Original Research Article

Influence of Different Levels of NPK and Biochar on Physico-Chemical Properties of Soil in Field ~~P~~pea

Comment [U1]: Suggestions:
1) The manuscript should be prepared based on the guidelines for author.
2) 1) The manuscript should be proofread by a Native Speaker.
3) There is no details of a statistical analysis in the materials and methods section.

Formatted: English (United States)

Abstract

An experiment was conducted during in *Rabi* season (December 2021 – March 2022) on central research farm of Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with three levels of NPK andBiochar(0 ~~%~~, 50 ~~%~~ and100%). The result shows that application of different levels combination of inorganic fertilizers increased growth, yield of field pea and improved soil chemical properties. It was recorded from the application of NPK and Biochar fertilizers in treatment T_9 [NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100%] maximum bulk density 1.274 Mg m^{-3} at and 1.279Mgm^{-3}, particle density 2.518 Mg m^{-3} and 1.523Mgm^{-3}, % pore space 47.71% and 44.68%, water holding capacity 39.75% and 36.82%, pH 7.05 at and 7.15 at, EC 0.473dSm^{-1} and 0.479 dSm^{-1}, organic carbon 0.497% and 0.495%, available nitrogen 314.56 kg ha^{-1} and 311.55kg ha^{-1}, available phosphorus 38.70 kg ha^{-1} and 36.28kg ha^{-1}, available potassium 220.42 kg $ha^{-1}$and 217.67kg ha^{-1}all parameters at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm best from T_1 [NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %].

Comment [U2]: Please add implication.

Key word: Field pea, Biochar, NPK, Physico-Chemical Properties of Soil, etc.

Introduction

Field Pea (*Pisumsativum* L.) is an important Rabi leguminous crop grown in Indian subcontinent. It is one of the main sources of dietary protein for most Indians. The productivity (1356 kg ha^{-1}). Moreover, its high yield potential (3.5 tonnes ha^{-1}) through balanced fertilization envisages ample scope to increase its yields further (Anonymous, 2009).Pea is one of the important vegetables in the world and ranks among the top 10 vegetable crops. Pea is commonly used in human diet throughout the world and it is rich in protein (21-25 %), carbohydrates, vitamin A and C, Ca, phosphorous and has high levels of amino acids lysin and tryptophan (Bhat *et al.*, 2013).Pea is one of the foremost important versatile legume crops which is highly nutritious due to its important bio-chemical attributes viz protein content, protein quality (having good amount of essential amino acids such as lysine, methionine, leucine etc. which are not synthesized by the human body), minerals, oil, and sugar content. Peas are highly nutritive and contain a high percentage of digestible 22.5% proteins, 58.5% carbohydrates, 1.0% fats, 4.4% fibbers and 3% minerals vitamins, particularly of the B group (Verma*et al.*, 2018).Pea is also widely used as pulse in daily diet, it contains a high percentage of digestible proteins (7.2100g^{-1} of edible protein), good content of vitamins i.e., Vit B1 (.025 mg 100g^{-1}),VitC (9mg100g^{-1}), and minerals like Phosphorus (139mg 100g^{-1}), Magnesium (34mg100g^{-1}) and Iron (1.5mg100g^{-1}) (Singh *et al.*, 2005).

The nitrogen (N) is a vital nutrient for the activity of plant organs. It is a fraction of many components, so plant growth can be affected by the amount of nitrogen. The present study was under taken to verify the effect of different fertilizer forms on the performance of pea varieties (AL-Bayati*et al.,* 2019).

Phosphorus is known to play an important role in growth and development of the crop and have direct relation with root proliferations, straw strength, grain formation, crop maturation (Bhat *et al.*, 2013). Enhancing P availability to crop through phosphate-solubilizing bacteria (PSB) holds promise in the present scenario of escalating prices of phosphatic fertilizers and a general deficiency of Phosphorus in Indian soils (Joshi *et al.*, 2020).

Potassium is associated with the movement of water, nutrients, and carbohydrates in plant tissue, it's involved with enzyme activation within the plant, which affects protein, starch and adenosine triphosphate (ATP) production. The production of ATP can regulate the rate of photosynthesis (Kumari*et al.*, 2012).Biochar is a carbon rich product that is produced by pyrolysis (heating in incomplete or partial absence of oxygen) of biomass at relatively low temperature (<700°C) (Demirbas, A., 2002; Mayhead, G. J., 2010).

Materials and Methods

A field experiment conducted at the Soil Science Research Farm, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, during the *Rabi*season of (December 2021 – March 2022) growing field pea*Var*. Rachnaapplied 3 levels of NPK and Biochar respectively NPK and Biochar (0 %, 50 % and 100 %)experiment is lead to observe the physical and chemical parameters. In physical parameters like that bulk density, particle density, pore space and water holding capacity through method by 100 ml graduated measuring cylinder and process by Muthuvel*et al.*, 1992.

In chemical parameters through method by-

a) Soil pH –method given by (Jackson,M. L. 1958) through using digital pH meter.

Comment [U3]: ?

Comment [U4]: ?

Formatted: Highlight

b) Soil EC (dSm^{-1})-method given by (Wilcox, 1950) through using digital EC meter.

c) Organic Carbon (%)- Wet oxidation method given by (Walkley and Black, 1947)

d) Available Nitrogen (kg ha^{-1})-Kjeldhal Method (Subbiah and Asija, 1956)

e) Available Phosphorus (kg ha^{-1})- Colorimetric method by using Jasper single beam U.V. Spectrophotometer at 660 nm wavelength given by (Olsen *et al.*, 1954)

f) Available Potassium (kg ha^{-1})- Flame photometric method by using Metzer Flame Photometer given by (Toth and Prince, 1949)

Results and Discussion

1. **Physical Properties of Soil**

Bulk density (Mg m^{-3})

The response bulk density of soil was found to be non-significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum bulk density of soil was recorded 1.274and 1.279Mgm^{-3} in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum bulk density of soil was recorded 1.242and 1.246Mgm^{-3}at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1 (NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %)respectively.**(Das *et al*., 2020 and Panday*et al*., 2017).**

Particle density (Mg m^{-3})

The maximum particle density of soil was recorded 2.518and 2.523Mgm^{-3}in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum particle density of soil was recorded 2.485and 2.488Mgm^{-3} at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1(NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %) respectively. **(Chanu*et al*., 2020 andSharma, N. and Thakur, K. S., 2016).**

Pore space (%)

The response pore space of soil was found to be significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum porespaceof soil was recorded 58.71 and 57.68 % in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum porespaceof soil was recorded 46.25 and 44.50 %at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1(NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %) respectively.**(Chanu*et al*., 2020 andSharma, N. and Thakur, K. S., 2016).**

Water holding capacity (%)

The response water holding capacity of soil was found to be significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum water holding capacityof soil was recorded 47.75 and 44.82 % in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum water holding

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Comment [U5]: Please check how to prepare the citations.

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Highlight

Formatted: Space After: 8 pt

capacityof soil was recorded 33.56 and 30.45 % at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1(NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %)respectively.**(Rani *et al*., 2017 and Yadav *et al*., 2018).**

Formatted: Highlight

2. Chemical Properties of Soil

Soil pH (1:2.5) w/v

The response pH of soil was found to be non-significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum pH of soil was recorded 7.05and 7.15 in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum pH of soil was recorded 6.62and 6.66 at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1(NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %), respectively.**(Rani *et al*., 2017 and Yadav *et al*., 2018).**

Formatted: Highlight

Soil EC (dSm^{-1})

The response EC of soil was found to be non-significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum EC of soil was recorded 0.473 and 0.479 dSm^{-1}in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum EC of soil was recorded 0.442 and 0.445 dSm^{-1} 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1 (NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %), respectively**(Das *et al*., 2020 and Panday*et al*., 2017).**

Formatted: Highlight

Organic carbon (%)

The response organic carbon of soil was found to be non-significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum organic carbon of soil was recorded 0.497 and 0.495 % in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum organic carbon of soil was recorded 0.472 and 0.470 % at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1(NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %), respectively**(Chethan*et al*., 2018, Gabr et *al*., 2007 and Rani *et al*., 2017).**

Formatted: Highlight

Available nitrogen (kg ha^{-1})

The response available nitrogen of soil was found to be significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum available nitrogen of soil was recorded 314.56 and 311.55 kg ha^{-1} in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum available nitrogen of soil was recorded 292.75 and 288.32 kg ha^{-1} at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1(NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %), respectively**(Toppo*et al*., 2017 and Singh *et al*., 2015).**

Formatted: Highlight

Available phosphorus (kg ha^{-1})

The response available phosphorusof soil was found to be significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum available phosphorus of soil was recorded 38.70 and 36.28 kg ha^{-1} in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum available phosphorusof soil was recorded 21.45 and 19.34 kg ha^{-1} at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1(NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %), respectively**(Bunker *et al*., 2018, Rajput, R. L. and Kushwah, S. S., 2005 and Bhat *et al*., 2013).**

Formatted: Highlight

Available potassium (kg ha^{-1})

The response available potassiumof soil was found to be significant in levels of NPK and biochar. The maximum available potassium of soil was recorded 220.42 and 217.67 kg ha^{-1} in treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) and minimum available potassiumofsoil was recorded 192.23 and 190.55 kg ha^{-1} at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm in treatment T_1 (NPK @ 0% + Biochar @ 0 %), respectively**(Bunker *et al*., 2018, Rajput, R. L. and Kushwah, S. S., 2005 and Bhat *et al*., 2013).**

Formatted: Highlight

Table1: Effect of different levels of NPK and biochar on bulk density (Mg m^{-3}), particle density (Mg m^{-3}), pore space (%) and water holding capacity(%)of soil.

Treatments		Bulk density (Mg m^{-3})		Particle density (Mg m^{-3})		Pore space (%)		Water holding capacity(%)	
		0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm	0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm	0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm	0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm
T_1	Absolute control	1.242	1.246	2.485	2.488	46.25	44.50	33.56	30.45
T_2	NPK @ 0 % + Biochar @ 50 %	1.243	1.247	2.489	2.491	48.87	45.85	34.97	31.85
T_3	NPK @ 0 % + Biochar @ 100 %	1.245	1.250	2.492	2.496	49.65	47.10	36.09	33.08
T_4	NPK @ 50 % + Biochar @ 0 %	1.249	1.254	2.495	2.501	50.34	48.65	37.41	34.67
T_5	NPK @ 50 % + Biochar @ 50 %	1.252	1.256	2.499	2.506	52.21	50.72	39.23	36.90
T_6	NPK @ 50 % + Biochar @ 100 %	1.257	1.261	2.505	2.510	53.45	51.54	41.78	39.56
T_7	NPK @ 100 % + Biochar @ 0 %	1.262	1.267	2.508	2.514	55.67	53.90	42.21	40.40
T_8	NPK @ 100 % + Biochar @ 50 %	1.268	1.273	2.513	2.519	57.32	55.28	45.87	43.26
T_9	NPK @ 100 % + Biochar @ 100 %	1.274	1.279	2.518	2.523	58.71	57.68	47.75	44.82
	F-Test	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	S	S	S
	S.Ed. (±)	-	-	-	-	0.80	0.68	0.52	0.47
	C.D. at 0.5%	-	-	-	-	1.56	1.32	1.02	0.91

Table2: Effect of different levels of NPK and biochar on pH (1:2.5) w/v, EC (dSm^{-1}), organic carbon (%), available nitrogen ($kg\ ha^{-1}$), available phosphorus ($kg\ ha^{-1}$) and available potassium ($kg\ ha^{-1}$)of soil.

Comment [U6]: Soil:H2O?

Treatments		Soil pH (1:2.5) w/v		EC (dSm^{-1})		Organic carbon (%)		Available nitrogen ($kg\ ha^{-1}$)		Available phosphorus ($kg\ ha^{-1}$)		Available potassium ($kg\ ha^{-1}$)	
		0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm	0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm	0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm	0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm	0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm	0 – 15 cm	15 – 30 cm
T_1	Absolute control	6.62	6.66	0.442	0.445	0.472	0.470	292.75	288.32	21.45	19.34	192.23	190.55
T_2	NPK @ 0 % + Biochar @ 50 %	6.65	6.70	0.446	0.448	0.474	0.471	294.54	290.65	22.62	20.78	196.41	194.82
T_3	NPK @ 0 % + Biochar @ 100 %	6.68	6.76	0.449	0.451	0.477	0.473	296.32	292.90	24.78	22.90	201.58	198.56
T_4	NPK @ 50 % + Biochar @ 0 %	6.72	6.82	0.453	0.455	0.478	0.475	299.70	295.65	25.05	23.06	202.08	199.72
T_5	NPK @ 50 % + Biochar @ 50 %	6.78	6.88	0.458	0.460	0.483	0.480	301.62	298.72	27.42	26.82	204.56	201.80
T_6	NPK @ 50 % + Biochar @ 100 %	6.84	6.95	0.462	0.465	0.489	0.485	304.80	302.35	30.61	29.45	207.78	205.45
T_7	NPK @ 100 % + Biochar @ 0 %	6.91	7.01	0.467	0.471	0.490	0.488	307.08	305.62	32.54	31.72	211.81	208.72
T_8	NPK @ 100 % + Biochar @ 50 %	6.98	7.08	0.470	0.474	0.493	0.491	310.25	308.38	35.17	34.20	215.95	212.65
T_9	NPK @ 100 % + Biochar @ 100 %	7.05	7.15	0.473	0.479	0.497	0.495	314.56	311.55	38.70	36.28	220.42	217.67
	F-Test	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	S	S	S	S	S
	S.Ed. (±)	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.87	1.59	2.05	1.70	1.70	1.52
	C.D. at 0.5%	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.78	3.14	4.15	2.43	3.46	3.08



Fig.1: Effect of different levels of NPK and biochar on bulk density (Mg m^{-3}), particle density (Mg m^{-3}), pore space (%) andwater holding capacity(%)of soil.

Comment [U7]: Please add the standard of the means on the bar graphs.



Fig.2: Effect of different levels of NPK and biochar on pH (1:2.5) w/v, EC (dSm^{-1}), organic carbon (%), available nitrogen ($kg\ ha^{-1}$), available phosphorus ($kg\ ha^{-1}$) and available potassium ($kg\ ha^{-1}$) of soil.

Comment [U8]: Please add the standard of the means on the bar graphs.

Comment [U9]: Please prepare the Figure with high resolution and based on the Guidelines for author.

Conclusions

According to the results revealed the various level of inorganic fertilizer and organic manures used from different sources fertilizers [*i.e.* Urea (N 46%), + SSP (16 P_2O_5) + MOP 60% K_2O)] in the experiment gave the best result in the treatment T_9 (NPK @ 100% + Biochar @ 100 %) followed by treatment T_8, in $T_9$the soil health parameters retained the suitable soil properties. Therefore, it can be recommended for farmers to obtain best combination Treatment (T_9) for higher farm income and sustainable agriculture.

Comment [U10]: What are T8 and T9? Please rewrite.

Reference

AL-Bayati H. J. M., Ibraheem, F. F. R., Allela, W. B. A. M. and AL-Taey, D. K. A. (2019) Role of organic and chemical fertilizer on growth and yield of two cultivars of pea (*Pisumsativum* L.) *Plant Archives.* 19 (1): 1249-1253.

Anonymous (2009) FAOSTAT, Production. Cited February 12, 2015, 33: S141–S145.

Bhat, T. A., Gupta, M., Ganai, M. A., Ahanger, R. A. and Bhat, H. A. (2013) Yield, Soil Health and Nutrient Utilization of Field Pea (*Pisumsativum* L.) as Affected by Phosphorus and Biofertilizers under Subtropical Conditions of Jammu. *International Journal of Modern Plant and Animal Science*. 1 (1): 1-8.

Bouyoucos, G.L, (1927) The hydrometer as a new method for the mechanical analysis of soils. *Soil Sci*. 23: 343-353.

Bunker, R. R., Narolia, R. K., Pareek, P. K. and Nagar, V. (2018) Effect of nitrogen, phosphorus and bio-fertilizers on growth and yield attributes of field pea (*Pisum sativum*L.). *International Journal of Chemical Studies*. 6(4):1701-1704.

Chanu, C. K., Sarangthem, I., Devi, N. S., Luikham, E., Singh, N. G. and Sharma, L. D. (2020) Effect of nitrogen and molybdenum on crop growth, yield and soil properties of field pea in acid soil (*Pisumsativum*L.). *International Journal of Chemical Studies*; 8(5): 2023-2027.

Chethan, K. V., David, A. A., Thomas, T., Swaroop, N., Rao S. and Hassan, A. (2018) Effect of different levels of N P K and Zn on physico-chemical properties of soil growth parameters and yield by pea (*Pisumsativum*L.) Cv. Rachana. 7 (3): 2212-2215.

Das, D., David, A. A., Swaroop, N., Hasan, A. and Thomas, T. (2020) Response of Different Levels of Inorganic Fertilizer, Organic Manure and Bio-Fertilizer on Physico-chemical Properties of Soil in Field Pea (*PisumSativum*L.) Var. Kashi Ageti. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.,9*(10): 468-474.

Demirbas, A. (2002) An overview of biomass pyrolysis. Energy Source, 25, 471-482.

Fisher, R. A. and Yates (1960) *Statistical method for research worker Oliver and Boyd Ltd*. Edin. burgh and London.10.

Gabr, S. M., Elkhatib, H. A. and El-Keriawy, A. M. (2007) Effect of Different Biofertilizer Types and Nitrogen Fertilizer Levels on Growth, Yield and Chemical Contents of Pea Plants (*PisumSativum*L.). *J. Agric. &Env. Sci. Alex. Univ., Egypt*, 6(2): 192- 218.

Jackson, M. L. (1958) Soil chemical analysis Prentice Hall of India Ltd. New Delhi. 219-221.

Joshi, H. N., Varma, L. R. and More, S. G. (2020) Effects of organic nutrients in combination with biofertilizers on uptake N, P, K and yield of field pea (*Pisumsativum* L.) CV. Bonneville. *The Pharma Innovation Journal*. 9 (3): 385-389.

Kumari, A., Singh, O.N. and Kumar, R. (2012) Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth, seed yield, and economics of field pea (*Pisumsativum* L.) and soil fertility changes. *Journal of Food Legumes*. 25(2): 121-124.

Mayhead, G. J. (2010) Pyrolysis of Biomass. Berkeley: University of California.

Munsell, A. H. (1971) Munsell's description of his colour system, from a lecture to the American Psychological Association. *American Journal of Psychology* 23(2): 236-244.

Muthuvel, P., Udayasoorian, C., Natesan, R. and Ramaswamy, P. P. (1992) Introduction to Soil Analysis, *Tamil Nadu Agricultural University Coimbatore*-641002.

Olsen, S. R., Cole, C. V., Watanabe, F. S. and Dean, L. A. (1954). Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate ($NaHCO_3$), *U.S.D.A. Circular*. 939: 1-19.

Pandey, V., Dahiya, O. S., Mor, V. S., Yadav, R., Jitender, O., Peerzada, H. and Brar, A. (2017) Impact of Integrated Nutrient Management on Seed Yield and Its Attributes in Field Pea (*Pisumsativum*L.). *Chem. Sci. Rev. Lett*., 6(23): 1428-1431.

Rajput, R. L. and Kushwah, S. S. (2005) Effect of integrated nutrient management on the yield of field pea (*Pisumsativum* L.). *Legume Research*, 28(3): 231-232.

Rani, S., Kumar, P. and Yadav, A. K. (2017) Effect of Biofertilizers in Conjunction with Chemical Fertilizers on Growth Behaviour and Profitability of Field Pea (*Pisum Sativum*L.) Grown in Western Plains of Haryana. *Chem. Sci. Rev. Lett.*, 6(22): 801-805.

Sharma, N. and Thakur, K. S. (2016) Effect of Integrated Nutrient Management on Soil Properties and Nutrient Content in Field Pea (*PisumSativum* L.). *The Bioscan*, 11(1): 455-458.

Singh, D. K., Singh, A. K., Singh, S. K., Singh, M. and Srivastava, O. P. (2015) Effect of Balanced Nutrition on Yield and Nutrient Uptake of Pea (*Pisumstivum*L.) Under Indo-Gangetic Plains of India. *The Bioscan*. 10(3): 1245-1249.

Singh, R.K., Jagdish, S., De, N. and Mathura, R. (2005) Integrated nutrient management influences yield and nodulation of Pea. *Vegetable Science*. 32(1): 59-61.

Subbiah, B. V. and Asiija, E. C. (1956) A rapid procedure for estimation of available nitrogen in soil. *Current Science* 25(8): 259-260.

Toppo, A. K., David, A. A. and Thomas, T. (2017) Response of different levels of FYM, PSB and Neem Cake on soil health, yield attribute and nutritional value of field pea (*Pisumsativum*L.) var. ICARU. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*; 6(5): 167-170.

Toth, S. J. and Prince, A. L. (1949) Estimation of cation exchange capacity and exchangeable Ca, K and Na content of soil by flame photometer technique. *Soil Sci.*, 67: 439-445.

Verma, P. D., Swaroop, N., Upadhyay, Y., Swamy, A. and. Dhruw, S. S. (2018) Role of phosphorus, zinc and rhizobium on growth and yield of field pea (*Pisumsativum* L) var. Rachna. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 7 (1): 1479-1492.

Walkley, A. and Black, I. A., (1947) Estimation of soil organic carbon by the chromic acid titration method. *Soil Science*. 47: 29-38.

Wilcox, L.V. (1950) Electrical conductivity. Am. Water Works Assoc. *J*. 42: 775-776.

Yadav, D. D., Kumar, Y., Balaji, R. and Pandey, A. K. (2018) Efficacy of organic manures and bio fertilizers on growth and productivity of dwarf pea (*Pisumsativum* L.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 7(2): 3823-3826.