

Impact of Inorganic Fertilizer and Organic manure on Physico-chemical properties of soil in Pea (*Pisum sativum*.L) cultivated field

Abstract

The field experiment was carried out at central research farm of department of soil science and agricultural chemistry, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj during Rabi season 2023-24. The texture of the soil in the experimental region was sandy loam. The design was set up using randomized block design, with three levels of FYM (0:50:100), and NPK (0:50:100) at different levels. The treatment T₉ (@100% NPKS + 100% FYM) gave the best results in terms of plant height, number of siliqua plant⁻¹, and total Field Pea yield. It also showed a slight decrease in pH, bulk density, and particle density; however, there was a significant increase in pore space, water holding capacity, EC, organic carbon, available nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, as well as plant growth and yield attributes. There was no discernible difference in the growth and production of Field Pea under control. The use of NPK and FYM, significantly increases the characteristics of growth and total yield attributes of Field Pea.

Keywords:Field Pea, NPK, FYM, Growth and Yield, etc.

INTRODUCTION

“Pea is a nutritional vegetable crop, it has a significant amount of digestible carbohydrates, protein, lipids, minerals, and vitamins. It also has a high level of antioxidant activity, it contains 2% fat, 60-65% carbohydrates, 25–28% protein, and other minerals. Lysine and tryptophan are two amino acids found in pea in large quantities like cereal grains”. [23-26] “The seeds are free of cholesterol, abundant in fiber, and low in fat. It can be cultivated for hay, pasturage, green manure, and as a forage crop. Compared to soybean, it has 5 to 20 % fewer trypsin inhibitors. As a result, it can be fed to animals without undergoing the extrusion heating process. Pea plays a key role in promoting sustainable agriculture by maintaining soil fertility through biological nitrogen fixation in conjunction with symbiotic rhizobium present in its root nodules”(Negi et al., 2004).

According to Pawar et al. (2017), “it is the second most valuable legume crop in the world. The dry, green foliage is fed to cattle, and the exceptionally nutrient dense green pods are preferred for food”. According to Gopinath et al. (2007), “this legume has a high

concentration of nutrients per 100 g of edible part, including digestible protein (7.2 g), carbs (15.8 g), vitamin A (139 I.U.), vitamin C (9 mg), magnesium (34 mg), and phosphorus (139 mg). The availability of nutrients is directly related to food production. The need for chemical fertilizers has increased as a result of the need to produce more and more food for the growing population”. “Despite the best use of high yielding varieties and higher volumes of chemical fertilizers, the rise of food production has slowed over the past three decades” (Sharma et al., 2006; Kumar et al., 2022; Lalito et al., 2018; Sharma et al., 2023).

“Soil is fundamental to crop production. Without soil, no food could be produced on a large scale, nor would livestock be fed. Because it is finite and fragile, soil is a precious resource that requires special care from its users. Many of today’s soil and crop management systems are unsustainable. A sound knowledge of soil health/quality is essential to a large extent for agricultural sustainability. The concept of soil quality emerged in the literature in the early 1990s” (Doran and Safely, 1997; Wienhold et al., 2004), and the first official application of the term was approved by the Soil Science Society of America Ad Hoc Committee on Soil Quality (S- 581) and discussed by Karlen et al. (1997). Soil quality was been defined as “the capacity of a reference soil to function, within natural or managed ecosystem boundaries, to sustain plant and animal productivity, maintain or enhance water and air quality, and support human health and habitation”. “Subsequently the two terms are used interchangeably” (Karlen et al., 2001) although it is important to distinguish that, soil quality is related to soil function (Karlen et al., 2003), whereas soil health presents the soil as a finite non-renewable and dynamic living resource (Doran and Zeiss, 2000). Doran and Parkin “define soil quality as “the capacity of soil to function, within ecosystem and land use boundaries, to sustain biological productivity, maintain environmental quality, and promote plant and animal health”. It is worth noting here that “soil health” and “soil quality: are synonymous terms”. “The soil health can be asses to sustain plant and animal productivity and diversity; maintain or enhance water and air quality; support human health and habitation” (Doran et al., 1994).

“Inorganic fertilizer as like (nitrogen) is important for all crops. It increases growth and development of all living tissues and increases protein content in the pulses. It also increases utilization of phosphorus and potassium to an appreciable extent. Inorganic fertilizer (i.e. P) not only improves the growth, seed yield, nodulation and quality of legumes, but also increases the organic matter, nitrogen and P content in soils, have reported that yield of grains increases with the increasing levels of phosphorus. Phosphorus is the second most important

plant nutrient that must be added to the soil to maintain plant growth and sustain crop yield. Potassium enables crops to tolerate water stress, and bringing about improvement in crop yield and quality. Organic manure like FYM or compost is applied to enrich the soil fertility and provide plants with many macro and micro nutrients. Farm yard or compost manure seems to act directly for increasing the crop yields either by acceleration of respiratory process with increasing cell permeability and hormonal growth action or by combination of all these processes. It improves physicalchemical properties of soil such as aggregation, aeration, permeability, water holding capacity, slow release of nutrients, increase in cation exchange capacity, stimulation of soil flora and fauna etc” (Karlenet *al.*, 2003).

Materials and Methods

During the Rabi Season of 2023–2024, the research was conducted at the Soil Science Research Farm, Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Naini Agricultural Institute, Prayagraj. Prayagraj district, with its exceptionally hot summers and relatively chilly winters, embodies the subtropical belt of South East Uttar Pradesh in terms of agroclimatology. The location's highest temperature is between 46°C and 48°C, with rare dips below 4°C or 5°C. There was a 20–94% variation in the relative humidity. This location receives around 1100 mm of rain on average each year. Three levels of inorganic fertilizer (N, P, and K; 0, 50, and 100%) and one level of FYM (0, 50, and 100%) were used in the experiment, which was conducted using a Randomized Block Design (RBD). Each treatment was duplicated three times. T1 [ABSOLUTE CONTROL], T2 [NPK @0% +FYM @50%], T3 [NPK @ 0%+FYM @100%], T4 [NPK @ 50%+ FYM @0%], T5 [NPK @ 50% +FYM@50%], T6 [NPK @50%+FYM@100%], T7 [NPK @ 100%+ FYM @0%], T8 [NPK @ 100%+ FYM @50%], and T9 [NPK @ 100%+ FYM @ 100%] were the treatments. Characteristics of growth and yield were noted during the trial. The inorganic nutrients came from rhizobium, urea, SSP, MOP, and micronutrients, in that order.

Results and Discussions

After harvesting the shows that soil bulk density was found to be non significant by organic and inorganic. The maximum soil bulk density at 0-15 to 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T1 [NPK@0% +FYM @0%] which was 1.37 and 1.42 Mg m⁻³ and minimum soil bulk density was recorded in T9 NPK @100% +FYM@100%] which was 1.25 and 1.36 Mg m⁻³. These results indicated that the soil pH was decreased by N application at different stages. N

application could increase the N contents of leaf and stem **Heng et al. (2014)**. Similar findings were recorded by **Verma and Baigh, (2012)**, **Muthuval, et al. (1992)** . **Similar results were also reported by Tadesse, et al. (2013) and Abou El-Magd et al. (2006)**. The maximum soil particle density at 0-15 to 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T₁[NPK@0% +FYM @0%] which was 2.66 and 2.70 Mg m⁻³ and minimum soil particle density was recorded in T₉ NPK @100% +FYM@100%] which was 2.61 and 2.66 Mg m⁻³. As the production of total biomass was higher in these treatments, more amount of residue might have added in the soil in form of leaf fall and roots which will build up the organic matter level in soil that might be the reason in lower bulk density. Similar findings were recorded by **Kumar et al. (2008)**, **Reddy et al. (2005)**. Also similar results were also reported by **Sudarso and Pontianak (2010)**, **Githinji et al. (2013)** and **Mukherjee et al. (2014)**. The maximum soil % pore space at 0-15 to 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉ NPK@100%+FYM@100%], which was 49.31 and 45.33% and minimum soil % pore space was recorded in T₁[NPK@0% +FYM @0%], which was 45.31 and 42.13%. Similar results were also reported by **Sudarso and Pontianak (2010)**, **Githinji et al. (2013)** and **Mukherjee et al. (2014)**. The maximum soil pH at 0-15 to 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T₁ [NPK@0% +FYM @0%], which was 7.73 and 7.77 and minimum soil pH was recorded in T₉ NPK@100%+FYM@100%], which was 7.62 and 7.60. Similar results were also reported by **Tadesse, et al. (2013)** and **Abou El-Magd et al. (2006)**. The maximum soil EC (dS m⁻¹) at 0-15 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉ NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 0.48 Mg m⁻¹ and minimum was recorded in T₁[NPK@0%+FYM@0%] which was 0.33 Mg m⁻¹. At 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉ NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 0.40 Mg m⁻¹ and minimum was recorded in T₁[NPK@0% +FYM @0%] with 0.31 Mg m⁻¹. Similar findings were recorded by **Muthuval, et al. (1992)** , **Kumar, (2008)** **Gupta et al. (2000)**.

Table 1: Physical properties of soil sample after harvesting of Pea (*Pisum sativum* L.)

Treatments combination		Bulk density (Mg m-3)		Particle density (Mg m- 3)		% pore space		pH(1:2)		EC (dS m-1)	
		0-15	15-30	0-15	15-30	0-15	15-30	0-15	15-30	0-15	15-30
T ₁	ABSOLUTE CONTROL	1.37	1.42	2.66	2.7	45.31	42.13	7.73	7.77	0.33	0.31
T ₂	[NPK@0% +FYM @50%]	1.33	1.41	2.65	2.69	45.5	42.32	7.7	7.72	0.35	0.32
T ₃	[NPK@0%+FYM @100%]	1.31	1.4	2.63	2.68	47.86	43.38	7.68	7.7	0.37	0.34
T ₄	[NPK@50%+FYM@0 %]	1.34	1.41	2.65	2.69	46.71	43.53	7.69	7.71	0.38	0.38
T ₅	[NPK@50%+FYM@5 0%]	1.31	1.39	2.64	2.68	47.82	43.64	7.65	7.67	0.41	0.36
T ₆	[NPK@50%+FYM@1 00%]	1.30	1.39	2.63	2.67	48.46	44.28	7.61	7.64	0.42	0.37
T ₇	[NPK@100%+FYM@ 0%]	1.31	1.39	2.64	2.69	46.38	44.2	7.67	7.69	0.46	0.38
T ₈	[NPK@100%+FYM@ 50%]	1.30	1.38	2.63	2.68	48.6	44.42	7.63	7.65	0.47	0.39
T ₉	[NPK@100%+FYM@ 100%]	1.25	1.36	2.61	2.66	49.31	45.33	7.62	7.6	0.48	0.40
F- test		NS	NS	S	S	S	S	NS	NS	S	S
S. Ed. (±)		0.166	0.315	0.078	0.08	0.539	0.436	0.24	0.233	0.075	0.073
C. D. (P = 0.05)		0.349	0.662	0.164	0.168	1.132	0.916	0.50 4	0.489	0.158	0.153

The data recorded on % organic carbon was recorded at 0-15 and 15-30 cm soil depth. The result of the data shows that soil % organic carbon was found to be significant by organic and inorganic. The maximum soil % organic carbon at 0-15 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉ [NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 0.46 and minimum was recorded in T₁ [NPK@0% +FYM @0%] which was 0.36. At 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉ [NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 0.45 and minimum was recorded in T₁ [NPK@0% +FYM @0%] with 0.35%. It was also observed that the organic carbon of soil was gradually increased with an increase in dose of NPK.

Selvi et al. (2002). The maximum soil available nitrogen (kg ha^{-1}) at 0-15 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉ [NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 276.32 and minimum was recorded in T₁ [NPK@0% +FYM @0%] which was 256.29. At 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉ [NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was

267.87 and minimum was recorded in T₁[NPK@0% +FYM @0%] with 247.22. Similar results were also reported by **Bhende, et al., (2015) and Vimera et al. (2012)** who reported that application of 100 % NPK fertilizers recorded maximum available NPK in soil after harvesting of respective crops. The maximum soil available phosphorus (kg ha⁻¹) at 0-15 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 21.45 and minimum was recorded in T₁[NPK@0% +FYM @0%] which was 18.33. The maximum soil available phosphorus (kg ha⁻¹) at 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 19.21 and minimum was recorded in T₁[NPK@0% +FYM@0%] with 16.45. The organic acids and hydroxy acids liberated during the decomposition of organic matter may form complex or chelate Fe, Al, Mg and Ca and prevented them from reacting with phosphate (**Sharma et al., 2001**). The maximum soil available potassium (kg ha⁻¹) at 0-15 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 226.74 and minimum was recorded in T₁[NPK@0%+FYM@0%] which was 199.94. The maximum soil available potassium (kg ha⁻¹) at 15-30 cm soil depth was recorded in T₉NPK@100%+FYM@100%] which was 221.67 and minimum was recorded in T₁[NPK@0%+FYM@0%] with 195.31. Similar findings were recorded by **Kumar et al. (2008) and Reddy et al. (2005)** also the integrated use of organic along with inorganic amendments increased the mineralization of organic manures and during the decomposition of organic manures, many organic acids are released that makes complexes with the clay preventing the fixation of potassium in the soil and also facilitating its release in the soil (**Walia et al., 2010**).

Table 2: Chemical properties of soil sample after harvesting of Pea (*Pisum sativum* L.)

Treatments combination		% Organic Carbon		Available N (kg ha ⁻¹)		Available P (kg ha ⁻¹)		Available K (kg ha ⁻¹)	
		0-15	15-30	0-15	15-30	0-15	15-30	0-15	15-30
T ₁	ABSOLUTE CONTROL	0.36	0.35	256.29	247.22	18.33	16.45	199.94	195.31
T ₂	[NPK@0% +FYM @50%]	0.41	0.38	258.26	253.19	18.98	16.76	206.59	202.52
T ₃	[NPK@0%+FYM @100%]	0.44	0.40	263.29	255.22	19.56	17.20	210.61	206.54
T ₄	[NPK@50%+FYM@0%]	0.42	0.39	259.80	253.73	19.67	17.56	208.51	204.76
T ₅	[NPK@50%+FYM@50%]	0.43	0.41	266.74	257.67	20.11	18.05	214.00	210.93
T ₆	[NPK@50%+FYM@100%]	0.45	0.42	269.04	258.97	20.33	18.29	220.72	215.09
T ₇	[NPK@100%+FYM@0%]	0.4	0.38	271.91	262.84	20.46	18.66	218.78	213.71
T ₈	[NPK@100%+FYM@50%]	0.43	0.40	274.59	257.52	21.20	18.98	222.72	216.89

T ₉ [NPK@100%+FYM@100%]	0.46	0.45	276.32	267.87	21.45	19.21	226.74	221.67
F- test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
S. Ed. (±)	0.075	0.074	0.687	1.183	0.141	0.115	0.66	0.714
C. D. (P = 0.05)	0.158	0.155	1.443	2.484	0.296	0.242	1.38	1.499

Conclusion

From trial it was concluded that T₉ (NPK@ 100% + FYM@ 100%) was found to be best for soil health, obtaining more productivity and also economically feasible. The result of the experiment concluded as the application NPK and FYM in treatment T₉ was found most effective in improving Physico- Chemical properties of soil as it decreases bulk density, particle density and pHand increases pore space, water holding capacity, EC, Organic carbon, available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc) and text-to-image generators have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc have been used during writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

References

1. Abou El-Magd et al. (2006). Abou El-Magd, M. M., El-Bassiony, A. M. and Fawzy, Z. F. (2006). Effect of organic manure with or without chemical fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of some varieties of broccoli plants. Journal of Applied Sciences Research. 2: 791-798.

2. Bhende, et al., (2015) Bhende, S. K., Deshmukh, H. K., Nimbolkar, P.K., Dewangan, R. K. and Nagone, A. H. (2015) Effect of phosphorus and potassium on quality attributes of okra cv. „ArkaAnamik“. *Int. J. Environ Sci.* 6(2) 225-231
3. Doran and Parkin
Doran, J.W. and Parkin, T.B. (1994) Defining and assessing soil quality. Pages 3-21 in J.W. Doran *et al.*, (eds.) Defining soil quality for a sustainable environment. Soil Science Society of America Special Publication no. 35, Madison, WI.
4. Doran and Safley, 1997 Doran, J.W. and Safley, M. (1997) Defining and assessing soil health and sustainable productivity. In: Pankhurst, C. *et al.* (eds.). Biological indicators of soil health. Wallingford, UK: CAB International. p. 1–28.
5. Doran and Zeiss, 2000).
Doran JW, Zeiss MR. 2000. Soil health and sustainability: managing the biotic component of soil quality. *Applied Soil Ecology*; 15:3–11.
6. Doran *et al.*, 1994 Doran JW, Parkin TB. 1994. Defining and assessing soil quality. In J. W. Doran *et al.*, (eds.) Defining soil quality for a sustainable environment. Soil Science Society of America Special Publication no. 35, Madison, WI.; 3-21.
7. Gopinath, K. A., Saha, S., Mina, B. L., Pande, H., Kumar, N., Srivastva, A. K. and Gupta, H. S. (2007). Yield potential of garden pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) varieties, and soil properties under organic and integrated nutrient management systems. *Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science*, 55(2), 157-167.
8. Karlen *et al.* (1997 Karlen DL, Mausbach MJ, Doran JW, Cline RG, Harris RF, Schuman GE. 1997. Soil quality: A concept, definition, and framework for evaluation. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*; 61:4-10.
9. Karlen *et al.*, 2001 Karlen, D.L., Andrews, S.S. and Doran, J.W. (2001). Soil quality: Current concepts and applications. *Advances in Agronomy*; 74: 1-40.
10. Karlen *et al.*, 2003
Karlen DL, Doran JW, Weinhold BJ, Andrews SS. 2003. Soil quality: Humankind's foundation for survival. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*; 58.
11. Mukherjee *et al.* (2014 Mukherjee A, Lal R. 2014. Biochar Impacts on soil physical properties and green house gas emissions. *Agronomy*; 3:313- 339.
12. Muthuval, et al. (1992) .Muthuval, *et al.* (1992) Elucidated the Laboratory manual on

soil analysis for physical and chemical characteristics of soil, Introduction to soil analysis. Laser typesetting and offset printing by scroll DP, 68, D. B. Road, R.S. Puram, Coimbatore-641002.

13. Negi, Susheela, Singh, R. V. and Dwivedi, G. K. (2004). Effect of biofertilizers, FYM, NPK and Lime on Pea in Acidic Soil of Uttaranchal hills. *Veg. Science*, 31, 193 -195.
14. Pawar, Y., Varma, L. R., Verma, P., Joshi, H. N., More, S. G. and Dabhi, J. S. (2017). Influences of integrated use of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients on growth, flowering and yield of garden pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) cv. Bonneville. *Legume Research*, 40(1), 117-124.
15. Reddy *et al.* (2005) Reddy Y, Reddy A, Jadav DS. 2005. Effect of urea rates, FYM, CaCO₃, Salinity and alkalinity level on urea hydrolysis and nitrification in soil. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*. ;20:117-122.
16. Sharma, G. D., Thakur, R., Chouhan, N. and Keram, K. S. (2006). Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield, nutrient uptake, protein content, soil fertility and economic performance of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) in a Vertisol. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*, 63(3), 320-326.
17. Tadesse, et al. (2013) Tadesse, T., Dechassa. N., Bayu, W. and Gebeyehu, S. (2013) Effects of Farmyard Manure and Inorganic Fertilizer Application on Soil PhysicoChemical Properties and Nutrient Balance in Rain-Fed Lowland Rice Ecosystem. *American Journal of Plant Sciences*, 4: 309-316.
18. Walia *et al.*, 2010
Walia MK, Walia SS, Dhaliwal S.S. 2010. Long term effect of integrated nutrient management on properties of Typic Ustochrept after 23 cycles of an irrigated rice – wheat system. *Journal of Sustainable Agriculture*. ;34:724– 743.
19. Wienhold *et al.*, 2004 Wienhold B J Andrews S S and Karlen D L 2004 Soil quality: A review of the science and experiences in the USA. *Environ. Geochem. Hlth.* 26, 89-95.
20. Kumar P, David AA, Thomas T, Reddy IS. Impact of Integrated Nutrient Management on Physico-chemical properties of soil in Pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) var. GS 10. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*. 2022 Jun 27;34(20):521-6.

21. Lalito C, Bhandari S, Sharma V, Yadav SK. Effect of different organic and inorganic nitrogenous fertilizers on growth, yield and soil properties of pea (*Pisum sativum* L.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2018;7(4):2114-8.
22. Sharma M, Shilpa, Kaur M, Sharma AK, Sharma P. Influence of different organic manures, biofertilizers and inorganic nutrients on performance of pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) in North Western Himalayas. *Journal of Plant Nutrition*. 2023 Feb 25;46(4):600-17.

23. Amoako, O. A., F. Addae-Frimpomaah, J. Adjebeng-Danquah, H. Abeka, R. Y. Agyare, M. Asante, R. Alhassan, and A. A. Ibrahim. 2023. "Growth and Productivity of Pigeon Pea Genotypes under Different Plant Geometry and Its Residual Impact on Some Soil Chemical Properties". *Asian Journal of Soil Science and Plant Nutrition* 9 (1):56-71. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajssp/2023/v9i1174>.

24. Meena ,Arpana Kumari, Narendra Swaroop, Tarance Thomas, and Anurag Kumar Singh. 2023. "Effect of Different Levels of Organic Manures on Physico-Chemical Properties of Soil under Cowpea Crop in an Inceptisol of Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India". *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science* 35 (17):109-16. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ijpss/2023/v35i173189>.
25. Ansari RA, Mahmood I. Optimization of organic and bio-organic fertilizers on soil properties and growth of pigeon pea. *Scientia Horticulturae*. 2017 Dec 19;226:1-9. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030442381730451X>

26. Ansari RA, Mahmood I. Optimization of organic and bio-organic fertilizers on soil properties and growth of pigeon pea. *Scientia Horticulturae*. 2017 Dec 19;226:1-9. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S030442381730451X>