

# SOIL FERTILITY AND YIELD OF FINGER MILLET (*Eleusinecoracana* L.) AS INFLUENCED BY PHOSPHORUS MANAGEMENT PRACTICES IN SANDY LOAM SOILS

## ABSTRACT

Finger millet (*Eleusinecoracana*L.) is an important small millet crop grown in India and has the pride of place in having highest productivity among millets. However, the productivity comes down in low available soil phosphorus areas where finger millet is grown. A field experiment was carried out at Agricultural Research Station, Perumalapalle, Tirupati, Acharya N. G. Ranga Agricultural University, Andhra Pradesh, India during *kharif*, 2018 on sandy loam soil to study the effect of phosphorus fertilizer, PSB and VAM on soil fertility status and yield of finger millet. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with nine treatments consisting of combination of phosphorus fertilizer, PSB and VAM and replicated thrice. Soil samples were collected at initial and after harvest and analyzed for physico-chemical, chemical properties and grain yield was recorded after harvest. The results revealed that application of PSB, VAM along with phosphorus fertilizer exerted significant effect on available N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, S and DTPA extractable micronutrients. Significantly the highest available N (150 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (42.34 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), K<sub>2</sub>O (227 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), S (9.57 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), DTPA extractable Manganese (38.67 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was registered with application of 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>6</sub>). Moreover, this treatment led to the highest recorded grain yield of finger millet, achieving 4328 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Physico-chemical properties (pH, EC and OC) were non significant with phosphorus management practices. In conclusion, the results underscore the positive impact of the combined application of PSB, VAM, and phosphorus fertilizer on both soil fertility parameters and finger millet yield. This research provides valuable insights for enhancing agricultural practices in regions characterized by sandy loam soils and low phosphorus availability, contributing to the sustainable productivity of finger millet crops in India.

**Keywords:** Phosphorus fertilizer, PSB, VAM, soil fertility, grain yield and finger millet.

## INTRODUCTION

“Finger millet is known as a low fertilizer input crop by the small farmers who live on subsistence farming. Under low nutrient input conditions, the crop expresses poor yields. In India, it is mostly cultivated in resource poor soils of tropics and sub-tropics”. [21] “In some nutritional components, finger millet is a superior crop compared to some major cereal crops especially polished rice. Among the millets, finger millet has a high amount of calcium (0.38%), fiber (18%), phenolic compounds (0.3–3%) and sulphur containing amino acids”. [22] “It provides food security for poor farmers, although finger millet plays a very important role especially in the diet of rural people”. [23]

One of the main problem faced by the farmers is inherent low soil phosphorus in areas where finger millet is commonly grown. Phosphorus has distinct role in yield improvement of finger millet. Application of biofertilizers solubilized the insoluble phosphates in soil and thus improves nutrient availability. Since fertile soil is the fundamental resource for higher production, its maintenance is a prerequisite for long term sustainable crop production which cannot be maintained by using chemical fertilizers alone. Mycorrhiza fungi which constitute a group of important soil micro-organisms are ubiquitous throughout the world are known to improve the plant growth through better uptake of nutrients especially phosphorus. Keeping this in view, an investigation was planned to study comprehensively the role of phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizers (PSB and VAM) in improving soil properties and yield of finger millet.

## **MATERIAL AND METHODS**

An experiment was conducted during *kharif*, 2018 at Agricultural Research Station, Perumallapalli, Tirupati, Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural University, Andhra Pradesh, India, which is geographically situated at 13° 36' 761"N latitude and 79° 20' 704"E longitude with an altitude of 182.9 m above the mean sea level, which falls under Southern Agro Climatic Zone of Andhra Pradesh. During the crop growth period the weekly maximum temperatures ranged from 32.0 to 37.2°C with an average of 34.6°C, while the weekly minimum temperatures ranged from 22.2 to 27.1°C with an average of 24.6°C. The total sunshine hours were 66 hours with an average of 3.9 h day<sup>-1</sup>. The total rainfall received during the crop growth period was 272.7 mm during *kharif*, 2018. The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design and replicated thrice with nine (9) treatments.

The treatments consists of :

T<sub>1</sub>:No Phosphorus

T<sub>2</sub> :100 % Recommended dose of phosphorus (RDP)

T<sub>3</sub> :125 % RDP,

T<sub>4</sub> :100 % RDP + Phosphorus Solubilizing Bacteria @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup>(PSB)

T<sub>5</sub> :100 % RDP + Vesicular ArbuscularMycorrhizae @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>(VAM)

T<sub>6</sub> :100 % RDP + PSB + VAM

T<sub>7</sub> :75 % RDP + PSB

T<sub>8</sub> :75 % RDP + VAM

T<sub>9</sub> :75 % RDP + PSB + VAM

The recommended dose of nitrogen and potassium were applied in the form of urea and muriate of potash as basal . Phosphorus was applied in the form of single super phosphate as per treatments. PSB and VAM were thoroughly mixed with 100 kg FYM and applied as per treatments at the time of sowing.

“The soil samples were collected randomly from 0 to 15 cm depth at initial and after harvest. The soil samples were shade dried, pounded and sieved through 2 mm sieve (0.5 mm sieve for organic carbon)and analysed for its physico-chemical and chemical properties by using standard procedures. The pH of the soil was determined in 1:2.5 (soil:water) suspension by using a digital pH meter” (Jackson 1973). “The electrical conductivity of the soil saturation extract was determined with the help of a Wheatstone conductivity bridge” (Jackson 1973). Organic carbon in soil was determined by methods described by Walkley and Black (1934). “The available nitrogen was estimated by the alkaline permanganate” method by Subbiah andAsija(1956). The available phosphorus in soil was describe by Olsen *et al.* (1954).The available potassium of the soil samples was extracted with neutral normal ammonium acetate solution. Exchangeable calcium and magnesium was extracted with neutral ammonium acetate and determined by titrating with 0.01 N EDTA as per procedure out lined by Jackson (1973). Available sulphur in

soil samples was extracted with 0.15 per cent  $\text{CaCl}_2 \cdot 2\text{H}_2\text{O}$  (Williams and Steinberg's, 1959). DTPA extractable micronutrients were determined by using atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Varian AA 240 FS). Crop was harvested after attained physiological maturity and grain yield was recorded and expressed in  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ .

Initial experimental soil was sandy loam in texture, slightly alkaline in reaction, low in organic carbon and nitrogen, non saline nature, medium in available phosphorus and potassium, sufficient in DTPA extractable micronutrients. Initial soil properties of experimental field was presented in table 1.

## **STATISTICAL DATA ANALYSIS**

The data on various soil properties and yield were subjected to statistical scrutiny by following the analysis of variance for randomized block design as outlined by Panse and Sukhatme (1985). Statistical significance was tested with 'F' test at 5 percent and 1 per cent level of probability. Further multiple comparison tests have been done using duncan's multiple range test (DMRT) to identify the homogenous groups of treatments using SPSS-20.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Physico-Chemical properties**

Data pertaining to physico-chemical properties of soil after harvest was presented in table 2.

The application of phosphatic fertilizer, PSB, and VAM displayed no significant impact on the physico-chemical properties of the soil, including pH, electrical conductivity (EC), and organic carbon (OC). The maximum soil pH (7.77) was noticed with 75 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_7$ ) while, the lowest pH (7.55) was recorded with no phosphorus ( $T_1$ ). The EC range varied from 0.409  $\text{dS m}^{-1}$  with no phosphorus ( $T_1$ ) to 0.477  $\text{dS m}^{-1}$  due to application of 75 % RDP + VAM @ 12.5  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_8$ ). Higher soil OC (0.39 %) was registered with 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml  $\text{ha}^{-1}$  + VAM @ 12.5  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_6$ ) whereas, the lowest (0.36%) was observed with no phosphorus ( $T_1$ ) and 100 % RDP ( $T_2$ ).

### **Chemical properties**

Chemical properties *viz.*, available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium were significantly influenced by phosphorus management practices at harvest was presented in table 2.

#### **Available nitrogen:**

“The investigation into available nitrogen content in the soil yielded significant variations across the treatments. Remarkably, the highest available N ( $150 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) was recorded with 100 % RDP + PSB @  $750 \text{ ml ha}^{-1}$  + VAM @  $12.5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_6$ ) followed by 100 % RDP + PSB @  $750 \text{ ml ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_4$ ) which was on par with 75 % RDP + PSB @  $750 \text{ ml ha}^{-1}$  + VAM @  $12.5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_9$ )”. [20]The lowest ( $117 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) was observed with no phosphorus ( $T_1$ ).Significantly the highest available N was recorded with application of 100 % RDP + PSB @  $750 \text{ ml ha}^{-1}$  + VAM @  $12.5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  might be due to phosphorus application favourably responded to buildup N, P and K status of the soil. Increased buildup of N, P and K status was noted with increase in level of phosphorus. Further, the release of organic acids and hormones due to phosphorus bacterial activity might have helped in not only solubilize and mineralize P from insoluble compounds but also release other nutrients like available N in rhizosphere soil. VAM also increased nitrogen status in the mycorrhizosphere by decomposing organic matter. The results are in agreement with those of Ramakrishnaiah and Vijaya (2013) and Venkatarao *et al.* (2017).

#### **Available phosphorus:**

“Phosphorus management practices exerts significant effect on available  $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$  after harvest. The highest available  $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$  ( $42.74 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) was observed with 100 % RDP + PSB @  $750 \text{ ml ha}^{-1}$  + VAM @  $12.5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_6$ ) which was on par with 100 % RDP + PSB @  $750 \text{ ml ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_4$ ), 100 % RDP + VAM @  $12.5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_5$ ) and 75 % RDP + PSB @  $750 \text{ ml ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_7$ ). The lowest ( $33.95 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) was observed with no phosphorus ( $T_1$ ).The increase in available  $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$  content in soil with combined application of P fertilizer, PSB and VAM may be attributed to direct addition of P as well as solubilization of native P through release of various organic acids during microbial processes which solubilizes the tricalcium phosphate into monocalcium phosphate makes plant available form”(Kamble *et al.*, 2018)

#### **Available potassium:**

Application of phosphorus fertilizer, PSB and VAM exerted significant influence on available  $\text{K}_2\text{O}$  status in the soil after harvest. The highest available  $\text{K}_2\text{O}$  ( $227 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) was obtained with 75 % RDP + PSB @  $750 \text{ ml ha}^{-1}$  + VAM @  $12.5 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  ( $T_9$ ) which was on par with 75 %

RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>7</sub>), 125 % RDP (T<sub>3</sub>), 75 % RDP + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>8</sub>) and 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>6</sub>). The treatment no phosphorus (T<sub>1</sub>) which received the lowest (196 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) available K<sub>2</sub>O. The highest available K<sub>2</sub>O due to application of 75 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> may be attributed to direct addition of K to available pool of soil K. The beneficial effect of PSB and VAM on available K<sub>2</sub>O might also attributed to the organic acids released due to microbial activity which might have mobilized the native or non-exchangable form of K and charge the soil solution with K ions, so that it may be readily available. Similar results are perceived by Sharma *et al.* (2003) and also these results were agreement with finding of vajantha and subbarao (2017). These results emphasize the complex and synergistic interactions between phosphorus management practices, biofertilizers, and soil nutrient dynamics, underscoring the importance of adopting holistic approaches to enhance soil nutrient availability and subsequent crop performance.

### **Secondary nutrients**

Exchangeable calcium (Ca) and magnesium (Mg) in the soil exhibited no significant changes as a result of phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizer. Maximum exchangeable Ca and Mg (3.00 and 1.93 meq 100 g<sup>-1</sup>) was obtained with 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>6</sub>) while the lowest (2.55 and 1.60 meq 100 g<sup>-1</sup>) was noticed with no phosphorus (T<sub>1</sub>).

Available S significantly influenced by phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizers. Significantly the highest available S (9.57 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded with 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>6</sub>) followed by 125 % RDP (T<sub>3</sub>), 75 % RDP + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>8</sub>) and 75 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>7</sub>). The lowest (7.69 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was observed with no phosphorus (T<sub>1</sub>). Significantly the highest available S after harvest was registered with combined application of 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> and VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> may be due to S is added through SSP which is source of phosphatic fertilizer and VAM fungi provides significant amount of sulphur by making their widely extended hyphal network on the upper or lower side of the soil layer. The present findings are in accordance with findings of Pramanik and Bera (2013).

### **DTPA extractable micronutrients**

Data pertaining to DTPA extractable micronutrients in soil after harvest of finger millet was presented in Table 3.

All DTPA extractable cationic micronutrients *viz.*, Fe, Zn and Cu were not significantly influenced by application of phosphorus fertilizer and biofertilizers except Mn. The higher DTPA extractable Fe, Zn and Cu (6.38, 1.15 and 1.63 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) was recorded with combined application of with 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>6</sub>) while the lowest was (4.67, 0.95 and 1.46 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) noticed with no phosphorus (T<sub>1</sub>). The DTPA extractable Mn varied significantly with treatments. “Significantly the highest DTPA extractable Mn (38.67 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) obtained from 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>6</sub>). The lowest (31.32 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was registered with no phosphorus (T<sub>1</sub>). Maximum post harvest DTPA extractable Mn was obtained with 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> may be due to application of biofertilizers affected the plant nutrient dynamics in soil, especially fewer mobile nutrients in soil solution with their hyphae, which explore the soil for nutrients”. (Sharma *et al.*, 2003).

### **Grain Yield**

Data presented in Table 4 on grain yield revealed that phosphorus management practices showed a greater impact on grain yield of finger millet.

Grain yield of finger millet was significantly influenced by phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizers. Significantly the highest grain yield (4328 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded with application of 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>6</sub>) followed by 75 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (T<sub>9</sub>). The lowest grain yield (3692 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded with no phosphorus (T<sub>1</sub>).

The highest grain yield was recorded with application of 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> might be attributed to better supply of nutrients along with conducive physical environment leading to better root activity and higher nutrient absorption, which resulted in more plant growth and superior yield attributes responsible for higher yield. The application of biofertilizers (PSB and VAM) increase the efficiency of chemical fertilizers due to control release of nutrients in the soil through microbial activity which might have facilitated better crop

growth. The present findings are in accordance with findings of **Abbasi and Yousra** (2012), **Acharya et al.** (2012) and **Kejiya et al.** (2019).

## Conclusion

Combined application of 100 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> is the most efficient phosphorus management practice for sustainable grain yield and soil fertility followed by 75 % RDP + PSB @ 750 ml ha<sup>-1</sup> + VAM @ 12.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>.

## REFERENCES

1. Abbasi MK, Yousra, M. Synergistic effects of biofertilizer with organic and chemical N sources in improving soil nutrient status and increasing growth and yield of wheat grown under greenhouse conditions. *Plant Biosystems*. 2012, 146, 181-189.
2. Acharya R, Dash AK, Senapati HK. Effect of integrated nutrient management on microbial activity influencing grain yield under rice-rice cropping system in an acid soils. *Asian Journal of Microbiology, Biotechnology and Environmental Sciences*. 2012, 14, 365-368.
3. Gafoor RA, Pillai S and Nishan MA. 2021. Effect on integrated nutrient management on finger millet (*Eleusinecoracana* (L.) Gaertn.): A review. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 2021, 10(5), 292-298.
4. Harika JV, Maitra S, Shankar T, Bera M and Manasa P. Growth, yield and quality of finger millet (*Eleusinecoracana* L. gaertn) as influenced by integrated nutrient management. *International Journal of Bioresource Science*, 2019, 6(2), 65-70.
5. Jackson ML. *Soil Chemical Analysis*. 1967, Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.
6. Kamble BM, Kathmale DK, Rathod SD. Soil nutrient status, uptake, yield and economics of groundnut-wheat cropping sequence as influenced by organic sources and fertilizers. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2018, 66 (1), 66-75.
7. Kejiya P. Effect of phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizers on yield and quality of finger millet (*Eleusinecoracana* L.). 2019, *Ph.D Thesis*. Acharya N.G. Ranga Agricultural university, Andhra Pradesh.
8. Kejiya P, Vajantha B, Naidu MVS, Nagavani, AV. Effect of phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizers on yield and quality of finger millet (*Eleusinecoracana* L.). *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2019, 8 (7), 846-852.

9. Maitra S., Reddy MD and Nanda SP. Nutrient management in finger millet (*Eleusinecoracana* L. Gaertn) in India. *International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology*, 2020, 13(1), 13-21.
10. Olsen SR, Cole CV., Watanabe FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. *Circular of United States Department of Agriculture*. 1954, 939.
11. Panse VG, Sukhatme PV. *Statistical methods for Agricultural Research*, New Delhi. 1985.
12. Pramanik K, Bera, AK. Effect of biofertilizers and phytohormone on growth, productivity and quality of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*. L). *Journal of Crop and Weed*. 2013, 9(2), 122-127.
13. Ramakrishnaiah G, Vijaya, T. Influence of VAM fungi, *Azotobacter* sp. and PSB on soil phosphatase activity and nutrients (N, P, K, Cu, Zn, Fe and Mn) status in the rhizosphere of *stevia rebaudiana*(Bert.) plants. *American Journal of Plant Sciences*. 2103, 4, 1443-1447.
14. Sharma RP, Datta N, Sharma PK. Combined of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and FYM in onion (*Allium cepa*) under high hills, dry temperate conditions of north western Himalayas. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2003, 73: 225-227.
15. Subbiah BV, Asija CL. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available nitrogen in soils. *Current Science*. 1956, 25: 32.
16. Vajantha B, Subbarao M. Comparative study of organic and inorganic fertilizers on soil fertility status, nutrient uptake and yield in finger millet. *Trends in Biosciences*. 2017, 9624-9627.
17. VenkataraoChV, Naga SR, Yadav BL, Shivran AC, Singh SP. Influence of phosphorus and biofertilizers on soil fertility and enzyme activity of soils grown under mungbean [*Vignaradiata*(L.)Wilczek]. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*. 2017, 6 (12), 737-741.
18. Walkley A, Black, C.A. Estimation of organic carbon by chromic acid titration method. *Soil science*. 1934, 37: 29-34.
19. William CH, Steinbergs. In: *Methods and analysis of soil, plants, water and fertilizers*. Fertilizer development and consultation organization, New Delhi, India, 1959, p.58.
20. Kejiya P, Vajantha B, Naidu MV, Nagavani AV. Effect of Phosphatic Fertilizer and Biofertilizers on Yield and Quality of Finger Millet (*Eleusinecoracana* L.). *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci*. 2019;8(7):846-52.

21. Kamble BM, Kathmale DK, Rathod SD. Soil nutrient status, uptake, yield and economics of groundnut-wheat cropping sequence as influenced by organic sources and fertilizers. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2018;66(1):66-75.
22. Sandhya Rani Y., Triveni U. Patro, T.S.S.K. and Divya M. YIELD AND QUALITY IMPROVEMENT IN FINGER MILLET THROUGH NUTRIENT MANAGEMENT IN RED SANDY LOAM SOILS. *Progressive Research – An International Journal Society for Scientific Development*. Volume 12 (2) : 154-160, (2017)
23. Thilakarathna MS, Raizada MN. A review of nutrient management studies involving finger millet in the semi-arid tropics of Asia and Africa. *Agronomy*. 2015 Jun 30;5(3):262-90.

**Table 1. Initial soil properties of the experimental field**

Particulars	Value
<b>A. Physical characteristics</b>	
Sand (%)	68.26
Silt (%)	20.50
Clay (%)	11.24
Textural class	Sandy loam
<b>B. Physico-chemical characteristics</b>	
Soil pH (1:2.5 Soil water suspension)	7.62
EC (dS m <sup>-1</sup> ) at 25 <sup>o</sup> C	0.40
<b>C. Chemical characteristics</b>	
Organic carbon (%)	0.33
Available N (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	120
Available P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	43.8
Available K <sub>2</sub> O (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	218
Exchangeable Ca (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> )	2.53

Exchangeable Mg (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> )	1.63
Available S (ppm)	7.31
DTPA extractable Fe (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	1.50
DTPA extractable Mn (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	33.84
DTPA extractable Zn (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	5.05
DTPA extractable Cu (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	1.05

**Table 2. Physico-chemical and chemical properties of soil after harvest of finger millet as influenced by phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizers**

Treatments	pH	EC (dS m <sup>-1</sup> )	OC (%)	Available nitrogen (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Available P <sub>2</sub> O <sub>5</sub> (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Available K <sub>2</sub> O (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
T <sub>1</sub>	7.55	0.409	0.36	117 <sup>b</sup>	33.95 <sup>c</sup>	196 <sup>c</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	7.58	0.460	0.36	121 <sup>ab</sup>	35.75 <sup>bc</sup>	201 <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	7.72	0.448	0.37	125 <sup>ab</sup>	40.65 <sup>ab</sup>	226 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	7.66	0.447	0.37	142 <sup>ab</sup>	42.34 <sup>a</sup>	213 <sup>abc</sup>
T <sub>5</sub>	7.73	0.410	0.38	125 <sup>ab</sup>	41.77 <sup>a</sup>	219 <sup>ab</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	7.66	0.452	0.39	150 <sup>a</sup>	42.74 <sup>a</sup>	222 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	7.77	0.428	0.38	134 <sup>ab</sup>	41.72 <sup>a</sup>	226 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	7.73	0.477	0.37	129 <sup>ab</sup>	40.63 <sup>ab</sup>	224 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	7.61	0.418	0.38	138 <sup>ab</sup>	38.88 <sup>ab</sup>	227 <sup>a</sup>
F value	1.13	0.26	0.40	1.94*	3.85*	3.68*
p-value	0.39 3	0.969	0.903	0.023	0.010	0.013
* Significant at p=0.05 level      ** Significant at p=0.01 level						
Note : Same set of alphabets indicates no significant difference or at par with each other (DMRT)						

**Table 3. Secondary nutrients and DTPA extractable micronutrients in soil as influenced by phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizers in finger millet**

Treatments	Exchangeable calcium (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> )	Exchangeable magnesium (meq 100 g <sup>-1</sup> )	Available sulphur (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	DTPA extractable Micronutrients (mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )			
				Iron	Manganese	Zinc	Copper
T <sub>1</sub>	2.55	1.60	7.69 <sup>c</sup>	4.67	31.32 <sup>c</sup>	0.95	1.46
T <sub>2</sub>	2.70	1.73	8.07 <sup>bc</sup>	4.70	34.07 <sup>bc</sup>	0.97	1.50
T <sub>3</sub>	2.83	1.78	9.39 <sup>ab</sup>	5.84	34.41 <sup>bc</sup>	0.98	1.51
T <sub>4</sub>	2.60	1.77	8.85 <sup>abc</sup>	6.07	34.50 <sup>bc</sup>	1.04	1.56
T <sub>5</sub>	2.65	1.85	8.64 <sup>abc</sup>	6.16	35.96 <sup>ab</sup>	1.02	1.52
T <sub>6</sub>	3.00	1.93	9.57 <sup>a</sup>	6.38	38.67 <sup>a</sup>	1.15	1.63
T <sub>7</sub>	2.64	1.62	9.24 <sup>ab</sup>	5.88	35.95 <sup>ab</sup>	1.03	1.55
T <sub>8</sub>	2.73	1.83	9.37 <sup>ab</sup>	5.13	34.73 <sup>abc</sup>	0.99	1.52
T <sub>9</sub>	2.80	1.89	8.75 <sup>abc</sup>	6.20	37.15 <sup>ab</sup>	1.10	1.61
F value	2.39	0.92	1.79*	2.57	2.87*	2.41	1.52
p-value	0.065	0.521	0.025	0.061	0.034	0.064	0.256

\* Significant at p=0.05 level      \*\* Significant at p=0.01 level  
 Note : Same set of alphabets indicates no significant difference or at par with each other (DMRT)

**Table 4. Grain yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of finger millet as influenced by phosphatic fertilizer and biofertilizers**

Treatments	Grain yield
T <sub>1</sub>	3692 <sup>d</sup>
T <sub>2</sub>	3846 <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>3</sub>	4083 <sup>abc</sup>
T <sub>4</sub>	3946 <sup>bc</sup>

T <sub>5</sub>	3858 <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>6</sub>	4328 <sup>a</sup>
T <sub>7</sub>	3783 <sup>cd</sup>
T <sub>8</sub>	3942 <sup>bc</sup>
T <sub>9</sub>	4157 <sup>ab</sup>
F value	3.54*
p-value	0.015

\* Significant at p=0.05 level \*\* Significant at p=0.01 level  
 Note : Same set of alphabets indicates no significant difference or at par with each other (DMRT)



**Plate 1. Overall view of the experimental field**