Response of Inorganic, Organic Fertilizer and microbial inoculants on physico-chemical properties of soil in cultivation of wheat (*Triticum aestivum. L*) var. PBW-373

ABSTRACT

The objective of the experiment was to evaluate the response of inorganic fertilizer, organic fertilizer and microbial inoculants on soil health of wheat. The design applied was 3x3 randomized block design. It was observed that treatment T_9 (100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6.0 kg ha^{-1}) improved the soil WHC, OC, available N,P and K resulted in a slight change in soil pH 7.34, EC 0.49 dS m^{-1}, bulk density 1.14 Mg m^{-3} and particle density 2.54 Mg m^{-3}. In post-harvest soil of fertilizers observations were resulted in significant increase in pore space 48.97 %, water holding capacity 46.85 %, organic carbon 0.48 %, and available N 286.92 kg ha^{-1} ,P20.05 kg ha^{-}1,K 201.87 kg ha^{-1},significant increase in case of Nitrogenkg ha^{-1}, Phosphorus kg ha^{-1}, Potassium kg ha^{-1} was found to be significant among other treatments in wheat cultivation.

Keywords: Farm Yard Manure, Inorganic fertilizers, Phosphorus Solubilizing bacteria,Soil health, Wheat, etc.

1. INTRODUCTION

In addition to providing nutrients, the soil serves as a natural habitat for plant growth. Certain soils are productive and allow for lush plant development with minimal human intervention, whereas other soils may not support any useful plant life at all even with extensive human intervention. The soil needs to be easily tillable and fertile, have all the nutrients needed in amounts that plants can easily access, be physically sound enough to support plants, and have the right amount of moisture and air content for healthy root development in order to be considered productive. The soil must consistently supply these requirements for the duration of the plant's life.

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum L.*) is the first important *Rabi* cereal crop for the majority of world'spopulations. It belongs to grass family *Poaceae* (*Graminae*). It is the most important staple foodof about two billion people (36% of the world population). India is the second largest producer of wheat (99.70 million tons) next only to China(125.60 million tons) and cover the largest area under its cultivation (29.58 mha), which is about14 percent of the world wheat area and average productivity of 3377 kg ha^{-1}**.(MoA and FW 2018).**

Nitrogen (N) is major factor for yield of wheat (**Andrews *et al*., 2004**). Wheat is an important cereal crop and requires a good supply ofnutrients especially nitrogen foritsgrowth **(Mandal *etal*., 1992)**andyield(**Krylovand Pavlov, 1989**).

Phosphorus is essential for enhancing seed maturity and seed development (**Ziadi*et al.*2008**). Phosphorus plays a significant role in several vital functions such as photosynthesis,transformation of sugar to starch, protein information, nucleic acid production, nitrogen fixationand formation of oil. It is also, the part of all biochemical cycles in plants (**Mehrvarz andChaichi, 2008**).

Potassium controls the permeability of cellular membranes, maintaining correctprotoplasmic hydration, and stabilizing emulsions with high colloidal characteristics, all of whichcontribute to the preservation of cellular organization. Potassium stabilizes numerous enzymesystemandhasaconsiderablebufferingeffect. Potassium is known as "quality element" and itwas considered as a key factor in crop production (**Moussa, 2000**).

Judicious use of FYM with chemical fertilizers improves soil physical, chemical and biological properties and improves the crop productivity **(Sharma *et al*., 2007).**

Biofertilizer enhance soil fertility also crop productivity by fixing atmospheric nitrogen, mobilizing sparingly soluble P and by facilitating the release of nutrients through decomposition of crop residues. Phosphorous solubilizing bacteria (PSB) as bio-fertilizers have been found effective in solubilizing the fixed soil P and applied phosphates resulting in higher crop yields**.** Seed or soil inoculation with PSB, particularly belonging to the genera *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus*, have been known to improve plant uptake of nutrients and there by increase the use efficiency of applied chemical fertilizers **(Panhwar*etal*., 2014a &b).**

Inorganic fertilizers provide essential nutrients like nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, while organic fertilizers enrich the soil with organic matter, improving its structure and fertility. Microbial inoculants introduce beneficial microorganisms that enhance nutrient uptake and plant growth.Inorganic fertilizers, when used excessively, can lead to soil degradation, nutrient imbalances, and reduced microbial activity. Conversely, organic fertilizers and microbial inoculants promote soil health by increasing microbial diversity, improving soil structure, and enhancing nutrient cycling. They also help in retaining soil moisture and reducing erosion. By reducing reliance on synthetic fertilizers, the study of organic fertilizers and microbial inoculants promotes sustainable agricultural practices. This approach minimizes the environmental impact of farming, including reducing greenhouse gas emissions, nitrogen runoff, and groundwater pollution. Building soil health through the use of organic fertilizers and microbial inoculants can enhance the resilience of wheat crops to climate change. Healthy soils are better able to withstand extreme weather events, such as droughts or heavy rainfall, and maintain productivity in changing environmental conditions. Optimizing fertilizer and inoculant use based on crop and soil requirements can lead to cost savings for farmers. Additionally, improved soil health and increased yields contribute to long-term economic sustainability in agriculture. (**Smith *et al.*, 2016**)

2. METHODOLOGY

The present experiment was conducted during winter season (2022-2023) at Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry Crop Research Farm of the Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh. Prayagraj is located at 25^{0}47’69” N latitude and 81^{0}85’74” E longitude at an elevation of 98 m from the mean sea level. This region has a sub-tropical climate prevailing in the South-East part of UP.

The soil of the experimental site is alluvial and falls under Inceptisol order. The soil samples were randomly collected from five different sites in the experimental plot prior to tillage operation from a depth of 0-15 cm (furrow slice layer).The soil sample will be reduced in volume by quartering and canning the composites. The soil sample will then be air dried and run through a 2 mm sieve in order to prepare it for chemical analysis (pH, EC, organic carbon, available nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, as well as physical analysis (bulk density, particle density, pore space%, water holding capacity%).

Table1. Treatment combination of wheat var.PBW-373

S.No.	Treatment combination
T_1	Absolute Control,
T_2	(RDF @ N: P: K (120:60:40 kg ha^{-1}),
T_3	(100% RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}),
T_4	(100% RDF + FYM @ 10 t ha^{-1}),
T_5	(100% RDF + FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1}),
T_6	(100 % RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}+ PSB 1.5 kg ha^{-1}),
T_7	(100% RDF + FYM @ 10 t ha^{-1}+ PSB 3.0 kg ha^{-1}),
T_8	(100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1}+PSB 4.5 kg ha^{-1}),
T_9	(100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6.0 kg ha^{-1}).

3. RESULTSANDDISCUSSION

3.1 Bulk Density (Mg m^{-3})

The data presented in Tableshows that bulk density of soil is influenced by various treatments. The application of inorganic and organic source of nutrients along with biofertilizer had significant effect on bulk density of soil. The range of values of bulk density varies from 1.14 to 1.24 Mg m^{-3} at 0-15 cm depth and 1.19 to 1.31 Mg m^{-3} at 15-30 cm depth. Among various treatments the maximum bulk density (1.31 Mg m^{-3}) was recorded in treatment T_1 (Absolute Control) and minimum bulk density was reported in T_9 (100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}). The soil structure improves when less dense inorganic, organic, and biofertilizer are used.Similar result has been recorded by (Mestdagh *et al.,* 2006).

3.2 Particle Density (Mg m^{-3})

A scrutiny of data presented in Tablerevealed that application of FYM with inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizer had non-significant effect on particle density of soil. The range of particle density varies from 2.53 to 2.55 Mg m^{-3} (0-15 cm depth) & 2.61 to 2.62 Mg m^{-3}. Similar result also found by (Toppo *et al.*, 2017).

3.3 Water Holding Capacity (%)

The data regarding the water holding capacity in soil as influenced by different treatments is given in Table, the application of various treatments had significant effect on water holding capacity of soil in wheat. The range of water holding capacity varies from 46.29 to 46.85 % at 0-15 cm depth and 41.76 to 43.43 % at 15-30 cm depth. Among various treatments the maximum water holding capacity (46.85 %) was recorded in treatment T_9 (100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}) and minimum water holding capacitywas reported in T_1 (Absolute Control).Similar result also found by (Das *et al.*, 2020).

3.4 Pore Space (%)

The effect of different treatments on pore space is presented in Table shows that pore space (%) vary significantly by the application of FYM with inorganic nutrient source and biofertilizer. However, the range of pore space varied from 47.13 to 48.97 % at 0-15 cm depth and 42.13 to 43.84 % at 15-30 cm depth. Among various treatments the maximum pore space (48.97 %) was recorded in treatment T_9(100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}) and minimum pore space was reported in T_1 (Absolute Control).Similar result also found by (Das *et al.*, 2020).

3.5 pH

It clearly revealed from the table that there was significant difference in the values of pH after each harvest of wheat due to different treatments applied in wheat. The soil pH over control due to various treatments applied inwheat. The maximumreduction in soil pH was recorded with the treatment of T_9(100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}). Similar result also found by (Selvi *et al.,2005*).

3.6 EC

It clearly revealed from the table that there was significant difference in the values of EC after each harvest of wheat due to different treatments applied in wheat. The EC tended to decrease over control due to various treatments applied in wheat. The maximum reduction in soil EC was recorded with the treatmentof T1(Absolute Control). Similar result also found by (Das *et al.,* 2020).

3.7 Organic Carbon (%)

The perusal of data pertaining to organic carbon content in soil after harvest of wheat has beenfurnishedintable.Themaximumbuilduporganiccarboncontentwasrecordedwiththeapplication of T9(100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}) which was significantly superior over rest of the treatments. It clearly indicated that the combined application of RDF with FYM along with PSB has significant influence on organic carbon build up in soil. Similar result also found by (Das *et al.*, 2020)

3.8 Available N,P,K

The available N, P, K after harvest of wheat varied in treatments. It has been observed that N, P, K content in the soil was increased due to different treatments over control. The maximum N, P, K was recorded in the treatments of T9 (100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}). The maximum build up of available N, P, K was noted in the treatments of T9 closely followed by T8. Similar result also found by (Karahne *et al*., 2009) and (Gopinath *et al.*, 2009)

Table. 2. Response of Inorganic, Organic Fertilizer and microbial inoculants on physical properties of soil.

Treatment	**BD (Mg m^{-3})**		**PD (Mg m^{-3})**		**Pore space (%)**		**WHC (%)**	
	0-15 cm	**15-30 cm**	**0-15 cm**	**15-30 cm**	**0-15 cm**	**15-30 cm**	**0-15 cm**	**15-30 cm**
Absolute Control	1.24	1.31	2.55	2.62	47.26	44.46	46.29	41.76
RDF @ N:P:K (120:60:40)	1.23	1.29	2.54	2.61	47.28	44.26	46.34	41.94
100% RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}	1.22	1.29	2.54	2.61	47.20	44.18	46.38	42.08
100% RDF + FYM @ 10 t ha^{-1}	1.21	1.27	2.53	2.62	47.66	44.93	46.44	42.50
100% RDF + FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1}	1.20	1.26	2.54	2.62	48.32	43.50	46.50	42.74
100 % RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}+PSB 1.5 kg ha^{-1}	1.19	1.25	2.53	2.62	49.39	43.46	46.57	42.97
100% RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + PSB 3 kg ha^{-1}	1.18	1.24	2.54	2.62	49.13	43.21	46.64	43.19
100% RDF +FYM @ 10 t ha^{-1}+ PSB 4.5 kg ha^{-1}	1.16	1.22	2.54	2.61	48.94	43.78	46.73	43.35
100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}	1.14	1.19	2.54	2.62	49.40	43.98	46.85	43.43
F-Test	NS	NS	NS	NS	S	S	S	S
S.Em. (±)	–	–	–	–	0.18	0.36	0.06	0.37
C.D. at 5%	–	–	–	–	0.52	1.06	0.19	1.08

Table3. Response of different levels of inorganic fertilizer, organic fertilizer and microbial inoculants on chemical properties of soil.

Treatment	pH		EC (dS m^{-1})		Organic carbon (%)	
	0-15 cm	**15 -30 cm**	**0–15 cm**	**15 – 30 cm**	**0-15 cm**	**15 – 30 cm**
Absolute Control	7.43	7.43	0.36	0.38	0.38	0.38
RDF @ N:P:K (120:60:40)	7.40	7.48	0.39	0.41	0.42	0.41
100% RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}	7.47	7.49	0.42	0.45	0.44	0.45
100% RDF + FYM @ 10 t ha^{-1}	7.46	7.45	0.44	0.45	0.44	0.42
100% RDF + FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1}	7.34	7.40	0.42	0.41	0.43	0.46
100 % RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}+PSB 1.5 kg ha^{-1}	7.40	7.43	0.40	0.42	0.46	0.48
100% RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + PSB 3 kg ha^{-1}	7.46	7.53	0.41	0.44	0.45	0.45
100% RDF +FYM @ 10 t ha^{-1}+ PSB 4.5 kg ha^{-1}	7.36	7.40	0.47	0.49	0.49	0.48
100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}	7.34	7.37	0.49	0.53	0.51	0.52
F-Test	S	S	S	S	S	S
S.Em. (±)	0.04	0.03	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
C.D. at 5%	0.10	0.10	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03

Table 4. Response of different levels of inorganic fertilizer, organic fertilizer and microbial inoculants on chemical properties of soil

Treatment	Available Nitrogen (kg ha^{-1})		Available Phosphorus (kg ha^{-1})		Available Potassium (kg ha^{-1})	
	0 – 15 cm	**15-30 cm**	**0 – 15 cm**	**15 – 30 cm**	**15 – 30 cm**	**15 – 30 cm**
Absolute Control	240.32	231.75	17.22	17.39	192.21	193.59
RDF @ N:P:K (120:60:40)	242.18	236.22	18.34	18.21	195.83	197.93
100% RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}	245.93	232.43	17.85	18.46	200.75	198.26
100% RDF + FYM @ 10 t ha^{-1}	257.48	246.17	18.41	18.52	200.31	199.12
100% RDF + FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1}	267.30	252.09	18.35	18.55	198.15	197.67
100 % RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}+PSB 1.5 kg ha^{-1}	255.98	245.26	18.75	18.80	203.13	198.45
100% RDF + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + PSB 3 kg ha^{-1}	272.88	265.74	19.21	19.34	205.94	199.26
100% RDF +FYM @ 10 t ha^{-1}+ PSB 4.5 kg ha^{-1}	279.76	274.77	19.53	19.79	203.37	201.52
100% RDF +FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB 6 kg ha^{-1}	286.92	280.38	20.05	19.89	218.14	200.64
F-Test	S	S	S	S	S	S
S.Em. (±)	1.09	1.14	0.29	0.27	3.40	0.38
C.D. at 0.5%	3.19	3.33	0.85	0.79	9.98	1.12

CONCLUSION

Use of inorganic fertilizers, organic fertilizers and microbial inoculants in the field can improve soil parameters and crop production. The available NPK in soil increased with application of recommended dose of nitrogen through higher amounts of organic manures over application of recommended dose of nitrogen through inorganic fertilizers. The implementation of treatment T_9 (100% NPK + FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB6 kg ha^{-1}) has significantly increase pore space, water holding capacity. Treatment combination T_9 (100% NPK + FYM @ 15 t ha^{-1} + PSB6 kg ha^{-1})is the best for significant increase of soil physical and chemical properties. It also contributes to soil fertility and soil resource management.

REFERENCES

1. Andrews, M., Lea, P.J., Raven, J.A, and Lindsey, K. (2004). Can Genetic Manipulation of Plant Nitrogen Assimilation Enzymes Result in Increased Crop Yield and Greater N-Use Efficiency. An Assessment. Annals of Applied Biology, 145: 25-40.
2. Mandal, N.N., P.P. Chaudhry, and Sinha, D. (1992). Nitrogen, nitrogen and potash uptake of wheat (var. Sonalika). Environ. Econ., 10: 297-297.
3. Ziadi, N., Bélanger, G., Cambouris, A.N., Tremblay, N., Nolin, M.C, and Claessens, A. (2008). Relationship between phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations in spring wheat. Agron. J., 100 (1): 80- 86.
4. Mehrvarz, S, and Chaichi, M.R. (2008).Effect of phosphate solubilizing microorganisms and phosphorus chemical fertilizer on forage and grain quality of barely (Hordeumvulgare L.). Am-Euras. J. Agric. & Environ. Sci., 3 (6): 855- 860.
5. Moussa, B.I.M. (2000). Response of wheat plants growth in sandy soils to K and some micronutrients fertilization. Egypt J. Soil Sci., 40 (4):481-493.
6. Sharma, M., Mishra, B, and Singh. R. (2007). Long-term effects of fertilizers and manure on physical and chemical properties of a mollisol. J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci., 55: 523–524.

7. Panhwar, Q.A., Shamshuddin, J., Naher, U.A., Radziah, O, and Razi, I.M. (2014). Changes in the chemical properties of an acid sulfate soil and the growth of rice as affected by biofertilizer, ground magnesium limestone and basalt application. Pedosphere., 24(6):827-835.
8. Panhwar, Q.A., Shamshuddin, J., Naher, U.R., Radziah, O, and Mohd Razi, I. (2014 a). Biochemical and molecular characterization of potential phosphate 11ulphate11ing bacteria in acid 11ulphate soils and their beneficial effects on rice production. PLOS ONE., 9(10): e 97241
9. Muthuvel P, Udayasoorian C, Natesan R, Ramaswami PR, (1992.)Introduction to Soil Analysis, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore;
10. Jackson ML, Soil Chemical Analysis. Prentice-Hall Inc., Englewood Cliffs, NJ. 1958;498.
11. Wilcox LV. (1950) Electrical Conductivity. Am. Water works Assoc. J. 42:776.
12. Walkley A, and Black IA. (1934) An examination of Degtjareff method for determining soil organic matter, and proposed modification of the chromic acid tritation method. Soil Science.37:29-38.
13. Subbiah BV, Asija GL. (1956) A Rapid Procedure for the Estimation of Available Nitrogen in Soils. Current Science.25:259-260.
14. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanabe FS, Dean LA. (1954) Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. USDA Circular 939. US Government Printing Office, Washington DC
15. Toth SJ, Prince AL. (1949) Estimation of cation exchange capacity and exchangeable calcium, potassium, and sodium contents of soils by flame photometer techniques. Soil Sci.67:439-445.
16. Lindsay WL, Norvell WA. (1969) Equilibrium relationship of Zn^{2+}, Fe^{2+}, Ca2+ and Hwith EDTA and DTPA in soils. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. ;35:62-68.
17. Bouyoucos GJ, (1927) The Hydrometer as a New Method for the Mechanical Analysis of Soils. Soil Science.23:343-353.
18. NHB. National Horticulture Database- 2018-19. National Horticulture Board Government of India, Gurgaon, India
19. Smith, P., House, J. I., Bustamante, M., Sobocká, J., Harper, R., Pan, G.,& Paustian, K.

(2016). Global change pressures on soils from land use and management. Global change biology, 22(3), 1008-1028.

20. Mestdagh I, Lootens P, Van Cleemput O, Carlier L. (2006) Variation in organic- carbon concentration and bulk density in Flemish grassland soils. Journal of plant nutrition and soil science. 169(5):616-22

21. Toppo, A. K., David, A. A. and Thomas, T. (2017) Response of different levels of FYM, PSB and Neem Cake on soil health, yield attribute and nutritional value of field pea (Pisum sativum L.) var. ICARU. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry; 6(5): 167-170.

22. Das, D., David, A.A., Swaroop, N., Hasan, A. and Thomas, T.(2020) Response of different levels of inorganic fertilizer, Organic manure and Bio-Fertilizer on Physico-Chemical Properties of soil in Pea (Pisum sativum L.) var. Kashi Ageti. Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci. 9(10): 468-474.

23. Selvi, D., Santhy, P. and Dhakshinamoorthy, M. (2005). Effect of inorganic fertilizer alone and in combination with FYM on physical properties and productivity of VerticHaplusterts under long-term fertilization. J. Ind. Soc. Soil Sci. 53: 302-07.

24. Karahne, V. and Singh, V. P. (2009) Effect of rhizobial inoculation on growth, yield, nodulation and biochemical characters of vegetable pea (Pisum sativum). ActaAgronomica Hungarica, 57(1): 47–56.

25. Gopinath, K. A., Saha, S., Mina, B. L., Pande, H., Kumar, N., Srivastava, A. K. and Gupta, H. S. (2009) 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.