

# Impact of P enriched compost on growth and yield attributes of barnyard millet in red and black soils of Madurai district, India

## ABSTRACT

A field study was conducted during the summer ( kharif ) season of 2023 at the Lalapuram village, Thirumangalam block of Madurai district, to assess the influence of phosphorus-enriched compost on the growth and yield parameters of barnyard millet in both red and black soils. The recommend dose of barnyard millet was 40: 20: 0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of NPK in which the recommended dose of P (20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was given in form of enriched compost and the enrichment was done at 1 : 10 ratio of P source and compost. Three different types of compost such as farmyard manure compost, municipal solid waste compost and vermicompost were enriched with two different P sources such as single super phosphate @ 100 kg / t of compost and rock phosphate @ 100 kg / t of compost. Azophos, a plant growth promoting rhizobacteria based microbial consortium was added to the P enriched compost @ 2 kg / ton of compost. Among the different combinations, application of SSP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> along with microbial consortium performed better in both the soils. The growth and yield attributes of barnyard millet in black soil was better compared to that of red soil. SSP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> along with microbial consortium recorded the highest growth parameters in terms of no. of tillers per plant (8.71), Leaf area index ( 2.98 ), root length ( 20.7 cm) and dry matter production (5260.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at 60 DAS and yield parameters in terms of no of productive tillers (6.81), panicle length (21.4 cm), panicle weight (14.65 g), 1000 grain weight (3.24 g), grain yield (2350 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and stover yield (4420 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Hence, it was found that the application of SSP-enriched vermicompost coupled with azophos at 30 and 60 DAS of the crop growth stages, can curtail N and P fertilizer consumption by 50 and 100 percent respectively while fostering sustainable plant growth and enhancement of yield.

**Keywords :** *Barnyard Millet, FYM, Vermicompost, MSWC*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Rapidly increasing population coupled with depleting resources and nutritional insecurity has necessitated the ecological sustainable increase in the overall grain production of the country. According to the recent estimates by the Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations (FAO) in order to feed people on large scale, food production has to be increased by 60% by the year 2050 (FAO, 2012) [1]. Agricultural intensification linked with best nutrient management system can help achieve this goal (Heffer *et al.*, 2016) [2]. Improving the nutrient use efficiency of the crop is a prerequisite which can be improved by certain best management practices. Poor fertilizer management practices lower the yield and productivity of crops. In order to attain optimal crop productivity, it is essential to effectively manage nutrients through judicious utilization of bio-fertilizers, organic and inorganic sources. (Ghaffari *et al.*, 2011) [3]

Recognizing the importance of the international year of millets 2023 and realizing the need for conserving the valuable soil resource, this research study was taken up targeting millet as test crop. Millets are the crops that have a high nutritional value and can be produced under marginal soil conditions. They are rich in vitamins and minerals which act as a source of livelihood for many people (Gowri and Shivakumar, 2020) [4]. Cultivation of millets among Indian farmers has declined during the past few decades. The low level of productivity and low economic returns of millets (Bana *et al.*, 2013) [5] are attributed to poor soil nutrient status and moisture stress. (Bana *et al.* 2018 [6]; Mubeena *et al.*, 2019 [7]). Hence one of the important approaches in achieving higher millet yields in rainfed areas are efficient nutrient management techniques (Bamboriya *et al.*, 2017 [8]; Bana *et al.*, 2016 [9]) and there is no systematic information available on nutrient management for various millet crops.

Barnyard Millet (*Echinochloa species*) is one of the small millets crop whose high nutrient content coupled with antioxidant effects make it a suitable functional food crop. It has the potential to offer both food and nutritional security, especially in regions with a high prevalence of nutritional deficiency. Recently, the demand of the crop has increased due to its high nutritional value. Despite its enormous potential, the crop has not gained popularity. (Sood *et al.*, 2015) [10]

Nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P) and potassium (K) are the three important nutrients required by plant for healthy growth. Among these, P is the second limiting nutrient next to nitrogen. Though different forms of P are abundantly present in soil, it is relatively unavailable or not readily available to the plants (Kishore *et al.*, 2015) [11]. P fixation is usually found in both acid and alkaline soil (Hamid *et al.*, 2012) [12]. This deficiency is usually compensated by adding chemical fertilizers. However, the chemical fertilizers are expensive and are not eco-friendly. Irregular usage of chemical fertilizers for a long time decreases soil activity and soil microflora. Usage of microorganisms to augment the P availability is the best alternative. (Kishore *et al.*, 2015) [11].

Addressing the nutritional need of the crop with efficient nutrient management practices is one of the best strategies to improve the availability of nutrients like phosphorous and to enhance the use efficiency of the plant nutrient. Hence barnyard millet being an important nutricereal, is chosen as a test crop and supplied with nutrients through various organic compost inoculated with cheaper microbial sources to enhance the growth, uptake and yield thus ensuring better income for the millet growers and marginal farmers to improve their livelihoods. With this background in a view, an experiment was conducted to evaluate, optimize and standardize the application of P enriched compost along with microbial consortium on the growth and yield of barnyard millet.

## **2. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

A field experiment was conducted during the summer (kharif) season of 2023 in the farmers field of Lalapuram village, Thirumanaglam block of Madurai district, Tamil Nadu, India, located at 9° 55.61328' N latitude and 78° 7.82442' E longitude at an altitude of 109 m above sea level to assess the impact of P enriched compost on growth and yield attributes of barnyard millet (*Echinochloa frumentacea*) in red and black soils of Madurai district. The field trial was laid in randomized block design (RBD) with three replications with an individual plot size of 5 × 4 m<sup>2</sup>. The black soil of the experimental site was sandy clay loam in texture, with pH 7.9, E C 0.36 dSm<sup>-1</sup> low in available

nitrogen ( $230 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), low in available phosphorus ( $9.8 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and high in available potassium ( $280 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) whereas the experimental red soil was sandy loam in texture, pH 7.2, EC  $0.30 \text{ dSm}^{-1}$ , low in available nitrogen ( $195 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), low in available phosphorus ( $11.6 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and medium in available potassium ( $249 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ). The test crop variety used was MDU - 1. The seeds were sown at a depth of 3-5 cm with the spacing of  $22.5 \times 10 \text{ cm}$ . Different composts namely farmyard manure compost, vermicompost and municipal solid waste compost, enriched with rock phosphate and single super phosphate along with azophos (microbial consortium) were adopted in fourteen different treatment combinations such as  $T_1$  - Absolute control,  $T_2$  - RDF of 40:20:0  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ,  $T_3$  - RP enriched FYM @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  with microbial consortium,  $T_4$  - SSP enriched FYM @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  with microbial consortium,  $T_5$  - RP enriched FYM @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  without microbial consortium,  $T_6$  - SSP enriched FYM @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  without microbial consortium,  $T_7$  - RP enriched vermicompost @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  with microbial consortium,  $T_8$  - SSP enriched vermicompost @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  with microbial consortium,  $T_9$  - RP enriched vermicompost @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  without microbial consortium,  $T_{10}$  - SSP enriched vermicompost @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  without microbial consortium,  $T_{11}$  - RP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  with microbial consortium,  $T_{12}$  - SSP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  with microbial consortium,  $T_{13}$  - RP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  without microbial consortium,  $T_{14}$  - SSP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  without microbial consortium. Same set of treatment combinations were adopted in both red and black soils. In control, recommended N and P fertilizers were applied basally at 86 and  $125 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  as urea and as single super phosphate (SSP) respectively. 25 % of recommended N ( $10 \text{ Kg ha}^{-1}$ ) i.e  $19 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  ammonium sulphate were applied in two splits. The first half of recommended N i.e  $9.5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  of ammonium sulphate were applied as basal and remaining second half i.e  $9.5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  of ammonium sulphate were given as top dressing using manual fertilizer applicator in all the treatmental plots ( $T_2$  to  $T_{13}$ ) while  $T_1$  received 100% RDF (40:20 N&P  $\text{Kg ha}^{-1}$ ).

### **2.1 Preparation of Enriched Compost**

The composts namely farmyard manure compost, vermicompost and MSWC were enriched with single super phosphate (16 %  $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$ ) and rock phosphate (17.5 %  $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$ ) at 1:10 ratio i.e 1 t compost was enriched with 100 kg single super phosphate and 100 kg rock phosphate along with 2 kg azophos as per treatment schedule. Finally, each compost heap was plastered with mud and left for a period of 45 days. Before and after the enrichment process, the compost samples were collected and analyzed for total nitrogen content by macro-kjeldhal method as described by Bremner and Mulvaney (1983) [13], total phosphorous content and total potassium content by vanadophosphomolybdate yellow colour method and by flame photometer method (Triacid extract) respectively as mentioned by Jackson (1973) [14]. The enriched composts were applied basally at the rate of  $750 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  as a basal application by mixing 1 kg of compost along with 5 kg of soil in proportion to the plot size of the field trial.

### **2.2 Crop Observations**

Five randomly selected plants were tagged to record the biometric observations. Biometric observations in terms of plant height, no of tillers / plant, dry matter production, leaf area index and

root length were assessed at 30 and 60 DAS in both red and black soils and yield attributes such as number of productive tillers per plant, panicle length, panicle weight, 1000 grain weight, grain yield and stover yield were recorded at maturity stages of crop in both red and black soils.

### 2.3 Statistical Analysis

The recorded data were statistically analyzed using R software. The subjected data was worked out for standard error of mean (SEM +) and critical difference (CD) to compare the differences between the treatment means.

## 3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Composition Of Enriched Compost

The data presented in Table 1 demonstrates the changes in the overall NPK (%) content of the enriched compost after the incubation period. The initial NPK (%) contents in farmyard manure compost were 0.62, 0.28 and 0.54 respectively. These values notably increased to 0.94, 1.08, and 0.83 percent, respectively when enriched with single super phosphate (SSP) containing 16% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> accompanied by azophos. The incubation of rock phosphate (RP) containing 17.5% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> along with azophos in FYM compost resulted in NPK content of 0.87, 0.97, and 0.72 percent. Upon enrichment with SSP and azophos, the NPK contents in vermicompost exhibited an improvement from 0.83, 0.41, and 0.75 to 1.25, 1.32, and 1.03, whereas in the case of RP enriched with azophos, the NPK contents transitioned to 1.08, 1.25 and 0.93 percent. Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) enriched with SSP along with azophos showed a gradual increase from 0.56, 0.35, and 0.42 to 0.81, 0.96, and 0.64 and enrichment with RP along with azophos recorded higher NPK contents of 0.75, 0.86 and 0.59 percent. This gradual surge in nitrogen content after enrichment was attributed to the introduction of azophos, which facilitates biological nitrogen fixation and enhances nutrient availability. The increase in phosphorus content is attributed to the inclusion of SSP and RP. The application of SSP has amplified phosphorus bioavailability due to its inherently soluble nature and organic acids generated by bacterial activity contributed to the solubilization of rock phosphate, thereby increasing the phosphorus content of the enriched compost.

**Table 1. NPK content (%) in compost before and after enrichment**

**Source of enrichment :** Single super phosphate (SSP), Rock phosphate (RP) along with Azophos

Organic sources	Before enrichment			After enrichment with SSP and azophos			After enrichment with RP and azophos		
	N	P	K	N	P	K	N	P	K
<b>FYM</b>	0.62	0.28	0.54	0.94	1.08	0.83	0.87	0.97	0.72

<b>Vermicompost</b>	0.83	0.41	0.75	1.25	1.32	1.03	1.08	1.25	0.93
<b>MSWC</b>	0.56	0.35	0.42	0.81	0.96	0.64	0.75	0.86	0.59

### 3.2 Effect of P Enriched compost on crop growth parameters

Table 2 illustrates the substantial impact of different nutrient management practices on various growth parameters such as plant height, no of tillers / plant, dry matter production, leaf area index and root length. Significantly T<sub>8</sub> - SSP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium, exhibited the highest values for various growth parameters of the crop. This includes maximum number of tillers per plant 8.71 and 8.53, leaf area index of 2.98 and 2.17, dry matter production of 5260.1 and 5055.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and root length 20.7 and 13.2 cm at 60 DAS in black and red soils. Shishehbor et al.(2013) [15] observed that on application of microbial inoculants in conjunction with vermicompost yielded more significant enhancements in terms of enlarging leaf area, increasing total chlorophyll content, and improving the overall yield.

The values for various favorable growth parameters were significantly low in treatment T<sub>1</sub> - Absolute control, with 5.19 and 5.10 number of tillers per plant, leaf area index of 1.71 and 1.49, dry matter production of 3210.1 and 2080.7 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and root length of 9.8 and 8.5 cm were recorded at 60 DAS in black and red soils .

Shirmohammadi et al. (2014) [16] recorded plant growth was promoted on combined application of biological phosphate (Phosphorous based bacterial strain) and inorganic phosphorous. Similar results were reported by Bana et al. (2012) [17]. This observed phenomenal growth with enriched compost application was due to the adoption of integrated nutrient management practices. Use of SSP enriched vermicompost which contains essential macronutrients, releases nutrients at a steady state coinciding with the crop growth stages. This steady supply of nutrients has led to an elevation in the availability of nutrients. Enhanced nutrient availability has triggered the activity of meristematic cells, promoting increased cell division and cell elongation. These physiological alterations are reflected in morphological characters amplifying the growth attributes of the crop (Patel *et al.*, 2020) [18]. In addition, use of azophos must have helped in mobilizing nutrients such as phosphorous and increased the nutrient availability for plant uptake. It also promoted the production of plant growth-promoting hormones such as auxins, cytokinins, and gibberellins. These hormones play pivotal roles in plant growth by encouraging cell division and elongation ultimately promoting plant and root development. These lines were in accordance with the work carried out by Jamuna (2020) [19] who reported that applied bacterial sources enhanced the crop growth and yield by help solubilizing the nutrient and improved the soil fertility.

### 3.3 Effect of P Enriched Compost On Yield Attributes

The yield and yield attributes of barnyard millet exhibited significant variations across different treatments, as outlined in Table 3. Among the various treatment combinations, the utilization of SSP - enriched vermicompost at a rate of 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in conjunction with azophos (T<sub>8</sub>), resulted in the highest yield attributes. Specifically, this treatment yielded 6.81 and 6.42 numbers of productive tillers with panicle lengths measuring 21.45 and 19.84 cm, panicle weights of 14.65 and 12.35 g, 1000 grain weights of 3.24

and 3.17 g, grain yields of 2350 and 2168 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, and stover yields of 4420 and 4184 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> at maturity stage in black and red soils respectively. Absolute control showed notable reduction in yield attributes of the crop. This reduction is evident in the form of a decreased number of productive tillers such as 4.07 and 2.10, accompanied by shorter panicle lengths of 10.10 and 9.12 cm and panicle weight of 8.31 and 5.41 g, while the 1000 grain weight were 1.82 and 1.60 g. Consequently, the grain yield reached 980 and 920 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, while the stover yield amounted to 2514 and 2210 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in the context of black soil and red soil respectively. Kumar et al. (2019) [20] documented that use of minimum dose of inorganic fertilizer along with azophos had created a profound impact on crop yield.

The observed higher yields and improved yield attributes in the treatment involving SSP-enriched vermicompost at 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> along with azophos. Chatterjee et al. [21] indicated inoculation of azophos resulted in greater positive impacts on crop yield and yield characteristics compared to treatments without inoculation. Furthermore, the advantages of using biofertilizers were more pronounced when combined with vermicompost, in contrast to their combination with farmyard manure. The significant improvement is due to the increased nutrient availability in the soil which ultimately increased the uptake in plants and grains and increased panicle length and weight of the panicles.

Similar observation has been made by (Pallavi *et al.*, 2016) [22] The improvement in growth characteristics can be attributed to an increased uptake of nitrogen and the efficient movement of assimilates from source to sink within the plant as the treatments included 50 % of recommendation. This phenomenon has led to the enhancement of various yield-related traits of barnyard millet which reflected in higher grain weight. The N<sub>2</sub> fixation mechanism under N poor environment (low available N of the experimental soil) by azophos is the reasons behind increased plant growth and nutrient uptake which produced more grain weight. Islam et al. (2012) [23] recorded similar results highlighting the use of microbial sources that promoted root and shoot growth of cereals.

**Table 2. Effect of enriched composts on growth attributes of barnyard millet at 60 DAS. (Mean of 3 replications)**

Treatment	Black soil				Red soil			
	No of tillers / plant	Leaf area index	Dry matter production (Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Root length (cm)	No of tillers / plant	Leaf area index	Dry matter production (Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Root length (cm)
T <sub>1</sub>	5.19	1.71	2868.2	9.8	5.10	1.49	2080.7	8.5
T <sub>2</sub>	7.01	2.16	3968.6	14.7	6.11	1.66	3872.6	11.9
T <sub>3</sub>	7.62	2.49	4751.3	17.6	7.10	1.88	4406.5	14.9
T <sub>4</sub>	8.17	2.61	4924.5	18.7	7.41	2.01	4660.8	16.5
T <sub>5</sub>	7.14	2.28	4074.9	15.9	6.42	1.72	3996.4	12.5
T <sub>6</sub>	6.63	2.09	3846.4	13.2	5.80	1.61	3674.2	11.3
T <sub>7</sub>	8.24	2.70	5031.7	19.1	8.01	2.08	4825.5	17.2
T <sub>8</sub>	8.71	2.98	5260.1	20.7	8.53	2.17	5055.1	18.2
T <sub>9</sub>	7.25	2.32	4261.2	16.4	6.52	1.75	3970.8	12.9
T <sub>10</sub>	8.41	2.88	5193.9	19.5	8.24	2.12	4895.4	17.4
T <sub>11</sub>	7.81	2.52	4873.9	18.1	7.21	1.91	4552.1	15.9
T <sub>12</sub>	7.38	2.39	4437.6	16.6	6.61	1.79	4131.3	13.3
T <sub>13</sub>	6.38	1.96	3761.5	12.6	5.51	1.54	2560.5	10.7
T <sub>14</sub>	7.54	2.45	4589.4	17.1	6.92	1.84	4314.5	13.9
sEd	0.112	0.044	28.17	0.186	0.14	0.026	74.95	0.29
CD(P=0.05)	0.24	0.091	60.33	0.42	0.29	0.054	160.01	0.61

T<sub>1</sub> - Absolute control,  
T<sub>2</sub> - RDF of 40 :20:0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>,  
T<sub>3</sub> - RP enriched FYM @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>4</sub> - SSP enriched FYM @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>5</sub> - RP enriched FYM @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>6</sub> - SSP enriched FYM @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>7</sub> - RP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium

T<sub>8</sub> - SSP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>9</sub> - RP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>10</sub> - SSP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>11</sub> - RP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>12</sub> - SSP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>13</sub> - RP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>14</sub> - SSP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium

**Table 3. Effect of enriched compost application on yield attributes of barnyard millet in black soil**

Treatments	No. of productive tillers per plant	Earhead length (cm)	Earhead weight (g)	1000 grain weight(g)	Grain yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Stover yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
T <sub>1</sub>	4.07	10.10	8.31	1.82	980	2514
T <sub>2</sub>	4.41	14.92	10.58	2.25	1520	3070
T <sub>3</sub>	5.53	17.88	11.92	2.75	1780	3760
T <sub>4</sub>	6.01	19.16	12.81	2.97	2105	4074
T <sub>5</sub>	4.61	15.96	10.98	2.39	1590	3220
T <sub>6</sub>	4.20	13.26	10.18	2.12	1430	2815
T <sub>7</sub>	6.34	20.75	13.21	3.08	2240	4224
T <sub>8</sub>	6.81	21.45	14.65	3.24	2350	4420
T <sub>9</sub>	4.82	16.53	11.20	2.48	1650	3290
T <sub>10</sub>	6.63	20.82	14.14	3.11	2280	4260
T <sub>11</sub>	5.72	18.12	12.38	2.85	1910	3980
T <sub>12</sub>	5.06	16.88	11.28	2.51	1701	3460
T <sub>13</sub>	4.23	12.22	9.64	2.01	1360	2660
T <sub>14</sub>	5.34	17.25	11.74	2.64	1773	3620
sEd	0.08	0.48	0.22	0.072	38.39	71.12
CD(P=0.05)	0.29	0.84	0.46	0.14	70.25	152.2

**Table 4. Effect of enriched compost application on yield attributes of barnyard millet in red soil**

Treatments	No. of productive tillers per plant	Earhead length (cm)	Earhead weight (g)	1000 grain weight (g)	Grain yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Stover yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
T <sub>1</sub>	2.10	9.12	5.41	1.60	920	2210
T <sub>2</sub>	3.05	12.92	7.28	2.04	1312	2845
T <sub>3</sub>	4.28	14.54	9.86	2.62	1671	3474
T <sub>4</sub>	5.05	16.76	10.94	2.80	1861	3794
T <sub>5</sub>	3.42	13.19	7.83	2.20	1405	3015
T <sub>6</sub>	2.68	11.12	6.57	1.91	1210	2681
T <sub>7</sub>	5.42	17.87	11.42	2.91	1976	3954
T <sub>8</sub>	6.42	19.84	12.35	3.17	2168	4184
T <sub>9</sub>	3.54	13.64	8.16	2.36	1480	3163
T <sub>10</sub>	6.05	18.77	11.81	3.06	2043	4024
T <sub>11</sub>	4.65	15.75	10.54	2.77	1761	3631
T <sub>12</sub>	3.61	13.86	8.62	2.41	1520	3242
T <sub>13</sub>	2.30	10.27	5.93	1.75	1110	2520
T <sub>14</sub>	3.98	14.23	9.32	2.50	1620	3405
sEd	0.17	0.42	0.25	0.05	46.47	74.76
CD(P=0.05)	0.37	0.90	0.55	0.10	92.45	160.25

T<sub>1</sub> - Absolute control,  
T<sub>2</sub> - RDF of 40 :20:0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>,  
T<sub>3</sub> - RP enriched FYM @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>4</sub> - SSP enriched FYM @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>5</sub> - RP enriched FYM @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>6</sub> - SSP enriched FYM @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>7</sub> - RP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium

T<sub>8</sub> - SSP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>9</sub> - RP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>10</sub> - SSP enriched vermicompost @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>11</sub> - RP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>12</sub> - SSP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with microbial consortium  
T<sub>13</sub> - RP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium  
T<sub>14</sub> - SSP enriched Municipal solid waste compost (MSWC) @ 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> without microbial consortium

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The findings of the experiment proves that application of compost prepared with the available organic recyclable bio waste viz., FYM / vermicompost / municipal solid waste compost and its enrichment with rock phosphate or super phosphate as P source @ 1:10 ratio followed by its application at 750 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> along with azophos 2 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> with minimum 25 percent recommended N through fertilizer applicator economizes the cost of inputs, enhances the red and black soils nutrient use efficiency towards obtaining maximum average yield of 2350 and 2168 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in barnyard millet cultivated in red and black soils.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

1. Statistics, A. (2015). Agricultural statistics at a glance 2014. government of India, ministry of agriculture, department of agriculture and cooperation, directorate of economics and statistics.
2. Heffer, P., & Prud'homme, M. (2016, December). Global nitrogen fertilizer demand and supply: Trend, current level and outlook. In International Nitrogen Initiative Conference. Melbourne, Australia.
3. Ghaffari A, Ali A, Tahir M, Waseem M, Ayub M, Iqbal A, Mohsin AU. Influence of integrated nutrients on growth, yield and quality of maize (*Zea mays* L.). American Journal of Plant Sciences. 2011 Mar 1;2(1):63.
4. Gowri, M. U., & Shivakumar, K. M. (2020). Millet scenario in India. *Economic Affairs*, 65(3), 363-370.
5. Bana RS, Rana KS, Dass A, Choudhary AK, Pooniya V, Vyas AK, Kaur R, Sepat S, Rana DS. A manual on dryland farming and watershed management. Division of Agronomy, IARI, New Delhi. 2013:104.
6. Bana RS, Sepat SE, Rana KS, Pooniya V, Choudhary AK. Moisture-stress management under limited and assured irrigation regimes in wheat (*Triticum aestivum*): Effects on crop productivity, water use efficiency, grain quality, nutrient acquisition and soil fertility. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2018 Oct 1;88(10):1606-2.
7. Mubeena P, Halepyati AS, Chittapur BM. Effect of date of sowing and nutrient management on nutrient uptake and yield of foxtail millet (*Setaria italica* L.). International Journal of Bio-resource and Stress Management. 2019;10(1):92-5.
8. Bamboriya SD, Bana RS, Pooniya V, Rana KS, Singh YV. Planting density and nitrogen management effects on productivity, quality and water-use efficiency of rainfed pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum*) under conservation agriculture. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2017;62(3):363-6.

9. Bana, R.S., Pooniya, V., Choudhary, A.K., Rana, K.S. and Tyagi, V.K., 2016. Influence of organic nutrient sources and moisture management on productivity, bio-fortification and soil health in pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum*) + clusterbean (*Cyamopsis tetragonoloba*) intercropping system of semi-arid India. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 86(11), pp.1418-25.
10. Sood S, Khulbe RK, Gupta AK, Agrawal PK, Upadhyaya HD, Bhatt JC. Barnyard millet—a potential food and feed crop of future. *Plant Breeding*. 2015 Apr;134(2):135-47.
11. Kishore N, Pindi PK, Ram Reddy S. Phosphate-solubilizing microorganisms: a critical review. *Plant Biology and Biotechnology: Volume I: Plant Diversity, Organization, Function and Improvement*. 2015:307-33.
12. .Hamid A, Ahmad L. Soil phosphorus fixation chemistry and role of phosphate solubilizing bacteria in enhancing its efficiency for sustainable cropping-A review. *J. Pure Appl. Microbiol.* 2012 Dec;66(4):1905-11.
13. Bremner JM, Mulvaney CS. Nitrogen—total. *Methods of soil analysis: part 2 chemical and microbiological properties*. 1983 Feb 1;9:595-624
14. Jackson ML (1973) *Soil Chemical Analysis*, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, pp 498
15. Shishehbor M, Madani H, Ardakani MR. Effect of vermicompost and biofertilizers on yield and yield components of common millet (*Panicum miliaceum*). *Annals of Biological Research*. 2013;4(2):174-80.
16. Shirmohammadi E, Alikhani HA, Pourbabaei AA, Etesami H. Improved phosphorus (P) uptake and yield of rainfed wheat fed with P fertilizer by drought-tolerant phosphate-solubilizing fluorescent pseudomonads strains: a field study in drylands. *Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition*. 2020 Dec;20:2195-211.
17. Bana RS, Gautam RC, Rana KS. Effect of different organic sources on productivity and quality of pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum*) and their residual effect on wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). *Annals of Agricultural Research*. 2012;33(3).
18. Patel, B. K., Patel, H. K., Makawana, S. N., Shiyal, V. N., & Chotaliya, R. L. (2020). Effect of various sources of nitrogen and phosphorus on growth, yield and economics of summer green gram (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and applied Sciences*, 11, 745-752.
19. Jamuna E. Influence of microbial bioinoculants on growth and yield attributes of sugarcane.
20. Kumar SS, Baradhan G, Saravanan V, Sudhakar P, Manimaran S. INFLUENCE OF DIFFERENT GRANULAR ORGANIC MANURES WITH INORGANIC FERTILIZERS FOR INCREASING THE YIELD OF HYBRID MAIZE (ZEA MAYS L.).
21. Chatterjee R. Influence of nutrient sources on growth, yield and economics of organic lettuce production under foothills of eastern Himalayan region. *Emirates Journal of Food and Agriculture*. 2015 Apr 10:460-2.

22. Pallavi C, Joseph B, Aariff Khan MA, Hemalatha S. Economic evaluation of finger millet under different nutrient management practices. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.* 2016;5(8):690-8.
23. Islam MZ, Sattar MA, Ashrafuzzaman M, Saud HM, Uddin MK. Improvement of yield potential of rice through combined application of biofertilizer and chemical nitrogen. *African Journal of Microbiology Research.* 2012 Jan 30;6(4):745-50.