

Original Research Article

<https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2021.1001.048>

Influence of Zinc Chelates on Yield and Zn Uptake by Maize

P. Malathi*

*Department of Natural Resources Management, Horticultural College and Research Institute,
Periyakulam, Tamil Nadu, India*

*Corresponding author

A B S T R A C T

Keywords

Maize, Zinc chelates, Yield, Zinc uptake

Article Info

Accepted:
04 December 2020
Available Online:
10 January 2021

New chelated Zn formulations TNAU Zn EDTA (9.7 % Zn) and TNAU Zn citrate (9.0 % Zn) were developed and tested in comparison with $ZnSO_4$ and commercial Zn EDTA in a field experiment with maize crop conducted during 2018-19 at Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore. The experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with treatments control (NPK alone), soil application of $7.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as $ZnSO_4$, 0.75 and $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn EDTA, TNAU Zn citrate and commercial Zn EDTA, foliar spray of 0.5 % $ZnSO_4$, TNAU Zn EDTA, TNAU Zn citrate and commercial Zn EDTA thrice on 30, 40 and 50 days after sowing (DAS). Significantly highest grain yield (7158 kg ha^{-1}) and stover yield (12741 kg ha^{-1}) were recorded in the treatment foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA which remained on par with the application of $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn EDTA, foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn citrate and foliar spray of 0.5 % commercial Zn EDTA. Foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn citrate registered grain yield of 6962 kg ha^{-1} and stover yield of 12115 kg ha^{-1} . Significantly highest grain Zn content and uptake of 32.4 mg kg^{-1} and 207 g ha^{-1} respectively were observed in the treatment foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU Zn citrate. Stover Zn content (36.5 mg kg^{-1}) and uptake (436 g ha^{-1}) were significantly highest with foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU Zn EDTA. Percentage yield increase due to foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA and 0.5 % TNAU Zn citrate formulations were 12.3 and 9.17 % respectively over $ZnSO_4$ foliar spray. The treatments foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA and 0.5 % TNAU Zn citrate thrice on 30, 40 and 50 DAS recorded higher grain and stover yield as well as Zn content and Zn uptake over all other treatments.

Introduction

Zinc deficiency in soil is increasing at an alarming rate due to intensive cropping and reduced use of organic manures. Coarse textured, calcareous, alkaline or sodic soils having sandy texture, high pH and low organic matter are generally deficient in available Zn. Zn was one of the first

micronutrients known to be essential for plants, animals and humans (Kabata-Pendias, 2000). Zinc plays a key role in various plant metabolic processes such as development of cell walls, respiration, carbohydrate metabolism and gene expression and regulation (Klug and Rhodes, 1987). Zn is a component of various enzymes involved in metabolic activities in plants. Plants grown on

Zn deficient soils have reduced productivity and contain very low concentrations of Zn in the edible parts. Zn deficiency is a serious nutritional and health problem in human beings, especially in the developing countries where cereal-based foods are dominating the diet. Challenge for agricultural scientists is to feed the ever growing world population with nourishing food.

Zinc sulphate, the major source of zinc has the disadvantage of rapid convertibility. It is reported that chelated zinc shows higher use efficiency than zinc sulphate fertilizer and hence can be applied at 8 to 10 times less dose than their corresponding salts. A chelate is a kind of organic chemical complex in which the metal is held so tightly that it cannot be stolen by the other substances, which could convert it to an insoluble form. Chelates are considered the most effective fertilizers, compared to the inorganic forms, such as sulfates, which can react with CaCO_3 forming low-solubility compounds (Loeppert, 1986; Vempati and Loeppert, 1988). Besides, the chelating agents increase the absorption of ions as the roots have more affinity for the chelated micronutrients. Chelated forms of Zn are more commonly used for foliar applications and have the advantage of being compatible with many herbicide and fungicide formulations in spray tank mixes, but they are more expensive than inorganic compounds (Alloway, 2008). An attempt was made to develop new chelated Zn formulations using EDTA and citric acid as chelating agents. The newly developed chelated Zn formulations were evaluated in a field experiment with maize crop.

Materials and Methods

The field experiment was conducted in Zn deficient soil at Eastern Block farm of Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore to evaluate newly developed chelated Zn

formulations with maize (TNAU Maize hybrid CO6) as test crop. Newly developed TNAU Zn EDTA (9.7 % Zn) and TNAU Zn citrate (9.0 % Zn) formulations were tested in comparison with ZnSO_4 and commercial Zn EDTA. Treatments comprised of control (NPK alone), soil application of 7.5 kg Zn ha^{-1} as ZnSO_4 , 0.75 and 1.5 kg Zn ha^{-1} as TNAU Zn EDTA, TNAU Zn citrate and commercial Zn EDTA, foliar spray of 0.5 % ZnSO_4 , TNAU Zn EDTA, TNAU Zn citrate and commercial Zn EDTA thrice on 30, 40 and 50 days after sowing (DAS).

The field experiment was conducted in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications. Soil Test Crop Response (STCR) based NPK fertilizer dose for Maize hybrid was worked out for a yield target of 9 t ha^{-1} and fertilizer N, P_2O_5 and K_2O applied were 259, 96 and 38 kg ha^{-1} respectively. STCR based NPK was applied to all treatments.

Since the experimental soil was deficient in available Fe, recommended dose of FeSO_4 , (50 kg ha^{-1}) was applied. Crop protection measures were taken up as and when needed. Plant samples were collected at late vegetative stage and harvest stage for assessing the Zn content and uptake. Zn content in plant samples was estimated using Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer (Jackson, 1973). Grain and Stover yield were recorded. The data obtained were subjected to statistical analysis as suggested by Panse and Sukhatme (1978).

Results and Discussion

The physico chemical characteristics of experimental soil were analyzed and the results are presented in Table 1. The experimental soil belongs to Periyanaickenpalayam series and comes under the taxonomic classification fine, montmorillonitic, isohyperthermic, calcareous

Typic Haplustert. The soil texture was clay loam. The soil was alkaline in reaction (8.07) with permissible amount of soluble salts (0.24 dS m⁻¹).

The experimental soil was calcareous. The organic carbon content of the soil was low (4.79 g kg⁻¹). The soil was low in available N (134 kg ha⁻¹), medium in available P (16.7 kg ha⁻¹) and high in available K (657 kg ha⁻¹). The soil was deficient in DTPA-Zn (0.60 mg kg⁻¹), DTPA-Fe (2.27 mg kg⁻¹), DTPA-Cu (0.89 mg kg⁻¹) and sufficient in DTPA-Mn (5.08 mg kg⁻¹).

Grain and Stover Yield

Regarding grain yield, significantly highest grain yield of 7158 kg ha⁻¹ was observed with foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA (T₁₀) which was statistically on par with the soil application of 1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA (T₄), foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn citrate (T₁₁) and foliar spray of 0.5 % commercial Zn EDTA (T₁₂) (Table 2). MacNacidhe and Fleming (1988) observed significant increase in grain yield due to foliar application of zinc in spring cereals and higher grain yield due to Zn EDTA than Zn sulphate. Similar to this result, Khalid *et al.*,

(2013) reported higher grain yield by the foliar application of Zn Ch: EDTA at 180 g Zn ha⁻¹ when compared to ZnSO₄ and Zn Ch: HEDTA. Similar results were also reported by Syed *et al.*, (2016) and Kulhare *et al.*, (2017). Better performance of Zn EDTA as compared to ZnSO₄.7H₂O in bajra was reported by Panda and Doddamani (2018).

Foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU chelated Zn formulations and soil application of 1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA recorded significantly higher and comparable yield among themselves. The results revealed that foliar spray of Zn chelates performed better when compared to soil application of the same.

The grain yields registered in the treatments soil application of 0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA (T₃), 1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn citrate (T₆), 1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as commercial Zn EDTA (T₈), 7.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as ZnSO₄ (T₂) and foliar spray of 0.5 % ZnSO₄ (T₉) were statistically comparable. Significantly lowest value (5867 kg ha⁻¹) was registered in control (NPK alone - T₁) and it remained on par with 0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn citrate (T₅) and 0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as commercial Zn EDTA (T₇).

Table.1 Initial soil sample characteristics

pH		8.07
EC	dSm ⁻¹	0.24
Organic Carbon	g kg ⁻¹	4.79
Available N	kg ha ⁻¹	134
Available P		16.7
Available K		657
DTPA-Fe	mg kg ⁻¹	2.27
DTPA-Zn		0.60
DTPA-Mn		5.08
DTPA-Cu		0.89

Table.2 Effect of Zn formulations on yield, Zn content and uptake at late vegetative stage of maize

Treatments	Late vegetative stage		Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹)	Stover yield (kg ha ⁻¹)
	Zn content (mg kg ⁻¹)	Zn uptake (g ha ⁻¹)		
T₁-Control (NPK alone)	39.3	260	5867	10088
T₂-7.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as ZnSO₄	41.1	297	6423	11198
T₃-0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA	42.2	314	6547	11483
T₄-1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA	43.0	347	6985	12352
T₅-0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn citrate	40.1	273	5937	10415
T₆-1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn citrate	41.6	303	6452	11408
T₇-0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as commercial Zn EDTA	39.6	265	5910	10355
T₈-1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as commercial Zn EDTA	41.5	287	6182	10662
T₉-Foliar spray of 0.5 % ZnSO₄*	42.6	295	6377	11067
T₁₀-Foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA *	44.8	365	7158	12741
T₁₁-Foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn citrate *	44.1	346	6962	12115
T₁₂-Foliar spray of 0.5 % commercial Zn EDTA *	43.2	336	6777	12052
SED	1.2	15	287	504
CD (P=0.05)	2.5	31	595	1044

*thrice on 30, 40 and 50 DAS

Table.3 Effect of Zn formulations on Zn content and uptake at harvest stage of maize

Treatments	Grain		Stover	
	Content (mg kg ⁻¹)	Uptake (g ha ⁻¹)	Content (mg kg ⁻¹)	Uptake (g ha ⁻¹)
T₁-Control (NPK alone)	26.5	143	30.8	287
T₂-7.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as ZnSO₄	28.4	166	33.8	354
T₃-0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA	28.5	172	34.4	365
T₄-1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA	29.5	192	35.8	416
T₅-0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn citrate	26.8	146	31.8	302
T₆-1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn citrate	29.1	173	34.2	361
T₇-0.75 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as commercial Zn EDTA	26.6	145	31.1	298
T₈-1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as commercial Zn EDTA	28.6	161	33.2	327
T₉-Foliar spray of 0.5 % ZnSO₄*	30.1	172	33.4	341
T₁₀-Foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA *	31.1	205	36.5	436
T₁₁-Foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn citrate *	32.4	207	35.1	396
T₁₂-Foliar spray of 0.5 % commercial Zn EDTA *	30.5	190	34.7	388
SED	0.8	13	1.0	26
CD (P=0.05)	1.7	26	2.0	54

*thrice on 30, 40 and 50 DAS

With respect to stover yield, the treatment foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA (T_{10}) recorded significantly higher stover yield of 12741 kg ha^{-1} (Table 2). Foliar spray of 0.5% chelated Zn formulations and soil application of $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn EDTA registered comparable stover yields. Stover yields observed with soil application of $0.75 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn EDTA (T_3) was statistically on par with soil application of $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn citrate(T_6) and commercial Zn EDTA(T_8), soil ($7.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$) and foliar application (0.5%) of recommended quantity of ZnSO_4 . Lowest stover yield of 10088 kg ha^{-1} was noticed in control (NPK alone - T_1). The results are in line with the findings of Ortega-Blu and Molina-Roco (2007) who reported higher corn dry matter with Zn EDTA as compared to ZnSO_4 .

Zn content and uptake at late vegetative stage

Zn content in maize plant at late vegetative stage varied from 39.3 to 44.8 mg kg^{-1} (Table 2). The treatment foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA (T_{10}) recorded significantly higher Zn content and control (NPK alone - T_1) recorded lowest Zn content. This is in agreement with the findings of Teixeira *et al.*, (2019) who reported that Zn content and Zn uptake in the Mombasa grass was directly proportional to the rate of foliar applied chelated Zn, contributing to the yield of better quality forage. The improvement in the Zn concentration and uptake observed in this experiment comparing ZnSO_4 and Zn-EDTA, is similar to that reported by Gangloff *et al.*, (2002). Foliar spray of 0.5% Zn formulations and soil application of $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn EDTA recorded significantly higher and comparable Zn content. With respect to Zn uptake at late vegetative stage, the treatment foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA (T_{10}) registered significantly higher Zn

uptake of 365 g ha^{-1} (Table 2). Zn uptake in the treatments, foliar spray of 0.5% chelated Zn formulations and soil application of $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn EDTA were comparable. Lowest Zn uptake of 260 g ha^{-1} was observed in control (NPK alone - T_1).

Zn content and uptake at harvest stage

Grain Zn content ranged from 26.5 to 32.4 mg kg^{-1} (Table 3). Marked variation in grain Zn content was observed among the treatments. Significantly highest grain Zn content was observed in the treatment foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU Zn citrate (T_{11}) which was on par with the treatment foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU Zn EDTA (T_{10}). Both Zn concentration and Zn content in plant shoots were higher in the presence of citrate than in the absence (Chairidchai and Ritchie, 1993). The treatments foliar spray of 0.5% commercial Zn EDTA and ZnSO_4 , soil application of $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as Zn EDTA and TNAU Zn citrates recorded comparable grain Zn content. Grain Zn content was lowest in control (NPK alone - T_1) which was on par with $0.75 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn citrate (T_5) and commercial Zn EDTA (T_7). Grain Zn uptake varied from 143 to 207 g ha^{-1} . The highest value was recorded in the treatment foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU Zn citrate (T_{11}). Grain Zn uptake in the treatments foliar spray of 0.5% chelated Zn formulations and soil application of $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn EDTA were comparable. These results are in agreement with the findings of Verma *et al.*, (2015), Islam *et al.*, (2016) and Kulhare *et al.*, (2017). Zn uptake in the treatments, soil application of $1.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as Zn citrate (T_6) and commercial Zn EDTA (T_8), soil application of $0.75 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as TNAU Zn EDTA (T_3), $7.5 \text{ kg Zn ha}^{-1}$ as ZnSO_4 (T_2) and foliar spray of 0.5 % ZnSO_4 (T_9) were statistically on par. Lowest grain Zn uptake of 143 g ha^{-1} was noticed in control (NPK alone - T_1).

Stover Zn content was in the range of 30.8 to 36.5 mg kg⁻¹ (Table 3). Stover Zn content was significantly highest with foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU Zn EDTA (T₁₀) and this remained comparable with foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU Zn citrate (T₁₁) and 0.5% commercial Zn EDTA (T₁₂), soil application of 1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA (T₄). Stover Zn content was lowest (30.8 mg kg⁻¹) in the treatment control (NPK alone -T₁). Stover Zn uptake was significantly highest (436 g ha⁻¹) in the treatment foliar spray of 0.5% TNAU Zn EDTA (T₁₀). Foliar spray of 0.5% chelated Zn formulations and soil application of 1.5 kg Zn ha⁻¹ as TNAU Zn EDTA recorded comparable stover Zn uptake values. Lima *et al.*, (2014) observed that Zn fertilization via soil as well as foliar can be adequate strategies to supply of Zn to maize plants. Control (NPK alone - T₁) registered the lowest stover Zn uptake of 287 g ha⁻¹. The increase in both grain and straw yield with application of Zn-EDTA might be due to the relatively greater amount of Zn uptake compared with ZnSO₄ application. These results are in agreement with the findings of Karak *et al.*, (2005) who reported that chelated Zn was the most efficient source of Zn for lowland rice production in calcareous soil. Also, Zn mobilisation efficiency was higher with Zn-EDTA than with ZnSO₄ for Zn uptake by grain and straw (Naik and Das, 2008). The results are in agreement with Takkar and Singh (1989).

Percentage yield increase due to foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAU Zn EDTA and 0.5 % TNAU Zn citrate formulations respectively were 22.0 and 18.7 % over control, 11.4 and 8.38 % over ZnSO₄ soil application and 12.3 and 9.17 % over ZnSO₄ foliar spray. The treatments foliar spray of 0.5 % TNAUZn EDTAand0.5 % TNAUZn citrate thrice on 30, 40 and 50 DAS recorded higher grain and stover yield as well as Zn content and Zn uptake over all other treatments.

References

- Alloway. B.J. (ed.). 2008. Micronutrient Deficiencies in Global Crop Production. Springer, Netherlands.
- Chairidchai, P. and G.S.P. Ritchie. 1993. The effect of citrate and pH on zinc uptake by wheat. Agron. J. 85: 322-328.
- Gangloff, W., D. G. Westfall, G. A. Peterson, and J. J. Mortvedt. 2002. Relative availability coefficients of organic and inorganic Zn fertilizers. J. Plant Nutr. 25: 259-273.
- Islam, M.R., N.Yesmin, M.Malika, A.Huda and M.M. Rahman. 2016. Effect of zinc supplied from two different sources on the growth, yield and zinc uptake of rice (cv. BRRI dhan49). Asian Australas. J Biosci. Biotechnol. 1(2): 230- 234.
- Jackson, M. 1973. Methods of chemical analysis: Prentice Hall of India (Pvt.) Ltd., New Delhi.
- Kabata-Pendias, A. 2000. Trace elements in soils and plants, 3rd edn. CRC, Boca Raton.
- Karak, T., U.K. Singh, S. Das, D.K. Das and Y. Kuzyakov. 2005. Comparative efficacy of ZnSO₄ and Zn-EDTA application for fertilization of rice. Arch Agron Soil Sci. 51: 253–264.
- Khalid, F., M. Tahir, N. Fiaz and M. A. Nadeem and S. M. W. Gillani. 2013. Hybrid maize response to assorted chelated and non chelated foliar applied zinc rates. Journal of Agricultural Technology. 9(2): 295-309.
- Klug, A. and D. Rhodes. 1987. ‘Zinc fingers’: a novel protein motif for nucleic acid recognition. Trends Biochem Sci. 12: 464–469.
- Kulhare, P.S., G.S. Tagore and G.D. Sharma. 2017. Effect of foliar spray and sources of zinc on yield, zinc content and uptake by rice grown in a Vertisol of central India. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 5(2): 35-38.

- Lima, P., A. Gisele, L.B. Ponte and A.B. Chico. 2014. An investigation of zinc uptake by maize plants after fertilization with soil and foliage. African Journal of Environmental Economics and Management. 2(1):177-180.
- Loeppert, R. H. 1986. Reactions of iron and carbonates in calcareous soils. J. Plant Nutr. 9: 195-214.
- MacNacidhe, F.S. and G.A. Fleming. 1988. A response in spring cereals to foliar sprays of zinc in Ireland. Irish Journal of Agricultural research, 27: 91-97.
- Naik, S.K. and D.K.Das. 2008. Relative performance of chelated zinc and zinc sulphate for lowland rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). NutrCycl Agroecosyst. 81: 219-227.
- Ortega-Blu R. and M. Molina-Roco. 2007. Comparison between sulfates and chelated compounds as sources of zinc and iron in calcareous soils. Agrociencia. 41: 491-502.
- Panda, B. and M.B. Doddamani. 2018. Efficiency of ZnSO₄.7H₂O and Zn EDTA in improving morphology and yield of bajra (*Pennisetum glaucum* L.). J. Farm Sci. 31(4):397-400.
- Panse, V. G. and Sukhatme, P. V. 1978. Statistical methods for agricultural workers. *Statistical methods for agricultural workers.*(Ed. 3).
- Syed, T., B.M. Anwar, H. Ashaq, M.A. Ganai and N.A. Teli. 2016. Effect of levels and sources of zinc on growth, yield and economics of rice (*Oryza sativa*) under temperate conditions. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 61(2): 186-190.
- Takkar, P.N. and T.Singh.1989. Zinc nutrition of rice as influenced by rates of gypsum and Zn fertilization of alkali soil. J Indian Soc Soil Sci. 70: 442-450.
- Teixeira, N.M., R. Heinrichs, C.S.B. Bonini, J. Afzal, G.C. Meirelles, C.V.S. Filho and Adonis Moreira. 2019. Chelated zinc leaf application on nutrients concentration and yield of Mombasa grass. Journal of plant nutrition. 42(1): 89-98.
- Vempati, R. K., and R. H. Loeppert. 1988. Chemistry and mineralogy of Fe-containing oxides and layer silicates in relation to plant available iron. J. Plant Nutr. 11: 1557-1574.
- Verma, V.K., R.N. Meena, S.P. Maurya, S. Bahadur, A. Gautam and Maniram. 2015. Effect of sources of zinc and various crop establishment methods on growth, yield and yield attributes of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) in eastern U.P. Ecology, Environment and Conservation. (21): 283- 287.

How to cite this article:

Malathi, P. 2021. Influence of Zinc Chelates on Yield and Zn Uptake by Maize. *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci*. 10(01): 397-403. doi: <https://doi.org/10.20546/ijcmas.2021.1001.048>