weeding (20 and 40 DAS) + recommended dose of N. P. K and Zn. followed by T5 treatment (5.17 t/ha), wherein line sowing of sprouted seed and improved practices (herbicide application followed by one hand weeding, N, P, K + Zn at recommended dose) were adopted. Similar results were reported by Rachel Sophia Alexander and James Martin (1995) at Coimbatore in clay loam soil condition. Averaged over management practices, varieties ADT 36 (6.09 t/ha) and ASD 16 (5.84 t/ha) recorded higher grain yields indicating the positive response of these varieties to improved management practices (T5) such as wet seeding and herbicide application.

From the two years of study, it could be concluded that direct seeding under puddled condition is as good as transplanting. Varieties ADT 36, ASD 16 and IET 9978 responded positively for direct seeding and improved management practices viz., direct seeding of sprouted seeds by broadcasting, butachlor application at 1.25 kg/ha 6 days after rice

emergence followed by one hand weeding maximum tillering stage and application recommended dose of N, P and K (125:50:5 kg/ha) and ZnSO4 (25 kg/ha); 1/3 N, full P and Z and 75% K as basal; 1/3 N at tillering and 1/3 with 25% K at P.I.stage.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful to the ICAR (All Indi Co-ordinated Rice Improvement Programme) for the financial assistance and for providing the see materials for conducting the experiments.

REFERENCES

DE DATTA, S.K. and NANTASOMSARAN, P. (1990). State and prospects of direct seeded flooded rice in tropic Asia. Paper presented in the International Ric Research Conference, 27-31, Aug. 1990, Scoul, Korea.

RACHEL SOPHIA ALEXANDER and JAMES MARTIN, (
(1995). Effect of rice establishment methods of succeeding pulses. Madras Agric. J. 82: 399-401.

WAHAB, K. and JAYAPRAKASH, T. (1995). Economics direct seeded rice as influenced by water and fertiliz application. Madras Agric. J. 82: 409-410.

(Received : July 1996 Revised : February 199

Madras Agric. J., 84(4): 219-222 April 1997 https://doi.org/10.29321/MAJ.10.A00875

POPULATION DENSITY OF EARTHWORMS UNDER DIFFERENT CROP ECOSYSTEMS

P.T.RAMESH, R.SAGAYA ALFRED and K. GUNATHILAGARAJ

Department of Environmental Sciences Agricultural College and Research Institute Tamil Nadu Agricultural University Coimbatore 641 003

ABSTRACT

The population density of earthworms under four different crop ecosystems viz. rice, cotton, sugarcane and pulse was assessed in six districts of Tamil Nadu. Among the four crop ecosystems studied, rice supported maximum earthworm population followed by sugarcane, cotton and pulses in that order. Among the different soils in the study area, organic matter rich soils supported more earthworm.

KEY WORDS: Earthworms, population density, crop ecosystems, soil types.

F. thworms are nocturnal invertebrates of agro ecceysters. This wonderful creature beneath our feet silently does the job of decomposition and humification by injesting soil and organic matter remains and make them undergo complex biochemical changes in it's intestine, excretes and mixes it well with the soil (N-vak and Rath, 1996). Thus, they enable the formation of nutrient rich humus that improves soil physical and chemical

characters, which inturn will improve crop growth. It is clear that a good population of earthworms helps in improving soil properties and boost crop yield. But modern agricultural practices drastically affect the population of earthworms. So, the present study was undertaken to estimate the population density of earthworms in six districts of Tamil Nadu with varying soil types.

WATERIALS AND METHODS

The quantitative study of earthworm opulations requires their extraction numeration in some portion of soil using any of he standard sampling methods. In this study, earthworm population was estimated by the handsorting method (Bretscher, 1896) in the rice, sugarcane, cotton and pulse cropped soils of the six districts selected (Table 1). Soil samples from an area of 1m2 were dug out from ten places from each crop ecosystem and earthworms were sorted out from them by hand. Sampling was done by digging with a spade first cutting around the edge of the sample. The samples were sorted against a pale coloured background to increase the probability of detecting earthworms for which white trays were used. After handsorting, the population of very small species and immature worms which were most commonly missed out in hand sorting was estimated by the soil washing method (Raw, 1960). The handsorted samples were washed away of soil in a 2 mm sieve within another 0.5 mm mesh sieve standing in a bowl of water. The sieves were then immersed in magnesium sulphate solution and the worms that floated to the surface were collected. Species wise population of worms was not attempted for want of expertise in the identification of earthworms.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Significant differences were observed in the population density of earthworms between different crop ecosystems. Of the four crop ecosystems sampled, rice ecosystem harboured more

Table 1. List of Places of sample collection

| District | Place | Soil type | Crop | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------|------------|-----------|--|--|
| *Kanyakumari | Killiyoor | Clay loam | Rice | | |
| 1 | Marthandam | Clay loam | Pulse | | |
| | | * | | | |
| Tirunelveli | Panakudi | Sandy loam | Rice | | |
| Kattabomman | Vasudevanallur | Clay loam | Cotton | | |
| | Vasudevanallur | Clay | Sugarcane | | |
| | Vasudevanallur | Sandy Clay | Pulse | | |
| V.O.Chidambaranar | Killikulam | Red soil | Rice | | |
| | Killikulam | Red soil | Cotton | | |
| | Killikulam | Red soil | Sugarcane | | |
| | Killikulam | Red soil | Pulse | | |
| Madurai | Othakadai | Sandy clay | Rice | | |
| | Othakadai | clay - | Cotton | | |
| | Usilampätti | clay | Sugarcane | | |
| | Vilankudi . | Sandy clay | Pulse | | |
| Kamarajar | Muthuramalingapuram | Black soil | Rice | | |
| , captain again | Muthuramalingapuram | Black soil | cotton | | |
| | Narikudi | Black soil | Sugarcane | | |
| | Narikudi | Black soil | Pulse | | |
| Ramanathapuram | Mandalamanickam | Black soil | Rice | | |
| Commission approximate | Kamudhi | Black soil | Cotton | | |
| | Mandalamanickam | Black soil | Sugarcane | | |
| | Valaiyapoongulam | Clay | Pulses | | |
| Coimbatore | Paddy Breeding Station | Clay soil | Rice | | |
| | Eastern block | Clay soil | Cotton | | |
| | Eastern Block, | Clay soil | Sugarcane | | |
| | TNAU University farm, TNAU | Red soil | Pulses | | |

^{*} No cultivation of sugarcane and cotton

Ramesh et al.,

Table 2. Population density of earthworms in individual crop ecosystems

| - Crop ecosystem | Mean population (m ⁻²) |
|------------------|------------------------------------|
| Rice | 62.23 |
| Cotton | 21.33 |
| Sugarcane | 45.17 |
| Pulses | 16.92 |
| SE - | 1.59 |
| CD (0.05) | 3.33 |
| CD (0.01) | 4.54 |

population of earthworms with an average population density of 62.23 m⁻² than sugarcane (45.17 m⁻²), cotton (21.3 m⁻²) and pulse crop ecosystems (16.92 m⁻²) (Table 2). The highest population density was observed in the rice fields of Tirunelveli Kattabomman district with an average of 111 m⁻² and lowest population of earthworms (2.7 m⁻²) was observed in cotton fields in the eastern block of the Tamil Nadu Agricultural University campus, Coimbatore (Table 3).

The differences in earthworm population among different crop ecosystem may be due to the fact that the number of species supported by agricultural soils depend mainly upon the kind and extent of the plant cover and it's permanence (Edwards and Lofty, 1978). Population density of earthworms recorded in the present study is far below than that recorded by Lavelle (1987) in tropical Nigeria (1000-3000 individuals m⁻²). It may be due to paucity of abundant organic matter or leaf litter, continuous moisture and less or no disturbance of soil, but the population estimated in this investigation comes nearer to the estimate of Khalaf-El- Duweini and Ghabbour (1965) in Egypt ; Lal (1974) in maize fields of Nigeria (100 m⁻²); Dash and Patra (1977) in grassland sites of Orissa and by Kaushal and Bisht (1994) in Himalayan pasture soil (138.8 m⁻²).

With respect to individual ecosystems, the higher population density encountered in rice fields might be due to the continuous availability of moisture and shade from the rice canopy. Shade might also have influenced the population of earthworms in sugarcane fields (Westernacher and Graff, 1987). Besides soil moisture, mulch cover might have also favoured the earthworm population in the sugarcane ecosystem. Low population of earthworms in cotton fields can be attributed to intense application of pesticides, frequent tillage of

Table 3. Population density of earthworms in different crop ecosystems in different districts

| District of CDV | Crop ecosystem (C) | | | | | | |
|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|---------|--|--|--|
| District (D) | Rice | Cotton | Sugarcane | Pulse | | | |
| Tirunelveli | | * | 111 8-3 | - 176 | | | |
| Kattabomman | 111.00 | 17.32 | 49.70 | 14.20 | | | |
| V.O.Chidamba- | | | . A | | | | |
| ranar | 54.80 | 24.20 | 35.30 | 27.30 | | | |
| Kamarajar | 37.80 | 28.50 | 31.80 | 14.90 | | | |
| Madurai | 57.40 | 24.60 | 52.20 | - 17.41 | | | |
| Ramanathapuram | 37.30 | 30.70 | 34.42 | 15.76 | | | |
| Coimbatore | 75.10 | 2.70 | 67.70 | 12.00 | | | |
| . • | SE | CD (0.05) | | CD (0.0 | | | |
| D at C | 4.31 | 8.99 | | 12.26 | | | |
| C at D | 3.91 | 8.15 | | 11.12 | | | |

soil, absence of ground cover and lack of adequamoisture in the soil surface. Frequent tillage of scoften leads to a reduction in earthworm activities because it increases the soil temperature adecreases the soil moisture reserves (Lal et al. 1978; Edwards and Lofty, 1982) apart from causing physical injury. As for the low earthword density in the pulse cropped soil, it might be due the fallow effect (Simpson et al., 1993).

Though modern agricultural practices can held responsible for the low earthworm population agricultural fields and those methods; cultivation that retain organic matter in the so without intense pesticide application are known; encourage earthworm activity (Zisci, 1969). Studie on the earthworm population in other croecosystems is also to be carried out to evolve strategy to increase their population in Tamil Nad soils.

REFERENCES

BRETSCHER, K. (1896). The Oligochaeta of Zurich. Rev Suisse Zool., 3: 499-532.

DASH, M.C. and PATRA, U.C. (1977). Density, biomass and energy budget of a tropical earthworm population from a grassland site in Orissa, India. Revue Ecol. Biol. Sol., 14 461-471.

EDWARDS, C.A. and LOFTY, J.R. (1978). The influence of arthropods and earthworms upon the root growth of cereals after five years of direct drilling. J. Appl. Ecol., 15: 789-795.

EDWARDS, C.A. and LOFTY, J.R. (1982). The effect of direct drilling and minimal cultivation on earthworm populations J. Appl. Ecol., 19: 723-724.

KAUSHAL, B.R. and BISHT, S.P.S. (1994). Population dynamics of the earthworm Amynthes alexandri (Annelida: Megascolicidae) in a Kumaun Himalayan pasture soil. Biol. Fertil. Soil 17: 9-13.

- ALAF-EL-DUWEINI, A.K. and GHABBOUR, S.I. (1965).

 Population density and biomass of earthworms in different
 types of Egyptian soils. J. Appl. Ecol., 2:271-281.
- L. R., (1974). No tillage effects on soil properties and maize (Zea mays L.) production in Western Nigeria. Plant Soil 40: 321-331.
- JL, R., WILSON, G.F. and OKIGBO, B.N. (1978). No till farming under various grasses and leguminous cover crops in tropical Alfison. 1. Crop performances. Field Crops Res., 1: 71-84.
- VELLE,P. (1987). Biological processes and productivity of soils in the humid tropics. In: The Geophysiology of Amazonia (DICKINSEN, R.E. and LOVELOCK, J.eds). New York: Wiley, pp.175-214.
- AYAK, A.K. and RATH,L.K.(1996). Vermiculture and it's application, Kisan world 23(1): 61-62.

adras Agric. J., 84(4): 222-223 April 1997

- RAW,F.(1960). Earthworm population studies: a comparison of smapling methods. Nature 186: 257.
- SIMPSON, I.C., ROGER,P.A., OFICIAL,R. and GRANT,I.F.(1993). Density and composition of aquatic oligochaeta populations in different farmers rice fields. Biol.Fertil.Soils 16: 34-40.
- WESTERNACHER,E. and GRAFF,O. (1987). Orientation behaviour of earthworms (Lumbricidae) towards different crops. Biol.Fertil.Soils 3: 131-133.
- ZISCI,A.(1969). Uber die Auswirking der Nachfrucht and Budenbearbeitung auf die Akitivitat der Regenwurmen. Pedobiologia 9: 141-145.

(Received: October 1996 Revised: April 1997)

RESEARCH NOTES

NITROGEN FIXATION AND NODULATION OF CASUARINA IN RELATION TO IRON AND ZINC

Nitrogen fixation is carried out by a wide ariety of symbiotic and free living organisms in ifferent soil conditions and moisture status.

Lasuarina equisetifolia is an actinorhizal plant hodulated by Frankia. Phosphorus availability can be increased in the soil through increased solubilisation and mineralisation by inoculating the soil with Vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizae (VAM), from and zinc application to nodulating tree crops has been found beneficial. Boardman and Mc Guire 1990) explained the role of zinc in forestry especially in nodule formation. Iron is mainly responsible for binding and reduction of dinitrogen Richards, 1990).

Nursery experiment was conducted during May '93 to September '93 in polythene bags containing potmixture (3:1 ratio soil : FYM) at the College Research Institute, Forest and Mettupalayam with one month old seedlings of C. equisetifolia. Major nutrients, Frankia and VAM inoculation were included as main treatments and micronutrient application as subtreatments. The experiment was laid out in factorial completely randomised design with four replications. After 120 days, the seedlings were carefully uprooted for measuring biometric characters and analysed for Zn and Fe contents. N fixation was estimated by total N difference method.

Table 1. Number of nodules per seedling

| Treatments. | Sandy | | | Sandy Loam | | | | | | |
|-------------------------|---------|------|--------|------------|------|---------|------|------|-------|------|
| | Control | Fe | Zn | Fe+Zn | Mean | Control | Fe | Zn | Fe+Zn | Mean |
| Control | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| Frankia | 1.99 | 2.34 | 2.64 | 2.92 | 2.47 | 2.99 | 2.24 | 3.39 | 3.74 | 3,32 |
| VAM | 0.71 | 0.71 | 1.73 | 1.99 | 1.28 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| Frankia+VAM | 2.54 | 2.73 | 3.16 | 3.46 | 2.97 | 2.54 | 2.73 | 2.99 | 3.32 | 2.90 |
| Fertilizer (NPK) | 0.71 | 1.55 | 1.85 | 2.23 | 1.58 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| Fertilizers+Frankia | 1.29 | 1.53 | 0.71 | 2.34 | 1.46 | 0.71 | 2.64 | 2.99 | 2.99 | 2.30 |
| Fertilizers + VAM | 0.71 | 0.71 | 1.53 | 2.21 | 1.29 | 0.71 | 2.64 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 1.19 |
| Fertilizers+Frankia+VAM | | 3.46 | 3.74 | 3.67 | 3.45 | 3.16 | 3.32 | 3.46 | 3.74 | 3,44 |
| | 0.71 | 0.71 | - 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 | 0.71 |
| Soil(-FYM) Mean | 1,36 | 1.60 | 1.86 | 2.25 | 1.77 | 1.44 | 1.93 | 1.82 | 1.93 | 1.78 |

C.D. (P=0.05) T-0.36 M-0.24 TxM - 0.27

C.D. (P=0.05) T-0.12 M-0.08 TxM - 0.13

SXSLNS