

## Effect of saline water irrigation and organic amendments on the growth and quality characters of cluster bean

**Comment [m1]:** If it is a scientific name, it should be written in italics, and if it is an English name, the scientific name should be mentioned in parentheses

### Abstract

The pot experiment was carried out to test the salinity tolerance level of MDU - 1 in the presence of organic manures. A pot experiment was conducted in the pot culture yard of the Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar, Cuddalore District, during January-May, 2024. Crop was raised using selected salinity tolerant Cluster bean variety MDU - 1 as test crop. The experimental soil was sandy loam in texture and taxonomically classified as *Typic Ustifluvent*. The treatments consisted of three levels of salinity viz., S<sub>1</sub>-Control (bore well water), S<sub>2</sub>(EC-2.5 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) and S<sub>3</sub>(EC-5.0 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) and four different sources of organic manures viz., O<sub>1</sub>-Humic acid (HA), O<sub>2</sub>-FYM, O<sub>3</sub>-Vermicompost (VC) and O<sub>4</sub>-Composted coirpith (CCP). The experiment was laid out in a Factorial Completely Randomized Design (FCRD) with three replications. The results of the pot experiment clearly indicated the response of cluster bean to saline water irrigation and soil application of different organic manures. Among the three levels of salinity tried, the treatment S<sub>1</sub>, irrigated through bore well water recorded the highest response in respect of growth and quality characters of Cluster bean as compared to saline water irrigation treatments S<sub>2</sub> and S<sub>3</sub>. All the sources of organics evaluated proved significant to increase the growth and quality characters of cluster bean. However, the effect was much pronounced with vermicompost applied treatments as compared to humic acid, composted coirpith and FYM. Among the various treatment combinations, application of vermicompost @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> through soil and irrigated with bore well water (S<sub>1</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) excelled the other treatments in respect of the growth, yield and nutrient uptake by cluster bean. However, this was followed by the treatment S<sub>1</sub>O<sub>1</sub>, which received soil application of humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and irrigated with bore well water. Further, the quality parameters like crude protein, crude fibre and gum content in cluster bean pods were also positively improved by the application of vermicompost @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> through soil and irrigated with bore well water (S<sub>1</sub>O<sub>3</sub>). However, it was followed by treatment S<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> (VC + saline water irrigation). Hence, soil application of vermicompost @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and saline water (EC-2.5 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) irrigation to salinity tolerant cluster bean variety MDU-1 was identified as the best treatment combination for sustainable cluster bean production under saline water irrigation.

**Comment [m2]:** Is there a scientific name? If it is a scientific name, it should be written in italics

**Comment [m3]:** what is this

**Key words:** Saline water, organic amendments, Cluster bean

**Comment [m4]:** Words that are not in the title of the article are usually used in keywords

## Introduction:

Salinity is a major problem throughout the world when excess soluble salts adversely affect soil behaviour by changing its physico-chemical properties and in turn have a strong bearing on the activity of plant growth, especially during the early seedling stage. Efforts have to be made to identify crop species which can be able to tolerate increasing soil salinity levels. Such a selection of salinity resistance crops is one of the wider objectives required primarily to increase crop productivity on salt affected lands, thereby enhancing food and income generation option for the poor section of the farming community. The most crucial and important stage in the life cycle of species growing in saline environment is the period of seed germination and early development of the seedling (Ranganathan and Rajalakshmi, 2006). Salinity stress negatively impacts agricultural yield throughout the world affecting crop production (Shuji *et al.*, 2002). The declining availability of fresh water has become a worldwide problem, which endorses the development of alternative, secondary quality water resources for agricultural use. Nowadays, the competition for fresh water in the development of urbanization, industry and agriculture caused the decline of fresh water for irrigation. The progressive decrease of fresh water resources is leading towards the inevitable use of saline water for irrigation purpose (Chowdary, 2014). Moreover, the continuous use of saline waters without amendments adversely affects the soil physico-chemical and biological properties and at the same time, it adversely affects the mineral composition, uptake and yield of crops under most situations (Ayers and Westcot, 1985 and Oster and Jayawardene, 1998). Application of organic manures and increased rate of nutrient application for crops in such soils hold promise in improving the fertility and productivity of crops. Several investigators reported that application of organic manures like FYM, compost and or green manuring is one of the easiest methods to mitigate the adverse-effects of use of poor quality of waters like saline or sodic water. Hence the present investigation was carried out to study the effect of saline water irrigation and organic amendments on the growth, quality and nutrient uptake of cluster bean.

## Materials and Methods:

The pot experiment was carried out in department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Annamalai University during January– May 2024. The texture of the soil was sandy loam and taxonomically classified as Typic ustifluvent with pH-7.9, EC - 0.86 dS m<sup>-1</sup> and represented low status of organic carbon (4.2 g kg<sup>-1</sup>). The soil had low available nitrogen (174.36 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), low available phosphorus (7.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and medium available potassium (118.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The twelve treatments consisted of three levels of saline water viz., S<sub>1</sub> – control (Bore well water), S<sub>2</sub> – Saline water (EC- 2.5) and S<sub>3</sub> – Saline water (EC- 5.0) as factor-A and four different sources of organic manures viz., O<sub>1</sub> – Humic Acid (HA), O<sub>2</sub> – Farm yard manure (FYM), O<sub>3</sub> – Vermicompost (VC) and O<sub>4</sub> – Composted coirpith (CCP) as factor-B. The experiment was laid out in a Factorial Completely Randomized Design (FCRD) with

**Comment [m5]:** A very concise written introduction should be more about the traits you did and how it compares to other research

**Comment [m6]:** This resource did not exist in the resource list

**Comment [m7]:** The materials and methods are not complete and the details have not been addressed. Materials and methods should be mentioned, the method of measurement, the time of measurement and the method of measurement based on the source

three replications using selected saline tolerance clusterbean variety MDU-1 as test crop. The calculated amount of different organics viz., Humic Acid, FYM, vermicompost and composted coir pith was applied just before sowing. A uniform NPK dose of 25:50:25 mg Kg<sup>-1</sup> was supplied through urea, super phosphate and muriate of potash to all the pots. The entire dose of NPK were applied as basal. Various growth components like plant height, number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup>, chlorophyll content, leaf area index (LAI) and dry matter production (DMP). Quality parameters like crude protein, crude fibre, and gum content. The plant samples were collected and analyzed for the concentration of nutrients like N, P and K were estimated using the standard procedure as outlined by Jackson (1973) and uptake were calculated.

## Result and Discussion:

### Growth characters

Irrigation with different salinity level water and application of different organic amendments favourably influenced the growth characters of clusterbean. Among the three levels of saline water irrigation treatments tried, the treatment S<sub>1</sub>, irrigated through bore well water recorded the highest plant height, number of branches per plant, chlorophyll content, leaf area index and Dry matter production (76.92, 11.57, 50.85, 1.14 and 90.58 cm). This was followed by the salinity level S<sub>2</sub> and S<sub>3</sub> saline water irrigation. Irrespective of the salinity levels, all the organic amendments evaluated significantly improved the growth characters of clusterbean. Application of vermicompost @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

(O<sub>3</sub>) recorded the maximum plant height, number of branches per plant, chlorophyll content, leaf area index and Dry matter production (77.26, 10.73, 52.76, 1.17 and 92.42 cm) of clusterbean. This was followed by the treatments (O<sub>1</sub>), applied with humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and application of composted coir pith @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (O<sub>4</sub>). The interaction effect due to different saline water irrigation and organic manures on the plant height was significant. Application of vermicompost @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> by soil application and bore well water irrigation (S<sub>1</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) recorded the maximum plant height, number of branches per plant, chlorophyll content, leaf area index and Dry matter production, number of branches per plant, chlorophyll content, leaf area index and Dry matter production (82.30, 12.30, 54.70, 1.25 and 96.25 cm) of clusterbean. However, this was followed by the treatment (S<sub>1</sub>O<sub>1</sub>). All the growth characters viz., plant height, chlorophyll, leaf area index, dry matter production and number of branches at all the growth stages of clusterbean were significantly decreased with increasing levels of salinity. The decreased growth with the increasing salinity level was possibly due to adverse soil chemical and physical properties, which hindered plant growth and biomass production. These results are in harmony with those obtained by Kadam *et al.* (2007); Jamaluddin *et al.* (2016) and Patel *et al.* (2024). The results of the study clearly brought out the usefulness of all the organic

**Comment [m8]:** It is better to include the amount of nutrients of organic fertilizers used in materials and methods

**Comment [m9]:** How many days after planting were the measurements of the mentioned traits done?

**Comment [m10]:** How to measure? What device was it done with?

**Comment [m11]:** The statistical analysis of the data was done based on which software and the average data comparison was done by which test

**Comment [m12]:** Are all numbers based on centimeters? The units are valid

**Comment [m13]:** ???

**Comment [m14]:** ???/Unit of measurement?

amendments evaluated in improving the growth and yield of clusterbean. Among various organic amendments, the application of vermicompost accounted for a significantly superior effect in promoting all the growth characters of clusterbean for saline water irrigation. Increased growth of clusterbean with the application of organics might be due to the improvement in nutrient availability and soil property due to the decomposition products such as polysaccharides, polyureoids, amino acids, humic and growth promoting substances. The earlier report of Rangarajan (1991) corroborates the present findings. Arancon *et al.* (2004) reported that leaf area increase in vermicompost treated strawberry (*Fragaria ananassa* Duch.) is due to an increase in microbial population in vermicompost. (Gomes *et al.*, 2011; Xing *et al.*, 2013) who reported the chlorophyll concentrations of leaves significantly decreased by salinity stress. However, inconsistent results were reported by Jungai *et al.* (2011), Akhzari *et al.* (2012) and Chaudhary *et al.* (2021) who stated salinity stress caused increasing chlorophyll concentrations of leaves. Results of the present study are consistent with Berova and Karanatsidis, (2009) and Seerangan *et al.* (2019) who stated chlorophyll contents increased significantly with vermicompost application. The improved growth characters due to organic manures in saline water irrigated plants might be due to the improved nutrient availability, microbial activity, reduced soluble salts in soil-water, lowered osmotic potential of the soil water and lower leaf water potential required to sustain transpiration. Therefore plants spent more energy for making osmotic adjustments as reported by Leone *et al.* (2000). Similar results were observed by Abid *et al.* (2002), Ashraf *et al.*, (2004) and Aslam *et al.*, (2020). Vermicompost contains plant nutrients including N, P, K, Ca, Mg, S, Fe, Mn, Zn, Cu and B. The high percentage of humic acids in vermicompost contribute to plant health, as it promotes the synthesis of phenolic compounds such as anthocyanins and flavonoids which may improve the plant quality (Theusnissen *et al.*, 2010) and (Tharun Kumar *et al.*, 2022).

**Comment [m15]:** Check that the date does not match in the list of sources

## Quality parameters

The quality parameters of clusterbean viz., Crude protein, Crude fibre and gum content were significantly increased with saline water irrigation and soil application of organic manures. Among the different levels of salinity water tried, the treatment S<sub>1</sub>, irrigated through borewell water recorded the highest crude protein (3.14 percent), fibre (13.65 per cent), and gum content (19.47 per cent) of clusterbean. This was followed by the treatments S<sub>2</sub> (EC-2.5 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) and S<sub>3</sub> (EC-5.0 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) saline water irrigation. Among the various organic manures evaluated, application of vermicompost @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (O<sub>3</sub>) was significantly superior in increasing the crude protein (3.24 percent), crude fibre (12.73 percent), and gum content (19.09 percent). This was followed by the treatments applied with humic acid (HA) @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (O<sub>1</sub>) and application of composted coir pith @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (O<sub>4</sub>). These treatments recorded the mean crude protein of 3.04 and 2.90 percent, crude fibre content 12.16 and 11.56 percent and gum content 17.86

**Comment [m16]:** Explain about this attribute?

and 16.56 per cent, respectively. Interaction effect due to saline water irrigation and soil application of organic manures on quality characters of clusterbean was significant. Application of VC @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> through soil and borewell water irrigation (S<sub>1</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) to clusterbean fruits registered the highest quality characters like crude protein (3.36 percent), crude fibre (14.70 per cent) and gum content (21.40 per cent). This was closely followed by the treatment (S<sub>1</sub>O<sub>1</sub>) which received humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and irrigated with borewell water. This might be due to improved nutrient environment in the rhizosphere as well as its utilization in the plants system, leading to enhanced translocation of nutrient, vitamins and proteins in pods. Another reason might be due to the increased activity of nitrate reductase which helped in synthesis and sustains amino acid proteins as reported by Chinaswamy and Marikulandi (1966); Lopes *et al.* (1996); Yadav and Vijayakumari (2004); Meena *et al.* (2016); Nagar *et al.* (2017). Application of organic manures through soil might have increased the nutrient availability which resulted in better accumulation of N content and hence the increased protein content in pods. These results are in accordance with earlier reports of (Olaniyi *et al.*, 2010); (Nithya *et al.*, 2024); Elayaraja *et al.* (2024). Irrigation with saline water to humic acid supplied with clusterbean also recorded the high protein content, crude fibre content and gum content. This might be due to the direct effect of humic substances depend on biochemical action on cell wall, membrane or cytoplasm, mainly hormonal acting in manner similar to plant growth substances and agricultural humic substances are reputed drought tolerance, enhance nutrient uptake and overall plant performance resulting in increasing quality characters of clusterbean. These results are in partly with results reported by Bhuvaneshwari *et al.* (2020).

### NPK uptake

Irrigation of clusterbean with saline water and organics positively increased the uptake of nitrogen by both pod and stover of clusterbean. Among the different levels of salinity tried, the treatment S<sub>1</sub>, irrigated through bore well water recorded the highest mean NPK uptake of (513.07, 209.53, 324.98) and (286.42, 77.72, 155.20) mg pot<sup>-1</sup> in pod and stover respectively. This was followed by the treatments S<sub>2</sub> (EC-2.5 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) and S<sub>3</sub> (EC-5.0 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) saline water irrigated plants by recording the N uptake by pod and stover respectively. Among the various organics evaluated, vermicompost application @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (O<sub>3</sub>) recorded the highest mean NPK uptake by pod (537.04, 225.93, 339.64 mg pot<sup>-1</sup>) and stover (297.39, 82.80, 161.70 mg pot<sup>-1</sup>). This was followed by the treatments, the application of humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (O<sub>1</sub>), application of CCP @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (O<sub>4</sub>) and FYM 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (O<sub>2</sub>). Regarding the interaction, the application of vermicompost @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and irrigated with borewell water irrigation (S<sub>1</sub>O<sub>3</sub>) recorded the highest nitrogen uptake of (585.39, 245.33, 372.88) and (342.82, 90.69, 177.28 mg pot<sup>-1</sup> in pod and stover respectively. However, it

was followed by the treatment pairs like S1O1, S2O3. The lowest nitrogen uptake by clusterbean pod and stover was noticed in the treatment S3O2 (saline water irrigation and FYM 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>). The addition of organics through soil and saline water irrigated plants enhanced the uptake of nutrients by clusterbean. This might be due to increased availability of nutrients, minimized soluble salt concentration due to slow and steady release of organic acid during decomposition of organic matter and improvement of favorable soil conditions as created by addition of organic amendments. Similar results were earlier made by El-Missery. (2003). Further, increased major (N, P and K) and micro (Fe, Cu, Zn and Mn) nutrients uptake by crops with application of organics along with saline water irrigation maybe due to improvement of the soil environment which encouraged proliferation of roots resulting in more absorption of water and nutrients from larger rhizosphere. Moreover, organic manures, during decomposition release nutrients, which became available to the plants and increased NPK concentration. The higher nutrients uptake with organic manure might be attributed to solubilization of native nutrients better availability of fertilizers, chelation of micronutrient complex with intermediate organic compounds, their mobilization and accumulation of nutrients by crop plants. These results are in parity with results reported by Salwa *et al.* (2010); Grzebisz *et al.* (2010) and Chesti *et al.* (2015). Vermicompost contains higher nutrient contents compared to conventional compost and they are more balanced so that their uptake by plant roots is more effective for plant growth stimulation (Vinothini *et al.* 2016). The increase in N, P and K concentration might be due to PGPR nitrogen fixation, the enhancement of plant growth by mycorrhizal colonization and enhanced uptake of phosphorous has been reported by Cavender *et al.*, 2003. Increased plant uptake might be related to increased nutrient availability on the soil (Roy *et al.*, 2006) due to vermicompost application that resulted in increasing soil pH, Physico-chemical properties.

### **Conclusion:**

The present investigation clearly indicated that organic manure application under saline water irrigation improving growth, quality parameters and nutrient uptake of clusterbean. From the results of the study, it was concluded that the soil application of vermicompost @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and saline water (EC-2.5 dS m<sup>-1</sup>) irrigation to saline tolerant clusterbean variety MDU-1 was significantly improved the growth and nutritional quality characters of clusterbean.

### **Reference:**

- Abid, Muhammad, S.A. Malik, Bilal, Khalid and R.A. Wajid, 2002. Response of okra to EC and SAR of irrigation water. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.*, **4(3)**: 311-314.
- Akhzari, D., A. Sepehry, M. Pessarakli, and H. Barani. 2012. Studying the effects of salinity stress on the growth of various halophytic plant species (Agropyron

- elongatum, Kochi prostrata and Puccinellia distans). *World Applied Sciences Journal* 16 (7): 998-1003.
- Arancon, N.Q.; Edwards, C.; Dick, R.; Dick, L. 2007 Vermicompost Tea Production and plant growth impacts. *Biocycle*. v.48, p.51-52,
- Ashraf M. Some important physiological selection criteria for salt tolerance in plants. *Flora*. 2004; 199: 361–376.
- Aslam Z., Ahmad A., Bellitürk K., Iqbal N., Idrees M., Rehman W. U., Akbar G., Tariq M., Raza M., Riasat S., et al. 2024. Effects of vermicompost, vermi-tea and chemical fertilizer on morpho-physiological characteristics of tomato in Suleymanpasa District, Tekirdag of Turkey. *Pure Appl Biol.* 9(3):1920–1931
- Ayers, R.S., and D.W. Westcot. 1985. *Water Quality for Agriculture*, FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper 29 rev 1. FAO, UN, Rome 174pp.
- Berova, M., and G. Karanatsidis. 2009. Influence of bio-fertilizer, produced by *Lumbricus rubellus* on growth, leaf gas exchange and photosynthetic content of pepper plants (*Capsicum annuum* L.). *Acta Horticulturae* 830: 447-452.
- Bhuvaneshwari, R., Nayana, N. L., Srinivasan, S., Karthikeyan, P., & Suganthi, S. (2020). Response of humic acid and zinc fertilization on the yield characters of brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). *Plant Archives*, 20(1), 1332-1334.
- Cavender, N.D., Atiyeh, R.M. and Michael, K. (2003) Vermicompost Stimulates Mycorrhizal Colonization of Roots of *Sorghum bicolor* at the Expense of Plant Growth. *Pedobiologia*, 47, 85-89.
- Chaudhary N, Puri C, Jaisi PN, Basnet S. Effect of Integrated nutrient management on yield and yield attributing characters of Black gram in Lamahi, Dang. *Sustainability in Food and Agriculture*. 2021; 1(2): 106-108.
- Chesti, M.H., A. Kohli, A. Mujtaba, J.A. Sofi, T. Nzir Qadri, R.J.A. Peer, M.A. Dar and I.A. Bisati, 2015. Effect of integrated application of inorganic and organic sources on soil properties, yield and nutrient uptake by crops in intermediate zone of Jammu and Kashmir. *J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci.*, 63: 88-92.
- Chinaswamy KN & Mariakulandi A. 1966. Influence of organic and inorganic manure on the firmness and storage life of tomato. *South Indian Horticulture*, 14: 36-42
- Chowdary, K.A., 2014. Effect of saline water irrigation on soil quality and performance of Jowar
- Elayaraja D., R. Kamaleshwaran, and S. Vennila, (2024). Studies on the Effect of Biofortification through Micronutrients Fortified Organics on the Soil Properties, Yield and Quality of Brinjal in Coastal Soil Environment and Ecology 42 (2) : 516—526.
- El-Missery, M.M.A., 2003. Effect of organic fertilization on yield and quality of some vegetable

- crops under saline conditions. *M.Sc. Thesis*, Faculty of Agric., Ain Shams Univ., Cairo, Egypt.
- Gomes, M.A.C., M.S. Suzuki, M.D. Cunha, and C.F. Tullii. 2011. Effect of salt stress on nutrient concentration, photosynthetic pigments, proline and foliar morphology of *Salvinia auriculata* Aubl. *Acta Limnologica Brasiliensia* 23(2): 164-176.
- Grzebisz, W., R. Lukowiak, M. Biber and K. Przygocka-cyna, 2010. Effect of multi-micronutrient fertilizers applied to foliage on nutritional status of winter oilseed rape and development of yield forming elements. *J. Elementol.*, **15(3)**:477-491.
- Jackson, M.L. 1973. Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall of India Pvt Ltd., New Delhi.
- (*Sorghum bicolor* L.). *M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis*, College of Agriculture, Hyderabad.
- Jamal Uddin, A.F.M., S. Mutahera, H. Mehraj, K. Momena and A.S.M. Nahiyani, 2016. Screening of brinjal lines to high salinity levels. *J. Biosci. Agric. Res.*, **7(2)**: 630-637.
- Kadam, J.R., S.D. Bhingardev and V.N. Walke, 2007. Effect of saline water and fertigation on the yield contributing parameters of brinjal. *Int. J. Agric. Sci.*, **3(1)**: 162-164.
- Leone, A.P., M. Menetiand and G. Sorrentino, 2000. Reflectance spectroscopy to study crop response to soil salinity. *Italian J. Agro.*, **4(2)**: 75-85.
- Lopes AJ, Stamford NP, Eigueiredo MVB, Burity NA & Ferroz EB. 1996. Effect of vermicompost, mineral nitrogen and mineralizing agent on nitrogen fixation and yield in cowpea. *Revista Brasileira de Ciencia do Solo*, 20: 55- 62.
- Nithya, S., Sethuraman, O. S., & Sasikumar, K. (2024). Effect of vermicompost and organic fertilizer on improved growth, productivity and quality of tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum*) plant. *Indian J. Sci. Technol*, 17(2), 142-148.
- Nagar M, Soni AK, Sarolia DK & Saini HR. 2017. Effect of organic manures and different levels of NPK on growth and quality of bottle gourd [*Lagenaria siceraria* (Mol.) Standl.]. *Journal of Agriculture and Ecology*, 4: 44-50; <http://doi.org/10.53911/JAE.2017.4206>.
- Olaniyi, J.O., W.B. Akanbi, O.A. Olaniran and O.T. Ilupeju, 2010. The effect of organo-mineral and inorganic fertilizers on the growth, fruit yield and chemical composition of okra. *J. Animal Plant Sci.*, **9**: 1135-1140.
- Oster, J.D. and N.S. Jayewardene, 1998. Agriculture management of sodic soil in sodic soils distribution processes, Management and Environmental Consequences (Eds. Summer, M.F. and Nadu, R.) Oxford Uni. Press, U.K., p.125-147.
- Patel, H., Parmar, V., Patel, P., & Mavdiya, V. (2024). Effect of organic fertilizers on

yield and yield attributes of cluster bean (*Cyamopsis tetragonoloba* L.) Cv. Pusa Navbahar. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*, 6(4), 1797-1799.

Rangarajan, T. 1991. Irrigation management on groundnut with special reference to field layout and soil amendments. M Sc(Ag) Thesis, Agriculture collage and Research Institue, TNAU. Madurai.

Ranganathan, R., and A. K. Rajalakshmi. "The effect of NaCl and Na<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> salinity on germination behaviour of *Avicennia officinalis* L." (2006): 585-588.

Roy, R.N., Finck, A., Blair, G.J. and Tandon, H.L.S. (2006). Plant Nutrition for Food

Seerangan, G., Sha, K., & Muraleedharan, A. (2019). Effect of organic inputs and inorganic nutrients on growth and yield of Cluster bean (*Cyamopsis tetragonoloba* L.) Taub. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 8(2S), 580-581.

Salwa, A.R., K.A. Hammad and F. Tantaui. 2010. Studies on salinity tolerance of two peanut cultivars in relation to growth, leaf water content and yield. *J. Applied Sci.* **16**:21-30.

Sharma and B.K. Dixit, 1987. Effect of nutrient application on rainfed soybean. *J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci.*, **35**(3): 452-455.

Shuji, Y., A. Ray and H. Paul Mike. 2002. Salt stress tolerance of plant. Centre for environmental stress physiology, JIRCAS Working Report, 25-33.

Tharun Kumar, A., Somasundaram, E., & Thavaprakash, N. (2022). Influence of Organic Nutrient Sources on Yield and Economics of Vegetable Cluster Bean (*Cyamopsis tetragonoloba* L.) Taub. Variety-MDU1. *International Journal of Environment and Climate Change*, 12(9), 125-131.


Theunissen, J., Ndakidemi, P.A. and Laubscher, C.P. (2010) Potential of Vermicompost Produced from Plant Waste on the Growth and Nutrient Status in Vegetable Production. *International Journal of Physical Science*, 5, 1964- 1973.

Vinothini V., Anuradha R., Senthilkumar R. 2016. Vermicompost production and nutrient analysis using *Eudrillus eugine*. *World Journal of Pharmaceutical Research* **5**(6): 1250-1257.

Xing, W., J. Wang, H. Liu, D. Zou, and H. Zhao. 2013. Influence of natural saline- alkali stress on chlorophyll content and chloroplast ultrastructure of two contrasting rice (*Oryza sativa* L. japonica) cultivars. *Australian Journal of Crop Science* **7**(2): 289-292.

Yadav RH & Vijayakumari B. 2004. Impact of vermicompost on biochemical characters of chilli (*Capsicum annum*). *Journal of Ecotoxicology and Environmental Monitoring*, **14**: 51-56.

UNDER PEER REVIEW



**Table 1. Effect of different salinity levels and organic amendments on the plant height, number of branches per plant and chlorophyll content of Cluster bean.**

| O<br>S         | Plant Height(cm) |                |                |                |              | Number of Branches |                |                |                |              | Chlorophyll(mg100g <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                |                |              |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
|                | O <sub>1</sub>   | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub> | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean         | O <sub>1</sub>     | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub> | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean         | O <sub>1</sub>                     | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub> | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean         |
| S <sub>1</sub> | 79.40            | 70.90          | 82.30          | 75.10          | <b>76.92</b> | 11.90              | 10.70          | 12.30          | 11.40          | <b>11.57</b> | 52.40                              | 46.90          | 54.70          | 49.40          | <b>50.85</b> |
| S <sub>2</sub> | 72.90            | 65.30          | 76.80          | 69.39          | <b>71.09</b> | 9.90               | 8.90           | 10.20          | 9.50           | <b>9.62</b>  | 51.50                              | 45.40          | 53.20          | 48.70          | <b>49.70</b> |
| S <sub>3</sub> | 69.10            | 61.80          | 72.70          | 66.20          | <b>67.45</b> | 9.40               | 8.19           | 9.70           | 8.90           | <b>9.04</b>  | 48.30                              | 43.10          | 50.40          | 45.90          | <b>46.92</b> |
| Mean           | <b>73.80</b>     | <b>66.00</b>   | <b>77.26</b>   | <b>70.23</b>   |              | <b>10.40</b>       | <b>9.26</b>    | <b>10.73</b>   | <b>9.34</b>    |              | <b>50.73</b>                       | <b>45.13</b>   | <b>52.76</b>   | <b>48.00</b>   |              |
|                | SEd              |                | CD(p=0.05)     |                |              | SEd                |                | CD(p=0.05)     |                |              | SEd                                |                | CD(p=0.05)     |                |              |
| S              | 1.13             |                | 2.34           |                |              | 0.16               |                | 0.33           |                |              | 0.77                               |                | 1.59           |                |              |
| O              | 1.31             |                | 2.70           |                |              | 0.18               |                | 0.38           |                |              | 0.89                               |                | 1.84           |                |              |
| S×O            | 2.27             |                | 4.68           |                |              | 0.32               |                | 0.66           |                |              | 1.54                               |                | 3.19           |                |              |

Comment [m17]:

Comment [m18]: This height has 93 grams of weight? Please explain, are these heights reasonable with these weights?

S-Salinity level: S<sub>1</sub>–Borewell Water Control; S<sub>2</sub>–EC-2.5dSm<sup>-1</sup>; S<sub>3</sub>–EC-5.0dSm<sup>-1</sup>

O-Organic manures: O<sub>1</sub>–Humic Acid 30@kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>2</sub>–Farmyard manure@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>3</sub>–Vermicompost@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup> and O<sub>4</sub>–Composted coir pith@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup>

**Table 2. Effect of different salinity levels and organic amendments on the leaf area index and dry matter production of Clusterbean.**

| O<br>S         | Leaf Area Index |                |                   |                |             | Dry Matter Production (g pot <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                   |                |              |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|--|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
|                | O <sub>1</sub>  | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub>    | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean        | O <sub>1</sub>                               | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub>    | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean         |
| S <sub>1</sub> | 1.16            | 1.05           | 1.25              | 1.11           | <b>1.14</b> | 93.49  | 83.64          | 96.25             | 88.95          | <b>90.58</b> |
| S <sub>2</sub> | 1.12            | 1.02           | 1.15              | 1.05           | <b>1.08</b> | 88.33  | 78.64          | 92.39             | 83.72          | <b>85.77</b> |
| S <sub>3</sub> | 1.07            | 0.96           | 1.13              | 1.01           | <b>1.04</b> | 83.15  | 73.41          | 88.63             | 77.12          | <b>80.57</b> |
| <b>Mean</b>    | <b>1.11</b>     | <b>1.01</b>    | <b>1.17</b>       | <b>1.05</b>    |             | <b>88.32</b>                                 | <b>78.56</b>   | <b>92.42</b>      | <b>83.26</b>   |              |
|                | <b>SEd</b>      |                | <b>CD(p=0.05)</b> |                |             | <b>SEd</b>                                   |                | <b>CD(p=0.05)</b> |                |              |
| S              | 0.016           |                | 0.035             |                |             | 1.36   |                | 2.80              |                |              |
| O              | 0.019           |                | 0.040             |                |             | 1.57   |                | 3.24              |                |              |
| S × O          | 0.033           |                | 0.070             |                |             | 2.72   |                | 5.61              |                |              |

S-Salinity level : S<sub>1</sub>– Borewell Water Control; S<sub>2</sub>–EC-2.5 dSm<sup>-1</sup>; S<sub>3</sub>–EC-5.0 dSm<sup>-1</sup>

O-Organic manures: O<sub>1</sub>–Humic Acid 30@kgha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>2</sub>–Farmyard manure@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>3</sub>–Vermicompost@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup> and O<sub>4</sub>–Composted coir pith @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

**Table 3. Effect of different salinity levels and organic amendments on the quality parameters of Clusterbean**

| O<br>S         | Crude Protein (%) |                |                   |                |             | Crude Fibre (%) |                |                   |                |              | Gum Content (%) |                |                   |                |              |
|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
|                | O <sub>1</sub>    | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub>    | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean        | O <sub>1</sub>  | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub>    | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean         | O <sub>1</sub>  | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub>    | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean         |
| S <sub>1</sub> | 3.21              | 2.91           | 3.36              | 3.08           | <b>3.14</b> | 14.10           | 12.90          | 14.70             | 13.3           | <b>13.65</b> | 20.10           | 17.30          | 21.40             | 18.90          | <b>19.47</b> |
| S <sub>2</sub> | 3.05              | 2.76           | 3.23              | 2.90           | <b>2.98</b> | 12.40           | 11.10          | 12.90             | 11.70          | <b>12.02</b> | 17.60           | 14.28          | 18.70             | 16.29          | <b>16.71</b> |
| S <sub>3</sub> | 2.84              | 2.62           | 3.13              | 2.74           | <b>2.84</b> | 10.80           | 9.00           | 10.60             | 9.70           | <b>9.82</b>  | 15.90           | 13.00          | 17.19             | 14.30          | <b>15.15</b> |
| <b>Mean</b>    | <b>3.04</b>       | <b>2.76</b>    | <b>3.24</b>       | <b>2.90</b>    |             | <b>12.16</b>    | <b>10.86</b>   | <b>12.73</b>      | <b>11.56</b>   |              | <b>17.86</b>    | <b>14.92</b>   | <b>19.09</b>      | <b>16.56</b>   |              |
|                | <b>SEd</b>        |                | <b>CD(p=0.05)</b> |                |             | <b>SEd</b>      |                | <b>CD(p=0.05)</b> |                |              | <b>SEd</b>      |                | <b>CD(p=0.05)</b> |                |              |
| S              | 0.046             |                | 0.096             |                |             | 0.192           |                | 0.397             |                |              | 1.278           |                | 0.573             |                |              |
| O              | 0.053             |                | 0.111             |                |             | 0.222           |                | 0.458             |                |              | 0.321           |                | 0.662             |                |              |
| S × O          | 0.093             |                | 0.192             |                |             | 0.385           |                | 0.795             |                |              | 0.556           |                | 1.147             |                |              |

S-Salinity level : S<sub>1</sub>– Borewell Water Control; S<sub>2</sub>–EC-2.5 dSm<sup>-1</sup>; S<sub>3</sub>–EC-5.0 dSm<sup>-1</sup>

O-Organic manures: O<sub>1</sub>–Humic Acid 30@kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>2</sub>–Farmyard manure@ 12.5tha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>3</sub>–Vermicompost@ 12.5tha<sup>-1</sup> and O<sub>4</sub> –Composted coir pith @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

**Table 4. Effect of different salinity levels and organic amendments on the nitrogen uptake by Cluster bean**

| O<br>S         | Nitrogen uptake-Fruit (mg pot <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                |                |               | Nitrogen uptake-Stover (mg pot <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                |                |               |
|----------------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|
|                | O <sub>1</sub>                                | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub> | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean          | O <sub>1</sub>                                 | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub> | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean          |
| S <sub>1</sub> | 537.14  | 437.52         | 585.39         | 492.26         | <b>513.07</b> | 312.12   | 235.43         | 342.82         | 255.34         | <b>286.42</b> |
| S <sub>2</sub> | 485.33  | 387.73         | 535.56         | 430.24         | <b>459.71</b> | 262.83   | 207.64         | 287.26         | 230.92         | <b>247.16</b> |
| S <sub>3</sub> | 427.26  | 342.28         | 490.19         | 387.52         | <b>411.81</b> | 227.54   | 182.20         | 262.10         | 207.26         | <b>219.77</b> |
| Mean           | <b>483.24</b>                                 | <b>389.17</b>  | <b>537.04</b>  | <b>436.67</b>  |               | <b>267.49</b>                                  | <b>208.42</b>  | <b>297.39</b>  | <b>231.17</b>  |               |
|                | SEd   |                | CD(p=0.05)     |                |               | SEd  |                | CD(p=0.05)     |                |               |
| S              | 7.62  |                | 15.73          |                |               | 4.20   |                | 8.67           |                |               |
| O              | 8.80  |                | 18.16          |                |               | 4.85   |                | 10.02          |                |               |
| S × O          | 15.24   |                | 31.46          |                |               | 8.10   |                | 17.35          |                |               |

S-Salinity level :S<sub>1</sub>– Borewell Water Control; S<sub>2</sub>–EC-2.5 dSm<sup>-1</sup>; S<sub>3</sub>–EC-5.0 dSm<sup>-1</sup>

O-Organic manures: O<sub>1</sub>–Humic Acid 30@kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>2</sub>–Farmyard manure@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>3</sub>–Vermicompost@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup> and O<sub>4</sub>–Composted coir pith @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

**Table 5. Effect of different salinity levels and organic amendments on the Phosphorus uptake by Cluster bean**

| O<br>S         | Phosphorus uptake-Fruit<br>(mg pot <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                   |                |               | Phosphorus uptake-Stover<br>(mg pot <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                   |                |              |
|----------------|--|----------------|-------------------|----------------|---------------|---|----------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------|
|                | O <sub>1</sub>                                     | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub>    | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean          | O <sub>1</sub>                                      | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub>    | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean         |
| S <sub>1</sub> | 222.11   | 180.67         | 245.33            | 190.02         | <b>209.53</b> | 84.54   | 65.26          | 90.69             | 70.42          | <b>77.72</b> |
| S <sub>2</sub> | 201.25   | 160.48         | 227.08            | 180.19         | <b>192.25</b> | 72.13   | 57.70          | 82.28             | 65.11          | <b>69.30</b> |
| S <sub>3</sub> | 177.79   | 140.25         | 205.40            | 162.00         | <b>171.36</b> | 62.88   | 50.38          | 75.44             | 60.88          | <b>62.39</b> |
| <b>Mean</b>    | <b>200.38</b>                                      | <b>160.46</b>  | <b>225.93</b>     | <b>177.40</b>  |               | <b>73.18</b>  | <b>57.78</b>   | <b>82.80</b>      | <b>65.47</b>   |              |
|                | <b>SEd</b>   |                | <b>CD(p=0.05)</b> |                |               | <b>SEd</b>  |                | <b>CD(p=0.05)</b> |                |              |
| S              | 3.16   |                | 6.52              |                |               | 1.15  |                | 2.37              |                |              |
| O              | 3.65   |                | 7.53              |                |               | 1.32  |                | 2.27              |                |              |
| <b>S × O</b>   | 6.32   |                | 13.05             |                |               | 2.30  |                | 4.75              |                |              |

S-Salinity level :S<sub>1</sub>– Borewell Water Control; S<sub>2</sub>–EC-2.5 dSm<sup>-1</sup>; S<sub>3</sub>–EC-5.0 dSm<sup>-1</sup>

O-Organic manures: O<sub>1</sub>–Humic Acid 30@ kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>2</sub>–Farmyard manure@ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>3</sub>–Vermicompost@ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and O<sub>4</sub>–Composted coir pith @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

**Table 6. Effect of different salinity levels and organic amendments on the Potassium uptake by Cluster bean**

| O<br>S         | Potassium uptake-Fruit<br>(mg pot <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                |                |               | Potassium uptake-Stover<br>(mg pot <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                |                |                |
|----------------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|--|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                | O <sub>1</sub>                                    | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub> | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean          | O <sub>1</sub>                                     | O <sub>2</sub> | O <sub>3</sub> | O <sub>4</sub> | Mean           |
| S <sub>1</sub> | 342.56  | 272.06         | 372.88         | 312.42         | <b>324.98</b> | 162.64   | 130.56         | 177.28         | 150.32         | <b>1545.20</b> |
| S <sub>2</sub> | 312.98  | 240.72         | 342.29         | 272.52         | <b>291.12</b> | 147.18   | 112.12         | 165.72         | 130.44         | <b>138.86</b>  |
| S <sub>3</sub> | 272.32  | 220.53         | 303.76         | 245.20         | <b>260.45</b> | 130.55   | 90.93          | 142.11         | 115.01         | <b>119.65</b>  |
| Mean           | <b>309.28</b>                                     | <b>244.43</b>  | <b>339.64</b>  | <b>276.71</b>  |               | <b>146.79</b>                                      | <b>111.20</b>  | <b>161.70</b>  | <b>131.92</b>  |                |
|                | SEd   |                | CD(p=0.05)     |                |               | SEd  |                | CD(p=0.05)     |                |                |
| S              | 4.84  |                | 9.98           |                |               | 2.30   |                | 4.75           |                |                |
| O              | 5.58  |                | 11.53          |                |               | 2.66   |                | 5.49           |                |                |
| S × O          | 9.68  |                | 19.79          |                |               | 4.60   |                | 9.51           |                |                |

S-Salinity level :S<sub>1</sub>– Borewell Water Control; S<sub>2</sub>–EC-2.5 dSm<sup>-1</sup>; S<sub>3</sub>–EC-5.0 dSm<sup>-1</sup>

O-Organic manures: O<sub>1</sub>–Humic Acid 30@kg ha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>2</sub>–Farmyard manure@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup>; O<sub>3</sub>–Vermicompost@12.5tha<sup>-1</sup> and O<sub>4</sub>–Composted coir pith @ 12.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

Comment [m19]: Please explain why it was done at the 5% level and the average comparison was not done at the 1% level?

UNDER PEER REVIEW

