



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2022; SP-11(4): 383-387  
© 2022 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
Received: 10-02-2022  
Accepted: 13-03-2022

**KS Bhargav**  
Senior Scientist, KVK,  
RVSKVV, Dewas,  
Madhya Pradesh, India

**Nishith Gupta**  
Scientist, KVK, RVSKVV,  
Dewas, Madhya Pradesh, India

**AK Dixit**  
Principal Scientist, KVK,  
RVSKVV, Agar Malwa, Madhya  
Pradesh

**SS Dhakad**  
Scientist, KVK, RVSKVV,  
Shajapur, Madhya Pradesh,  
India

## Enhancing the kabuli gram productivity through suitable technological interventions with furrow irrigated raised bed system

**KS Bhargav, Nishith Gupta, AK Dixit and SS Dhakad**

### Abstract

The present investigation was conducted to study the performance of kabuli gram (Phule G-517) sown on Furrow irrigated Raised Bed System (FIRBS) in Dewas district of Malwa Region of Madhya Pradesh. The field experiments were conducted by Krishi Vigyan Kendra, RVSKVV, Dewas at different villages of district viz. Narana, Nanadharakhedi, Dakachya, Gorba, Amlawati, Nipaniya, Rajoda, Binjayana, Khatmba and Chhoticurlai during the rabi season of the year 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 to evaluate the productive performance of Kabuli gram under FIRBS. On the basis of three years average data, 19.89 per cent yield advantages was recorded under demonstrations with improved technological practices with FIRBS as compared to farmer's traditional way of kabuli gram cultivation. The results of economic analysis of demonstrations revealed that average higher gross return Rs.128850 per ha and net return Rs.96410/ ha as compared to farmer's practices which were Rs. 107475/ ha and Rs 77797 per ha respectively. The average higher additional net returns Rs. 18713/ha and effective gain Rs. 15876 /ha obtained under demonstrations could be due to improved technology, raised bed technique, non-monetary factors, timely operations of crop cultivation and scientific monitoring. It is concluded that the technology needs to be popularized to decrease the extension gaps, technology gap, technology index, adoptions gaps and there by yield gap so as to increase the income of farmers. The economic details of the demonstrations give us a green signal to further popularize them among the farming community for large scale adoption.

**Keywords:** FIRBS, Phule G-517, Kabuli gram, FLD

### 1. Introduction

Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L) is the most important pulse crop of India contributing about 30% of total pulse acreage and about 40% of total pulse production of the nation. India ranked first in area and production in the world, followed by Pakistan, Australia and Iran. The highest productivity of 6120 kg/ha is observed in Isreal followed by Yemen, Canada and Egypt. India productivity was 920 kg/ha yields (Tiware and Shivhare, 2016) [17]. MP is the largest producer of chickpea in India which contributes about 39 per cent followed by state Maharashtra (14%) and Rajasthan state (14%) (Kumar, *et al.* 2011.) [5]. In several chickpea producing state Andhra Pradesh registered highest productivity 1559 kg/ha followed by Bihar 894 kg/ha, Gujarat 850 kg/ha and Madhya Pradesh 711.8 kg/ha (Anonymous 2011) [1].

The district level highest contribution in production of Kurnool, AP (2.56%) followed by Vidisha (2.07%), Sagar (1.99%) of M.P.state. Dewas district has 6<sup>th</sup> rank (1.33%) at the national level. District-wise area, production and yield of top ten district of India in respect of production are presented below which contributed 15.24 per cent and 18.86 per cent of total area and production of chickpea in the country. The yield was revealed that the potential districts yield is higher than the National average yield. While district Dewas (Madhya Pradesh) have more productivity of Chickpea 1511 kg/ha as compared to M.P. State and national level. Although the yield potential of chickpea varieties is about 2500 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The gap between present productivity and potential of variety may be due Adoption of traditional farming system, non-adoption of recommended production technologies due to lack of knowledge and conviction about latest technologies, major abiotic and biotic stresses. Thus, it can be inferred that front-line demonstration is an effective extension intervention to demonstrate the production potential of improved technologies in Chickpea crop on farmers' field. Therefore, it is recommended that the extension agencies engaged in transfer and application of agricultural technologies on farmer's field should give priority to organize frontline demonstrations for harnessing the productivity potential of chickpea crop, reduce the

**Corresponding Author**  
**KS Bhargav**  
Senior Scientist, KVK,  
RVSKVV, Dewas,  
Madhya Pradesh, India

technology gap, technology adoption and minimizing the disease and insect infestation.

In recent years, FIRBS has proved to be one of the important components of low cost sustainable production system. This planting system facilitates mechanical weed control, increased water use efficiency, reduced crop lodging and has lower seed requirement (Sayre, 2000)<sup>[8]</sup> and (Yadav *et al.*, 2002)<sup>[21]</sup>. In this system, water moves horizontally from the furrows into the beds (subbing) and is pulled upwards in the bed towards the soil surface by capillarity, evaporation and transpiration, and downwards largely by gravity. Raised bed planting of cereals, pulses and vegetables, on an average, increased yield by 24.2 per cent and saving of irrigation water by 31.2 per cent (Connor *et al.*, 2003)<sup>[3]</sup>. The major concern of this system is to enhance the productivity and save the irrigation water. Potential agronomic advantages of beds include improved soil structure due to reduced compaction through controlled trafficking, reduced water logging and timely machinery operations due to better surface drainage. Beds also create the opportunity for mechanical weed control and improved fertilizer placement (Singh *et al.*, 2002)<sup>[10]</sup>. Hence, the present investigation was, therefore conducted to study the performance of kabuli gram sown on Furrow irrigated Raised Bed System (FIRBS) in Malwa Region of Madhya Pradesh. Scientists of Krishi Vigyan Kendra, RVSKVV, Dewas were laid out the demonstrations on farmers field to initiated and disseminated the new variety of Kabuli gram Phule G-517 with new technology of Sowing Furrow Irrigated Raised Bed System (FIRBS).

## 2. Material and Methods

The field experiments were conducted by Krishi Vigyan Kendra, RVSKVV, Dewas at different villages of district viz. Narana, Nanadharakhedi, Dakachya, Gorba, Amlawati, Nipaniya, Rajoda, Binjayana, Khatmba and Chhoticurlai during the rabi season of the year 2015-16, 2016-17 and 2017-18 to evaluate the productive performance of Kabuli Gram under FIRBS. The village Narana, Dakachya, Rajoda and Nanadharakhedi situated in the block Sonkutch, Khatmba, Amlawati, Nipaniya, Binjayana and Chhoti churlai, comes in the block Dewas, while Gorba in Tonkkhurd block of the Dewas district. Total 33 demonstrations were conducted in 10 villages of 3 blocks. The climate of the region is tropical sub-humid receiving an annual rainfall of 1067 mm with maximum and minimum temperature of 45 °C and 5 °C, respectively. The soils of experiment sites were medium black soil with pH 7.5 to 7.8, organic carbon (0.28 to 0.40%) at the time of initiation of field experiment. On soil fertility account, it was low in available N (178 kg/ha), medium in P (17.2 kg/ha) and K (340 kg/ha) and S (13.8 kg/ha).

Before conducting the demonstrations a list of farmer prepared by group meeting and specific skill training was imparted to the selected farmers regarding different aspects of kabuli gram cultivation. In the demonstration one control plot was also kept where farmer practice was carried out.

The technological interventions were comprised of suitable improved varieties of kabuli gram that was Phule G-517 with full package of practices viz. proper tillage, proper seed rate, time of sowing and sowing on FIRBS, balanced dose of fertilizer (20 kg Nitrogen 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, 20 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha), Trichoderma and Rhizobium culture @ 5 gm/kg of seed as seed treatment, proper irrigation, weed management and improved plant protection measure were applied (Table 1) at

farmers' fields. The field was prepared and trapezoidal shape raised beds were made mechanically by tractor driven furrow irrigated raised bed planter. The experiments were conducted at 33 farmers' field and area of each field was kept 4000 sq m. The width of bed was kept 50 to 55 cm with two rows (at 40 to 45 cm distance) of kabuli gram on each raised bed. Recommended seed rate 80 kg/ha was used for sowing. First irrigation was applied at the time of branching (35-40 d after sowing) and second irrigation was at the stage of pod formation (90-95 d after sowing) through the furrow. But in the control plot where farmers practices were carried out (use of non-descriptive variety like dollar, sowing by simple seed drill, imbalance use of fertilizer, no weeding and indiscriminate use of plant protection measures).

The demonstrations on farmers' fields were monitored by respective scientists of krishi Vigyan Kendra from sowing to harvesting and made to guide them for timely application of important inputs and crop management. The relevant extension activities like field days at the demonstration site were organized These visits were also utilized to collect data, feedback information for further improvement in research and extension programme. Data of plant height, no of branches per plant, no of pods per plant, no of plants per sq mt, grain yield, biological yield were recorded from demonstrations field and control plot by random crop cutting method and analyzed with suitable statistical tool.

The data on production cost and monetary returns were collected from both the demonstrations and control plots to work out the economic feasibility of the technology. Cost of cultivation was calculated on the basis of prevailing rate of inputs. Gross income was calculated by yield multiplied with sale rate of produce. Net income and benefit cost ratio was computed by the following formula.

Net income = Gross income – Cost of cultivation

$$\text{Benefit cost ratio} = \frac{\text{Gross income}}{\text{Cost of cultivation}}$$

The technology gaps, extension gaps and technology index were calculated as per following formula given by Samui *et al.* (2000)<sup>[9]</sup>.

Technology Gap = Potential yield – Demonstration yield

Extension gap = Demonstration yield – Farmers yield (Control Plot)

$$\text{Technology Index} = \frac{(Y_i^* - Y_i)}{Y_i^*} \times 100$$

Where, Y<sub>i</sub>\* = Potential of the Crop

Y<sub>i</sub> = Demonstration yield of Crop

Additional Cost, Additional Return and Effective Gain were calculated as per following formula given by Singh *et al.* (2019)<sup>[14]</sup>.

Additional cost in improved technology (Rs/ha) = Cit-Cfp

Where, Cit = Cost of improved technology (Rs/ha)

Cfp = Cost of farmers practice (Rs/ha)

Additional returns (Rs/ha) = Nrit - Nrfp

Where, Nrit = Net returns of improved technology (Rs/ha)

Nrfp = Net returns of farmers practice (Rs/ha)

Effective gain (Rs/ha) = Additional returns – Additional cost of improved technology

### 3. Results and Discussion

The gap between the existing and recommended technologies of kabuli gram in was presented in table-1. Full gap was observed in case of use of variety, seed rate, method of sowing and partial gap was observed in Sowing time, fertilizer application, Irrigation, weed management and plant protection measures. This definitely was the reason of not achieving potential yield. Farmers were not aware about recommended technologies. Farmers in general used

unidentified varieties instead of the recommended high yielding resistant varieties. Unavailability of seed in time and lack of awareness were the main reasons. Farmers applied higher seed rate than the recommended and they were not using seed treatment technique for the management of seed born diseases and also not aware the application of micronutrient i.e. ammonium molybdate for enhancement of yield, because of lack of knowledge and interest.

**Table 1:** Differences between technological intervention and farmers practices

| Particular                | Technological Interventions                                                                                  | Existing Farmers Practices          | Gap     |
|---------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------|
| Variety                   | Phule G- 517 (Kripa)                                                                                         | Doller (Unidentified Variety)       | Full    |
| Seed Rate                 | 80 kg/ha                                                                                                     | 125 kg/ha                           | Full    |
| Seed Treatment            | <i>Trichoderma</i> powder and <i>Rhizobium</i> culture @ 5 g/kg seed and Ammonium Molybdate @ 1 g/kg seed    | Seed Treatment by chemical          | Full    |
| Time of Sowing            | 15 October to 15 November                                                                                    | First Fortnight of October          | Partial |
| Sowing Method             | Furrow Irrigated Raised Bed System                                                                           | Seed Drill                          | Full    |
| Fertilizer Application    | N:P:K 20:60:20 Kg/ha                                                                                         | Imbalance use of fertilizer         | Partial |
| Irrigation                | I <sup>st</sup> at the Time of Braching (40 to 45 DAS) II <sup>nd</sup> at the Pod Filling stage (75-80 DAS) | No consideration of Critical stages | Partial |
| Weed Control              | Pendimethalin 30% EC @ 3.3 lit./ha + One hand weeding at 60 days after sowing                                | Improper chemical weed Control      | Partial |
| Plant protection Measures | Need based Plant protection measures profenophos @ 750 to 800 ml/ha)                                         | Injudicious Use of Insecticide      | Partial |

The perusal of data given in table 2 reveals that the yield of kabuli gram fluctuated successively over the years in demonstration plots. During 2015-16 to 2017-18 the average demonstration yield was recorded to be 17.18 q/ha, it was noted highest yield 17.66 q/ha during 2017-18. The increase in percentage of yield was ranging between 14.58 to 26.14 during three years of study. On the basis of three years, 19.89 per cent yield advantages was recorded under demonstrations with improved technological practices with FIRBS as compared to farmer’s traditional way of kabuli gram cultivation. The results clearly speak the positive effects of improved technologies over the exiting practices towards enhancing the yield of kabuli gram. The significantly average number of pods /plant (51.4), number of plant/sq m (37.3), straw yield (17.18 q/ha) and, biological yield (35.54 q/ha) were observed under recommended practices with furrow

irrigated raised bed system with as compared to farmers conventional practices number of pod /plant (41.8), number of plant/sq m (32.4), straw yield (15.21) and biological yield (29.54 q/ha). Positively response of FIRBS technique was observed which improves the aeration and biological activities within the soil and improvement of nutrient holding capacity with the incorporation of biofertilizer was corroborated with the earlier findings of (Aulakh and Malhi 2005) [2]. The year-to-year fluctuations in yield and cost of cultivation can be explained on the basis of variations in prevailing social, economical and revailing microclimatic condition of that particular village. Yield enhancement in different crops in Front Line Demonstration has been also documented by Haque (2000) [4], Tiwari and Saxena (2001) [16], Tiwari *et al.*, (2003) [18], Tomer *et al.*, (2003) [19] and Singh *et al.* (2019) [11].

**Table 2:** Effect of package of practices on yield parameters of Kabuli Gram.

| Year     | No of Demonstration | Variety                       |             | Yield (q/ha) |       | Increasing in yield (%) | No of Plant / sq m |      | No of Pods / plant |      | Straw Yield (q/ha) |       | Biological Yield (q/ha) |       |
|----------|---------------------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|-------------------------|--------------------|------|--------------------|------|--------------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|
|          |                     | FP                            | RP          | FP           | RP    |                         | FP                 | RP   | FP                 | RP   | FP                 | RP    | FP                      | RP    |
| 2015 -16 | 10                  | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 14.75        | 16.90 | 14.58                   | 32.8               | 36.5 | 42.6               | 50.9 | 16.85              | 19.24 | 31.6                    | 36.14 |
| 2016 -17 | 15                  | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 14.25        | 16.98 | 19.16                   | 32.6               | 37.3 | 42.2               | 50.3 | 15.25              | 20.01 | 29.5                    | 36.99 |
| 2017 -18 | 8                   | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 14.00        | 17.66 | 26.14                   | 31.9               | 38.2 | 40.6               | 52.9 | 13.52              | 15.83 | 27.52                   | 33.49 |
| Mean     |                     |                               |             | 14.33        | 17.18 | 19.89                   | 32.4               | 37.3 | 41.8               | 51.4 | 15.21              | 18.36 | 29.54                   | 35.54 |

**Table 3:** Statistical analysis of Yield and Yield attributes of demonstration over farmer’s practices

| Treatment   | Yield (q/ha) | No of Plant / sq m | No of Pods / plant | Straw Yield (q/ha) | Biological Yield (q/ha) |
|-------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| RP          | 17.18        | 37.4               | 51.4               | 18.36              | 35.54                   |
| FP          | 14.33        | 32.4               | 41.8               | 15.21              | 29.54                   |
| SEm+        | 0.44         | 0.78               | 1.14               | 0.93               | 0.79                    |
| CD (P=0.05) | 1.27         | 2.23               | 3.28               | 2.68               | 2.29                    |

The technology gap shows the gap in the demonstration yield over potential yield and The results revealed that the average technology gap was recorded 0.82 which was maximum in

2015-16 (1.1 q/ha) and minimum in the year 2017-18 (0.34 q/ha) showed in Table 4 The trend reflects the farmers' cooperation in carrying out such demonstrations with

encouraging results in subsequent years. The demonstrations were laid down under the supervision of KVK Scientist at the farmer's field. The technology gap observed may be attributed

to the dissimilarity in soil fertility status and weather condition. Similarly result also observed by Mokidue *et al.* (2011)<sup>[6]</sup> and Tomar *et al.* (2011)<sup>[20]</sup>.

**Table 4:** Gap in grain yield production of kabuli gram under demonstration

| Year    | Variety                       |             | Yield (q/ha) |       | Potential Yield (q/ha) | Technology Gap (q/ha) | Extension Gap (q/ha) | Technology Index (%) |
|---------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------|-------|------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|         | FP                            | RP          | FP           | RP    |                        |                       |                      |                      |
| 2015-16 | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 14.75        | 16.9  | 18                     | 1.1                   | 2.15                 | 6.11                 |
| 2016-17 | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 14.25        | 16.98 | 18                     | 1.02                  | 2.73                 | 5.67                 |
| 2017-18 | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 14.00        | 17.66 | 18                     | 0.34                  | 3.66                 | 1.89                 |
| Average |                               |             | 14.33        | 17.18 | 18.00                  | 0.82                  | 2.85                 | 4.56                 |

Extension gap is a parameter to know the yield differences between the demonstrated technology and farmer's practice. The extension gap showed an increasing trend and observed data depicted in table 4. The extension gap are ranging between 2.15 to 3.66 q/ha during the period of study emphasizes the need to educate the farmers through various means for the adoption of improved Agriculture production to reverse the trend of wide extension gap. More and more use of new HYV's by the farmers will subsequently change this alarming trend of galloping extension gap. The new technologies will eventually lead to the farmers to disenchantment discontinuance of unidentified variety with the new technology. The results are in agreement with research worker Patel *et al.*, (2013), who stated that, location-based problem identification and thereby specific interventions may have great implications in the enhancement

of crop productivity.

The ratio between technology gap and potential yield expressed as percentage is technology index. The technology index showed the feasibility of the evolved technology at the farmer's fields. Higher technology index reflected the insufficient extension services for transfer of technology. The lower value of technology index shows the efficacy of good performance of technological interventions. The average technology index was observed 4.65 per cent under demonstration (Table 4). This variation indicates that result differ according soil fertility status, weather condition, non availability of irrigation water and insect-pests attack in the crop. The results of the present study are in consonance with the findings of Singh *et al.*, (2007)<sup>[13]</sup>, Patel *et al.*, (2013)<sup>[7]</sup> Singh (2015)<sup>[12]</sup> and Singh, *et al.*, (2019)<sup>[11]</sup>.

**Table 5:** Economic performance of the recommended practices over farmer's practices

| Year    | Variety                       |             | Cost of Cultivation (Rs) |       | Gross Return (Rs) |        | Net Return (Rs) |       | Additional Cost (Rs) | Additional Return (Rs) | Effective Gain (Rs) | B:C Ratio |      |
|---------|-------------------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------|-------------------|--------|-----------------|-------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------|-----------|------|
|         | FP                            | RP          | FP                       | RP    | FP                | RP     | FP              | RP    |                      |                        |                     | FP        | RP   |
| 2015-16 | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 29558                    | 32170 | 110625            | 126750 | 81067           | 94580 | 2612                 | 13513                  | 10901               | 3.74      | 3.94 |
| 2016-17 | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 29801                    | 32550 | 106875            | 127350 | 77074           | 94800 | 2749                 | 17726                  | 14977               | 3.59      | 3.91 |
| 2017-18 | Unidentified Variety (Doller) | Phule G-517 | 29750                    | 32600 | 105000            | 132450 | 75250           | 99850 | 2850                 | 24600                  | 21750               | 3.53      | 4.06 |
| Average |                               |             | 29703                    | 32440 | 107475            | 128850 | 77797           | 96410 | 2737                 | 18613                  | 15876               | 3.62      | 3.97 |

The input and output prices of commodities prevailed during each year of demonstration were taken for calculating cost of cultivation, net return and benefit cost ratio (Table 5). The data revealed that, monetary returns were directly influenced by the market price of kabuli gram and cost of production during the successive years of demonstrations. Different variables like seed, fuel, fertilizers, bio-fungicide, bio-insecticide, weedicide and chemical pesticides were considered as a technological intervention and on an average an additional average investment of Rs. 2737 was made under demonstration.

The results of economic analysis of demonstrations revealed that average higher gross return Rs.128850 per ha and net return Rs.96410/ ha as compared to farmer's practices which were Rs. 107475/ ha and Rs 77797 per ha respectively. The average higher additional net returns Rs. 18713/ha and effective gain Rs. 15876 /ha obtained under demonstrations could be due to improved technology, raised bed technique, non-monetary factors, timely operations of crop cultivation and scientific monitoring. Analysis of the yield performance also revealed that cost benefit ratio of demonstration plots were observed significantly higher (3.94, 3.91 and 4.06) than farmers practices 3.74, 3.59 and 3.53 respectively during

2015-16 to 2017-18. Hence, favorable cost benefit ratios proved the economic viability of the intervention made under demonstration and convinced the farmers on the utility of intervention. Similar findings were reported by Singh *et al.*, (2007)<sup>[13]</sup>, Patel *et al.*, (2013)<sup>[7]</sup>, Singh (2015)<sup>[12]</sup>.

#### 4. Conclusion

Organization of frontline demonstration is good practice to influence not only the participating farmers but also the neighboring farmers. As the demonstrations are conducted under the supervision of the scientist in farmers' fields, they are more authentic and results could to generalized to that vicinity. The demonstrated improved practices are superior when compared to farmers practice. The farmers expressed positive attitude towards the demonstrations through their perception on the technology. There was an extension gap between technological intervention and existing practices in kabuli gram production technology due to lack of knowledge and conviction of improved technologies. Technology and extension gap showed that the farmers were not aware about improved package and practices of kabuli gram production technologies; therefore it is recommended that the farmers should be aware for adoption of improved technologies and

varieties through various extension aids (training, demonstration *etc.*). The technology index shows the feasibility of the technology demonstrated at farmer's field. The lower technology index showed that the good performance of technological intervention. So, it is concluded that the technology needs to be popularized to decrease the extension gaps, technology gap, technology index, adoptions gaps and there by yield gap so as to increase the income of farmers. The economic details of the demonstrations give us a green signal to further popularize them among the farming community for large scale adoption. Therefore, under this situation, extension agencies can also play a significant role to transfer improved technologies among farming communities for sustainable production and productivity. Thus, it can be said, that the adoption of improved package of practices of kabuli gram production technology may result in higher productivity per unit area.

## 5. References

1. Anonymous. Area, production and productivity of major pulses. Agropedia, 2011.
2. Aulakh MS, Malhi SS. Interactions of nitrogen with other nutrients and water effect on crop yield and quality, nutrient use efficiency carbon sequestration and environmental pollution. *Advances Agronomy*. 2005;86:341-409.
3. Connor DJ, Gupta RK, Hobbs PR, Sayre KD. Bed planting in rice-wheat system. In: Addressing resource conservation issues in rice-wheat system of south Asia: A Resource book, 2003, 103-108
4. Haque MS. Impact of compact block demonstration on increase in productivity of rice. *Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education*. 2000;19(1):22-27
5. Kumar S, Sharma RC, Tripathi PN. Adoption of Storage and Grading Technology by Chickpea Growers of Harda (MP), *Journal of Extension Education*. 2011;16(1&2):45-48. <http://www.commoditiescontrol.com>
6. Mokidue L, Mohanty AK, Sanjay K. Correlating growth, yield and adoption of urd been technologies. *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2011;11(2):20-24.
7. Patel MM, Jhaharia AK, Khadda BS, Patil LM. Frontline demonstration: An effective communication approach for dissemination of sustainable cotton production technology. *Ind. J Extn.Edu. & R.D.* 2013;21:60-62.
8. Sayre K. Saving water and increasing sustainability with bed planting. *Outlook*. 2000;1:5.
9. Samui SK, Maitra S, Roy DK, Mandal AK, Saha D. Evaluation on front line demonstration on groundnut, *Journal of the Indian Society Coastal Agricultural Research*. 2000;18(2):180-183.
10. Singh JR, Srivastava RP, Gowai VG. Studies in nutrition of garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) with special reference to major elements. *J Sci Res Banaras Hindu University*. 2002;12:16-25.
11. Singh RK, Singh Dhananjay, Singh Richa. Accelerating the Chickpea Productivity through Suitable Technological Interventions in Vindhyan Plateau Zone of Madhya Pradesh. *Journal Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2019;55(1):(92-98).
12. Singh D. Impact of front line demonstrations on productivity of Carrot in Dholpur district of Eastern Rajasthan. *Ind. J Extn. Edu. & R.D.* 2015;7(2&3):94-95.
13. Singh DK, Gautam US, Singh RK. Study on yield gap and level of demonstrated crop production technology in Sagar district. *Ind. Res. J Extn. Edu.* 2007;7(2&3):94-95.
14. Singh Mamta, Dwivedi AP, Yadav KS. Gaps in pulses production in Vindhya Pleatue Agroclimatic zone of Madhya Pradesh: An assessment through frontier technology, *Indian Journal of Extension Education*. 2019;55(1):39-42.
15. Singh Om, Singh RP, Richa Singh, Dinesh Singh. Yield Gap Analysis of Potato through Front Line Demonstration, *Journal of Community Mobilization and Sustainable Development*. 2016;11(1):53-56.
16. Tiwari KB, Saxena L. Economic Analysis of FLD of oil seeds in Chindwara. *Bhartiya Krishi Anusandhan Patrika*. 2001;16(3&4):185-189.
17. Tiwari AK, Shivhare AK. Pulses in India: retrospect and prospects. Publication No.: DPD/Pub.1/Vol. 2/2016
18. Tiwari RB, Singh V, Parihar P. Role of front line demonstration in transfer of gram production technology. Maharashtra. *Journal of Extension Education*. 2003;22(1):19-20.
19. Tomer LS, Sharma PB, Joshi K. Study on yield gap and adaptation level of potato production technology in gird region. *Maharashtra Journal of Extension Education*. 2003;22(1):15-18.
20. Tomar RKS. Maxmization of productivity for chick pea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) through improved technologies in farmer's field. *Indian Journal of Natural Products and Resources*. 2010;1(4):515-7.
21. Yadav A, Malik RK, Chauhan BS, Kumar V, Banga RS, Singh S, *et al.* Feasibility of raising wheat on furrow irrigated raised beds in South Western Haryana. *International Workshop Proc. Herbicide Resistance Management and Zero Tillage in Rice Wheat Cropping System*. 2002, 201-206.