



E-ISSN 2347-2677

P-ISSN 2394-0522

<https://www.faujournal.com>

IJFBS 2022; 9(6): 49-52

Received: 25-09-2022

Accepted: 28-10-2022

Ni Made Witariadi

Faculty of Animal Husbandry,
Udayana University, Jln. Raya
Kampus Unud, Bukit Jimbaran,
Badung, Bali, Indonesia

**Ni Nyoman Candraasih
Kusumawati**

Faculty of Animal Husbandry,
Udayana University, Jln. Raya
Kampus Unud, Bukit Jimbaran,
Badung, Bali, Indonesia

Ni Made Suci Sukmawati

Faculty of Animal Husbandry,
Udayana University, Jln. Raya
Kampus Unud, Bukit Jimbaran,
Badung, Bali, Indonesia

Corresponding Author:**Ni Made Witariadi**

Faculty of Animal Husbandry,
Udayana University, Jln. Raya
Kampus Unud, Bukit Jimbaran,
Badung, Bali, Indonesia

Effect of substitution urea fertilizer with cow manure fertilizer on the productivity of *Asystasia gangetica* (L.) Subsp. *Micrantha*

Ni Made Witariadi, Ni Nyoman Candraasih Kusumawati and Ni Made Suci Sukmawati

DOI: <https://doi.org/0.22271/23940522.2022.v9.i6a.944>

Abstract

Research that aimed to examine the effect of substitution urea fertilizer with cow manure fertilizer on the productivity of *Asystasia gangetica* (L.) subsp. *Micrantha*, using a completely randomized design (CRD) with 7 treatments and 10 replications. The substitution treatment of urea fertilizer with cow manure i.e: D0: 0 tons ha^{-1} ; D1: 20 tons ha^{-1} ; D2: 200 kg urea ha^{-1} ; D3: 200 kg urea ha^{-1} + 5 tons ha^{-1} ; D4: 150 kg urea ha^{-1} + 10 tons ha^{-1} ; D5: 100 kg urea ha^{-1} + 15 tons ha^{-1} ; and D6: 50 kg urea ha^{-1} + 20 tons ha^{-1} . The observed variables were: growth variables, yield and characteristics. The results of the study saw that the substitution of urea fertilizer + cow manure increased the productivity of *Asystasia gangetica* (L.) subsp. *Micrantha*. It was concluded that the best treatment to increase the productivity of *Asystasia gangetica* (L.) subsp. *Micrantha* at the substitution of 50 kg urea ha^{-1} + 20 tons ha^{-1} .

Keywords: *Asystasia gangetica* (L.) subsp. *Micrantha*, cow dung, urea fertilizer, productivity, substitution

Introduction

Forage is the main source of feed for ruminants, both for basic life, growth, production and reproduction. Forage plays an important role because it contains nutrients (energy, protein, fat, fiber, vitamins and minerals) needed by ruminants to achieve optimal productivity. Provision of forage generally experiences problems during the dry season. In the dry season, the availability of forage is limited and the quality is low. Fulfill the availability of forage by selecting types of forage that have good adaptation to the environment and are responsive to fertilization.

A. gangetica (L.) subsp. *Micrantha* is a plant species in the Acanthaceae family that has the potential to be a source of forage and is easily found in yards, roadsides, gardens and open fields (Suarna *et al.*, 2019) ^[10]. *A. gangetica* has high palatability and digestibility, so it can be used as forage for animal feed, has high palatability and digestibility (Grubben, 2004) ^[5]. has crude protein content: 19.3% (Adigun *et al.*, 2014) ^[11] to 33% (Putra, 2018) ^[8]. Utilization of *A. gangetica* as animal feed requires proper cultivation so that it is continuously available and its quality is maintained by adding nutrients through fertilization.

Fertilization by adding nutrients has the potential to maximize plant genetics. Urea fertilizer is classified as an inorganic fertilizer containing high levels of nitrogen (46%). Nitrogen is a nutrient needed by plants and the continuous use of urea has a negative impact on the soil, so organic fertilizer is needed. Novizan (2000) ^[7] states that the composition of livestock manure varies greatly depending on the type of livestock, age of livestock, quality of feed, duration of storage and processing of livestock manure. High-quality feed produces better manure than low-quality feed (Rinsema, 1993) ^[9]. The value of organic fertilizers is generally based on the content of the elements N, P, K and organic matter content.

Wahyuni *et al.* (2018) ^[17] reported that the substitution of urea fertilizer 150 kg ha^{-1} + 15 tons ha^{-1} cow bio slurry fertilizer resulted in the growth and production of *Stenotaphrum secundatum* grass no effect to the application of urea fertilizer 300 kg ha^{-1} . Tifani *et al.* (2018) ^[14] reported that substitution urea 50 kg ha^{-1} of + 15 tons ha^{-1} cow slurry fertilizer could increase the growth and production of *Heteropogon contortus* grass. Witariadi and Kusumawati (2019) ^[16] that substitution of urea fertilizer 50 kg ha^{-1} of + 30 tons ha^{-1} of pig bio slurry gave the best results for the growth and production of *Panicum maximum* grass cv. Trichoglume.

Limited research information to determine the productivity of *A. gangetica* (L.) subsp. *Micrantha* substituted with urea fertilizer with cow manure is very appropriate.

Material and Methods

Experimental design

The experimental design used was a completely randomized design (CRD) consisting of 7 treatments and each treatment was repeated 10 times, so there were 70 experimental units. The treatment of substitution of urea fertilizer with cow manure: D0: 0 tons ha⁻¹; D1: 20 tons ha⁻¹; D2: 200 kg ha⁻¹; D3: 200 kg ha⁻¹ + 5 tons ha⁻¹; D4: 150 kg ha⁻¹ + 10 tons ha⁻¹; D5: 100 kg ha⁻¹ + 15 tons ha⁻¹; and D6: 50 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 tons ha⁻¹.

Fertilizer

Urea fertilizer is a nitrogen source (N: 46%) and results of analysis of cow manure: pH: 8.0; C-organic: 16.64%; N total: 1.76%; available P: 415.40 ppm; available K: 525.59 ppm (Laboratory of Soil Science, Faculty of Agriculture, Udayana University, 2022).

Observed Variables

Growth variable

Plant height (cm) was measured using a measuring tape that was measured from the base of the stem above the ground to the top leaves that were fully developed; Number of leaves (strands) was carried out by counting the total number of fully developed leaves; Number of branches (branches) was by counting the total number of branches that already have leaves that have developed perfectly.

Production variable

Leaf dry weight (g) was obtained by weighing plant leaves per pot which had been harvested and dried at 70 °C in an oven to achieve a constant weight; Stem dry weight (g) was obtained by weighing the plant stems pot⁻¹ which had been harvested and dried at 70 °C in the oven so as to achieve a constant weight; Forage total dry weight (g) was obtained by adding the dry weight of the stems and the dry weight of the leaves.

Variable Plant Growth Characteristics

The ratio of dry weight of leaves to dry weight of stems was obtained by dividing the dry weight of the leaves by the dry weight of the stems; Leaf area pot⁻¹ (cm²) the weight of the leaf samples was weighed and their area was measured using a leaf area meter.

Statistical analysis

All data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA to determine the differences among treatments. If differences were found ($p < 0.05$) then further analysis was performed with Duncan's multiple range test (Steel and Torrie, 1993) [12].

Results

Substitution of urea fertilizer with cow dung can increase the productivity of *A. gangetica* (L.) subsp. *Micrantha*, the best dosage 50 kg urea ha⁻¹ + 20 tons cow dung ha⁻¹ to increase the productivity of *A. gangetica* (L.) subsp. *Micrantha*. Data on the effect of substitution of urea fertilizer with cow dung on the productivity of *Asystasia gangetica* (L.) Subsp. *Micrantha* is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: The effect of substitution urea fertilizer with cow manure on the productivity of *Asystasia gangetica* (L.) Subsp. *Micrantha*

Variable	Threatments ¹⁾							SEM ³⁾
	D0	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	
Plant height (cm)	28.15 ^{d2)}	30.19 ^{cd}	30.99 ^{bcd}	34.12 ^{ab}	30.96 ^{bcd}	33.34 ^{abc}	35.64 ^a	1.13
Number of leaves (strands)	20.33 ^b	21.76 ^b	20.26 ^b	22.12 ^b	25.47 ^b	25.47 ^b	34.35 ^a	2.01
Number of branches (branches)	2.81 ^d	3.00 ^{cd}	3.30 ^{cd}	3.83 ^{bcd}	4.30 ^{bc}	4.76 ^b	6.21 ^a	0.43
Leaf dry weight (g)	0.74 ^b	1.04 ^b	0.95 ^b	1.01 ^b	1.11 ^b	1.17 ^b	1.78 ^a	0.198
Stem dry weight (g)	0.67 ^c	0.61 ^c	0.75 ^{bc}	0.97 ^{bc}	1.15 ^b	1.12 ^b	1.91 ^a	0.143
Total dry weight of forage (g)	1.41 ^b	1.65 ^b	1.71 ^b	1.98 ^b	2.27 ^b	2.30 ^b	3.70 ^a	0.293
Leaf/stem dry weight ratio	1.12 ^a	1.94 ^a	1.30 ^a	1.26 ^a	1.00 ^a	1.10 ^a	0.92 ^a	0.269
Leaf area pot ⁻¹ (cm ²)	1.112 ^c	1.547 ^{ab}	1.684 ^{ab}	1.338 ^{abc}	1.301 ^{bc}	1.409 ^{abc}	1.740 ^a	126.982

Notes:

D0: 0 tons ha⁻¹; D1: 20 tons ha⁻¹; D2: 200 kg ha⁻¹; D3: 200 kg ha⁻¹ + 5 tons ha⁻¹; D4: 150 kg ha⁻¹ + 10 tons ha⁻¹; D5: 100 kg ha⁻¹ + 15 tons ha⁻¹; D6: 50 kg ha⁻¹ + 20 tons ha⁻¹

SEM = Standar Error of the Treatment Means

Values with different superscripts on the same line indicate a significantly different ($p < 0.05$)

Data in table 1 shows that the average plant height of *A. gangetica* (L.) Subsp. *Micrantha* at the treatment dosage of 0 ton ha⁻¹ (D0) was 28.15 cm. In the treatment dosage of 200 kg urea ha⁻¹ + 5 tons ha⁻¹ (D3), 100 kg urea ha⁻¹ + 15 tons ha⁻¹ (D5); and 50 kg of urea ha⁻¹ + 20 tons ha⁻¹ (D6) respectively: 21.20; 18.43 and 26.60% significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher than treatment D0, but with treatment dosage of 20 tons ha⁻¹ (D1), 200 kg urea ha⁻¹ (D2) and 150 kg urea ha⁻¹ + 10 tons ha⁻¹ (D4) was not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$) compared to D0. The average number of leaves is 20.33 (D0). Treatments D1, D2, D3, D4 and D5 showed no significant difference ($p > 0.05$) compared to D0, but with D6 it was 68.96% significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher than D0. The average number of branches in the D0 treatment was 2.81 branches (Table 4.1). In treatment D4, D5 and D6 respectively: 53.02; 69.39 and 120.99%

significantly ($p < 0.05$) more than D0, while the D1, D2 and D3 treatments were statistically not significantly different ($p > 0.05$) compared to D0. The average number of branches was 2.81 (D0), in treatments D4, D5 and D6 respectively: 53.02; 69.39 and 120.99% significantly ($p < 0.05$) higher, while the D1, D2 and D3 treatments were statistically not significantly different ($p > 0.05$) compared to D0. The lowest average leaf dry weight was 0.74 g (D0), treatments D1, D2, D3, D4 and D5 were not significantly different ($p > 0.05$) but with treatment D6 it was 140.54% significant ($p < 0.05$) higher than treatment D0. The lowest average dry stem weight was 0.67 g (D0), treatments D1, D2, D3, D4 and D5 were not significantly different ($p > 0.05$), but treatment D6 was 185.07% significant ($p < 0.05$) is higher than D0. The lowest mean total dry weight of forage in the D0 treatment was 1.41

g, treatments D1, D2, D3, D4 and D5 were not significantly different ($p>0.05$), but 162.41% (D6) significantly higher ($p<0.05$) compared to D0. The lowest average leaf area was 1.112 cm² (D0), treatments D1, D2 and D6 respectively: 39.11; 51.43 and 56.47% significantly ($p<0.05$) were higher than treatment D0, while D3, D4 and D5 were not significantly different ($p>0.05$) compared to D0.

Discussion

The effect of replacing urea with cow manure significantly increased the growth and yield of *A. gangetica* (L.) Subsp. Micrantha. Substitution of 50 kg of urea ha⁻¹ + 20 tons of cow manure ha⁻¹ was able to give the best results among other substitution treatments. Increasing the application of cow manure fertilizer causes the nutrient content in the soil to increase. Agusman (2004) [2] stating that the higher the availability of nutrients in the soil, the plants can absorb nutrients for plant growth and development. The increased growth was due to the fact that cow manure contains complete nutrients, namely macro nutrients (N, P, K, Ca, Mg, S) and micro nutrients (Fe, Mn, Cu, Zn) which can improve soil physical, chemical and biological properties.

Cow manure fertilizer contains total N: 1.76% (very high). Sutedjo (2002) [11] states that nitrogen is the main nutrient for plant growth for the growth of the vegetative parts of plants (leaves, stems and roots). Syarief (1986) [13] states that Nitrogen is the main nutrient for plants as a constituent of protein and protoplasm.

C-organic is an organic material derived from natural carbon compounds. The organic C content of 16.64% contained in cow manure plays an important role as an indicator of soil fertility. High soil C-organic content causes moist soil conditions and the population of microorganisms in the soil is able to develop well and decompose organic matter more quickly, so that nutrients are available earlier to increase forage dry weight (Witariadi and Kusumawati, 2019) [16]. The provision of organic matter has an impact on plants where there is an increase in respiration activity supported by a high leaf area capable of increasing photosynthetic activity (Husma, 2010) [6].

Substitution of 50 kg urea ha⁻¹ + 20 tons of cow manure ha⁻¹ produced the highest leaf dry weight, stem dry weight and total dry weight of forage among other treatments. Leaf growth can accelerate the process of photosynthesis and affect photosynthetic results as a food reserve that is translocated as a result of plant dry weight (Djoehana, 1986) [3]. The dry weight produced by plants depends on the number and area of leaves that support the availability of leaf chlorophyll for photosynthesis. Witariadi and Kusumawati (2019) [16] stated that a high number of leaves is able to help the photosynthesis process run optimally with results in the form of carbohydrates and protein as a component of plant dry weight, the higher the carbohydrate and protein content of plants, the higher the dry weight of plants. The dry weight reflects the amount of photosynthesis as a result of photosynthesis because the dry matter is very dependent on the rate of photosynthesis. The results of photosynthesis are used by plants for growth and increase plant carbohydrates and protein as a component of plant dry weight yield. Gardener *et al.* (1991) [4] stated that the higher the photosynthetic yield, the greater the accumulation of food reserves which are translocated to produce plant dry weight.

The quality of forage is known by calculating the dry weight

ratio of the plants. If the ratio of dry weight of leaves to dry weight of stems gives high yields, it indicates that the plants planted are of good quality. Witariadi and Kusumawati (2018) [15] stated that plants with good quality were affected by higher leaf dry weight and lower stem dry weight because the carbohydrate and protein content was stored more in the leaves. As green fodder, the leaf parts are expected to be more, because more nutrient content is stored in the leaves and if the leaf parts are consumed by livestock it can increase livestock productivity.

Conclusion

From the results of the study it can be concluded: (1) Substitution of urea fertilizer with cow manure can increase the productivity of *A. gangetica* (L.) subsp. Micrantha. (2) The best dosage was found to increase the productivity of *A. gangetica* (L.) subsp. Micrantha is 50 kg urea ha⁻¹ + 20 tons ha⁻¹.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank the Chancellor of Udayana University through the Chairperson of the Udayana University Research and Community Service Institute for the funds provided through the Study Program Excellence Grants for the 2022 fiscal year, so that research and writing of this scientific paper can run well.

Conflict of interest declaration

We certify that there is no conflict of interest with any financial organization regarding the material discussed in the manuscript.

References

1. Adigun J, Osipitan A, Lagoke S, Adeyemi R, Afolami S. Growth and yield performance of cowpea (*Vigna Unguiculata* (L.) Walp) as influenced by row-spacing and period of weed interference in South-West Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Science Archives*. 2014;6(4):188-198.
2. Agusman AR. The Effect of Applying Compost and NPK Fertilizers on K Uptake and Yields of Corn in Entisol Soil. Thesis, UNS Faculty of Agriculture Surakarta; c2004.
3. Djoehana S. Fertilizer and Fertilization. First Printing, CV. Simplex; c1986.
4. Gardener F, Pearve RB, Mitchell RL. Physiology of Crop Plants. University of Indonesia Publisher, Jakarta; c1991.
5. Grubben GJH, Denton OA. Vegetables. Wageningen: PROTA (Plant Resources of Tropical Africa) Foundation; c2004.
6. Husma M. The Effect of Organic Matter and Potassium Fertilizer on the Growth and Production of Melon Plants (*Cucumis melo* L). Halu oleo University Agronomy Study Program, Kendari, Southeast Sulawesi; c2010.
7. Novizan. Elective Fertilization Instructions. Agro Media Pustaka, Jakarta; c2000.
8. Putra RI. Morphology, Biomass Production and Quality of Breech Ara (*Asystasia gangetica* (L.) T. Anderson) as Forage in Several Regions of West Java and Banten. Undergraduate Thesis in Nutrition and Feed Technology, Faculty of Animal Husbandry, Bogor Agricultural Institute; c2018.
9. Rinsema WT. Fertilizer and Method of Fertilization.

- Bhratara Karya Aksara Publisher, Jakarta; c1993.
10. Suarna IWSuryani NN, Budiasa KM, Wijaya IMS. Growth characteristics of *Asystasia gangetica* at various urea fertilization levels. *Pastura*. 2019;9(1):21-23.
 11. Sutedjo R. Organic Agriculture Towards Alternative and Sustainable Agriculture. Kasinius Publisher, Yogyakarta; c2002.
 12. Steel RGD, Torrie JH. Principles and Procedur of statistic. McGraw Hill Book Co.Inc.New York; c1991.
 13. Syarief WN. Fertilization Fundamentals. CV. Bina Aksara Publisher, Jakarta; c1986.
 14. Tifani AA, Suarna IW, Dan NM Witariadi. Effect of substitution of urea fertilizer with bio slurry and cow dung slurry on the growth and production of *heteropogon contortus* grass. e- Journal Peternakan Tropika; c2018, 6(1).
 15. Witariadi NM, Dan NNC, Kusumawati. Productivity of *Panicum maximum* grass fertilized with different types and dosage of bio slurry. *Pastura*. 2018;8(2):98-102.
 16. Witariadi NM, Dan NN Candraasih Kusumawati. Effect of substitution of urea fertilizer with bio slurry fertilizer on productivity of *Panicum maximum* cv. Trichoglume grass. *Jurnal Pastura*; c2019, 8(2).
 17. Wahyuni SS, Budiasa IKM, Dan IW Suarna. Substitution of urea fertilizer with cow bio-slurry fertilizer on the growth and production of *Stenotaphrum secundatum* grass. E-Jurnal Peternakan Tropical; c2018, 6(2).