__Original Research Article__

Impact of conservation tillage on soil physicalproperties under sorghum-wheat cropping system in semi-arid tropics of Haryana

ABSTRACT

The study was conductedatResearch Farm of CCSHAU, Hisar. Three tillage (Zero tillage, conventional tillage and minimum tillage)and four P treatments (0, 45, 60, and 75 kg ha^{-1}) were applied in wheat. The mean weight diameter of soil aggregates in 0-5 cm soil depth was significantly higher under zero tillage as compared to other tillage practices. Maximum aggregation was in 5-10 cm soil depth. Amongst three tillage systems, bulk density increased with depth. The saturated hydraulic conductivity was significantly improved under zero tillage as compared to other practices. Moisture content was significantly higher at field capacity under zero tillage as compared to other methods, while moisture content at permanent wilting point (PWP) was not affected significantly by tillage treatments. Infiltration rate was almost identicalunder conventional tillage and minimum tillage practices, respectively which was significantly lower than the zero tillage.

Keywords: Soil physical properties,Tillage practices, Sorghum-wheat.

INTRODUCTION

The world'spopulationis expandingday by day so the demand for food is also increasing, to meet the demand of growing population there is need to bring more lands under cultivation for crop production. The growing concern for ensuring food supply with the help of improved soil management practices requires for selection of better crop yield, sustainability and environmental friendly. As we know tillage practice is the mechanical manipulation of the soil with help of tools and implementsto provide favorable conditions for seed germination and crop growth by affectingthe soil characteristics like soil water conservation, soil temperature, infiltration and evapo-transpiration processes.Tillage practices have great impact on the soil properties and the soil environmentwhich leads to increase in the yield of the field crops.conventional tillage is also reported to have a huge impact on soil physical, chemical and biological properties which further are closely related to crop yield[41,42,43]. The use of conventional tillage techniques has resulted in edaphic issues such as soil erosion, degradation, and loss of fertility (Wani et al., 2023).Tillage practices affect physical properties of soil like bulk density, infiltration rate, hydraulic conductivity and moisture content etc. Thewishforincreasing yieldtomeetexpandingdemandshould bedonewithout soildegradationandthesoilshould beprepared in such a waytoserveasastoreratherthanasourceofatmospheric pollutants (Busari *et al*.,2015).

Conservation tillage practice maintains at least 30% of the soil surface covered with crop residue after planting to reduce soil erosionConservation tillage maintains the soil's stability and proper pore distribution, in contrast to conventional tillage techniques that break down soil aggregates and produce a hard pan.(Das et al., 2020).Lal (1990) described conservation tillage as the method of seedbed preparation that includes the presence of residue mulch and an increase in surface roughness as the key criteria. Conservation tillage along withcrop residue cover on soil,rotation of crops and crop diversity could be a practically applicable method to safeguard sustainable crop production and perpetuate environmental quality. So it could be assumed that conservation tillage is a component of conservation agriculture (CA). Conservation tillage helps in maintaining soil health along with increased production and hence it is an environment friendly option.

Conservation tillage is an ecological approach to soil surface management and seedbed preparation.Shifting from conventional to conservation tillage,in accordance with the principle of conservation agriculture, help in improving soil structure, increase soil organic carbon, minimize soil erosion, conserve soil water, decrease fluctuations in soil temperature and enhance soil quality and environmental regulatory capacity of the soil. Crop residue is an important renewable resource which provides essential nutrients to the soils along with conservation of soil. Developing techniques for effective utilization of this vast resource is a major challenge.Improperusesofcropresidues(e.g.removal,burningorploughingunder)can accelerateerosion,soilfertilitydepletionandenvironmentalpollutionthroughburning. The principleofconservationtillageinvolvesmaintenanceofsurfacesoilcoverthroughretentionofcropresi dues achievablebypracticingzerotillageandminimalmechanicalsoildisturbance.Retentionofcropresidues protectsthe soil fromdirectimpactofraindropsandsunlightwhiletheminimalsoildisturbanceenhancessoilbiological activitiesaswellassoilairandwatermovement.Soil compaction at the soil surface can be remediated by the usual soil tillage, root growth and biological activity. The soil is not inverted and mixed with the crop residues and this seems to profoundly impact on soil properties particularly in the upper soil layer under reduced tillage.So this study emphasized the need of conservation tillage for sustainable crop production and soil health.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study was conducted atresearch farm of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar. The experimental site atresearch farm of CCS Haryana Agricultural University, Hisar is situated in semi-arid, sub-tropics at latitude 29^{o} 10' North, longitude of 75^{o} 46' East and at an altitude of 215.2 m mean sea level in Haryana State of India.

The soil of the experimental field has been classified as Coarse loamy, calcareous, Typic Haplustepts by Soil Taxonomy and the relevant physico-chemical properties of the soil are given in table 1below.

Table 1.Physico-chemical properties of soil of the experimental site at initiation

Soil properties	Soil depth (cm)	
	0-15	15-30
Sand (%)	69.8	71.6
Silt (%)	16.4	12.8
Clay (%)	13.8	15.6
Textural class	Sandy loam	Sandy loam
$pH_{(1:2)}$	8.20	8.12
$EC_{(1:2)}$dS m^{-1}	0.52	0.54
Organic carbon (%)	0.48	0.34
Available N (kg ha^{-1})	140	126
Available P (kg ha^{-1})	14.6	11.7
Available K (kg ha^{-1})	450	478

The soil was sandy loam in texture, alkaline in reaction, nonsaline, medium in organic carbon content, low in available N, medium in available P and high in available K.

Soil samples were collected from different soil depth(0-5, 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25 and 25-30 cm)using core sampler for the determination of bulk density, hydraulic conductivity; moisture content at the field capacity level and permanent wilting point. Soil samples were also taken from each treatment without disturbing the natural aggregates from different soil depths for wet aggregate analysis. The big sized clods of soil samples were gently broken by free fall from about 60-70 cm height on a vegetative surface so as to break the clods at natural cleavage planes.Description of different treatments used in experiment is given in table 2 below.

Table 2. **Description of treatments used for the experiment and their plot allocations**

Treatment	Plot allocation	Description
Type of tillage (T)	Main plot	ZT: Zero tillage
		MT: Minimum tillage
		CT: Conventional tillage
Levels of phosphorus (P)	Sub-plot	P_0: 0 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}
		P_{45}: 45 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}
		P_{60}: 60 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}
		P_{75}: 75 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}

Soil analysis

Soil samples were analyzed forbulk density, moisture content at field capacity and permanent wilting point, wet aggregate analysis, saturated hydraulic conductivity and infiltration rate.The bulk density was determined using core sampler (5 cm inner diameter and 5 cm in height) from different soil depths (0-5, 5-10, 10-15, 15-20, 20-25 and 25-30 cm) after oven drying at 105°C for 24 hours.Soil infiltration rate was determined by using close top double ring infiltrometer (Malik*et al.,* 1985).

Saturated hydraulic conductivity of each soil core was determined by constant head permeameter (Richards, 1954) and calculated using Darcy's equation. Moisture content at field capacity and permanent wilting point was determined using pressure plate apparatus at 0.33 and 15 bar suction, respectively (Richards, 1954). Wet aggregate analysis was done by Yodder's apparatus (Yodder, 1936).

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was carried out for data calculation using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Corporation, USA) and SPSS 16 (Statistical Package for the Social Science, SPSS, Inc., Chicago, USA, window version 16.0).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Impact of tillage practices on soil physical properties

Wet aggregates: Mean weight diameter of soil aggregates (Table 3) was significantly higher under Zero tillage (ZT) as compared to other tillage practices.

Table 3. Mean weight diameter (mm) at various soil depths under zero (ZT), minimum (MT) and conventional (CT) tillage (± indicates standard error of mean of the observed values)

Depth (cm)	ZT	MT	CT
0-5	0.28 ± 0.012	0.25 ± 0.016	0.23 ± 0.014
5-10	0.29 ± 0.015	0.26 ± 0.015	0.24 ± 0.012
10-15	0.26 ± 0.013	0.24 ± 0.016	0.24 ± 0.012
15-20	0.23 ± 0.010	0.23 ± 0.009	0.22 ± 0.009
20-25	0.23 ± 0.008	0.22 ± 0.006	0.21 ± 0.005
25-30	0.24 ± 0.009	0.23 ± 0.006	0.22 ± 0.006

The maximum aggregation was foundin 5-10 cm soil depth and decreased upto 20 cm depth. It was also observed that there was no difference in mean weight diameter of soil aggregates throughout the depths under conventional tillage(CT) and minimum tillage (MT).The results are in conformity with those of Liebig *et al.*, (2004) who reported that within surface 7.5 cm, no-till system possessed greater soil aggregate stability (33.4%) relative to the CT system while Six *et al.*, (2000)reported that the rate of macroaggregate formation and degradation is reduced under no-till system compared to CT leading to formation of stable microaggregates.ZT practices lead to better soil aggregation, resulting in the formation of macroaggregates in tropics and subtropics (Sekaran et al. 2021).Aggregate size and stability and soil structure were analyzed, these properties improved more under NT systems than CT systems. Increase in SOC storage is found significant under conservation than conventional tillage in surface soil. It may be due to change in the soil porosity, water content and reduction in soilaggregation (Srivastava *et al.*, 2016). Water-stable aggregates cannot be sustained with CT since the residue cover is not sufficient to protect against surface crusting. Aggregate stability and size are very important in maintaining soil structure and minimizing erosion. Karlen *et al.*, (1994) demonstrated that there was a significant increase in aggregate size after 10 years of growing corn under a NT system on highly erodible silt loam with slopes of 10 to 13 percent, near Lancaster, Wisconsin. Rhoton*et al.*, (1993) conducted a 15-years study on four soils with different textures in four different southeastern States. Aggregate stability was higher under NT than CT in all soils. These studies indicate that physical soil properties are improved with NT, regardless of the temperature and moisture region.

Soil bulk density:Bulk density (BD) of a soil is an indication of the soil's compaction and thus resistance to tillage implements or plants as they penetrate the soil. The BD was increased with soil depth amongst all the tillage systems (Table 4).

Table 4. Soil bulk density (Mg m^{-3}) at various soil depths under zero (ZT), minimum (MT) and conventional (CT) tillage (± indicates standard error of mean of the observed values)

Depth (cm)	ZT	MT	CT
0-5	1.53 ± 0.015	1.57 ± 0.008	1.58 ± 0.009
5-10	1.56 ± 0.028	1.59 ± 0.008	1.58 ± 0.005
10-15	1.60 ± 0.017	1.60 ± 0.005	1.61 ± 0.010
15-20	1.64 ± 0.006	1.63 ± 0.008	1.63 ± 0.000
20-25	1.64 ± 0.005	1.65 ± 0.006	1.65 ± 0.006
25-30	1.65 ± 0.006	1.65 ± 0.005	1.65 ± 0.006

Highest BD(1.65 Mg m^{-3}) was observed in20-25 and 25-30 cm soil depth. The lowest and significantly lower BD was observed in the 0-5 cm soil depth under ZT (1.55 Mg m^{-3}) than MT (1.57 Mg m^{-3}) and CT (1.58 Mg m^{-3}) respectively.Similar results were also observed by other workers (Daraghmeh *et al.,* 2009; Osunbitan*et al.,* 2005; Logsdon *et al.,* 1999; Lo´pez-Fando and Pardo, 2009; Tripathi *et al.,*2005; Kahlon *et al.,*2013; Franzluebbers and Stuedemann, 2008 and Villamil *et al.,* 2006).

Saturated Hydraulic conductivity: Saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ks) is a quantitative measure of a saturated soil's ability to transmit water when subjected to a hydraulic gradient. It can be thought of as the ease with which pores of a saturated soil permit water movement.Kswas highest in 0-5 cm soil depth and significantly decreased inlower soil depth under theall tillage treatments (Table 5).

Table 5. Saturated hydraulic conductivity (cm hr^{-1}) for various depths under zero (ZT), minimum (MT) and conventional (CT) tillage (± indicates standard error of mean of the observed values)

Depth (cm)	ZT	MT	CT
0-5	0.84 ± 0.053	0.72 ± 0.053	0.68 ± 0.068
5-10	0.69 ± 0.050	0.68 ± 0.074	0.65 ± 0.030
10-15	0.66 ± 0.060	0.65 ± 0.032	0.65 ± 0.084
15-20	0.60 ± 0.059	0.62 ± 0.026	0.60 ± 0.066
20-25	0.59 ± 0.019	0.60 ± 0.053	0.59 ± 0.044
25-30	0.57 ± 0.078	0.60 ± 0.022	0.61± 0.055

The Ks was significantly increased in the 0-5 cm soil depth under ZT as compared to other tillage practices and statistically at par inlower soil depths.Since Ks is a function of the size and continuity of pores, therefore, higher accumulation of soil organic carbon and less soil disturbance in ZT may have promoted the formation of larger sized pores responsible for higher water transmission in surface layer as compared to MT and CT practices. Numerous studieshave indicated that ZT practices can significantlyenhance both saturated and unsaturated hydraulic conductivity (Krauss et al. 2020; Manasa et al. 2020;Maitra and Gitari, 2020).Ks is reported to be higher under ZT than MT and CT in different textured soils with a variable magnitude of difference between the two treatments (Naresh *et al.,* 2016). The hydraulic conductivity and infiltration rate were increased under zero tillage as compared to conventional tillage in an alluvial soil of the semi-arid subtropics(McGarry *et al.*,2000). The tillage practices were implemented for 6 and 8 years which showed that the soils under conservation tillage had better pore connectivity and higher saturated hydraulic conductivity than conventional tillage (Vogeler *et al.*, 2009).

Moisture content at field capacity: The moisture content was significantly higher at field capacity levelin 0-5 cm soil depth under ZT (16.56%), MT (16.06%) and CT (16.0%) respectively (Table 6).

Table 6. Moisture content at field capacity (%) at various depths under zero (ZT), minimum (MT) and conventional (CT) tillage (± indicates standard error of mean of the observed values)

Depth (cm)	ZT	MT	CT
0-5	16.56 ± 0.170	16.06 ± 0.210	16.00 ± 0.190
5-10	16.42 ± 0.190	16.17 ± 0.160	16.22 ± 0.230
10-15	16.57 ± 0.210	16.42 ± 0.223	16.34 ± 0.190
15-20	17.10 ± 0.177	17.07 ± 0.128	17.01 ± 0.190
20-25	17.24 ± 0.162	17.34 ± 0.115	17.56 ± 0.178
25-30	17.74 ± 0.178	17.89 ± 0.156	17.56 ± 0.155

The moisture content was increased with depth under different tillage practices. The ZT treatment was found effective over MT and CT in increasing water retention in soil as the moisture content at field capacity level and observed to be higher in 0-5, 5-10 and 10-15 cm soil depth respectively(Ghuman and Sur, 2001; Schwen *et al.,* 2011; Castellini and Ventrella, 2012).The volume of soil water held at field capacity level increased at a much higher rate than that of water held at permanent wilting point. NT systems along with using high-residue crops in the crop rotation, using cover crops that provide high levels of biomass, maintaining crop residue with a high content of carbon, and avoiding excessive removal of residue, as well as climate, are key to increasing the content of SOM(Ernest*et al.*,2015).

Moisture content at permanent wilting point:The moisture content was not affected by tillage treatment at permanent wilting point (PWP). However, the lowest moisture content at PWP was observed in the 0-5 cm soil depth which was gradually increased in 5-10, 10-15 and 15-20 cm and then remained identical at lower soil depths(Table 7).

Table 7: Moisture content at permanent wilting point (%) at various depths under zero (ZT), minimum (MT) and conventional (CT) tillage (± indicates standard error of mean of the observed values)

Depth (cm)	ZT	MT	CT
0-5	7.42 ± 0.079	7.40 ± 0.072	7.45 ± 0.081
5-10	7.60 ± 0.089	7.61 ± 0.086	7.55 ± 0.079
10-15	7.82 ± 0.068	7.78 ± 0.083	7.74 ± 0.081
15-20	7.98 ± 0.063	7.95 ± 0.062	7.91 ± 0.071
20-25	8.05 ± 0.054	8.01 ± 0.046	8.00 ± 0.042
25-30	8.06 ± 0.045	8.03 ± 0.051	8.04 ± 0.046

It is possibly due to higher clay content in lower soil depths and PWP is a function of textural pores rather than structural pores (Govaerts*et al.*, 2007).

Infiltration rate:Infiltration ratewas significantlyhigher underZT (3.83 cm hr^{-1}) as compared to CT (3.73 cm hr^{-1}) and MT (3.75 cm hr^{-1})practices. The infiltration rate was increased by 3 per cent in ZT practice over CT practice under sorghum-wheat cropping system.The water intake rate of soil increased in ZT as compared to MT and CT (Table 8).

Table 8. Infiltration rate (cm hr^{-1}) of soil under zero (ZT), minimum (MT) and conventional (CT) tillage (± indicates standard error of mean of the observed values)

Tillage practice	**Infiltration rate (cm hr^{-1})**
ZT	3.83 ± 0.096
MT	3.75 ± 0.095
CT	2.72 ± 0.056

ZT exhibited superior infiltration parameters compared to conventional tillage on as sandy Alfisol (Busari and Salako, 2012).As water infiltration into the soil is controlled by the number and connectivity of surface vented macrospores (Ehlers, 1975), therefore, the practice of ZT may have promoted macro-pores net working resulting in higher water infiltration into the soil as compared to soil which were disturbed under CT and MT practices (Horn and Baumgartl, 2000; Govaerts*et al.*, 2007). Similar results were also reported for loam (Ferrerras*et al.*, 2000) and sandy clay loam (Pelegrin and Moreno, 1993) soils.Infiltration, penetration resistance, and crusting/sealing improved under conservation tillage practices as compared to CT systems (Villamil *et al.*, 2006 and Franzluebbers, 2002).

CONCLUSIONS

The mean weight diameter (MWD) of soil aggregates was significantly higher under ZT as compared to MT or CT in 0-5 cm soil depth. The bulk density (BD) was increased with depth.There was no significant effect of tillage below 10 cm soil depth. Saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ks) was highest in the 0-5 cm soil depth then decreased with depth under different tillage systems. The Ks was significantly increased in the 0-5 cm soil depth under ZT as compared to other tillage practices. Moisture content at field capacity was significantly higher under ZT as compared to MT/CT in 0-5 cm soil depth. The infiltration rate was increased by 3 per cent in ZT practice over CT practice under sorghum-wheat cropping system

REFERENCES

1. Brady N C andWeil R R.2002. *The nature and properties of soils*. Pearson Education, NJ.

2. Busari M A, Kukal S S, Kaur A, Bhatt R and DulaziAA.2015. Conservation tillage impacts on soil, crop and the environment. *International Soil and Water Conservation Research***3**(2): 119-129.
3. Busari, M.A. and Salako, F.K. 2012. Effect of tillage and poultry manure application on soil infiltration rate and maize root growth in a sandy Alfisol. Agro-sci. J. Trop. Agric., Food, Environ. Ext., 11: 24–31.
4. Castellini M and Ventrella D.2012. Impact of conventional and minimum tillage on soil hydraulic conductivity in typical cropping system in Southern Italy. *Soil and Tillage Research***124**: 47-57.
5. Das, A., Layek, J., Idapuganti, R. G., Basavaraj, S., Lal, R., Rangappa, K., et al. (2020). Conservation tillage and residue management improves soil properties under a upland rice–rapeseed system in the subtropical eastern Himalayas. Land Degrad. Dev. 31, 1775–1791. doi: 10.1002/ldr.3568
6. Daraghmeh O A, Jensen J Rand Petersen C T.2009. Soil structure stability under conventional and reduced tillage in a sandy loam. *Geoderma***150**: 64-71.
7. Ehlers W.1975. Observation of earthworms channels and infiltration on tilled and untilled loess soil. *Soil Science***119**: 242-449.
8. Ernest H,Kumar A,Bhople B,Srivastava P K,Singh R D andKumarS.2015. Soil quality and health management through farming practices: to ensure agricultural sustainability. *Reseaerch Journal of Pharmaceutical, Biologicaland Chemical Sciences***6**(4): 1983-92.
9. Ferreras, L A, Costa J L,Garcia F Oand Pecorari C.2000. Effect of no-tillage on some soil physical properties of a structural degraded petrocalcicpaleudoll of southern “pampa” Argentina. *Soil and TillageResearch***54**: 31-39.
10. Franzluebbers A J.2002. Soil organic matter stratification ratio as an indicator of soil quality. *Soil and Tillage Research***66**(2): 95-106.

11. Franzluebbers A Jand Stuedemann J A.2008.Soil physical responses to cattle grazing cover crops under conventional and no tillage in the Southern Piedmont, USA. *Soil and Tillage Research***100**: 141-153.
12. Ghuman B S andSur H S.2001. Tillage and residue management effects on soil properties and yields on rain-fed maize and wheat in a sub-humid sub-tropical climate. *Soil and Tillage Research***58**: 1-10.
13. Govaerts B, Fuentes M, Sayre K D, Mezzalama M, Nicol J M, Deckers J, Etchevers Jand Figueroa-Sandoval B.2007.Infiltration, soil moisture, root rot and nematode populations after 12 years of different tillage, residue and crop rotation managements. *Soil and Tillage Research***94**: 209-219.
14. Horn R and Baumgartl T.2000. Dynamic properties of soil. *Handbook of Soil Science.* CRC Press, USA, 19-51.
15. Kahlon M S,Lal Rand Varughese M A.2013. Twenty-two years of tillage and mulch impact on physical characteristics and carbon sequestration. *Soil and Tillage Research***125**: 151-58.
16. Karlen D L, Wollenhaupt N C, Erbach D C, Berry E C, Swan J B, Eash N Sand Jordah J L.1994. Crop residue effects on soil quality following 10 years of no-till corn. *Soil and Tillage Research***31**:149-167.
17. Krauss, M., Berner, A., Perrochet, F., Frei, R., Niggli, U. and Mäder, P. 2020. Enhanced soil quality with reduced tillage and solid manures in organic farming – a synthesis of 15 years. Sci. Rep., 10: 4403.
18. Lal R.1990.*Soil erosion in the tropics: Principles and management*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
19. Liebig M A, Tanaka D Land Wienhold B J.2004. Tillage and cropping effects on soil quality indicators in the northern Great Plains. *Soil and Tillage Research***78**: 131-41.
20. Logsdon S D, Kasper T Cand Camberdella C A.1999. Depth incremental soil properties under no-till or chisel management. *Soil Science Societyof America Journal***63**:197-200.

21. Lopez-Fando Cand Pardo M T.2009. Changes in soil chemical characteristics with different tillage practices in a semi-arid environment. *Soil and Tillage Research***104**: 278-284.

22. Malik R S, Sharma S Kand Dhankar J S.1985: Design of sensitive practicable and closed top infiltrometer. *Soil Science***139**:452-57.

23. Maitra, S. and Gitari, H.I. 2020. Scope for adoption of intercropping system in organic agriculture. Ind. J. Nat. Sci., 11(63): 28624 - 28631.

24. Manasa, P., Maitra, S. and Barman S. 2020. Yield attributes, yield, competitive ability and economics of summer maize-legume intercropping system. Int. J. Agric. Environ. Biotechnol., 13(1): 33 - 38.

25. McGarry D, Bridge B DandRodford B J.2000. Contracting soil physical properties after zero and traditional tillage of an alluvial soil in the semi-arid subtropical. *Soil and Tillage Research***53**:105-115.

26. Naresh R K, Dwivedi A,Gupta R K, Rathore R S, Dhaliwal S S, Singh S P, Kumar P, KumarR, Singh V and SinghO.2016. Influence of conservation agriculture practices on physical, chemical and biological properties of soil and soil organic carbon dynamics in the subtropical climatic conditions: A review. *Journal of Pureand Applied Microbiology***10**: 1061-80.

27. Osunbitan J A, Oyedele D J, and Adekalu K O.2005. Tillage effects on bulk density, hydraulic conductivity and strength of a loamy sand soil in south western Nigeria. *Soil and Tillage Research***82**: 57-64.

28. Pelegrin Fand MorenoF.1993. Study of water infiltration in soil under different tillage systems. *Acta Horticulturae***335**:73-79.

29. Rasmussen K J.1999.Impact of ploughless soil tillage on yield and soil quality: A Scandinavian review. *Soil and Tillage Research***53** (1): 3-14.

30. Rhoton F E, Bruce R R, Buehring N W, Elkins G B, Langdale C W and Tyler D D.1993. Chemical and physical characteristics of four soil types under conventional and no-tillage systems. *Soil and Tillage Research***28**: 51-61.

31. Richards L A.1954.*Diagnosis and improvement of saline and alkali soils*. U.S. Salinity Laboratory U.S. Department of Agriculture. Hand Book 60.

32. Schwen A,BodnerG,SchollP, Buchan G DandLoiskandl W.2011: Temporal dynamics of soil hydraulic properties and the water-conducting porosity under different tillage. *Soil and Tillage Research***113**: 89–98.

33. Sekaran, U., Sagar, K.S. and Kumar, S. 2021. Soil aggregates, aggregate-associated carbon and nitrogen, and water retention as influenced by short and long-term no-till systems. *Soil Tillage Res*., 208: 104885.

34. Six J, Elliott E T and Paustian K.2000.Soil macroaggregate turnover and microaggregate formation: A mechanism for C sequestration under no-till agriculture. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry***32**: 2099-2103.

35. Srivastavaa P,Singh R, Tripathi Sand RaghubanshiAS.2016. An urgent need for sustainable thinking in agriculture – An Indian scenario.*Ecological Indicators* **67**: 611-22.

36. Tripathi R P, Sharma Pand SinghS.2005. Tilth index: An approach for optimizing tillage in rice-wheat system. *Soil and Tillage Research***80**: 125-137.

37. Villamil M B, Bollero G A, Darmody R G, Simmons F Wand Bullock D G.2006. No-till corn/soybean systems including winter cover crops: Effects on soil properties. *Soil ScienceSocietyof America Journal***70**: 1936-44.

38. Vogeler I,Rogasik J,Funder U, PantenK and Schnug E.2009. Effect of tillage systems and P-fertilization on soil physical and chemical properties, crop yield and nutrient uptake. *Soil and Tillage Research***103**: 137-43.

39. Wani, O. A., Sharma, V., Kumar, S. S., Babu, S., Sharma, K. R., Rathore, S. S., et al. (2023). Climate plays a dominant role over land management in governing soil carbon dynamics in North Western Himalayas. J. Environ. Manag. 338:117740. doi: 10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.117740

40. Yodder R E.1936. A direct method of aggregate analysis of soils and a study of the physical nature of erosion losses. *Journal of American Society of Agronomy***28**: 335-37.

41. Dakagan JB, Tudunwada IY, Ajiji SA, Aliyu JA. Distribution of Soil Chemical Properties of Smallholder Farms on Derelict Mined-Sites of Jos South LGA, Jos Plateau, Nigeria. AJSSPN [Internet]. 2024 Jan. 16 [cited 2024 May 21];10(1):30-44. Available from: https://journalajsspn.com/index.php/AJSSPN/article/view/208

42. Abrha H, Abraha B. Tillage and Crop Residue Effects on Soil Carbon and Moisture for Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) Productivity in Semiarid Regions of Tigray, Ethiopia. Asian Soil Res. J. [Internet]. 2023 Dec. 30 [cited 2024 May 21];7(4):20-32. Available from: https://journalasrj.com/index.php/ASRJ/article/view/138

43. de Cárcer PS, Sinaj S, Santonja M, Fossati D, Jeangros B. Long-term effects of crop succession, soil tillage and climate on wheat yield and soil properties. Soil and Tillage Research. 2019 Jul 1;190:209-19.