

# Influence of Soil Application through Integrated Nutrient Management on Soil Characteristics of Sweet Orange Orchard in Gird Region of Madhya Pradesh, India

## ABSTRACT

The experiment was carried out from November 2020 to March 2022 at the RVSKVV College of Agriculture's Research Farm, located in Gwalior (M.P.), in the Department of Horticulture. Three replications and a Randomized Block Design were used to set up the experiment. The all soil characteristics analysis both initial and final level after experiment respectively minimum soil pH (7.05, 7.49), EC  $\text{dsm}^{-1}$  (0.225, 0.220) and maximum Organic carbon % (2.117, 3.263), Nitrogen  $\text{Kg ha}^{-1}$  (177.14, 187.29), Phosphorus  $\text{Kg ha}^{-1}$  (13.38, 13.58) and Potassium  $\text{Kg ha}^{-1}$  (207.88, 229.45) quality parameters were most effectively achieved with treatment  $T_5$  RDF 90 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron). Because sweet orange orchards are located in the Gird Region of Madhya Pradesh, this particular treatment is most suited for use there.

*Keywords: Sweet orange; bio fertilizer; Vermicompost; Nitrogen; Phosphorus; Potassium*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Sweet orange (*Citrus Sinensis* L.) is an important fruit crop which belongs to family Rutaceae, especially citrus fruit which are generally known to be rich in these vitamins and minerals. Sweet oranges need a well-drained medium or soft loam soil with a 2-3 cm depth of slightly heavier subsoil. Cultivation generally avoided in shallow soils. It grows in a wide variety of soil types, from clay to light sandy, and is salt tolerant. Mineral elements are acquired by plant roots from soil solution under optimum soil moisture and temperature. The nutrient availability and uptake is influenced by soil physical, chemical, mineralogical and biological properties. The important soil properties that affect the nutrient availability include soil depth, soil PH, BC,  $\text{CaCO}_3$  content, organic carbon content and plant nutrients concentration in soil solution. Sometimes soil possesses sufficient amount of nutrient concentration in soil media but its availability become to plant is hindered due to some external factors, under such situation foliar feeding of nutrient become necessary to save the crop. yield and quality of produce.

The integrated nutrient management infuses long term sustainability in the productivity level because of availability of nutrients in soil for next season crop. Incorporation of organic fertilizers is a common practice to improve the yield of many fruit crops. It also limits chemical intervention and finally minimizes the negative impact on the wider environment. it is the important alternative source, which is not only beneficial to maintain the soil health but also to sustain the fruit production. Application of organic manure combined with chemical fertilizer is associated with increased soil fertility and improved soil physical and chemical properties, thus it can increase crop production.

## 2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

### 2.1 Site of experiment

In the academic year of 2021–22, the experiment was carried out in the Research Farm of the Department of Horticulture at RVSKVV College of Agriculture, Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh). The Gwalior is situated at 26° 13' N latitude and 78° 14' E longitudes at an altitude of 211.5 m above mean sea level (MLS) in Gird region. It has a subtropical climate with hot and summer where maximum temperature exceeds 45°C in May June. The winters are cold and are minimum temperature reaches as low as 2°C in

42 December and January. Frost generally occurs from the last week of December to first week of February.  
 43 Usually the monsoon arrives in the second fortnight of June and lasts mid of September.

44 The experiment was laid out in completely randomized design considering the uniformity of 10-year-old  
 45 cv. Mosambi plants (6 x 6 m) with thirteen treatments and replicated thrice during the two years (2021  
 46 and 2022) of research.

47 Table 1 describes the different treatments.  
 48

Treatments symbol	Treatments details
T <sub>1</sub>	RDF (Recommended Dose of Fertilizer) 100 % (800:400:400 g/plant) Control
T <sub>2</sub>	RDF 90 % + Vermicompost
T <sub>3</sub>	RDF 90 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB)
T <sub>4</sub>	RDF 90 % + Vermicompost + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron)
T <sub>5</sub>	RDF 90 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron)
T <sub>6</sub>	RDF 80 % + Vermicompost
T <sub>7</sub>	RDF 80 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB)
T <sub>8</sub>	RDF 80 % + Vermicompost + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron)
T <sub>9</sub>	RDF 80 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron)
T <sub>10</sub>	RDF 70 % + Vermicompost
T <sub>11</sub>	RDF 70 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB)
T <sub>12</sub>	RDF 70 % + Vermicompost + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron)
T <sub>13</sub>	RDF 70 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron)

49  
 50 **2.1.1 Methods of application of treatments**

51 For application of manure and fertilizers the top soil around the tree (equal to the leaf canopy of the tree)  
 52 is dug up to 30 cm and the fertilizers were uniformly mixed into the soil and thereafter, it was levelled.  
 53 Irrigation was supplied immediately after fertilizer application.

- 54
- 55 • Recommended dose: 800 g N<sub>2</sub>/plant, 400 g P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> /plant, 400 g K/plant
  - 56 • Urea, di ammonium phosphate and murate of potash were used as the source of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium. The dose of NPK was given as per treatment.
  - 57 • Vermicompost, PSB, KMB and Azotobacter were also applied as per treatment.
  - 58 • Zn, Cu, Iron and Boron were also applied as a micro nutrient.
- 59

60 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

61  
 62 The results (Table 2,3 and 4) showed the initial and final soil analysis levels for various applications of  
 63 integrated nutrient management in sweet orange orchards.  
 64

65  
 66 **3.1 Soil pH**  
 67

68 The minimum soil pH at initial and final level (6.80,7.62, 7.05 and 7.64, 7.64, 7.55 during first, second  
 69 and pooled year respectively) was recorded under the treatment T<sub>5</sub> (RDF 90 % + Vermicompost +  
 70 (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) which was significantly superior to all the  
 71 treatments under study. Treatment T<sub>5</sub> was followed by T<sub>9</sub> (RDF 80 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter +  
 72 PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) that reported soil pH at initial and final level of 7.55,7.25, 7.50  
 73 and 7.62, 7.62, 7.62 during first, second and pooled year respectively. The maximum soil pH at initial and  
 74 final level (7.74, 7.85, 7.68 and 7.85, 7.87, 7.86 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was  
 75 recorded under T<sub>10</sub> (RDF 70 % (560:280:280 g/plant/hectare) + Vermicompost). Naik and Babu (2007)

76 reported that there was increase in soil pH due to the application of different organic amended plots. This  
77 could be due to low buffering action of organic fertilizers and soil (Biswas et al., 1971).

### 78 79 **3.2 Soil Electrical conductivity ( $\text{dsm}^{-1}$ )** 80

81 The minimum electrical conductivity ( $\text{dsm}^{-1}$ ) at initial and final level (0.265, 0.175, 0.225 and 0.265, 0.175,  
82 0.220 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded under the treatment T<sub>5</sub> (RDF 90  
83 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) which was significantly  
84 superior to all the treatments under study. Treatment T<sub>5</sub> was followed by T<sub>9</sub> (RDF 80 % + Vermicompost +  
85 (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) that reported electrical conductivity ( $\text{dsm}^{-1}$ ) at initial  
86 and final level of 0.267, 0.253 and 0.260 and 0.267, 0.253, 0.260 during first, second and pooled year  
87 respectively. The maximum electrical conductivity ( $\text{dsm}^{-1}$ ) at initial and final level (0.378, 0.362, 0.370 and  
88 0.378, 0.362, 0.370 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded under T<sub>10</sub> (RDF 70 %  
89 (560:280:280 g/plant/hectare) + Vermicompost). The increase in total salt from added organic manures  
90 was probably high which in turn affected EC of the soil Beri et al. (1992).

### 91 92 **3.3 Organic carbon %** 93

94 The maximum organic carbon % at initial and final level (2.117, 2.257, 2.278 and 2.994, 3.532, 3.263  
95 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded under the treatment T<sub>5</sub> (RDF 90 % +  
96 Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) which was significantly superior  
97 to all the treatments under study. Treatment T<sub>5</sub> was followed by T<sub>9</sub> (RDF 80 % + Vermicompost +  
98 (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) that reported organic carbon % at initial and final  
99 level of 2.117, 2.254, 2.185 and 2.851, 3.322, 3.086 during first, second and pooled year respectively.  
100 The minimum organic carbon % at initial and final level (0.996, 1.117, 1.056 and 1.318, 1.371, 1.344  
101 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded under T<sub>10</sub> (RDF 70 % (560:280:280  
102 g/plant/hectare) + Vermicompost). This might be due to the increase in soil micro flora which decomposes  
103 organic matter in soil resulting in to release of nitrogen in available form (Syed, 2009) in banana.

### 104 105 **3.4 Nitrogen ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )** 106

107 The maximum available nitrogen ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) at initial and final level (167.76, 186.52, 177.14 and 176.34,  
108 198.24, 187.29 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded under the treatment T<sub>5</sub>  
109 (RDF 90 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) which was  
110 significantly superior to all the treatments under study. Treatment T<sub>5</sub> was followed by T<sub>9</sub> (RDF 80 % +  
111 Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) that reported available nitrogen  
112 ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) at initial and final level of 167.49, 185.87, 176.68 and 175.62, 197.50, 186.56 during first, second  
113 and pooled year respectively. The minimum available nitrogen ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) at initial and final level (157.67,  
114 173.35, 165.51 and 162.98, 184.58, 173.78 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was  
115 recorded under T<sub>10</sub> (RDF 70 % (560:280:280 g/plant/hectare) + Vermicompost). The use of microbial  
116 consortia in conjunction with organic manures and inorganic source of NPK proved efficient in maintaining  
117 soil nitrogen levels because the microbial population was substantially greater  
118 under such treatments. Mahendra et al. (2009).

### 119 120 121 **3.4 Phosphorus ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ )** 122

123 The maximum available phosphorus ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) at initial and final level (13.22, 13.54, 13.38 and 12.96,  
124 14.19, 13.58 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded under the treatment T<sub>5</sub>  
125 (RDF 90 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) which was  
126 significantly superior to all the treatments under study. Treatment T<sub>5</sub> was followed by T<sub>9</sub> (RDF 80 % +  
127 Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) reported available phosphorus  
128 ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) at initial and final level of 12.97, 13.40, 13.19 and 12.81, 14.14, 13.47 during first, second and  
129 pooled year respectively. The minimum available phosphorus ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ) at initial and final level (10.12,  
130 11.24, 10.68 and 10.48, 10.98, 10.73 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded

131 under T<sub>10</sub> (RDF 70 % (560:280:280 g/plant/hectare) + Vermicompost). Generally, addition of organic  
132 manures with inorganic fertilizers has been reported as beneficial in increasing the phosphorus availability  
133 (Dixit and Gupta, 2000).

134  
135

**Table 2:** Influence of soil applications through Integrated Nutrient Management on Soil pH and electrical conductivity in Sweet Orange Orchard cv. Mosambi (*Citrus Sinensis* L.)

Treatments symbol	Soil pH Initial level			Soil pH Final Level			Electrical conductivity initial level $\text{dsm}^{-1}$			Electrical conductivity final level $\text{dsm}^{-1}$		
	Year 2021	Year 2022	Pooled	Year 2021	Year 2022	Pooled	Year 2021	Year 2022	Pooled	Year 2021	Year 2022	Pooled
T <sub>1</sub>	7.47	7.68	7.41	7.65	7.73	7.71	0.321	0.272	0.297	0.321	0.272	0.297
T <sub>2</sub>	7.66	7.83	7.56	7.83	7.83	7.83	0.373	0.354	0.364	0.373	0.354	0.364
T <sub>3</sub>	7.46	7.47	7.40	7.63	7.62	7.63	0.273	0.263	0.268	0.273	0.263	0.268
T <sub>4</sub>	7.43	7.63	7.38	7.64	7.65	7.65	0.277	0.264	0.270	0.277	0.264	0.270
T <sub>5</sub>	6.80	7.62	7.05	7.64	7.64	7.55	0.265	0.175	0.225	0.265	0.175	0.220
T <sub>6</sub>	7.74	7.85	7.68	7.85	7.87	7.86	0.378	0.362	0.370	0.378	0.362	0.370
T <sub>7</sub>	7.67	7.27	7.62	7.73	7.73	7.73	0.353	0.274	0.314	0.353	0.274	0.314
T <sub>8</sub>	7.53	7.73	7.48	7.78	7.78	7.70	0.363	0.286	0.325	0.363	0.286	0.325
T <sub>9</sub>	7.55	7.25	7.50	7.62	7.62	7.62	0.267	0.253	0.260	0.267	0.253	0.260
T <sub>10</sub>	7.77	7.86	7.72	7.86	7.88	7.87	0.385	0.374	0.379	0.385	0.374	0.379
T <sub>11</sub>	7.60	7.61	7.53	7.83	7.83	7.58	0.354	0.284	0.319	0.354	0.284	0.319
T <sub>12</sub>	7.59	7.76	7.52	7.76	7.77	7.77	0.373	0.353	0.363	0.373	0.353	0.363
T <sub>13</sub>	7.47	7.64	7.41	7.74	7.73	7.49	0.284	0.266	0.275	0.284	0.266	0.275
<b>SE(m)</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>0.06</b>	<b>0.09</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.001</b>	<b>0.005</b>	<b>0.003</b>	<b>0.008</b>	<b>0.005</b>
<b>CD (5%)</b>	<b>0.35</b>	<b>0.19</b>	<b>0.32</b>	<b>0.04</b>	<b>0.03</b>	<b>0.36</b>	<b>0.026</b>	<b>0.004</b>	<b>0.058</b>	<b>0.010</b>	<b>0.023</b>	<b>0.057</b>

136 **Table3:** Influence of soil applications through Integrated Nutrient Management on Soil organic carbon and nitrogen in Sweet Orange  
 137 Orcharcv. Mosambi (*Citrus Sinensis* L.)

Treatment s symbol	Organic Carbon % initial level			Organic Carbon % final level			Nitrogen initial level (Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Nitrogen Final level (Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		
	Year 2021	Year 2022	Pooled	Year 2021	Year 2022	Pooled	Year 2021	Year 2022	Pooled	Year 2021	Year 2022	Pooled
T <sub>1</sub>	1.367	1.335	1.351	2.758	2.767	2.763	163.52	184.00	173.76	174.29	193.81	184.05
T <sub>2</sub>	1.112	1.225	1.169	1.547	1.892	1.720	159.59	175.46	167.53	164.90	187.60	176.25
T <sub>3</sub>	2.112	2.151	2.131	2.834	3.036	2.935	167.27	185.74	176.51	175.59	197.49	186.54
T <sub>4</sub>	1.552	2.116	1.834	2.809	2.924	2.866	166.66	185.34	176.00	175.12	196.93	186.02
T <sub>5</sub>	2.117	2.257	2.187	2.994	3.532	3.263	167.76	186.52	177.14	176.34	198.24	187.29
T <sub>6</sub>	0.998	1.182	1.090	1.451	1.396	1.424	158.17	173.38	165.78	163.74	186.97	175.35
T <sub>7</sub>	1.224	1.332	1.278	2.700	2.708	2.704	163.26	183.18	173.22	173.76	192.71	183.23
T <sub>8</sub>	1.189	1.227	1.208	2.433	2.313	2.373	162.93	178.70	170.81	168.45	187.65	178.05
T <sub>9</sub>	2.117	2.254	2.185	2.851	3.322	3.086	167.49	185.87	176.68	175.62	197.50	186.56
T <sub>10</sub>	0.996	1.117	1.056	1.318	1.371	1.344	157.67	173.35	165.51	162.98	184.58	173.78
T <sub>11</sub>	1.220	1.324	1.272	2.447	2.447	2.447	163.17	180.38	171.78	173.34	191.70	182.52
T <sub>12</sub>	1.115	1.227	1.171	2.017	2.279	2.148	161.93	177.25	169.59	166.85	187.64	177.25
T <sub>13</sub>	1.415	1.342	1.378	2.775	2.792	2.784	163.68	185.06	174.37	174.62	196.16	185.39
<b>SE(m)</b>	<b>0.010</b>	<b>0.023</b>	<b>0.016</b>	<b>0.277</b>	<b>0.175</b>	<b>0.226</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>1.07</b>	<b>1.23</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>1.06</b>
<b>CD (5%)</b>	<b>0.030</b>	<b>0.068</b>	<b>0.288</b>	<b>0.812</b>	<b>0.514</b>	<b>0.391</b>	<b>3.37</b>	<b>2.91</b>	<b>3.96</b>	<b>3.61</b>	<b>2.65</b>	<b>2.93</b>

138 **Table 4:** Influence of soil applications through Integrated Nutrient Management on Soil phosphorus and potassium in Sweet Orange  
 139 Orchard c.v. Mosambi (*Citrus Sinensis* L.

TREATMENTS SYMBOL	PHOSPHORUS INITIAL LEVEL (KG HA <sup>-1</sup> )			PHOSPHORUS FINAL LEVEL (KG HA <sup>-1</sup> )			POTASSIUM INITIAL LEVEL (KG HA <sup>-1</sup> )			POTASSIUM FINAL LEVEL (KG HA <sup>-1</sup> )		
	YEAR 2021	YEAR 2022	POOLED	YEAR 2021	YEAR 2022	POOLED	YEAR 2021	YEAR 2022	POOLED	YEAR 2021	YEAR 2022	POOLED
T <sub>1</sub>	11.78	12.27	12.03	12.36	12.87	12.62	184.37	223.60	203.98	202.27	237.83	220.05
T <sub>2</sub>	11.16	11.49	11.32	11.32	10.56	10.94	173.27	222.17	197.72	195.40	233.27	214.33
T <sub>3</sub>	11.90	13.26	12.58	12.87	13.74	13.31	187.30	224.97	206.13	208.07	243.73	225.90
T <sub>4</sub>	12.07	12.96	12.52	12.54	13.51	13.03	187.23	224.83	206.03	208.03	242.43	225.23
T <sub>5</sub>	13.22	13.54	13.38	12.96	14.19	13.58	188.63	227.13	207.88	213.67	245.23	229.45
T <sub>6</sub>	11.45	10.93	11.19	10.48	10.98	10.73	176.90	218.07	197.48	195.27	232.80	214.03
T <sub>7</sub>	11.42	11.99	11.71	12.28	12.04	12.16	184.23	222.53	203.38	199.13	237.67	218.40
T <sub>8</sub>	12.52	10.35	11.43	11.45	12.38	11.91	180.40	219.83	200.12	197.67	235.77	216.72
T <sub>9</sub>	12.97	13.40	13.19	12.81	14.14	13.47	187.67	226.80	207.23	213.13	244.90	229.02
T <sub>10</sub>	10.12	11.24	10.68	10.82	11.76	11.29	173.43	217.90	195.67	193.93	232.53	213.23
T <sub>11</sub>	10.79	12.45	11.62	11.70	12.47	12.08	183.40	220.53	201.97	198.53	236.90	217.72
T <sub>12</sub>	10.49	12.33	11.41	12.12	11.27	11.70	177.67	219.40	198.53	197.57	233.67	215.62
T <sub>13</sub>	12.25	12.69	12.47	12.82	13.12	12.97	186.10	223.93	205.02	203.77	239.50	221.63
<b>SE(M)</b>	<b>0.521</b>	<b>0.543</b>	<b>0.532</b>	<b>0.45</b>	<b>0.55</b>	<b>0.50</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>1.15</b>	<b>1.13</b>	<b>0.94</b>	<b>1.03</b>
<b>CD (5%)</b>	<b>1.53</b>	<b>1.59</b>	<b>1.94</b>	<b>1.33</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>1.34</b>	<b>2.64</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>6.33</b>	<b>3.32</b>	<b>2.78</b>	<b>4.53</b>

140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193

### 3.5 Potassium (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)

The maximum available potassium (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at initial and final level (188.63, 227.13, 207.88 and 213.67, 245.23, 229.45 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded under the treatment T<sub>5</sub> (RDF 90 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) which was significantly superior to all the treatments under study. Treatment T<sub>5</sub> was followed by T<sub>9</sub> (RDF 80 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) that reported available potassium (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at initial and final level of 187.67, 226.80, 207.23 and 213.13, 244.90, 229.02 during first, second and pooled year respectively. The minimum available potassium (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at initial and final level (173.27, 222.17, 197.72 and 193.93, 232.53, 213.23 during first, second and pooled year respectively) was recorded under T<sub>10</sub> (RDF 70 % (560:280:280 g/plant/hectare) + Vermicompost). In spite of crop uptake more content of NPK was observed in soil. This may be attributed due to more activity and multiplication of nitrogen fixing bacteria and PSB in microbial consortia in the soil for further decomposition and mineralization of FYM, vermicompost and poultry manure might have contributed in availability of more nutrients in the soil Gogoi et al., (2004).

## 4. CONCLUSION

From the present study it may be concluded that:

The treatments had a significant effect on the nutritional status of orchard soil, viz. soil pH, soil electrical, conductivity, organic carbon%, available nitrogen, available phosphorus, available potassium were affected significantly by various treatments. Among the treatments, T<sub>5</sub> (RDF 90 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron) was found to be significantly superior to rest of the treatments under study. It was however followed closely by T<sub>9</sub> (RDF 80 % + Vermicompost + (Azotobacter + PSB + KMB) + (Zn + Cu + Fe + Boron).

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author expresses gratitude to Rajmata Vijayaraje Scindia Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh research guide, department head, and staff for providing the facilities needed to carry out the experiment. A special thank you to the friends and family for their unwavering support.

## Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

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

Option 2:

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

Details of the AI usage are given below:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

## REFERENCES

Anees, M., Tahir, F.M., Shazad, J. and Mahmood, N. (2011). Effect of foliar application of micronutrients on quality of Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) Dasehari fruit. *Mycopathology*, **9**(1): 25-28.

- 194 Beri V, Sidhu B S, Bhat A K, Singh G P and Singh B. (1992). Nutrient balance and soil properties as  
195 affeded by management of crop residues. Proceedings of the International Symposium on Nutrient  
196 management for sustained productivity. Department of Soils, Punjab Agricultural University: 133-  
197 135.
- 198 Biswas T D, Jain B L, Mandel S C. (1971). Cumulative effecs of different levels of manures on physical  
199 properties of soil. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 19 (1): 31-37.
- 200 Butani A, Chovatia R, Rankja N.J. (2012). Effect of chemical fertilizer and Vermicompost on yield and  
201 nutrient content and uptake by fruit of banana (*Musa parasidiaca* L.) cv. GRAND NAINÉ. The Asian  
202 Journal of Horticulture, Corpus ID: 130615046.
- 203 Dixit K G and Gupta B. (2000). Effect of FYM, chemical and bio-fertilizers on yield and quality of rice.  
204 Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science 48: 773-780.
- 205 Dutta P., Kundu S., Baur F.K., Talang H. And Majumder D. (2014). Effect of bio-fertilizers on  
206 physicochemical qualities and leaf mineral composition of guava grown in alluvial zone of West  
207 Bengal. J. Crop Weed Sci., **10**(2): 268-271.
- 208 Gogoi, D, Kotoky, U. And Hazarika, S. (2004). Effect of bio-fertilizer on productivity and soil characeristics  
209 in banana. Indian J. Hort., 61: 354-56.
- 210 Lal, G. and Dayal, H. (2014). Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield quality of acid lime (*Citrus*  
211 *aurantifolia* Swingle). Acad. J., 40(9): 2985-2991.
- 212 Mahendra, Singh H. K. and Singh J. K. (2009). Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and  
213 quality of citrus. Asian Journal Horticulture 4:47-49.
- 214 Naik MH, Babu RS, (2007). Feasibility of organic farming in guava (*Psidium guajava* L.). Acta  
215 Horticulturae., 735: 365-372.
- 216 Srivastava, A. Singh, J.K. and Singh, H.K. (2014). Integrated nutrient management on growth, yield and  
217 quality of papaya (*Carica papaya*) cv. Co-7. The Asian J. Hort., **9**(2): 390-395.
- 218 Syed, Z., (2009). Integrated nutrient management studies in Banana (cv. Ardhapuri). The Asian J. Hort, 4  
219 (1):126-130.

