



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2021; 10(12): 1810-1814  
© 2021 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
Received: 04-10-2021  
Accepted: 21-11-2021

**Sudhir Pal**  
Department of Soil Science &  
Agricultural Chemistry  
Chandra Shekhar Azad  
University of Agriculture &  
Technology, Kanpur, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**SB Pandey**  
Department of Soil Science &  
Agricultural Chemistry  
Chandra Shekhar Azad  
University of Agriculture &  
Technology, Kanpur, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Anshul Singh**  
Department of Soil Science &  
Agricultural Chemistry  
Chandra Shekhar Azad  
University of Agriculture &  
Technology, Kanpur, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Satyaveer Singh**  
Department of Agronomy  
Chandra Shekhar Azad  
University of Agriculture &  
Technology, Kanpur, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Ravindra Sachan**  
Department of Soil Science &  
Agricultural Chemistry  
Chandra Shekhar Azad  
University of Agriculture &  
Technology, Kanpur, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Ankit Yadav**  
Department of Soil Science &  
Agricultural Chemistry  
Chandra Shekhar Azad  
University of Agriculture &  
Technology, Kanpur, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

**Corresponding Author:**  
**Sudhir Pal**  
Department of Soil Science &  
Agricultural Chemistry  
Chandra Shekhar Azad  
University of Agriculture &  
Technology, Kanpur, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

## Effect of Phosphorus, Boron and Rhizobium inoculation on productivity and profitability of chickpea

**Sudhir Pal, SB Pandey, Anshul Singh, Satyaveer Singh, Ravindra Sachan and Ankit Yadav**

### Abstract

Field experiments were conducted to study the effect of Phosphorus, Boron and Rhizobium inoculants on yield attributes and yield of chickpea during rabi season 2018-19 and 2019-20 at students instructional farm, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture & Technology, Kanpur. The experiment comprised of eighteen treatments viz. T<sub>1</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>0</sub>, T<sub>2</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>4</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>0</sub>, T<sub>5</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>6</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>7</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>0</sub>, T<sub>8</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub>, T<sub>9</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>10</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>0</sub>+Rhizobium, T<sub>11</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>1</sub>+Rhizobium, T<sub>12</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>2</sub>+Rhizobium, T<sub>13</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>0</sub>+Rhizobium, T<sub>14</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub>+Rhizobium, T<sub>15</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub>+Rhizobium, T<sub>16</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>0</sub>+Rhizobium, T<sub>17</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub>+Rhizobium, T<sub>18</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>2</sub>+Rhizobium and replicated thrice. Results of the experiment reflected that yield attributes like of chickpea crop significantly increased with the use of phosphorus, boron and rhizobium inoculation. Maximum number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> 68.65, number of grains pods<sup>-1</sup> 1.79, 100 grains weight 20.55 gm and harvest index 44.29% were recorded under T<sub>18</sub> (P<sub>90</sub> +B<sub>2</sub> + rhizobium). The crop yield of chickpea significantly increased due to phosphorus and boron application @ 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> and 1.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively. Rhizobium inoculation significantly increased yield, both grain 18.52 q ha<sup>-1</sup> and stover 24.44 q ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded under T<sub>14</sub> (P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub>+Rhizobium) of chickpea crop during both the years of the experimentation. The maximum gross return Rs. (125546), net return Rs. (86846) and B:C ratio (2.24) were recorded under T<sub>18</sub> (P<sub>90</sub> +B<sub>2</sub> + rhizobium). Combined application of phosphorus, boron and rhizobium inoculation. The present study showed that application of phosphorus, boron and rhizobium inoculation along with recommended nitrogen and potassium could be an effective option for enhancing chickpea yield attributes, yield and economic return.

**Keywords:** Chickpea, Yield attributes, Yield, Economics, Phosphorus, Boron and *Rhizobium*, Uday

### Introduction

Pulses play a pivotal role and occupy a unique position in Indian agriculture by virtue of their inherent capacity to grow on marginal lands. It is an easily available source of protein in the rural heart of India. Pulses provide significant nutritional and health benefits and are known to reduce several non-communicable diseases such as colon cancer and cardio-vascular diseases (Jukanti *et al.* 2012) [10]. India is the largest producer and consumer of pulses in the world. Chickpea mainly cultivated in the cool, dry season of the semi-arid tropical region. The plant is well adapted to tropical climates with moderate temperatures and is successfully cultivated under irrigation in the cool season of many tropical countries (Bejiga and Van der Maesen, 2006) [3]. Many attractive dishes viz – sweets, snacks and namkeen are also prepared from its flour called besan. Also eaten as whole fried or boiled and salted. Fresh green leaves (sag) are used as vegetables and green grains as hare chhole or chholia. Straw of gram is an excellent fodder while both husk and bits of ‘Dal’ are valuable cattle feed. Leaves consist of mallic and citric acid and are very useful for stomach ailments and blood purifier. Today, Chickpea is the third most important pulse crop in the world after dry bean and pea.

Phosphorus is one of the essential nutrients for legume growth and BNF (Mhango *et al.*, 2008) [15]. Phosphorus deficiency can limit nodule number, leaf area, and biomass and grain development in legumes. Symbiotic nitrogen fixation has a high P demand because the process consumes large amounts of energy (Schulze *et al.*, 2006) [23] and energy generating metabolism strongly depends upon the availability of P (Plaxton, 2004) [18]. P fertilization stimulates root growth, photosynthesis and increases hydraulic conductivity of roots. Phosphorus is used in numerous molecular and biochemical plant processes, particularly in energy acquisition, storage and utilization (Epstein and Bloom, 2005) [6].

The role of boron in cell wall integrity, cell division, plasma membranes, phenol metabolism,

and its requirement for the nitrogen fixation and in the reproductive growth of plants. Boron is recognized as an essential micronutrient for vascular plants and is believed to be involved in nucleic acid metabolism, sugar biosynthesis and translocation, active nutrient absorption, regulation of rate of photosynthesis and nodulation process (Prajapati *et al.* 2017)<sup>[19]</sup>. Boron is very important in cell division and in pod and seed formation. Boron ranks third place among micronutrients in its concentration in seed and stem as well as its total amount after zinc (Shil *et al.* 2007)<sup>[25]</sup>.

*Rhizobium* are symbiotic bacteria that facilitate formation of nodules on the roots of legume hosts, within which the bacteria fix atmospheric nitrogen into ammonia. Symbiotic nitrogen fixation is the main route for sustainable input of nitrogen into ecosystems.

### Materials and methods

Field experiments were conducted during the rabi season 2018-19 and 2019-20 at students instructional farm, Chandra Shekhar Azad university of Agriculture & Technology, Kanpur. Initial soil properties of experimental field had sandy loam texture, low in organic carbon 0.35% alkaline pH 7.97 and electrical conductivity 0.36 dsm<sup>-1</sup>. Available N 197.25 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> 12.14 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, K<sub>2</sub>O 265.15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, and B 0.33 mg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The soil samples was analysed for pH, EC by (Jackson 1973)<sup>[8]</sup> and organic carbon by the method described by (Walkley and Black, 1934)<sup>[31]</sup>. Available N was determining by alkaline per magnate method as described by Subbiah and Asija (1956)<sup>[27]</sup>. Available phosphorus was extracted with 0.5 M NaHCO<sub>3</sub> (Olsen *et al.* 1954)<sup>[17]</sup>. The available K was determined by flame photo meter (Jackson 1973)<sup>[8]</sup>. Available boron was determined by Azomethine-H method (Chopra and kanwar 1991)<sup>[5]</sup>. The plant samples were also analyse for N, P, K and B. Nitrogen was determined by Kjeldahl's method (Jackson 1973)<sup>[8]</sup> Phosphorus was estimated by vanadomolybdo phosphoric yellow colour method (Jackson 1973)<sup>[8]</sup>. Potassium was estimated by flame photometric method. Boron was estimated by Azomethine-H method as described by (Chopra and kanwar 1991)<sup>[5]</sup>. The experiment was laid out in factorial randomized block design with three replications. Chickpea cultivar uday was sown in row 45 cm apart on 20 November in 2018 and 21 November in 2019 and harvested on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2019 and 11<sup>th</sup> April in 2020 repectively. Full dose of nitrogen and potash were applied at the time of sowing uniformly. Phosphorus, boron and rhizobium were applied as per treatments. N, P, K and B were applied through urea, SSP, muriate of potash and borax respectively. The crop received two uniform irrigations (pre sowing and pre flowering). The number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup>, number of grains pods<sup>-1</sup>, 100 grains weight in gm and harvest index, grain and straw yield were recorded as per standard procedure. The net return of chickpea grown under various treatments was calculated by subtracting cost of cultivation of individual treatments from gross returns of respective treatments and finally the benefit cost ratio was calculated.

### Results and discussion

**Yield attributes and yield** - the data pertaining to yield attributes and yield of chickpea were presented in table 1 and 2. Experimental results revealed that number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup>, number of grains pod<sup>-1</sup>, test weight (100 grains weight gm) and harvest index % significantly increased due to application of phosphorus, boron and rhizobium inoculation. The number

of pods plant<sup>-1</sup> Varied from 48.85- 67.25, number of grains pods<sup>-1</sup> 1.32- 1.77, 100 grains weight 17.08 to 20.37 and harvest index 41.68 to 44.26 % on the pooled basis. The highest values of number of pods plants<sup>-1</sup> 68.65, number of grains pod<sup>-1</sup> 1.79, 100 grains weight 20.55 gm and harvest index 44.29 % were recorded under T<sub>18</sub> (P<sub>90</sub> +B<sub>2</sub> + rhizobium) and respective minimum were 48.20, 1.30, 16.96 gm and 41.67 % respectively under T<sub>1</sub> (P<sub>0</sub>+B<sub>0</sub>) during first year.

This increased might be due to essentiality of phosphorus for legume growth. Phosphorus always play role in increasing nodule number, biomass and grains development. Symbiotic nitrogen fixation has more phosphorus demand like phosphorus boron is essential micronutrient and essential for cell wall integrity, cell division, nitrogen fixation. Rhizobium is symbiotic bacteria which facilitase nodules formation on the root of legume crop. On the whole all three factors increased yield attributes of chickpea. This finding supported by Meena *et al.* (2001)<sup>[13]</sup>, Umar *et al.* (2001), Malik *et al.* (2002)<sup>[12]</sup>, Bhat *et al.* (2005)<sup>[4]</sup>, Shekhawat and Shivay (2012)<sup>[24]</sup>, Rahman *et al.* (2014)<sup>[21]</sup>, Prajapati *et al.* (2017)<sup>[19]</sup>, Ullah *et al.* (2018)<sup>[28]</sup>, Kumar *et al.* (2019)<sup>[11]</sup>, Meleta and Girma (2019)<sup>[19]</sup> and Rathor *et al.* (2020).

Grain, straw and biological yield of chickpea significantly increased due to phosphorus (60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup>) and boron (1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup>) over their controls. Inoculation of rhizobium further increased grain & stover yield of chickpea significantly over without inoculation. Combine use of phosphorus 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> ha<sup>-1</sup> and boron 1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> alone with rhizobium significantly increased grain 18.52 q ha<sup>-1</sup>, stover 24.44 q ha<sup>-1</sup> and biological yield 42.96 q ha<sup>-1</sup> of chickpea recorded under T<sub>14</sub> (P<sub>60</sub> +B<sub>1</sub> + rhizobium) over other treatments during second year. It may due to rhizobium which fix atmospheric nitrogen and increased the supply of other nutrients to plants and ultimately increased grain and stover yield of chickpea. This finding supported by Jena *et al.* (2009)<sup>[9]</sup>, Singh *et al.* (2014)<sup>[26]</sup>, Alam and Islam (2016)<sup>[1]</sup>, Alam *et al.* (2017)<sup>[2]</sup>, Quddus *et al.* (2018)<sup>[20]</sup>, Kumar *et al.* (2019)<sup>[11]</sup>, Meleta and Girma (2019)<sup>[19]</sup> Neha *et al.* (2019)<sup>[16]</sup> and Rathor *et al.* (2020).

**Profitability:** The maximum gross return Rs. 125546, net return Rs. 86866 and benefit cost ratio 2.24 was found with T<sub>18</sub>(P<sub>90</sub> +B<sub>2</sub>+ *rhizobium*) during second year. The application of phosphorus, boron and *rhizobium* enhanced the gross return with the magnitude of 58.54 percent, net return 45.35 percent and benefit cost ratio 50.34 percent. The minimum gross return Rs.72643, net return Rs. 40919 and benefit cost ratio 1.28 recorded under T<sub>1</sub>(P<sub>0</sub> +B<sub>0</sub>) during first year showed the table number 3. Similar finding of increased the crop yield and profitability with combined application of phosphorus, boron and *rhizobium* inoculation has been reported by Meleta and Girma (2019)<sup>[19]</sup>, Verma *et al.* (2019)<sup>[30]</sup>.

### Conclusions

The current study demonstrate the benefit of phosphorus, boron and *rhizobium* alone with recommended N K for achieving higher productibility and profitability by chickpea crop. Application of phosphorus, boron and rhizobium inoculation increased yield attributes, yield and economics of chickpea crop. Finally it can be concluded that the treatment T<sub>14</sub> (P<sub>60</sub> +B<sub>1</sub>+ *rhizobium*) is a best option for improving productivity and profitability of chickpea crop.

**Table 1:** Effect of treatments on yield attributes of chickpea crop.

Treatments	No. of pods plant <sup>-1</sup>			No. of grains pod <sup>-1</sup>			100 grains wt. in gm			Harvest index		
	2018-19	2019-20	Pooled	2018-19	2019-20	Pooled	2018-19	2019-20	Pooled	2018-19	2019-20	Pooled
T <sub>1</sub>	48.20	49.50	48.85	1.30	1.34	1.32	16.96	17.20	17.08	41.67	41.68	41.68
T <sub>2</sub>	50.30	50.80	50.55	1.41	1.43	1.42	17.25	18.15	17.70	41.77	41.81	41.79
T <sub>3</sub>	51.80	52.10	51.95	1.45	1.48	1.47	17.45	18.40	17.93	41.90	41.93	41.92
T <sub>4</sub>	54.10	57.20	55.65	1.49	1.50	1.495	17.32	17.83	17.57	42.37	42.45	42.41
T <sub>5</sub>	58.35	62.35	60.35	1.58	1.62	1.60	19.05	19.25	19.15	42.83	42.93	42.88
T <sub>6</sub>	60.55	64.40	62.48	1.62	1.67	1.65	19.45	19.64	19.55	43.38	43.44	43.41
T <sub>7</sub>	55.40	59.00	57.20	1.50	1.52	1.51	17.40	17.85	17.63	43.67	43.71	43.69
T <sub>8</sub>	59.45	63.35	61.40	1.59	1.64	1.62	19.13	19.32	19.23	43.89	44.07	43.98
T <sub>9</sub>	61.85	65.40	63.63	1.64	1.68	1.66	19.75	19.73	19.74	44.15	44.27	44.21
T <sub>10</sub>	49.40	51.20	50.30	1.50	1.58	1.54	16.99	17.47	17.23	41.70	41.72	41.71
T <sub>11</sub>	54.50	54.70	54.60	1.56	1.64	1.60	17.89	18.90	18.40	41.79	41.84	41.82
T <sub>12</sub>	55.70	56.20	55.95	1.59	1.67	1.67	17.99	18.98	18.49	41.90	42.02	41.96
T <sub>13</sub>	55.40	59.10	57.25	1.60	1.62	1.61	17.45	17.99	17.72	42.46	42.61	42.54
T <sub>14</sub>	63.45	66.40	64.93	1.69	1.71	1.70	19.85	19.97	19.91	42.99	43.10	43.04
T <sub>15</sub>	65.35	67.85	66.60	1.73	1.77	1.75	20.15	20.49	20.32	43.39	43.57	43.48
T <sub>16</sub>	57.20	61.20	59.20	1.61	1.64	1.63	17.52	18.02	17.77	43.73	43.87	43.80
T <sub>17</sub>	64.55	67.55	66.05	1.71	1.73	1.72	19.92	20.02	19.97	44.05	44.09	44.07
T <sub>18</sub>	65.85	68.65	67.25	1.75	1.79	1.77	20.20	20.55	20.37	44.23	44.29	44.26
Overall mean	57.30	59.83	58.57	1.57	1.61	1.59	18.43	18.88	18.65	42.88	42.97	42.93
SEm±	P 0.82	P 0.95	P 0.62	P 0.04	P 0.04	P 0.03	P 0.27	P 0.32	P 0.20	P 0.16	P 0.16	P 0.12
	B 0.82	B 0.95	B 0.62	B 0.04	B 0.04	B 0.03	B 0.27	B 0.31	B 0.20	B 0.16	B 0.16	B 0.12
	Rh 0.67	Rh 0.78	Rh 0.50	Rh 0.03	Rh 0.03	Rh 0.02	Rh 0.22	Rh 0.26	Rh 0.16			
C.D. at 5%	P 1.66	P 1.93	P 1.25	P 0.08	P 0.09	P 0.06	P 0.56	P 0.64	P 0.42	P 0.32	P 0.33	P N.S.
	B 1.66	B 1.93	B 1.25	B 0.08	B 0.09	B 0.06	B 0.56	B 0.64	B 0.42	B 0.32	B 0.33	B N.S.
	Rh 1.35	Rh 1.58	Rh 1.02	Rh 0.06	Rh 0.07	Rh 0.05	Rh 0.46	Rh 0.52	Rh 0.35			

T<sub>1</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> ( 0kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium* ), T<sub>2</sub> : P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (0 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>3</sub> : P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (0 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>4</sub> : P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>5</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>6</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>7</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>8</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>9</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>10</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>11</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>12</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>13</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>14</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>15</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>16</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>17</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>18</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*).

**Table 2:** Effect of treatments on grain, straw and biological yield of chickpea crop.

Treatments	Yield (q ha <sup>-1</sup> )								
	Grain			Stover			Biological		
	2018-19	2019-20	Pooled	2018-19	2019-20	Pooled	2018-19	2019-20	Pooled
T <sub>1</sub>	12.07	12.40	12.24	16.88	17.34	17.11	28.94	29.74	29.34
T <sub>2</sub>	13.92	14.10	14.01	19.40	19.62	19.51	33.32	33.38	33.35
T <sub>3</sub>	14.85	15.10	14.98	20.59	20.91	20.75	35.44	36.01	35.73
T <sub>4</sub>	14.37	14.65	14.51	19.54	19.86	19.70	33.91	34.51	34.21
T <sub>5</sub>	16.65	16.90	16.78	22.22	22.46	22.34	38.87	39.36	39.11
T <sub>6</sub>	17.71	17.89	17.80	23.11	23.29	23.20	40.82	41.18	41.00
T <sub>7</sub>	15.68	15.82	15.75	20.22	20.37	20.30	35.90	36.17	36.04
T <sub>8</sub>	17.95	18.13	18.04	22.94	23.00	22.97	40.87	41.13	41.01
T <sub>9</sub>	18.51	18.72	18.62	23.41	23.56	23.48	41.92	42.28	42.10
T <sub>10</sub>	13.42	13.85	13.64	18.76	19.34	19.05	32.19	33.19	32.69
T <sub>11</sub>	15.15	15.80	15.47	21.10	21.96	21.53	36.25	37.76	37.00
T <sub>12</sub>	16.05	16.30	16.18	22.21	22.49	22.35	38.26	38.79	38.53
T <sub>13</sub>	16.92	17.05	16.99	22.92	22.96	22.94	39.84	40.01	39.92
T <sub>14</sub>	18.15	18.52	18.33	24.06	24.44	24.25	42.21	42.96	42.59
T <sub>15</sub>	19.05	19.33	19.19	24.76	25.03	24.89	43.81	44.36	44.09
T <sub>16</sub>	17.82	18.03	17.93	22.93	23.16	23.05	40.75	41.19	40.97
T <sub>17</sub>	19.00	19.32	19.16	24.13	24.49	24.31	43.13	43.81	43.47
T <sub>18</sub>	19.65	19.90	19.78	24.77	25.94	25.35	44.42	44.93	44.67
Overall Mean	16.50	16.76	16.63	21.89	22.23	22.06	38.38	38.93	38.66
SEm±	P 0.55	P 0.61	P 0.40	P 0.69	P 0.89	P 0.54	P 0.82	P 0.93	P 0.61
	B 0.55	B 0.61	B 0.40	B 0.69	B 0.89	B 0.54	B 0.82	B 0.93	B 0.61
	Rh 0.45	Rh 0.50	Rh 0.32	Rh 0.56	Rh 0.72	Rh 0.42	Rh 0.67	Rh 0.76	Rh 0.52
C.D. at 5%	P 1.12	P 1.24	P 0.82	P 1.39	P 1.79	P 1.11	P 1.66	P 1.89	P 1.24
	B 1.12	B 1.24	B 0.82	B 1.39	B 1.79	B 1.11	B 1.66	B 1.89	B 1.24
	Rh 0.92	Rh 1.01	Rh 0.67	Rh 1.13	Rh 1.46	Rh 0.87	Rh 1.35	Rh 1.51	Rh 1.06

T<sub>1</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> ( 0kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium* ), T<sub>2</sub> : P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (0 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>3</sub> : P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (0 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>4</sub> : P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>5</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>6</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub>

Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>7</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>8</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>9</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>10</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>11</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>12</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>13</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>14</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>15</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>16</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>17</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>18</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*).

**Table 3:** Effect of treatments on economics of various treatments of chickpea crop.

Treatment	Total cost of cultivation (₹ ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Gross income (₹ ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Net return (₹ ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Benefit cost ratio (B:C)	
	2018-19	2019-20	2018-19	2019-20	2018-19	2019-20	2018-19	2019-20
T <sub>1</sub>	31724		72643	79187	40919	47463	1.28	1.49
T <sub>2</sub>	32864		83710	90319	50846	57455	1.54	1.74
T <sub>3</sub>	34004		89197	96613	55193	62609	1.62	1.84
T <sub>4</sub>	34724		85929	93264	51205	58540	1.47	1.68
T <sub>5</sub>	35864		99143	107093	63279	71229	1.76	1.98
T <sub>6</sub>	37004		104930	112832	67926	75828	1.83	2.04
T <sub>7</sub>	36220		92661	99529	56441	63309	1.55	1.74
T <sub>8</sub>	37360		105869	113683	68509	76323	1.83	2.04
T <sub>9</sub>	38500		108926	117176	70426	78676	1.83	2.04
T <sub>10</sub>	31924		80760	88792	48836	56868	1.52	1.78
T <sub>11</sub>	33064		91093	101181	58029	68117	1.75	2.06
T <sub>12</sub>	34204		96316	104201	62157	69997	1.81	2.04
T <sub>13</sub>	34924		101090.00	108374	66166	73450	1.89	2.10
T <sub>14</sub>	36064		107913.00	117169	71849	81105	1.99	2.24
T <sub>15</sub>	37204		112771.00	121766	75567	84562	2.03	2.27
T <sub>16</sub>	36420		105258	113372	68838	76952	1.89	2.11
T <sub>17</sub>	37560		111910	121124	74350	83564	1.97	2.22
T <sub>18</sub>	38700		115553	125546	76853	86846	1.98	2.24
Overall mean	35463		98093	106179	62633	70716	1.75	1.98
SEm±			P 471.53 B 471.53 Rh 385.00	P 483.97 B 483.97 Rh 395.16	P 668.09 B 668.09 Rh 545.50	P 561.72 B 561.72 Rh 458.64	P 0.046 B 0.046 Rh 0.037	P 0.062 B 0.062 Rh 0.051
C.D. at 5%			P 974.19 B 974.19 Rh 995.42	P 999.89 B 999.89 Rh 816.60	P 1380.29 B 1380.29 Rh 1127.00	P 1160.52 B 1160.52 Rh 947.65	P 0.095 B 0.095 Rh 0.077	P 0.129 B 0.129 Rh 0.105

T<sub>1</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (0 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>2</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (0 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>3</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (0 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>4</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>5</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>6</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (60 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>7</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>8</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>9</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>0</sub> (90 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> without *Rhizobium*), T<sub>10</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>11</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>12</sub>: P<sub>0</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (0 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>13</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>14</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>15</sub>: P<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (60 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>16</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>0</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P+0 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>17</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>1</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P+1 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*), T<sub>18</sub>: P<sub>2</sub>B<sub>2</sub> Rh<sub>1</sub> (90 kg P+2 kg B ha<sup>-1</sup> with *Rhizobium*).

## References

- Alam MS, Islam MF. Effect of zinc and boron on seed yield and yield contributing traits of mungbean in acidic soil. *Journal of Bioscience and Agriculture Research*. 2016;11(2):941-946.
- Alam MS, Aliand KJ, Hoque A. Yield and yield component of chickpea as affected by boron application. *Int. J Exp. Agric*. 2017;15(2):1-9.
- Bejiga G, Van der Maesen LJG. *Cicer arietinum* L. *Plant Resources of Tropical Africa*. 2006;1:42-46.
- Bhat B, Kumar N, Chandra R. *Rhizobium* and VAM inoculation effect on mungbean (*Vignaradiata*) with varying phosphorus levels. *Legume Res*. 2005;26(6):284-287.
- Chopra SL, Kanwar JS. *Analytical agriculture chemistry*. Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi, 1991.
- Epstein E, Bloom AJ. *Mineral nutrition of plants: Principles and perspectives*, 2nd ed. Sunderland, Massachusetts: Sinauer Associates, 2005.
- Gomez KA, Gomez AA. *Statistical procedures for Agriculture Research*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edn. John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1984, 194.
- Jackson ML. *Soil chemical analysis*. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi, 1973.
- Jena D, Nayak SC, Mohanty B, Jena. Mukhi SK. Effect of boron and boron enriched organic manure on yield and quality of groundnut in boron deficient alfisol. *Environment and Ecology*. 2009;237(2):685-688.
- Jukanti AK, Gaur PM, Gowda CLL, Chibbar RN. Nutritional quality and health benefits of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *A Review British J Nutr*. 2012;108:S11-S26.
- Kumar J, Kumar S, Prakash V. Effect of Biofertilizers and Phosphorus Levels on Soil Fertility, Yield and Nodulation in Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2019;67(2):199-203.
- Malik MA, Hussain S, Warraich EA, Habib, UUah S. Effect of seed inoculation and phosphorus application on growth, seed yield and quality of mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.) cv. NM-98. *International Journal of Agriculture and Biology*. 2002;4(4):515-516.
- Meena LR, Singh RK, Gautam RC. Effect of conserved soil moisture, phosphorus levels and bacterial inoculation on dry matter production and uptake pattern of phosphorus by chickpea. *Indian J Pulse Res*. 2001;18:32-35.
- Meleta T, Girma A. Effects of *Rhizobium* Inoculation and Phosphorus Fertilizer Rates on Growth, Yield and Yield Components of Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) at Goro, Bale Zone, Oromia Regional State. *International*

- Journal of Applied Agricultural Sciences. 2019;5(3):62-70.
15. Mhango WG, Mughogho SK, Sakala WD, Saka AR. The effect of phosphorous and sulphur fertilizers on grain Legumes and maize productivity in Northern Malawi. Bunda Journal of Agriculture, Environmental Science and Technology. 2008;3:20-27.
  16. Neha, Pareek N, Raverkar KP. Effect of rhizobium and PGPR inoculation in mungbean on productivity and soil properties in mungbean-wheat sequence. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2019;67(4):458-464.
  17. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanable FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorous in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. USDA, Cric. 1954;930:19-23.
  18. Plaxton WC. Plant response to stress: biochemical adaptations to phosphate deficiency. *In: Goodman R (eds.) Encyclopedia of Plant and Crop Science.* New York: Marcel Dekker, 2004, pp.976-980.
  19. Prajapati MK, Kumar V, Singh RP, Jayant H, Ram S. Effect of nitrogen levels and micronutrients on yield of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) in indo gangatic plain of Varanasi. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017, SP1:999-1001.
  20. Quddus MA, Hossain MA, Naser HM, Naher N, Khatun F. Response of chickpea varieties to boron application in calcareous and terrace soils of banladesh. Bangladesh J. Agril. Res. 2018;43(4):543-556.
  21. Rahman MS, Islam MN, Shaheb MR, Arafat MA, Sarker PC, Sarker MH. Effect of seed treatment with boron and molybdenum on the yield and seed quality of chickpea. Int. J Expt. Agric. 2014;4(3):1-6.
  22. Rathod S, Channakeshava S, Basavaraja B, Shashidhara KS. Effect of soil and foliar application of zinc and Boron on growth, yield and micro nutrient uptake of Chickpea. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2020;9(4):3356-3360.
  23. Schulze J, Temple G, Temple SJ, Beschow H, Vance CP. Nitrogen fixation by white lupin under phosphorus deficiency. Annals of Botany. 2006;98:731-740.
  24. Shekhawat K, Shivay YS. Residual effect of nitroge sources sulfur and boron levels on mungbean (*Vigna radiata*) in sunflower (*Helianthus annus*) Mungbean system. Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science. 2012;58(7):765-776.
  25. Shil NC, Noor S, Hossain MA. Effect of boron and molybdenum on the yield of chickpea. Agri. J of Rural Dev. 2007;5(1&2):17-24.
  26. Singh AK, Khan MA, Srivastava A. Effect of boron and molybdenum application on seed yield of mungbean. Asia. J Biol. Sci. 2014;9(2):169-172.
  27. Subbiah BV, Asija CL. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available N in soil. Curr. Sci. 1956;25:259-260.
  28. Ullah S, Jan A, Ali M, Ahmad A, Ullah A, Ahmad G *et al.* Effet of phosphorus and zinc under different application methods on yield attributes of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). IJAAER. 2018;3(1):79-85.
  29. Umar M, Khaliq A, Tariq M. J Bio. Sci. 2001;1(6):427-428.
  30. Verma VK, Yadav J, Kumar S, Pyare R, Verma M. Superimposition effect of sulphur, boron, FYM and Rhizobium on productivity of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2019;8(3):2193-2195.
  31. Walkley A, Black CSA. Old piper, S.S. soil and plant analysis. Soil Sci. 1934;37:29-38.