc | 29954 | 28960 | 3.53 |
| ED2 | 2.90 a | 4.68 a | 4.10 a | 5.97 ab | 31970 | 29052 | 2.70 |
| INM | 2.91 a | 4.80 a | 3.76 bc | 6.32 a | 34341 | 28034 | 2.04 |
| FRG'97 | 2.78 ab | 4.32 ab | 3.87 ab | 5.35 bc | 28635 | 28438 | 4.28 |
| FP | 2.52 c | 4.15 b | 3.51 c | 5.07 c | 29742 | 23776 | 2.82 |
| Control | 1.36 d | 2.20 c | 2.36 d | 2.88 d | 23295 | 5600 | - |

Table 17.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKSZn kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Wheat | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $89-30-49-15-0.6$ | $72-11-32-4$ |
| ED2 | $126-41-70-27-0.75$ | $97-13-42-5.5$ |


| INM | $116-13-34-14-0.7+$ CD 5t/ha | $97-13-42-5.5$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| FRG'97 | $90-20-35-10-2$ | $70-6-20-4$ |
| FP | $86-26-27$ | $72-14-21-13$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |
| Location: Chandina, Comilla |  |  |
| Cropping pattern: Potato-T.Aus-T.Aman | Year of establishment | $: \mathbf{1 9 9 9 - 0 0}$ |

Significantly higher tuber yield was obtained from INM, FP and ED2 followed by ED1 and FRG'97. In T.Aus and T.Aman almost similar trend was found. Farmers traditionally applied a very high dose of fertilizer in potato. The highest gross margin was calculated from INM followed by ED2. Regarding the MBCR the highest value was recorded from ED 1 which was closely followed by ED2 and FRG'97. However, the total yield was higher in FP but due to the excess fertilization cost the MBCR was the least.

Table 18. Effect of different fertilizers on the grain yield of crops in Potato-T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Chandina during 1999-00

| Treatment | Grain/Fiber yield |  |  | VC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Potato | T.Aus |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{ED}_{1}$ | 15.9 b | 3.4 b | 4.5 b | 11229 | 117381 | 5.79 |
| $\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ | 17.9 ab | 3.8 ab | 5.15 ab | 13813 | 126867 | 5.58 |
| INM | 18.5 a | 3.9 a | 5.57 a | 15232 | 127508 | 4.20 |
| FRG '97 | 16.2 b | 3.5 b | 4.88 ab | 12216 | 118604 | 5.50 |
| FP | 18.8 a | 4.0 a | 5.45 a | 27699 | 121871 | 3.10 |
| Control | 6.1 c | 1.9 c | 3.5 c | 0 | 63570 | - |

Table 18.1. The treatment combinations were as follows:

| Treatment | Potato | T.Aus | T. Aman |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NPKS kg/ha | NPKS kg/ha | NPKS kg/ha |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=\mathrm{ED}_{1}$ | $80-11-50-13-4$ | $51-10-55-8$ | $51-10-55-8$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}=\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ | $113-20-101-15-5$ | $72-12-60-12$ | $72-12-60-12$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}=$ FM | $103-14-90-15-5+C D 10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ | $72-12-60-12$ | $72-12-60-12$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}=$ FRG'97 | $95-20-56-8-3$ | $64-14-40-8$ | $64-14-40-8$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}=\mathrm{FP}$ | $225-117-225$ | $90-59-100$ | $90-59-100$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{0}=$ Control | $(0-0-0-0)$ | $(0-0-0-0)$ | $(0-0-0-0)$ |

## Location: Laksam, Comilla

Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman Year of establishment :1999-2000
In Boro rice, significantly higher grain yield was recorded from ED2, INM and FP followed by ED1 and FRG'97. Similar trend was found in T.Aman rice also. Highest gross margin was calculated from INM followed by ED2. But the highest gross margin was found in FRG'97 followed by ED2.

Table 19. Effect of different fertilizers on Agroeconomic performance of Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Laksam during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  | VC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 5.56b | 4.68b | 6.9 | 5.14 | 6312 | 73908 | 5.45 |
| ED2 | 6.28ab | 5.30a | 7.6 | 6.48 | 7884 | 87256 | 6.05 |
| INM | 6.36a | 5.40a | 7.8 | 6.81 | 9795 | 89135 | 5.00 |
| FRG'97 | 5.88b | 4.73b | 6.6 | 5.67 | 5747 | 80793 | 7.18 |


| FP | 6.33 a | 4.93 ab | 7.8 | 5.9 | 10554 | 81966 | 4.02 |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Control | 3.56 c | 2.09 c | 4.2 | 2.73 | 0 | 39480 | - |

Table 19.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $96-18-25-14$ | $52-12-58-8$ |
| ED2 | $135-22-37-22$ | $74-15-62-13$ |
| INM | $125-17-27-22+$ CD 10 t/ha | $74-15-62-13$ |
| FRG'97 | $95-17-14$ | $45-7-25-4$ |
| FP | $145-25-60$ | $95-45-52$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

Location: Shibpur, Norshingdi
Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000

In Boro rice, significantly higher grain yield was recorded from INM and ED2 followed by other treatments. Identical yield was obtained from ED1, FRG'97 and FP. Similar trend was also found in T.Aman rice also. Highest gross margin was calculated from INM followed by ED2. Similarly the highest MBCR was found in INM followed by FRG'97.

Table 20. Effect of different fertilizers on agro-economic performance of Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Shibpur during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw/stover yield (t/ha) |  | TVC <br> $(T k / h a)$ | GM <br> (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| ED1 | 5.21 b | 3.62 c | 6.74 b | 3.95 c | 29606 | 31546 | 1.67 |
| ED2 | 5.71 ab | 4.40 ab | 6.96 b | 4.41 b | 31736 | 35220 | 1.68 |
| INM | 6.46 a | 4.86 a | 8.02 b | 5.21 a | 34455 | 43909 | 2.00 |
| FRG'97 | 5.56 b | 3.70 c | 7.04 b | 4.03 b | 30644 | 34472 | 1.80 |
| FP | 5.25 b | 3.51 c | 6.69 b | 3.83 c | 32388 | 29098 | 1.03 |
| Control | 2.25 c | 2.13 d | 4.08 c | 2.96 d | 21375 | 17767 | - |

Table 20.1. Fertilizer doses

| Treatment | Fertilizer doses (NPKS kg/ha \& cowdung t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman |
| ED1 | $83-21-40-3$ | $57-9-25-2$ |
| ED2 | $116-30-55-5$ | $78-12-32-3$ |
| INM | $106-25-455+$ CD 5 t/ha | $78-12-32-3$ |
| FRG'97 | $100-15-40-10$ | $60-8-30-4$ |
| FP | $100-30-60-4$ | $80-16-20-2$ |
| Control | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |

## Location: Kushtia

Cropping pattern: Onion-T.Aus -T.Aman Year of establishment : 1999-00

Significantly higher bulb yield was obtained from INM and $E D_{2}$ followed by other treatments. In T.Aus the trend was almost similar. But in T.Aman rice there was no significant difference among the treatments except with control.

The highest gross margin was calculated from INM followed by ED2. Regarding MBCR the highest value was recorded from $\mathrm{ED}_{2}$, which was closely followed by INM.

Table 21. Effect of different fertilizers on the grain yield of crops in Onion-T.Aus -T.Aman cropping pattern at Kushtia during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain/Fiber yield |  |  | VC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Onion | T.Aus | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{ED}_{1}$ | 8.87 b | 3.16 b | 4.45 a | 10253 | 152767 | 6.14 |
| $\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ | 11.2 a | 3.85 a | 4.60 a | 11870 | 181100 | 7.61 |
| INM | 11.1 a | 6.92 a | 4.80 a | 13039 | 185356 | 7.25 |
| FRG'97 | 9.52 b | 3.20 b | 4.35 a | 10372 | 161538 | 6.82 |
| FP | 9.87 b | 3.25 b | 4.66 a | 11942 | 165433 | 6.25 |
| Control | 5.03 c | 2.06 c | 2.25 b | 0 | 90750 | - |

Table 21.1. The treatment combinations were as follows:

| Treatment | Onion <br> (NPKS kg/ha) | T.Aus <br> (NPKS kg/ha) | T. Aman <br> (NPKS kg/ha) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ ED $_{1}$ | $80-26-20-0-2$ | $55-15-7-3$ | $55-15-7-3$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}=\mathrm{ED}_{2}$ | $110-35-20-5$ |  |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}=$ IFM | $100-30-20-5+C D 10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ | $75-18-10-5$ | $75-18-10-5$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}=$ FRG'97 | $100-40-60-25-2$ | $75-18-10-5$ | $75-18-10-5$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}=\mathrm{FP}$ | $109-22-74-17-$ | $70-6-15-4$ | $70-6-15-4$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{0}=$ Control | $(0-0-0-0)$ | $52-25-31-4$ | $52-25-31-4$ |

Appendix table 1. Initial soil status of the experimental site

| Location with AEZ | Land type | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{R} \\ & \text { /I } \end{aligned}$ | pH | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O.C } \\ & \text { (\%) } \end{aligned}$ | Total N (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{K} \\ \text { (m.eq./100g } \\ \text { soil) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | P | S | Zn | B |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ppm |  |  |  |
| Muktagacha (9) | MHL | 1 | 5.56 | 1.98 | 0.171(L) | 0.085 (VL) | 7.33 (VL) | 28.3 (Opt.) | - | - |
| Hathazari (23) | MHL | 1 | 4.68 | 1.15 | 0.08 | 0.04 | 9.45 | 14.66 | 1.91 | 0.81 |
| Hathazari (23) | MHL | 1 | 5.23 | 1.90 | 0.11 | 0.29 | 9.83 | 6.67 | - | 0.09 |
| Narikeli (9) | MHL | 1 | 5.6 | 1.30 | 0.75 (L) | 0.65 (0) | 7.5 (L) | 8.0 (L) | 4.0 (M) | 0.17 (L) |
| Palima (9) | MHL | 1 | 6.2 | 1.44 | 0.09 (VL) | 0.16 (L) | 6.83 (VL) | 21.77 (Opt) | 2.04(H) | 0.20 (L) |
| Palima (9) | MHL | 1 | 5.3 | 2.08 | 0.10 (L) | 0.12 (L) | 5.0 (VL) | 51.0 (H) | 2.42(H) | - |
| Narikeli | MHL | 1 | 5.6 | 1.20 | 0.07 (VL) | 0.62 (0) | 8.0 (L) | 7.8 (L) | 4.0 (M) | 0.17 (L) |
| Lebukhali | MHL | R | 5.3 | 1.44 | 0.08 (VL) | 0.28 (Opt) | 4.4 (VL) | 33.46(Opt) | $0.34(\mathrm{VL})$ | - |
| Paba | MHL | 1 | 8.5 | 1.52 | 0.07 (VL) | 0.16 (L) | 5.16 (L) | 19.5 (M) | 0.65 (L) | 0.29 (L) |
| Barind (25) | MHL | 1 | 8.48 | 1.53 | 0.08 (VL) | 0.16 (L) | 5.16 (L) | 19.5 (M) | 0.65 (L) | 0.29 (L) |
| Munshiganj(19) | MLL | 1 | 4.9 | 1.97 | 0.11 (L) | 0.30 (Opt) | 29.0 (Opt) | 127.8 (VH) | 4.36 (VH) | 0.58(Opt) |
| Atkapalia | MHL | R | 7.06 | 1.41 | 0.03 | 0.23 | 5.7 | 65.2 | 0.66 | - |
| Syedpur (3) | MHL | 1 | 5.4 | 2.41 | 0.14 (L) | 0.17 (M) | 9.1 (L) | 33.9 (Opt) | 1.3 (Opt) | 0.24 (L) |
| Polashbari | MHL | 1 | 5.9 | 1.27 | 0.08 (VL) | 0.09 (L) | 10.1 (L) | 12.5 (L) | 1.1 (M) | 0.19 (L) |
| Nilphamari | MHL | 1 | 5.1 | 1.55 | 0.09 (VL) | 0.12 (L) | 16.5 (M) | 18.5 (M) | 1.24 (M) | 0.27 (L) |
| Kushtia | MHL | 1 | 8.1 | 2.54 | 0.15 (L) | 0.69 (VH) | 3.98 (VL) | 30.0 (0) | 0.82 (L) | 0.36 (M) |
| Shibpur | MHL | 1 | 5.62 | 1.70 | 0.13 (L) | 0.17 (M) | 6.1 (L) | 30.8 (0) | 1.17 (M) | 0.22 (L) |
| Bagherpara | MHL | 1 | - | - | 0.11 (L) | 0.39 (H) | 17.9 (M) | 7.34 (VL) | 3.29 (VH) | 0.4 (M) |
| Norail | MHL | 1 | - | - | 0.11 (L) | 0.27 (M) | 1.88 (VL) | 36.0 (H) | $2.57 \mathrm{VH})$ | 0.82 (0) |
| Goyeshpur | MHL | 1 | 7.7 | 2.06 | 0.12 (L) | 0.23 (M) | 6.5 (VL) | 5.36 (M) | 0.45 (M) | 0.33 (0) |

Appendix table 2. Crop management practices

| Site | Cropping pattern | Variety | Seed rate (kg/ha) | Planting time | Harvesting time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Muktagacha | Mustard | Tori-7 | 10 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb |
|  | Boro | BR 28 | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 33 | 40 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of July | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov |
| Bagherpara | Mustard | Tori-7 | 08 | $33^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb |
|  | Boro | BR 28 | 40 | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of Feb | Last week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | Last week of July | $4{ }^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov |
| Narikeli | Mustard | Tori-7 | 08 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov | Last week of Jan |
|  | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 50 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | Last week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 50 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov |
| Palima | Mustard | Tori-7 | 10 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of Jan |
|  | Jute | 0-9897 | 12 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of April | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Aug |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 33 | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Aug | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Nov |
| Narikeli | Wheat | Kanchan | 100 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of March |
|  | Jute | 0-9897 | 10 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of April | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 50 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Nov |
| Kishoregonj | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of March |
|  | Jute | Falgunitosa | 08 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of April | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 50 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Aug | $4{ }^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov |
| Lebukhali | Mungbean | Kanti | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of April |
|  | T.Aus | BR 2 | 40 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of May | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Aug. |
|  | T.Aman | BR 23 | 40 | Last week of Aug | Last week of Dec |
| Palima | Boro | BR 29 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 33 | 40 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov |
| Kendua | Boro | BR 3 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb. | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | Last week of July | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov |
| Hathazari | Boro | BR 29 | 35 | 3rd week of Jan | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 30 | 35 | Last week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Syedpur | Boro | BR 14 | 40 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Polashbari | Boro | BR 2 | 40 | $11^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Nilphamari | Boro | BR 14 | 40 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Jan | 1st week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $33^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Paba | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of March |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 30 | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of July | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov. |
| Barind | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | Last week of Nov | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of March |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 29 | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of July | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov |
| Munshiganj | Potato | Diamont | 1500 | Last week of Nov. | $11^{\text {st }}$ week of March |
|  | Jute | O-9897 | 10 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of April | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of July |
| Atkapalia | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | Last week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Goyeshpur | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. | ${ }^{\text {3rd }}$ week of March |
|  | Jute | 0-9897 | 08 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of April | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of July |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 50 | Last week of July | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov |
| Chatmohor | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of March |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | Last week of July | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov |
| Chandina | Potato | Diamont | 1500 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec.. | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb. |
|  | T.Aus | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | Last week of April | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug. | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov. |
| Laksam | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 40 | Last week of Jan. | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug. | $1^{\text {st }} \text { week of Dec. }$ |
| Shibpur | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 40 | Last week of Jan. | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | $11^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug. | $11^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. |
| Kushtia | Onion | Taherpuri | - | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Jan. | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of April. |
|  | T.Aus | IR 50 | 40 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of May | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug. |
|  | T.Aman | BR 22 | 40 | 3rd week of Aug. | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Dec. |

## Integrated nutrient management for Potato-T.Aus-T.Aman rice cropping pattern

The experiment was initiated from rabi, 1996-97 at Chandina, Comilla with Potato-T.aus- T.aman cropping pattern in medium highland area under irrigated condition to develop a cropping pattern based fertilizer recommendation considering carryover effect of nutrient in Potato-T.aus-T.aman cropping pattern. But the experiment was could not be completed as the crops were damaged due to flood during 1997-98 and 1998-99 and in 1999-00 the experiment was started again. The experiment was laid out in RCB design with five dispersed replications. Different fertilizer combinations were tested in $8 \mathrm{mx5} 5 \mathrm{~m}$ unit plot area. Treatments are shown below-

| Potato | T.Aus | T.Aman |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Absolute control | T1= Absolute control | $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ Absolute control |
| $\begin{aligned} T_{2}= & R F \text { for MYG (120-70-120-20- } \\ & 4 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha} \text { of } N, P, K, S \text { and } Z n) \end{aligned}$ | $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ RF for MYG | $\mathrm{T}_{2}=$ RF for MYG |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}=$ Soil test based fertilizer rate for | $\mathrm{T}_{3 \cdot 1}=100 \%$ nutrient rate | $\mathrm{T}_{3.1}=100 \%$ nutrient rate |
| MYG (150-40-150-10 kg/ha of | $\mathrm{T}_{3 \cdot 2}=100 \% \mathrm{~N}+66 \%$ others | $\mathrm{T}_{3 \cdot 2}=100 \% \mathrm{~N}+66 \%$ others |
| N, P, K and S) | $\mathrm{T}_{3 \cdot 3}=100 \% \mathrm{~N}+33 \%$ others | $\mathrm{T}_{3 \cdot 3}=100 \% \mathrm{~N}+33 \%$ others |
|  | $\mathrm{T}_{3.4}=100 \% \mathrm{~N}+0$ | $\mathrm{T}_{3.4}=100 \% \mathrm{~N}+0$ |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}=\mathrm{T} 3+\mathrm{CD} 10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ | $\mathrm{T}_{4 \cdot 1}=100 \%+66 \%$ others | $\mathrm{T}_{4.1}=100 \%+66 \%$ others |
|  | $\mathrm{T}_{4.2}=100 \%+33 \%$ others | $\mathrm{T}_{4.2}=100 \%+33 \%$ others |
|  | $\mathrm{T}_{5}=$ Farmers' dose | $\mathrm{T}_{5}=$ Farmers' dose |

Potato variety Diamont was planted in last week of November and harvested in $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of February. T.Aus (BR-22) was transplanted in last week of April and harvested in $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July. Similarly T.Aman rice (BRRI Dhan-32) was transplanted in $1^{\text {st }}$ week of August and harvested in $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of November.

In potato superior tuber yield ( $19.2 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was recorded from soil test base recommended fertilizer dose for HYG along with 10 t /ha cowdung which was also identical to farmers' dose and STB for MYG (without cowdung). Application of cowdung increases the yield about 30\%. In farmers dose they applied a extremely high fertilizer in potato.

In T.Aus and T.Aman 66\% recommended dose of PK along with full dose of N produced identical yield with full recommended dose of NPK. Therefore it was found that at least $33 \%$ PK could be reduced in T.Aus and T.Aman if the potato grown with full recommended dose of NPK. But when potato grown with recommended fertilizer for HYG along with cowdung the succeeding crops T.Aus and T.Aman produced identical yield with full dose of recommended fertilizer when grown with even 33\% PK+full N.

From cost and return analysis it was found that the highest gross margin (112625Tk/ha) was calculated from ( $\mathrm{T}_{4.1}$ ) soil test based fertilizer dose for HYG along with cowdung in potato and $66 \%$ of recommended PK with full dose of N in T.Aus and T.Aman followed by $33 \%$ recommended dose with full $N$. But the highest MBCR was obtained from $T_{3.3}$ where potato grown with STB fertilizer dose for HYG and succeeding crops grown with $33 \%$ PK+full $N$ followed by $\mathrm{T}_{4.1}$.

Table 1. Agro-economic performance of Potato-T.Aus - T.Aman cropping pattern at Chandina, Comilla during 1999-2000

| Treat | Fertilizer dose (NPKSZn kg/ha) |  |  | Tuber/grain yield (t/ha) |  |  | VC <br> (Tk/ha) | GM <br> (Tk/ha) | MBCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Potato | T.Aus | T.Aman | Potato | T.Aus | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| T | 0-0-0-0 | 0-0-0-0 | 0-0-0-0 | 6.89c | 1.98c | 2.12d | 0 | 36014 |  |
| T2 | 120-30-100-8-2 | 70-12-25 | 70-12-25 | 15.2b | 3.44ab | 4.78b | 13350 | 89790 | 4.03 |
| T3.1 | 150-18-125-10 | 90-12-33-10 | 90-12-33-10 | 17.8ab | 3.74ab | 5.09ab | 17937 | 97273 | 3.41 |
| T3.2 |  | 90-8-23-7 | 90-8-23-7 |  | 3.62ab | 4.98b | 14285 | 99315 | 4.43 |
| T3.3 |  | 90-4-11-3 | 90-4-11-3 |  | 3.0b | 3.89bc | 10559 | 91071 | 5.21 |
| T3.4 |  | 90-0-0-0 | 90-0-0-0 |  | 2.72bc | 3.35c | 6843 | 89047 | 7.75 |
| T.11 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 150-18-125-10+CD } \\ & \text { 10t/ha } \end{aligned}$ | 90-8-23-7 | 90-8-23-7 | 19.2a | 4.39a | 5.69a | 15535 | 112625 | 4.93 |
| T4.2 |  | 90-4-11-3 | 90-4-11-3 |  | 3.53ab | 5.14ab | 11647 | 106643 | 6.06 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 225-100-180 | 90-30-50 | 90-30-50 | 17.5ab | 4.31a | 5.65a | 24141 | 98079 | 2.57 |

Effects of rice straw on the performance of Boro-Fallow-T.Aman rice system
The experiment was conducted at 4 different locations during 1998-99 to 1999-2000 with 8 treatments and 6 (six) dispersed replications to see the effect of Boro rice straw incorporation on the yield of succeeding T.Aman rice. Boro rice was grown with recommended fertilizer and the succeeding T.Aman rice was grown as per treatment mentioned below-

1. T.Aman grown with $\mathrm{RF}_{2}$
2. $1 / 3$ Boro rice straw ( $2 / 3$ should be harvested from top) incorporation then T.Aman with $R F_{2}$
3. $2 / 3$ Boro rice straw ( $1 / 3$ should be harvested from top) incorporation then T.Aman with $R F_{2}$
4. As of 2 but T.Aman with 65-22-25-20-5 kg NPKSZn/ha.
5. As of 3 but T.Aman with 50-18-16-20-5 kg NPKSZn/ha.
6. Recommended fertilizer for high yield goal $\left(R F_{1}\right)$
7. Recommended fertilizer for moderate yield goal $\left(\mathrm{RF}_{2}\right)$
8. Farmers practices (Harvesting).

## Location: Mymensingh

## Year of conduction:1998-99 to 1999-2000

Boro rice' 98-99: About $4 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $4.5 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ of grain and straw yield, respectively, were recorded from recommended dose of fertilizers. Boro rice was harvested at different height as per treatment. The highest amount of Boro rice straw ( $3.73 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was added when $2 / 3$ rd of straw was incorporated into the soil. About $2.7 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $2.0 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ of rice straw were added in the soil from $1 / 3 \mathrm{rd}$ and farmers' practice, respectively.

Performance T. Aman rice: Two years of data showed that grain yield did not vary significantly with different treatments. The effect of Boro rice straw on the yield of T.Aman rice was not evident. However, the highest grain yield was recorded from $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ where $2 / 3$ rd Boro rice straw was incorporated along with recommended fertilizer for MYG was applied. Similarly, the highest gross margin (19765 $\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and BCR (2.65) was also calculated from the same treatment.

Performance of Boro rice: In Boro rice of the second and $3^{\text {rd }}$ cycle, no significant differences in the yield were observed due to the addition of different amount of rice straw in 1998-99. In this experiment it was found that the incorporation of Boro rice straw could not influence significantly on the yield of succeeding T.Aman rice. Similar result was found in two years of experimentation. The study should be continued for another crop cycles to assess the accumulation of organic matter, improved soil fertility and thereby increase soil health and production of Boro-T. Aman rice cropping system.

Table 1. Performance of Boro rice under Boro-Fallow-T.Aman cropping pattern at Netrokona MLT site during rabi- 98-99

| Grain yield (t/ha) | Straw yield (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.06 | 4.49 |

Table 2. Rice straw in corporated in to the soil after Boro harvest during 98-99 and 1999-2000

| Treatment | Rice straw incorporated (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1998-99 | 1999-2000 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=\left(\mathrm{RF}_{2}-30 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{ha}\right)$ | 1.94 | 2.12 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}=\left(1 / 3\right.$ Straw $\left.+R F_{2}\right)$ | 2.65 | 2.86 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}=(2 / 3$ Straw + RF 2 ) | 3.74 | 3.59 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}=($ (1/3 Straw+65-22-5-20-5 Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 2.62 | 2.70 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}=(2 / 3$ Straw+50-18-16-20-5Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 3.68 | 3.92 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ ( $\mathrm{HYG}^{\text {R }} \mathrm{FF}_{1} 76-16-46-11-1.5 \mathrm{Kg}$ NPKSZn/ha) | 2.01 | 2.15 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7}=\left(\mathrm{MYG}-\mathrm{RF}_{2} 60-8-30-4-0 \mathrm{Kg}\right.$ NPKSZn/ha) | 1.95 | 2.12 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8}=$ ( Farmers practice) | 1.97 | 2.09 |

Table 3. Effect of rice straw on agro-economic performance of T.Aman rice at Netrakona during 1999

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw yield (t/ha) |  | TVC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | B CR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1999 | 2000 | 1999 | 2000 |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=\left(\mathrm{RF}_{2}-30 \mathrm{Kg} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{ha}\right)$ | 3.80 | 4.00 | 4.30 | 4.89 | 11599 | 17151 | 2.40 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}=\left(1 / 3\right.$ Straw $\left.+R F_{2}\right)$ | 3.93 | 4.34 | 4.68 | 4.95 | 11990 | 14080 | 2.17 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}=\left(2 / 3\right.$ Straw + RF ${ }_{2}$ ) | 4.19 | 4.90 | 4.85 | 5.46 | 11990 | 19765 | 2.65 |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T}_{4}=(1 / 3 \text { Straw }+65-22-25-20-5 \mathrm{Kg} \\ \text { NPKSZn } / \mathrm{ha}) \end{gathered}$ | 4.06 | 4.66 | 4.73 | 5.28 | 13852 | 16933 | 2.22 |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T}_{5}=(2 / 3 \text { Straw }+50-18-16-20-5 \mathrm{Kg} \\ \text { NPKSZn/ha) } \end{gathered}$ | 3.96 | 4.68 | 4.76 | 5.16 | 13596 | 16504 | 2.21 |
| $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{T}_{6}=\left(\mathrm{HYG}^{2}-\mathrm{RF}_{1} 76-16-46-11-1.5 \mathrm{Kg}\right. \\ \text { NPKSZn/ha) } \end{gathered}$ | 4.26 | 4.74 | 4.96 | 5.32 | 13661 | 18494 | 2.35 |
|  | 4.00 | 4.56 | 4.65 | 5.27 | 11990 | 18290 | 2.53 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8}=$ ( Farmers practice-105-23-3021 NPKS Kg./ha) | 3.89 | 4.28 | 4.56 | 5.03 | 14174 | 15381 | 2.09 |
| Level of significance | NS | NS | NS | NS |  |  |  |

Table 4. Performance of Boro rice under Boro-Fallow-T.Aman cropping pattern at Netrokona MLT site during rabi- 99-2000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw yield (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1999-2000$ | $2000-01$ | $1999-2000$ | $2000-01$ |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{1}$ | 4.38 | 4.85 | 5.33 | 5.62 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | 4.16 | 5.04 | 4.87 | 5.68 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 4.24 | 5.25 | 5.00 | 6.09 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 3.95 | 5.05 | 4.64 | 5.83 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | 4.23 | 5.08 | 5.02 | 5.88 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{6}$ | 4.28 | 4.96 | 4.96 | 5.81 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{7}$ | 4.31 | 4.87 | 5.03 | 5.79 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{8}$ | 4.03 | 4.89 | 4.72 | 5.64 |

Performance of T.Aman rice: Significantly higher grain yield was obtained from T5, T4 and T2. It indicates that incorporation of $2 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ Boro rice straw along with recommended fertilizer for MYG or a reduced rate of MYG produced identical yield. Therefore a substantial amount of NPK could be reduced in T.Aman rice if $2 / 3^{\text {rd }}$ Boro rice straw incorporated in the soil.

Table 5. Effect of rice straw on agro-economic performance of T.Aman rice at Rangpur during 19992000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) | Straw yield (t/ha) | TVC <br> (Tk/ha) | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ (\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha}) \end{gathered}$ | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}=\left(1 / 3\right.$ Straw + RF ${ }_{2}$ ) | 4.55bc | 5.46bc | 26461 | 59799 | 3.26 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}=(2 / 3$ Straw + RF 2 ) | 5.00ab | 6.08b | 27436 | 63134 | 3.30 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}=(1 / 3$ Straw+65-22-25-20-5 Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 4.86b | 5.83b | 28245 | 61080 | 3.16 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}=(2 / 3$ Straw+50-18-16-20-5Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 5.21ab | 6.19ab | 28638 | 63667 | 3.22 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}=\left(\mathrm{HYG}-\mathrm{RF}_{1} 76-16-46-11-1.5 \mathrm{Kg}\right.$ NPKSZn/ha) | 5.46a | 6.66a | 25852 | 68688 | 3.66 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7}=\left(\mathrm{MYG}-\mathrm{RF}_{2} 60-8-30-4-0 \mathrm{Kg}\right.$ NPKSZn/ha) | 4.24c | 5.23c | 25211 | 58854 | 3.33 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8}=$ ( Farmers practice-105-23-30-21 Kg NPKS/ha) | 4.78b | 6.03b | 26104 | 62681 | 3.40 |

## Location: Pabna

## Year of conduction: 1999-2000

Performance of Boro rice: About $4.89 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $7.88 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ of grain and straw yield, respectively, were recorded from recommended fertilizer.

Table 6. Performance of Boro rice under Boro-Fallow-T.Aman cropping pattern at Pabna MLT site during rabi- 98-99

| Grain yield (t/ha) | Straw yield (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4.89 | 7.88 |

Performance of T.Aman rice: No significant difference was observed in the yield of T.Aman rice. However the highest yield was obtained from T4, which was identical to other treatments. Therefore, T.Aman rice could be grown with reduced fertilizer (MYG) without significant reduction of grain yield if Boro rice straw incorporated in the soil.

Table 7. Effect of rice straw on agro-economic performance of T.Aman rice at Pabna during 1999-2000

| Treatment | Grain <br> yield <br> (t/ha) | Straw yield (t/ha) | TVC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=\mathrm{RF} 2$ | 2.73b | 3.54 | 34040 | 23970 | 1.70 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}=\left(1 / 3\right.$ Straw $\left.+R F_{2}\right)$ | 3.13a | 4.07 | 34040 | 25785 | 1.73 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}=\left(2 / 3\right.$ Straw $\left.+\mathrm{RF}_{2}\right)$ | 2.98ab | 3.87 | 34040 | 24135 | 1.63 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}=(1 / 3$ Straw+65-22-25-20-5 Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 3.28a | 4.26 | 35611 | 25359 | 1.69 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}=(2 / 3$ Straw+50-18-16-20-5Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 3.23a | 4.20 | 35023 | 25082 | 1.68 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}=\left(\right.$ HYG- RF ${ }_{1}$ 76-16-46-11-1.5Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 3.10a | 4.03 | 35000 | 24995 | 1.70 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7}=\left(\mathrm{MYG}-\mathrm{RF}_{2} 60-8-30-4-0 \mathrm{Kg}\right.$ NPKSZn/ha) | 3.23a | 4.20 | 34387 | 27800 | 1.81 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8=}$ ( Farmers practice-105-23-30-21 NPKS Kg/ha) | 3.08a | 4.00 | 35108 | 18862 | 1.53 |

## Location: Comilla

Performance of Boro rice: About 5.15 t/ha and 6.9 t/ha of grain and straw yield, respectively, were recorded from recommended fertilizer.

Table 8. Performance of Boro rice under Boro-Fallow-T.Aman cropping pattern at Comilla MLT site during rabi- 98-99

| Grain yield (t/ha) | Straw yield (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 5.15 | 6.9 |

Performance of T.Aman rice: No significant difference was observed in the yield of T.Aman rice. However the highest yield was obtained from T2, which was identical to other treatments. It is clear from the study that T.Aman rice could be grown with reduced fertilizer (MYG) without significant reduction of grain yield if Boro rice straw incorporated in the soil.

Table 9. Effect of rice straw on agro-economic performance of T.Aman rice at Comilla during 19992000

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) | Straw yield (t/ha) | TVC (Tk/ha) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GM } \\ & \text { (Tk/ha) } \end{aligned}$ | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}=\left(1 / 3\right.$ Straw $\left.+R F_{2}\right)$ | 4.52 | 4.49 | 31503 | 67472 | 3.14 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}=\left(2 / 3\right.$ Straw $+\mathrm{RF}_{2}$ ) | 4.65 | 5.35 | 31572 | 69128 | 3.19 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}=(1 / 3$ Straw+65-22-25-20-5 Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 4.45 | 5.27 | 32331 | 66889 | 3.07 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}=(2 / 3$ Straw+50-18-16-20-5Kg NPKSZn/ha) | 4.42 | 5.58 | 31740 | 67580 | 3.13 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}=\left(\begin{array}{l}\text { HYG- RF }\end{array}\right.$ | 4.29 | 4.96 | 32946 | 64844 | 2.97 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{7}=\left(\mathrm{MYG}-\mathrm{RF}_{2} 60-8-30-4-0 \mathrm{Kg}\right.$ NPKSZn/ha) | 4.06 | 5.75 | 32434 | 65536 | 3.02 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{8}=$ ( Farmers practice-105-23-30-21 NPKS Kg./ha) | 4.30 | 5.40 | 35541 | 60759 | 2.71 |
| Level of significance | NS | NS |  |  |  |

Development of fertilizer recommendation for T.Aus (HYV)-T.Aman (HYV)-Fallow system under rainfed condition at Surma-Kushyara floodplain soil

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet under rainfed condition in medium high land of Surma-Kushyara flood plain soil during the year 2000 to determine the profitable fertilizer dose for T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern. The trial was laid out in RCB design with 5 dispersed replications. Six different treatments were tested. T.aus was transplanted in $1^{\text {st }}$ week of June and harvested in mid. August and T.aman was transplanted in $1^{\text {st }}$ week of September and harvested in last week of November. Crop variety BR 26 and BRRI Dhan 32 was used for T.Aus and T.Aman, respectively.

In T.Aus rice, the identical grain yield was recorded from $T_{1}$ and $T_{2}$ where recommended dose of fertilizer for HYG and MYG were applied which were significantly differed with other treatments. Reduction of S and Zn from recommended dose significantly reduced the yield. The lowest yield was recorded from farmers' practice.

Similarly, in T. aman rice, similar yield was obtained from recommended fertilizer for HYG and MYG and reduction of full or half amount of PK from recommended fertilizer dose for MYG significantly reduced the grain yield. The higher gross margin and BCR were also obtained from the same treatment.

Table : Treatments and fertilizer level for T.Aus and T.Aman

| Treatment |  | Fertilizer level(N-P-K-S-Zn kg/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| T. Aus | T. Aman | T. Aus | T. Aman |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=\mathrm{RF}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{RF}_{1}$ | 77-23-54-9-1 | 77-15-50-4-0 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}=R F_{2}$ | $\mathrm{RF}_{2}$ | 57-19-42-7-1 | 57-12-40-3-0 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}=\mathrm{RF}_{2}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{Zn}$ | $\mathrm{RF}_{2}$ | 57-19-42-0-0 | 57-12-40-3-0 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}=\mathrm{RF}_{2}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{Zn}$ | $\mathrm{RF}_{2}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}$ | 57-19-42-0-0 | 57-0-0-3-0 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}=\mathrm{RF}_{2}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{Zn}$ | $\mathrm{RF}_{2}-1 / 2 \mathrm{P}-1 / 2 \mathrm{~K}$ | 57-19-42-0-0 | 57-6-20-3-0 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}=\mathrm{FP}$ | FP | 65-8-10-0-0 | 65-8-10-0-0 |

[^1]Table 2. Effect of different level of fertilizers on the agro-economic performance of T.Aus- T.Aman cropping pattern at FSRD, Golapganj, Sylhet during 1998-99

| Treatment | Grain yield ( t/ha) |  | Straw yield ( t/ha) |  | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { TVC } \\ \text { ( Tk/ha) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { GM } \\ \text { (Tk./ha) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | T.Aus | T.Aman | T.Aus | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 4.33a | 5.28a | 5.31a | 6.70a | 31111 | 66109 | 2.32 |
| T2 | 4.21ab | 5.05a | 5.11ab | 6.28ab | 29831 | 64929 | 2.34 |
| T3 | 3.98c | 4.71a | 4.82c | 5.19bc | 29491 | 57774 | 2.11 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 3.89d | 4.27b | 5.02c | 5.45cd | 28219 | 56786 | 2.13 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 3.91 bc | 4.52b | 4.92bc | 5.53d | 28855 | 59545 | 2.20 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | 3.28 e | 3.83c | 4.23c | 5.07d | 27888 | 52572 | 1.99 |

Appendix table1. Crop management practices

| Site | Crop | Variety | Seed rate (kg/ha) | Planting time | Harvesting time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Netrokona | Boro | BR 3 | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb | Last week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 29 | 40 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Nilphamari | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 40 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | Last week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov |
| Goyeshpur | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 50 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | Last week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 50 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov |
| Comilla | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 4040 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of June |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 33 |  | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Aug | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Nov |

## Subproject: Crop Response to Added Nutrients

## Response of crops grown in different cropping patterns and environments to added fertilizer nutrients

The experiment on six dominant cropping patterns was conducted during 1997-98 to 1999-2000 at different major AEZs to determine optimum and economic dose of fertilizer nutrients for major crops grown in different environments. Details about site characteristics and crop management are given in appendix table $1 \& 2$, respectively. The experiment was laid out in RCB design with six replications across the field. Four different levels of NPK and S for different crops grown in different cropping patterns were tested all over the country. The treatment concept was as follows-

| Levels | N | P | K | S |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | MYG | MYG | MYG | MYG |
| 2 | HYG | HYG | HYG | HYG |
| 3 | HYG 1.34 | HYG D1.34 | HYG ロ1.34 | HYG D1.34 |

Different cropping patterns tested in different locations

| Cropping pattern | Locations |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mustard - Boro - T.Aman | Bagherpara, Palima, Narikeli, Muktagacha |
| Boro-T.Aman | Phulpur, Netrokona, Hathazari, Shibpur, Laksam |
| Wheat-T.Aman | Barind, Paba, Goyeshpur |
| Potato-Jute | Munshiganj |
| Onion-T.Aus-T.Aman | Kushtia |
| Mungbean-T.Aus-T.Aman | Lebukhali |

## Location: Muktagacha, Mymensingh

Cropping pattern: Mustard-Boro-T.Aman

## Mustard

Seed yield of mustard increased with the increase of nitrogen levels. A response curve was drowning from the data but it is not possible to find out the optimum level from this curve as the yield increased linearly. Therefore the crop will be grown with another higher level of $N$ to find out the optimum level. However, a response of PK and S was observed to some extent and the optimum level for agronomic yield and for economic yield was calculated from the response curve.

## Boro rice

Grain yield of Boro rice increased up to 120 kg N/ha and there after the yield reduced slowly. More or less similar trend was found in PK and S. But the response was not very distinct. Yield increases slowly to some extent and then tended to decrease. From the response curve the optimum level was find out.

## T.Aman rice

Grain yield increased with the increase of N levels up to $60 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and thereafter it becomes stagnant. Similarly the response was found in PK and $S$ up to 16 , 60 and $5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of PK and S , respectively. From the response curve the optimum level was calculated.


Figure 1. Response of Mustard to NPKS grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern


Figure 2. Response of Boro to NPKS grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern


Figure 3. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern
From the response curve both agronomically and economically optimum level of different nutrients was calculated and it was evident that the agronomicaly optimum level is much higher than economically optimum level.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Mustard | - | 27 | 42 | 8 | - | 15 | 25 | 5 |
| Boro | 160 | 25 | 60 | 13 | 90 | 16 | 21 | 8 |
| T.Aman | 91 | 19 | 58 | 5 | 65 | 15 | 33 | 5 |

Table 1. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Mustard-BoroT.Aman cropping pattern at Muktagacha, Mymensingh, 1999-2000 to 2000-01

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  |  |  | Grain yield |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mustard | Boro | T.Aman | Mustard (kg/ha) | Boro (t/ha) | T.Aman (t/ha) |  |
| N levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 384.0 | 3.85 | 2.88 |  |
| 40 | 80 | 45 | 487.5 | 4.57 | 3.98 |  |
| 60 | 120 | 60 | 515.0 | 4.76 | 4.32 |  |
| 80 | 160 | 85 | 551.5 | 4.75 | 4.3 |  |
| P levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 428.0 | 4.27 | 3.47 |  |
| 20 | 16 | 13 | 460.0 | 4.64 | 4.13 |  |
| 25 | 24 | 16 | 496.5 | 4.97 | 4.23 |  |
| 35 | 32 | 23 |  |  | 4.19 |  |
| K levels |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  |  | Grain yield |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mustard | Boro | T.Aman | Mustard (kg/ha) | Boro (t/ha) | T.Aman (t/ha) |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 440.0 | 4.43 | 3.5 |
| 35 | 30 | 45 | 491.5 | 4.66 | 4.15 |
| 50 | 45 | 60 | 496.5 | 4.73 | 4.1 |
| 70 | 60 | 85 | 469.5 | 4.68 | 3.95 |
| Slevels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 405.0 | 4.49 | 3.94 |
| 5 | 8 | 4 | 466.5 | 4.79 | 4.31 |
| 7 | 12 | 5 | 496.5 | 4.91 | 4.26 |
| 10 | 16 | 7 | 475.0 | 4.83 | 4.2 |

## Location: Phulpur, Mymensingh <br> Cropping pattern: Boro -T.Aman Year of establishment: 1998-1999 to 1999-2000

In Boro rice, grain yield increased markedly with the increase of nitrogen up to $96 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and after that level tended to decrease. In case of $P, K$ and $S$ a slow response was found and the yield increased up to the application of $12 \mathrm{~kg}, 30 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $14 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively. In T. Aman rice, a positive response of N was found and the grain yield increased up to $95 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Response of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S was not clear. The optimum level of the nutrient for the crop was not possible to find out.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.


Figure 4. Response of Boro to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Phulpur, Mymensingh


Figure 5. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Phulpur, Mymensingh
Table 2. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Phulpur, Mymensingh, 1998-99 to 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 3.49 | 2.83 |
| 96 | 70 | 4.79 | 4.44 |
| 135 | 95 | 4.77 | 4.75 |
| 189 | 130 | 4.34 | 4.70 |
| P levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 4.35 | 4.35 |
| 8 | 5 | 4.57 | 4.88 |
| 12 | 7 | 4.67 | 4.55 |
| 17 | 10 | 4.50 | 4.45 |
| $K$ Levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 4.45 | 4.13 |
| 30 | 22 | 4.95 | 4.28 |
| 41 | 28 | 4.82 | 4.55 |
| 57 | 39 | 4.60 | 4.30 |
| SLevels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 4.36 | 4.18 |
| 14 | 8 | 4.92 | 4.28 |
| 19 | 11 | 4.59 | 4.55 |
| 27 | 15 | 4.40 | 4.34 |

## Location: Netrokona

Cropping pattern: Boro -T.Aman Year of establishment: 1998-1999 to 1999-2000
In Boro rice, grain yield increased linearly with the increase of nitrogen and the highest grain yield was
recorded from the highest N level. In case of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S a slow response was found and the yield increased up to the application of $45 \mathrm{~kg}, 40 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $10 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively. In T. Aman rice, a positive response of N was found and the grain yield increased up to $95 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and thereafter started to fall. Response of $P$ and $K$ was observed to some extent. A slow response of crop to $S$ was observed and the yield increased linearly.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Boro | - | 37 | 40 | 17 | - | 15 | 20 | 8 |
| T.Aman | 164 | 18 | 16 | - | 75 | 10 | 12 | - |






Figure 6. Response of Boro to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Netrokona, Mymensingh
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Figure 7. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Netrokona, Mymensingh

Table 3. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Netrokona, 1998-99 to 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 3.13 | 2.65 |
| 60 | 70 | 4.13 | 4.22 |
| 84 | 94 | 4.44 | 4.45 |
| 108 | 130 | 4.77 | 4.43 |
| P levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 4.06 | 4.25 |
| 30 | 9 | 4.27 | 4.60 |
| 45 | 12 | 4.41 | 4.45 |
| 60 | 17 | 4.23 | 4.56 |
| K Levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 4.12 | 3.85 |
| 25 | 14 | 4.39 | 4.25 |
| 40 | 18 | 4.44 | 4.45 |
| 55 | 25 | 4.40 | 4.15 |
| S Levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 4.29 | 4.18 |
| 10 | 5 | 4.43 | 4.40 |
| 20 | 7 | 4.43 | 4.46 |
| 30 | 10 | 4.38 | 4.55 |

## Location: Kushtia

Bulb yield of onion increased with the increase of $N$ levels and the highest yield was recorded from $120 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Almost similar result was observed in three years of study. But the response of P was not evident. However, yield trended to increase up to $44 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$. Application of K and S up to 124 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $20 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$, respectively, found to increase the yield. Yield of T.Aus rice increased markedly with the increase of nitrogen level and the highest grain yield was recorded from $70 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. But PK and $S$ have no response on the yield. However, the yield increased slowly to some extent.

Yield of T.Aman rice increased sharply up to $70 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and thereafter the trend reduced slowly. Potassium, $K$ and $S$ failed to produce any significant effect on the yield of rice. However, a slow positive response towards the yield was observed to certain level.

From the response curve the optimum dose of the nutrient elements for the crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Onion | 172 | 54 | 150 | 20 | 145 | 12 | 70 | 18 |
| T.Aus | 75 | 16 | 27 | 9 | 67 | 10 | 27 | 8 |
| T.Aman | 81 | 18 | 30 | 10 | 55 | 10 | 30 | 8 |






Figure 8. Response of Onion to NPKS grown in Onion-T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Kushtia Sadar during 1998-99 to 2000-01


Figure 9. Response of T.Aus to NPKS grown in Onion-T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Kushtia Sadar during 1998-99 to 2000-01


Figure 10. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Onion-T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Kushtia Sadar during 1998-99 to 2000-01

Table 4. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Onion- T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Kushtia, 1998-99 to 2000-01

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  |  | Grain yield/ Bulb yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Onion | T.Aus | T.Aman | Onion | T.Aus | T.Aman |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 7.40 | 2.78 | 3.24 |
| 60 | 35 | 35 | 10.27 | 3.64 | 4.38 |
| 120 | 70 | 70 | 12.47 | 3.83 | 4.45 |
| 180 | 100 | 100 | 11.92 | 3.75 | 4.73 |
| P levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 11.15 | 3.67 | 4.37 |
| 22 | 9 | 9 | 11.67 | 3.80 | 4.48 |
| 44 | 18 | 18 | 12.47 | 3.83 | 4.58 |
| 66 | 27 | 27 | 12.00 | 3.77 | 4.50 |
| $K$ levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.16 | 3.50 | 4.25 |
| 62 | 15 | 15 | 11.00 | 3.65 | 4.42 |
| 124 | 30 | 30 | 12.47 | 3.83 | 4.45 |
| 187 | 45 | 45 | 11.59 | 3.62 | 4.40 |
| S levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 10.30 | 3.46 | 4.10 |
| 10 | 5 | 5 | 11.00 | 3.86 | 4.46 |
| 20 | 10 | 10 | 12.47 | 3.83 | 4.48 |
| 30 | 15 | 15 | 11.38 | 3.66 | 4.36 |

## Location: Munshigonj

Cropping pattern: Potato - Jute Year of Conduction: 1997-98 to 1999-2000

## Potato

The average of three years data showed that tuber yield of Potato increased with the increase of nitrogen and the highest value ( $28.0 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was recorded from $160 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. But PK and S failed to produce any significant effect towards the yield. The phenomena could be explained that the initial status of the soil was very rich in those elements and therefore, no response was observed at all.

Jute
Response of nitrogen towards the fiber yield of jute was observed. Fiber yield increase up to the application of nitrogen @ $60 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then trended to decrease. A very little response of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S was found on the fiber yield of jute.

From the response curve the following fertilizer doses was found optimum for Potato and Jute in Munshigonj.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Potato | 196 | 23 | 70 | 25 | 120 | 15 | 50 | 15 |
| Jute | 73 | 13 | 40 | 18 | 60 | 10 | 30 | 15 |



Figure 11. Response of Potato to N, P, K and S grown in Potato - Jute cropping pattern at Munshiganj during199798 to 1999-2000


Figure 12. Response of Jute to N, P, K and S grown in Potato - Jute cropping pattern at Munshiganj during 199798 to 1999-2000

Table 5. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Onion- T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Munshigonj in 1998-99 to 2000-01

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Tuber/ Fiber yield (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potato | Jute | Potato | Jute |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 15.8 | 1.67 |
| 80 | 30 | 22.8 | 2.30 |
| 160 | 60 | 28.0 | 2.77 |
| 240 | 90 | 27.6 | 2.70 |
| Plevels 0 |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 26.2 | 2.32 |
| 13 | 7 | 27.2 | 2.40 |
| 26 | 14 | 27.0 | 2.40 |
| 39 | 21 | 26.8 | 2.38 |
| $K$ Levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 26.5 | 2.20 |
| 66 | 17 | 27.2 | 2.45 |
| 133 | 34 | 27.0 | 2.41 |
| 200 | 51 | 26.9 | 2.40 |
| SLevels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 25.9 | 2.27 |
| 15 | 10 | 27.2 | 2.40 |
| 30 | 20 | 26.9 | 2.40 |
| 45 | 30 | 26.5 | 2.38 |

## Location: Palima, Tangail

Cropping pattern: Mustard-Boro T.Aman Year of establishment:1997-98 to 1999-00

## Mustard

In Mustard, response of nitrogen to certain extent was observed. Seed yield increased significantly up to $60 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then tended to decrease. Similarly, phosphorus also showed some response towards the yield and yield increased up to $20 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{ha}$. A little response of $K$ was also found. Seed yield increased up to $45 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{ha}$. From the response curve an optimum level of NP and K was calculated

## Boro rice

Grain yield of rice increased up to the application of $\mathrm{N} @ 90 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ and thereafter the yield decreased slowly. Similar trend was observed in case of phosphorus and the highest yield was recorded from 30 $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{ha}$. Response of K was not very clear but yield slightly increased up to $50 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$.

## T.Aman rice

Response of nitrogen was found on the yield of T.Aman rice. Yield increased markedly with the increase of nitrogen up to $60 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ and thereafter slowly increased up to $80 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$. After that level grain yield started to decrease.

In case of phosphorus and potassium a little response was observed and the grain yield slowly increases up to 20 and $50 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of P and K , respectively.


Figure 13. Response of Mustard to NPK grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Palima, Tangail during 1998-99 to 1999-2000


Figure 14. Response of Boro to NPK grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Palima, Tangail during 1999-2000


Figure 15. Response of T.Aman to NPK grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Palima, Tangail during 1999-2000

From the data a response curve was drown and the optimum dose of NP and K both for agronomic and economic as well was find out.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Mustard | 82 | 30 | 47 | - | 60 | 20 | 35 | - |
| Boro | 125 | 31 | 62 | - | 70 | 12 | 45 | - |
| T.Aman | 86 | 23 | 45 | - | 60 | 12 | 30 | - |

Table 6. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Mustard- Boro -T.Aman cropping pattern at Palima, Tangail, 1999-2000 to 2000-01

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  |  | Grain yield |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mustard | Boro | T.Aman | Mustard (kg/ha) | Boro (t/ha) | T.Aman (t/ha) |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 343.0 | 3.67 | 2.13 |
| 60 | 90 | 60 | 700.0 | 5.07 | 3.54 |
| 90 | 130 | 80 | 691.5 | 4.93 | 3.68 |
| 120 | 180 | 120 | 640.9 | 4.52 | 3.60 |
| P levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 376.5 | 3.98 | 3.07 |
| 20 | 20 | 15 | 716.5 | 4.87 | 3.31 |
| 30 | 30 | 20 | 691.5 | 4.93 | 3.34 |
| 40 | 40 | 30 | 701.5 | 4.92 | 3.34 |
| $K$ levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 638.5 | 4.50 | 3.25 |
| 30 | 50 | 30 | 750.5 | 4.83 | 3.41 |
| 45 | 75 | 50 | 853.5 | 4.79 | 3.46 |
| 60 | 100 | 70 | 776.5 | 4.65 | 3.37 |

## Location: Shibpur, Narshingdi

Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1998-99 to 1999-2000

## Boro rice

A positive response of $N$ was observed towards the grain yield of rice. Yield increased markedly over nitrogen up to $100 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ and thereafter started to fall. Phosphorus also showed some response to the grain yield and yield increased up to the application of $26 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{ha}$.

Similarly, response of $K$ and $S$ was evident to some extent. Higher grain yield was recorded from 50 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $20 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of K and S , respectively.

## T.Aman rice

Grain yield of T.Aman rice increased with the increase of nitrogen and the highest yield was recorded from $100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. But response of phosphorus on grain yield was not clear. However a small response was found up to $26 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{ha}$. Yield of rice increased up to $50 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{ha}$. After that the yield started to decrease.

Sulphur also showed some response towards yield and highest yield was recorded with the application of $20 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~S} / \mathrm{ha}$.


Figure 16. Response of Boro rice to NPKS grown in Boro- T.Aman cropping pattern at Shibpur, Norshingdi during 1998-99 to 1999-2000


Figure 17. Response of T.Aman rice to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Shibpur, Norshingdi during 1998-99 to 99-2000

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Boro |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| T.Aman |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 7. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Shibpur, Narshingdi, 1998-99 to 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |
| N levels | 0 | 0 | 4.25 | 2.53 |
|  | 50 | 50 | 5.72 | 3.79 |
|  | 100 | 100 | 6.56 | 4.63 |
| Plevels | 150 | 150 | 5.92 | 4.18 |
|  | 0 | 0 | 5.01 | 3.39 |
|  | 13 | 13 | 5.67 | 4.08 |
|  | 26 | 26 | 6.56 | 4.63 |
| K Levels | 39 | 0 | 5.88 | 3.79 |
|  | 0 | 25 | 4.82 | 3.73 |
|  | 25 | 50 | 5.48 | 3.81 |
|  | 50 | 75 | 6.56 | 4.63 |
|  | 75 | 0 | 5.69 | 3.56 |
|  | 0 | 10 | 4.99 | 3.25 |
|  | 10 | 20 | 5.96 | 3.43 |
|  | 20 |  | 6.56 | 4.63 |
|  | 30 |  | 5.67 | 3.25 |

## Location: Lebukhali, Patuakhali Cropping pattern: Mungbean - T.Aus - T.Aman Year of establishment: 1998-99 to 1999-2000

Average data of two years showed that in mungbean, the response of $N$ and $P$ was observed to some extent and yield increased up to 10 and $14 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of N and P , respectively. But the response of K was not clear. In T.Aus rice response of $N$ and $P$ was found towards the grain yield. Yield increased with the increase of $N$ and $P$ levels up to $75 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $21 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$, respectively. But the response of K was not very clear, however, the yield increased up to $18 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{ha}$.

In T.Aman rice grain yield increased up to the application of $75 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Phosphorus also shows some response towards the grain yield. Grain yield increased up to $21 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{P} / \mathrm{ha}$. A small response of K was observed up to $18 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~K} / \mathrm{ha}$.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Mungbean | 17.2 | 30 | 9 | - | 10 | 21 | 8 | - |
| T.Aus | 91 | 32 | 15 | - | 62 | 15 | 10 | - |
| T.Aman | 150 | 17 | 15 | - | 80 | 12 | 12 | - |



Figure 18. Response of Mungbean to NPK grown in Mungbean-T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Lebukhali, Patuakhali during 1998-99 to 1999-2000


Figure 19. Response of T.Aus to NPK grown in Mungbean-T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Lebukhali, Patuakhali during 1998-99 to 1999-2000



Figure 20. Response of T.Aman to NPK grown in Mungbean-T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Lebukhali, Patuakhali during 1998-99 to 1999-2000

Table 8. Effect of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Mungbean-T.Aus-T.Aman cropping pattern at Lebukhali, 1998-99 to 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  |  | Grain yield (kg/ha, t/ha) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mungbean | T.Aus | T.Aman | Mungbean | T.Aus | T.Aman |
| N levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 10 | 55 | 55 | 795.7 | 3.00 | 3.08 |
| 20 | 75 | 75 | 874.9 | 4.17 | 4.18 |
| 30 | 90 | 90 | 870.0 | 4.87 | 4.71 |
| Plevels |  | 837.7 | 4.43 | 4.53 |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 14 | 18 | 18 | 797.7 | 3.88 | 4.18 |
| 21 | 21 | 21 | 833.3 | 4.36 | 4.48 |
| 28 | 25 | 25 | 870.0 | 4.84 | 4.71 |
| Klevels |  |  | 866.0 | 4.55 | 4.42 |
| 0 | 0 | 14 |  |  |  |
| 5 | 14 | 18 | 841.0 | 4.29 | 4.44 |
| 10 | 18 | 21 | 863.3 | 4.45 | 4.56 |
| 15 | 21 |  | 850.7 | 4.77 | 4.71 |

## Location: Hathazari

Cropping pattern: Boro-T.Aman Year of establishment: 1998-99 to 1999-2000
In Boro rice, grain yield increased with the increase of nitrogen and the highest yield was recorded from $140 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then tended to decrease. Almost similar trend was observed in case of $P, K$ and $S$ and grain yield increased up to the application $36 \mathrm{~kg}, 97 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $18 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively.

In T.Aman rice, a positive response of N was found and the grain yield increased up to $93 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Response of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S was also observed to some extent and grain yield increased up to $22 \mathrm{~kg}, 49 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $10 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $P, K$ and $S$, respectively.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Boro | 190 | 43 | 130 | 22 | 100 | 30 | 70 | 19 |
| T.Aman | 115 | 39 | 92 | 10 | 70 | 22 | 45 | 8 |



Figure 21. Response of Boro to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Hathazari, Chittagong in 1998-99 to 1999-2000


Figure 22. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Hathazari, Chittagong in 1998-99 to 1999-2000

Table 9. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield and economics of Boro in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Hathazari, 1998-99 to 99-00

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Tuber/ Fiber yield (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 3.25 | 3.0 |
| 100 | 68 | 4.17 | 3.86 |
| 140 | 93 | 5.02 | 4.46 |
| 196 | 130 | 4.90 | 4.13 |
| P levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 3.71 | 2.87 |
| 25 | 18 | 4.52 | 3.57 |
| 36 | 22 | 5.03 | 4.01 |
| 50 | 31 | 4.87 | 3.96 |
| $K$ Levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 3.87 | 3.36 |
| 69 | 49 | 4.34 | 3.90 |
| 97 | 62 | 5.03 | 3.97 |
| 136 | 87 | 4.80 | 3.87 |
| SLevels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 4.09 | 3.64 |
| 13 | 8 | 4.56 | 3.95 |
| 18 | 10 | 5.03 | 4.09 |
| 25 | 14 | 4.78 | 3.93 |

## Location: Paba, Rajshahi

Cropping pattern: Wheat - T.Aman Year of establishment: 1998-99 to 1999-2000
Average of two years data showed that in wheat, grain yield increased with the increase of nitrogen up to $105 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then started to reduce. Similar trend was observed in case of P and the yield increased up to the application of $30 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of P . Potassium and sulphur failed to show any sharp response on the yield of Wheat. However, the yield increased up to the application of 30 kg and 20 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of K and S , respectively.

In T.Aman rice, grain yield increased with the increase of nitrogen up to $90 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then trended to decrease. Similar trend was found in case of $P, K$ and $S$ and yield increased up to $15 \mathrm{~kg}, 30 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $20 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Wheat | 121 | 32 | 23 | 20 | 70 | 20 | 10 | 12 |
| T.Aman | 105 | 18 | 27 | 22 | 70 | 18 | 20 | 14 |



Figure 23. Response of Wheat to NPKS grown in Wheat-T.Aman cropping pattern during 1998-99 to 20002001 at Paba, Rajshahi





Figure 24. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Wheat-T.Aman cropping pattern during 1998-99 to 1999-2000 at Paba, Rajshahi

Table 10. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield crops in Wheat - T.Aman cropping pattern at Paba, Rajshahi, 1998-99 to 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wheat | T.Aman | Wheat | T.Aman |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 1.87 | 2.17 |
| 70 | 60 | 3.00 | 3.77 |
| 105 | 90 | 3.35 | 4.44 |
| 140 | 120 | 3.22 | 4.12 |
| P levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 2.42 | 3.17 |
| 20 | 10 | 3.05 | 3.91 |
| 30 | 15 | 3.35 | 4.44 |
| 40 | 20 | 3.11 | 4.20 |
| K Levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 2.88 | 3.14 |
| 20 | 20 | 3.04 | 3.45 |
| 30 | 30 | 3.35 | 3.60 |
| 40 | 40 | 2.96 | 3.47 |
| SLevels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 2.78 | 3.14 |
| 10 | 10 | 3.02 | 3.42 |
| 20 | 20 | 3.35 | 3.65 |
| 30 | 30 | 3.08 | 3.53 |

## Location:Barind, Rajshahi

## Cropping pattern: Wheat - T.Aman <br> Year of establishment: 1999-2000

Grain yield of Wheat markedly increased up to $100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then started to reduce. Phosphorus, Potassium and Sulphur also show some response towards the yield and yield increase up to $26 \mathrm{~kg}, 83$ kg and $30 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively. In T.Aman rice, response of N was very distinct up to 100 $\mathrm{kg} \mathrm{N} / \mathrm{ha}$. After that level tended to reduce. Phosphorus, Potassium and Sulphur also show some response towards the yield and yield increase up to $26 \mathrm{~kg}, 83 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $30 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Wheat | 180 | 28 | 77 | 35 | 90 | 20 | 35 | 19 |
| T.Aman | 111 | 21 | - | 10 | 70 | 15 | - | 7 |



Figure 25. Response of Wheat to NPKS grown in Wheat-T.Aman cropping pattern during 1999-2000 to 2000-2001 at Barind, Rajshahi


Figure 26. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Wheat-T.Aman cropping pattern during 1999-2000 at Barind, Rajshahi

Table 11. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield crops in Wheat - T.Aman cropping pattern at Barind, Rajshahi, 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wheat | T.Aman | Wheat | T.Aman |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 1.58 | 2.38 |
| 50 | 70 | 3.04 | 3.34 |
| 100 | 100 | 3.70 | 3.70 |
| 150 | 130 | 3.68 | 3.49 |
| P levels 0 |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 2.88 | 3.07 |
| 13 | 15 | 3.37 | 3.43 |
| 26 | 18 | 3.70 | 3.53 |
| 39 | 23 | 3.48 | 3.47 |
| $K$ Levels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 3.08 | 3.09 |
| 42 | 15 | 3.50 | 3.29 |
| 83 | 20 | 3.70 | 3.53 |
| 125 | 26 | 3.42 | 3.46 |
| SLevels |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 3.28 | 3.18 |
| 15 | 7 | 3.47 | 3.49 |
| 30 | 9 | 3.7 | 3.53 |
| 45 | 12 | 3.65 | 3.51 |

## Location: Goyeshpur, Pabna

## Cropping pattern: Wheat - T.Aman <br> Year of establishment: 1999-2000

Grain yield of Wheat markedly increased up to $70 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ but the yield increased slowly up to 100 kg $\mathrm{N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then started to reduce. Phosphorus, Potassium and Sulphur also show some response towards the yield and yield increase up to $30 \mathrm{~kg}, 50 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $25 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively. In T.Aman rice, response of $N$ was very distinct and the grain yield increased linearly with the increase of nitrogen level. Phosphorus, Potassium and Sulphur also show some response towards the yield and yield increase up to $18 \mathrm{~kg}, 20 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $10 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Wheat | 106 | 30 | 45 | 26 | 70 | 22 | 27 | 18 |
| T.Aman | - | 22 | 20 | 12 | - | 15 | 15 | 8 |





Figure 27. Response of Wheat to NPKS grown in Wheat-T.Aman cropping pattern at Goyeshpur, Pabna during 1999-2000 to 2000-01


Figure 28. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Goyeshpur, Pabna in 19992000
Table 12. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield crops in Wheat - T.Aman cropping pattern at Goyeshpur, Pabna, 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wheat | T.Aman | Wheat | T.Aman |  |
| N levels |  | 0 |  |  |
|  | 0 | 56 | 1.96 | 3.21 |
|  | 70 | 80 | 2.91 | 4.05 |
|  | 104 | 2.95 | 4.34 |  |
| Plevels |  |  | 2.84 | 4.69 |
|  | 0 | 0 |  |  |
|  | 150 | 2.37 | 3.97 |  |
|  | 18 | 2.85 | 4.19 |  |
|  |  | 2.95 | 4.38 |  |


| K Levels | 40 | 21 | 2.90 | 4.25 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 0 | 0 | 2.40 | 3.55 |
|  | 30 | 15 | 2.78 | 4.34 |
| SLevels | 50 | 20 | 2.95 | 4.39 |
|  | 70 | 25 | 2.91 | 4.30 |
|  | 0 | 0 |  | 4.45 |
|  | 15 | 10 | 2.50 | 4.67 |
|  | 25 | 15 | 2.83 | 4.55 |
|  | 35 | 20 | 2.95 | 4.49 |

Location : Melandah, Jamalpur
Cropping pattern : Mustard-Boro-T.Aman Year of establishment : 999-2000
In Mustard, a positive response of N was observed. Seed yield increased with the increase of N level and the highest yield was recorded from $100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Similarly P, K and S also have some response and yield increased up to $24 \mathrm{~kg}, 26 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $30 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively. In Boro rice, grain yield increased up to $145 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then showed to decrease. As regards $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S grain yield increased up to $24 \mathrm{~kg}, 45 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $22 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively.

In T.Aman rice, the grain yield increased markedly up to $90 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then decreased slowly. Similarly P, K and S also produced some response and yield increased up to $16 \mathrm{~kg}, 29 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $13 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $P, K$ and $S$ respectively.

From the data a response curve was drown and the optimum dose of $\mathrm{N} P$ and K both for agronomic and economic as well was find out.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Mustard | 82 | 30 | 47 | - | 60 | 20 | 35 | - |
| Boro | 125 | 31 | 62 | - | 70 | 12 | 45 | - |
| T.Aman | 86 | 23 | 45 | - | 60 | 12 | 30 | - |





Figure 29. Response of Mustard to NPKS grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern in 1999-2000 at Melandah, Jamalpur


Figure 30. Response of Boro to NPKS grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern in 1999-2000 at Melandah, Jamalpur



Figure 31. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern in 1999-2000 at Melandah, Jamalpur
Table 13. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Mustard- Boro -T.Aman cropping pattern at Melandah, Jamalpur, 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  |  | Grain yield |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mustard | Boro | T.Aman | Mustard (kg/ha) | Boro (t/ha) | T.Aman (t/ha) |
| $N$ levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 510 | 3.65 | 3.41 |
| 70 | 100 | 70 | 610 | 4.70 | 4.15 |
| 100 | 145 | 100 | 650 | 4.96 | 4.69 |
| 130 | 190 | 130 | 625 | 4.87 | 4.26 |
| P levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 520 | 3.80 | 3.64 |
| 18 | 18 | 13 | 627 | 4.56 | 4.24 |
| 24 | 26 | 16 | 650 | 4.96 | 4.69 |
| 30 | 34 | 20 | 630 | 4.64 | 4.32 |
| $K$ levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 551 | 4.47 | 3.70 |
| 18 | 32 | 23 | 630 | 4.75 | 4.22 |
| 26 | 45 | 29 | 650 | 4.96 | 4.69 |
| 34 | 58 | 35 | 635 | 4.62 | 4.25 |
| S levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 545 | 4.02 | 4.08 |
| 25 | 16 | 9 | 623 | 4.54 | 4.40 |
| 30 | 22 | 13 | 650 | 4.96 | 4.69 |
| 35 | 28 | 17 | 622 | 4.71 | 4.45 |

## Location: Bagherpara, Jessore

Cropping pattern: Mustard - Boro - T.Aman
In Mustard, a positive response of N was observed to some extent. Seed yield increased with the increase of $N$ level and the highest yield was recorded from $86 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Similarly P and K also have some response and yield increased up to 15 kg and $8 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of P and K, respectively. The soil is calcareous and rich in K. Therefore, the response of $K$ was not evident. Sulphur has a good response toward the seed yield and yield increased linearly with the increase of $S$.

In Boro rice, grain yield increased linearly with the increase of nitrogen level and the highest yield was obtained from highest level. As regards $P$ and $S$ grain yield also increased linearly but the trend was not very sharp.

In T.Aman rice, the grain yield increased linearly with the increase of $N P$ and $S$ levels and the highest grain yield was recorded from the highest level. As the yield of all the crops increased linearly with the increase of N P and S level, therefore, it was not possible to calculate the optimum dose of the nutrient elements. Another higher level will be tested in the next year for all the nutrients to get an optimum level.


Figure 32. Response of Mustard to $\mathrm{N}, \mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Bagherpara, Jessore in 1999-2000



Figure 33. Response of Boro to N, P and S grown in Mustard-Boro- T.Aman cropping pattern at Bagherpara, Jessore in 1999-2000



Figure 34. Response of T.Aman to N, P and S grown in Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Bagherpara, Jessore in 1999-2000

Table 14. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Mustard- Boro -T.Aman cropping pattern at Bagherpara, Jessore, 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  |  |  | Grain yield |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mustard | Boro | T.Aman | Mustard (kg/ha) | Boro (t/ha) | T.Aman (t/ha) |
| N levels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 228 | 2.73 | 1.82 |
| 61 | 90 | 60 | 564 | 3.55 | 2.57 |
| 86 | 125 | 80 | 568 | 4.30 | 3.48 |
| 120 | 175 | 105 | 561 | 4.83 | 4.14 |
| Plevels |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 0 | 506 | 3.05 | 2.6 |
| 11 | 5 | 6 | 583 | 4.02 | 3.51 |
| 15 | 7 | 8 | 595 | 4.30 | 3.99 |


| 21 | 10 | 11 | 589 | 4.72 | 3.48 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Klevels |  | - | 553 | - | - |
| 0 | - | - | 597 | - | - |
| 8 | - | - | 578 | - | - |
| 11 | - | - |  |  |  |
| Slevels | - | 0 | 520 | 4.02 | 2.86 |
| 0 | 0 | 11 | 561 | 4.40 | 3.28 |
| 24 | 9 | 14 | 581 | 3.48 |  |
| 30 | 12 | 18 | 601 | 4.67 | 4.04 |

## Location : Laksam, Comilla

Cropping pattern: Boro -T.Aman Year of establishment: 1998-99 to 1999-2000
In Boro rice, grain yield increased with the increase of nitrogen and the highest yield was recorded from $120 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and then tended to decrease. But the response of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S towards the grain yield was not so distinct. However the yield increased slowly up to the application $30 \mathrm{~kg}, 40 \mathrm{~kg}$ and 20 $\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively.

In T.Aman rice, a positive response of $N$ was found and the grain yield increased up to $90 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Response of $P, K$ and $S$ was also observed to some extent and grain yield increased up to $26 \mathrm{~kg}, 20 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $20 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S , respectively.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Boro | 150 | 40 | 50 | 28 | 100 | 17 | 27 | 19 |
| T.Aman | 117 | 31 | 23 | 18 | 70 | 18 | 10 | 10 |





Figure 35. Response of Boro to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Comilla in 1999-2000


Figure 36. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Comilla in 1999-2000 Table 15. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield and economics of Boro in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Laksam, Comilla, 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Boro | T.Aman |  | Boro | T.Aman |  |
| 0 |  | N levels |  |  |  |
| 60 | 0 |  | 3.49 | 2.5 |  |
| 120 | 45 |  | 5.13 | 3.25 |  |
| 180 | 90 |  | 6.36 | 3.75 |  |
|  | 135 |  | P levels | 6.26 | 3.60 |
| 0 |  |  | 5.73 |  |  |
| 15 | 13 |  | 6.03 | 3.56 |  |
| 30 | 26 |  | 6.36 | 3.68 |  |
| 45 | 39 |  | 6.29 | 3.75 |  |


|  |  | K Levels |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0 |  | 5.91 | 3.69 |
| 20 | 20 |  | 6.21 | 3.90 |
| 40 | 33 |  | 6.36 | 3.85 |
| 60 | 51 |  | 6.31 | 3.75 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| 0 | 0 | 5.90 | 3.05 |  |
| 10 | 10 | 6.09 | 3.75 |  |
| 20 | 20 | 6.36 | 3.52 |  |

## Location: Kishoregonj

Cropping pattern: Boro -T.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-2000
In Boro rice, grain yield increased markedly with the increase of nitrogen up to $80 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ and after that level tended to decrease. In case of $P, K$ and $S$ a slow response was found and the yield increased up to the application of $32 \mathrm{~kg}, 55 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $9 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S respectively.

In T. Aman rice, a positive response of N was found and the grain yield increased up to $75 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Response of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S was also observed to some extent and grain yield increased up to $21 \mathrm{~kg}, 36 \mathrm{~kg}$ and $5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of $\mathrm{P}, \mathrm{K}$ and S , respectively.

From the response curve the optimum doses of the nutrients for different crops were calculated.

| Crop | Agronomically optimum dose |  |  |  | Economically optimum dose |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | P | K | S | N | P | K | S |
| Boro | 82 | 28 | 68 | 10 | 60 | 20 | 30 | 7 |
| T.Aman | 79 | 25 | 38 | 5 | 55 | 13 | 20 | 4 |





Figure 37. Response of Boro to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Kishoregonj 2000


Figure 38. Response of T.Aman to NPKS grown in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Kishoregonj 2000
Table 16. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield of crops in Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern at Kishoregonj, 1999-2000

| Nutrient levels (kg/ha) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Boro | T.Aman | Boro | T.Aman |
| N levels | 0 | 0 | 4.10 | 3.00 |
|  | 80 | 55 | 5.65 | 3.64 |
|  | 115 | 75 | 5.55 | 3.77 |
|  | 150 | 95 | 5.13 | 3.63 |
| Plevels | 0 | 0 | 4.90 | 3.49 |
|  | 23 | 16 | 5.45 | 3.66 |
|  | 32 | 21 | 5.50 | 3.77 |
|  | 41 | 26 | 5.40 | 3.69 |
| K Levels | 0 | 0 | 5.00 | 3.58 |


|  | 40 | 28 | 5.32 | 3.66 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 55 | 36 | 5.50 | 3.77 |
| SLevels | 70 | 44 | 5.40 | 3.67 |
|  | 7 | 0 | 4.82 | 3.45 |
|  | 9 | 3 | 5.22 | 3.58 |
|  | 11 | 7 | 5.50 | 3.77 |

Location: Baliakandi, Faridpur
Cropping pattern: Onion-B.Aman Year of establishment: 1999-00
Bulb yield of onion increased with the increase of N and the highest yield ( $14.5 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was recorded from $100 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$. Almost similar trend was found in case of $P$ \& S and the yield increased up to 60 kg and $20 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ of P and S respectively.


Figure 39. Response of Onion to NPKS grown in Onion-B.Aman cropping pattern at Baliakandi, Rajbari during 2000-01

Table 17. Effects of different levels of fertilizer nutrients on the yield and economics of Onion in Onion-T.Aman cropping pattern at Baliakandi, 1999-00

| Fertilizer levels |  | Bulb yield (t/ha) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| N levels $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ |  | 10.0 c |
|  | 0 | 13.0 b |
|  | 50 | 14.5 a |
| Plevels (kg/ha) | 100 | 14.4 a |
|  | 0 |  |
|  | 12.6 b |  |
|  | 30 | 13.9 ab |
|  | 14.5 a |  |
|  | 90 | 14.3 a |



Appendix table 2. Crop management practices

| Site | Cropping pattern | Variety | Seed rate (kg/ha) | Planting time | Harvesting time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Muktagacha | Mustard Boro <br> T.Aman | Tori-7 | 10 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb |
|  |  | BR 28 | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of May |
|  |  | BRRI Dhan 33 | 40 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of July | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov |
| Bagherpara | Mustard | Tori-7 | 08 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov <br> 3rd week of Feb | $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb |
|  | Boro | BR 28 | 40 |  | Last week of May $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | Last week of July |  |
| Site | Cropping pattern | Variety | Seed rate (kg/ha) | Planting time | Harvesting time |
| Narikeli | Mustard | Tori-7 | 08 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov | Last week of Jan |
|  | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 50 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | Last week of May$1^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 50 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of July |  |
| Palima | Mustard | Tori-7 | 10 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of Jan |
|  | Jute | 0-9897 | 12 | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of April | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Aug <br> $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Nov |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 33 | 40 | $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ week of Aug |  |
| Narikeli | Wheat | Kanchan | 100 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of March <br> $1^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug <br> $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Nov |
|  | Jute | 0-9897 | 10 | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of April |  |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 50 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug |  |


| Site | Cropping pattern | Variety | Seed rate (kg/ha) | Planting time | Harvesting time |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Kishoregonj | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of March |
|  | Jute | Falgunitosa | 08 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of April | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 50 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Aug | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Nov |
| Lebukhali | Mungbean | Kanti | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of April |
|  | T.Aus | BR 2 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of May | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Aug. |
|  | T.Aman | BR 23 | 40 | Last week of Aug | Last week of Dec |
| Palima | Boro | BR 29 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 33 | 40 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov |
| Kendua | Boro | BR 3 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb. | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | Last week of July | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov |
| Hathazari | Boro | BR 29 | 35 | 3rd week of Jan | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 30 | 35 | Last week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Syedpur | Boro | BR 14 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Polashbari | Boro | BR 2 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Feb | $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Nilphamari | Boro | BR 14 | 40 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of Jan | 1st week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of July | Last week of Nov |
| Paba | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of March |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 30 | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of July | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov. |
| Barind | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | Last week of Nov | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of March |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 29 | 40 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of July | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Nov |
| Munshiganj | Potato | Diamont | 1500 | Last week of Nov. | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of March |
|  | Jute | O-9897 | 10 | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of April | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of July |
| Atkapalia Goyeshpur | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | Last week of July | Last week of Nov |
|  | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of March |
|  | Jute | 0-9897 | 08 | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of April | $3^{\text {rd }}$ week of July |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 50 | Last week of July | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov |
| Chatmohor | Wheat | Kanchan | 120 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of March |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | Last week of July | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov |
| Chandina | Potato | Diamont | 1500 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of Feb. |
|  | T.Aus | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | Last week of April | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of July |
|  | T.Aman | BR 11 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug. | $3{ }^{\text {rd }}$ week of Nov. |
| Laksam | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 40 | Last week of Jan. | $2^{\text {nd }}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug. | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. |
| Shibpur | Boro | BRRI Dhan 29 | 40 | Last week of Jan. | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of May |
|  | T.Aman | BRRI Dhan 32 | 40 | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug. | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Dec. |
| Kushtia | Onion | Taherpuri | - | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Jan. | $1^{\text {st }}$ week of April. |
|  | T.Aus | IR 50 | 40 | $4^{\text {th }}$ week of May | $1{ }^{\text {st }}$ week of Aug. |
|  | T.Aman | BR 22 | 40 | ${ }^{3 r d}$ week of Aug. | $2{ }^{\text {nd }}$ week of Dec. |

## Subproject: Verification of Fertilizer Management Practices

## Effect of urea super granule (USG) on the performance of upland vegetable crops

The experiment was carried out at Palima FSRD site, Tangail during 2000-2001 under AEZ-8 to see the efficiency of USG on upland vegetable crops. The crop was Brinjal and Cabbage. The experiment was carried out followed by RCBD with 6 dispersed replications. Five treatments were; $T_{1}=$ Prilled urea (Recommended dose for HYG), $T_{2}=$ USG (Recommended dose for HYG), $T_{3}=$ USG ( $10 \%<$ Rec. dose for HYG), $T_{4}=$ USG ( $20 \%<$ Rec. dose for HYG), $T_{5}=$ Farmers practice

| Treatment | $\mathrm{N}(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ | $\mathrm{P}(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ | $\mathrm{K}(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ | $\mathrm{S}(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ | $\mathrm{CD}(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 195 | 56 | 162 | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | 195 | 56 | 162 | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}$ | 175 | 56 | 162 | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}$ | 155 | 56 | 162 | 3 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}$ | 125 | 35 | 115 | - | 5 |

## Performance of USG on Brinjal and Cabbage:

Significantly higher fruit yield of Brinjal was recorded from recommended dose of USG which was also identical to $10 \%$ less recommended dose of USG (Table 1). Prilled urea of recommended dose produced identical yield with $20 \%$ less USG. Almost similar result was observed in head yield of cabbage (Table 2). Regarding economics the highest gross margin and BCR was also calculated from the same treatment.

Therefore, from the result of one year experimentation it might be concluded that the efficiency of USG is more than prilled urea in upland vegetable crops and $10-20 \%$ nitrogen could be saved if USG was used as source of N instead of prilled urea.

Table 1. Effect of Urea Super Granule (USG) on the agro-economic performance of Brinjal at Palima, Tangail, 2000-01

| Treatment | Yield (t/ha) | TVC <br> (Tk/ha) | Gross margin <br> (Tk/ha) | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prilled urea (Rec.) | 48.0 b | 57531 | 230769 | 5.01 |
| USG (Rec.) | 68.1 a | 60001 | 389079 | 7.48 |
| USG (10\%<Rec.) | 65.3 a | 59853 | 350247 | 6.85 |
| USG(20\%<Rec.) | 51.9 b | 59705 | 251935 | 5.22 |
| Farmer's dose | 39.6c | 51159 | 186681 | 4.65 |

Market price : Fruit = @ Tk. 6/kg
Table 2. Effect Urea Super Granule (USG) on agro-economic performance of Cabbage at Palima, Tangail, 2000-01

| Treatment | Yield of head <br> (t/ha) | TVC (Tk/ha) | Gross margin <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | BCR |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prilled urea (Rec.) | 56.940 b | 59277.00 | 57997.83 | 3.13 |
| USG (Rec.) | 65.040 a | 59277.00 | 73092.34 | 5.65 |
| USG (10\%<Rec.) | 60.140 ab | 58773.00 | 68875.50 | 4.58 |
| USG (20\%<Rec.) | 55.090 b | 58285.00 | 56033.67 | 3.16 |
| Farmer's dose | 46.160 c | 53307.00 | 45304.83 | 1.00 |

Market price: Head=@Tk 2.34/kg; Leaves=@Tk.

Effect of different levels and methods of nitrogen application on the growth and yield of Cauliflower

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site Goyeshpur, Pabna during the winter season of 2000-01 to find out an optimum dose and method of application of nitrogen for Cauliflower. The experiment was laid out in two factor RCB design with three replications. Four level of nitrogen fertilizer were used e.g. Control (No), Medium yield goal (MYG=68kgN/ha), High yield goal (HYG=98kg N/ha) and farmers practice ( $F P=120 \mathrm{kgN} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). Three management practices were $\mathrm{M} 1=$ Half of N will be applied as basal and rest two equal splits at 30 and 45 DAP, $\mathrm{M} 2=\operatorname{In}$ three equal installment at 15,30 and 45 DAP ( farmers practice ), $\mathrm{M} 3=\ln 2$ equal installments at 15 and 35 DAP (Rec. practice) as top dress.

The result showed that the highest yield achieved from High Yield Goal (HYG) with M1 treatment where $50 \%$ nitrogen used as basal and two equal top dress used at 30 and 45 DAP. This yield was at par with HYG and FP treatment where different management was used.
From economic profile it was found that highest gross return, added return, and highest MBCR were obtained from High Yield Goal with M1 treatment (Table-2).

Table 1. Yield and yield contributing characters of cauliflower with different fertilizer doses and different management

| Treatment | Curd length (cm) | Breath (cm) | Marketable wt (kg) | Yield (t/ha) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 6.41 b | 12.41 b | 0.70 d | 25.99 d |
| MYG+M1 | 7.50 a | 15.70 a | 1.14 c | 41.98 c |
| MYG+M2 | 7.73 a | 16.00 a | 1.21 bc | 44.70 bc |
| MYG+M3 | 7.83 a | 15.30 a | 1.18 c | 43.15 c |
| HYG+M1 | 8.57 a | 16.63 a | 1.62 a | 59.39 a |
| HYG +M2 | 7.57 a | 15.97 a | 1.22 bc | 44.70 bc |
| HYG+ M3 | 8.23 a | 17.17 a | 1.52 ab | 55.64 ab |
| FP+M1 | 7.87 a | 16.43 a | 1.36 a | 44.31 bc |
| FP+M2 | 8.10 a | 17.03 a | 1.21 bc | 49.04 abc |
| FP+M3 | 7.97 a | 15.07 a | 1.35 ab | 44.47 bc |
| CV (\%) | 7.2 | 7.9 | 13.7 | 13.5 |

Table 2. Economic performance of different treatment of cauliflower

| Treatment | Yield <br> (t/ha) | Gross return <br> (Tk/ha) | Added <br> return <br> (Tk/ha) | TVC <br> (Tk/ha) | Added cost <br> (Tk/ha) | MBCR <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 25.99 | 129950 | - | 33998 | - | - |
| MYG+M1 | 41.98 | 209900 | 79950 | 34898 | 900 | 88.83 |
| MYG+M2 | 44.70 | 223500 | 93550 | 35108 | 1110 | 84.28 |
| MYG+M3 | 43.15 | 215750 | 85800 | 34898 | 900 | 95.33 |
| H YG+M1 | 59.39 | 296950 | 167000 | 35074 | 1076 | 155.20 |
| HYG +M2 | 44.70 | 223500 | 93550 | 35484 | 1480 | 62.95 |
| HYG+M3 | 55.64 | 278200 | 148250 | 35074 | 1076 | 137.78 |
| FP+M1 | 44.31 | 246550 | 91600 | 34631 | 633 | 144.70 |
| FP+M2 | 49.04 | 265200 | 115250 | 34841 | 843 | 136.71 |
| FP+M3 | 44.47 | 222370 | 92400 | 34631 | 633 | 145.91 |

Verification of fertilizer doses of pineapple at Madhupur Tract area (AEZ-28) Tangail

The experiment was initiated during 1998 at Madhupur Tract (AEZ-28) of Tangail to find out an optimum fertilizer dose and verify the present national recommendation of fertilizer for pineapple. Five different fertilizer doses were tested which were; $T_{1}=$ RF (HYG) $=300-112-40-27 \mathrm{NPKS} \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}$,
$T_{2}=R F(M Y G)=240-88-30-21$ NPKS kg/ha, $T_{3}=I F M(H Y G)=290-106-30-27 \mathrm{NPKS} \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha}+10 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ cow dung, $T_{4}=F P=927-80-1030-30$ NPKS kg/ha and $T_{5}=A b s o l u t e ~ C o n t r o l ~$

Pineapple was transplanted on 20-12-98 to 30-12-98.Flowering started from 20-3-2000 and harvesting started on 02-7-2000

The highest no. of plant flowered ( $68.59 \%$ ) in the dose $T_{1}$ (RF for HYG) followed by $T_{3}$ (IFM for HYG). The highest fruit length was found from $T_{2}(11.94 \mathrm{~cm})$ followed by $T_{4}(11.72)$. Highest fruit weight was obtained from $T_{2}(1.59 \mathrm{~kg})$ followed by $T_{1} \& T_{3}$. The highest fruit yield ( $38.95 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was obtained from $T_{1}$ followed by $T_{3}$ (38.78). The highest Gross margin was obtained from T 1 followed by $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ ( Tk . 90133.34) and MBCR was highest in $T_{1}(1.29)$ followed by $T_{2}$.

Table 1. Effect of different fertilizer doses on the performance of Pineapple, 2000

| Treatments | Plants <br> flowered (\%) | Fruit <br> length <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Fruit <br> breath <br> $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Fruit wt. <br> $(\mathrm{kg} /$ fruit $)$ | Fruit <br> yield <br> $(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha)}$ | Gross <br> return <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Fertilizer <br> cost $(\mathrm{VC})$ <br> $\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Gross <br> margin <br> $(\mathrm{tk} / \mathrm{ha)}$ | MBCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=$ RF (HYG) | 68.59 | 11.63 a | 36.46 | 1.55 a | 38.95 a | 105427 | 15294 | 90133 | 1.29 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}=$ RF (MYG) | 62.00 | 11.94 a | 38.56 | 1.59 a | 37.19 a | 99365 | 12068 | 87297 | 1.13 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}=$ IFM (HYG) | 67.72 | 11.26 b | 37.07 | 1.55 a | 38.78 a | 105448 | 24493 | 80955 | 0.81 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}=$ FP | 55.01 | 11.72 a | 36.65 | 1.45 b | 29.37 a | 87302 | 43165 | 44137 | 0.04 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}=$ Ab.Control | 52.51 | 8.84 c | 33.03 | 0.97 c | 19.52 b | 85688 | 0.00 | 85688 | - |
| $\mathrm{CV}(\%)$ | 23.65 | 2.77 | 15.26 | 5.49 | 24.74 |  |  |  |  |

## Multilocation verification of trial of promising cropping patterns

The trial was conducted at Tangail and Bogra with two different cropping patterns during 1999-2000 to verify the productivity and profitability of new fertilizer recommendation with current recommendation and farmers practice. Location and cropping patterns tested are shown below-

| Cropping pattern | Location |
| :--- | :--- |
| Mustard Boro-T.Aman | Tangail, Bogra |
| Potato-Boro-T.Aman | Bogra |

## Cropping pattern : Mustard-Boro-T.Aman <br> Location: Tangail

The trial was conducted at Palima FSR site Tangail during 1999-00. The results showed that the new recommendation produced the highest seed yield in Mustard that was identical to farmers' dose. But in Boro and T.Aman rice the grain yield was not differed significantly among the fertilizer doses.

From economic point of view, the highest gross margin and BCR was calculated from the new recommendation followed by farmers' dose. New fertilizer recommendation is superior to present recommendation in respect of yield and economics.

Table 1. Yield of Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern as affected by different fertilizer recommendation at Palima, Tangail during 1998-99

| Treatment | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  | TVC (Tk/ha) | GM (Tk/ha) | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mustard | Boro | T.Aman |  |  |  |
| Current dose | 0.69 b | 6.0 | 3.87 | 42792 | 38578 | 1.8 |
| New dose | 0.78 a | 6.3 | 3.85 | 43551 | 46671 | 2.13 |
| Farmers dose | 0.65 c | 3.92 b | 3.56 | 33093 | 44200 | 2.0 |

Fertilizer doses (kg/ha)

| Treatment | Crops |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |


| N-P-K-S-Zn (kg/ha) | Mustard | Boro | T.Aman |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current dose | $70-10-20-20-1$ | $100-15-35-6$ | $70-8-25-4$ |
| New dose | $100-26-33-20-0$ | $80-6-25-0$ | $70-5-20-4$ |
| Farmers' dose | $100-15-20-0-0$ | $110-10-20-0$ | $45-12-20-0$ |

## Cropping pattern: Mustard-Boro-T.Aman

Location : Bogra
The trial was conducted at Narhatta, Bogra during 1999-2000. The results are given in Table 4d. Results revealed that the current fertilizer recommendation gave the highest seed yield in Mustard. But in boro identical yield was obtained from present and new recommendation. In T.Aman rice produced significantly higher yield over present recommendation.

Table 2. Yield of Mustard-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern as affected by different fertilizer recommendation at Narhatta, Bogra during 1998-99

| Treatment <br> (N-P-K-S-Zn-B kg/ha) | Grain yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Mustard | Boro | T.Aman |
| Current dose | 0.94 ab | 4.88 a | 4.76 a |
| New dose | 1.12 a | 4.97 a | 4.64 a |
| Farmers' dose | 0.79 b | 4.18 a | 4.07 b |
| Control | 0.36 c | 2.45 b | 2.39 c |

Fertilizer doses (kg/ha)

| Treatment |  | Crops |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| N-P-K-S-Zn (kg/ha) | Mustard | Boro | T.Aman |  |
| Current dose | $80-60-40-20-0$ | $100-34-72-8-0$ | $50-18-48-3-0$ |  |
| New dose | $70-46-42-20-1-1.5$ | $80-60-30-0-0$ | $70-30-20-10-0$ |  |
| Farmers' dose | $78-35-38-0-0$ | $78-32-31-0$ | $50-17-21-0-0$ |  |
| Control | $0-0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ | $0-0-0-0$ |  |

## Cropping pattern: Potato -Boro-T.Aman Location: Bogra

The trial was conducted at Narhatta, Nandigram and Joypurhat MLT site of Bogra during 1999-2000. It reveals that at Narhatta, Nandigram and Joypurhat the new recommendation produced the superior tuber yield of Potato. Current recommendation and Farmers' dose produced identical yield. In Boro both the recommended doses produced identical yield irrespective of locations. But in T.aman rice new recommendation produced significantly higher yield in all the locations.

Table 3. Yield of Potato-Boro-T.Aman cropping pattern as affected by different fertilizer recommendation at Narhatta, Nandigram and Joypurhat of Bogra, 1999-2000

| Treatment | Tuber yield of Potato (t/ha) |  | Grain yield of Boro ( $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) |  |  | Grain yield of T.Aman (t/ha) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Narhatta | Nandigram | Joypurhat | Narhatta | Nandigram | Joypurhat | Narhatta | Nandigram | Joypurhat |
| Current dose | 20.8 b | 23.4 b | 23.1 b | 4.86 a | 4.56 a | 4.96 a | 3.75 b | 3.82 b | 3.97 b |
| New dose | 24.2 a | 28.3 a | 27.0 a | 4.96 a | 4.76 a | 5.28 a | 4.12 a | 4.28 a | 4.46 a |
| Farmers' dose | 22.2 ab | 26.4 ab | 24.5 b | 4.45 b | 4.08 b | 4.55 b | 3.55 b | 3.64 b | 3.61 c |

Fertilizer doses (kg/ha)

| Treatment | Crops |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Potato | Boro | T.Aman |
| Current dose | $100-26-90-15-4$ | $100-15-45-8-0$ | $75-12-40-5-0$ |
| New dose | $160-43-133-0-0$ | $100-13-20-0-0$ | $80-13-20-10-4$ |
| Farmers' dose | $156-31-112-0-0$ | $73-13-12-0-0$ | $56-10-13-0-0$ |

## Boron fertilization to Mustard

Mustard is the major oil seed crop grown about 70\% of the total oil seed area in Bangladesh. But the average yield of Mustard per unit area is very low. During the recent years micro nutrient problems have been warranted due to intensive cropping of rice with other crops. A widespread Boron deficiency is now exists in different parts of Bangladesh soil and it might be responsible for low yield of Mustard. Gupta (1980) reported that Boron deficiency causes less siliqua formation and reduce yield. In this regards a number of experiments were conducted to find out an optimum dose of Boron for Mustard in different locations. A recommendation for Boron in Mustard has come out from these experiments and it needs to be verified in other Mustard growing areas. Therefore the trial was conducted to verify the recommendation in Mustard at different locations.
The trial was conducted at Phulpur and Netrokona MLT sites of Mymensingh, Narikeli FSRD site of Jamalpur during 1999-2000. The experiment was laid out in RCB design with 5-6 replications. Mustard variety Tori-7 was used in different locations. Three different fertilizer doses - i. Recommended dose as per BARC fertilizer recommendation guide, ii. Alternative recommendation as per On-station experiment results and iii. Farmers' dose were tested. Seeds were sown during 5-20 November in different locations. Boric acid was used as the source of Boron. Recommended spacing and seed rate was used and different intercultural operations were done as and when required
Location: Mymensingh Variety : Tori-7
The trial was conducted at Phulpur and Netrokona MLT sites of Mymensing during 2000-01. At Phulpur seed yield of Mustard increased significantly over farmers dose as the farmers did not applied Boron in Mustard. However, 1 kg or 1.5 kg Boron/ha are identical (Table1). But at Netrokona seed yield increased significantly, with the increase of Boron level. Highest yield ( $618 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was recorded from the application of 1.5 kg Boron/ha.

Table 1. Effect of Boron fertilization on the yield of Mustard at Phulpur and Netrokona during 200001

| Treatment | $(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{Zn}-\mathrm{B} \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ |  | Seed yield (kg/ha) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Phulpur | Netrokona |
| Recommended dose | $80-26-33-20-2-1$ | 680 a | 522 b |  |  |  |
| Alternative recommendation | $80-26-33-20-1.5$ | 760 a | 618 a |  |  |  |
| Farmers' dose | $50-13-33-4-0+C D @ 5 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ | 560 b | 382c |  |  |  |

Location : Jamalpur Variety : Tori-7
The trial was conducted at Narikeli FSRD sites of Jamalpur during2000-01. Results revealed that Boron fertilization has significant effects on the seed yield of Mustard (Table 2). Highest seed yield was obtained from the application of Boron @ $1.5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ followed by current recommendation. Farmers dose produced the least yield where no Boron was applied at all.

Table 2. Effect of Boron fertilization on the yield of Mustard at Narikeli FSRD site, Jamalpur 2000-01

| Treatment | $(\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{P}-\mathrm{K}-\mathrm{S}-\mathrm{Zn}-\mathrm{B} \mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Seed yield (kg/ha) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Recommended dose | $80-26-33-20-2-0$ | 956 b |
| Alternative recommendation | $80-26-33-20-2-1.5$ | 1247 a |
| Farmers' dose | $67-23-23-0-0$ | 813 c |

## Testing of NPKS multi-nutrient fertilizers under farmer's condition

The experiment was conducted at eight different locations across the Bangladesh during 2000-01 to test the utility of multi-nutrient fertilizers in terms of productivity and labour cost and to enhance balance application of fertilizer nutrients in Boro rice. Variety BRRI Dhan- 28 and BRRI Dhan- 29 were transplanted during last week of January to $1^{\text {st }}$ week of February across the locations. The following treatments were tested:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Treatments: } \\
& \mathrm{T}_{1}=\text { Control } \\
& \mathrm{T}_{2}=\mathrm{FP} \text { (158-56-45-18 kg NPKS/ha for Bagharpara) } \\
& \quad(108-60-28-16-6 \mathrm{~kg} \text { NPKSZn } / \mathrm{ha} \text { for Magura) } \\
& \mathrm{T}_{3}=\text { MNF for MYG: 100-20-30-10 kg NPKS/ha } \\
& \mathrm{T}_{4}=\text { MNF for HYG: 140-28-42-14 } \mathrm{kg} \text { NPKS } / \mathrm{ha} \\
& \mathrm{~T}_{5}=\text { Single fert. For MYG: 100-20-30-10 kg NPKS/ha } \\
& \mathrm{T}_{6}=\text { Single fert. for HYG: 140-28-42-14 } \mathrm{kg} \text { NPKS/ha }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Performance of Boro rice at different locations:

The results showed that almost there was no significant difference in grain yield of boro rice was observed in most of the locations. Single fertilizer and multinutrient fertilizer produced identical yield in most of the sites. Only at Magura a significant difference was observed in grain yield of boro rice between the single and multinutrient fertilizers. Even, no difference in grain yield was found between the fertilizers of two levels-MYG and HYG at Jessore, Jamalpur and Gazipur.

Therefore, from the study it might be concluded that no significant difference in grain yield of boro rice was observed between the single and multinutrient fertilizers.

Table 1. Performance of NPKS Multinutrient fertilizer on Boro rice at different locations

| Treatment | Grain yield at different locations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Jessore | Magura | Jamalpur | Tangail | Rangpur | Nilphamari | Pabna | Gazipur |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | 3.27 b | 2.37 d | 2.42 b | 2.90 c | 2.14 c | 2.01 c | 3.32 c | 2.35 b |  |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}$ | 6.52 a | 4.58 b | 4.64 a | 5.70 ab | 6.15 b | 5.80 b | 4.66 b | 7.08a |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 6.14 a | 5.60 a | 4.84 a | 5.90 ab | 5.96 b | 5.88 b | 5.11 ab | 7.28 a |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 6.94 a | 5.74 a | 4.92 a | 6.15 a | 7.40 a | 7.11 a | 5.97 a | 6.42 a |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 6.51 a | 4.24 c | 4.80 a | 5.65 b | 5.89 b | 5.90 b | 5.09 ab | 6.62 a |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | 6.56 a | 4.46 bc | 5.09 a | 5.85 ab | 7.26 a | 6.99 a | 4.92 b | 6.91 a |  |

## Improvement of Agroforestry Systems

## Performance of Dioscorea bulbifera and Dioscorea alata grown together on Ziga plant

The experiment was conducted at the Regional Agricultural Research Station, Jessore for two years during 1999-2000 and 2000-01 with five replications. Six planting systems viz. (1) 1 plant of bulbifera, (2) 1 plant of alata, (3) 1 bulbifera +1 alata, (4) 2 bulbifera +1 alata, (5) 1 bulbifera +2 alata and (6) 2 bulbifera +2 alata were studied using a single Ziga plant as support. The unit plots measured $3 \times 3 \mathrm{~m}$. Pits measuring $50 \times 50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}$ were dug beside the Ziga plants during the third week of April. Yam seeds of $100-200 \mathrm{~g}$ were planted during the fourth week of April. D. alata was harvested during the second week of January while D. bulbifera during the second week of February. Data on bulbil and rhizome number and yield were recorded and analyzed statistically. D. alata was found to produce much higher yield than D. bulbifera. Rhizome was the main contributor to the yam yield in D. alata while bulbil contributed more to the yield in $D$. bulbifera. Since the yam yield in D. alata was higher than that in D. bulbifera the combined yam yield from the two yam species was higher where the relative number of $D$. alata plants was higher in the mixture. Yield of the individual species and combined yield from the two species per support increased with the increase in planting density ( Table 1 and 2).

Table 1. Yam yield of D. alata and D. bulbifera on Ziga plant at RARS, Jessore

| Treatment | Yam yield (kg/support) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | D. alata |  |  | D. bulbifera |  |  | D. alata + <br> D. bulbifera |
|  | Bulbil | Rhizom | Total | Bulbil | Rhizom | Total |  |
|  | 1999-2000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | - | - | - | 0.76 | 0.18 | 0.94 | 0.94 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 0.19b | 3.14ab | 3.30 b | - | - | - | 3.30 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 0.16b | 2.50b | 2.71b | 0.83 | 0.09 | 0.88 | 3.59 |
| T4 | 0.40b | 4.01ab | 4.43ab | 1.21 | 0.20 | 1.41 | 5.84 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 0.49b | 3.93ab | 4.33ab | 0.27 | 0.19 | 0.46 | 4.79 |
| T6 | 1.14a | 5.04a | 6.18a | 1.01 | 0.19 | 1.20 | 7.38 |
|  | 2000-01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | - | - | - | 1.64 | 0.18 | 1.82 | 1.82 |
| T2 | 0.36 | 2.42b | 2.78 b | - | - | - | 2.78 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 0.22 | 2.29b | 2.51b | 1 | 0.11 | 1.11 | 3.62 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 0.23 | 3.59ab | 3.82ab | 1.06 | 0.18 | 1.24 | 5.06 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 1.34 | 5.21a | 6.15a | 1.09 | 0.1 | 1.19 | 7.34 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | 0.59 | 3.48a | 6.07a | 1.18 | 0.21 | 1.39 | 7.46 |
| F test | NS | * | * | NS | NS | NS | ** |
|  | Year mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | - | - | - | 1.20 | 0.18 | 1.38 | 1.38 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 0.28 | 2.78 | 3.04 | - | - | - | 3.04 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 0.19 | 2.40 | 2.61 | 0.92 | 0.10 | 1.00 | 3.61 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 0.32 | 3.80 | 4.13 | 1.14 | 0.19 | 1.33 | 5.45 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 0.92 | 4.57 | 5.24 | 0.68 | 0.15 | 0.83 | 6.07 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | 0.87 | 4.26 | 6.13 | 1.10 | 0.20 | 1.30 | 7.42 |

Table 2. Number of bulbil and rhizome of D. alata and D. bulbifera on Ziga plant at RARS, Jessore

| Treatment | Bulbil and rhizome number/support |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | D. alata |  | D. bulbifera |  | Total |  |
|  | Bulbil | Rhizome | Bulbil | Rhizome | Bulbil | Rhizome |
|  | 1999-2000 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | - | - | 13 | 1 | 13 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 8 | 1 | - | - | 8 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 6 | 1 | 12 | 1 | 18 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 12 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 24 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 12 | 2 | 6 | 1 | 18 | 3 |
| T6 | 37 | 2 | 14 | 2 | 51 | 4 |
|  | 2000-01 |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | - | - | 11 | 1 | 11 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 11 | 1 | - | - | 11 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 7 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 20 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 15 | 1 | 11 | 2 | 26 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 91 | 2 | 11 | 1 | 102 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | 71 | 2 | 10 | 2 | 81 | 4 |
|  | Year mean |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}$ | - | - | 12 | 1 | 12 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{2}$ | 10 | 1 | - | - | 10 | 1 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{3}$ | 7 | 1 | 13 | 1 | 19 | 2 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{4}$ | 14 | 1 | 12 | 2 | 25 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{5}$ | 52 | 2 | 9 | 1 | 60 | 3 |
| $\mathrm{T}_{6}$ | 54 | 2 | 12 | 2 | 66 | 4 |

Performance of Potato yam grown on the existing homestead trees at Jamalpur
The experiment was conducted at FSRD Site, Narikeli, Jamalpur during March 2000 to January 2001 to determine the compatibility of potato yam with different tree species. Four common tree species were selected in five farmers' houses. Each house was treated as a replication. The selected tree species viz. drumstick (Moringa oleifera), ziga (Odina woodier), mander (Erythrina indica), pitraj (Aphanamixix polystachya) were compared with the vertical bamboo support. Single standard sized germinated yam seed (average weight of 120 g ) was planted in the pit in the third week of April 2000. Bamboo fencing was given in all the pits to protect the creeper from animals as well as to support for climbing on the host plant. The yam started flowering in the middle of September 2000 and harvesting began from November 2000. The periodical harvesting continued up to January 2001. The data on different characters were statistically analyzed and the means were separated as per LSD test.

The different types of support significantly influenced the number of yam/plant and the total weight of yam/plant. All the living tree species produced the similar yield among which drumstick produced the highest yam yield/plant ( 5.6 kg ). The lower yield in the tree species might be due to the competing with the growing canopy of the host plant as well as the nutrient. Vertical bamboo support gave enough space for canopy development and thus produced highest yam yield (Table 3). Moreover, there was no nutrient competition. However, in conclusion it could be said that for the low cost involvement existing homestead tree species might be utilized for potato yam cultivation.

Table 3. Performance of potato yam in different plant species at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur

| Treatment | Yam/plant (no.) | Average weight of <br> individual yam (g) | Total weight of <br> yam/plant (kg) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drumstick | 26.0 ab | 212.4 | 5.6 b |
| Ziga | 24.4 b | 203.2 | 4.7 b |
| Mander | 22.0 b | 208.4 | 4.7 b |
| Pitraj | 24.6 b | 221.4 | 4.8 b |
| Vertical bamboo support | 31.8 a | 213.6 | 6.8 a |
| F | $* *$ | NS | $* *$ |
| CV\% | 17.66 | 9.31 | 10.95 |

Figure in a column having similar/no letter do not differ significantly

## Study on the feasibility of growing vegetables in home garden round the year

The trial was initiated at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur in rabi 1999-2000 with a view to find out a profitable sequence of vegetables pattern and to utilize the shady place of homestead. Five vegetables pattern, which included 17 different kinds of vegetables to cultivate in three different seasons of the year. The patterns were as follows:

| Rabi | Kharif-I | Kharif-II |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Tomato | Indian spinach | Data |
| Lalsak+Cabbage | Brinjal | Kangkong |
| Corriander+ Onion | Okra | Broad leaf coriander |
| Spinach+ Garlic | Chili |  |
| Carrot+ Bitter gourd | Latiraj kachu |  |

Rabi: The highest yield was obtained from Lalshak + Cabbage ( $13+53 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) followed by Tomato ( 38.5 $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and Carrot + Bitter gourd ( $20.4+6.40 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The lowest yield was obtained from Spinach+Garlic ( $6.6+5.2 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The highest gross benefit (Tk.385000/ha), Net return (Tk.265000/ha) and benefit cost ratio (3.2) were obtained from Tomato (Table 4).

Table 4. Yield, cost and return of different vegetables of Rabi at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur 19992000

| Crop | Date of planting | Date of 1st harvesting | Field duration (days) | Yield (kg/ plot) | Yield (t/ha) | Gross benefit (Tk/ha) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TVC } \\ & \text { (Tk/ha) } \end{aligned}$ | NR (Tk/ha) | BCR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rabi vegetables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tomato | 23/10/99 | 1/12000 | 107 | 19.25 | 38.5 | 385000 | 120000 | 265000 | 3.20 |
| Lalsak + | 23/10/99 | 20/11/99 | 37 | 6.5 | 13.00 | 291000 | 122000 | 169000 | 2.38 |
| Cabbage | 26/10/99 | 1/1/2000 | 76 | 26.5 | 53.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Corriander | 23/10/99 | 3/1/2000 | 97 | 0.5 | 1.00 | 150000 | 112000 | 38000 | 1.33 |
| + Onion | 23/10/99 | 5/2/2000 | 102 | 6.0 | 12.00 |  |  |  |  |
| Spinach | 17/10/99 | 28/11/99 | 41 | 3.3 | 6.60 | 189000 | 112000 | 77000 | 1.68 |
| + Garlic | 23/10/99 | 12/2/2000 | 109 | 2.6 | 5.20 |  |  |  |  |
| Carrot+ | 9/11/99 | 15/1/2000 | 66 | 10.2 | 20.4 | 201600 | 110000 | 91600 | 1.83 |
| Bitter gourd | 20/11/99 | 15/1/2000 | 90 | 3.2 | 6.40 |  |  |  |  |
| Kharif vegetables/ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indian Spinach | 23-3-2000 | 30-4-2000 | 100 | 31.7 | 63.4 | 190200 | 100000 | 90200 | 1.90 |
| Brinjal | 25-3-2000 | 25-6-2000 | 125 | 17.5 | 35.0 | 175000 | 96000 | 79000 | 1.82 |
| Okra | 23-3-2000 | 5-5-2000 | 102 | 15.0 | 34.0 | 180000 | 90000 | 90000 | 2.00 |
| Kharif II vegetables |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Data | 2-7-2000 | 15-8-2000 | 68 | 17 | 34 | 102000 | 84000 | 18000 | 1.24 |
| Kangkong | 12-8-2000 | 15-9-2000 | 48 | 20 | 40 | 200000 | 80000 | 120000 | 2.5 |
| Broad leaf coriander | 20-7-2000 | 20-8-2000 | 65 | 4.0 | 8 | 240000 | 76000 | 164000 | 3.15 |
| Chili | 25-4-2000 | 10-6-2000 | 141 | 3.5 | 7 | 40000 | 110000 | 30000 | 1.27 |
| Latiraj kachu | 19-4-2000 | 15-6-2000 | 146 | 14.5 | 29 | 203000 | 116000 | 87000 | 1.75 |

Kharif-I: The highest yield was performed by the Indian Spinach ( $63.40 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) followed by Brinjal 35.00 $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and Okra $34.00 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ respectively. The highest gross benefit was obtained by Indian Spinach (Tk.190200/ha) followed by Okra Tk.180000/ha and Brinjal Tk.175000/ha respectively. The highest benefit cost ration was found by the Okra (2.0) followed by Indian Spinach (1.9) and Brinjal (1.82) respectively. Benefit cost ratio from Okra was the highest because total variable cost of Okra was minimum than other vegetable grown.

Kharif-II: The highest yield was obtained from the Kangkong (40 t/ha) followed by data ( $34 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and Latiraj Kachu ( $29 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The lowest was obtained from Chili ( $7 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The highest gross benefit was obtained from broad leaf lovi (Tk.2, 40,000/ha) followed by Latiraj kachu and Kang-kong (Tk.2, $03,000 / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and (Tk.2,00000/ha) respectively. The lowest gross benefit was obtained from the data (Tk. 1,02,000/ha). The maximum benefit cost ratio were obtained from Broad leaf coriander (3.15) and lowest was from data (1.24).

Performance of the vegetables patterns: Tomato-Indian Spinach-Data was better than those of others patterns. This pattern gave the highest net return (Tk.373200/ha) and BCR (2.22) compared to Lalsak + Cabbage - Brinjal - Kangkong (Net return Tk. 368000/ha, BCR 2.20), Coriander + Onoin - Okra - Broad leaf coriander (Net return Tk. 292000/ha, BCR 2.00) and Carrot + Bitter gourd - Latiraj kachu (Net return Tk. 178600/ha, BCR 1.79) respectively (Table 5).

Table 5. Cost and return of different vegetables pattern round the year at FSRD site, Narikeli, Jamalpur 1999-2000

| Patterns | Gross return <br> (Tk.) | TVC (Tk.) | Net return (Tk.) | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tomato- Indian spinach -Data | 677200 | 304000 | 373200 | 2.22 |
| Lalsak + Cabbage- Brinjal -Kangkong | 666000 | 298000 | 368000 | 2.20 |
| Coriander+Onion- Okra -Broad leaf coriander | 570000 | 278000 | 292000 | 2.00 |
| Spinach+ Garlic -Chili-Chili | 329000 | 404600 | 107000 | 1.41 |
| Carrot+ Bitter gourd -Latiraj kachu | 222000 | 226000 | 178600 | 1.79 |

Among the five vegetables patterns tested Tomato - Indian spinach - Data gave the highest net return (Tk. 3,73,200/ha) followed by Lalshak + cabbage - Brinjal - Kangkong (Tk. 3,68,000/ha) and Coriander + Onion - Okra -Broad leaf coriander (Tk. 2,92,000/ha). This pattern may be continued for the next year as the source of vitamin and minerals which most essentials for the farmers' health and cash earning.

## Performance of Potato yam grown on the existing homestead trees at Faridpur

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Ishan Gopalpur, Faridpur during 2000-01. The experiment was laid out in RCB design with five replications. Five different treatments (support) viz. Drumstick, Ziga, Mandar, Pitraj and vertical bamboo were included in the study. A pit measuring $50 \times 50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}$ were dug under the tree trunk. Well de composed cowdung @ $5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{pit}$ and Furadun @ $10 \mathrm{~g} /$ pit was applied and mixed in the soil during pit preparation. Two germinated yam seeds were planted in each pit. Adequate plant protection measures are being taken as and when necessary. Yams were harvested during 29/10/2000 to 05/12/2000. Data on yield and yield components were recorded and analyzed statistically. Highest average yield of potato yam ( $15.00 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{bamboo}$ ) was obtained from vertical bamboo support. The second highest yield ( $14.08 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant and $12.68 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant) were obtained from Ziga and drumstick support. Lowest yield ( $3.75 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{plant}$ ) was obtained from Pitraj (Table 6).

Table 6. Performance of potato yam grown on existing homestead trees at FSRD site, Ishan Gopalpur, Faridpur during 1998-2001

| Treatment | Yam/ treatment (no.) | Weight/yam <br> (g) | Yield/treatment (kg) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 1998-99 | 1999-00 | 2000-01 | Average |
| Drumstick | 42.5d | 295b | 3.92 | 12.35b | 12.68c | 9.66 |
| Ziga | 48.3a | 289c | 4.13 | 12.84b | 14.08b | 10.35 |
| Mander | 20.8c | 157c | 4.40 | 2.94c | 6.62d | 4.65 |
| Pitraj | 16.7d | 147d | 3.88 | 1.36 d | 3.75 e | 3.00 |
| Bamboo support | 41.3b | 325a | 4.25 | 14.74a | 15.00a | 11.00 |
| CV (\%) | 5.6 | 1.8 | 11.4 | 6.3 | 5.1 |  |
| Level of significance | ** | ** | -- | ** | ** |  |

** means significant at $1 \%$ level

## Performance of potato yam grown on the existing homestead trees at Sylhet

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet during 1999-2000 to 2000-01. The experiment was laid out in RCB design with four replications. The four different treatments (Support) such as mango, coconut, rain tree and betel nut were included in the study. Pit measuring $50 \times 50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}$ were dug and well-decomposed cowdung at the rate of $4 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{pit}$ was applied and mixed the soil during pit preparation. Farmer's homestead yam planting was made during 20 April to 28 April. To protect pest (leaf eating) furadan was used at the rate of $5 \mathrm{gm} / \mathrm{plant}$. Harvesting was done from last week of December to second week of January. The highest yield of potato yam (5.27 $\mathrm{kg} /$ plant) was obtained from betel nut as support tree followed coconut as support tree ( $3.98 / \mathrm{kg} /$ plant). The lowest yield ( $2.40 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{plant}$ ) was obtained from rain tree support (Table 7 ).

Table 7. Yield performance of potato yam with different tree species at FSRD site, Golapgonj, Sylhet during 1999-2001

|  | No. of yam |  |  |  | Average wt/yam (g) |  |  | Yeild/plant (kg) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Support tree | 1999-2000 | $2000-01$ | Mean | $1999-2000$ | $2000-01$ | Mean | $1999-$ <br> 2000 | $2000-01$ | Mean |  |
| Coconut | 15 | 17 | 16 | 250 | 248 | 249 | 3.70 | 4.21 | 3.98 |  |
| Betelnut | 16 | 20 | 18 | 290 | 295 | 292.5 | 4.50 | 5.90 | 5.27 |  |
| Mango | 15 | 16 | 15.5 | 225 | 236 | 230.5 | 3.20 | 3.78 | 3.57 |  |
| Raintree | 10 | 13 | 11.5 | 200 | 218 | 209 | 1.90 | 2.83 | 2.40 |  |

## Performance of Potato yam grown on the existing homestead trees at Tangail

The experiment was conducted at FSRD site, Palima during 2000-2001. Five tree species i) Drumstick ii) Ziga iii) Mandar iv) Kadam v) Mehagoni and vi) Bamboo were used as support.The pit size was $50 \times 50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}$. One pit was prepared for one tree species and bamboo with 100 gm urea, 75 gm TSP and 80 gm MP in ten cooperator farmers homestead. Yam planting was done during $1^{\text {st }}$ week of April, 2000.To protect pest (leaf feeder) furadan was applied at the rate of $5 \mathrm{gm} /$ plant. Harvesting was done during 10 Nov. 2000 to 15 February 2001. The highest yield of potato yam ( $6.5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{plant}$ ) was obtained from bamboo as vertical support material while the lowest yield ( $2.1 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant) was obtained from Mandar tree support. The highest yield of bamboo support might be due to large seed size ( 400 g ), sufficient light and comparatively less affected by pest at vegetative stage. The lowest yield from Mandar support might be due to small seed size ( 300 g ), large canopy of Mandar tree and severely affected by leaf feeder in vegetative stage. It was observed that the survival rate was highest (80\%)
with bamboo made support which was followed by Mehagoni ( $70 \%$.) Kadam tree required the highest days for initiation and harvesting of yam and Drumstick required the lowest days for initiation and harvesting of yam (Table 8).

Table 8. Performance of potato yam grown on some homestead supports at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail during 1999-2000

| Supporting <br> materials | Survival <br> $(\%)$ | Flowering <br> (days) | Days to harvest | Yam/plant (no.) | Yield/plant <br> (kg) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Drumstick | 66 | 126 | 213 | 21 ab | 4.4 bc |
| Ziga | 62 | 133 | 215 | 14 d | 2.9d |
| Mandar | 44 | 137 | 219 | 11 e | 2.1 e |
| Kadam | 60 | 141 | 231 | 19 bc | 3.9c |
| Mehagoni | 70 | 132 | 229 | 17 c | 4.2 c |
| Bamboo (vertical) | 80 | 127 | 220 | 24 a | 6.5 a |
| CV (\%) | -- | -- | 11.23 | 9.21 |  |

## Performance of Potato yam grown on the existing homestead tree spices at Barind, Rajshahi

The trial was conducted at FSRD site, Chabbishnagar, Rajshahi, during 2000-01. The trial was laid out in RCB design with six dispersed replications. Each replication represents one farmer. In some replications, Potato yam could not be established due to drought. That is why statistical analysis was not possible. Five different treatments (support) viz. Drumstick, Ziga, Mandar, Babla and Neem trees were included for the support of potato yam. Pits size was $50 \times 50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}$ and well-decomposed cow dung @ 5 kg per pit was applied and mixed with the soil during pit preparation. Potato yams were planted from April 21, 2000.

Data on number of potato yam and yield of potato yam ( $\mathrm{kg} /$ plant) were taken. The number of potato yam ranged from 6 to 10.6. The maximum number of potato yam was received from drumstick tree (10.6) where as minimum number of potato yam was received from Ziga tree (6). The yield of potato yam ranged from 1.51 to $4.2 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant. The highest yield ( 4.20 $\mathrm{kg} /$ plant) was produced by the drumstick support where as lowest yield ( $1.51 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant)

Table 9. Yield of potato yam on the existing homestead tree spices

| Name of tree | No. of <br> potato yam | Yield of potato <br> yam (kg/plant) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Drumstick | 10.6 | 4.20 |
| Ziga | 6 | 1.51 |
| Mandar | 7.6 | 2.92 |
| Babla | 7.1 | 2.98 |
| Neem | 6.2 | 2.2 | was received from the Ziga tree support (Table 9).

## Performance of Potato yam grown on different homestead trees at Rangpur

The trial was carried out for three consecutive years from 1998-99 to 2000-01 at FSRD site, Syedpur, Rangpur and MLT sites Lalmonirhat, Polashbari and Nilphamari MLT sites. A total of six farmers, in each of the years were involved in this study. Five different support were used. These were Mandar, Ziga, Drumstick, Pitraj and Bamboo. Planting was done during the month of April of each individual years. Two germinating yam seedling were planted in two pits near each tree trunk. Pit size was $50 \times 50 \times 50 \mathrm{~cm}$. Soil of each pit was well mixed with 5 kg cowdung. In the initial stage care was taken so that the creepers were not damaged by the animals and can climb the tree. Granular insecticide was applied time to time at the base of the yam plants and it was well mixed with the soil to control the
leaf feeder which affects the growth of the yam plant. Data on number and weight of yam per plant were recorded after harvest and analyzed. The mean potato yam yield on different support arrangements for three successive years has been presented in the table. It is evident from the study that the highest number (38) and weight ( 5.5 kg ) of yam per plant was obtained when it was allowed to grow on the bamboo support. Presence of sufficient sunlight and absence of shading effect might have contributed to the better yield of yam on vertical bamboo support. Ziga and Mandar support produced 30 numbers of yam which yielded more than $4 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant. Pitraj support produced less number of yam (26) per plant weighing $4.4 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant (Table 10 and 11).

Table 10. Performance of potato yam grown on different support trees for 3(three) years at four locations of greater Rangpur area during 1998-99 to 2000-01

| Tree Species | Yam per plant (no.) |  |  |  |  | Weight of yam per plant (kg) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2000-01$ | $1999-00$ | $1998-99$ | Mean | $2000-01$ | $1999-00$ | $1998-99$ |  |  |
| Mandar | 29 | 42 | 20 | 30.3 | 4.53 | 5.1 | 3.6 |  |  |
| Ziga | 29 | 43 | 18 | 30.0 | 5.16 | 5.3 | 2.8 |  |  |
| Drumstick | 26 | 35 | 19 | 26.7 | 5.74 | 4.0 | 3.4 |  |  |
| Pitraj | 33 | 26 | 23 | 27.3 | 5.39 | 3.9 | 3.1 |  |  |
| Bamboo (sole) | 43 | 41 | 30 | 38.0 | 6.79 | 5.6 | 4.2 |  |  |

Table 11. Performance of potato yam grown on different support trees for 3(three) years four locations of greater Rangpur during 1998-99, 1999-00 and 2000-01

| Tree Species | Yam/support (no) | Wt. of yam/support (kg) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Mander | 30 b | 4.41 ab |
| Zigha | 30 b | 4.42 ab |
| Drumstick | 27 b | 4.38 ab |
| Pitraj | 27 b | 4.13 b |
| Bamboo sole | 38 a | 5.53 a |
| CV (\%) | 8.9 | 12.8 |

## On-Farm Trials with Advance Lines and Technologies

## On-farm trial with phosphorus efficient genotypes of Wheat

Four advance lines/varieties of wheat (Kanchan, Chirya, BAW-923, BAW-966) were tested with three levels of phosphorus ( 0,30 and $60 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) in the farmers field at MLT site Sherpur during rabi 2000-01. Application of 30 and $60 \mathrm{~kg}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} /$ ha increased the yield of genotypes significantly over control. The highest grain yield was obtained from $60 \mathrm{~kg}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5} / \mathrm{ha}$ application (Table 1). Among the genotypes tested Chirya produced the highest grain yield ( $4.83 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) followed by Kanchan and BAW 966 ( $4.38 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ each) respectively.

On-farm performance of promising Groundnut varieties

To evaluate the yield performance of some groundnut varieties and lines at farmers field three trials were conducted at FSRD site, Noakhali, Lebukhali and Kalapara during 2000-01. At Noakhali, BARI Badam-6 yielded better ( $2.93 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) which is identical with the yield obtained from BARI Badam-5 and ICG-89257 (yield range: 2.52-2.87 t/ha). The tested variety ACC-12 (Jhinga) produced significantly the highest yield at Lebukhali ( $2.15 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and Kalapara ( $2.25 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). Over the locations Noakhali performed better than other two sites (Table 2).

Table 2. Yield performance of groundnut varieties/lines at different locations during 2000-01

| Varieties/lines | Pod yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Noakhali | Lebukhali | Kalapara |
| Local | 2.32 b | - | - |
| BARI Badam-6 | 2.93 a | 1.77 c | 1.88 c |
| BARI Badam-5 | 2.87 ab | - | - |
| ICG 89257 | 2.52 ab | - | - |
| DG-2 | - | 1.91 b | 1.93 b |
| Dhaka-1 | - | 1.33 d | 1.67 d |
| Acc-12 (Jhinga) | - | 2.15 a | 2.25 a |
| CV (\%) | 11.30 | 7.3 | 15.6 |

## Evaluation of chickpea varieties for intercropping with Mustard

Yield performance of two varieties of chickpea BARI Chola-2 and BARI Chola-5 were assessed against two intercropping systems viz. 2 rows and 4 rows of chickpea alternate with 2 rows of mustard at the farmers field of Chowgacha MLT site during rabi 2000-01. Results revealed that chickpea yield was mainly influenced by the planting system but not by the chickpea variety. Four rows of chickpea alternate with two rows of mustard produced the highest chickpea yield ( $344 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) whereas two rows of chickpea alternate with two rows of mustard produced the highest mustard yield ( $219 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ).

Chickpea equivalent yield did not vary widely among different planting systems and chickpea variety ( $332-438 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). There was no significant difference in yield between the two varieties of chickpea (Table 3).

Table 3. Yield performance of chickpea, intercropped with mustard at the MLT site Chowgacha during rabi 2000-01

| Treatments | Yield (kg/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Chickpea | Mustard | Chickpea equivalent |
| Two rows of chickpea (Var. BARI chola-2) alternate <br> with two rows of mustard (50c:50m) | 247 | 213 | 332 |
| Four rows of BARI Chola-2 alternate with two rows of <br> mustard (67c:33m) | 330 | 158 | 438 |
| Two rows of BARI chola -5 alternate with two rows of <br> mustard (50c:50m) | 255 | 219 | 404 |
| Four row of BARI chola -5 alternate with two rows of <br> mustard (76c:33m) | 344 | 139 | 339 |

Price: Chickpea $=$ Tk 22.00/kg, Mustard $=$ Tk. 15.00/kg

## On-farm adaptability trial of Country bean varieties at Madhupur

On-farm adaptability trial of six promising country bean varieties against local check was conducted at MLT site, Modhupur, Tangail during 2000-01 to evaluate the suitable variety/varieties for the area. Among the varieties tested the highest yield ( $3.51 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{pit}$ ) was obtained from BARI Sheem-1 followed by IPSA Sheem-2 ( $3.46 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{pit}$ ) and Kartikoda Sheem ( $3.39 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{pit}$ ) respectively. BARI Sheem-2, Bata Sheem and local gave also identical yield ( $2.24-2.12 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{pit}$ ). BARI Sheem -2 gave higher yield it was also 45 days earlier over the local variety. Bata Sheem, Kartikoda Sheem, BARI sheem- 2 produced sheem for longest duration (80-108 days) and BARI Sheem-2 was the earliest variety (Table 4).

Table 4. Performance of country bean varieties at MLT site, Modhupur, Tangail during 2000-01

| Varieties | $1^{\text {st }}$ harvest to last harvest (days) | Yield (kg/pit) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BARI Sheem 1 | $137-211$ | 3.51 a |
| BARI Sheem 2 | $70-178$ | 2.25 bc |
| IPSA Sheem 2 | $137-211$ | 3.46 a |
| Kartikoda seem (MCC) | $108-197$ | 3.39 a |
| Madhupur seem (MCC) | $137-211$ | 3.24 a |
| Bata Sheem (MCC) | $107-187$ | 2.24 c |
| Local (Check) | $148-211$ | 2.12 c |
| CV (\%) | - | 8.45 |

## Advance yield trial of Chickpea

The trial was conducted at FSRD site, Chabbishnagar, Rajshahi during rabi 2000-01 to select chickpea lines having high yield potential. Five lines (Viz. ICC-4958, Anugri, BC-3, BC-5, BC-6) were tested in this trial. Yield performance of five lines of chickpea are presented in table 5 . Among the lines a significant variation was observed in seed yield of chickpea. The line Anugri gave superior yield ( $1.13 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) followed by ICC-4958 ( $1.02 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) respectively. From other three lines the yield ranged 0.63-0.76 t/ha. Days to maturity of the tested lines also differed significantly. The lowest duration was observed in Anugri and BC-5 (99 days) and the highest was ICC-4958 (107 days).

Table 5. Performance of advance lines of chickpea at FSRD site, Chabbishnagar, Rajshahi

| Treatments | Days to maturity | Yield (t/ha) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| ICC-4958 | 107 | 1.02 |
| Anecgri | 99 | 1.13 |
| BC-3 | 103 | 0.63 |
| BC-5 | 99 | 0.65 |
| BC-6 | 100 | 0.755 |
| CV (\%) | 8.7 | 3.78 |
| LSD (0.05) | 5.67 | 3.4 |

## On-farm verification of different levels of N -fertilizer for growing Bushbean

An experiment was conducted at farmers field of Shahrasti MLT site, Comilla during rabi 2000-01 to determine the optimum and economic dose of N -fertilizer of bushbean. Six different N -levels (Viz. 0 , $30,60,90,120$ and $150 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) were used as six treatments. Results revealed that there was significant response of bushbean to N -fertilizer application. There were variation among different doses of N for yield. Upto the application of $120 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ the yield of bushbean increased (1.22-5.45 $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) but further addition of $\mathrm{N}(150 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha})$ decreased the yield and gross margin. Highest length and breadth of bushbean were obtained from $150 \mathrm{~kg} \mathrm{~N} / \mathrm{ha}$ along with recommended doses of other fertilizers (Table 6).

Table 6. Yield and yield attributes of Bushbean at Shahrasti, Comilla during rabi 2000-01

| N-level (kg/ha) | Length of <br> bushbean $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Breadth of <br> bushbean $(\mathrm{cm})$ | Yield (t/ha) | Gross margin <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{T}_{1}=0$ | 8.5 | 2.75 | 1.22 | 3,913 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{2}=30$ | 9.3 | 2.86 | 2.51 | 13,839 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{3}=60$ | 10.5 | 3.41 | 3.76 | 23,429 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{4}=90$ | 11.7 | 3.95 | 4.36 | 27,819 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{5}=120$ | 12.4 | 4.30 | 5.45 | 36,177 |
| $\mathrm{~T}_{6}=150$ | 13.3 | 4.44 | 5.23 | 33,981 |
| $\mathrm{CV}(\%)$ | 6.7 | 3.2 | 11.4 |  |

## Preliminary yield trial of Barely for saline areas

To find out the suitable lines/variety with high yield potentials for the saline areas of Noakhali, Khulna and Patuakhali, the tiral was conducted during rabi 2000-01. Six varieties/lines viz., BSH-32, BSH-2, BB-1, BSHL-6, BSHL-2, BSHL-4 were tested in the trial. It was observed from the results that among the locations barley yielded better at Khulna (yield ranged from 780-1830 kg/ha) followed by Patuakhali ( $644-1922 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). Noakhali showed poor performance (yield ranged from $303-842 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) from other locations. The highest yield was obtained from advance line BSH-2 (1922 kg/ha) at Patuakhali followed by BSHL-6 (1830 kg/ha) at Khulna. BSHL-2 gave lower yield in three locations (303, 780 and $727 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) respectively (Table 7.)

Table 7. Performance of different Barely lines in saline areas during rabi 2000-01

| Lines/variety | Grain yield (kg/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Noakhali | Khulna | Patuakhali |
| BSH-32 | 708 | 790 c | 1425 b |
| BSH-2 | 400 | 1180 b | 1922 a |
| BB-1 | 575 | 1410 b | 1475 b |
| BSHL-6 | 842 | 1830 a | 644 c |
| BSHL-2 | 303 | 780 c | 727 c |
| BSHL-4 | 408 | 1230 b | 730 c |
| CV (\%) | 23.21 | 11.14 |  |

## On-farm variety trial with some BINA released Mustard varieties

Six BINA released mustard varieties/lines viz. BINA Sharisha-3 and 4, Agroni, Safal, MM-19 and 20 with two check varieties were tested at the FSRD site, Syedpur, Rangpur during rabi season of 1999-2001 to evaluate their performance and to identify the suitable mustard varieties with good yield potentials to fit the existing cropping pattern. Results revealed that BARI Sharisha- 8 produced significant highest seed yield ( 2.31 and $1.89 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) for both the year and also earlier to 96 and 100 days than the BINA mustard varieties/lines. The next higher seed yield was obtained from BINA Sharisha-3 (1.74 and 1.63 $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) for both the years which were at per with the yield of BINA Sharisha-4, MM-20 and Shajal respectively (Table 8).

Table 8. Yield performance of BINA released mustard varieties at the FSRD site Syedpur, Rangpur during rabi 1999-2000 and 2000-01

| Varieties/lines | Days to maturity |  | Seed yield (t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1999-2000$ | $2000-01$ | $1999-2000$ | $2000-01$ |
| BINA Sharisha 3 | 98 a | 101 ab | 1.74 b | 1.63 b |
| BINA Sharisha 4 | 97 b | 97 c | 1.54 c | 1.51 b |
| Agroni | 98 a | 99 bc | 1.46 c | 1.18 d |
| Shafal | 98 a | 99 bc | 1.34 d | 1.50 d |
| MM-19 | - | 102 a | - | 1.46 bc |
| MM-20 | - | 102 a | - | 1.52 b |
| Jata | - | 102 a | - | 1.27 cd |
| BARI Sharisha 8 | 96 c | 100 ab | 2.31 a | 1.89 a |
| CV (\%) | 0.2 | 1.2 | 5.7 | 8.4 |

## Adaptive trial of developed and advanced lines/varieties of Rapeseed and Mustard at farmers field

Four different experiments were conducted at FSRD site Faridpur and Tangail, MLT sites Damurhuda and Gangni during rabi season of 2000-01 to evaluate promising Rape and Mustard varieties/lines at farmers field. At Tangail all the lines and varieties produced similar yields were obtained ranging from 1.32 to 1.50 t/ha respectively. At Damurhuda and Gangni almost similar yields ranging from 1.25 to $1.88 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and 1.10 to $1.70 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ respectively. At Fardipur the line OTBC-1193 yielded the best ( 2.02 $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) over the locations (Table 9).

Table 9. Yield performance of some promising rape mustard varieties/lines at different locations during rabi season of 2000-01

| Varieties/lines | Yield on locations (t/ha) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Faridpur | Damurhuda | Gangni | Tangail |
| OTBC-1193 | 2.02 a | 1.25 c | 1.48 cd | 1.38 a |
| OTBC-1097 | 1.64 b | 1.88 a | 1.70 a | 1.43 a |
| Jamalpur-1 | 1.52 bc | 1.52 abc | 1.55 bc | 1.32 a |
| BARI Sharisha-9 | 1.29 c | 1.63 ab | 1.40 de | 1.45 a |
| ISD local | 1.43 bc | 1.43 bc | 1.67 a | 1.44 a |
| Tori-7 | - | 1.40 bc | 1.10 f | - |
| BARI Sharisha-7 | - | 1.46 bc | 1.38 de | - |
| BARI Shahisha-8 | - | 1.65 ab | 1.56 bc | - |
| Jata | - | 1.76 ab | 1.64 ab | - |
| Rai-5 | - | 1.64 ab | 1.30 e | 1.50 a |
| CV (\%) | 1.1 | 5.5 | 15.09 |  |

## Adaptability trial of newly released Potato varieties

Eight varieties of potato viz. Chamak, Ailsa, Diamant, Heera, Dheera, Multa, Petronis and Cardinal as check were tested to select the suitable variety for those regions. Results revealed that Heera, Dheera, Cardinal, Diamont were statistically superior (yield ranged from 33.86 to $27.03 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ at Rangpur and at Comilla was 20.62 to $16.19 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). Multa and petronis gave intermediate levels of yields. Large scale production program may be initiated with the above varieties provided the seed tubers are available (Table 10).

Table 10. Performance of potato varieties at different locations during rabi 2000-01

| Varieties | Tuber yield (t/ha) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Chandina | Syedpur | Nilphamari | Polashbari |
| Chamak | 17.76 b | 30.44 a | - | - |
| Ailsa | 12.09 d | 23.81 c | - | - |
| Diamont | 16.19 bc | 28.32 ab | 30.53 a | 31.98 ab |
| Heera | 20.6 a | 30.79 a | 29.76 a | 32.83 a |
| Cardinal | 20.43 a | 27.03 a | 29.24 a | 32.27 ab |
| Dheera | 20.43 a | 31.18 a | 30.59 a | 33.86 a |
| Multa | - | - | 26.07 b | 27.71 cd |
| Petronis | - | - | 24.79 b | 27.13 c |
| CV (\%) | 11.7 | 10.3 | 8.2 | 5.4 |

## Eeffect of management practices on the performance of late sown Rapeseed mustard

The experiment was conducted at two FSRD sites Jamalpur and Pabna and a MLT site, Comilla during rabi 2000-01 to identify a suitable management practice for minimizing the yield loss of rapeseed/mustard under late sown condition. The significant highest grain yield was obtained from high management practices due to high fertilizer packages and high management practice in all over the locations. Lowest yield was obtained from low management practices. Similar trend was found in last year (1999-2000) (Table 11).

Table 12. Effect of management practices on the yield of late sown rapeseed mustard at different locations during rabi season of 1999-2000 and 2000-01

| Treatments |  | Seed yield on locations (Kg/ha) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Jamalpur | Pabna | Comilla |
| Low management (60-40-30-10kg/ha of $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}-\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$, respectively + no irrigation + no weeding + no use of insecticide \& fungicide. | $\begin{gathered} 1999-2000 \\ 2000-01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 286 c \\ & 166 c \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 114.33 \mathrm{c} \\ & 941.00 \mathrm{~b} \end{aligned}$ | 671c |
| Medium management(100-60-45-20 kg/ha of $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}-$ $\mathrm{K}_{2} 0-\mathrm{S}$, respectively+one weeding and thinning at 21 DAS+insecticide (Ripcord) spray only at the time of aphid infestation + fungicide (Rovral 50 WB) spray only during disease prevalence) | $\begin{gathered} 1999-2000 \\ 2000-01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 617b } \\ & 491 b \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 442.00b } \\ 1133.33 b \end{array}$ | 1270b |
| High management (140-80-60-30 kg/ha of $\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{P}_{2} \mathrm{O}_{5}-\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{O}-\mathrm{S}$, respectively + two irrigation one at 21 DAS and $42 \mathrm{dAS}+$ two hand weeding at 21 DAS and 35 DAS+ insecticide (Ripcord) and fungicide (Rovral 50 WB) spray at every 20 days interval from seedling emergence to harvest). | $\begin{gathered} 1999-2000 \\ 2000-01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1079 a \\ 782 a \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { 844.33a } \\ \text { 1483.33a } \end{array}$ | 1483a |
| CV (\%) | $\begin{gathered} 1999-2000 \\ 2000-01 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10.33 \\ & 11.70 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20.97 \\ & 10.71 \end{aligned}$ | $13.8$ |

## Yield trial of Potato in saline area

An on-farm adaptability trial was conducted to assess the yield performance of potato in saline area, Noakhali during rabi 2000-01. Twenty different varieties and lines were tested under this trial. Dheera produced the highest yield of 9.86 t/ha followed by 384011.3 ( $9.39 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). Marilia and 94.66 gave identical yield ( 8.48 and $7.70 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). Other varieties/lines of potato showed less yield due to late planting and high salinity in the soil during growing period (Table 12).

## Performance of Onion varieties in farmers field

On-farm performance of onion varieties (viz. BARI Piaj-1, HYV Taherpuri, Zitka and Skhsagar) at Gangni MLT site and Khustia Sadar during rabi 2000-01 to find out a suitable variety of onion for use in Khustia region. Results revealed that highest bulb yield was obtained from BARI Piaj-1 (10.05 t/ha) (Table 13). The rest three varieties gave identical yield with BARI Piaj-1.

Table 12.Yield performance of new varieties/lines in the saline area at Atkapalia, Noakhali

| Lines/varieties | Tuber yield (t/ha) |
| :--- | :---: |
| 94.319 | 3.81 |
| 384011.3 | 9.39 |
| Pontiac | 6.56 |
| 93.41 | 4.07 |
| 982013.5 | 3.34 |
| 93.314 | 4.98 |
| 94.66 | 7.70 |
| Marilia | 8.48 |
| 384091.11 | 5.37 |
| 88.163 | 5.16 |
| Heera | 5.68 |
| Dheera | 9.86 |
| 93.44 | 3.85 |
| 93.16 | 3.36 |
| Cardinal | 4.03 |
| 384558.10 | 3.76 |
| 86.140 | 2.35 |
| Diamant | 3.32 |
| 94.42 | 2.10 |
| 93.319 | 1.80 |

Table 13. Yield performance of onion varieties at Kushtia Sadar and Gangni MLT sites

| Varieties | Plant height (cm) | No.of bulb per kg | Bulb yield (t/ha) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Taherpuri | 35.57 | 70.67 | 9.36 a |
| BARI Piaj-1 | 36.07 | 70.33 | 10.05 |
| Zitka | 35.23 | 73.00 | 8.87 |
| Sukhsagar | 35.23 | 71.67 | 8.97 |
| LSD (0.05) | ns | ns | ns |
| CV (\%) | 1.5 | 3.8 | 5.5 |

## Validation trial of newly improved varieties of Mukhikachu

The performance of mukhikachu varieties/lines viz. local, Bilashi and MK-140 were evaluated in the faremrs field at FSRD site, Narikeli and MLT site Sherpur during the kharif-II season of 2000 under AEZ-9. Significantly yield was obtained from Bilashi ( $18.79 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) which produced $37 \%$ higher than local variety ( $11.77 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). There was found no significant effect on yield of two different locations (16.28 and $15.58 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The highest weight of secondary corm and cormels/plant was produced from Bilashi ( 613 g ) followed by MK-140(587g) respectively. But the local variety gave higher number of corm and carmels/plant (18) than Bilashi (14) and MK-140 (15) (Table 14)

Table 14. Yield and yield contributing characters of Mukhikachu at two different locations in Jamalpur

|  | Treatment | Secondary corm and <br> cormel/plant (no.) | Weight of secondary corn and <br> cormel/plant (g) | Yield (t/ha) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | Narikeli (FSRD) | 16 | 505 | 16 |
|  | Sherpur (MLT) | 16 | 548 | 16 |
| F-test |  | ns | ns | ns |
| Variety/line | Local | 18 a | 380 b | 12 c |
|  | Bilashi | 14 b | 613 a | 19 a |
|  | MK-140 | 15 b | 587 a | 17 b |
| F-test |  | $*$ | $* *$ | $*$ |
| CV (\%) |  | 8.37 | 12.89 | 1097 |

## Performance of newly released Wheat varieties

To evaluate the yield performance of four different newly released varieties of wheat conducted at different FSRD and MLT sites during rabi season of 2000-01. It was found that the yield performance of different varieties varied with the locations. On an average, all the varieties performed best at Faridpur ( $3.17 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) followed by Kushtia ( $3.07 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). Tangail ( $2.24 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ), Jhalokati ( $2.18 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and Pirojpur ( $2.13 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) performed almost same within the locations. Among the new varieties Saurav yielded the best at Kushtia ( $3.50 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The varieties under trial were produced an average yield of more than 2 t /ha except in Pirojpur.

Table 15. Yield performance of newly released wheat varieties at different locations during rabi 2000-01

| Varieties | Yield (t/ha) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Jhalokati | Pirojpur | Kushtia | Tangail | Faridpur | Mean |
| Protiva | 2.33 a | 2.54 a | 2.79 a | 2.26 a | 3.13 b | 2.61 |
| Kanchan | 2.26 a | 2.21 b | 3.37 a | 2.33 a | 3.48 a | 2.73 |
| Gourab | 2.06 b | 1.96 ab | 2.60 a | 1.94 b | 3.13 b | 2.34 |
| Sourav | 2.06 b | 1.81 ab | 3.50 a | 2.42 a | 2.93 b | 2.54 |
| Mean | 2.18 | 2.13 | 3.07 | 2.24 | 3.17 |  |
| CV (\%) | 2.64 | 19.89 | 18.6 | 7.13 | 8.2 |  |

## Varietal trial of Brinjal

Six varieties of brinjal viz. Jamalpuri, Singnath, Khatkhatia, Uttara, Kazla, Nayantara were tested at FSRD site Syedpur and BARI-GKF program Kurigram to select the suitable variety for Rangpur region. The results showed that Nayantara gave the highest yield ( $22.54 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) compared to other tested varieties and $2^{\text {nd }}$ highest yield from Kazla (20.49 t/ha). In Kurigram, number of fruits per plant (53) and fruit yield ( $50.2 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was significantly highest in Uttara than the other varieties of brinjal. The lowest yield ( $3.09 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) was obtained from Noyantara (Table 16).

Table 16. Performance of the yield of brinjal varieties at different locations during rabi 2000-01

| Varieties | No. of fruits/plant |  | Fruit yield (t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Syedpur | Kurigram | Syedpur | Kurigram |
| Islampuri | 2 f | 7.0 c | 12.80 d | 33.1 d |
| Singnath | 3 de | 27.5 b | 13.03 d | 33.7d |
| Khatkhatia | 3 e | 10.5 d | 16.78 c | 40.7 b |
| Uttara | 6 b | 52.5 a | 17.58 c | 50.2 a |
| Kazla | 7 a | 23.3 c | 20.49 b | 36.3 c |
| Nayantara | 3 e | 10.0 d | 22.54 a | 30.9 e |
| CV (\%) | 12.3 | 6.7 | 8.5 | 3.9 |

## Superimposed trial of T.Aman rice

Seven T.aman rice varieties viz. BRRI Dhan-30, 31, 32, 34 and 39 were evaluated against BR-11 as check at FSRD sites. Tangail and Rangpur during kharif-II 2000. Result revealed that BRRI Dhan 32 yielded the best ( $4.28 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) which was identical to those of BRRI Dhan- $30 \& 31$ and BR-11 at Tangail. Among the varieties BR-11 gave highest yield ( $4.57 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) within at per with BRRI Dhan-30 and 31 (4.14 and $3.87 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) at Rangpur. BRRI Dhan-33 was found to be the shortest duration (199 and 76 days) variety at both locations (Table 17).

Table 17. Grain yield of T.aman rice varieties at different locations during 2000-01

| Variety | Tangail |  | Rangpur |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Duration (days) | Yield (t/ha) | Duration (days) | Yield (t/ha) |
| BRRI Dhan-30 | 143 | 3.96 a | 96 b | 4.14 ab |
| BRRI Dhan-31 | 140 | 3.82 a | - | - |
| BRRI Dhan-32 | 133 | 4.28 a | 89 c | 3.87 bc |
| BRRI Dhan-33 | 119 | 3.44 b | 76 c | 3.52 c |
| BRRI Dhan-34 | - | - | - | - |
| BRRI Dhan-39 | - | - | 81 d | 3.70 bc |
| BR-11 | 148 | 3.78 a | 103 a | 4.57 a |
| CV (\%) | - | 12.6 | 3.4 | 9.2 |

## Superimposed variety trial of Jute

A superimposed variety trial was conducted at the FSRD site Syedpur, Rangpur during the kharif-I season of 1998 to 2000 . The objective was to observe the performance of different jute varieties under research and farmers management. Five varieties viz. OM-1, 0-9897, Atompat-38, BINA Deshipat-2 and JRO-524 (local) were tested in research as well as under farmers management. Under research management fertilizers @ 132-25-42-28 kg N-P-K-S/ha was used while farmer management received no fertilizer. Results revealed that research managed OM-1 and 0-9897 gave significantly higher fibre yield ( 2.21 and $2.24 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) in three successive years. Fibre yield of BINA released jute
varieties were more than $2.0 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$. Under farmers management all varieties gave identical yield (ranged from 1.86 to $1.94 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) over JRO-524 (1.73 t/ha) (Table 18).

Table 18. Performance of Jute varieties under different management at FSRD site, Rangpur during kharif 1998 to 2000

| Management | Treatment |  | Fibre yield (t/ha) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
|  |  | 2000 | 1999 | 1998 | Mean |  |
| Research | OM-1 | 2.63 a | 1.94 ab | 2.06 | 2.21 ab |  |
| management | 0-9897 | 2.49 b | 2.10 a | 2.14 | 2.24a |  |
| (132-25-42-28 | Atompat-38 | 2.36 bc | 1.82 bc | - | 2.09 ab |  |
| kg N-P-K-S/ha) | BINA Deshi pat-2 | 2.28 c | 1.86 bc | - | 2.07 ab |  |
|  | JRO-524(local) | 2.37 bc | 1.70 c | 2.01 | 2.03 b |  |
|  | CV (\%) | 5.0 | 9.5 | 7.2 |  |  |
| Farmer |  |  |  | - | 1.94 |  |
| management | OM-1 | 2.48 a | 1.64 a | - | 1.94 |  |
| (no fertilizer) | Atompat-38 | 2.22 b | 1.66 a | - | 1.86 |  |
|  | BINA Deshi pat-2 | 2.17 bc | 1.54 a | - | 1.78 |  |
|  | JRO-524(local) | 2.10 c | 1.54 a | - | 1.73 |  |

## On-farm performance of promising Sweet potato varieties

On-farm performance of sweet potato varieties namely BARI Sweet potato-4, BARI Sweet potato-5, Daulatpuri (at Faridpur) and Tripti (at Jamalpur) were evaluated against one local variety at FSRD sites Faridpur and Jamalpur during rabi season of 2000-01. At Faridpur among the varieties farmers accepted BARI Sweet potato-5 because of its high yielding ( $35.68 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) character and rich in carotene where as the local variety produced the least yield ( $29.48 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). It's taste also good and market price is almost similar to the local variety but local variety is sweeter than BARI developed varieties. At Jamalpur, Tripti gave significantly highest yield ( $30.34 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) which was followed by BARI SP-5 (27.71 $\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and BARI SP-4 ( $23.52 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) where as local variety gave the lowest tuber yield ( $15.96 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). Farmers opined that local variety had better keeping quality than the released varieties when preserved under normal condition. These new varieties may harvest few days earlier than the local and can sale it in higher price. They also prefer the yellow colour of BARI SP-4 and SP-5 (Table 19).

Table 19. Yield obtained from different sweet potato varieties at different locations

| Variety | Yield (t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Faridpur | Jamalpur |
| BARI sweet potato-4 | 34.80 b | 23.52 c |
| BARI sweet potato-5 | 35.68 a | 27.71 b |
| Daulatpuri | 34.26 b | - |
| Tripti | - | 30.34 a |
| Local | 29.48 c | 15.96 d |
| CV (\%) | 2.6 | 4.35 |

## Varietal trial of Turmeric in shady places in fruit orchard

The yield of turmeric varieties evaluated against a local variety at the farmers field under shade of fruit orchard at FSRD site, Faridpur during 1999-2000 and 2000-01. The highest fresh and average dry yield was obtained from Turmeric line T-063 ( $28.82 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $5.80 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) which was followed by Dimla ( $27.32 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $5.46 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and local variety ( $13.88 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and $2.69 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) (Table 20).

Table 20. Yield performance of turmeric under shady place at FSRD site, Faridpur

| Variety/line | Fresh yield (t/ha) | Dry yield (t/ha) |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $1999-2000$ | $2000-01$ | Average |
| T-063 | 28.82 a | 5.83 | 5.76 | 5.80 |
| Dimla | 27.32 b | - | 5.46 | 5.46 |
| Local | 13.38 c | 2.70 | 2.68 | 2.69 |
| CV (\%) | 1.2 | - | - | - |

Yield performance of some newly released Boro rice varieties under farmers' condition

To evaluate the yield performance and acceptability of newly released Boro rice varieties an experiment was carriedout at FSRD site Palima, Tangail during 1998 to 2000. Results showed that the maturity period of different varieties varied from 137-169 days. Among the four tested varieties BRRI Dhan 29 gave superior yield ( 5.43 and $5.98 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) for both the years and it was 10 days earlier over check variety IR-8 (169 days). It was at per with BR-14 (5.38 and $5.40 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The lowest yield was obtained from IR-8 ( 4.38 and $4.40 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) for both the years (Table 21).

Table 21. Duration and yield performance of Boro rice varieties at FSRD site Palima, Tangail during 1998-2000

| Varieties | Duration (days) |  | Grain yield (t/ha) |  | Straw yield (t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $1998-99$ | $1999-2000$ | $1998-2000$ | $1999-2000$ | $1998-99$ | $1999-2000$ |
| BRRI Dhan 29 | 156 | 159 | 5.98 A | 5.53 a | 6.36 a | 6.05 a |
| BRRI Dhan 28 | 144 | 137 | 5.33 c | 4.70 bc | 5.65 b | 5.38 bc |
| BR-28 | 142 | 139 | 4.60 dc | 3.98 d | 5.22 b | 4.59 d |
| BR -14 | 155 | 158 | 5.40 bc | 5.38 a | 5.72 b | 6.04 a |
| IR-8(Check) | 166 | 169 | 4.40 e | 4.38 cd | 5.44 b | 5.05 cd |
| CV (\%) | - | - | - | 5.69 | 8.35 | 6.65 |

## Performance of different Tomato varieties at Tangail

An experiment was conducted at FSRD site Palima, Tangail during 2000-01 to select the suitable varieties of tomato. BARI released six varieties were tested under this trial. The results showed that BARI Tomato 3, 7 and 9 gave better yield (ranged from 75.75 to $86.72 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). A significant difference was found in fruits/plant from BARI Tomato 9 (26.70) followed by BARI Tomato 7 (25.82) and BARI Tomato 3 (19.01). The highest gross margin was found from BARI Tomato 3 which was followed by BARI Tomato 7 and BARI Tomato 9 respectively (Table 22).

Table 22. Performance of different Tomato varieties at FSRD site, Palima, Tangail

| Varieties | No. of fruits/plant | Tomato yield (t/ha) | Gross margin <br> $($ Tk/ha) | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BARI Tomato-3 | 19.01 b | 75.75 c | 428102 | 3.83 |
| BARI Tomato-4 | 12.34 c | 27.24 e | 59921 | 1.40 |
| BARI Tomato-5 | 14.40 c | 26.34 e | 53003 | 1.35 |
| BARI Tomato-6 | 11.22 c | 37.36 d | 96120 | 1.64 |
| BARI Tomato-7 | 25.82 a | 86.72 a | 351794 | 3.33 |
| BARI Tomato-9 | 26.70 a | 80.45 b | 315419 | 3.09 |
| CV (\%) | 10.42 | 4.55 | - | - |

Adaptive trial of summer Tomato in Patuakhali area

The trial was conducted at FSRD site Lebukhali, Patuakhali during kharif 2000 to evaluate the performance of summer tomato varieties in Patuakhali region. Out of two varieties, BARI Tomato-5 performed better than BARI Tomato-4 in respect of yield (20.62 t/ha), fruits/plant (17) and weight of fruit (32g) (Table 23).

Table 23. Fruit yield of summer tomato varieties during kharif 2000 at Lebukhali, Patuakhali

| Variety | Days of 50\% <br> flowering | Fruits/plant (no.) | Weight/fruit (g) | Yield (t/ha) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BARI Tomato 4 | 28 | 15 | 30 | 17.61 |
| BARI Tomato 5 | 29 | 17 | 32 | 20.62 |

## On-farm adaptability of two summer Tomato varieties

An on-farm study was carried out at FSRD site, Goyeshpur, Pabna during kharif-II season of 2000. Performance of two summer tomato variety viz. BARI Tomato-4 and BARI Tomato-5 were evaluated under farmers condition. Yield and other economic profile were presented in Table-24. The yield of BARI Tomato-4 was $58 \mathrm{~kg} /$ tunnel and that of BARI Tomato- 5 was $46 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{tunnel}$. On an average yield of the varieties was $23 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ and gross margin obtained was Tk. 142220/ha.

Table 24. Performance of BARI released summer tomato varieties at FSRD site, Goyeshpur, Pabna during Kharif-II of 2000

| No. of co- <br> operator | Av. yield (kg/tunnel) |  | Total yield <br> $(\mathrm{kg} / \mathrm{tunnel})$ | Yield <br> $(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Gross margin <br> $(\mathrm{Tk} / \mathrm{ha})$ |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-4 | BARI Tomato 5 |

## Bread wheat adaptive lines trial at farmers field

The performance of 4 advanced lines of bread wheat viz. BAW 444, BAW 966, BAW 969, ABW 989 were evaluated against two previously released wheat variety Kanchan and Gourab at different FSRD sites and MLT sites during rabi 2000-01. The yields of the tested lines differed significantly among themselves and among the locations. All the lines performed best at Jessore ( $4.68 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) followed by Palima ( $4.26 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ), Rangpur ( $4.24 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ), Rajshahi ( $3.83 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) and Jamalpur ( $3.80 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ). The advance line BAW 444 yielded the best at Jessore ( $5.39 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) which was identical with BAW 969 ( $5.02 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) at Pabna. The new BAW line BAW 969 produced maximum average yield of $4.16 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ over the locations. Tangail and Comilla showed similar yield potentialities ( 3.49 and $3.61 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) (Table 25).

Table 25. Yield obtained from different advance lines/varieties of bread wheat

| Varieties/ <br> lines | Yield on locations (t/ha) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Jessore | Jamalpur | Tangail | Pabna | Comilla | Rangpur | Rajshahi | Mean |  |
| Kanchan | 4.78 b | 3.80 bc | 3.67 ab | 4.65 a | 2.97 a | 4.44 a | 3.93 | 4.03 ab |  |
| Gourab | 4.67 b | 3.96 ab | 3.08 c | 4.58 a | 3.67 b | 4.23 b | 4.00 b | 4.03 ab |  |
| BAW-944 | 5.39 a | 3.58 de | 3.70 ab | 3.47 b | 3.67 b | 4.30 ab | 3.73 | 3.98 b |  |
| BAW-966 | 4.17 c | 4.2 a | 3.07 c | 3.97 b | 4.10 a | 4.34 ab | 3.97 ab | 3.97 b |  |
| BAW-969 | 4.72 b | 3.50 de | 3.67 ab | 5.02 a | 3.75 b | 4.28 b | 4.20 a | 4.16 b |  |
| BAW-989 | 4.33 bc | 3.74 cd | 3.77 a | 3.90 b | 3.52 bc | 4.24 b | 3.83 c | 3.87 b |  |
| Mean | 4.68 b | 3.80 c | 3.49 c | 4.26 b | 3.61 c | 4.24 b | 3.83 c | 4.01 |  |
| F-test | $* *$ | $*$ | ns | - | $*$ | ns | - | - |  |
| CV (\%) | - | 1.93 | 1.41 | 6.8 | 4.2 | 8.2 | 7.1 | - |  |

On-farm trial of off-season Pineapple production using growth regulator (Ethrel)

The experiment was carried out during September 1996-97 at Modhupur MLT site, Tangail to achieve extra income from off-season pineapple (using growth regulaor) though high market price. It was found that September forcing (Ethrel solution 39\%) produced earliest inflorescence and first flowering ( 359 days). The highest flowering percentage ( $84 \%$ ) was obtained from control plot followed by November forcing ( $78 \%$ ). In ripening control plot takes longest time ( 622 days) than other treated plots (ranged from 533-667 days). Highest fruit yield was obtained from control plot ( $31.28 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ ) but the price/fruit, gross margin and BCR were found highest in September forcing and the lowest form November forcing (Table 26 and 27).

Table 26. Effect of growth regulation (Ethrel) of off-season pineapple at MLT site of Modhupur, Tangail

| Treatment | Plant age <br> (days) | $1^{\text {st }}$ flowering <br> (days) | Flowering <br> (\%) | Ripening <br> (days) | Fruit weight with <br> crown $(\mathrm{kg})$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| September forcing | 313 | 359 d | 45 c | 535 c | 1.63 |
| October forcing | 343 | 382 c | 38 bc | 610 bc | 1.51 |
| November forcing | 373 | 477 b | 78 ab | 607 c | 1.62 |
| Without hormone | 313 | 510 a | 84 a | 622 a | 1.53 |
| CV (\%) | - | 0.42 | 19.65 | 0.94 | 6.88 |

Table 27. Cost and return of off-season pineapple at MLT site Modhupur, Tangail

| Treatment | Fruits/ha (no.) | Fruit yield <br> $(\mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha})$ | Variable cost <br> $($ Tk.) | Gross margin <br> (Tk/ha) | BCR |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| September forcing | 14312 c | 19.62 c | 132494 | 227141 | 2.71 |
| October forcing | 16473 b | 20.59 bc | 74002 | 118103 | 2.60 |
| November forcing | 20219 ab | 27.89 ab | 86978 | 101280 | 2.16 |
| Without forcing | 24350 a | 31.28 a | 80918 | 121464 | 2.50 |
| CV (\%) | 14.98 | 18.14 | - | - | - |

## Technology Transfer

## Pilot production

| Title | Location | Area (ha) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Production program of wheat at farmers levels | Jamalpur | 0.8 | 10 | 3.14 t/ha |
| 2. Production program Mustard at farmers level | Jamalpur | 0.6 | 12 | 0.813 t/ha |
| 3. Production program Okra (BARI Derosh-1) | Mymensingh | 0.21 | 10 | 14.95 t/ha |
|  | Jamalpur | 0.204 | 12 | 11.30 t/ha |
| 4. Production program of Bottle gourd (BARI Lau-1) | Sylhet | 15 | 50 | 232 no./family |
| 5. Pilot production program of BARI JPS-1 \& 2 | Rangpur | 0.328 | 164 | 16.49 t/ha |
| 6. Improvement of quality fruit production through top working of Jujube | Jamalpur | 20 | 12 | $15 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant |
| 7. Plantation of improve varieties of fruits trees in homestead area | Jamalpur |  |  |  |
| BARI Guava |  |  | 30 | 60 sapling |
| Kagi Lemon |  |  | 30 | 30 sapling |
| Langra |  |  | 30 | 40 sapling |
| Fazli |  |  | 30 | 40 sapling |
| Khirshapati |  |  | 30 | 40 sapling |
| Gopalbhog |  |  | 10 | 40 sapling |
| Tissue culture |  |  | 10 | 10 sapling |
| Banana |  |  | 10 | 20 sapling |
| Betel vine |  |  | 10 | 30 sapling |
| 8. Production program of Mustard-BoroT.Aman cropping pattern using balanced fertilizer recommendation | Jamalpur | 0.04 | 10 | Mustard: $0.89 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |
|  |  | 0.04 | 10 | Boro: 5.6 t/ha |
|  |  | 0.04 | 10 | T.Aman: 4.09 t/ha |
| 9. Production program of Wheat-Jute- <br> T.Aman cropping pattern using balanced fertilizer recommendation | Jamalpur | 0.10 | 10 | Wheat: $3.2 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |
|  |  | 0.10 | 10 | Jute: $2.0 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |
|  |  | 0.10 | 10 | T.Aman: $4.37 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |
| 10. Production program of Boro/GM (Sesbania)-T.Aman cropping pattern using balanced fertilizer recommendation | Jamalpur | 0.04 | 15 | Boro: $5.32 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |
|  |  | 0.04 | 15 | GM: 16.0 t/ha |
|  |  | 0.04 | 15 | T.Aman: $4.25 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |

## Technology Transfer

a. Crops

| Technology | Location | Area (ha)/ <br> Pit (no.) | Farmers <br> involved <br> (no.) | Yield <br> (t/ha) |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| BARI Lou-1 | Faridpur | 0.37 | 100 | 30.70 | Not much interested to grow for <br> small sizeless testy |
|  | Sylhet | 2 (pits) |  | 52 | 28.8 |
| Mare interested for yield bigger |  |  |  |  |  |
| BARI Chola-5 | Faridpur |  |  |  | size |


| Technology | Location | Area (ha)/ <br> Pit (no.) | Farmers <br> involved <br> (no.) | Yield <br> (t/ha) | Impact |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Late jute seed | Tangail | 96 (deci) |  |  |  |  |  |  | 6 | 0.37 | - |
| Wheat (Min. tillage) | Noakhali | 4.0 | 20 | 3.12 | New crop in site |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## b. Cropping patterns

| Cropping pattern | Location | Area (ha/ plant) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wheat-Jute-T.Aman | Faridpur | 20 | 50 | Kanchan: 3.20 |
|  |  |  |  | Jute (0-9897): 2.30 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Dhan-32: 4.60 |
|  | Tangail | 2.11 | 19 | Sourav: 1.89 |
|  |  | 1.68 |  | O-9897: 2.36 |
|  |  | 1.65 |  | BRRI Dhan-32: 3.45 |
| Mustard-Boro-T.Aman | Tangail | 1.80 | 19 | BARI Sarisha-8: 1.62 |
|  |  |  |  | Tori-7: 0.73 |
| Wheat-Dhaincha- T.Aman | Rajshahi | 17 | 10 | Kanchan: 1.7 |
|  |  | 12 | 7 | Local: 13.7 |
|  |  | 10 | 5 | Sharna: 3.20 |
| Chickpea- Dhaincha-T.Aman | Rajshahi | $15$ | - | BARI chola-5: 1.25 |
|  |  |  |  | Local: 13.0 |
|  |  |  |  | Sharna: 3.05 |
| Wheat-Mungbean- T.Aman | Pabna | 16.4 | 5 | Kanchan: 3.06 |
|  |  |  |  | Kanti: 4.5 |
|  |  |  |  | BR11: 4.33 |
| Maize-GM-T.Aman | Pabna | 16.26 | 85 | Pacific-11: 9.16 |
|  |  | $5$ | $85$ | Hybrid maize: 9.5 |
| Potato-T.Aus-T.Aman (no tillage) | Patuakhali | 2.0 | 42 | Heera: 18.00 |
|  |  |  |  | BRRI Dhan-27: 3.75 |
|  |  |  |  | BRRI Dhan-32: 4.50 |
| Mungbean-T.Aus- T.Aman | Patuakhali | 3.0 | 30 | Kanti: 0.95 |
|  |  |  |  | BRRI Dhan-27: 3.50 |
|  |  |  |  | BRRI Dhan-32: 4.60 |
| Inter cropping paired row Sugarcane with Potato-Onion-Chilli | Patuakhali | 0.75 | 12 | Sugarcane: 12500 cane |
|  |  |  |  | Potato: 10.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Onion: 5.00 |
|  |  |  |  | Chilli: 0.13 |
| Sorjan method of cropping on Tidally flooded area | Patuakhali | 0.031 | - | Banana: $650 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Red amaranth: 0.60 |
|  |  |  |  | Tomato: 0.15 |
|  |  |  |  | Cabbage: 0.50 |
|  |  |  |  | Cauliflower: 0.50 |
|  |  |  |  | Chilli: 0.25 |
|  |  |  |  | Amaranth: 0.75 |
|  |  |  |  | Okra: 0.30 |
|  |  |  |  | Bitter gourd: 0.15 |
|  |  |  |  | Ribbed gourd: 0.30 |
|  |  |  |  | Marginal: 0.50 |
| Controlling of Mango hopper | Faridpur | 1500 | 350 | 101 |
| Production of fruit trees | Faridpur | 40 | 24 | Mango: 130 |
|  |  | 44 | 24 | Coconut: 125 |
|  |  | 41 | 24 | Jackfruit: 100 |


| Cropping pattern | Location | Area (ha/ plant) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Improving Jujube by top working | Patuakhali | 25 | 10 | $5 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{plant}$ |
|  | Faridpur | 40 | 40 | 30.00 |
| Improving production of fruit trees by fertilizer management | Sylhet | 95 | 25 | Better performance |
| Plantation of guava, BARI Litchi, Seedless leman, BARI kormel, and coconut | Sylhet | 860 | 80 | Better performance |
| Composting with kitchen and farmer waste | Sylhet | 10 | 8 | $750 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{heap}$ |
| Mango hopper control | Faridpur | 1500 | 35 | $101 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant |
|  | Tangail | 5 | 40 | $125 \mathrm{~kg} /$ tree |
|  | Patuakhali | 500 | 160 | $50-60 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{plant}$ |

## c. Seed production program

| Technology | Location | Area (ha) | Farmers involved <br> (no.) | Yield/ Impact |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| BARI Dhaincha | Rajshahi | 54 | - | 1.01 |
| BARI Sarisha-7, 8 | Rajshahi | 13.0 | 28 | 1.32 |
| Chickpea (BARI Chola-2, 3, 4, 5, 6) | Rajshahi | 18.0 | 62 | 1.23 |
| Wheat (Kanchan, Inkilab) | Rajshahi | 3.5 | 11 | 2.8 |
| Sunflower (Kironi) | Rajshahi | 0.5 | 3 | 1.2 |
| Safflower (Saff-1) | Rajshahi | 1.0 | 4 | 0.92 |
| Linseed (Nila) | Rajshahi | 0.96 | 1 | 0.60 |
| Cauliflower | Bogra | 0.004 | - | 0.496 |
| BARI Motoshuti-1, 2 | Bogra | 0.004 | - | 0.150 |
| BARI Onion-1 | Bogra | 0.004 | - | 0.680 |
| BARI Jhar sheem-1) | Bogra | 0.004 | - | 1.74 |
| Late Jute (O-9897) | Tangail | 0.38 | 6 | 0.373 |
| Year round Homestead vegetables | Patuakhali | 0.0008 | 30 | 31.60 |
| production |  |  |  |  |

## d. Seed Exchange program

| Technology | Location | Area (ha) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Mustard | Rajshahi | 21 | 130 | 1.23 |
| Chickpea | Rajshahi | 50 | 220 | 1.34 |
| Wheat | Rajshahi | 1 | 5 | 2.90 |
| Sunflower | Rajshahi | 0.66 | 3 | 0.98 |
| Through DAE |  |  |  |  |
| Mustard | Rajshahi | 30 | 180 | 1.02 |
| Chickpea | Rajshahi | 42 | 220 | 1.34 |
| Fodder production | Faridpur | 0.4 | 6 | $150 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$ |

## e. Homestead vegetable production

| Technology | Location | Area (ha) | Farmers <br> involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Tomato | Tangail | 2 plots | - | $23 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm |
| Okra | Tangail | 2 plots | - | $30 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{farm}$ |
| Indian spinach | Tangail | 2 plots | - | $32 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{farm}$ |
| Brinjal | Tangail | 2 plots | - | $24 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{farm}$ |
| Chilli | Tangail | 2 plots | - | $2.4 \mathrm{~kg} /$ farm |


| Vegetables |  | Patuakhali | 0.008 | 30 | $4.32 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{farm}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Potato yam |  | Tangail | 6 pits | - | $4 \mathrm{~kg} /$ plant |
| BINA Dhan-6 |  | Sylhet | 1.0 | 4 | 6.00 |
| BRRI Dhan-32 |  | " | 5.0 | 11 | 5.10 |
| BRRI Dhan-26 |  | " | 6.0 | 8 | 5.80 |
| BRRI Dhan-31 |  | Noakhali | 1.0 | 6 | 4.58 |
| BRRI Dhan-32 |  | " | 10.5 | 35 | 4.58 |
| BINA-6 |  | Faridpur | 12 | 47 | 7.50 |
| BRRI Dhan-29 |  | " | 12 | 47 | 6.90 |
| BRRI Dhan-33 |  | Tangail | 1.15 | 12 | 4.17 |
| Local T.Aman |  | Patuakhali | 2 | 35 | 2.38 |
| CP-1 | Okra | Rajshahi | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 9.00 |
|  | Data | " | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 10.00 |
|  | Tomato | " | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 16.00 |
| CP-2 | Spinach | Rajshahi | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 11.95 |
|  | Lalshak | " | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 10.00 |
|  | Brinjal | " | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 38.00 |
| CP-3 | Kangkong | Rajshahi | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 9.5 |
|  | Lalshak | Rajshahi | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 14.76 |
|  | Brinjal | Rajshahi | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 19.00 |
| CP-3 | Lalshak | Rajshahi | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 14.66 |
|  | Okra | Rajshahi | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 15.23 |
|  | Spinach | Rajshahi | 10.5 sqm | 10 | 19.00 |

## f. Crop Museum

| Technology | Location | Area (ha) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Wheat (Provati) | " | 0.13 | 4 | Kanchan: 2.15 |
|  |  |  |  | Akbar: 32 |
|  |  |  |  | Inkilab: 3.20 |
| Maize (SP-1) | Barind | 0.18 | 4 | 10.10 |
| Chickpea (Anigeri) | Barind | 0.16 | 4 | 0.86 |
|  |  |  |  | ICC-958:0.74 |
|  |  |  |  | Local: 1.18 |
| Kaon | Barind | 0.06 | 4 | 1.80 |
| China | Barind | 0.06 | 4 | 2.08 |
| Linseed | Barind | 0.06 | 4 | 1.16 |
| Safflower | Barind | 0.26 | 4 | 0.91 |
| Sunflower | Barind | 0.22 | 4 | 1.02 |
| Gujitil | Barind | 0.06 | 4 | 0.65 |
| Potato | Barind | 0.20 | 4 | Cardinal:35.0 |
|  |  |  |  | BADC: 28.0 |
| Chickpea | Bogra | 0.4 | - | BARI Chola-1: 0.80 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Chola-2: 1.20 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Chola-3: 1.10 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Chola-4: 1.20 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Chola-5: 1.25 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Chola-6: 0.97 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Chola-7: 1.34 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Chola-8: 1.10 |
| Moshur | Bogra | 0.4 | - | BARI Mushur-1: 1.03 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Mushur-2: 1.11 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Mushur-3: 1.00 |


| Technology | Location | Area (ha) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tomato | Bogra | 0.4 | - | BARI Mushur-4: 1.01 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Faln-1: 0.92 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-1: 80.0 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-2: 85.0 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-3: 83.75 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-5: 70.25 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-6: 70.50 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-7: 63.75 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-8: 77.50 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Tomato-9: 74.25 |
| Bush bean | Bogra | 0.4 | - | BARI Jharseem-1: 20.21 |
| Mustard | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Tori-7: 1.31 |
|  |  |  |  | Katlynia: 1.28 |
|  |  |  |  | Sonali Sarisha: 1.30 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Sarisha-6: 1.33 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Sarisha-7: 0.86 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Sarisha-8: 1.26 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Sarisha-9: 1.33 |
| Linseed | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Nila: 1.16 |
| Niger | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Shova: 1.21 |
| Safflower | Bogra | 0.4 | - | BARI Saf-1: 1.04 |
| Sunflower | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Kironi: 1.12 |
| Soybean | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Shohag: 1.24 |
|  |  |  |  | Soybean-4: 1.16 |
| Coriander | Bogra | 0.4 | - | BARI Coriander-1: 0.98 |
| Wheat | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Agrani : 3.61 |
|  |  |  |  | Akbar: 4.44 |
|  |  |  |  | Kanchan: 4.86 |
|  |  |  |  | Sourav: 4.72 |
|  |  |  |  | Gourav: 3.75 |
|  |  |  |  | Provati: 4.86 |
|  |  |  |  | Balaka: 4.02 |
|  |  |  |  | Kallyansona: 4.16 |
|  |  |  |  | Inia: 4.02 |
|  |  |  |  | Sonalika: 3.47 |
|  |  |  |  | Triticaly: 3.75 |
|  |  |  |  | Khari: 3.61 |
|  |  |  |  | Duram : 3.70 |
|  |  |  |  | Ananda: 4.30 |
| China | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Tushar: 1.22 |
| Kaon | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Titash: 1.10 |
| Barley | Bogra | 0.4 | - | BARI Barley-1: 1.80 |
| Sweet potato | Bogra | 0.4 | - | Tripti : 35.92 |
|  |  |  |  | Kamalasunduri: 32.02 |
|  |  |  |  | Dualatpuri: 18.28 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Sweet potato 4: 28.88 |
|  |  |  |  | BARI Sweet potato-5: 25.88 |

## g. Plantation crop

| Title | Location | Area <br> (ha/ <br> plant) | Farmers involved <br> (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Guava-1, 2 | Faridpur | 30 | 12 | Growth stage |
|  | Rajshahi | 200 | 80 | Plantation in 1987-000 |
|  | Rajshahi | 90 | 40 | do |
|  | Faridpur | 24 | 12 | Growth stage |
| Amrapali | Rajshahi | 145 | 75 | Planted in 1987-2000 |
|  | Faridpur | 12 | 12 | Growth stage |
| Mohananda | Faridpur | 24 | 12 | do |
| Mollika | Faridpur | 24 | 12 | do |
| Safeda-1 | Faridpur | 6 | 6 | do |
| Coconut-1, 2 | Faridpur | 24 | 12 | do |
|  | Rajshahi | 5 | 5 | Planted in 1987-2000 |
| BARI litchi-1,2,3 | Faridpur | 6 | 6 | Growth stage |
|  | Rajshahi | 15 | 7 | Planted in 1988-2000 |
| Drumstick (Laizna baramashi) | Rajshahi | 2000 | 110 | Planted in 1988-2000 |
| Sissoo | Rajshahi | 500 | 24 | do |
| Lemon | Rajshahi | 90 | 40 | do |
| Rose apple | Rajshahi | 20 | 20 | do |
| Coconut | Rajshahi | 5 | 5 | do |
| Neem | Rajshahi | 80 | 45 | do |
| Ipil-ipil | Rajshahi | 6000 | 110 | do |
| Controlling mango hopper | Pabna | 3000 | - | 125 kg/plant |
| BARI Guava 2 \& Polly peayra | Patuakhali | 75 | 22 | $8-10 /$ plant |

h. Livestock

| Technology | Location | Area <br> (ha/ <br> no.) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Beef fattening with UMS | Faridpur | 50 | 20 | Treated cattle gained body weight $450 \mathrm{~g} /$ day against untreated cattle $95 \mathrm{~g} /$ day |
|  | Tangail | 10 | 20 | Treated cattle gained body wt. $440 \mathrm{~g} /$ day against untreated cattle $178 \mathrm{~g} /$ day |
|  | Rajshahi | 24 | 12 | Treated cattle gained body wt. $680 \mathrm{~g} /$ day against untreated cattle $232 \mathrm{~g} /$ day |
|  | Jamalpur | 24 | 9 | Treated cattle gained body wt. $230 \mathrm{~g} /$ day against untreated cattle $99 \mathrm{~g} /$ day. Milk production 2.70 $\mathrm{g} /$ day against control $2.40 \mathrm{~g} /$ day . |
|  | Sylhet | 10 | 27 | Treated $275 \mathrm{~g} /$ day. Non Treated $95 \mathrm{~g} /$ day |
|  | Pabna | 30 | 24 | Treated $380 \mathrm{~g} /$ day . Untreated $90 \mathrm{~g} /$ day . |
| Deworming on live wt. gain and milk production | Jamalpur | 46 | 9 | Deworming cattle gained $196 \mathrm{~g} /$ day against control $94 \mathrm{~g} /$ day. Milk production $2.25 \mathrm{~g} /$ day against control $1.13 \mathrm{~g} /$ day. |
| Milk cow management | Faridpur | 30 | 10 | Treated cattle gave yield 3.50 liter/day against control 1.50 liter/day |
| Deworming of cattle | Faridpur | 80 | 60 | Treated cattle gained body wt. $130 \mathrm{~g} /$ day against untreated cattle $70 \mathrm{~g} /$ day. |
|  | Sylhet | 73 | 536 | Treated cattle gained body wt. $120.5 \mathrm{~g} /$ day against untreated cattle $92 \mathrm{~g} /$ day. |
| Rearing of Broiler | Rajshahi | 1000 | 5 | Body wt. against $51.85 \mathrm{~g} /$ day . Mortality $2 \%$. |
|  | Jamalpur | 90 | 9 | Egg production 55.84\%. |


| Technology | Location | Area <br> (ha) <br> no.) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pabna | 300 | 1 | Average wt. $758 \mathrm{~g} / 5$ th week. |
|  | Patuakhali | 830 | 10 |  |
| Vaccination program poultry production | Sylhet | 660 | 72 | Mortality \% was decreased |
| Rearing of Fayomi chicken under semiscavenging systems | Sylhet | 400 | 12 | Good impact for the regularities of laying |
| Broiler rearing at farmers level | Sylhet | 9200 | 7 | Av. body wt. at 6 weeks 1.7 kg . Good impact for higher growth rate and market demand |
| Vaccination of poultry birds | Patuakhali | 200 | 250 | Farmers were not interested for vaccination for high cost |
| Performance of different Broiler strain under farmers management conditions | Tangail | 100 | 4 | The final live wt. of starbro, Hybroarbora cores and van cob. Strain were 1700,150 g, 1628 and 1622 g per bird |
| Vaccination of cattle and Buffalo | Rajshahi | 156 | 48 | The villagers should keen interested with vaccinations program |
| Deworming of cattle | Rajshahi | 156 | 48 | Av. body wt. gain $141.66 \mathrm{~g} /$ day cattle |
| Rearing of BlackBengal goats with supplementary feeds | Rajshahi | 24 | 8 | Av. body wt. gain $29 \mathrm{~g} /$ day and milk production 240 $\mathrm{ml} /$ day |
| Vaccination to poultry | Rajshahi | 2750 | 48 | Farmers were trained and motivated to vaccination of poultry. |
| Rearing of common Broiler | Rajshahi | 1000 | 5 | BCR 1.51. Av. body wt. gain 51.85 g after seven week |
| Rearing of layer duck | Faridpur | 75 | 15 | Egg production/year 325/duck |
| Utilization of Algae as cattle feed | Faridpur | 20 | 8 | 190 g final body weight |
| Vaccination to poultry | Tangail | 2230 | 389 | Decreases the mortality of poultry |
|  | Faridpur | 4000 | 350 | Farmers satisfied with vaccination program |
| Rearing of layer hen | Faridpur | 110 | 18 | Av. egg wt. 58g |
| Deworming of cattle | Faridpur | 120 | 90 | Av. body wt. gained $130 \mathrm{~g} /$ day |
| Vaccination program on cattle health | Tangail | 241 | 105 | Keen interested with vaccination |
|  | Faridpur | 25 | 70 | The villagers showed interested to vaccination |
| Production program of Broiler chicken | Faridpur | 7000 | 20 | 2.0 kg/bird after 7 weeks |
| Comparative performance of different breeds of laying duck | Tangail | 40 | 4 | Egg production 85\%. Lower mortality (31\%) |

j. Fisheries

| Technology | Location | Area (ha/no.) | Farmers involved (no.) | Yield/Impact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rajpunti culture in seasonal pond | Faridpur | 0.104 | 6 | Farmers should be motivated after 5 months Rajpunti gain wt. of 104.0 gm . |
|  | Sylhet | 0.008 | 2 | $1.59 \mathrm{t} / \mathrm{ha}$. Interested to cultivate for low cost |
|  | Rajshahi | 10 | 5 | The yield per hectare was 1728 gkg. BCR: 3.82 |
| Study on semi-intensive carp poly culture in perennial pond | Sylhet | 1.6 | 12 | Body wt. of fish have increased |
| Monoculture of pangas | Sylhet | 0.35 | 4 | Farmers showed mixed reaction on monoculture of Thai pangas. cost of feed is very high. |
| Raising productivity of pond through Duck cum-fish culture | Sylhet | 1 | 1000 | BCR: 4.72. Good impact about technology 25 Duck reared. |
| Poly culture technique of carp fish in perennial ponds under low cost management of High Barind Tract | Rajshahi | 5 | 5 | The yield was 2.6 t/ha. BCR: 3.22 |
| Agro-Fishery Minipond | Patuakhali | 0.036 | 1 | Yield obtained 1800 kg vegetable, 684 kg Banana, 17 kg fish amounting to a gross margin of Tk. 7181 against Tk. 647. |
| Fish culture in T.Aman rice Field | Rajshahi | 0.048 | - | The fish yield was $210 \mathrm{~kg} / \mathrm{ha}$ in 3 moths. |


[^0]:    $N=$ Number of egg, $N=$ Number of fruit,

[^1]:    $\mathrm{RF}_{1}=$ Recommended fertilizer dose for high yield goal
    $\mathrm{RF}_{2}=$ Recommended fertilizer dose for moderate yield goal
    FP = Farmer's practice.

