

Effect of FYM, Phosphorus and PSB on growth, yield attributes, yield and economics of *Kharif* Green gram (*Vignaradiata* (L.) Wilczek).

Abstract

A field experiment was carried out during *Kharif* 2020 and 2021 at Kanpur, India to find out the effect of FYM, phosphorus and PSB on growth and yield of Green gram variety Shweta. There were twenty treatment combinations of 4 levels of FYM t ha⁻¹: control (F₀), 1.0 t (F₁), 2.0 t (F₂), and 3.0 t (F₃), and 5 levels of phosphorus kg ha⁻¹ and PSB viz., PSB only (P₁), 20 kg P₂O₅ (P₂), 20 kg P₂O₅ + PSB (P₃), 40 kg P₂O₅ (P₄) and 40 kg P₂O₅ + PSB (P₅) laid out in Factorial Randomized Block Design and replicated thrice. The FYM, phosphorus, and PSB were applied as per treatment. The higher growth attributes and number of pods per plant, pod weight plant⁻¹, test weight, seed yield, gross income, net income and B:C ratio were recorded with 3t FYM/ha among the FYM levels and 40 kg P₂O₅ /ha + PSB among the levels of PSB and phosphorus.

Keywords: Economics FYM, Green gram, Phosphorus, PSB, Yield

1. INTRODUCTION

Green gram [*Vignaradiata*(L.)Wilczek] is one of the important pulse crops grown in the arid and semi-arid regions of India. It is basically a short duration *kharif* pulse crop and can also be grown as catch crop between *rabi* and *kharif* seasons. Being a leguminous crop, it can fix atmospheric nitrogen. Its green plants are used as fodder after removing the mature pods. In India, Green gram occupies 34.37 lakh ha area and contributes to 17.83 lakh tonnes in pulse production (Anonymous, 2019-20). In, Uttar Pradesh the total area under Green gram was 0.49 lakh ha with an annual production of 0.14 lakh tonnes (Anonymous, 2019-20). In India, the availability of large quantity of FYM rich in organic matter necessitates the need for supplementing it with the fertilizers. Application of FYM to field crops also avoids its use for burning purposes. Indian soils are poor to medium in available phosphorus. Phosphorus is immobile in soil system and hardly 15-20 % of the applied P is utilized by a crop to which it is applied. The rest remains in a fixed state in soil. The P solubilizing microorganisms can mineralize organic P into a soluble form. These micro-organisms render more P into solution than is required for their own growth and metabolism, the surplus is available for plants to absorb. Phosphorus (P) is one of the major essential elements required for the growth and development of the plants. Plants generally take up P in inorganic form (H₂PO₄⁻, HPO₄²⁻) from soil solution (Hocking, 2001). In leguminous crops, P promotes root nodulation, nitrogen fixation, nutrient use efficiency, efficient partitioning of photosynthesis between source and sink, and biomass production (Rao, 2009). The non-availability of fertilizers at economic prices is another problem for the farmers. Under these circumstances, a system comprising balanced use of fertilizer along with multinutrient organic manures and low cost bio fertilizer needs to be evolved. Keeping the above facts in view a present investigation was planned and carried out at the C.S. Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur during *kharif* 2020 and 2021 to study the effect of FYM, phosphorus and PSB on growth and yield attributes, yield and economics of Green gram.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was carried out at C.S. Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur during *khariif* 2020 and 2021. The soil of the experimental area was sandy loam in texture, slightly alkaline in reaction (pH 7.7, 7.8), low in organic carbon (0.41, 0.42 %) and available N (184.5, 186.0 kg ha⁻¹), medium in available P (16.53, 16.9 kg ha⁻¹) and available K (149.36 151.3 kg ha⁻¹) in 2020 and 2021, respectively. The treatments comprised of combinations of 4 levels of FYM viz., control (F₀), 1.0 t/ha (F₁), 2.0 t/ha (F₂), and 3.0 t/ha (F₃), and 5 levels of phosphorus and PSB viz., PSB only (P₁), 20 kg P₂O₅/ha (P₂), 20 kg P₂O₅/ha + PSB (P₃), 40 kg P₂O₅/ha (P₄) and 40 kg P₂O₅/ha + PSB (P₅) laid out in Factorial Randomized Block Design and replicated thrice. The Green gram variety shweta was used during both years. The crop was sown in lines 45 cm apart with a plant to plant distance of 10 cm using a seed rate of 15 kg/ha.

The dry matter accumulation was recorded from five plants sampled from third row of each plot leaving 0.5 m row length both side as border. The sampled plants cut close to the ground, dried in hot air oven at 60 °C till constant weight. Nodules collected from five sample plants were dried in open for two days and then dried in oven at 65 °C for 36 hours for recording dry weight. The number of branches was counted on tagged plants and average number of branches per plant was calculated. Yield attributes viz. number of pods/plant, pod weight/plant, seeds/pod were recorded from 5 sampled plants. One thousand grain from each treatment were collected at the time of threshing, counted and weighed and recorded as thousand grain weight. Before threshing, bundle weight in each net plot was taken with the help of spring dial balance. The figures were converted into kg ha⁻¹. After threshing, winnowing and cleaning, seed yield of each net plot was weighed and converted into kg ha⁻¹. Grain yield from each net plot was subtracted from the biological yield to get stover yield per net plot. The harvest index was also recorded by dividing the economic yield by the biological yield. The common cost of cultivation of Green gram was worked out considering the prevailing market rates of different inputs and operations. Then the cost of each treatment was added to common cost and thus total cost of cultivation for each treatment was worked out and recorded (Rs ha⁻¹). The income received from grain and straw in each treatment were added together to get gross income under different treatments. The cost of cultivation of each treatment was subtracted from gross income of respective treatments and recorded as net profit. The total gross return was divided by total cost of cultivation to get return per rupee of investment.

The data recorded on different crop characters during two years of experimentation were subjected to statistical analysis. Year wise analysis was done as suggested by (Gomez and Gomez 1984) and subsequently pooled over years after testing the homogeneity of error variances of two years. Statistical analysis was done with the help of window-based SPSS (Statistical Product and Service Solutions) Version 10.0, SPSS, Chicago, IL Software on computer.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Growth Attributes

The higher number of plants/meter was recorded at 40 kg P₂O₅ + PSB in both the years and pooled. The interaction effect among FYM levels and Phosphorus levels and PSB was non-significant (Table 1). It might be due to fact that the experimental crop was sown with uniform seed rate at uniform row spacing under same climatic condition. Similar observations were also made by Keerthiet *al.* (2015) and Rekhaet *al.* (2018). The dry weight (g) at maturity was significantly affected by different doses of FYM, Phosphorus and PSB. The interactions were however non significant. At maturity higher dry matter/plant was recorded in 3t FYM/ha (11.59 g) and it being at par with 2t FYM/ha was significantly superior to 1 t FYM/ha and control. Similar findings were reported by Kataraet *al.* (2022). Further the highest dry matter accumulation plant⁻¹ (11.31 g) was recorded in 40 kg P₂O₅/ha + PSB and it being at par with 40 kg P₂O₅/ha alone was significantly superior to 20 kg P₂O₅/ha + PSB, 20 kg P₂O₅/ha and PSB alone in both the years and in pooled analysis. It might be due to favorable condition for regulating the metabolic and enzymatic process in plants as reported by Aslam *et al.* (2010), Chestiet *al.*(2012), Verma *et al.*(2017) and Patel *et al.* (2018). The number of branches plant⁻¹ was also influenced significantly under different treatments of FYM and different levels of phosphorus and PSB. However their interaction effect was non-significant. The highest number of branches plant⁻¹ was recorded with the application of FYM 3t/ha (4.95) and it was significantly superior to rest of the treatments. The application of 2t FYM/ha was also significantly superior than 1t/ha FYM and control. Similar finding were also reported by Choudharyet *al.* (2011) and Hossain *et al.* (2018). Further the highest number of branches plant⁻¹ at maturity was recorded in 40 kg P₂O₅ + PSB (4.52) and it being at par with 40 kg P₂O₅/ha alone and 20 kg P₂O₅/ha + PSB was significantly superior over 20 kg P₂O₅/ha and PSB alone. This might be due to application of higher doses of FYM which provide favorable condition for growth and development. The results are in agreement with those of supported by Ehsan *et al.* (2017), Kumar and Yadav, (2018) and Kumar *et al.* (2022). Dry weight of nodules plant⁻¹ (g) among the different levels of FYM, phosphorus and PSB increased upto 60 DAS was influenced significantly due to different levels of FYM, phosphorus and PSB however their interaction effect was non-significant. The highest dry weight of nodules was recorded with 3t FYM/ha (14.34 g) at 60 DAS and it was significantly superior to rest of the treatments in both the years and in pooled analysis. This was in conformity with those of Choudharyet *al.* (2011), Malik *et al.* (2014) and Sutrisno and Yusnawan, (2018). The highest dry weight of nodules was recorded with the application of 40 kg P₂O₅/ha + PSB (13.42 g) upto 60 DAS and it was significantly superior to rest of the treatments. The highest dry weight of nodules/plant might be due to favorable condition provided by FYM which increased the dry weight of nodules as reported by Singh *et al.* (2010), Maheteleet *al.*(2011), Tagore *et al.* (2013) and Rathouret *al.* (2015).

3.2 Yield attribute

The number of pods plant⁻¹, weight of pods plant⁻¹ (g), number of seeds pod⁻¹, weight of seeds plant⁻¹ (g) and test weight (g) increased significantly due to different levels of FYM, phosphorus and PSB. However their interaction effect among different levels of FYM, phosphorus and PSB was non-significant (Table 2). The highest number of pods plant⁻¹ (14.70), weight of pods plant⁻¹ (7.44 g), number of seeds pod⁻¹ (9.62), weight of seeds plant⁻¹ (4.01g) and test weight (41.36g) were recorded with 3t/ha FYM and it was significantly superior to other levels of FYM and control in both the years and in pooled analysis. The increasing doses of FYM increased number of pods plant⁻¹, weight of pods plant⁻¹ (g), number of seeds pod⁻¹, weight of seeds plant⁻¹ (g) and test weight (g) as compared to control. Similar findings are also reported by Rahman *et al.* (2008), Kumawatet *al.* (2010), Choudharyet *al.* (2011), Yadav *et al.* (2021) and Choudharyet *al.* (2022). Further the highest number of pods plant⁻¹ (13.99), weight of pods plant⁻¹ (6.57g), number of seeds pod⁻¹ (8.82), weight of seeds plant⁻¹ (3.68g) and test weight (40.85g) was recorded with application of 40 kg P₂O₅ + PSB and it was significantly superior to other doses of P₂O₅ + PSB except 40 kg P₂O₅/ha alone. The combined application of phosphorus with PSB increased number of pods plant⁻¹, weight of pods plant⁻¹ (g), number of seeds pod⁻¹, weight of seeds plant⁻¹ (g) and test weight (g) as compared to phosphorus applied alone. This increase might be due to application of higher doses of phosphorus with PSB which provided favorable condition for growth and better

development of plant by providing favorable condition for regulating the metabolic and enzymatic process in plants. Similar observations were reported by Kumawat *et al.* (2009), Piret *et al.* (2009), Singh *et al.* (2018) and Singh *et al.* (2022).

3.3 Yield

The seed yield (kg ha^{-1}), stover yield (kg ha^{-1}), biological yield (kg ha^{-1}), and harvest index (%) were influenced significantly due to different doses of FYM, phosphorus and PSB however their interaction effect was non-significant (Table 3). The highest seed yield (894 kg ha^{-1}), stover yield (1486 kg ha^{-1}), biological yield (2371 kg ha^{-1}), and harvest index (37.65%) were recorded with the application of 3t/ha FYM and it was significantly superior to lower doses of FYM and control on pooled basis. Similar findings were also reported by Kumawat *et al.* (2010), Rekha *et al.* (2018), Choudhary *et al.* (2022) and (Kumar *et al.*, 2022). The application of levels of phosphorus and PSB also influenced significantly the seed yield (825 kg ha^{-1}), stover yield (1351 kg ha^{-1}), biological yield (2171 kg ha^{-1}), and harvest index (37.98%). The application of 40 kg P_2O_5 + PSB was significantly superior to the rest of the treatments on pooled basis. It may be due to favourable condition provided by higher dose of FYM, phosphorus and PSB which increased the better growth and development of crop with better yield attributes. Similar observations were reported by Malik *et al.* (2013), Singh *et al.* (2018), Rekha *et al.* (2018) and Sharma *et al.* (2021).

3.4 Economics

The highest cost of cultivation (27955 Rs ha^{-1}), gross income (68744 Rs ha^{-1}), net income (40790 Rs ha^{-1}) and B:C (2.46) ratio were recorded with 3 t FYM/ha followed by 2 t/ha FYM and the minimum cost of cultivation was observed under control in both the years and in pooled analysis (Table 4). This may be due to positive effect of FYM on yield of crop through increased growth and yield attributes. Similar findings were also reported by Singh *et al.* (2011), Jat *et al.* (2014), Kishore *et al.* (2021) and Gurjar *et al.* (2022). However the phosphorus with and without PSB recorded increased cost of cultivation (28292 Rs ha^{-1}), gross income (63431 Rs ha^{-1}), net income (35191 Rs ha^{-1}) and B:C (2.23) ratio with the application of 40 kg P_2O_5 /ha + PSB followed by 40 kg P_2O_5 alone, 20 kg P_2O_5 /ha + PSB, 20 kg P_2O_5 alone, while the minimum was observed in PSB alone in both the years and in pooled analysis. The increase in net income and B:C ratio might be due to more output as compared to input. Similar findings were reported by Meena *et al.* (2015), Singh *et al.* (2018), Kumar and Yadav, (2018) and Teja *et al.* (2022).

Table -1 Effect of FYM, Phosphorus and PSB on growth attribute of Green gram

Treatment	Plant population per running meter			Dry weight (g) at Maturity			No. of branchesplant ⁻¹ at maturity			Dry weight of nodules plant ⁻¹ (g) at 60 DAS		
	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled
Level of FYM t ha⁻¹												
0 t ha⁻¹	10.86	10.99	10.93	10.41	10.52	10.47	3.90	3.91	3.91	11.91	11.99	11.95
1 t ha⁻¹	10.66	11.00	10.83	10.93	11.04	10.99	4.18	4.15	4.16	12.79	12.76	12.77
2 t ha⁻¹	10.73	10.86	10.80	11.17	11.30	11.23	4.48	4.47	4.48	13.27	13.26	13.27
3 t ha⁻¹	10.60	10.99	10.88	11.49	11.69	11.59	4.94	4.96	4.95	14.34	14.34	14.34
SEd ±	0.254	0.306	0.199	0.139	0.173	0.103	0.082	0.099	0.063	0.169	0.196	0.128
CD at 5%	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	0.281	0.351	0.203	0.166	0.200	0.125	0.342	0.396	0.253
Level of phosphorus and PSB												
PSB	10.50	10.91	10.71	10.70	10.85	10.77	4.14	4.15	4.15	12.63	12.69	12.66
20 Kg P₂O₅	10.75	10.75	10.75	10.94	11.09	11.02	4.36	4.35	4.35	12.85	12.76	12.80
20 Kg P₂O₅+ PSB	10.75	11.00	10.87	11.01	11.13	11.07	4.39	4.39	4.39	13.06	13.17	13.11
40 Kg P₂O₅	10.66	10.99	10.83	11.15	11.21	11.18	4.47	4.46	4.46	13.42	13.42	13.42
40 Kg P₂O₅+ PSB	10.92	11.17	11.04	11.20	11.41	11.31	4.52	4.51	4.52	13.43	13.41	13.42
SEd ±	0.284	0.342	0.222	0.155	0.173	0.115	0.092	0.110	0.071	0.189	0.219	0.143
CD at 5%	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	0.314	0.351	0.227	0.185	0.223	0.140	0.382	0.443	0.282

Table- 2 Effect of FYM, Phosphorus and PSB on yield attributes of Green gram

Treatment	Number of Pods/Plant			Weight of pod/plant (g)			Number of seed/pod			Weight of seed/plant (g)			Test weight (g)		
	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled
Level of FYM t ha⁻¹															
0 t ha ⁻¹	11.64	11.75	11.70	4.54	4.54	4.55	7.58	7.63	7.60	2.76	2.75	2.76	40.12	40.13	40.13
1 t ha ⁻¹	13.49	13.58	13.54	4.63	5.60	5.62	7.93	7.93	7.93	3.13	3.15	3.14	40.29	40.30	40.30
2 t ha ⁻¹	13.94	14.10	14.02	6.44	6.42	6.43	8.49	8.50	8.50	3.61	3.62	3.62	40.73	40.75	40.74
3 t ha ⁻¹	14.54	14.86	14.70	7.46	7.43	7.44	9.62	9.62	9.62	4.01	4.01	4.01	41.35	41.36	41.36
SEd ±	0.188	0.198	0.135	0.170	0.185	0.124	0.163	0.179	0.120	0.041	0.052	0.033	0.113	0.087	0.071
CD at 5%	0.381	0.401	0.267	0.344	0.375	0.246	0.330	0.363	0.237	0.083	0.106	0.065	0.228	0.175	0.140
Level of phosphorus and PSB															
PSB	12.85	12.98	12.91	5.31	5.32	5.31	7.94	8.01	7.97	2.99	2.99	2.99	40.30	40.31	40.31
20 Kg P ₂ O ₅	13.06	13.19	13.13	5.84	5.82	5.83	8.24	8.26	8.25	3.28	3.28	3.28	40.58	40.59	40.59
20 Kg P ₂ O ₅ + PSB	13.54	13.73	13.63	6.07	6.03	6.05	8.40	8.40	8.40	3.39	3.40	3.40	40.64	40.65	40.65
40 Kg P ₂ O ₅	13.68	13.88	13.78	6.29	6.27	6.28	8.62	8.62	8.62	3.55	3.55	3.55	40.76	40.78	40.77
40 Kg P ₂ O ₅ + PSB	13.89	14.10	13.99	6.58	6.55	6.57	8.82	8.81	8.82	3.68	3.68	3.68	40.84	40.86	40.85
SEd ±	0.210	0.221	0.151	0.190	0.207	0.139	0.182	0.201	0.134	0.046	0.059	0.037	0.126	0.097	0.079
CD at 5%	0.426	0.448	0.299	0.384	0.419	0.275	0.369	0.406	0.265	0.093	0.119	0.072	0.255	0.196	0.167

Table- 3 Effect of FYM, Phosphorus and PSB on yield of Green gram

Treatment	Seed Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)			Stover Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)			Biological Yield (kg ha ⁻¹)			Harvest Index (%)		
	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled	2020	2021	Pooled
Level of FYM t ha⁻¹												
0 t ha ⁻¹	615	616	616	1023	1030	1027	1638	1646	1642	37.54	37.41	37.47
1 t ha ⁻¹	697	701	699	1195	1163	1179	1885	1864	1874	36.98	37.60	37.29
2 t ha ⁻¹	825	793	809	1394	1335	1365	2219	2144	2182	37.15	37.70	37.43
3 t ha ⁻¹	996	891	894	1499	1473	1486	2392	2354	2371	37.44	37.85	37.65
SEd ±	1.79	2.08	1.35	2.88	3.35	2.18	3.33	3.76	2.48	0.070	0.084	0.055
CD at 5%	3.63	4.20	2.68	5.82	6.78	4.32	6.73	7.62	4.91	0.141	0.170	0.110
Level of phosphorus with PSB												
PSB	665	666	666	1141	1138	1139	1805	1791	1798	36.85	37.17	37.01
20 Kg P ₂ O ₅	734	712	723	1248	1221	1234	1982	1953	1967	37.03	37.47	37.25
20 Kg P ₂ O ₅ + PSB	766	761	764	1298	1258	1278	2060	2019	2039	37.21	37.69	37.45
40 Kg P ₂ O ₅	799	790	795	1337	1298	1318	2136	2088	2112	37.40	37.82	37.61
40 Kg P ₂ O ₅ + PSB	828	823	825	1366	1337	1351	2184	2159	2171	37.89	38.06	37.98
SEd ±	2.01	2.32	1.51	3.22	3.75	2.44	3.72	4.21	2.77	0.078	0.094	0.062
CD at 5%	4.06	4.70	3.00	6.51	7.59	4.83	7.53	8.52	5.49	0.158	0.190	0.123

4. CONCLUSION

It can be concluded from the above study that application of 3 t ha⁻¹ FYM and 40 kg P₂O₅+ PSB is optimum for higher growth and yield attributes, yield and monetary returns in Green gram.

REFERENCES

Anonymous, (2019-20). Directorate of Economics and Statistics, DAC&FW, Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Government of India, New Delhi. *Agricultural Statistics at a glance*.

Aslam, M., Hussain, N., Zubair, M., Hussain, S. B., & Baloch, M. S. (2010). Integration of organic & inorganic sources of phosphorus for increased productivity of Green gram (*Vignaradiata*). *Pak. J. Agri. Sci*, 47(2), 111-114.

Chesti, M. H., Ali, T., & Bhat, M. A. (2012). Effect of organic and inorganic phosphorus sources on quality of green gram (*Vignaradiata* L.) under temperate conditions of Jammu and Kashmir. *Legume Research: An International Journal*, 35(1).

Choudhary, B. L., Raha, P., Kundu, A., & Rani, M. (2022). Replacement of Synthetic Nitrogenous Fertilizer by Human Hair Hydrolysates in Cultivation of Green gram (*Vignaradiata* L.). *Waste and Biomass Valorization*, 1-13.

Choudhary, H. R., Sharma, O. P., Yadav, L. R., & Choudhary, G. L. (2011). Effect of organic sources and chemical fertilizers on productivity of Green gram. *Journal of Food Legumes*, 24(4), 324-326.

Ehsan, Q., Rana, D. S., & Choudhary, A. K. (2017). Effect of crop establishment methods and phosphorus nutrition on growth and productivity of Green gram (*Vignaradiata* L. Wilczek) in semi-arid Afghanistan. *Annals of Agricultural Research*, 38(2), 200-207.

Gomez KA, Gomez AA (1984). Statistical procedures for agricultural research. *John Wiley & Sons*.

Gurjar, R., Tomar, D., Singh, A., & Kumar, K. (2022). Integrated nutrient management and its effect on Green gram (*Vignaradiata* L. Wilczek): A revisit. *The Pharma Innovation Journal* 2022; 11(4): 379-384.

Hocking, P. J. (2001). Organic acids exuded from roots in phosphorus uptake and aluminum tolerance of plants in acid soils.

Hossain, M. E., Islam, M. S., & Rahaman, M. S. (2018). Growth Performance and Development Attributes of Green gram (*Vignaradiata* L.) as Influenced by Organic Manure and Inorganic Fertilizer. *Asian Journal of Advances in Agricultural Research*, 7(2), 1-13.

Jat, S. L., Prasad, K., & Parihar, C. M. (2014). Effect of organic manuring on productivity and economics of summer Green gram (*Vignaradiata* var. *radiata*). *Annals of Agricultural Research*, 33(1&2).

- Katara, A. K., Chaudhary, A. N., Chavda, M. H., &Vala, Y. B. (2022). Response of moth bean (*Vigna acconitifolia* L.) to FYM and phosphorus with and without biofertilizers and their effect on growth, yield attributes and yield. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*; 11(1): 167-173.
- Keerthi, M. M., Babu, R., Joseph, M., &Amutha, R. (2015).Optimizing plant geometry and nutrient management for grain yield and economics in irrigated greengram. *American Journal of Plant Sciences*, 6(08), 1144.
- Kishor, K., Kumar, V., Upadhaya, B., &Borpatragohain, B. (2021). Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth, yield and economics of summer Green gram (*Vignaradiata*). *The Pharma Innovation Journal*, 10(8), 978-983.
- Kumar, P., Kumar, S., Kumar, V., Dixit, V., Verma, S., & Singh, V. (2022).Zn and B Mediated Effect on Yield Attribute, Yield, and Nutrient Uptake in Lentil (*Lens culinaris* Medik.).*International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*, 34(22), 1045-1055. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2022/v34i2231468>
- Kumar, S., & Yadav, S. S. (2018).Effect of phosphorus fertilization and bio-organics on growth, yield and nutrient content of Green gram (*Vignaradiata* (L.)Wilczek). *Res J AgricSci*, 9(6), 1252-1257.
- Kumawat, N., Kumar, R., & Sharma, O. P. (2009).Nutrient uptake and yield of Green gram [*Vignaradiata* (L.)Wilczek] as influenced by organic manures, PSB and phosphorus fertilization. *Environ Ecol*, 27(4B), 2002-2005.
- Kumawat, N., Sharma, O. P., Kumar, R.&Kumari, A. (2010). Yield and yield attributes of Green gram [*Vignaradiata* (L.) Wilczek] as affected by organic manures, PSB and phosphorus fertilization. *Environ Ecol*, 28(1A), 332-335.
- Mahetele, D., &Kushwaha, H. S. (2011).Productivity and profitability of pigeonpea as influenced by FYM, PSB and phosphorus fertilization under rainfed condition. *Journal of food legumes*, 24(1), 72-74.
- Malik, J. K., Singh, R., Thenua, O. V. S., & Kumar, A. (2013). Response of pigeonpea (*Cajanuscajan*)+Green gram (*Phaseolusradiatus*) intercropping system to phosphorus and biofertilizers. *Legume Res*, 36(4), 323-330.
- Malik, M. M. R., Akhtar, M. J., Ahmad, I., & Khalid, M. (2014).Synergistic use of rhizobium, compost and nitrogen to improve growth and yield of Green gram (*Vignaradiata*). *Pak. J. Agri. Sci*, 51(1), 383-388.
- Meena, R. S., Dhakal, Y., Bohra, J. S., Singh, S. P., Singh, M. K., Sanodiya, P., &Meena, H. (2015). Influence of bioinorganic combinations on yield, quality and economics of Green gram. *Am J ExpAgric*, 8(3), 159-166.
- Patel, H. F., Maheriya, V. D., Attar, S. K., & Patel, H. R. (2018). Nutrient uptake and yield of Kharif green gram as influenced by levels of sulphur, phosphorus and PSB inoculation. *Legume Research*, 41(3), 405-409.

Pir, F. A., Nehvi, F. A., Abu-Manzar, D. S., & Allai, B. A. (2009). Integrated phosphorus management in Green gram in Kashmir valley. *Trends in Biosci*, 2(2), 25-26.

Rahman, M. M., Bhuiyan, M. M. H., Sutradhar, G. N. C., Rahman, M. M., & Paul, A. K. (2008). Effect of phosphorus, molybdenum and rhizobium inoculation on yield and yield attributes of Green gram. *Int. J. Sustain. Crop Prod*, 3(6), 26-33.

Rao, I. M. (2009). Essential plant nutrients and their functions. *CIAT working Document No.209*.

Rathour, D. K., Gupta, A. K., Choudhary, R. R., & Sadhu, A. C. (2015). Effect of integrated phosphorus management on growth, yield attributes and yield of summer green gram (*Vignaradiata* L.). *The Bioscan*, 10(1), 05-07.

Rekha, K., Pavaya, R. P., Neha, C., & Patel, S. (2018). Effect of FYM, Phosphorus and PSB on Growth, Yield and Quality of Greengram [*Vignaradiata* (L.)Wilckzek] on Loamy Sand. *International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management*, 9(2), 220-223.

Sharma, A., Pathania, P., & Sharma, M. (2021). Effect of PSB, FYM with variable levels of P on the yield attributes and productivity of black gram in Shiwalik hills of Himachal Pradesh. *FOOD LEGUMES*, 34(1), 31-37.

Singh, G., Ram, H., Sekhon, H. S., Aggarwal, N., Kumar, M., Kaur, P., ...&Sarma, P. (2011). Effect of nitrogen and phosphorus application on productivity of summer Green gram sown after wheat. *Journal of Food Legumes*, 24(4), 327-329.

Singh, G., Sekhon, H. S., Ram, H., & Sharma, P. (2010). Effect of farmyard manure, phosphorus and phosphate solubilizing bacteria on nodulation, growth and yield of kabuli chickpea. *Journal of Food Legumes*, 23(3and4), 226-229.

Singh, R., Singh, P., Singh, V., & Yadav, R. A. (2018). Effect of phosphorus and PSB on yield attributes, quality and economics of summer greengram (*Vignaradiata* L.). *Journal of pharmacognosy and phytochemistry*, 7(2), 404-408.

Singh, V., Singh, A., Verma, S., Rastogi, M., Yadav, P. K., & Kumar, V. (2022). Evaluation of Different Microbial Inoculum on Green gram (*Vignaradiata* L.) Growth, Development and Nutrient Availability. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*, 34(20), 295-301. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2022/v34i2031155>

Sutrisno, S., & Yusnawan, E. (2018). Effect of manure and inorganic fertilizers on vegetative, generative characteristics, nutrient, and secondary metabolite contents of Green gram. *Biosaintifika: Journal of Biology & Biology Education*, 10(1), 56-65.

Tagore, G. S., Namdeo, S. L., Sharma, S. K., & Kumar, N. (2013). Effect of Rhizobium and phosphate solubilizing bacterial inoculants on symbiotic traits, nodule leghemoglobin, and yield of chickpea genotypes. *International Journal of Agronomy*, 2013.

Teja, M. S., Kishore, A., Sharma, J. D., Kumar, S. P., Reddy, K. S., & Pramod, T. (2022). Different levels of phosphorus and phosphorus solubilizing bacteria (PSB) influence growth,

yield and economics of green gram [*Vignaradiata* L.]. *FOOD LEGUMES*, 35(3), 180-183.

Verma, G., Singh, M., Morya, J., & Kumawat, N. (2017). Effect of N, P and biofertilizers on growth attributes and yields of Green gram [*Vignaradiata* (L.) Wilczek] under semi-arid tract of Central India. *International Archive of Applied Sciences and Technology*, 8(2), 31-34.

Yadav, K. K., Meena, M. K., & Mali, N. L. (2021). Impact of graded levels of fertility and biofertilizers on yield attributes and yields of Green gram [*Vignaradiata* (L.) Wilczek]. *International Research Journal of Humanities and Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2(6), 280-289.

UNDER PEER REVIEW