www.ThePharmaJournal.com

# The Pharma Innovation



ISSN (E): 2277-7695 ISSN (P): 2349-8242 NAAS Rating: 5.23 TPI 2022; 11(12): 5661-5672 © 2022 TPI www.thepharmajournal.com Received: 02-09-2022 Accepted: 06-10-2022

P Anji Babu

#### Ph.D., Scholar, Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Agricultural College, Bapatla, Andhra Pradesh, India

#### A Lalitha Kumari

Professor and Head, Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Agricultural College, Bapatla, Andhra Pradesh, India

#### D Srinivas

Associate Dean (Soil science), Agricultural College, Naira, Andhra Pradesh, India

P Venkata Subbaiah Programme Coordinator,

KVK, Garikapadu, Andhra Pradesh, India

#### K Srinivasulu

Professor, Department of Agronomy, Agricultural College, Bapatla, Andhra Pradesh, India

#### D Ramesh

Assistant Professor, Department of Statistics and Computer Applications, Agricultural College, Bapatla, Andhra Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author: P Anji Babu Ph.D., Scholar, Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Agricultural College, Bapatla, Andhra Pradesh, India

## Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on plant micro nutrient content in direct seeded rice

### P Anji Babu, A Lalitha Kumari, D Srinivas, P Venkata Subbaiah, K Srinivasulu and D Ramesh

#### Abstract

Micronutrients help in chlorophyll formation, nucleic acid, protein synthesis and play an active role in several enzymatic activities of photosynthesis as well as respiration and influences rice and black gram yields. This study aims to examine the integrated effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on plant micronutrient contents in direct seeded rice.

The experiment was laid out in split – split plot design with main, sub and sub-sub plots with direct seeded rice–black gram cropping sequence. The main plot comprised of two levels of fertilizers *viz.*, F<sub>1</sub>-100% RDF and F<sub>2</sub>-75% RDF, the sub plot comprised of two doses of pigeon pea bio char *viz.*, B<sub>1</sub> – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and B<sub>4</sub>- Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and the sub-sub plot comprised of two levels of humic acid *viz.*, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and replicated thrice.

The results of this study showed that, significantly higher iron and manganese contents in plant was recorded with the application of B<sub>4</sub>- Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> at all the growth stages of direct seeded rice, whereas, the higher zinc (except in panicle initiation stage) and copper content was significantly recorded with application of B<sub>4</sub>- Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> only. However, the zinc content in panicle initiation stage significantly influenced by the application of B<sub>4</sub>- Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Significant interaction effect was observed between B<sub>4</sub> - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>2</sub> - 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>4</sub>S<sub>2</sub>) in manganese content at active tillering and panicle initiation stages of *kharif* direct seeded rice during two years of study.

Keywords: Green leaf manure, humic acid and Micro nutrient content

#### Introduction

Cultivation of high yielding crop varieties and multiple cropping is depleting the fertility of soils at a rapid pace. The soils, which were, once well supplied with available nutrients, are now gradually becoming deficient. Soil organic matter encourages granulation, increases cation exchange capacity (CEC) and is responsible for adsorbing power of the soils up to 90%. Cations such as  $Ca^{2+}$ ,  $Mg^{2+}$  and  $K^+$  are produced during decomposition. Addition of organic materials like green leaf manure increases the availability of micronutrients. The increased availability was attributed to enhanced microbial activity in the soil and the consequent release of complex organic substances that could have prevented micronutrients from precipitation, fixation, oxidation and leaching and also addition of these nutrients through organic sources. The unbalanced use of N fertilizers has at times led to environmental confrontations, disturbance in soil nutrient balance and depletion of soil fertility. Even the introduction of high yielding varieties and intensive cultivation with excess and imbalanced use of chemical fertilizers and irrigation showed reduction in the soil fertility status.

Rice-pulse (Green gram/Black gram) is the predominant cropping system of major rice growing areas of Andhra Pradesh. This cropping sequence is practically feasible, viable, economical, eco-friendly, water saving technology for sustaining soil fertility and rice productivity. Thus, increasing soil fertility and long-term sustainable production of direct seeded rice – black gram cropping sequence through the integrated application of bio char, green leaf manure, paddy straw and humic acid along with inorganic fertilizers is of significant importance to mitigate the problems of fertilizer consumption, environmental contamination, and economic cost of the production of direct seeded rice – black gram cropping sequence, while maintaining the soil fertility, crop yield and soil quality.

Green leaf contains higher content of easily mineralizable nitrogen. Karanj (*Pongamia pinnata* L. Pierre) is one of the nitrogen fixing trees (NFTS) medium sized deciduous and are

commonly found in many rural areas and it is an easily available and cheapest source of nutrient which can be used as green leaf manure. Incorporation of pongamia leaves improves soil fertility and had favourable effect on growth and yield of many crops. Rice straw is the source of primary, secondary and micronutrients to the plant growth and constant source of energy for heterotrophic microorganisms which help in increasing availability of nutrients, quality and quantity of crop produce, it can be hypothesized that the use of proper combination of these locally available organic wastes which are narrow in C:N ratio and safe to apply for agricultural purposes, is as critical as that for integrated use. Humic substances are major components of organic matter, have both direct and indirect effects on plant growth (Sangeetha et al., 2006) [10]. Humic acid (HA) improves the physical chemical and biological properties of the soil and influences plant growth. Because of its molecular structure, it provides numerous benefits to crop production. It helps to maintain soil structure, assisting in transferring the nutrients from the soil to the plant, enhances the water retention, increases seed germination rate, improves water availability, root penetration and stimulates development of micro flora population in the soils. Humic acid though is not a fertilizer but considered complementary to fertilizer.

Integrated application of bio char, green leaf manure, paddy straw and humic acid along with inorganic fertilizers could be one of the primary game-changer in soil fertility and longterm sustainable production of direct seeded rice – black gram cropping sequence. Therefore, we made a complete focus in our research study to compare and explore the positive effects of the integrated application of bio char, humic acid and other amendments on carbon contents, stocks and soil quality in direct seeded rice – black gram cropping sequence. As a part of our study we are presenting the one of the objective of our study *i.e.* micro nutrient contents in direct seeded rice.

#### Material and Methods

#### **Experimental site description**

Field experiment were carried out during *kharif* and *rabi* seasons of 2020-21 and 2021-22 at Agricultural College Farm, Bapatla, geographically located at an altitude of 5.49 m above mean sea level,  $15^{\circ}$  54' North latitude,  $80^{\circ}$  30' East longitude and about 8 km away from Bay of Bengal. It is located in Krishna agro-climatic zone of Andhra Pradesh. The experimental soil was neutral in reaction, low in electrical conductivity, while all micro-nutrients [(Fe: 6.96 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), (Mn: 3.80 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), (Zn: 1.01 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and (Cu: 2.15 mg kg<sup>-</sup>)] were above critical levels.

#### **Experimental design and treatments**

The experiment was laid out in split – split plot design with main, sub and sub-sub plots with direct seeded rice–black gram cropping sequence. The main plot comprised of two levels of fertilizers *viz.*, F<sub>1</sub>- 100% RDF and F<sub>2</sub>- 75% RDF, the sub plot comprised of two doses of pigeon pea bio char *viz.*, B<sub>1</sub> - Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> - Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and B<sub>4</sub>- Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and the sub-sub plot comprised of two levels of humic acid *viz.*, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and replicated thrice. The *rabi* experiment was continued on the same site without disturbing the soil with black gram as test crop to study the residual effect of different nutrient sources applied to preceding rice crop.

#### **Plant Analysis details**

#### **Collection and Preparation of Plant Samples**

The plant samples collected (at tillering, panicle initiation and at harvest stages) in direct seeded rice and (30, 60 days and harvest stages) in black gram were washed with dilute HCl and then with double distilled water. The samples were shade dried initially and then oven dried at 65°C temperature and powdered.

**Micronutrients Fe, Mn, Cu, Zn:** Zinc, copper, manganese, and iron in the diacid extract were determined using atomic absorption spectrophotometer as per the specifications mentioned by Lindsay and Norvell (1978)<sup>[6]</sup>.

#### Results and Discussion Micro nutrient content in direct seeded rice Iron content

Close observation of data related to iron content in direct seeded rice presented in table 1, 2, 3 and 4, revealed that different nutrient management in sub plots viz.,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $B_3$  and  $B_4$  had shown significant influence on iron content. Irrespective of the growth stage of direct seeded rice and year of the study, application of  $B_4$  – Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded significantly higher iron content [(601.99 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 607.95 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (548.51 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 554.98 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (178.93 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 183.55 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021) and (411.67 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 419.53 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021)] at active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages respectively in direct seeded rice.

The increased Fe content due to combined application of green leaf manure and inorganic sources over RDF alone might be due to the supply of chelating agents by organic materials, which help in maintaining the solubility of micronutrients including Fe. The profound influence of organic matter on the solubility of Fe was proved by Debiprasad *et al.* (2010) <sup>[4]</sup>. Irrespective of the year of the study, the Fe content in rice decreased with the growth stage from active tillering to harvest stage. Among different organic sources, green leaf manure recorded maximum Fe content at all stages over others. These results were in conformity with the findings of Shinde *et al.* (2017) <sup>[12]</sup> and Shahi *et al.* (2017) <sup>[11]</sup> who recorded increased iron content at early stages of rice crop.

Among the two levels of humic acid application, the  $S_2 - 30$  kg ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded significantly higher iron content [(495.30 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 501.19 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (445.85 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 451.25 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (162.13 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 166.23 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021) and (373.02 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 379.08 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021)] than  $S_1 - 20$  kg ha<sup>-1</sup> humic acid application in active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages respectively in direct seeded rice. Nikbakht *et al.* (2008) <sup>[8]</sup>, Celik, *et al.* (2010) <sup>[1]</sup>, also recorded similar results. However the individual effect of RDF and interaction effect between RDF, B<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>2</sub>, B<sub>3</sub>, B<sub>4</sub> and two doses of humic acid application on iron content was found non-significant.

#### Manganese Content

Manganese content in direct seeded rice at all growth stages [(tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw)] was presented in the tables 5, 6, 7 and 8. Perusal of the data revealed that the application of  $B_4$  – Green leaf manure @ 6 t

ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded significantly higher manganese content [(216.31 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 220.39 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (198.07 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 202.00 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (48.63 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 55.00 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021) and (117.48 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 122.65 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021)] at active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages respectively in direct seeded rice.

The results of the present study revealed that the combined application of organics (*viz.*, paddy straw and green leaf manure) and inorganic fertilizers recorded highest manganese content. This might be due to increased water soluble, exchangeable and easily reducible fractions of Mn in soil. Irrespective of the year of study, the Mn content in rice straw decreased with the advancement of crop growth from active tillering to harvest indicating the dilution effect (Debiprasad *et al.*, 2010)<sup>[4]</sup>.

Among the two levels of humic acid application, the  $S_2 - 30$  kg ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded significantly higher manganese content [(180.50 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 184.44 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (159.84 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 163.37 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (44.27 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 49.37 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021) and (105.11 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 49.74 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021)] than  $S_1 - 20$  kg ha<sup>-1</sup> humic acid application in active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages respectively in direct seeded rice. Turan *et al.* (2011) <sup>[13]</sup>, Asri *et al.* (2015) <sup>[1]</sup>, also recorded similar results.

The significant interaction was established between B and S. The higher interaction effect was observed between  $B_4$  – Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and  $S_2$  – 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>4</sub>S<sub>2</sub>) (220.40 and 224.62 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 2021 respectively) at active tillering stage and it was on par with the application of  $B_4$  – Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and  $S_1$  – 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>4</sub>S<sub>1</sub>) (212.23 and 216.17 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 2021 respectively) and with the application of  $B_3$  - Paddy straw @ 5t ha<sup>-1</sup> and  $S_2$  – 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>3</sub>S<sub>2</sub>) (210.93 and 214.79 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 2021 respectively) at active tillering stage in direct seeded rice.

In panicle initiation stage, the same significant B and S interaction effect was found. The higher interaction effect was observed between  $B_4$  – Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and  $S_2$  – 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> ( $B_4S_2$ ) (200.51 and 203.99 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 2021 respectively) and it was on par with the application of  $B_4$  – Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and  $S_1$  – 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> ( $B_4S_1$ ) (195.63 and 200.01 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 2021 respectively) at panicle initiation stage in direct seeded rice.

However the individual effect of RDF and interaction effect between RDF,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $B_3$ ,  $B_4$ ; F and S interaction effect on manganese content was found non-significant at active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages in direct seeded rice.

#### **Zinc Content**

Data pertaining to zinc content presented in tables 9, 10, 11 and 12, revealed that the zinc content was significantly influenced by the individual effect of green leaf manure and two levels of humic acid. However the individual effect of RDF and interaction effect between RDF, B<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>2</sub>, B<sub>3</sub>, B<sub>4</sub>; F and S; B and S; was found non-significant on zinc content in active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages in direct seeded rice.

The significantly higher zinc content was recorded with the

application of  $B_4$  – Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> [(46.76 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 52.61 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (41.68 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 47.40 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (29.00 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 34.96 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021) and (22.99 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 28.26 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021)] at active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages respectively in direct seeded rice.

Increase in concentration of zinc with application of organics along with the inorganics was probably due to chelation of zinc with organic ligands, which might have enhanced the availability of zinc and its absorption by the plants. The result of this study was in accordance with the findings of Muthukumararaja and Sriramachandrasekharan (2014)<sup>[7]</sup>. Nitrogen enhances zinc content partly through growth promotion but mainly by increasing soil Zn solubility and root efficiency for Zn absorption as reported by Ghoneim *et al* (2016)<sup>[5]</sup>. The higher nutrient content in organics treated plot might be due to its effect on microbial activity that in turn enhanced the rate of decomposition of organic matter and solubility of nutrients.

Irrespective of the year of the study, the Zn content in rice decreased with the growth stage from active tillering to harvest stage in straw due to dilution effect and as the Zn content in grain was higher when compared to straw. The decreased zinc content with the advancement of crop growth could be due to highest utilization of zinc in the synthesis of some growth promoting hormones and in the reproductive processes of plants which are vital for grain formation. Similar results were reported by Prakash *et al.* (2019) <sup>[9]</sup>.

Whereas in panicle initiation stage only, among the two levels of humic acid application, the  $S_2 - 30$  kg ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded significantly higher zinc content (35.93 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 40.59 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021) with compare to  $S_1 - 20$  kg ha<sup>-1</sup> humic acid application in direct seeded rice. However, the same humic acid application showed non-significant individual effect in other growth stages like active tillering and harvest (grain and straw) stages. Similar results were reported by Nikbakht *et al.* (2008) <sup>[8]</sup>.

With regard to the other individual effect like RDF and interaction effect between RDF,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $B_3$ ,  $B_4$ ; F and S; on zinc content was found non-significant in active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages in direct seeded rice.

#### **Copper Content**

Data pertaining to copper content presented in tables 13, 14, 15 and 16, revealed that the copper content was significantly influenced by the application green leaf manure. However the individual effect of RDF, two levels of humic acid application and interaction effect between RDF, B<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>2</sub>, B<sub>3</sub>, B<sub>4</sub>; F and S; B and S; was found non-significant on copper content in active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages in direct seeded rice.

The significantly higher copper content was recorded in application of  $B_4$  – Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> [(19.33 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 25.85 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (16.77 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 20.09 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021), (7.36 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 10.34 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021) and (8.75 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in *Kharif* 2020 and 10.81 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> *Kharif* 2021)] at active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages respectively in direct seeded rice.

Irrespective of the year of the study, the Cu content in rice decreased with the growth stage from active tillering to

panicle initiation stage. When compared to Cu content in grain, straw at harvest was higher in all treatments. Among different organic sources, green leaf manure recorded maximum Cu content at all stages over others.

The increase in Cu content due to combined application of green leaf manure and inorganics might be due to better root proliferation which helped in the absorption of Cu from native source under favourable reduced conditions (Debiprasad *et al.*, 2010)<sup>[4]</sup>. Cu had a strong affinity for the N atom of amino

groups and it appeared quite likely that soluble N compounds like amino acids act as Cu carriers in xylem and phloem Davari *et al.* (2012)<sup>[3]</sup>.

With regard to the other individual effect like RDF and interaction effect between RDF,  $B_1$ ,  $B_2$ ,  $B_3$ ,  $B_4$ ; F and S; on copper content was found non-significant in active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest (grain and straw) stages in direct seeded rice.

			Kharif - 20	20			Kharif - 2	021	
RDF	Bio char, Paddy straw		Humic Ac	id			Humic A	cid	
	and Greenleaf manure	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	$\mathbf{S}_2$	<i>if</i> - 2021 <i>ic</i> Acid F x B F 379.15 416.72 544.45 610.58 3 377.27 415.22 540.62 605.32 B Mean 5 378.21 0 415.97 5 542.54 5 607.95 0 0 0 8.29 7.75 7.41	F Mean
	B1	371.66	375.41	373.54		375.75	382.55	379.15	
	B2	409.05	414.17	411.61	400.11	413.20	420.24	416.72	407 72
$\mathbf{F}_1$	B3	507.63	572.10	539.87	482.11	511.69	577.21	544.45	487.73
	<b>B</b> 4	583.18	623.70	603.44		590.86	630.30	610.58	
	F x S	467.88	496.35			472.88	502.58	610.58 377.27 415.22 540.62 605.32 <b>B Mea</b> 378.2 415.9 542.5 607.9:	
	<b>B</b> 1	370.04	374.16	372.10		374.39	380.15	377.27	
	B <sub>2</sub>	403.68	411.60	407.64		413.51	416.93	415.22	
$F_2$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	498.02	569.31	533.67	478.49	506.33	574.91	540.62	484.61
-	<b>B</b> <sub>4</sub>	579.10	621.97	600.53		583.43	627.20	605.32	
	F x S	462.71	494.26			469.42	499.80		
	B x S			B Mea	an	E	S x S	B M	ean
	$B_1$	370.85	374.79	372.8	2	375.07	381.35	378.	21
	$B_2$	406.37	412.88	409.6	3	413.36	418.59	415.	97
	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	502.83	570.71	536.7	7	509.01	576.06	542.	.54
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	581.14	622.84	601.9	9	587.15	628.75	607.	95
	S Mean	465.30	495.30			471.15	501.19		
	Factor	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (%	ó)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	(%)
	F	8.360	NS	8.53		8.228	NS	8.2	9
	В	11.139	34.32	8.03		10.881	33.53	7.7	5
	S	6.625	19.86	7.76		6.356	19.06	7.4	-1
	F x B	15.753	NS			15.387	NS		
	F x S	9.369	NS			8.989	NS		
	B x S	13.250	NS			12.713	NS		
	FxBxS	18.738	NS			17.979	NS		

F<sub>1</sub>: 100% RDF, F<sub>2</sub>: 75% RDF, B<sub>1</sub> – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>4</sub> - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

Table 2: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on iron content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) at panicle initiation stage of direct seeded rice

	Dia ahan Daddu atnow		Kharif - 20	020			Kharif - 20	)21	
RDF	and Croon loof manuna		Humic A	cid			Humic Ac	cid	
	and Green lear manure	<b>S</b> 1	S2	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	<b>S</b> <sub>2</sub>	F x B	F Mean
	<b>B</b> 1	329.84	337.08	333.46		334.10	342.00	338.05	
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	361.77	368.83	365.30	424.05	365.81	374.45	370.13	420.10
$F_1$	B <sub>3</sub>	459.85	515.17	487.51	434.05	465.65	519.57	492.61	439.10
	B4	534.10	565.79	549.95		538.43	572.82	555.63	
	F x S	421.39	446.72			426.00	452.21		
	B1	326.35	335.47	330.91		331.01	339.80	335.41	
	B <sub>2</sub>	359.18	368.20	363.69	431.41	362.85	372.11	367.48	
F <sub>2</sub>	B3	452.76	515.15	483.96		462.01	518.84	490.43	436.91
	B4	533.08	561.07	547.08		538.22	570.43	554.33	
	F x S	417.84	444.97			423.52	450.30		
	B x	S		B Me	ean	E	B x S	B M	lean
	$B_1$	328.09	336.27	332.	18	332.56	340.90	336	5.73
	$B_2$	360.47	368.52	364.	49	364.33	373.28	368	5.80
	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	456.31	515.16	485.	73	463.83	519.21	491	.52
	$B_4$	533.59	563.43	548.	51	538.33	571.63	554	.98
	S Mean	419.62	445.85			424.76	451.25		
Factor		SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)
F		6.859	NS	8.7	7	7.245	NS	8.	10
B		10.486	32.31	8.3	9	10.791	33.25	8.	53
	S	6.034	18.09	7.8	3	5.624	16.86	7.	29

F x B	14.829	NS	15.26	) NS	
F x S	8.533	NS	7.953	NS	
B x S	12.068	NS	11.24	' NS	
FxBxS	17.066	NS	15.90	5 NS	

F1: 100% RDF, F2: 75% RDF, B1 – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B2 – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B3 - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B4 - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, S1 - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, S2 - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

Table 3: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on iron content (mg kg-1) in grain of direct seeded rice

			Kharif - 2(	020			Kharif - 20	21	
RDF       F1       F2	Bio char, Paddy straw		Humic Ac	cid			Humic Ac	id	
	and Greemeal manure	S1	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	S2	F x B	F Mean
	B1	132.47	141.03	136.75		135.65	145.53	140.59	
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	153.29	158.87	156.08	1(0.22	157.94	162.22	160.08	164.16
$F_1$	B3	165.40	169.52	167.46	100.22	169.39	174.08	171.73	104.10
	B4	177.59	183.62	180.61		181.24	187.19	184.21	
	F x S	157.19	163.26			161.05	167.26		
	<b>B</b> <sub>1</sub>	125.73	139.36	132.55		132.33         143.03         137.68           156.11         160.23         158.17           168.96         172.05         170.50           180.25         185.52         182.89           150.41         165.21			
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	152.26	156.49	154.38		156.11	160.23	158.17	162.31
F <sub>2</sub>	B3	164.31	167.54	165.92	157.52	168.96	172.05	170.50	
	B4	173.88	180.62	177.25		180.25	185.52	182.89	
	F x S	154.04	161.00			159.41	165.21		
	B x	S		B Me	an	E	3 x S	B M	ean
	$B_1$	129.10	140.20	134.0	55	133.99	144.28	139	.14
	$B_2$	152.78	157.68	155.2	23	157.03	161.23	159	.13
	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	164.85	168.53	166.0	59	169.18	173.06	171	.12
	$B_4$	175.74	182.12	178.9	93	180.74	186.35	183	.55
	S Mean	155.62	162.13			160.23	166.23		
	Factor	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (*	%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)
	F	2.430	NS	8.49	)	2.648	NS	8.9	95
	В	3.826	11.79	8.34	1	3.668	11.30	7.7	79
	S	1.778	5.33	7.43	3	1.723	5.17	7.1	17
	F x B	5.411	NS			5.188	NS		
	F x S	2.514	NS			2.437	NS		
	BxS	3.555	NS			3.446	NS		
	FxBxS	5.028	NS			4.874	NS		

F<sub>1</sub>: 100% RDF, F<sub>2</sub>: 75% RDF, B<sub>1</sub> – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>4</sub> - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

Table 4: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on iron content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in straw of direct seeded rice

	Die show Dedder steren ond		Kharif - 202	0			Kharif -	2021	
RDF	Bio char, Paddy straw and		Humic Acie	ł			Humic A	Acid	
	Greenleal manure	S <sub>1</sub>	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	F x B	F Mean
	B1	304.77	324.47	314.62		309.32	330.09	319.71	
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	352.69	365.51	359.10	269.62	357.61	369.42	363.51	272 45
$F_1$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	380.54	390.01	385.28	308.03	383.39	396.45	389.92	373.45
	$B_4$	408.60	422.47	415.53		413.69	427.65	420.67	
	F x S	361.65	375.61			366.00	380.90		
	B1	289.26	320.64	304.95		294.94	325.61	310.27	
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	350.32	360.05	355.18		355.11	364.16	359.64	
F <sub>2</sub>	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	378.03	385.46	381.75	362.42	381.11	394.97	388.04	369.08
	<b>B</b> 4	400.05	415.55	407.80		412.51	424.27	418.39	
	F x S	354.42	370.43			360.92	377.25		
	B x S			B M	lean		B x S	B M	ean
	$B_1$	297.02	322.55	309	0.79	302.13	327.85	314.	.99
	$B_2$	351.50	362.78	357	7.14	356.36	366.79	361.	.57
	$\mathbf{B}_3$	379.29	387.74	383	8.51	382.25	395.71	388.	.98
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	404.32	419.01	411	.67	413.10	425.96	419.	.53
	S Mean	358.03	373.02			363.46	379.08		
	Factor	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	(%)
	F	5.590	NS	8.	49	5.179	NS	8.8	3
	В	8.802	27.12	8.	34	9.045	27.87	8.4	4
	S	4.090	12.26	7.	48	4.046	12.13	7.3	4
	FxB	12.448	NS			12.792	NS		
	FxS	5.784	NS			5.722	NS		
	BxS	8.180	NS			8.092	NS		
	FxBxS	11.568	NS			11.443	NS		

F<sub>1</sub>: 100% RDF, F<sub>2</sub>: 75% RDF, B<sub>1</sub> – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>4</sub> - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

#### https://www.thepharmajournal.com

Table 5: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on manganese content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) at active tillering stage of direct seeded rice

	D's show De liberature and		Kharif - 202	20			Kharif - 20	21	
RDF	Bio char, Paddy straw and		Humic Aci	d			Humic Ac	id	
RDF           F1           F2	Greenieal manure	S1	S2	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	S2	F x B	F Mean
	$B_1$	137.28	139.15	138.22		141.12	142.73	141.93	
	$\mathbf{B}_2$	149.35	152.92	151.14	176 01	153.55	157.08	155.31	180.00
F1	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	187.97	212.16	200.07	1/0.81	191.94	216.06	204.00	180.90
	<b>B</b> 4	214.27	221.41	217.84		218.21	226.50	222.36	
	F x S	172.22	181.41			176.21	185.59		
	<b>B</b> 1	136.16	138.67	137.42		139.55	142.34	140.95	
	$B_2$	147.68	150.56	149.12		151.62	154.58	153.10	
F <sub>2</sub>	<b>B</b> 3	183.50	209.70	196.60	174.48	186.99	213.52	200.26	178.18
	B4	210.19	219.38	214.79		214.13	222.73	218.43	
	F x S	169.38	179.58			173.08	183.29		
	B x S			B M	lean	E	S x S	B N	Iean
	$\mathbf{B}_1$	136.72	138.91	137	7.82	140.34	142.54	141	1.44
	$B_2$	148.52	151.74	150	).13	152.59	155.83	154	4.21
	$B_3$	185.74	210.93	198	3.33	189.47	214.79	202	2.13
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	212.23	220.40	216	5.31	216.17	224.62	220	).39
	S Mean	170.80	180.50			174.64	184.44		
	Factor	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)
	F	3.274	NS	9.	13	3.528	NS	9.	63
	В	3.408	10.50	7.	72	3.380	10.41	8.	52
	S	1.875	5.62	7.	23	1.816	5.44	7.	95
	F x B	4.820	NS			4.780	NS		
	F x S	2.651	NS			2.568	NS		
	BxS	3.750	11.24			3.632	10.89		
	F x B x S	5.303	NS			5.136	NS		

F<sub>1</sub>: 100% RDF, F<sub>2</sub>: 75% RDF, B<sub>1</sub> – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>4</sub> - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

Table 6: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on manganese content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) at panicle initiation stage of direct seeded rice

	Die share Dedder streer and		Kharif - 20	20			Kharif -	2021	
RDF	Bio char, Paddy straw and		Humic Ac	cid			Humic A	Acid	
RDF F1 F2	Greemear manure	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	S <sub>2</sub>	F x B	F Mean
	B1	116.61	119.52	118.07		121.60	123.84	122.72	
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	127.62	132.49	130.05	156 15	130.94	135.80	133.37	160.20
$F_1$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	166.80	190.59	178.70	130.43	170.12	194.57	182.35	100.59
	<b>B</b> 4	196.78	201.18	198.98		202.10	204.16	203.13	
	F x S	151.95	160.94			156.19	164.59		
	B1	114.58	118.45	116.52		118.15	121.43	119.79	
	$B_2$	127.28	130.29	128.79		131.47	132.61	132.04	
F <sub>2</sub>	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	160.43	186.38	173.41	153.97	163.75	190.70	177.22	157.48
F <sub>2</sub>	B4	194.48	199.84	197.16		197.91	203.82	200.87	
	F x S	149.19	158.74			152.82	162.14		
	B x S			B M	ean		B x S	B M	ean
	$B_1$	115.60	118.98	117.	29	119.87	122.63	121	.25
	$B_2$	127.45	131.39	129.	42	131.21	134.21	132	.71
	$B_3$	163.62	188.49	176.	05	166.93	192.64	179	.78
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	195.63	200.51	198.	07	200.01	203.99	202	.00
	S Mean	150.57	159.84			154.50	163.37		
	Factor	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	(%)	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)
	F	3.122	NS	9.8	6	3.180	NS	9.8	30
	В	3.615	11.14	8.0	7	3.628	11.18	7.9	91
	S	1.695	5.08	7.3	5	1.676	5.02	7.1	7
	F x B	5.112	NS			5.131	NS		
	F x S	2.397	NS			2.370	NS		
	B x S	3.390	10.16			3.352	10.05		
	FxBxS	4.795	NS			4.740	NS		

 $\begin{array}{c} F_1: \ 100\% \ RDF, F_2: \ 75\% \ RDF, B_1 - Bio \ char \ @ \ 5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_2 - Bio \ char \ @ \ 7.5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_3 \ - \ Paddy \ straw \ @ \ 5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_4 \ - \ Green \ leaf \ manure \ @ \ 6 \ t \ ha^{-1}, S_1 \ - \ Humic \ acid \ @ \ 20 \ kg \ ha^{-1}, S_2 \ - \ Humic \ acid \ @ \ 30 \ kg \ ha^{-1} \end{array}$ 

#### https://www.thepharmajournal.com

	D's also De blassformer		Kharif - 20	020			Kharif - 2(	)21	
RDF	Blo char, Paddy straw		Humic Ac	cid			Humic Ac	cid	
RDF       F1       F2	and Greenleal manure	S1	S2	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	S2	F x B	F Mean
	B1	38.33	39.33	38.83		41.64	44.30	42.97	
	$\mathbf{B}_2$	41.66	43.18	42.42	12.06	45.68	48.90	47.29	10 00
$F_1$	<b>B</b> 3	44.95	46.07	45.51	45.90	49.57	50.10	49.84	40.00
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	48.27	49.90	49.09		54.61	56.21	55.41	
RDF     B       F1	F x S	43.30	44.62			47.88	49.88		
	$B_1$	38.17	38.54	38.36		41.06	42.73	41.90	
	$\mathbf{B}_2$	41.38	42.53	41.96		44.76	47.11	45.94	
$F_2$	<b>B</b> 3	44.66	45.53	45.09	43.39	48.81	49.86	49.33	47.94
	B4	47.26	49.09	48.17		53.46	55.73	54.60	
	F x S	42.87	43.92			47.02	48.86		
B x		S		B Me	ean	]	B x S	B M	lean
	$B_1$	38.25	38.94	38.5	59	41.35	43.52	42.	43
	$B_2$	41.52	42.85	42.1	9	45.22	48.01	46.	61
	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	44.80	45.80	45.3	30	49.19	49.98	49.	.58
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	47.76	49.50	48.6	53	54.04	55.97	55.	.00
	S Mean	43.08	44.27			47.45	49.37		
	Factor	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)
	F	0.688	NS	7.7	2	0.801	NS	8.	11
	В	0.982	3.03	7.7	9	1.213	3.74	8.	58
	S	0.381	1.14	6.2	7	0.489	1.47	6.9	95
	F x B	1.389	NS			1.716	NS		
	F x S	0.538	NS			0.692	NS		
	B x S	0.761	NS			0.978	NS		
	FxBxS	1.077	NS		_	1 383	NS		

Table 7: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on manganese content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in grain of direct seeded rice

Table 8: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on manganese content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in straw of direct seeded rice

	D's day Dalla day and		Kharif - 202	20			Kharif -	2021	
RDF	Blo char, Paddy straw and		Humic Aci	d			Humic A	Acid	
	Greenieal manure	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>	F x B	F Mean
	<b>B</b> 1	91.56	92.21	91.89		95.59	96.27	95.93	
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	99.46	99.87	99.66	104 51	103.84	104.26	104.05	100.41
$F_1$	B3	106.43	110.70	108.56	104.51	111.11	115.57	113.34	109.41
	<b>B</b> 4	116.41	119.46	117.94		121.53	124.72	123.12	
	F x S	103.46	105.56			108.02	110.21		
	$B_1$	90.36	91.79	91.08		94.34	95.83	95.09	
	B <sub>2</sub>	99.23	99.62	99.42		103.59	104.00	103.80	
F <sub>2</sub>	B3	105.35	109.35	107.35	103.72	109.98	114.16	112.07	108.00
	B4	116.17	117.90	117.03		121.28	123.08	122.18	
	F x S	102.78	104.66			107.30	109.27		
	BxS	5		B M	ean	]	B x S	B M	ean
	$B_1$	90.96	92.00	91.	48	94.96	96.05	95.	51
	$\mathbf{B}_2$	99.34	99.74	99.	54	103.72	104.13	103	.92
	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	105.89	110.02	107	.96	110.55	114.86	112	.71
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	116.29	118.68	117	.48	121.40	123.90	122	.65
	S Mean	103.12	105.11			107.66	109.74		
	Factor	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)
	F	1.331	NS	8.2	26	1.389	NS	8.2	26
	В	1.700	5.24	7.6	66	1.775	5.47	7.6	66
	S	0.638	1.91	6.0	00	0.667	2.00	6.1	2
	F x B	2.405	NS			2.511	NS		
	FxS	0.903	NS			0.943	NS		
	B x S	1.277	NS			1.333	NS		
	FxBxS	1.806	NS			1.885	NS		

 $F_1: 100\% \text{ RDF}, F_2: 75\% \text{ RDF}, B_1 - Bio \text{ char } @ 5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_2 - Bio \text{ char } @ 7.5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_3 - Paddy \text{ straw } @ 5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_4 - Green \text{ leaf manure } @ 6 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, S_1 - Humic \text{ acid } @ 20 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}, S_2 - Humic \text{ acid } @ 30 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ 

#### https://www.thepharmajournal.com

Table 9: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on zinc content (mg kg-1) at active tillering stage of direct seeded rice

	D'aller Daller der and		Kharif - 2	2020			Kharif - 2	021	
RDF       F1       F2	Bio char, Paddy straw and		Humic A	cid			Humic A	cid	
	Greenieal manure	S <sub>1</sub>	S2	F x B	F Mean	S1	S2	F x B	F Mean
	B1	31.53	32.42	31.98		35.55	36.46	36.00	
	B2	36.59	36.77	36.68		40.31	41.40	40.86	12 75
F1	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	40.49	42.89	41.69	39.36	44.19	46.93	45.56	45.75
	<b>B</b> 4	46.22	47.95	47.08		51.76	53.40	52.58	
	F x S	38.71	40.01			42.95	44.55		
	B1	31.62	32.82	32.22		34.75	35.87	35.31	
	B2	36.19	36.59	36.39		39.72	40.31	40.02	
F <sub>2</sub>	B3	39.87	42.22	41.05	39.02	43.62	46.42	45.02	43.24
	<b>B</b> 4	46.00	46.88	46.44		51.68	53.59	52.63	
	F x S	38.42	39.63			42.44	44.05		
	B x S			B M	ean	]	3 x S	B N	Aean
	$B_1$	31.58	32.62	32.	10	35.15	36.17	35	5.66
	$B_2$	36.39	36.68	36.	53	40.02	40.86	4(	).44
	$\mathbf{B}_3$	40.18	42.56	41.	37	43.90	46.68	45	5.29
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	46.11	47.41	46.	76	51.72	53.49	52	2.61
	S Mean	38.56	39.82			42.70	44.30		
	Factor	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	(%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	′ (%)
	F	0.804	NS	10.	05	0.966	NS	1(	).88
	В	0.993	3.06	8.7	8	1.069	3.29	8	.51
	S	0.567	NS	7.0	9	0.728	NS	8	.20
	F x B	1.405	NS			1.512	NS		
	F x S	0.803	NS			1.030	NS		
	BxS	1.135	NS			1.456	NS		
	FxBxS	1.605	NS			2.059	NS		

F<sub>1</sub>: 100% RDF, F<sub>2</sub>: 75% RDF, B<sub>1</sub> – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>4</sub> - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

Table 10: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on zinc content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) at panicle initiation stage of direct seeded rice

	D's show De 11, store and 1		Kharif - 20	20			Kharif - 20	)21	
RDF	Bio char, Paddy straw and		Humic Aci	id			Humic Ac	cid	
	Greenleal manure	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean
	B1	27.80	30.70	29.25		32.18	34.73	33.45	
	B2	32.75	34.58	33.67		35.57	37.41	36.49	40.00
$\mathbf{F}_1$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	35.09	37.21	36.15	35.30	41.14	43.53	42.34	40.00
	<b>B</b> 4	40.71	43.57	42.14		46.86	48.59	47.73	
	F x S	34.09	36.52			38.94	41.07		
	<b>B</b> <sub>1</sub>	27.67	28.99	28.33		31.26	32.80	32.03	
	B <sub>2</sub>	32.57	33.10	32.84		35.50	37.23	36.37	39.29
F <sub>2</sub>	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	34.82	36.39	35.60	34.50	40.52	42.87	41.69	
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	39.50	42.93	41.22		46.64	47.53	47.08	
	F x S	33.64	35.35			38.48	40.11		
	B x S			B M	lean	В	x S	B M	ean
	$\mathbf{B}_1$	27.74	29.85	28	.79	31.72	33.76	32.	74
	$B_2$	32.66	33.84	33.	.25	35.53	37.32	36.	43
	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	34.95	36.80	35.	.88	40.83	43.20	42.	01
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	40.10	43.25	41.	.68	46.75	48.06	47.	40
	S Mean	33.86	35.93			38.71	40.59		
	Factor	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)
	F	0.609	NS	8.	54	0.865	NS	10.	69
	В	0.996	3.07	9.	89	1.035	3.19	9.0	)4
	S	0.625	1.87	8.	77	0.603	1.81	7.4	16
	F x B	1.409	NS			1.463	NS		
	F x S	0.883	NS			0.853	NS		
	B x S	1.249	NS			1.207	NS		
	FxBxS	1.767	NS			1.707	NS		

 $F_1: 100\% \text{ RDF}, F_2: 75\% \text{ RDF}, B_1 - Bio \text{ char } @ 5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_2 - Bio \text{ char } @ 7.5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_3 - Paddy \text{ straw } @ 5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_4 - Green \text{ leaf manure } @ 6 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, S_1 - Humic \text{ acid } @ 20 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}, S_2 - Humic \text{ acid } @ 30 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ 

	D'a dan Dalla (mana)	Kharif - 2020				Kharif - 2021				
RDF	Greenleaf manure		Humic A	Acid		Humic Acid				
		$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	
	<b>B</b> 1	21.80	22.49	22.15		25.35	27.35	26.35		
	$B_2$	24.13	25.18	24.66		28.77	30.04	29.41	20.54	
$F_1$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	26.43	27.21	26.82	25.73	30.40	31.86	31.13	50.54	
	<b>B</b> 4	28.74	29.89	29.32		34.29	36.27	35.28		
	F x S	25.27	26.19			29.70	31.38			
	B1	26.22	21.95	24.08		25.26	26.17	25.71		
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	21.95	24.73	23.34		28.65	29.02	28.84	29.99	
$F_2$	<b>B</b> 3	26.22	26.83	26.53	25.66	30.21	31.30	30.75		
	B4	28.04	29.32	28.68		33.45	35.83	34.64		
	F x S	25.60	25.71			29.39	30.58			
B x S			B Mean		an	E	S x S	B N	Mean	
B1		24.01	22.22	23.11		25.30	26.76	26.03		
	$B_2$	23.04	24.96	24.00		28.71	29.53	29.12		
	$B_3$	26.01	27.02	26.51		30.30	31.58	30.94		
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	28.39	29.60	29.00		33.87	36.05	34.96		
	S Mean	25.36	25.95			29.55	30.98			
	Factor	SEm <u>+</u>	CD ( $p = 0.05$ )	CV (%	6)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD ( $p = 0.05$ )	CV (%)		
	F	0.591	NS	10.2	7	0.590	NS	10	).55	
В		0.758	2.34	10.22	2	0.625	1.92	8	.15	
S		0.409	NS	7.80		0.521	NS	8	.43	
F x B		1.072	NS			0.883	NS			
	FxS	0.579	NS			0.737	NS			
	BxS	0.818	NS			1.042	NS			
F x B x S		1.157	NS			1.473	NS			

#### Table 11: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on zinc content (mg kg-1) in grain of direct seeded rice

 $\begin{array}{c} F_1: \ 100\% \ RDF, \ F_2: \ 75\% \ RDF, \ B_1 - Bio \ char \ @ \ 5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, \ B_2 - Bio \ char \ @ \ 7.5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, \ B_3 \ - \ Paddy \ straw \ @ \ 5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, \ B_4 \ - \ Green \ leaf \ manure \ @ \ 6 \ t \ ha^{-1}, \ S_1 \ - \ Humic \ acid \ @ \ 20 \ kg \ ha^{-1}, \ S_2 \ - \ Humic \ acid \ @ \ 30 \ kg \ ha^{-1} \end{array}$ 

Table 12: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on zinc content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in straw of direct seeded rice

			Kharif - 2	Kharif - 2021						
RDF	Bio char, Paddy straw and		Humic A	Acid		Humic Acid				
	Greenieai manure	<b>S</b> <sub>1</sub>	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	
	B1	17.20	17.54	17.37		20.14	19.61	19.88		
	B <sub>2</sub>	19.12	19.19	19.16		21.56	21.42	21.49	22.69	
$F_1$	B3	20.61	21.52	21.06	20.18	23.34	26.32	24.83	23.08	
	B4	22.78	23.44	23.11		27.70	29.36	28.53		
	F x S	19.93	20.42			23.19	24.18			
	<b>B</b> <sub>1</sub>	17.24	17.69	17.46		19.90	19.36	19.63		
	B <sub>2</sub>	18.97	19.12	19.05		21.43	21.35	21.39	23.48	
F <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>3</sub>	20.37	21.27	20.82	20.05	23.05	26.82	24.93		
	B4	22.70	23.04	22.87		27.33	28.64	27.98		
	F x S	19.82	20.28			22.93	24.04			
B x S				B Me	an	E	B x S	B N	lean	
	<b>B</b> 1	17.22	17.62	17.42		20.02	19.49	19.75		
	$B_2$	19.05	19.16	19.10		21.50	21.38	21.44		
	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	20.49	21.39	20.94		23.20	26.57	24.88		
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	22.74	23.24	22.99		27.52	29.00	28.26		
	S Mean	19.87	20.35			23.06	24.11			
	Factor	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD ( $p = 0.05$ )	CV (%)		
	F	0.394	NS	9.5	)	0.405	NS	9.42		
В		0.414	1.28	7.1.	3	0.353	1.09	8.	18	
S		0.303	NS	7.3	3	0.437	NS	8.	07	
F x B		0.586	NS			0.499	NS			
	F x S	0.429	NS			0.618	NS			
	B x S	0.606	NS			0.873	NS			
F x B x S		0.857	NS			1.235	NS			

 $\begin{array}{c} F_1: \ 100\% \ RDF, F_2: \ 75\% \ RDF, B_1 - Bio \ char \ @ \ 5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_2 - Bio \ char \ @ \ 7.5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_3 \ - \ Paddy \ straw \ @ \ 5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_4 \ - \ Green \ leaf \ manure \ @ \ 6 \ t \ ha^{-1}, S_1 \ - \ Humic \ acid \ @ \ 20 \ kg \ ha^{-1}, S_2 \ - \ Humic \ acid \ @ \ 30 \ kg \ ha^{-1} \end{array}$ 

#### https://www.thepharmajournal.com

Table 13: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on copper content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) at active tillering stage of direct seeded rice

	D's share De 11-stars and 1	Kharif - 2020				Kharif - 2021				
RDF	Chooploof monune		Humic A	cid		Humic Acid				
	Greemeal manure	S1	S2	F x B	F Mean	S1	S2	F x B	F Mean	
	B1	14.86	15.12	14.99		19.87	20.21	20.04		
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	16.34	16.40	16.37		21.85	21.92	21.89	22.04	
$F_1$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	17.49	18.19	17.84	17.16	23.39	24.33	23.86	22.94	
	<b>B</b> 4	19.17	19.68	19.43		25.64	26.32	25.98		
	F x S	16.97	17.35			22.69	23.20			
	B1	14.88	14.90	14.89		19.90	19.93	19.91		
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	16.23	16.34	16.28	17.02	21.70	21.85	21.78	22.76	
F <sub>2</sub>	<b>B</b> 3	17.31	18.00	17.65		23.14	24.07	23.61		
	B4	19.11	19.37	19.24		25.55	25.90	25.73		
	F x S	16.88	17.15			22.57	22.94			
B x S				B M	ean		B x S	B Me	ean	
B1		14.87	15.01	14.94		19.88	20.07	19.9	98	
	$B_2$	16.28	16.37	16.33		21.78	21.89	21.83		
	$B_3$	17.40	18.10	17.75		23.27	24.20	23.73		
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	19.14	19.53	19.33		25.59	26.11	25.85		
	S Mean	16.92	17.25			22.63	23.07			
	Factor	SEm+	CD ( $p = 0.05$ )	CV (	(%)	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (%)		
	F	0.299	NS	8.5	6	0.376	NS	8.0	6	
В		0.422	1.30	8.5	5	0.548	1.69	8.3	0	
S		0.195	NS	7.5	9	0.257	NS	7.5	1	
F x B		0.597	NS			0.774	NS			
	F x S	0.276	NS			0.364	NS			
	B x S	0.390	NS			0.514	NS			
F x B x S		0.552	NS			0.727	NS			

F<sub>1</sub>: 100% RDF, F<sub>2</sub>: 75% RDF, B<sub>1</sub> – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>4</sub> - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

Table 14: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on copper content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) at panicle initiation stage of direct seeded rice

	D' des Dalla des al	Kharif - 2020					<i>Kharif</i> - 2021					
RDF	Bio char, Paudy straw and		Humic Ac	id		Humic Acid						
	Greenieal manure	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	S <sub>1</sub>	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean			
	B1	12.59	12.71	12.65		15.44	15.71	15.57				
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	13.62	13.50	13.56		16.98	17.04	17.01	17.02			
$F_1$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	14.73	15.16	14.95	14.59	18.18	18.91	18.54	17.85			
	<b>B</b> 4	16.90	17.52	17.21		19.92	20.45	20.19				
	F x S	14.46	14.72			17.63	18.03					
	B1	11.60	12.21	11.91		15.32	15.48	15.40				
	B <sub>2</sub>	12.55	13.28	12.92		16.86	16.98	16.92	17.67			
F <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>3</sub>	14.47	14.60	14.53	13.92	17.99	18.70	18.35				
	B4	16.12	16.55	16.34		19.86	20.13	19.99				
	F x S	13.69	14.16			17.51	17.83					
B x S				B Me	ean	]	B x S	B Me	ean			
	$B_1$	12.10	12.46	12.28		15.38	15.60	15.4	19			
	$B_2$	13.08	13.39	13.24		16.92	17.01	16.97				
	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	14.60	14.88	14.74		18.08	18.81	18.44				
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	16.51	17.03	16.77		19.89	20.29	20.09				
	S Mean	14.07	14.44			17.57	17.93					
	Factor	SEm <u>+</u>	CD ( $p = 0.05$ )	CV (	%)	SEm+	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (%)				
	F	0.370	NS	10.7	/2	0.395	NS	10.8	39			
В		0.396	1.22	9.6	3	0.439	1.35	8.5	7			
S		0.238	NS	8.1	9	0.216	NS	8.9	5			
	F x B	0.560	NS			0.621	NS					
	F x S	0.337	NS			0.305	NS					
	B x S	0.476	NS			0.431	NS					
F x B x S		0.674	NS			0.610	NS					

 $\begin{array}{c} F_1: \ 100\% \ RDF, F_2: \ 75\% \ RDF, B_1 - Bio \ char \ @ \ 5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_2 - Bio \ char \ @ \ 7.5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_3 \ - \ Paddy \ straw \ @ \ 5 \ t \ ha^{-1}, B_4 \ - \ Green \ leaf \ manure \ @ \ 6 \ t \ ha^{-1}, S_1 \ - \ Humic \ acid \ @ \ 20 \ kg \ ha^{-1}, S_2 \ - \ Humic \ acid \ @ \ 30 \ kg \ ha^{-1} \end{array}$ 

#### https://www.thepharmajournal.com

		/	1 -1>		
<b>Table 15:</b> Effect of bio char	crop residues and humic acid	on conner content (r	$m\sigma k\sigma^{-1}$	in grain of	direct seeded rice
rubic ici Entect of old entar,	erop residues una numie uera	on copper content (i		in grain or	anoet becaea mee

	D' I D II (		Kharif - 20	20	Kharif - 2021					
RDF	Bio char, Paddy straw and		Humic Ac	id		Humic Acid				
	Greemeal manure	$S_1$	S2	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	S2	F x B	F Mean	
	B1	5.59	5.96	5.78		7.52	7.79	7.65		
	<b>B</b> <sub>2</sub>	6.22	6.46	6.34		9.00	8.59	8.80	0.04	
$F_1$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	6.52	6.79	6.66	6.55	8.90	9.53	9.22	9.04	
	<b>B</b> 4	7.24	7.61	7.42		10.16	10.85	10.50		
	F x S	6.39	6.70			8.90	9.19			
	<b>B</b> 1	5.58	5.74	5.66		7.27	7.46	7.37		
	B2	6.20	6.27	6.23		8.29	8.16	8.23	8.71	
F <sub>2</sub>	B3	6.49	6.69	6.59	6.45	8.70	9.42	9.06		
	B4	7.09	7.52	7.30		10.00	10.36	10.18		
	F x S	6.34	6.56			8.57	8.85			
B x S				B Me	an	E	s x S	B Me	ean	
B1		5.58	5.85	5.72	2 7.39 7.63		7.51			
	$B_2$	6.21	6.36	6.29		8.65	8.38	8.51		
	$B_3$	6.50	6.74	6.62		8.80	9.48	9.14		
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	7.16	7.56	7.36		10.08	10.61	10.34		
	S Mean	6.37	6.63			8.73	9.02			
	Factor	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (%)		
	F	0.116	NS	8.7	1	0.188	NS	9.3	5	
	В	0.149	0.46	7.9	5	0.233	0.72	8.0	8	
S		0.090	NS	7.80	)	0.140	NS	7.7	1	
F x B		0.211	NS			0.329	NS			
	FxS	0.127	NS			0.197	NS			
	BxS	0.180	NS			0.279	NS			
	FxBxS	0.255	NS			0.395	NS			

 $F_1: 100\% \text{ RDF}, F_2: 75\% \text{ RDF}, B_1 - Bio \text{ char } @ 5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_2 - Bio \text{ char } @ 7.5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_3 - Paddy \text{ straw } @ 5 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, B_4 - Green \text{ leaf manure } @ 6 \text{ t ha}^{-1}, S_1 - Humic \text{ acid } @ 20 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}, S_2 - Humic \text{ acid } @ 30 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ 

Table 16: Effect of bio char, crop residues and humic acid on copper content (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in straw of direct seeded rice

RDF	D' I D II I I I		Kharif - 2	020		Kharif - 2021					
	Blo char, Paddy straw and		Humic A	.cid		Humic Acid					
	Greenleal manure	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean	$S_1$	$S_2$	F x B	F Mean		
	B1	6.69	6.78	6.74		8.27	8.38	8.32			
	B2	7.40	7.42	7.41	] [	9.14	9.17	9.15	0.59		
$F_1$	<b>B</b> <sub>3</sub>	7.92	8.24	8.08	7.75	9.78	10.18	9.98	9.38		
	B4	8.68	8.91	8.79		10.72	11.01	10.87			
	F x S	7.67	7.84		] [	9.48	9.68				
	<b>B</b> <sub>1</sub>	6.60	6.75	6.67		8.16	8.33	8.25			
	B <sub>2</sub>	6.87	7.40	7.13	] [	8.49	9.14	8.82	9.42		
F <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>3</sub>	7.84	8.15	7.99	7.63	9.68	10.07	9.87			
	B4	8.65	8.77	8.71	1 [	10.69	10.83	10.76			
	F x S	7.49	7.76		] [	9.25	9.59				
B x S				B Mean		В	x S	B M	ean		
	$B_1$	6.65	6.76	6.71		8.21	8.36	8.2	28		
	$B_2$	7.13	7.41	7.27		8.82	9.15	8.99			
	$\mathbf{B}_3$	7.88	8.19	8.03		9.73	10.12	9.93			
	$\mathbf{B}_4$	8.66	8.84	8.75		10.71	10.92	10.	81		
	S Mean	7.58	7.80			9.37	9.64				
Factor		SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV (	(%)	SEm <u>+</u>	CD (p = 0.05)	CV	(%)		
F		0.114	NS	7.2	7	0.141	NS	7.8	31		
В		0.168	0.52	7.5	6	0.207	0.64	7.7	13		
S		0.079	NS	7.0	2	0.097	NS	7.2	21		
F x B		0.237	NS			0.293	NS				
	FxS	0.111	NS			0.138	NS				
	B x S	0.158	NS			0.195	NS				
F x B x S		0.223	NS			0.275	NS				

F<sub>1</sub>: 100% RDF, F<sub>2</sub>: 75% RDF, B<sub>1</sub> – Bio char @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>2</sub> – Bio char @ 7.5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>3</sub> - Paddy straw @ 5 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, B<sub>4</sub> - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>1</sub> - Humic acid @ 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>

#### Conclusion

Significantly higher iron and manganese contents in plant was recorded with the application of  $B_4$ - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and  $S_2$  - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> at all the growth stages

of direct seeded rice, whereas, the higher zinc (except in panicle initiation stage) and copper content was significantly recorded with application of  $B_4$ - Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> only. However, the zinc content in panicle initiation stage

significantly influenced by the application of B<sub>4</sub>- Green leaf manure @ 6 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>2</sub> - Humic acid @ 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>.

#### References

- 1. Asri FO, Demirtas EI, Ari N. Changes in fruit yield, quality and nutrient concentrations in response to soil humic acid applications in processing tomato. Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science. 2015;21(3):585-591.
- Celik H, Katkat AV, Aşık BB, Turan MA. Effects of humus on growth and nutrient uptake of maize under saline and calcareous soil conditions. Žemdirbystė -Agriculture. 2010;97:15-22.
- 3. Davari M, Sharma SN, Mirzakhani M. Residual influence of organic materials, crop residues, and bio fertilizers on performance of succeeding mungbean in an organic ricebased cropping system. International Journal of Recycling of Organic Waste in Agriculture. 2012;1(14):1-9.
- Debiprasad D, Hrusikesh P, Ramesh C, Tiwari, Mohammad S. Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on Fe, Mn, Cu and Zn uptake and content of rice grain at harvest and straw at different stages of rice (Oryza sativa) crop growth. Advances in Applied Science Research. 2010;1(3):36-49.
- 5. Ghoneim AM. Effect of different methods of Zn application on rice growth, yield and nutrients dynamics in plant and soil. Journal Agriculture and Economic. Research Institute. 2016;6(2):1-9.
- 6. Lindsay WL, Norvell WA. Development of DTPA soil test for zinc, iron, manganese and copper. Soil Science Society of America Journal. 1978;41:421-428.
- Muthukumararaja TM, Sriramachandrasekharan MV. Enhancing rice productivity through integration of organics and zinc in a zinc deficient soil. Journal of International Academic Research for Multidiciplinary. 2014;2(2):359-368.
- Nikbakht A, Mohsen K, Babalar M, Xia YP, Luo A, Etemadi N. Effect of humic acid on plant growth, nutrient uptake and postharvest life of Gerbera. Journal of Plant Nutrition. 2008;31(12):2155-2167.
- Prakash P, Hemalatha M, Joseph M. Influence of Zinc Nutrition and Green Leaf Manuring on Dry Matter Yield, Nutrient Uptake and Economics of Rice Cultivation. Indian Journal of Ecology. 2019;46(1):65-69.
- Sangeetha M, Singaram P, Devi RD. Effect of lignite humic acid and fertilizers on the yield of onion and nutrient availability. Proceedings of 18<sup>th</sup> world congress of soil science. USA; c2006.
- 11. Shahi UP, Prajapati D, Dhyani BP, Tomar SS, Kumar A, Dwivedi A, *et al.* Effect of balance potassium management on performance of basmati rice in rice-potato-maize cropping system of western Uttar Pradesh, India. International Journal of current microbiology and applied Sciences. 2017;4:147-155.
- 12. Shinde SE, More SS, Gokhale NB, Patil KD. Evaluation of the rice hybrids grown under different INM practices for prmary nutrients content and yield under lateritic soil of south konkan. International Journal of chemical Studies. 2017;5(6):970-975.
- 13. Turan MA, Asik BB, Katkat AV, Celik H. The effects of soil-applied humic substances to the dry weight and mineral nutrient uptake of maize plants under soilsalinity conditions. Notulae Botanicae Horti Agrobotanici Cluj-

Napoca. 2011;39(1):171-177.