

## Assessment of Fertility Status of Soils under Different Cropping Patterns in rainfed Semi-Arid Eastern Plain of Rajasthan

### Abstract

Soil fertility assessment is essential for effective land management practices. Therefore, this study was conducted to assess the physico-chemical characteristics of soil under different [(Pearl millet (S<sub>1</sub>), Sorghum (S<sub>2</sub>), Ground nut (S<sub>3</sub>), Mung-bean (S<sub>4</sub>), Maize (S<sub>5</sub>), Pasture (S<sub>6</sub>)] cropping systems and to test for significant differences in the nutrient in order to provide basis for recommending site specific land management practices in the study area. Soil samples under the aforementioned cropping systems were collected from 3 sites (Malpura Todaraisingh Piplu) in Tonk District. The samples collected from (surface and subsurface) levels using soil auger. The samples collected were subjected to physico-chemical analyses at the Institute of Agricultural science BHU Varanasi. The results of the analyses showed that the pH of all the soils ranged between slightly acidic to slightly alkaline. Whereas the organic carbon, Nitrogen, was observed low to medium in ranges. Good physical condition of soil observed in descending order to Mung-bean, groundnut, Maize, Sorghum, Pearl-millet, Pasture.

**Keywords:** Cropping systems; land management; soil fertility; statistical analyses; Sustainable productivity

### 1. Introduction

Soil quality is highly dependent on soil management practices, and it influences crop production. Evaluating soil characteristics across varying cropping systems over extended periods is vital for maintaining soil quality. This is crucial as soil serves plays as a-an essential role within ecosystems namely, facilitating nutrient cycling, regulating water availability, and fostering optimal crop development. As a developing country India not only faces water scarcity problems but also the challenge to maintain soil health and guarantee food security. Changes in various cropping patterns can significantly impact soil properties, particularly with the increased use of fertilizers and low efficiency in nutrient utilization, thereby affecting soil quality. Multiple studies indicate that while there may be short-term gains in crop yield, over time, these changes can lead to soil chemical, physical, and biological alterations that are detrimental to sustainable agricultural practices (Choudhary et. al., 2024). The modifications in soil are a reflection of various management approaches applied, including crop rotation and diversification. These alterations in soil quality are not solely attributed to tillage methods and fertilizer usage but also to factors such as crop varieties and planting techniques within agricultural patterns.

Crop diversification, often referred to as planned diversity in cropping systems, is essential not only for maximizing crop production but also for promoting soil health. By balancing soil biodiversity, enhancing nutrient use efficiency, and mitigating soil-borne pathogens, crop diversification plays a crucial role in sustainable agriculture (Somasundaram et. al., 2018). The benefits of optimized crop diversification extend to growers and the environment like. Increasing crop diversity contributes to the heterogeneity of soil chemical nutrients, physical structures, and functional microorganisms across different spatial scales, ultimately leading to improved soil health and crop yields. However, the

**Commented [P1]:** This abstract is not a full representation of the paper. An abstract should summarize the paper in totality from introduction to conclusion. The introduction is too short and vague. What was the knowledge gap that led to this investigation/research? How were the samples collected? How were they analysed? Which methods were used to analyse the data scientifically? What are the key points or results that were significant? What does the study conclude? These should be presented for the reader to quickly judge the relevance of the paper

**Commented [P2]:** Give the values instead. A reader may not know what ranges of values represented by these.

**Commented [P3]:** This is not scientific. Use figures

**Commented [P4]:** What is meant by good physical condition? In what aspect?

**Commented [P5]:** Confirm if this is analysis or analyses

**Commented [P6]:** This entire sentence or paragraph does not have a citation. Where is this data originating from?

**Commented [P7]:** Read more and add more references

relationship between crop diversification and soil-borne pathogens can be complex. While increased crop diversity generally reduces the prevalence of soil-borne diseases, there are instances where this relationship may not hold true. For example, Yang, et. al., (2020) found that incorporating more pulse crops into rotations actually increased the pathogen index, potentially due to an increase in pulse-specific pathogens. Therefore, while crop diversification is generally beneficial, the impact on soil-borne diseases may vary depending on factors such as species redundancy and the host-specificity of pathogens. Cropping systems are essential components of farming, illustrating the patterns of crops grown on a farm and their interactions with other aspects such as resources and available technology. There's a general acknowledgment that mycorrhizal fungi activity can enhance soil quality, and cropping systems play a role in promoting the inoculation of these fungi. Furthermore, mycorrhizal fungi contribute to early crop growth by establishing symbiotic relationships with plant roots, facilitating improved water and nutrient uptake.

**Commented [P8]:** From whom? Always cite what you say since these are not your words

Rajasthan is segmented into three agro-climatic zones: Zone VI, covering the Trans-Gangetic Plains region; Zone VIII, encompassing the Central Plateau and Hills region; and Zone XIV, representing the Western Dry region. The soil in Rajasthan falls under various classifications according to the USDA Land Division program, including Aridisols, Alfisols, Entisol, Inceptisols, and Vertisol (Choudhary et. al., 2024). In India, The lack research data on this topic especially in the tropical and sub-tropical rainfed regions, is concerning, particularly regarding the environmental and economic impacts of conventional crop cultivation. Consequently, there's growing interest in alternative approaches like organic farming. However, there's a lack of comprehensive, long-term studies on how different crops (such as sorghum, pearl millet, groundnut, and green gram) and production systems (organic and integrated) affect soil physio-chemical properties, particularly in India's rainfed semiarid areas. These crops were selected based on their suitability for the study region, as they are well-adapted to the rainfed regions of semi-arid tropics and are commonly cultivated there. Therefore, our current research aims to assess the influence of various crops on soil physical and chemical properties in rainfed semi-arid areas.

**Commented [P9]:** Further reading is required

## 2. Material and methods

### 2.1 Present Study Area

Tonk is situated in North Eastern of Rajasthan, between 25°41' and 26°34' north latitudes and between 75°07' and 76°19' east longitudes. It is bounded in the north by Jaipur district, in the south by Bundi and Bhilwara districts, in the west by Ajmer district and in the east by Sawai Madhopur district. It is situated in agro-climatic zone 3-A, specifically the semi-arid eastern plain zone the climate is different from typical semi-arid Rajasthan and is more sub-humid climate. The area does remain dry for almost part of the year and humidity increases only during the monsoon months. Summers are hot and during the peak summer months of May-June the temperature soars to more than 40°C. In winter months that stretch from November to February the mean temperature is low, around 20 °C but the lowest temperatures dip to around 5-6°C. Rainfall is moderate as the average annual rainfall in this district is about 520 mm and rains are received during the monsoon months of July to September.

**Commented [P10]:** Refer readers to the figure.within the paper

**Commented [P11]:** All this need to be cited.Give the researchers credit for their works

### 2.2 Soil Samples Collection Sites

A total of 72 samples were collected from Tonk district Rajasthan in the year of September 2021. The samples were from 6 cropping systems: Pearl millet (S<sub>1</sub>), Sorghum (S<sub>2</sub>), Ground nut (S<sub>3</sub>), Mung-bean (S<sub>4</sub>), Maize (S<sub>5</sub>), and Pasture (S<sub>6</sub>). 12 samples were collected from each cropping system in which six samples were taken from 0-15 cm and remaining 6 samples were taken from 15-30 cm depth with the help of soil auger and soil samples were collected and placed in a labelled polythene bags.

### 2.3 Process of Soil Sampling

The soil samples after collection, were taken to the laboratory for further analysis. To begin with, these samples were carefully dried in the shade to ensure accuracy in subsequent processing steps. The first step in the processing involved removing any unwanted materials such as roots and stones from the samples. Additionally, any clods present in the samples were broken down using a wooden mallet. Following this, the samples were sieved using a 2 mm sieve to ensure uniformity (table 1). The sieved samples were then carefully stored in polybags for later assessment of various physico-chemical parameters. Throughout this process, all necessary precautions were taken, adhering to the methodology outlined by Jackson. Furthermore, the chemical properties of the soil were estimated using the standard procedure outlined by Page et al. (1982).

**Commented [P12]:** What do you mean further? Was there an analysis done before?

**Commented [P13]:** Jackson who? Cite the method and owner. Which year?

**Commented [P14]:** Note, citation formats within text are different from those at the end of a sentence

**Table 1. Procedure used for physical and chemical analysis of soil.**

S. No.	Parameters	Method	Scientist
<b>Physical properties</b>			
1.	Bulk density (Mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Pycnometer	Black <i>et al.</i> (1965)
2.	Particle density (Mg kg <sup>-1</sup> )	Pycnometer	Black <i>et al.</i> (1965)
3.	Water holding capacity	Keen box	Piper (1966)
<b>Chemical properties</b>			
4.	pH	Glass electrode pH meter	Jackson (1973)
5.	EC (dSm <sup>-1</sup> )	Electrical conductivity meter	Jackson (1973)
6.	Organic carbon (%)	Wet oxidation method	Walkey and Black (1934)
7.	Available nitrogen	Alkaline Potassium permanganate	Subbiah and Asija (1956)
8.	Available phosphorus	Modified Olsen's method	Olsen <i>et al.</i> (1954)
9.	Available potassium	Extractable K <sub>2</sub> O Ammonium acetate	Schollenberger and Simon (1945)
10.	Exchangeable calcium and magnesium	EDTA titration method	Jackson (1973)
11.	Available sulfur	Turbidimetric method	Chesnin and Yien (1950)




**Table 2 Soil physio-chemical parameters of Tonk District Rajasthan.**

Average Mean of Soil Under Different Depth									
Cropping patterns	Depth	pH	EC(dsm <sup>-1</sup> )	OC (%)	OM (%)	BD (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	PD (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	Porosity (%)	WHC (%)
Pearl millet (S <sub>1</sub> )	0- 15 cm	7.4	0.59	0.53	0.91	1.38	2.23	38.12	36.85
	15-30 cm	6.7	0.84	0.38	0.66	1.44	2.45	41.22	45.87
Sorghum (S <sub>2</sub> )	0- 15 cm	6.8	0.88	0.43	0.74	1.36	2.13	37.09	33.72
	15-30 cm	6.3	0.65	0.35	0.60	1.5	2.6	42.31	47.51
Ground nut (S <sub>3</sub> )	0- 15 cm	6.7	0.56	0.75	1.29	1.34	2.65	49.43	55.85
	15-30 cm	7.1	0.76	0.51	0.88	1.32	2.54	48.03	45.87
Mung-bean (S <sub>4</sub> )	0- 15 cm	7.3	0.41	0.88	1.52	1.38	2.59	46.72	50.12
	15-30 cm	6.5	0.32	0.64	1.10	1.33	2.54	47.64	44.21
Maize (S <sub>5</sub> )	0- 15 cm	6.9	0.75	0.56	0.97	1.4	2.28	38.60	32.12
	15-30 cm	7.2	0.47	0.63	1.09	1.43	2.6	45.00	44.21
Pasture (S <sub>6</sub> )	0- 15 cm	7	0.35	0.41	0.71	1.48	2.56	42.19	32.12
	15-30 cm	6.9	0.54	0.49	0.84	1.57	2.69	41.64	28.21

**Commented [P18]:** The table has no statistical data. Show us the tests of significance with LSD values and highlight which ones are significant

UNDER PEER REVIEW



The pH of the soil is an important property because it affects nutrients availability and supply, microbial growth and the physical state of the soil. The pH values represents, the combined effect of acid-base reactions occurring in the soil environment (Mokolobate and Haynes 2002). Soil pH of the different cropping system [Pearl millet (S<sub>1</sub>), Sorghum (S<sub>2</sub>), Ground nut (S<sub>3</sub>), Mung-bean (S<sub>4</sub>), Maize (S<sub>5</sub>), Pasture (S<sub>6</sub>)] on surface layer observed from 6.7 to 7.4 and subsurface layer from 6.3 to 7.2 respectively 7.4, 6.8, 6.7, 7.3, 6.9, 7, and 6.7, 6.3, 7.1, 6.5, 7.2, 6.9. The pH value Highest observed in surface layer as compare to sub surface layer. In same way highest EC observed in surface layer (0.88 dsm<sup>-1</sup>) in sorghum cropping system and lowest EC observed (0.35 dsm<sup>-1</sup>) in pasture land while in subsurface layer highest EC observed in pearl millet (0.84 dsm<sup>-1</sup>) and lowest find in Mung bean (0.32 dsm<sup>-1</sup>).

Commented [P19]: According to?

Soil Organic Matter of the different cropping system [Pearl millet (S<sub>1</sub>), Sorghum (S<sub>2</sub>), Ground nut (S<sub>3</sub>), Mung-bean (S<sub>4</sub>), Maize (S<sub>5</sub>), Pasture (S<sub>6</sub>)] vary in surface layer from 0.71 to 1.52% and 0.60 to 1.10 % in subsurface layer respectively 0.91 and 0.66%, 0.74 and 0.60 %, 1.29 and 0.88%, 1.52 and 1.10%, 0.97 and 1.09%, 0.71 and 0.84% (Fig. 2) . Highest OM observed in Mung bean cropping system (1.52 and 1.10 %) after that ground nut (1.29 and 0.88%).

Commented [P20]: Were they significantly different?

Commented [P21]: Use past tense




Fig. 2 soil organic matter in different cropping system in surface and subsurface

The bulk density of surface layer observed from 1.34 to 1.48 g cm<sup>-3</sup> and in subsurface observed from 1.32 to 1.57 g cm<sup>-3</sup> lowest BD of surface & subsurface layer observed in ground nut (1.34 and 1.32 g cm<sup>-3</sup>) and highest observed in pasture 1.48 and 1.57 g cm<sup>-3</sup> (table 2 and fig. 3). In ground-nut BD lowest observed because its pods increase the porosity and microbial activity most of surface layer also covered by plant parts (stem, leaves) due to moisture and temperature also maintain while BD highest observed in pasture land because animal feed on grasses and there weight compacts the land, which reduce the porosity and increase the bulk density.


Commented [P22]: You have not referred to this figure as you present the results

Commented [P23]: Review this statement. Say BD ranged from ...for farming system... and from... for system x

Commented [P24]: Rephrase. It is confusing

Commented [P25]: Good

Commented [P26]: Are you presenting results or discussing them? Discussions must compare your work with other researchers' works and they must then be cited.



**Fig. 3 soil bulk density in different cropping system.**

Soil Porosity ~~were was~~ observed to be increasing from surface to subsurface in pearl millet and sorghum land ~~ie.e.~~ 38.12% to 41.22% and 37.09 to 42.31 but decreasing with increasing soil depths in groundnut and pasture land ~~respectively~~ 49.43 to 48.03% and 42.19 to 41.64% ~~respectively~~ (Tables 2 and Fig6). There is observed higher soil porosity with increasing the soil depth. The higher soil porosity with increasing soil depth on Maize and sorghum can be as a result of shallow root system of Maize and sorghum compared to groundnut and pasture.

Water holding capacity observed in surface layer ranged from 55.85 to 32.12%. Highest WHC observed ~~in was in~~ ground nut (55.85 %~~-%~~) and lowest observed in maize ~~32.12(32.12 %).~~ pasture 32.12%. ~~While inIn~~ sub surface layer, WHC observed ~~wasin~~ 47.51 to 28.21% (table 2). ~~The h~~ Highest WHC ~~observed~~ in sub surface layer ~~was recorded for find out in sorghum-sorghum at~~ 47.51% and lowest ~~was~~ observed in Pasture land (28.21% ~~)~~ because in compaction in pasture land and high in bulk density low in porosity due to WHC decrease.

### 3.2 Status of macronutrients

**Table 3. Nutrient rating of the soil test values. Source: (Ramamoorthy and Bajaj 1969).**

Parameters	Low	Medium	High
Organic carbon (%)	<0.5	0.5-0.75	>0.75
Available N (kg/ha)	<280	280-560	>560
Available P (kg/ha)	<12.5	12.5-25	>25
Available K (kg/ha)	<135	135-335	>335
Available S (kg/ha)	<10	10-20	>20
Deficient		Sufficient	
Calcium (Meq/100 g)	<1.0	>1.0	
Magnesium (Meq/100 g)	<1.5	>1.5	

**Commented [P27]:** Where has this figure been referred?

**Commented [P28]:** Amend correct use of respectively and avoid repetition

**Commented [P29]:** This is an attribution from who?

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Commented [P30]:** This one is hanging

**Commented [P31]:** Present the data correctly. If it is a range, give correct range. The grammar is quite confusing. You need to rephrase this whole paragraph

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Formatted:** Highlight

**Commented [P32]:** According to who? Which other studies observed this and how are they different from yours?

**Commented [P33]:** What's the relevance of this table? You need to tell the readers and refer to it within the text. Tables should be presented after the relevant data has been presented for each section and not bundled together.



**Table 4. Status of available macro nutrients viz. N, P, K, Ca, Mg, S, in the soil of Tonk District**

Average Mean of Soil Macro Nutrient Under Different Depth							
Cropping patterns	Depth	N (Kg/ha)	P (Kg/ha)	K (Kg/ha)	S (Kg/ha)	Ca (Meq/100g)	Mg (Meq/100g)
Pearl millet (S <sub>1</sub> )	0- 15 cm	260	15.5	315.21	10.35	14.06	2.65
	15-30 cm	275	17.3	310.75	12.08	8.24	3.98
Sorghum (S <sub>2</sub> )	0- 15 cm	263	16.3	155.27	15.69	0.54	5.06
	15-30 cm	235	15.9	354.29	16.76	5.38	4.06
Ground nut (S <sub>3</sub> )	0- 15 cm	380	19.8	174.92	18.3	2.56	9.05
	15-30 cm	330	26.4	224.02	22.45	16.43	7.32
Mung-bean (S <sub>4</sub> )	0- 15 cm	568	23.5	124.36	17.62	8.04	11.35
	15-30 cm	480	20.9	254.95	12.45	12.09	13.07
Maize (S <sub>5</sub> )	0- 15 cm	340	26.5	195.45	14.32	0.45	1.45
	15-30 cm	329	23.4	310.85	18.95	5.36	8.54
Pasture (S <sub>6</sub> )	0- 15 cm	270	14.2	145.98	8.65	0.48	2.09
	15-30 cm	254	18.2	198.45	14.61	19.54	5.06

**Commented [P37]:** Table has no statistical data and therefore these are just rendered to be figures without scientific meaning

**Commented [P34]:**

Highest values (568 Kg/ha and 480 Kg/ha) of Nitrogen was obtained from mung bean soil in the study area at the surface and subsurface soil levels (table 4 and fig. 4). ~~Whereas, while~~ lowest values of Nitrogen were recorded in pearl millet and maize (260 Kg/ha and 329 Kg/ha). The highest values recorded in the mung bean because it is legumes crop those fix atmosphere N<sub>2</sub> and after harvesting crop roots also retained in soil those increase the N<sub>2</sub> level in soil. Soil phosphorus of the different cropping system [Pearl millet (S<sub>1</sub>), Sorghum (S<sub>2</sub>), Ground nut (S<sub>3</sub>), Mung-bean (S<sub>4</sub>), Maize (S<sub>5</sub>), Pasture (S<sub>6</sub>)] vary in surface layer from 26.5 to 14.2 Kg/ha and 26.4 to 15.9 Kg/ha in subsurface layer respectively 15.5 and 17.3 Kg/ha, 16.3 and 15.9 Kg/ha, 19.8 and 26.4 Kg/ha, 23.5 and 20.9 Kg/ha, 26.5 and 23.4 Kg/ha, 14.2 and 18.2 Kg/ha (table 4 and fig. 6). In surface layer highest phosphorus observed was in Maize 26.5 Kg/ha and subsurface in pasture 14.2 Kg/ha while in subsurface highest observed in groundnut 26.4 Kg/ha and lowest observed in 15.9 Kg/ha.


**Commented [P38]:** According to who

**Commented [P39]:** Past tense

**Commented [P40]:** brackets

**Commented [P41]:** brackets

**Commented [P42]:** how were the results different




**Fig. 4 soil nitrogen in different cropping system**

The sulphur content in surface and subsurface layer highest observed in ground nut soil 18.3 Kg/ha and 22.45 Kg/ha while in subsurface layer lowest observed in pasture 8.65 Kg/ha and pearl millet 12.8 Kg/ha (table 4 and fig. 5). Because groundnut is an oily crop which has high sulphur requirements when sulphur fertilizers applied to it, some residue is left in the soil due to which the sulphur content was show high in groundnut soil sample.

**Commented [P43]:** Grammar is off

**Commented [P44]:** When did you find out this? Which study in which year? Cite relevant authors




**Fig. 5 Soil available sulphur in different cropping system**

The highest calcium and magnesium was highest observed in surface layer (respectively 14.06 Meq/100g and 11.35 Meq/100g respectively) and lowest was observed 0.45 Meq/100g and 1.45 Meq/100g. While in subsurface layer, highest value observed 19.54 Meq/100g and 13.07 Meq/100g and lowest find out 5.36 Meq/100g and 3.98 Meq/100g respectively.

**Commented [P45]:** For which nutrients?

**Commented [P46]:** Grammar and sentence flow is very poor, correct this



**Fig. 6** physio- chemical characteristics of soil under different cropping system on surface and sub-surface layer

#### 4. Correlation between physical and chemical properties of soil

Correlation between physico-chemical properties and available macro-nutrients in soils ~~shows-is shown~~ in table 5 below. -The pH of the soil samples showed positive and significant correlation with EC ( $r = 0.548^*$ ) at 5% level of significance in overall sample observation and negative correlation with nitrogen ( $r = -0.162^*$ ) and phosphors ( $r = -0.256^*$ ). The EC of soil samples showed positive and significant correlation with nitrogen ( $r = 0.117^*$ ) and ~~sulfur~~sulphur ( $r = 0.135^{**}$ ) at 5% and 1% level of significance in overall sample observation. OC of soil also showed positive and significant correlation with nitrogen ( $r = 0.874^{**}$ ), phosphors ( $r = 0.540^{**}$ ). The bulk density of soil samples showed negative and significant correlation with porosity ( $r = -0.319^{**}$ ), water holding capacity ( $r = -0.433^{**}$ ), calcium ( $r = -0.134^{**}$ ), at 5% and 1% level of significance. The particle density of soil samples showed positive and significant correlation with porosity ( $r = 0.745^{**}$ ) at 5% and 1% level of significance. The available nitrogen in soil samples showed negative and significant correlation with calcium ( $r = -0.624^{**}$ ) and potassium ( $r = -0.400^{**}$ ) and positively non-significant correlation with phosphorus ( $r = 0.547$ ).

**Commented [P47]:** WHICH METHOD WAS USED FOR THE CORRELATION

**Commented [P48]:** There needs to be an explanation and discussions for these correlations. Why are they positively and negatively correlated? WHAT DOES IT MEAN TO A LAYMAN?

**Table 5. Correlation between soil physico-chemical properties of Tonk District in Rajasthan.**

	pH	EC(ds/m)	OC (%)	BD (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	PD (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	Porosity (%)	WHC (%)	N (Kg/ha)	P (Kg/ha)	K (Kg/ha)	S (Kg/ha)	Ca (Meq/100g)	Mg (Meq/100g)
pH	1												
	0.548												
EC(ds/m)	*	1											
OC (%)	0.381	-0.485	1										
BD (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	-0.141	-0.140	0.444*	1									
PD (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	-0.178	-0.567	0.276	0.394	1								
Porosity (%)	-0.081	-0.485	0.598	-0.319**	0.745**	1							
WHC (%)	-0.189	-0.095	0.480	-0.433	0.413**	0.738**	1						
	-												
N (Kg/ha)	0.162		0.874*										
	*	0.499**	*	-0.493	0.260	0.628	0.493	1					
	-												
P (Kg/ha)	0.256		0.540*										
	*	0.039	*	-0.407	0.128	0.435	0.241	0.547	1				
K (Kg/ha)	-0.244	0.160	-0.412	0.196	0.005	-0.125	0.190	-0.400	-0.169	1			
S (Kg/ha)	0.041	0.237**	0.351	-0.309	0.306	0.532	0.519	0.246	0.647**	-0.043	1		
Ca (Meq/100g)												1	
	0.211	-0.106	0.025	-0.134**	0.283	0.205	-0.056	0.624**	0.109	0.258	0.122**		
Mg (Meq/100g)													1
	-0.051	-0.481	0.720	-0.458	0.449	0.793	0.617	0.804**	0.390	-0.147	0.443	0.230	

## 5. CONCLUSION

This study assessed the physico-chemical (pH, bulk density, available Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Potassium, organic matter, organic carbon and secondary nutrient) parameters of soil under different [Pearl millet (S<sub>1</sub>), Sorghum (S<sub>2</sub>), Ground nut (S<sub>3</sub>), Mung-bean (S<sub>4</sub>), Maize (S<sub>5</sub>), Pasture (S<sub>6</sub>)] cropping systems. ~~According to result~~ Results show high macro nutrient observed in Ground nut and Mung-bean land, ~~as well as and~~ physical properties of soil are also found to have improved for the two ~~also good as compared~~ to other cropping systems. Therefore, future land management practices should be such that will not impact these parameters as the bulk density currently recorded is above the tolerant limit for most crops cultivated in the study area.

## References

- BV S. A rapid procedure for the determination of available nitrogen in soils. *Curr Sci.* 1956;25:259-60
- Choudhary, R., Choudhary, R., Choudhary, S., & Nath, T. (2024). Assessment of groundwater quality of different villages of Malpura block in Tonk district, Rajasthan. *Int J Adv Biochem Res*, 8(3S), 445-450.
- Choudhary, R., Nath, T., Sharma, P. K., Nagar, P. K., Meena, A. K., & Naga, I. R. (2024). Soil Quality Assessment of Different Villages of Malpura Block in Tonk District of Rajasthan, India. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*, 36(5), 352-362.
- Das DK. The 17th Prof. JN Mukherjee-ISSS Foundation Lecture\*: Role of Soil Information Systems in Sustainable Use of Land Resources. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science.* 1999;47(4):584-610.
- FAO, 2020. Crop production manual A guide to fruit and vegetable production in the Federated States of Micronesia FAO Subregional Office for the Pacific Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Apia, 2020
- Food and Agricultural Organisation. (2017). *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World.* Rome: FAO, IFAD, UNICEF, WFP AND WHO.
- J. Somasundaram, R. Chaudhary, D. Awanish Kumar et al., "Effect of contrasting tillage and cropping systems on soil aggregation, carbon pools and aggregate-associated carbon in rainfed vertisols," *European Journal of Soil Science*, vol. 69, no. 5, pp. 879–891, 2018.
- Olsen SR. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. US Department of Agriculture; 1954.
- Osman KT. Soils: principles, properties and management. Springer Science & Business Media; 2012 Dec 4.
- Page AL, Miller RH, Keeny DR. Methods of soil and plant analysis. American Society of Agronomy, Madison. 1982.
- Panda SC. Soil management and organic farming. Agrobios; 2006.
- Parker FW, Nelson WL, Winters E. The broad interpretation and application of soil test information.
- Piper CS. Soil and plant analysis. Scientific Publishers; 2019.

**Commented [P49]:** This is not a conclusion. You already said this in introduction and methods. It should not be part of the conclusion

**Commented [P50]:** Is this the only conclusion you can come up with based on all the data presented?

**Commented [P51]:** Poor grammar. You have also not shown or alluded to any data to come to this massive conclusion.

Ramamoorthy B, Bajaj JC. Available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium status of Indian soils. Fertiliser news. 1969.

Walkley A, Black IA. An examination of the Degtjareff method for determining soil organic matter, and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration method. Soil science. 1934 Jan 1;37(1):29-38.

Yang, T., Siddique, K. H., & Liu, K. (2020). Cropping systems in agriculture and their impact on soil health-A review. *Global Ecology and Conservation*, 23, 101118.

**Commented [P52]:** This is not acceptable. The reference list/ list of bibliography should have all authors cited within the text and manuscript. You have included works that have not been cited. The article is under researched. You only read three works for the entire manuscript with the methods excluded.

UNDER PEER REVIEW