



# Response of Inorganic Fertilizers, Organic Manure and Biofertilizer on the Physical Parameters of the Soil under the Cultivation of Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) CV. Arun

Anil Kumar <sup>a++\*</sup>, Arun Alfred David <sup>a#</sup>, Tarence Thomas <sup>a†</sup>,  
Ram Bharose <sup>a‡</sup>, Narendra Swaroop <sup>a#</sup>, Alok M. Lall <sup>a†</sup>,  
Iska Srinath Reddy <sup>a++</sup>, Rohan Serawat <sup>a++</sup>  
and Neha Toppo <sup>a++</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj (Allahabad), 211 007 U.P., India.

## **Authors' contributions**

*This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.*

## **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2023/v35i214009

## **Open Peer Review History:**

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/105861>

**Original Research Article**

**Received: 29/07/2023**  
**Accepted: 05/09/2023**  
**Published: 25/10/2023**

<sup>++</sup> Research Scholar;

<sup>#</sup> Associate Professor;

<sup>†</sup> Professor;

<sup>‡</sup> Assistant Professor;

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: Anilkumarmahala4747@gmail.com, 19phcss108shiats@gamil.com;

## ABSTRACT

Application of inorganic fertilizer, biofertilizer and organic manure to the soil can have various effects on the physical parameters of soil, such as soil structure, porosity, water holding capacity, bulk density. The designed lay out 48 total soil samples were taken from different depths 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm. The optimal combination of these inputs depends on the type of soil, crop and climate. Generally, the application of organic manure can improve the soil structure and porosity, while the addition of biofertilizer can enhance the soil fertility and microbial activity. The use of inorganic fertilizer can provide essential nutrients for plant growth, but it should be applied in appropriate amounts and forms to avoid negative impacts on the soil quality. The conjunctive use of N P K and different vermicompost and rhizobium the treatment T<sub>16</sub>- [RDF @ 100 % + VC @ 100 % + Rhizobium @ 100 %] gave best results physical properties of soil.

**Keywords:** Vermicompost; rhizobium; soil bulk density; soil water holding capacity; soil porosity; soil particle density.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Soil is a complex mixture of minerals, organic matter water, air and micro-organisms that serves as a foundation for plant growth as well as a variety of ecosystem services. It is an essential natural resource that supports human livelihoods biodiversity and a variety of ecosystem services such as carbon sequestration, nutrient cycling and water regulation. Achieving sustainable farming practices, reducing climate change and preserving global food security depend on managing and conserving soil health [1]. the health of the soil and the services it offers are seriously threatened by soil degradation, which is caused by problems including erosion, pollution and misuse. using techniques like crop rotation, conservation tillage and organic farming, which enhance soil health and reduce the adverse effects of agricultural activities on soil quality is essential for maintaining the long-term health and sustainability of soils [2]. Soil plays a crucial role in the growth and development of chickpeas, which are a type of legume that is commonly grown for its nutritious seeds. chickpeas require well-drained soils with good structure, a neutral pH, and adequate levels of nutrients, particularly nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium [3]. Physical properties play an important role in determining soil's suitability for agricultural, environmental and engineering uses. The supporting capability; movement, retention and availability of water and nutrients to plants; ease in penetration of roots, and flow of heat and air are directly associated with physical properties of the soil. physical properties also influence the chemical and biological properties [4,5]. The most pertinent physical properties of soil relevant to its use as a medium for plant growth (Hillel

2015).Vermicompost is a nutrient-rich organic fertilizer produced by the breakdown of organic matter by earthworms [6-8]. vermicompost contains beneficial microorganisms that help to improve soil health by increasing soil fertility, water-holding capacity and nutrient availability. Studies have shown that the application of vermicompost can significantly improve soil health in chickpea fields [9] (Sharma et al., 2020). A judicious use of organic manures and biofertilizers may be effective not only sustaining crop productivity and in soil health, but also in supplementing chemical fertilizers of crop (Jaipal et al., 2011).

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Site Details

The field experiment was carried out at the research farm of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj during in *rabi* season 2021-22. The maximum temperature of the location ranges between 46.0-48°C and seldom falls below 4°C-5°C. The relative humidity ranges between 20-94%. The average rainfall of this area is around 1100 mm annually. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design (RBD) with 16 treatments and included in Table 2. The treatments have been replicated three times. The different treatments were employed randomly in each replication.

### 2.2 Soil Sampling and Laboratory Testing

Soil sampling was done with the standard sampling tools from two depths 0-15cm and 15-30 cm. analysis of the soil samples was under

the methods, the physical parameters include bulk density, particle density, pore space, water holding capacity.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

As presented in Table 2., the maximum bulk density  $\text{Mg m}^{-3}$  was found in 2020-21 and 2021-22 at different depths at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm were in  $T_{16}$  were  $1.32 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  and  $1.36 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  found to be non-significant followed by in  $T_{15}$  i.e.,  $1.31 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  and  $1.35 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ , minimum was found  $T_1$  i.e.,  $1.12$  and  $1.22 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ . The maximum bulk density in the year 2021-22 were found in  $T_{16}$  were  $1.33 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  and  $1.37 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  found to be non-significant followed by in  $T_{15}$  i.e.,  $1.13 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  and  $1.23 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$ , minimum was found  $T_1$  i.e.,  $1.13$  and  $1.23 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  respectively. higher bulk density may be due to more organic matter in  $T_{16}$ . Similar results were reported by (Goyal et al., 2019).

The maximum particle density of soil were found in treatment  $T_{16}$  i.e., the particle density was  $2.67 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  at 0-15 cm depth and  $2.74 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  at 15-30 cm depth during 2020-21 while in 2021-22, it

was  $2.68 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  at 0-15 cm depth and  $2.75 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  at 15-30 cm depth of soil, in comparison with  $T_1$  where minimum values of the result were found i.e.  $2.50 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  at 0-15 cm depth and  $2.61 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  at 15-30 cm depth of soil during 2021 while in 2022 it was  $2.51 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  and  $2.62 \text{ Mg m}^{-3}$  at both 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm depth of soil, respectively. higher particle density was found due to proper incorporation of N P K, vermicompost and rhizobium parallel results were reported by (Goyal et al., 2019).

The maximum pore space (%) of soil in treatment  $T_{16}$  i.e., 50.74 and 47.01 % at 0-15 and 15-30 cm of soil depth during 2021 and for 2022 it was 51.23 and 48.42 % at soil depth 0-15 and 15-30 cm, respectively. The minimum values of the result were found be significant in treatment  $T_1$ , which was 44.50 and 43.30 % at 0-15 and 15-30 cm of soil depth during 2020-21 while during year 2021-22 it was 44.67 and 43.61 % at soil depth 0-15 and 15-30 cm respectively [10-12]. There is almost a linear increase in porosity with increase in doses of vermicompost and rhizobium. correspondent results were reported by (Das et al., 2016).

**Table 1. Soil physical parameters**

S. No.	Particulars Physical Properties	Scientist Name	Methods	Unit
1.	Bulk density	Black (1965)	Pycnometer	$\text{Mg m}^{-3}$
2.	Particle density	Black (1965)	Pycnometer	$\text{Mg m}^{-3}$
3.	Pore space	Black (1965)	-	(%)
4.	Water holding capacity	Muthuval et al. (1992)	Graduated measuring cylinder	(%)

**Table 2. Treatment combination of Chickpea var. Arun2021-22**

Treatments	Treatment Combination
$T_1$	Absolute control
$T_2$	[RDF @ 0 % + VC @ 25 % + Rhizobium @ 25 %]
$T_3$	[RDF @ 0 % + VC @ 50 % + Rhizobium @ 50 %]
$T_4$	[RDF @ 0 % + VC @ 100 % + Rhizobium @ 100 %]
$T_5$	[RDF @ 25 % + VC @ 0 % + Rhizobium @ 0 %]
$T_6$	[RDF @ 25 % + VC @ 25 % + Rhizobium @ 25 %]
$T_7$	[RDF @ 25 % + VC @ 50 % + Rhizobium @ 50 %]
$T_8$	[RDF @ 25 % + VC @ 100 % + Rhizobium @ 100 %]
$T_9$	[RDF @ 50 % + VC @ 0 % + Rhizobium @ 0 %]
$T_{10}$	[RDF @ 50 % + VC @ 25 % + Rhizobium @ 25 %]
$T_{11}$	[RDF @ 50 % + VC @ 50 % + Rhizobium @ 50 %]
$T_{12}$	[RDF @ 50 % + VC @ 100 % + Rhizobium @ 100 %]
$T_{13}$	[RDF @ 100 % + VC @ 0% + Rhizobium @ 0 %]
$T_{14}$	[RDF @ 100 % + VC @ 25 % + Rhizobium @ 25 %]
$T_{15}$	[RDF @ 100 % + VC @ 50 % + Rhizobium @ 50 %]
$T_{16}$	[RDF @ 100 % + VC @ 100 % + Rhizobium @ 100 %]

Note: RDF- Recommend dose of fertilizer, Basal dose of Nitrogen ( $20 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) Phosphorus ( $40 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), Potassium ( $20 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ), vermicompost and biofertilizer was applied

Table 3. Response of inorganic fertilizer, organic manure and biofertilizer on physical soil properties

S. No.	Soil bulk density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )				Soil particle density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )				Soil porosity (%)				Soil water holding capacity(%)			
	2020-21		2021-22		2020-21		2021-22		2020-21		2021-22		2020-21		2021-22	
	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm
T <sub>1</sub>	1.12	1.22	1.13	1.23	2.50	2.61	2.51	2.62	44.5	43.3	44.67	43.61	34.32	34.76	35.42	35.77
T <sub>2</sub>	1.15	1.25	1.15	1.25	2.52	2.62	2.52	2.62	45.51	44.31	45.55	44.51	35.31	35.67	36.13	36.86
T <sub>3</sub>	1.16	1.26	1.17	1.27	2.52	2.63	2.53	2.62	45.51	44.32	45.54	45.63	36.24	36.68	37.33	37.89
T <sub>4</sub>	1.17	1.29	1.17	1.29	2.54	2.64	2.55	2.64	47.52	46.34	47.59	46.94	36.02	36.86	37.23	37.9
T <sub>5</sub>	1.19	1.30	1.20	1.30	2.55	2.64	2.56	2.65	47.53	46.35	48.86	47.56	36.44	37.8	37.75	38.08
T <sub>6</sub>	1.19	1.28	1.20	1.29	2.57	2.66	2.58	2.66	47.54	45.37	47.53	46.24	37.53	37.86	38.36	38.76
T <sub>7</sub>	1.20	1.27	1.21	1.30	2.58	2.67	2.59	2.68	47.56	45.85	47.63	46.46	37.25	38.09	38.95	38.94
T <sub>8</sub>	1.22	1.28	1.23	1.30	2.59	2.68	2.6	2.68	47.59	46.04	48.54	46.45	38.43	38.95	39.46	39.83
T <sub>9</sub>	1.24	1.29	1.25	1.29	2.59	2.69	2.62	2.69	47.59	46.15	47.52	46.24	39.46	39.98	40.45	40.7
T <sub>10</sub>	1.25	1.30	1.27	1.31	2.6	2.69	2.62	2.7	47.62	46.34	47.62	46.46	39.23	40.4	41.26	41.74
T <sub>11</sub>	1.25	1.30	1.28	1.32	2.61	2.69	2.63	2.7	48.55	45.54	48.96	45.34	40.35	41.54	42.16	41.92
T <sub>12</sub>	1.27	1.31	1.31	1.32	2.62	2.7	2.63	2.71	49.52	45.58	49.74	46.47	41.24	41.91	43.25	42.67
T <sub>13</sub>	1.30	1.32	1.32	1.33	2.64	2.71	2.65	2.72	50.64	47.4	50.78	47.75	42.46	43.54	44.56	43.65
T <sub>14</sub>	1.30	1.33	1.32	1.33	2.64	2.72	2.66	2.73	50.68	47.5	50.94	47.77	42.77	44.70	45.04	45.23
T <sub>15</sub>	1.31	1.35	1.32	1.36	2.65	2.72	2.67	2.73	50.71	46.65	50.96	47.91	43.18	44.55	45.53	46.51
T <sub>16</sub>	1.32	1.36	1.33	1.37	2.67	2.74	2.68	2.75	50.74	47.01	51.23	48.42	45.25	46.60	46.36	47.57
F-test	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
S.Em. (±)	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.65	0.38	0.68	0.43	1.07	1.17	1.18	1.17
C. D. @5%	0.06	0.03	0.07	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.05	0.04	1.88	1.10	1.97	1.24	3.08	3.39	3.42	3.38

The maximum water holding capacity (%) of soil found in treatment T<sub>16</sub> i.e., which was 45.25% at 0-15 cm depth and 46.60% at 15-30 cm soil depth during 2021 while during 2022 it is observed as 46.36 % at 0-15 cm and 47.57% at 15-30 cm soil depth. Timely the minimum values of the result were found in treatment T<sub>1</sub> which was 34.32% at 0-15 cm and 34.7% at 15-30 cm soil depth during 2020-21 similarly, 35.42% and 35.77% at 0- 15 and 15-30 cm soil depth during 2021-22, respectively [13,14]. There is increase in water holding capacity with increase in doses of vermicompost and rhizobium. comparable results were reported by (Singh et al.,2018).

#### 4. CONCLUSION

It revealed from the trial that application of N P K, vermicompost and rhizobium Bio-fertilizers in treatment T<sub>16</sub> was found best, since the results is based on one season physical properties. The T<sub>1</sub> shows the poor physical condition where N P K, vermicompost and rhizobium bio-fertilizers was applied in least amount. This concludes that use of vermicompost and rhizobium Bio-fertilizer has improved the physical health of soil which leads to overall better health of soil.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my Advisor Dr. Arun A David, Associate Professor, department of soil science and agricultural chemistry, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, for his diligent guidance and constructive suggestions at every step during my work. I thank him for his priceless follow-up and valuable suggestions for improving the quality of this work. I got to learn a few from an ocean of knowledge and share my gratitude for his diligence, also extend my gratitude to all the teaching and non-teaching staff of our department because without them I would not be able to complete my work.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

1. Lal R. Challenges and opportunities in soil organic matter research. *European Journal of Soil Science*. 2009;60(2):158-69.
2. Pimentel D, Burgess M. An environmental, energetic and economic comparison of organic and conventional farming systems. *Integrated Pest Management: Pesticide Problems*. 2014;3:141-66.
3. Thakur R, Pristijono P, Scarlett CJ, Bowyer M, Singh SP, Vuong QV. Starch-based films: Major factors affecting their properties. *International journal of biological macromolecules*. 2019;132: 1079-89.
4. Brady NC, Weil RR. *the nature and properties of soils*, 13<sup>th</sup> edition, pearson education (Singapore) Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India; 2004.
5. Das A, David AA, Swaroop N, Thomas T, Rao S, Hasan A. Assessment of physico-chemical properties of river bank soil of Yamuna in Allahabad city, Uttar Pradesh. *International Journal of chemical studies*. 2018;6(3):2412-2417.
6. Deshmukh MS, Kachave TR, Kanase PM. Evaluation of macro and micronutrient status of pomegranate orchards from Maharashtra region by soil and leaf analysis, *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2020;9(1):1378-1382.
7. Gajbhiye KS, Gaikawad ST, Challa O, Hazare TN, Deshmukh SN. Evaluation of optimum range of soil moisture stress for establishment of wheat crop in Vertisols. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2018;38(1):139-141.
8. Hillel D. *Soil and water - Physical principles and process*, academic press. Inc. New York; 1971.
9. Singh S, Tripathi A, Maji D, Awasthi A, Vajpayee P, Kalra A. Evaluating the potential of combined inoculation of *Trichoderma harzianum* and *Brevibacterium halotolerans* for increased growth and oil yield in *Mentha arvensis* under greenhouse and field conditions. *Industrial Crops and Products*. 2019; 131:173-81.
10. Mustafa AA, Singh M, Sahoo RN, Ahmed N, Khanna M, Sarangi A, Mishra AK. Land suitability analysis for different crops: A multi criteria decision making approach using remote sensing and GIS. 2011;3:61-84. Available:<http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>
11. Mustafa AA, Singh M, Sahoo RN, Ahmed N, Khanna M, Sarangi A, Mishra AK. Characterization and classification of soils of Kheragarah, Agra and their productivity

- potential. *Journal of Water Management*. 2011;19:1-19.
12. Six J, Elliott ET, Paustian K. Soil structure and soil organic matter: II. A normalised stability index and the effect of mineralogy. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 2000;64:1042-1049.
13. Sharma PK. Emerging technologies of remote sensing and GIS for the development of spatial data structure. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2004;52:384-406.
14. Velayutham M, Mandal DK, Mandal C, Sehgal J. Agro-ecological Subregion of India for Planning and Development, NBSS Publication 35, NBSS&LUP, Nagpur. 1999;1-372.

© 2023 Kumar et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

*Peer-review history:*

*The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:*  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/105861>