

# Effect of tillage practices and fertility levels on nutrient uptake and content in grain and straw of wheat under rice- wheat cropping system

## Abstract

The present investigation entitled “Effect of tillage practices and fertility levels and yield of wheat in rice- wheat cropping system” was conducted at Agronomy Research Farm, CSAUAT, during *rabi* 2021-22 and 2022-23. The experiment was laid out into Split plot design with three replication. The parameters were observed plant *viz.* Nitrogen content in grain and straw (%), Nitrogen uptake in grain and straw ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), Phosphorus content in grain and straw (%), Phosphorus uptake in grain and straw ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), Potassium content in grain and straw (%), Nitrogen uptake in grain and straw ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ). Basis on the pooled data the results of study revealed that in case of tillage practices maximum nitrogen content in grain and straw (1.80 and 0.53 %), Nitrogen uptake in grain and straw (93.34 and 36.26  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ). Phosphorus content in grain and straw (0.31 and 0.20 %) Phosphorus uptake in grain and straw (16.23 and 13.80  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), Potassium content in grain and straw (0.42 and 1.38 %), Potassium uptake in grain and straw (22.15 and 93.88  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) respectively was reported in conventional tillage whereas in case of various fertility levels maximum nitrogen content in grain and straw (1.83 and 0.59 %), Nitrogen uptake in grain and straw (100.31 and 35.06  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ). Phosphorus content in grain and straw (0.35 and 0.25 %) Phosphorus uptake in grain and straw (18.16 and 16.63  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) respectively, Potassium content in grain and straw (0.45 and 1.41 %), Potassium uptake in grain and straw (24.97 and 101.03  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) respectively with the application of 125% RDF + tebuconazole.

**Keywords:** Conventional tillage, Flag leaf stage, Nutrient uptake and Tebuconazole,

## 1. Introduction

Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.), being an important prehistoric crop, is backbone of our national food security system. The idiom “Dal roti chalna” itself realized its significance in our livelihood. Its straw is accounted as a major feed to a large number of cattles. Thus, among the food grains, wheat is the richest source of protein and it stands at second place after pulses. It is utilized for bread, cakes, cookies, noodles, petri- products and chapatti etc. Wheat grains contains starch 60- 68%, protein 8-15%, fat 1.5-2.0%, cellulose 2.0-2.5%, and minerals 1.5-2.0% (Kumar *et al.* 2019). Wheat crop contributes substantially to the national food security by providing more than 50 % of the calories to the people who mainly depend on it. As such, wheat provides a major source of energy requirement of

human diet and animal feed across the world. Globally, wheat is cultivated approximately 224 million hectares with an average annual global production of about 775.8 million metric tonnes. The largest producer of wheat in the world is the European Union followed by China, India and United States of America. India, being blessed and enriched with a diverse agro- ecological condition, ensuring food and nutritional security to a majority of the Indian population through production and steady supply particularly in the recent past, is the second largest producer of wheat worldwide. In India, wheat is grown on 33.64 million hectares area with 107.59 million tons production and 3206.30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> productivity during 2019-20 (Directorate of Economics and Statistics). The entire wheat growing area of the country has been categorized in to 6 major zones. The highest area of wheat cultivation is occurred in North- Western Plain Zone (NEPZ). Wheat is cultivated in all states of India except Kerala. Uttar Pradesh is major wheat growing State of India. In Uttar Pradesh wheat is grown in 9.85 million hectares area with 35.50 million tonnes production followed by Madhya Pradesh (area 6.39 million hectares and production 17.17 million tonnes) and Punjab (area 3.5 million hectares and production 17.14 million tonnes) respectively.) The global demand of wheat will increase to about 900 million tons of wheat by the year 2050. It has been estimated that India will need at least 140 million tonnes of wheat by 2050 as against present estimated production of 109.24 million tonnes. The world acreage under wheat crop accounts 216.18 million ha producing 763.6 million metric tonnes with an average of 3530 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. In India, it covers 29.32 million ha producing 103.6 million metric tonnes, one third of the total food grain production, with an average productivity of 3530 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The current world population of 7.7 billion is expected to reach 9.7 billion by 2050. India is the second most populous country (1.3 billion) after China (1.41 billion) and expected to surpass that of China touching a peak 1.7 billion by 2050 (**Kar et al., 2021**). Accordingly, wheat is likely to continue to be vital in ensuring food security across the globe Uttar Pradesh is India's biggest wheat-growing state with 9.65 million hectares (36.6%), 26.87 million tonnes (39.3%), and a productivity of 2785 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (**Anonymous, 2019**). In Asia about 90% of the world's rice is grown and produced is 142 million ha area with the production of 622 million tons (**Rashid et al., 2012**). Rice is one of the major contributors to the food grain production contributing approximately 43per cent of the total food grain production in India (**Mondal et al., 2020**). In India rice is cultivated in an area of 44.38 million hectares with a production of 104.31million tons. The country has to produce about 130 million tons of rice by 2025 to meet the food requirement of the growing population. Over 2 billion people in Asia alone derive 80% of their energy needs from, rice which contains 80% carbohydrates, 7-8% protein, 3% fat and 3% fiber. The export destinations are Middle-East countries, Malaysia, Korea, Japan, Australia, U.S.A,

Canada, U.K., Italy and Sweden. The demand of Aromatic rice for internal consumption and also for export is increasing day by day (**Ankit et al. 2022**). Aromatic Rice emit specific aroma in field, at harvestings, in storage, during milling cooking and eating (**Rajeev et al. 2014**). Aroma development influenced by both genetic and environment factors. It is known that aroma is best developed when aromatic rice is grown in areas where temperature is cooler during flowering/maturity. Nearly two-third of basmati rice produced in India is exported. Basmati rice is the leading aromatic fine quality rice of the world trade and it fetches export price in the international market. In fact, Basmati rice is a gift from “Mother – Nature” to the Indian sub-continent and grows in the Indo-Gangetic plain only. There are known 23 varieties of basmati rice up to 2015, which have been approved under the Seeds Act, 1966. India is the largest producer and exporter of basmati rice in the world (**Shoomro et al., 1999**). India produce more than 70% of the total world basmati rice production and the rest is produced by Pakistan. The production of Basmati rice in India is 8.7 million tonnes from 2.1 Million hectares during 2014-15. Generally, conventional tillage aims at reversing and stirring a deep layer of soil; incorporating and destroying plant debris; exposing soil pests to sunshine for control; lump breaking and ground leveling. Conventional tillage involves many mechanical operations starting with deep ploughing, deep discing, ripping, shallow tyne workings, and fine seedbed preparation after the harvesting of different grain crops, in both winter and summer production seasons. Thereafter a fallow period is given to enable moisture capture before the planting of the next crop. This approach results in a bare soil surface exposed to wind and water erosion and high compaction after heavy rains which then needs to be loosened again to assist in weed control and to promote moisture absorption from subsequent rainfalls. Reduced tillage is designated as full-width tillage that disturbs the entire soil surface, leaving 15% to 30% of residue cover after planting. Other conservation tillage practices in the inland PNW include minimum tillage, delayed minimum tillage, under cutter fallow, chisel, discs, and sweep tillage systems. The under cutter method of fallow management uses wide V blade sweeps that slice beneath the soil surface and simultaneously deliver nitrogen during primary spring tillage followed by one or two non-inversion rod weeding operations during the summer to control weeds (**Pathania et al., 2020**). Both minimum tillage and delayed minimum tillage use undercutter V-sweep as a primary tillage. Herbicides may be used to control weeds following primary tillage, but secondary tillage such as rod weeding is used more commonly. Delayed minimum tillage is similar to minimum tillage except primary spring tillage with undercutter V-sweep is delayed until at least mid-May (**Ali et al., 2021**).

Reduced tillage practices cannot be approached with “one size fits all.” Reduced tillage

options that you can choose will depend on conditions such as type of crop rotation, soil type, water availability for cover cropping, finance to purchase new soil management tools, and your goals for reducing tillage. It is advisable to discuss first with your Cooperative

Plant naturally takes time for growth and development and use of plant growth promoters provides nutrients for the soil microorganism, thus increasing the activities of microbes in soil, which in turn helps to convert unavailable plant nutrients into available form for faster plant growth promotion. Natural plant growth promoters (Phyto hormones) are involved in urging and stimulating root and shoot growth whereas organic plant growth promoters (PGPS) including soil fertility and productivity of crop also help in faster growth plant growth promotion and avoids grain disease. With improved chemistry plant growth promoters have multisite modes of action without being in contact only on leaf surface and are absorbed by the leaves and other plant parts and move within in treated plant (Menhenett, 1985).

## 2. Material and Method

The field experiment was conducted during *Rabi* of 2021-22 and 2022-23 at Agronomy Research Farm, CSAUAT, Kanpur. The experiment was laid out into Split plot design with 3 replication. Two levels of tillage *viz.* (1) Conventional tillage Two ploughing followed by sowing), (2) Reduce tillage (one ploughing followed by sowing were randomly allotted to main plot while ten 10 fertility levels *viz.* (1) Absolute Control. (2) RDF (150.60.40 NPK kg/ha), 3) 75% RDF (112.5; 15 30 NPK kg/ha + 10t FYM/ha) (4) 125% RDF (187.5; 75; 50 NPK kg/ha) (5) RDF (150; 60; 40 NPK kg/ha) + Two spray of chloromequate chloride (Lihocine 0.2% at first node (45 Days) and flag leaf stage (80 DAS). (6) RDF (150; 60; 40 NPK kg/ha) + Two Spray of tebuconazole (Folicur 430 SC @ 0.1%) at first node and flag leaf stage (80 DAS). (7) 75 % RDF (112.5:45:30 NPK kg/ha + 10t FYM/ha + Two Spray of Chloromequate chloride (Lihocine 0.2% at first node (45 DAS) and flagleaf stage (80DAS) (8) 75 % RDF (112.5:45:30 NPK kg/ha + 10t FYM/ha + Two Spray to tebuconazole (Folicur 430SC @0.1% at first node and flag leaf stage (80DAS) (9) 125% RDF (187.5:75:50 NPK kg/ha+ Two Spray of Chloromequate chloride (Lihocine 0.2% at first node (45 DAS) and flag leaf stage (80DAS) (10) 125 % RDF (187.5:75:50 NPK kg/ha + Two Spray of tebuconazole Folicur 430SC @ 0.1% (Folicur 430 SC @ 0.1 % at first node and flag Leaf (80DAS) were randomly allocated to sub plots. Standard culture practices recommended for Wheat was followed uniformly in all experimental plots.

### N, P & K content and uptake in grain and straw of straw

Grain uptake ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) = Grain yield ( $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ )  $\times$  Nutrient content (%) in grain

Straw uptake ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) = Straw yield ( $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ )  $\times$  Nutrient content (%) in straw

### **3. Result and discussion**

#### **Nitrogen content in grain and straw (%)**

The data of nitrogen content in grain was not significantly affected but in straw was significantly influenced by tillage practices and fertility levels. The grain have highest amount of nitrogen content than straw. The maximum nitrogen content in grain was recorded in the conventional tillage practice (1.80 and 1.76 %) followed by the reduce tillage (1.77 and 1.75%) and maximum nitrogen content in straw was recorded in conventional tillage (0.53 and 0.50 %) followed by reduce tillage (0.51 and 0.48%) during 2021-22 and 2022-23 year of study. Among fertility levels, The highest nitrogen content in grain (1.83 and 1.80%) and straw (0.59 and 0.56 %) were recorded in 125% RDF+ tebuconazole and it was at par with 125% RDF+ chloromequat chloride (1.82 and 1.79%) and (0.57 and 0.54 %) in grain and straw respectively. The minimum nitrogen content in grain (1.73 and 1.69%) and straw (0.47 and 0.45%) were recorded in the control and interaction in nitrogen content in grain and straw between tillage practices and fertility levels during both year of experimentation. These results also confirms the findings of **Verma *et al.* (2006) and Kacharoo and Razdan (2006)**

#### **Nitrogen uptake in grain and straw (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)**

The data of nitrogen uptake in grain was not significantly affected but in straw was significantly influenced by tillage practices and fertility levels. The grain have highest amount of nitrogen uptake than straw. The maximum nitrogen uptake in grain was recorded in the conventional tillage practice (93.34 and 89.44 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by the reduce tillage (88.69 and 85.56 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and maximum nitrogen uptake in straw was recorded in conventional tillage (36.26 and 33.90 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by reduce tillage (34.51 and 32.13 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) during 2021-22 and 2022-23 year of study. Among fertility levels, The highest nitrogen uptake in grain (100.31 and 97.38 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and straw (35.06 and 38.67 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) were recorded in 125% RDF+ tebuconazole and it was at par with 125% RDF + chloromequat chloride (98.89 and 95.57 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and (40.36 and 37.88 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in grain and straw respectively. The minimum nitrogen uptake in grain (78.40 and 75.01 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and straw (29.77 and 29.61 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) were recorded in the control. There were no significant interaction in nitrogen uptake in grain and straw between tillage practices and fertility levels during both year of experimentation. The consequences of the current investigation are additionally in concurrence with the investigation of **Gholami *et al.* (2014), and Shri *et al.*, (2021)**

#### **Phosphorus content in grain and straw (%)**

The data of phosphorus content in grain was not significantly affected but in straw was significantly influenced by tillage practices and fertility levels. The grain have highest amount of nitrogen content

than straw. The maximum phosphorus content in grain was recorded in the conventional tillage practice (0.31 and 0.27 %) followed by the reduce tillage (0.28 and 0.24 %) and maximum phosphorus content in straw was recorded in conventional tillage (0.20 and 0.19 %) followed by reduce tillage (0.18 and 0.17 %) during 2021-22 and 2022-23 year of study. Among fertility levels, The highest phosphorus content in grain (0.35 and 0.31 %) and straw (0.25 and 0.23 %) were recorded in 125 % RDF + tebunconazole and it was at par with 125 % RDF + chloromequat chloride (0.33 and 0.30 %) and (0.23 and 0.22 %) in grain and straw. The minimum phosphorus content in grain (0.22 and 0.19 %) and straw (0.12 and 0.12) were recorded in the control followed by RDF (0.26 and 0.23 %) and (0.16 and 0.15 %) in grain and straw. There were no significant interaction in phosphorus content in grain and straw between tillage practices and fertility levels during both year of experimentation. These results also confirm the findings of **Bakhshandeh et al. (2018)** and **Seth and Singh (2020)**.

#### **Phosphorus uptake in grain and straw ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )**

The data of nitrogen uptake in grain was not significantly affected but in straw was significantly influenced by tillage practices and fertility levels. The grain have highest amount of phosphorus uptake than straw. The maximum phosphorus uptake in grain was recorded in the conventional tillage practice ( $16.23$  and  $14.05 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) followed by the reduce tillage ( $14.24$  and  $12.23 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and maximum phosphorus uptake in straw was recorded in conventional tillage ( $13.80$  and  $12.87 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) followed by reduce tillage ( $12.47$  and  $11.56 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) during 2021-22 and 2022-23 year of study. Among fertility levels, The highest phosphorus uptake in grain ( $18.16$  and  $15.99 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and straw ( $16.63$  and  $15.29 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) were recorded in 125% RDF + tebunconazole and it was at par with 125% RDF + chloromequat chloride ( $17.38$  and  $14.97 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and ( $15.36$  and  $14.38 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) in grain and straw. The minimum phosphorus uptake in grain ( $10.21$  and  $8.40 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and straw ( $7.52$  and  $7.36 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) were recorded in the control. There were no significant interaction in phosphorus uptake in grain and straw between tillage practices and fertility levels during both year of experimentation. The consequences of the current investigation are additionally in concurrence with the investigation of **Gupta et al. (2020)** and **Saini et al. (2020)**

#### **Potassium content in grain and straw (%)**

The data of potassium content in grain was not significantly affected but in straw was significantly influenced by tillage practices and fertility levels. The grain have highest amount of potassium content than straw. The maximum potassium content in grain was recorded in the conventional tillage practice ( $0.42$  and  $0.41\%$ ) followed by the reduce tillage ( $0.41$  and  $0.40\%$ ) and maximum potas

sium content in straw was recorded in conventional tillage (1.38 and 1.36 %) followed by reduce tillage (1.36 and 1.35%) during 2021-22 and 2022-23 year of study. Among fertility levels, The highest potassium content in grain (0.45 and 0.45 %) and straw (1.41 and 1.39%) were recorded in 125% RDF+ tebuconazole and it was at par with 125% RDF + chloromequat chloride (0.44 and 0.44 %) and (1.40 and 1.39%) in grain and straw. The minimum potassium content in grain (0.37 and 0.36 %) and straw (1.31 and 1.30 %) were recorded in the control followed by RDF (0.39 and 0.38 %) and (1.35 and 1.33 %) in grain and straw. There were no significant interaction in potassium content in grain and straw between tillage practices and fertility levels during both year of experimentation and pooled. These results also confirm the findings of Gupta *et al.* (2007), Kumari *et al.* (2015) and Singhet *et al.* (2018)

#### **Potassium uptake in grain and straw ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )**

The data of potassium uptake in grain was not significantly affected but in straw was significantly influenced by tillage practices and fertility levels. The grain has the highest amount of potassium uptake than straw. The maximum potassium uptake in grain was recorded in the conventional tillage practice (22.15 and 21.09  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) followed by the reduce tillage (20.84 and 19.56  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and maximum potassium uptake in straw was recorded in conventional tillage (93.88 and 91.03  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) followed by reduce tillage (91.52 and 88.73  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) during 2021-22 and 2022-23 year of study. Among fertility levels, The highest potassium uptake in grain (24.97 and 23.74  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and straw (101.03 and 98.12  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) were recorded in 125% RDF+ tebuconazole and it was at par with 125% RDF + chloromequat chloride (24.11 and 22.90  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and (99.11 and 96.58  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) in grain and straw. The minimum potassium uptake in grain (16.99 and 15.93  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) and straw (82.41 and 80.07  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) were recorded in the control. There were no significant interaction in potassium uptake in grain and straw between tillage practices and fertility levels during both year of experimentation and pooled. The consequences of the current investigation are additionally in concurrence with the investigation of Singhet *et al.* (2019), Yadav *et al.* (2019) and Puniya *et al.* (2019)

#### **4. Conclusion**

With rice management the management varied significantly in respect of soil organic carbon and available nutrients as NPK in soil and soil organic matter improve with treatment Bio-decomposer Treated Residue statically at par with Urea Treated Residue (5 % urea ) The treatment and at different stage of wheat during both the year of study. Different nutrient management option varied significantly in respect of soil organic carbon and available nutrients as NPK in soil and soil organic matter improve with treatment 75 %

RDF + 10 t FYM + Growth Regulator (Chlormequat chloride @0.2 % + Tebuconazole@0.1 %)staticallyatparwithtreatment125 %RDF +GrowthRegulator(Chlormequat chloride@0.2 %+Tebuconazole@0.1 %).Thetreatmentandatdifferentstageofwheatduringboth theyears ofstudy.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

**Table-1:EffectoftillagepracticesandfertilitylevelsonNitrogen contentand uptake ingrain and straw of wheat**

Treatment	Nitrogencontent(%)						Nitrogenuptake(kgha <sup>-1</sup> )					
	Grain			Straw			Grain			Straw		
TillagePractices	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled
Conventionaltillage	1.803	1.76	1.78	0.53	0.50	0.52	93.34	89.44	91.59	36.26	33.90	35.08
Reducetillage	1.774	1.75	1.76	0.51	0.48	0.50	88.69	85.56	87.12	34.51	32.13	33.32
<b>SE(m)</b>	0.007	0.001	0.012	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.133	0.556	0.203	0.159	0.197	0.092
<b>C.D.</b>	NS	NS	NS	0.016	0.005	0.016	0.872	3.646	1.327	1.042	1.293	0.605
<b>FertilityLeve I</b>												
<b>F1(Control)</b>	1.73	1.69	1.71	0.47	0.45	0.46	78.40	75.01	76.70	29.77	29.61	28.69
<b>F2-RDF(150.60.40NPK kg/ha)</b>	1.75	1.72	1.74	0.50	0.47	0.48	83.56	80.28	81.92	32.01	29.78	30.89
<b>F3-75%RDF+10tFYM/ha</b>	1.76	1.73	1.75	0.51	0.48	0.49	85.82	82.51	84.17	33.07	30.81	31.94
<b>F4-125%RDF</b>	1.77	1.74	1.76	0.52	0.49	0.50	88.01	84.65	86.33	34.25	31.96	33.11
<b>F5- RDF+chloromequatechloride</b>	1.78	1.75	1.77	0.53	0.50	0.51	90.28	86.88	88.58	35.51	32.85	34.18
<b>F6- RDF +tebunconzole</b>	1.79	1.76	1.78	0.54	0.51	0.52	92.33	89.12	90.73	36.75	34.38	35.56
<b>F7-75%RDF+10tFYM/ha+ Chloromequatechloride</b>	1.80	1.77	1.79	0.55	0.52	0.53	95.13	91.87	93.50	37.98	35.57	36.78
<b>F8-75%RDF+10tFYM/ha+ Tebunconzole</b>	1.81	1.78	1.80	0.56	0.53	0.54	97.01	93.71	95.36	39.09	36.65	37.87
<b>F9- 125%RDF+chlorome quatechloride</b>	1.82	1.79	1.81	0.57	0.54	0.55	98.89	95.57	97.23	40.36	37.88	39.12
<b>F10-125%RDF+tebunconzole</b>	1.83	1.80	1.82	0.59	0.56	0.57	100.31	97.38	99.05	35.06	38.67	40.86
<b>SE(m)</b>	0.017	0.017	0.023	0.006	0.007	0.005	1.154	0.971	0.979	0.388	0.346	0.319
<b>C.D.</b>	NS	NS	NS	0017	0.019	0.014	3.322	2.795	2.818	1.118	0.995	0.329

**Table- 2:EffectoftillagepracticesandfertilitylevelsonPhosphorus content and uptakeingrain andstraw of wheat**

Treatment	Phosphoruscontent(%)						Phosphorusuptake(kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )					
	Grain			Straw			Grain			Straw		
TillagePractices	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled
Conventionaltillage	0.31	0.27	0.293	0.20	0.19	0.19	16.23	14.05	15.14	13.80	12.87	13.34
Reducetillage	0.28	0.24	0.266	0.18	0.17	0.18	14.24	12.23	13.24	12.47	11.56	12.02
<b>SE(m)</b>	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.001	0.068	0.030	0.038	0.067	0.012	0.065
<b>C.D.</b>	0.019	0.008	0.004	0.007	0.009	0.004	0.444	0.200	0.246	0.440	0.081	0.424
<b>FertilityLevel</b>												
<b>F1(Control)</b>	0.22	0.19	0.20	0.12	0.12	0.12	10.21	8.40	9.31	7.52	7.36	7.44
<b>F2-RDF(150.60.40NPKg/ha)</b>	0.26	0.23	0.24	0.16	0.15	0.15	12.63	10.71	11.67	10.244	9.40	9.82
<b>F3-75%RDF+10tFYM/ha</b>	0.27	0.24	0.25	0.17	0.16	0.16	13.38	11.42	12.40	11.02	10.16	10.59
<b>F4-125%RDF</b>	0.28	0.25	0.26	0.17	0.17	0.17	14.14	12.13	13.14	11.86	10.97	11.42
<b>F5- RDF+chloromequatechloride</b>	0.29	0.26	0.27	0.19	0.18	0.18	14.93	12.88	13.90	12.73	11.82	12.28
<b>F6- RDF +tebunconzole</b>	0.30	0.27	0.28	0.20	0.19	0.19	15.70	13.64	14.67	13.61	12.68	13.14
<b>F7-75%RDF+10tFYM/ha+ Chloromequatechloride</b>	0.31	0.27	0.29	0.021	0.20	0.20	16.61	14.25	15.43	14.50	13.55	14.02
<b>F8-75%RDF+10tFYM/ha+ tebunconzole</b>	0.32	0.28	0.30	0.22	0.21	0.21	17.38	14.97	16.79	15.36	14.38	14.87
<b>F9- 125%RDF+chloromequatechloride</b>	0.33	0.30	0.31	0.23	0.22	0.22	18.16	15.99	17.07	16.63	15.29	15.96
<b>F10-125%RDF+tebunconzole</b>	0.35	0.31	0.33	0.25	0.23	0.24	19.21	17.01	18.11	17.91	16.53	17.23
<b>SE(m)</b>	0.003	0.003	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.159	0.137	0.151	0.144	0.120	0.141
<b>C.D.</b>	0.010	0.007	0.008	0.006	0.006	0.006	0.457	0.394	0.436	0.415	0.346	0.406

**Table-3: Effect of tillage practices and fertility level on potassium content and grain and straw of wheat**

Treatment	Potassium content (%)						Potassium uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )					
	Grain			Straw			Grain			Straw		
Tillage Practices	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled	2021-22	2022-23	Pooled
Conventional tillage	0.42	0.41	0.420	1.38	1.36	1.375	22.15	21.09	21.62	93.88	91.03	92.46
Reduce tillage	0.41	0.40	0.408	1.36	1.35	1.360	20.84	19.56	20.20	91.52	88.73	90.13
<b>SE(m)</b>	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.006	0.004	0.006	0.097	0.025	0.067	0.113	0.259	0.191
<b>C.D.</b>	0.008	0.003	0.005	0.019	0.010	0.019	0.637	0.166	0.193	0.743	1.700	1.253
<b>Fertility Level</b>												
<b>F1 (Control)</b>	0.37	0.36	0.368	1.31	1.30	1.310	16.99	15.93	16.46	82.41	80.07	81.24
<b>F2-RDF (150.60.40 NPK kg/ha)</b>	0.39	0.38	0.385	1.35	1.33	1.343	18.81	17.45	18.13	86.70	83.37	85.04
<b>F3-75% RDF+10t FYM/ha</b>	0.40	0.40	0.398	1.36	1.34	1.353	19.69	18.55	19.12	88.17	85.44	86.80
<b>F4-125% RDF</b>	0.41	0.41	0.410	1.37	1.34	1.358	20.57	19.65	20.11	90.23	86.82	88.85
<b>F5- RDF+chloromequatechloride</b>	0.42	0.41	0.415	1.37	1.35	1.365	21.49	20.05	20.77	92.12	89.01	90.56
<b>F6- RDF +tebunconzole</b>	0.42	0.42	0.420	1.38	1.37	1.378	21.86	20.96	21.41	94.25	91.43	92.84
<b>F7-75% RDF+10t FYM/ha+ Chloromequatechloride</b>	0.43	0.43	0.428	1.38	1.37	1.380	22.92	21.75	22.34	95.62	93.13	93.77
<b>F8-75% RDF+10t FYM/ha+ tebunconzole</b>	0.44	0.43	0.433	1.39	1.38	1.390	23.52	22.31	22.92	97.37	94.86	96.11
<b>F9- 125% RDF+chloromequatechloride</b>	0.44	0.44	0.438	1.40	1.39	1.395	24.11	22.90	23.50	99.11	96.58	97.85
<b>F10-125% RDF+tebunconzole</b>	0.45	0.45	0.448	1.41	1.39	1.403	24.97	23.74	24.36	101.03	98.12	99.58
<b>SE(m)</b>	0.004	0.005	0.004	0.013	0.015	0.014	0.204	0.177	0.193	1.130	1.051	0.827
<b>C.D.</b>	0.013	0.014	0.012	0.037	0.041	0.041	0.587	0.510	0.555	3.254	3.027	2.381

## References

**Ali, I., Khan, A., Ali, A., Ullah, Z., Dai, D. Q., Khan, N., and Sher, H. (2021).**

Iron and zinc micronutrients and soil inoculation of *Trichoderma harzianum* enhance wheat grain quality and yield. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, **13**:960948.

**Ankit, Bana, R. S., Rana, K. S., Singh, R., Godara, S., Grover, M., ... & Yogi, A. K. (2022).** No-tillage with residue retention and foliar sulphur nutrition enhances productivity, mineral biofortification and crude protein in rainfed pearl millet under Typic Haplustepts: Elucidating the responses imposed on an eight-year long-term experiment. *Plants*, *11*(7), 943.

**Gholami, A., Asgari, H. R., and Zeinali, E. (2014).** Effect of different tillage systems on soil physical properties and yield of wheat (Case study: Agricultural lands of Hakimabad village, Chenaran township, Khorasan Razavi province).

**Gupta, M., Bali, A. S., Sharma, B. C., Kachroo, D., & Bharat, R. (2007).** Productivity, nutrient uptake and economics of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) under various tillage and fertilizer management practices. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, *52*(2), 127-130.

**Gupta, R. K., Kaur, J., Kang, J. S., Singh, H., Kaur, S., Sayed, S., ... & Hossain, A. (2022).** Tillage in combination with rice straw retention in a rice-wheat system improves the productivity and quality of wheat grain through improving the soil physio-chemical properties. *Land*, *11*(10), 1693.

**Kachroo, D., and Razdan, R., (2006).** Growth, nutrient uptake and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) as influenced by biofertilizers and nitrogen. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. *51*(1): 37-39

**Kar, S., Pramanick, B., Brahmachari, K., Saha, G., Mahapatra, B. S., Saha, A., & Kumar, A. (2021).** Exploring the best tillage option in rice based diversified cropping systems in alluvial soil of eastern India. *Soil and Tillage Research*, *205*, 104761.

**Kumar S, Pandey ID, Rather SA, Rewasia H. (2019).** Genetic variability and inter-trait association for cooking and micronutrient (Fe and Zn) traits in advance lines of kalamamak aromatic rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). *Journal of Animal and Plant Sciences*. *29*(2):1232-1239

**Kumar, V., Kumar, M., Singh, S. K., & Chandra, S. K. (2015).** Impact of conservation agriculture on yield, nutrient uptake and quality of wheat crop in Calci orthents. *Plant Archives*, *15*(1), 371-376.

**Menhenett, R. (1985).** Development and use of plant growth regulators on glasshouse ornamentals and bulbs. *Monograph-British Plant Growth Regulation Group*.

**Mondal, S., Naik, S. K., Haris, A. A., Mishra, J. S., Mukherjee, J., Rao, K. K., & Bhatt, B. P. (2020).** Effect of conservation tillage and rice-based cropping systems on soil

aggregation characteristics and carbon dynamics in Eastern Indo-Gangetic Plain. *Paddy and water environment*, 18(3), 573-586.

**Pathania, P., Rajta, A., Singh, P. C., & Bhatia, R. (2020).** Role of plant growth-promoting bacteria in sustainable agriculture. *Biocatalysis and Agricultural Biotechnology*, 30, 101842.

**Puniya, R., Pandey, P. C., Bisht, P. S., Singh, D. K., & Singh, A. P. (2019).** Effect of long-term nutrient management practices on soil micronutrient concentrations and uptake under a rice-wheat cropping system. *The Journal of Agricultural Science*, 157(3), 226-234.

**Rajeev, R., Singh, V., Singh, S. S., Kumar, V., Hazra, K. K., Nath, C. P., and McDonald, A. (2014).** Impact of conservation tillage in rice-based cropping systems on soil aggregation, carbon pools and nutrients. *Geoderma*, 340: 104-114.

**Rashid, M. H., Alam, M. M., Rao, A. N., & Ladha, J. K. (2012).** Comparative efficacy of pretilachlor and hand weeding in managing weeds and improving the productivity and net income of wet-seeded rice in Bangladesh. *Field Crops Research*, 128, 17-26.

**Saini, A., Manuja, S., Kumar, S., Hafeez, A., Ali, B., & Poczai, P. (2022).** Impact of cultivation practices and varieties on productivity, profitability, and nutrient uptake of rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) and wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) cropping system in India. *Agriculture*, 12(10), 1678.

**Seth, M., Manuja, S., & Singh, S. (2020).** Effect of tillage and site specific nutrient management on yield, nutrient uptake and status of soil in wheat in rice-wheat cropping system. *Journal of Crop and Weed*, 16(3), 32-37.

**Shoomro, A. S., Soomro, A. S., and Mazari, S. N. (1999).** Impact of plant growth regulators on yield and yield components in rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) under field conditions. *International Journal of Applied Sciences and Biotechnology*, 8(3): 318-322.

**Shri, A., Kumari, P., Kumari, C., Kumar, D., and Choudhury, S. R. (2021).** Effect of different levels of nitrogen and plant growth regulators on yield and nutrient uptake of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Journal of food science*, 83(1): 237-245

**Singh, M., Singh, O., & Singh, R. (2019).** Impact of Wheat Establishment Methods and Weed Management Practices on Weed Flora, Yield and Nutrient Uptake of Wheat in Rice-Wheat Cropping System: Establishment methods and weed management practices on weed dynamics nutrient uptake of wheat. *Journal of AgriSearch*, 6(2), 73-77.

**Singh, S. K., Kumar, M., Singh, R. P., Bohra, J. S., Srivastava, J. P., Singh, S. P., & Singh, Y. V. (2018).** Conjoint application of organic and inorganic sources of

nutrients on yield, nutrient uptake and soil fertility under rice (*Oryza sativa*)-wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) system. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*, 66(3), 287-294.

**Verma, A., Nepalia, V., and Kanthaliya, P. C. (2006).** Effect of integrated nutrient supply on growth, yield and nutrient uptake by maize (*Zeamays*)-wheat (*Triticumaestivum*) cropping system. *Indian journal of Agronomy*, 51(1): 3-6.

**Yadav, G. S., Lal, R., Meena, R. S., Babu, S., Das, A., Bhowmik, S. N., ... & Saha, P. (2019).** Conservation tillage and nutrient management effects on productivity and soil carbon sequestration under double cropping of rice in north eastern region of India. *Ecological Indicators*, 105, 303-315.

UNDER PEER REVIEW

UNDER PEER REVIEW