



ISSN (E): 2277-7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2023; SP-12(10): 1218-1221
© 2023 TPI
www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 01-08-2023
Accepted: 04-09-2023

Priya Kochale

Ph.D. Scholar, Agronomy,
College of Agriculture, JNKVV,
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,
India

PB Sharma

Professor & Head, Agronomy,
College of Agriculture, JNKVV,
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,
India

Shani Gulaiya

Ph.D. Scholar, Agronomy,
College of Agriculture, JNKVV,
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,
India

Kamal Kishor Patel

Ph.D. Scholar, Soil Science and
Agriculture Chemistry, College of
Agriculture, JNKVV, Jabalpur,
Madhya Pradesh, India

Ashish Kumar

Ph.D. Scholar, Extension
Education, College of
Agriculture, JNKVV, Jabalpur,
Madhya Pradesh, India

Abhishek Sharma

Ph.D. Scholar, Agronomy,
College of Agriculture, JNKVV,
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,
India

Corresponding Author:

Shani Gulaiya

Ph.D. Scholar, Agronomy,
College of Agriculture, JNKVV,
Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh,
India

Impact of nutrient management practices and soybean based cropping systems on soil fertility status

Priya Kochale, PB Sharma, Shani Gulaiya, Kamal Kishor Patel, Ashish Kumar and Abhishek Sharma

Abstract

The field experiment was conducted during three seasons (*Kharif, Rabi* and *Summer*) in the two consecutive years 2021-22 to 2022-23 at Instructional Research Farm, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India. The experiment was laid out in split plot design with 24 treatment combinations of six different nutrient management practices and 4 cropping systems. The allocation of various treatments to different plots was done randomly with three replications. Under main plot, NM₁ (100% organic), NM₂ (50% Organic NM + NF inputs Beejamrit + Ghanjeevamrit + Jeevamrit), NM₃ (50% Organic NM + 50% Inorganic NM), NM₄ (25% Organic NM + NF inputs Beejamrit + Ghanjeevamrit + Jeevamrit + 25% Inorganic NM), NM₅ (Farmer practices), NM₆ (100% Inorganic NM). CS₁ (Soybean-wheat), CS₂ (Soybean-berseem), CS₃ (Soybean-mustard-green gram), CS₄ (Soybean-lentil-sorghum) allotted under sub-plot. The result revealed that the Available nitrogen was maximum (272.25 kg ha⁻¹) under 100% nutrient management with soybean-mustard-wheat cropping system followed by INM (50% org + 50% inorg) i.e. (268.50 kg ha⁻¹), and 50% org + NF inputs (264.66 kg ha⁻¹). The phosphorus and potassium was maximum i.e. 13.48 kg ha⁻¹ and 292.08 kg ha⁻¹ under 100% organic nutrient management with soybean-berseem cropping system.

Keywords: Soybean based cropping systems, nutrient management, nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium

Introduction

Soybean based cropping systems are important for sustaining agricultural production and also maintain soil fertility with an ecological balance. This system also reduces the dependency on chemical fertilizers and help in monetary saving. Sustaining production and productivity of any system is of paramount importance by improving the soil physical, chemical and biological properties (Karunakaran and Bahera, 2017) [4]. Application of organic material along with inorganic fertilizers into the soils leads to increase in productivity of the cropping system enhance the use efficiency of fertilizer input and sustain the soil health for longer period (Jat *et al.*, 2015) [3]. Organic manures are a potential source of micronutrients and improve soil structure by providing binding effect to soil aggregates, increase water holding capacity and improve buffering capacity of soils

Integrated nutrient management refers to the maintenance of soil fertility and plant nutrient supply at an optimum level for sustaining the benefit manner. The objective of Integrated nutrient management improves the available nutrient status of the soil with the incorporation of FYM alone or in combination with chemical fertilizer could be attributed to the slow decomposition of organic manure producing acids and enhancing soil biological activity. That is provide congenial soil physical conditions, conserve soil nitrogen and increase the availability of other nutrients. Besides, adoption of proper input-management technologies, diversification or intensification through crops of diverse nature may be a good proposition to break the monotony of the system (Tripathi and Singh 2008) [9]. Therefore, crop diversification is going to play major role for sustaining the productivity, while conserving the natural resources and utilizing them more efficiently in the long run.

Methods and Materials

The field experiment was conducted during three seasons (*Kharif, Rabi* and *Summer*) in the two consecutive years 2021-22 to 2022-23 at Instructional Research Farm, Department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Jawaharlal Nehru Krishi Vishwa Vidyalaya, Jabalpur, Madhya Pradesh, India.

The experiment was laid out in split plot design with 24 treatment combinations of six different nutrient management practices and 4 cropping systems. The allocation of various treatments to different plots was done randomly with three replications. Nutrient management practices were taken as main plot and cropping system taken as sub plot. Main plot, NM₁ (100% organic), NM₂ (50% Organic NM + NF inputs), NM₃ (50% Organic NM + 50% Inorganic NM), NM₄ (25% Organic NM + NF inputs + 25% Inorganic NM), NM₅ (Farmer practices), NM₆ (100% Inorganic NM). Sub-plot CS₁ (Soybean-wheat), CS₂ (Soybean-berseem), CS₃ (Soybean-mustard-green gram), CS₄ (Soybean-lentil-sorghum). The physico-chemical properties of soil were estimated by the standard method.

Soil of the experimental field soil was sandy in texture, slightly alkaline in reaction (pH 7.28) with medium OC content (0.68%), high EC (0.381 dSm⁻¹) and analyzing low in available Nitrogen (258 kg ha⁻¹ N), Medium in available Phosphorus (13.5 kg ha⁻¹ P) and medium available potassium (284 kg ha⁻¹ K) starting the present experiment during *Kharif* 2021 (Table 2). The status of soil slightly varied under different treatments (cropping system) over the initial status after harvest of the *Rabi* and *Summer* crops during 2022-2023.

Results and Discussion

Nitrogen

Due to application of different nutrient management practices and cropping systems the available soil nitrogen changes.

It was observed that maximum available soil nitrogen was found under 100% organic nutrient management (272.25 kg ha⁻¹) followed by INM (50% org + 50% inorg) i.e. (268.50 kg ha⁻¹), 50% org + NF inputs (264.66 kg ha⁻¹) and INM (25% org + 25% inorg) + NF inputs (262.91 kg ha⁻¹). This could be attributed to increased rate of mineralization of organic matter in the soil which was enhanced by the addition of organic manure (FYM) and hence caused a build-up of NH₄-N and NO₃-N in soil (Shilpashree *et al.*, 2012). Whereas the lowest build-up of available soil nitrogen was under farmer practices (251.66 kg ha⁻¹) respectively.

Concerning the effect of cropping sequence on available soil nitrogen, the soybean-mustard-green gram showed the higher value of available soil nitrogen (263.55 kg ha⁻¹) and no significant difference were found between soybean-berseem cropping system (263.88 kg ha⁻¹) and soybean wheat cropping system (263.27 kg ha⁻¹). The lower value of available soil nitrogen (263.11 kg ha⁻¹) was marked under soybean-lentil-sorghum (f) cropping system. Oelmann *et al.* (2007) [5] observed that presence of legumes correlated positively with soil NO₃-N concentrations because of atmospheric N₂ fixation, whereas fodder sorghum being a non-legume and exhaustive crop which depleted more N at harvest.

The interaction effect between different nutrient management and cropping systems was found to be significant. Soybean-mustard-green gram cropping system with the application of 100% organic nutrient management recorded the higher available nitrogen

Phosphorus

The effect of different nutrient management on available soil

phosphorus showed significant variation but not affected by cropping systems.

It was revealed that the application of 100% organic nutrient management showed maximum (13.48 kg ha⁻¹) available soil phosphorus followed by 100% inorganic nutrient management (12.59 kg ha⁻¹) and INM (25% org + 25% inorg) + NF inputs i.e. (12.23 kg ha⁻¹). The addition of FYM increased P content and possibly by increasing retention of P in soil through release of various organic acid and CO₂ during process of decomposition of organic matter (Rajkhowa *et al.*, 2003) [6]. And the lowest available soil phosphorus was observed under farmer practices (11.60 kg ha⁻¹) respectively.

On the other hand, the higher value of available soil phosphorus was found under soybean-berseem cropping system (12.38 kg ha⁻¹) which was statistically at par with soybean-mustard-green gram cropping system (12.32 kg ha⁻¹) and followed by soybean-wheat (12.30 kg ha⁻¹) cropping system. Singh *et al.*, 2002 [8] reported that the inclusion of legume crop in the sequence increase the available phosphorus in the soil due to better physico-chemical properties and microbial population in soil which helped to solubilized fixed P in soil. The soybean-lentil-sorghum cropping system had lowest value (12.28 kg ha⁻¹) of available soil phosphorus. It may be due to lower uptake of phosphorus by the crop.

The interaction effect between different nutrient management practices and cropping systems on bacterial population was found to be non-significant.

Potassium

The data revealed that the available potash was significantly affected by different nutrient management practices and soybean based cropping systems.

It was found that the value of available potash was maximum under 100% organic nutrient management (292.08 kg ha⁻¹) which was followed by 50% organic + NF (290.50 kg ha⁻¹), INM (25% Org + 25% inorg + NF inputs) (287.25 kg ha⁻¹), INM (50% org + 50% inorg) (285.91 kg ha⁻¹) and Inorganic nutrient management (283.66 kg ha⁻¹). The increase in available K under integrated treatments ascribed to more release of non-exchangeable K from the soils as FYM increased soil cation exchange capacity (Bhattacharyya *et al.*, 2008; Blake *et al.*, 1999) [1, 2] and also reduced fixation of K in soil. And the lowest value of available potash was observed in farmer practices (281.25 kg ha⁻¹), respectively.

The available potash was slightly changed with different soybean based cropping systems. The soybean-berseem cropping system showed the higher value of available potash (287.55 kg ha⁻¹) while there is no significant difference was found between soybean-mustard-green gram (287.05 kg ha⁻¹) and soybean-wheat (286.61 kg ha⁻¹) cropping system. Whereas the lowest value of potash (285.88 kg ha⁻¹) was registered under soybean-lentil-sorghum (f) cropping system. Gangwar and Ram (2005) [10] reported that the available potassium in the soil increased due to inclusion of leguminous crops in the sequence.

The interaction effect between different nutrient management and cropping systems found to be non-significant.

Table 1: Effect of nutrient management and cropping systems on nitrogen.

Nutrient management	Cropping systems (kg ha ⁻¹)				
	Initial status 260				
	CS1	CS2	CS3	CS4	Mean
100% org	272.66	272.33	273.00	271.00	272.25
50% org + NF inputs	265.00	264.33	265.00	264.33	264.66
INM (50% org + 50% inorg)	268.33	268.66	268.00	269.00	268.50
INM (25% org + 25% inorg) + NF inputs	262.66	263.33	263.66	262.00	262.91
Farmer practices	250.66	251.33	252.00	252.66	251.66
100% inorg	260.33	261.33	261.66	259.66	260.75
Mean	263.27	263.55	263.88	263.11	
				Interaction	
	Nutrient Management	Cropping System	Factor B at same level of A		Factor A at same level of B
SEm±	0.18	0.15	0.36		0.37
CD (p =0.05)	0.57	0.44	1.10		1.09

Where, CS1 is Soybean-wheat, CS2 is Soybean-berseem (F + S), CS3 is Soybean-mustard-green gram, CS4 is Soybean-lentil-sorghum (fodder)

Table 2: Effect of nutrient management and cropping systems on phosphorus.

Nutrient management	Cropping systems (kg ha ⁻¹)				
	Initial status 11.50				
	CS1	CS2	CS3	CS4	Mean
100% org	13.42	13.66	13.44	13.39	13.48
50% org + NF inputs	11.93	11.99	11.96	11.89	11.94
INM (50% org + 50% inorg)	12.09	12.11	12.10	12.05	12.09
INM (25% org + 25% inorg) + NF inputs	12.22	12.26	12.23	12.19	12.23
Farmer practices	11.58	11.61	11.61	11.59	11.60
100% inorg	12.59	12.63	12.61	12.55	12.59
Mean	12.30	12.38	12.32	12.28	
				Interaction	
	Nutrient Management	Cropping System	Factor B at same level of A		Factor A at same level of B
SEm±	0.03	0.02	0.04		0.05
CD (p =0.05)	0.10	0.08	N/S		N/S

Where, CS1 is Soybean-wheat, CS2 is Soybean-berseem (F + S), CS3 is Soybean-mustard-green gram, CS4 is Soybean-lentil-sorghum (fodder)

Table 3: Effect of nutrient management and cropping systems on potassium.

Nutrient management	Cropping systems (kg ha ⁻¹)				
	Initial status 282				
	CS1	CS2	CS3	CS4	Mean
100% org	291.66	292.66	292.33	291.66	292.08
50% org + NF inputs	289.33	291.66	290.66	290.33	290.50
INM (50% org + 50% inorg)	286.00	286.66	286.00	285.00	285.91
INM (25% org + 25% inorg) + NF inputs	287.33	288.33	287.66	285.66	287.25
Farmer practices	281.00	282.33	281.66	280.00	281.25
100% inorg	284.33	283.66	284.00	282.66	283.66
Mean	286.61	287.55	287.05	285.88	
				Interaction	
	Nutrient Management	Cropping System	Factor B at same level of A		Factor A at same level of B
SEm±	0.17	0.17	0.34		0.41
CD (p =0.05)	0.55	0.50	N/S		N/S

Where, CS1 is Soybean-wheat, CS2 is Soybean-berseem (F + S), CS3 is Soybean-mustard-green gram, CS4 is Soybean-lentil-sorghum (fodder)

Conclusion

Based on the results it can be concluded that the nutrient content of soil slightly changes from the initial status due to different nutrient management practices and cropping systems. The nitrogen was maximum (272.25 kg ha⁻¹) under 100% nutrient management with soybean-mustard-wheat cropping system. The phosphorus and potassium was maximum i.e. 13.48 kg ha⁻¹ and 292.08 kg ha⁻¹ under 100% organic nutrient management with soybean-berseem cropping system.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my gratitude to Dr. P.B. Sharma Professor & Head, Department of Agronomy for guiding me during the entire research work.

Conflict of interest: None

References

- Bhattacharyya R, Kundu S, Prakash V, Gupta HS. Sustainability under combined application of mineral and

- organic fertilizers in a rainfed soybean–wheat systems of the Indian Himalayas. *European Journal of Agronomy* 2008;28:33-46.
2. Blake L, Mercik S, Koerschens M, Goulding KWT, Stempen S, Weigel A, *et al.* Potassium content in soil, uptake in plants and the potassium balance in three European long-term field experiments. *Plant and Soil*. 1999;216:1-14.
 3. Jat LK, Singh YV, Meena SK, Meena S, Parihar KM, Jatav MS, *et al.* Does Integrated nutrient management enhance agricultural productivity. *Journal of pure and applied microbiology*. 2015;9(2):1211-1221
 4. Karunakaran V, Bhera UK. Conservation agriculture in soybean (*Glycine max*)-wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) cropping system: A review. *Agriculture Reviews*. 2017;36:169-183.
 5. Oelmann Y, Wilcke W, Temperton VM, Buchmann N, Roscher C, Schumacher J, *et al.* Soil and plant 176 nitrogen pools as related to plant diversity in an experimental grassland. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 2007;71:720-729.
 6. Rajkhowa DJ, Saikia M, Rajkhowa KM. Effect of vermicompost and levels of fertilizer on green gram. *Legume Research*. 2003;26:63-65.
 7. Shilpashree VM, Chidanandappa HM, Jayaprakash R, Punitha BC. Effect of integrated nutrient management practices on distribution of nitrogen fractions by maize crop in soil. *Indian Journal of Fundamental and Applied Life Sciences*. 2012;2:38-44.
 8. Singh SP, Kushwah VS, Sharma SC. Effect of crop residue management on productivity, sustainability and economics of soybean (*Glycine-max*)–potato (*Solanum tuberosum*)–wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) sequence. In: *Extended summmeries 2nd International Agronomy Congress*, Nov. 26-30, 2002, New Delhi, India. 2002;1:351-352.
 9. Tripathi SC, Singh RP. Effect of crop diversification on productivity and profitability of rice (*Oryza sativa*)-wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) cropping system. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 2008;53(1):27-31.
 10. Gangwar B, Ram B. Effect of crop diversification on productivity and profitability of rice (*Oryza sativa*)-wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) system. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2005;75(7):435-438.