

## Impact of Different Nutrient Management Practices on Soil Physico-Chemical Properties and Economics of Soybean in Kymore Plateau and Satpura Hills Agro-Climatic Zone

### ABSTRACT

The field trial was conducted at Krishi Nagar Farm, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Jawaharlal Nehru KrishiVishwaVidyalaya, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India, during the kharif season of 2021. The field experiment comprised six treatments and was conducted in a randomized block design (RBD) with four replications. Results showed a slight reduction in soil pH in treatments 100% Organic NM, 50% Organic NM + NF inputs BJK, 50% Organic + 50% Inorganic NM, and 25% Organic + NF inputs BJK + 25% Inorganic NM, while an increase was observed in T5 and T6 compared to the initial soil status. Changes in EC and OC under various treatments were not significant, but available N, P, and K levels varied significantly across treatments, showing increased values from the initial soil status. The treatment with 100% Organic NM had the highest cost of cultivation (Rs.31624), gross monetary return (Rs. 58605/ha), net monetary return (Rs. 26982/ha), and B:C ratio (1.85), followed by the treatment with 50% Organic NM + NF inputs.

**Keywords:** Soybean; natural farming; Beejamrit; Jeevamrit; Ghanjeevamrit; organic; inorganic; nutrient management; pH; organic Carbon; soil fertility.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Soybean (*Glycine max* L Merrill) is the most significant seed legume globally. Native to northeastern China and belonging to the family Fabaceae, soybean is extensively cultivated in India, particularly in Madhya Pradesh, due to its adaptability to various agro-climatic conditions and high market value. It boasts exceptional nutritive value, with a protein content of 42-43% and oil content of 18-20%, rich in essential fatty acids, vitamins (A and D), carbohydrates (30%), and fiber (4%). Popularly known as the golden bean, wonder crop, and man-made meat, soybean's global production for 2021-22, according to USDA, is estimated at 372.5 million tons from 120.50 million hectares. In India, soybean cultivation covers 11.34 million hectares, with an

estimated production of 11.99 million tons in 2021-22. Madhya Pradesh leads with 5.51 million hectares and a production of 5.56 million tons. The integrated application of organic manure and inorganic fertilizers has emerged as an effective approach, enhancing both output and crop production stability. Blending chemical fertilizers with organic manures demonstrates potential in preserving soil fertility while sustaining crop productivity. Microbial activity in soil fertility and crop productivity is crucial, with Jeevamrit, available in solid form as "Ghanjeevamrit," aiding in bolstering microbial activity. The ongoing use of synthetic fertilizers has damaged soil quality and impacted soil microorganisms. Chemical fertilizers, though costlier and

potentially harmful, can be supplemented with organic resources for optimal nutrient supply. Integrated nutrient management (INM) stands as a crucial element in sustainable agriculture, balancing resource management to meet evolving human needs without environmental degradation. This holistic approach involves organic manures, green manures, bio-fertilizers, crop rotation with legumes, and minimal chemical fertilizer usage to achieve optimal yields while preserving soil health.[3]. Application of organic manure in conjunction with inorganic fertilizers in an integrated manner, proved to be the best alternative. Integrating chemical fertilizer with organic manures has been proven to be highly promising in terms of not only preserving higher output but also increasing crop production stability. When used with lower dosages of inorganic fertilizers, farmyard manure or vermicompost enhanced soil fertility, crop growth, and yield. Chemical fertilizers, on the other hand, have a negative impact on soil fertility leading to unsustainable yields, while integration of chemical fertilizers with organic manures and bio-fertilizers would be able to maintain soil fertility and sustain crop productivity [4]. The INM is made up of components, which possess great diversity in terms of chemical and physical properties, nutrient release efficiencies, positional availability, and crop specificity and farmers acceptability. Only organic manures cannot meet the total nutrient needs of modern agriculture, integrated use of nutrients from fertilizers and an organic resource seems to be a need of the time. The complementary use of chemical fertilizers and organic manures may increase the

efficiency of chemical fertilizers in order to maintain a high level of crop productivity [5].

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

A field experiment entitled “Studies on the effect of varying nutrient management practices on growth and yield of soybean (*Glycine max* L Merrill)” was conducted during *kharif*2021. The field trial was conducted at Krishi Nagar Farm, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Jawaharlal Nehru KrishiVishwaVidyalaya, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India, during the *kharif* season of 2021. The district Jabalpur is located in Madhya Pradesh, India, and is located between 23°18' N latitude and 79°98' E longitude, with an average altitude of approximately 411.78 meters (1387.73 ft) above mean sea level with a total area of 5198 km<sup>2</sup>. According to the National Agricultural Research Program's criteria, Jabalpur is located in the "Kymore Plateau and Satpura Hills" agro-climatic zone. According to a new concept established by National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning, Nagpur, this area is part of agro-ecological sub region No. 10.1, which is a sub-humid (dry) eco-region (Malwa plateau, Vindhyan Scarp Land and Narmada Valley). Temperatures range from a low of 5°C in December and January to a high of 46°C in May and June. In terms of maximum weekly temperature ranges from 26.8<sup>0</sup>C to 37.7<sup>0</sup>C and minimum weekly temperature ranges from 21.6<sup>0</sup>C to 26.7<sup>0</sup>C, maximum and minimum relative humidity during morning ranges from 74.0 to 94.6% and evening 31.7 to 85.1%, the crop was exposed to a total of 63.2 hours of sunlight

throughout the crop growing season, with sunshine hours ranging from 0.2 to 8.2 hours and total seasonal rainfall of 652.4 mm with 45 wet days. . As a result, it encouraged crop establishment, followed by crop growth, development, and yield. These conditions were also quite congenial at this stage. Entire weather conditions were almost favorable for proper growth, development and yield of crops. The current study, as previously stated, was a long-term investigation. As a result, data on the initial status of numerous soil physico-chemical properties were evaluated. Soil samples were collected from each plot at a depth of

0-15 cm before sowing. Soil analysis findings from various plots were recorded. The data on the original status of the soil and the values of its chemical properties are presented below: The Physico-chemical properties of experimental field were shown in Table 1. The soil in the experimental field had a Sandy Clay Loam texture, neutral in reaction (pH 7.20) with a medium OC content (0.59 percent), and EC (0.30 dS/m), and analyzed low in available nitrogen (216.50 kg/ha N), medium in available phosphorus (12.42 kg/ha P), and medium in available potassium (240.51 kg/ha K).

**Table 1: Physico-chemical properties of experimental location**

Texture	Sandy clay loam (Sand:54.5%, Silt:23.51%, and Clay:21.99%)
Soil reaction	7.20
Electrical conductivity (dS/m)	0.30
Soil organic carbon (%)	0.59
Available Nitrogen kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	216.50
Available Phosphorus kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	12.42
Available potassium kg ha <sup>-1</sup>	240.51

### 2.1 Experimental techniques

The field experiment consisted with six treatments and they were tested in **factorial**

**experiment in a Randomized Block Design (RBD)** with four replications. The details of the treatments are given below:

**Table 2: Treatments Details of Experiments**

S. No	Treatments
T <sub>1</sub>	100% Organic nutrient management
T <sub>2</sub>	50% Organic NM +NF inputs Beejamrit+ Jeevamrit+Ghanjeevamrit
T <sub>3</sub>	50% Organic NM + 50% Inorganic NM
T <sub>4</sub>	25% Organic +NF inputs Beejamrit+Jeevamrit+Ghanjeevamrit 25% Inorganic NM
T <sub>5</sub>	Farmer practices
T <sub>6</sub>	100% Inorganic nutrient management

**Organic NM: Nutrient Management**

**NF: Natural Farming Inputs**

**Table 3. Methods used for determination the Physico-chemical properties of soil**

Nutrient	Analytical method	Method employed	References
Nitrogen	Alkalinepermanganatemethod	(Subbiahand	21

		Asija,1956)	
Phosphorus	Olsen's method	(Olsen <i>et al.</i> ,1954)	22
Potassium	Flame photometer method	(Chapman and Pratt, 1961)	23
Soil pH 1:2.5 (soil water ratio)	Glass electric pH meter	(Piper,1967)	24
Electrical conductivity (dS /m)	Solu-bridge method	(Black, 1965)	25
Organic Carbon (%)	Walkley and Black rapid titration method	(Walkey and Black,1934)	26

### Physico- chemical properties

A composite soil samples were taken from 0-15 cm depth and kept in polythene bags for analysis of various soil chemical properties. The soil chemical properties were measured before sowing and after the harvest of crop.

#### Soil pH

To analysis the soil pH 10 g soil was taken in a clean 50 ml beaker and dissolved in 25 ml of distilled water. The suspension was stirred intermittent for 30 minutes. The pH was recorded using a digital pH meter having glass electrode pH meter [23].

#### Soil EC

For determination of EC, 10 g of soil was taken in 50 ml beaker, 25 ml of distilled water was added and the suspension was stirred intermittently for 30 minutes

$$\text{Organic carbon (\%)} = \frac{10 (B - T \times 0.003 \times 100)}{B \times \text{weight of soil (g)}}$$

Where,

B= Volume (ml) of Ferrous ammonium sulphate needed for blank

T= Volume (ml) of Ferrous ammonium sulphate needed for soil sample

#### Available soil nitrogen

allowing the suspension to settle for about one hour to measure EC in the supernatant solution using EC meter [24].

#### Organic carbon content of soil

The organic carbon content in soil was determined by following modified [26] method. An air dried soil sample (0.5g) was placed at the bottom of a dry 500 ml conical flask, and 10 ml of 1 N K<sub>2</sub>Cr<sub>2</sub>O<sub>7</sub> was added with a volumetric pipette and swirled briefly. 20 ml of concentrated H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> was then added and swirled 23 times and kept in the flask for 30 min. Then 200 ml of distilled water, 10 ml of H<sub>2</sub>PO<sub>4</sub> and 10 ml of 2% sodium fluoride solution and 2 ml of diphenylamine indicator were added titrated the content with 0.5N Fe (NH<sub>4</sub>)<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> till the colour flashed from blue-violet to green. Organic carbon is calculated by using the following formula:

The alkaline potassium permanganate method was used to determine available nitrogen in soil [21]. Twenty grams of soil were placed in a distillation flask, and 20 millilitre of water were added. The distillation flask was immediately fitted into the distillation apparatus after adding 100 ml

of 0.32 percent  $\text{KMnO}_4$  and 100 ml of 2.5 percent  $\text{NaOH}$  solution were added. The delivery tube of the distillation apparatus was then dipped in 25 ml of 4 percent boric acid containing mixed indicator adjusted to

pH 4.5 in a conical flask. Distilled ammonia gas collected in boric acid from the distillation flask was back titrated with 0.02 N standards  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$ . The following formula was used to calculate the available nitrogen:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Available N (kg/ha)} &= \frac{(T-B) \times N \times 0.0003 \times 10^6}{20} \times 2.24 \\ &= (T-B) \times 31.36 \end{aligned}$$

Where,

B= Volume (ml) of  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  needed for blank

T= Volume (ml) of  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$  needed for soil sample

N= Normality of  $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$

#### Available soil phosphorus ( $\text{P}_2\text{O}_5$ )

The available phosphorus was extracted using sodium bi-carbonate (0.5 M  $\text{NaHCO}_3$ ) adjusted to pH 8.5 according to the method [22]. In a 150 ml conical flask, a 2.5 g soil sample was collected. Fifty millilitres of sodium bicarbonate and one pinch of carbon black (activated charcoal) were mixed into

the soil and thoroughly shaken for 30 minutes on a mechanical shaker. After that, the contents were filtered using Whatman No. 42 filter paper. In a 25 ml volumetric flask, 5.0 ml of filtered aliquot was taken. It is treated with 2 drops of p-nitro phenol indicator. Add drops of dilute acid to the yellowish solution to make it colourless. Four ml of reagent B is added to dilute the solution to the mark. The flask is sealed and homogenised by inverting it three or four times. When the blue colour is fully developed than transmittance or absorbance of the content at 730 nm can be measured using a spectrophotometer. The phosphorous concentration was calculated using a standard curve.

$$\text{Soil available Phosphorus (ka/ha)} = \frac{Q \times 2.24 \times 10^6}{A \times S \times 10^6} = \frac{Q \times V \times 2.24}{A \times S}$$

Where,

Q=quantity of P in micro-gram read on X-axis against a sample reading

V=Volume of extracting reagent used (ml)

A=Volume of aliquot used for colour development (ml)

S= Weight of soil sample (g)

#### Available soil potassium ( $\text{K}_2\text{O}$ )

Available potassium was determined by neutral ammonium acetate method outlined by [23]. Five gram of soil was taken in 100 ml conical flask and then 25 ml of the neutral 1.0 N ammonium acetate solution

was added and shaken for 5 minutes on mechanical shaker. Then the contents were filtered through Whatman No.1 paper. The concentration of K in the filtrate was measured by using flame photometer. The concentration of potassium was worked out with the help of standard curve.

$$\text{Soil available potassium (kg/ha)} = c \times \frac{25}{5} 2.24 = C \times 11.2$$

Where,

C= concentration (mg/L) of potassium in the soil sample filtrate obtained on X- axis, against the reading.

### Economics of the Treatments

#### Cost of cultivation

The costs of cultivation for each treatment have been worked out on the basis of prevalent market price of different inputs used for raising the crop under different treatments for a hectare area.

#### Gross monetary returns (GMRs)

The values realized from the produce obtained under each treatment was computed on the basis of existing market price of the produce (both seed and haulm) and computed the gross monetary returns

(GMRs) hectare under different treatments as per the following formula.

$$\text{Gross monetary returns (Rs ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \text{Value of seed} + \text{Value of stover}$$

#### Net monetary returns (NMRs)

The net monetary returns (NMR) per hectare under each treatment were determined by subtracting the cost of cultivation of a particular treatment from the GMR of the same treatment as per the following formula.

$$\text{Net monetary returns (Rs ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \text{Gross monetary returns} - \text{Cost of cultivation}$$

#### Benefit-cost ratio (B: C)

To estimate the benefits under different treatments for each rupee of expenditure incurred, B: C ratio of each treatment was calculated as below:-

$$\text{B: C ratio} = \frac{\text{Gross monetary returns (Rs/ha)}}{\text{Cost of cultivation (Rs/ha)}}$$

### 2.2 Statistical analysis of treatment

The standard procedure was used to tabulate and statistically evaluate the data related to each crop characteristic. Valid conclusions were reached by testing the relevance of treatments and the analysis of variance for randomized block designs. The 'F' test of significance was used to examine the

differences in treatment means based on the null hypothesis. When the F-test variance ratios were deemed significant at the 5% level of significance, the resulting standard error of mean (SEM±) and crucial differences (CD) were computed and interpreted to provide a description of the findings [6].

**Table 3: Skeleton for analysis of variance (ANOVA)**

Source of variance	d.f.	SS	MSS	'F' Value		
				Calculated	Tabulated	
					5%	1%
Replication	(r-1) = 3	RSS	RMSr	RMSe		
		d.f.		EMSe		
Treatment	(t-1) = 5	TSS	TMSr	TMSt		
		d.f.		EMSe		
Error	(r-1) (t-1) = 15	ESS	EMSe			

		d.f.				
Total	(rt-1) = 23	Total SS				

The significant differences between different treatments were judged by using critical differences (C.D.) which was calculated as follows:

$$S. Ed. = SEm \times \sqrt{2} \text{ CD} = SEd \times t_{5\%} \text{ for error d.f}$$

Where,

S. Em = Standard error of treatment means

S.Ed = Standard error of difference between treatment means

C. D. = Critical difference

r = Number of replications

edf = Error degree of freedom

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### 3.1 Impact of different nutrient management practices on physico-chemical properties of soil:

Data pertaining to various soil chemical properties viz., pH, EC, OC and available N, P and K contents were determined before sowing and after harvest of crop under different treatments presented in Table 4 and depicted in Fig 1 & 2 respectively. It is clear from the results that soil pH slightly reduced in T<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>4</sub> and increased in T<sub>5</sub> and T<sub>6</sub> as compared to initial status of soil. While in case of EC and OC of soil under different treatments did not found any remarkable changes but in case of available N, P and K of soil showed significant difference under different treatments with increased values from initial soil status indicated that the maximum pH was observed under 100% Inorganic NM (7.18) followed by Farmer practices (7.17), whereas lowest pH was recorded under the treatment of 100 % Organic NM (7.11). The

available N, P and K was influenced statistically significantly by different treatments and maximum nitrogen was registered under treatment of 100% organic nutrient management (244 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), phosphorus (12.70 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and potassium (270 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by 50 % Organic NM +NF inputs BJK. Whereas lowest value of N, P and K was recorded under the treatments of Farmer Practice 227.75, 12.47 and 247 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. However, in case of EC and OC was not affected significantly by various treatments. It may be due to the significant increase in available N content of soil was due to increased mineralization of organic N by active microorganisms and the regular dynamics of biomass carbon. The higher soluble P in the organic systems is mainly attributed to the release of inorganic P from added organics, inhibition of P adsorption by organic molecules released from the organics. These results are in agreement with the findings [7, 8, 9, 10 & 11].

**Table 4: Impact of different nutrient management practices on physico-chemical properties of soil**

Treatment No.	pH	EC (dS/m)	OC (%)	Available nutrients (kg/ha)		
				N	P	K

T <sub>1</sub> 100 % Organic NM	7.11	0.32	0.63	244.00	12.70	267.00
T <sub>2</sub> 50 % Organic NM +NF inputs BJJ	7.12	0.31	0.62	238.75	12.53	260.50
T <sub>3</sub> 50% Organic+50% Inorganic NM	7.12	0.29	0.61	238.50	12.50	256.75
T <sub>4</sub> 25% Organic + NF inputs BJJ +25% Inorganic NM	7.14	0.30	0.62	230.00	12.67	252.00
T <sub>5</sub> Farmer Practice	7.17	0.29	0.61	227.75	12.47	247.00
T <sub>6</sub> 100 % Inorganic NM	7.18	0.30	0.60	234.25	12.62	263.50
<b>Initial status of soil</b>	<b>7.20</b>	<b>0.28</b>	<b>0.59</b>	<b>216.50</b>	<b>12.41</b>	<b>240.50</b>
<b>SEm ±</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>1.57</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>1.88</b>
<b>CD (5%)</b>	<b>0.02</b>	<b>NS</b>	<b>NS</b>	<b>4.44</b>	<b>0.07</b>	<b>5.67</b>




Fig. 1: Impact of different nutrient management practices on pH, EC and OC of soil




Fig. 2: Impact of different nutrient management practices on Available N, P and K of soil (kg/ha)

### 3.2 Impact of different nutrient management practices on economics:

Economic analysis of treatments was determined on per hectare area basis, which

includes cost of cultivation, gross monetary return, net monetary return and benefit-cost ratio as affected by various treatments are given in Table 5.

### 3.2.1 Cost of cultivation (Rs/ha)

Data on cost of cultivation showed variations among the different treatments represent in Table 5 and depicted in Fig 3. On an average the highest cost of cultivation

was found under the treatment of 100% organic nutrient management (Rs. 31624/ha) followed by T<sub>2</sub> (50% organic+ NF inputs (beejamrit +jeevamrit+ ghanjeevamrit) + 50% inorganic NM (Rs.31128/ha) and lowest cost of cultivation was recorded under the treatment of T<sub>5</sub> farmer practice (Rs.20800/ha). These findings are in close conformity with the results of [12, & 13].





Fig. 3: Impact of different nutrient management practices on cost of cultivation (Rs/ha) of soybean under different treatments

### 3.2.2 Gross monetary returns (Rs/ha)

Data on gross monetary returns showed variations among the different treatments represent in Table 5 and depicted in Fig 4. On an average highest gross monetary returns was obtained from T<sub>1</sub> (100% organic nutrient management) (Rs.58606/ha)

followed by T<sub>2</sub> (50% organic+ NF inputs (beejamrit +jeevamrit+ ghanjeevamrit) + 50% inorganic NM) (Rs.50712/ha) however, lowest gross monetary returns obtained from (T<sub>5</sub> farmer practice)(Rs.36419/ha). These findings are in close conformity with the results of [14, 15 & 16].




**Fig. 4: Impact of different nutrient management practices on gross monetary returns (Rs/ha) of soybean under different treatments**

**3.2.3 Net monetary returns (Rs/ha)**

Data on net monetary returns showed variations among the different treatments represent in Table 5 and depicted in Fig 5. The highest net monetary returns were found in T<sub>1</sub> (100% organic nutrient management) (Rs. 26982/ha) followed by T<sub>2</sub> (50%

organic+ NF inputs (beejamrit +jeevamrit + ghanjeevamrit) + 50% inorganic NM) (Rs.19584/ha) however, lowest net monetary returns were found in T<sub>5</sub> (farmer practice) (Rs.15619/ha). These results are with close agreement [17, 18 &19].




**Fig. 5: Impact of different nutrient management practices on net monetary returns (Rs/ha) of soybean under different treatments**

**3.2.4 Benefit-cost ratio**

Data on B: C ratio showed variation among the different treatments represent in Table 5 and depicted in Fig 6. The highest average benefit cost ratio was found in T<sub>1</sub> (100% organic nutrient management) (1.85)

followed by T<sub>5</sub> (Farmer practice) (1.75) and lowest benefit cost ratio was recorded in T<sub>2</sub> (50 % Organic NM +NF inputs BJJ) (1.62). These results are in with close agreement [20, 21 & 22].



**Fig. 6: Impact of different nutrient management practices on B: C Ratio (per rupees investment) of soybean under different treatments**

**Table 5: Economic analysis of soybean under different treatments**

Treatment No.	Cost of Cultivation (Rs/ha)	GMR (Rs/ha)	NMR (Rs/ha)	B:C
T <sub>1</sub> 100 % Organic NM	31624	58606	26982	1.85
T <sub>2</sub> 50 % Organic NM +NF inputs BJK	31128	50712	19584	1.62
T <sub>3</sub> 50% Organic+50% Inorganic NM	24704	41686	16982	1.68
T <sub>4</sub> 25% Organic + NF inputs BJK +25% Inorganic NM	24840	42962	18122	1.72
T <sub>5</sub> Farmer Practice	20800	36419	15619	1.75
T <sub>6</sub> 100 % Inorganic NM	23484	39349	15865	1.67

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Based on foregoing results and discussion it can be concluded that among different nutrient management practices treatments (100% organic nutrient management) have shown positively impact on soil health with the post-harvest values of available N (244 kg/ha), P (12.70 kg/ha), K (267 kg/ha), pH (7.11), EC (0.32ds/m) and organic carbon (0.63%) where the initial values were available N (216.50 kg/ha), P (12.41 kg/ha), K (240.50 kg/ha), pH (7.20), EC (0.28 dS/m) and organic carbon (0.59 %). Whereas the higher Gross monetary returns (Rs.58606/ha), Net monetary returns (Rs.26982/ha) and in terms of per rupees investment (1.85) were obtained under the treatment (100% organic nutrient management).

#### 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.

#### REFERENCES

1. Morya J, Tripathi RK, Kumawat N, Singh M, Yadav RK. Tomar IS and Sahu Y 2018. Influence of Organic and Inorganic Fertilizers on Growth, Yields and Nutrient Uptake of Soybean (*Glycine max Merrill L.*) under Jhabua Hills. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Science 7(02): 725-730.
2. SOPA. 2021. The soybean processor association of india statistics [sopa.org](http://sopa.org).
3. Prakash O, Kumar R, Kumar R, and Chandini 2019. The Impact of Chemical Fertilizers on Our Environment and Ecosystem. Research Trends in Environmental

- Sciences 35: (69) pp.69-86.  
Circular 939: 19-23.
4. Devakumar N, Rao GGE, Shubha S, Imran khan, Nagaraj and Gowda S.B. 2008. Activities of Organic Farming Research Centre, Navile, Shimoga, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru, India. 23 (2):1-4.
  5. Ramesh P, Panwar N, Panwar N, Singh AB and Ramana S. 2009. Production potential, nutrient uptake, soil fertility and economics of soybean (*Glycine max*) - Based cropping systems under organic, chemical and integrated nutrient management practices. Indian Journal of Agronomy 54(3):278-283.
  6. Gomez AK and Gomez AA. 1984. Statistical procedure for agriculture research, II Edition, A Willey-International Science Publication. Indian Journal of Agronomy,53(4): 295-298.
  7. Van Bruggen AHC and Finckh MR .2015. Plant diseases and management approaches in organic farming systems. Annual Review of Phytopathology 54: 25-54.
  8. Siddappa .2015. Use of jeevamrit and farmyard manure on growth and yield of field bean (*Lablab purpureus var. lignosus*). M.Sc. Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru, India p 78-80.
  9. Potkile SN, Bhale VM, Deshmukh JP, Dandge MS and Shingrup PV. 2017. Effect of organic sources on soil health improvement and growth of soybean wheat cropping sequence. Trends in Biosciences 10(28): 5917-5923.
  10. Jagdale AL. 2018. Studies on effect of organic formulations on growth yield and soil nutrient dynamics in soybean, M.Sc. Thesis, VasantryaNaikMarathwadaAgri cultural University, Parbhani, India p 35-37
  11. Kumar B and Devakumar N. 2002. Influence of different levels of jeevamrit and panchagavya on yield and quality parameters of organic frenchbean (*Phaseolus vulgaris L*). In: Proceedings of Scientific Track "Innovative Research for Organic Agriculture 3.0", 19th Organic World Congress, November 9-11, New Delhi, India. p 459 462.
  12. Satpute TG, More SS and Sanap DJ. 2009. Costs, returns and resource use efficiency of organic and inorganic soybean farming in Parbhani, India. Agriculture update, 4 (1/2): 189-193.
  13. Deshmukh KK, Khatik SK and Dubey DP. 2005. Effect of integrated use of inorganic, organic and biofertilizers on production, nutrient availability and economic feasibility of soybean grown on soil of Kymore Plateau and Satpura Hills. Journal of Soils and Crops, 15 (1): 21-25.
  14. Bachhav, S.D., Patel, S.H. and Suryawanshi, P.K.2012. Yield and economics of soybean influenced by integrated nutrient management practices, International. Journal Forestry & Crop Improvement, 3 (2):140-143.
  15. Ramesh, P., Panwar, N. R. and Singh, A. B. 2010. Crop productivity, soil fertility and economics of soybean (*Glycine max*), chickpea (*Cicerarietinum*) and blond psyllium (*Plantagoovata*) under organic nutrient management practices. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 80 (11) 965-969.
  16. Dabhi BM, Lokhande AK and Polara JV. 2010. Effect of integrated nutrient management in soybean (*Glycine max*). Advances in Plant Sciences, 23 (1): 101-102.

17. Shwetha BN. 2008, Effect of nutrient management through the organics in soybean-wheat cropping system. M.Sc. Thesis, University of Agricultural Science, Dharwad, India p 35-47.
18. Chakraborty B. and Hazari S. 2012. Impact of Inorganic and Organic Manures on Yield of Soybean and soil properties. Soybean Research 14(2):54-62(2016).
21. Subbiah BV and Asija GL. 1956. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available nitrogen in soils. Current Science 25: 259- 260.
22. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Frank S, Watanabe and Dean LA. 1954. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. U.S.D.A. Circular. 939: 1- 19.
23. Chapman HD and Pratt PF. 1961. Methods of analysis of soils, plants and water. Division of Agriculture Science,
19. Lakpale R and Shrivastava GK. 2006. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and economics of soybean. Ann. Pl. Soil Res., 8 (2): 138-140.
20. Shivakumar BG and Ahlawat IPS. 2008. Integrated nutrient management in soybean (*Glycine max*) - wheat (*Triticumaestivum*) cropping system. Indian Journal of Agronomy, 53 (4): 273-278. University of California, Berkeley, the USA. 150-210.
24. Piper CS. 1967. Soil and plant analysis. University of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia.
25. Black CA. 1965. Method of soil analysis. American Society of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA: 131-137.
26. Walkley A. and Black IA. 1934. An examination of the Degtjareff method for determining organic carbon in soils: Effect of variations in digestion conditions and of inorganic soil constituents. Soil Science, 63:251-263.