

# GLOBAL PARTNERSHIP ON NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT

## BMP Case Study

---

### Overview

*Name:* The Right Source and Rate of Potassium (K) for Processing Tomatoes

*Location/Terrain:* Xinjiang, China

*Crop(s):* Tomatoes

*Nutrient(s):* Potassium (K)

*Rationale:* Due to years of omission of K in nutrient management in production of tomatoes in the region, yields were restricted by inadequate K.



---

### Issue(s) of Concern/Challenges:

Farmers often omitted K in nutrient management in the production of tomato crops for years, leading to significant soil K depletion and decreased soil K availability. Therefore, the yield and benefit of processing tomatoes in the northwestern province is often restricted by inadequate K nutrition.

### Practice Description:

Test different types of K fertilizer to see which one increases yields in a cost-effective manner.

### Practice Objectives:

Find both the most cost-effective and yield maximizing K containing fertilizer

### Outcomes:

The most common sources of K fertilizer are KCL, KH<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub>, KNO<sub>3</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>. It was concluded that KCL was the most economical source of K.

### Significance:

The use of KCL resulted in an increase in yields and profit.

---

## Data/Graphs:

Table 1. Effect of different sources of K on yield and benefit of processing tomatoes in Xinjiang (2004-2005) (Hu et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2008).

K source	2004				2005	
	Toutunhe farm 1		Toutunhe farm 5		Toutunhe farm 5	
	Yield, kg/ha	Income from K application, \$/ha	Yield, kg/ha	Income from K application, \$/ha	Yield, kg/ha	Income from K application, \$/ha
KCl	78,510	1,144	63,225	655	97,366	407
K <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub>	73,350	972	57,900	478	90,725	143
K <sub>2</sub> SO <sub>4</sub> ·2MgSO <sub>4</sub>					90,862	130

Table 2. Effect of different sources of K on yield and benefit of processing tomatoes in Xinjiang (2004-2005) (Hu et al., 2007; Zhang et al., 2008).

	K <sub>2</sub> O rate, kg/ha	Yield t/ha	Lycopene, mg/100g	Solids, %	Vitamin C, mg/100g	Income from fertilizer application, \$***
2003*	0	86.1 b**			10.5	
	90	92.6 b			19.2	159
	180	101.3 a			11.1	388
	270	91.7 b			9.2	11
2004*	0	95.1 b	6.1	8.9	8.0	
	90	98.8 b	8.0	8.9	8.3	64
	180	109.0 a	10.5	10.5	9.7	341
	270	95.4 b	8.6	8.5	8.9	-164



For more information, please contact Chuck Chaitovitz at [chuck.chaitovitz@gef.org](mailto:chuck.chaitovitz@gef.org) or visit [www.gpa.unep.org/index.php/global-partnership-on-nutrient-management](http://www.gpa.unep.org/index.php/global-partnership-on-nutrient-management).

- Cheng, X.J., J. Wang, X.P. Huang, C. Li, L.P. Tian, L. Xue, and J.R. Zhao. 2007. *J. Anhui Agri. Sci.* 35(35): 11509-11511. (In Chinese).  
 Hu, W., Y. Zhang, H.Y. Wang, G.H. Qi, and L.C. Yang. 2007. *Xinjiang Agri. Sci.* 44 (4): 494-497. (In Chinese).  
 Tang, M.Y., Y. Zhang, and W. Hu. 2009. *Soil Fert. Sci. China*, 3: 26-30. (In Chinese).  
 Zhang, Y., H.G. Ma, W.L. Xu, H.Y. Wang, G.H. Qi, and L.C. Yang. 2008. *Soil Fert. Sci. China*. 3: 40-51. (In Chinese).  
 Zhang X.L., H.G. Ma, L. Zhao. 2002. *Xinjiang Agri. Sci.* 39 (5): 278-282. (In Chinese).  
 Tang M.R., Y. Zhang, W. Hu, G.Z. Hu, Q.J. Li, Y.K. Yao, Y. Gao. 2010. *Plant Nutr. Fert. Sci.* 16(5): 1238-1245. (In Chinese).