Effectiveness of organics with nutrient levels and bio-fertilizers through soil chemico-biological properties on wheat (*TriticumAestivum* L) crop [Cv.PBW-343] in *Inseptisols*.

ABSTRACT:

Aims: To enhancesoil quality, production, productivity and profitability maximization with higher economic returns through INM.

Study design: Effectiveness of organics with nutrient levels and bio-fertilizers through soil chemico-biological properties on wheat (*TriticumAestivum* L) crop [Cv.PBW-343] in *Inseptisols*.

Place and duration of study: The cumulatiive study period of 2018-2019 and 2019-2020,at Research Farm, Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj District of Uttar Pradesh.

Methodology: Randomized block design (RBD) fallowed here with 12 treatment combinationsreplicated 3 times**.** RDF of NPKwas applied @ 120:60:40kg ha^{-1} as urea (46% N), single super phosphate (16% P_2O_5), muriate of potash (60% K_2O) and zinc sulphate (21% Zn). The *Azotobacter* spp. and *Azospirilium*spp. (seed inoculants), applied at 3 kg ha^{-1} with FYM @ 5tha^{-1}, at 5cm depth in furrows,beforeseed sowing was done on 13^{th} and 14^{th} of November (2018-2019) with spacing of22.5 X 5 cm. Wheat cultivar used hereis PBW-343 as a test crop.

Results: The cumulative mean of low soil pH (6.82), EC(0.37 dS m^{-1}) and free lime content (13.55 %), the higher CEC (16.37 cmol $(p^{+})kg^{-1}$), higher available NPKSof 262.12:21.75:220.51:32.57kg ha^{-1}, respectively, high available Fe and Zn (i.e. 3.90 and 1.79 mg kg^{-1}), low available Mn and Cu (3.77 and 0.31 mg kg^{-1}), further the cumulative mean of dehydrogenase enzyme activity (1.49 µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1}), alkaline phosphatase activity(186.35 µg pNP g^{-1} hr^{-1}) and microbial biomass carbon (37.59 gm kg^{-1}) waslabelled in treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Znincomparison to in-organic application over control.

Conclusion: The combined application of FYM, *Azatobacter* spp and *Azospirilium* spphas lead to improvement in soil health potentialfor yield sustenance under wheat crop cultivation.

Key wards: Bio-fertilizers, farm yard manure (FYM), integrated nutrient mangement (INM), NPKS, enzyme activites.

1.0 INTRODUCTION:

Wheat is the staple food in the traditional wheat growing northwest and central India, is soft to medium hard, medium protein, white bread wheat, is one of the most important and widely cultivated staple food crops among the cereals which cultivated for its seed and as Botanically, the wheat kernel is a type of fruit called a caryopsis, belongs to family *Poaceae.*Wheat is consumed at the household level, local restaurants, and eateries in the form of handmade breads called *chapattis* or *rotis* or *parathas* (unleavened flat bread) using *atta* (whole wheat flour) estimated at around 75-80 percent of total consumption. Wheat yields in largely irrigated northern India (Punjab, Haryana, and Western Uttar Pradesh) are about 4.5 to 5.0 tons per hectare, while yields in western and central states (Gujarat, Rajasthan, Madhya Pradesh, Bihar and parts of Uttar Pradesh) are relatively lower at 1.5 to 3.0 tons per hectare. (Grain and Feed Annual, 2019).

On account of containing world energy crisis and spiraling pricesof chemical fertilizer, by means of a high annual productivity of crops resulting in removal of nutrients in substantial amounts that exceed replenishment through chemical fertilizer and manures ultimately leading to poor soil health.Regarding lack of knowledge about the benefits of organic usages, people started using in-organic chemical fertilizers in indiscriminate way to maintain crop productivity. This result to crops more prone to attack of insect pest and drastic decline of the crop yield (Dotaniya *et al.*,2016). Such emerging trends of indiscriminate use of fertilizer without use of organic sources of nutrients are also responsible for deterioration of soil health. Imbalance fertilizer use has resulted in multinutrient deficiency in soils. Therefore, soils encounter a diversity of constraints because of soil quality and ultimately end up with poor functional capacity (Singh *et al.,* 2016).Soil microorganisms are important to agroecosystems. They are involved in key roles, such as aggregate formation, humus formation, nutrient cycling, decomposition of various compounds and other transformations in soil (Wu *et al.,* 2011). Fertilization usually favours the accumulation of bacterial residues and increases soil microbial biomass.In addition to this, organic matter in soil improves soil structures, nutrient retention, aeration, soil moisture holding capacity and water infiltration (Mehran *et al.,* 2011).The use of humic acid and soil micro-organisms, particularly bacterium can assist in the potential phyto-technical increase of these crops, as well as reduce the costs of nitrogen inputs used by the same.Traditionally, microbiological counts in soil has its important significance during bio-transformation of mineral substance, achieving microbial population with in soil communities. In soil, biological enzyme activities are potential indicators in measuring soil quality because they are sensitive, rapid and inexpensive representatives of the potential metabolic activity of the soil (Liang, *et al.*, 2014). However, soil which was analysed under research investigation was sandy loam, as a result, the respiration rate of microorganisms decreases with decreasing in bio-availability of nutrients. Hence, tooptimize crop productivity and maintaining a healthy ecosystem, achieved by providing the necessary conditions and the need for greater use of bio-fertilizers and organics.

2.0 MATERIALS AND METHODS:

The experimental study on"Effectiveness of organics with nutrient levels and bio-fertilizers through soil chemico-biological properties on wheat (*TriticumAestivum* L) crop [Cv.PBW-343] in *Inseptisols*."was conductedduring the cumulative period, beginning from *rabi* seasons 2018-2019 and 2019-2020 at Research Farm, Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj District of Uttar Pradesh.

The excavated soil sample from experimental site**,** mentioned that, the land topography range was nearly levelled with 1-3% slope, soil is of sandy loam texture with neutral to alkaline in reaction (6.82), EC was non-saline (0.30 dSm^{-1}) in nature, low organic carbon content (0.319%), low to medium available N (151 kg ha^{-1}), available P (14.80 kg ha^{-1}) and available K (240.3kg ha^{-1}).

The layout of the research field was depicted in randomized block design (RBD) with twelve treatment combinations (Table 1)which is replicated thrice**.** Recommended dose of NPK (100%) was applied to the wheat crop are N (120 kg ha^{-1}), P_2O_5 (60 kg ha^{-1}) and K_2O (40 kg ha^{-1}). The sources of NPK fertilizers was nitrogen through urea (46% N), phosphorus through single super phosphate (16% P_2O_5), potash through muriate of potash (60% K_2O) and zinc through zinc sulphate (21% Zn). The bio-fertilizers i.e. *Azotobactor* and *Azospirilium* used as seed inoculant was applied at3 kg ha^{-1} with 5 kg of well decomposed farm yard manure (FYM) and was applied at 5cm depth in furrows, just before the seed sowing which is carried out on 13th and 14th of November month during 2018 and 2019 with row spacing of 22.5 cm and plant spacing of 5 cm. The bread wheat cv. PBW-343 variety was used for its performance in the experimental research as a test crop.

Generally, soil chemical properties describes a detailed information of change of a substance into completely different form, in order to know its internal quality.

Thus, the data set down from the post soil sample collection after the harvest of wheat crop during the course of experimental research 2018-2019 and 2019-2020. The outcome of the results are analysed under lab condition with standard methods employed are presented in Table 2.

Table 1: Treatment details:

Treatments	***Rabi*** **(Wheat-*var PBW-343*)**
T_1	Control
T_2	75 % N
T_3	$N_{120}P_{60}K_{40}$
T_4	T_2+ FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}
T_5	T_2+ *Azotobactor* and*Azospirillum* @3kg ha^{-1}
T_6	T_4 +*Azotobactor* and *Azospirillum* @3kg ha^{-1}
T_7	T_2+ Zn @ 25 $kgha^{-1}$
T_8	T_4+ Zn@ 25 $kgha^{-1}$
T_9	T_5+Zn@ 25 $kgha^{-1}$
T_{10}	50 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}
T_{11}	50%N + *Azotobactor* and *Azospirillum* @3kg ha^{-1}
T_{12}	T_{10}+*Azotobactor* and *Azospirillum* @3kg ha^{-1}+ Zn @ 25 $kgha^{-1}$

Table 2: Standard methods employed for analysing physical properties of soil:

I	Chemical properties	Authors	Methods	Units
1.	Soil pH (1:2.5)	Jackson, 1973	pH meter	
2.	Electrical conductivity (1:2.5)	Wilcox, 1950	EC bridge (Systronics digital conductivity meter–304.)	dS m^{-1}
3.	Cation exchange capacity	Black, 1965	Sodium saturation method	cmol (p^{+}) kg^{-1}
4.	Free lime	Piper, 2002	Rapid acid titration method	Percentage
5.	Organic carbon	Walkley and Black, 1947	Walkley and Black Wet oxidation method	Percentage
6.	Available nitrogen	Subbiah and Asija, 1956	Modified alkaline permanganate oxidation method	$kgha^{-1}$
7.	Available phosphorus	Olsen *et al.* 1954.	Olsen's extraction followed by Spectrophotometric method	$kgha^{-1}$
8.	Available potassium	Toth and Prince, 1949	Neutral normal ammonium acetate extraction fallowed by Flame photometric method	$kgha^{-1}$
9.	Available Sulphur	Chesnin and Yien, 1950	Turbidimetric method	$kgha^{-1}$
10.	Available Fe, Mn, Cu & Zn	Lindsay and Novell, 1978	DTPA extraction followed by Atomic Absorption Spectrophotometer	$mgkg^{-1}$
II	**Biological properties**			
1.	Dehydrogenase activity	Casida *et al*., 1964	Triphenyl tetrazolium chloride method	µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1}
2.	Alkaline phosphatase activity	Tabatabai & Bremner, 1969	p-nitrophenol phosphate method	µg pNP g^{-1} hr^{-1}
3.	Microbial Biomass Carbon	Voroney*et al*., 1993	$CHCl_3$ fumigation extraction method	mg kg^{-1}

3.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSSION:

Appraisal of the data, transcribed from soil analysis, have focused that constituents like FYM, bio-fertilizers and N-levels have found effective in performing healthier results with regard to soil which have been put under research investigation.

The observations on chemical soil properties with respect to soil pH, variation among the different treatments shows non-significant. The range of soil pH was observed from 6.76-7.31, 6.87-7.40 and 6.82-7.36, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis, However, the treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, have got low soil pH i.e. 6.76, 6.87 and 6.82, when compared with chemically treated plot (T_3) consisting of 100% N i.e. 7.31, 7.40 and 7.36, over control plot (T_1), i.e. 7.06, 7.18 and 7.12, respectively,are presented inTable 3. The results further admitted that, organically treated plots registered less soil pH values in the treatments (T_6) consisting of 75 % N +FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} +*Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}), i.e. 6.79, 6.88 and 6.83 and (T_8) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1}+ Zn, i.e. 6.78, 6.89 and 6.83, and (T_{12}) consisting of 50 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter*+*Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, i.e. 6.88, 7.00 and 6.94, which are at par and followed to treatment (T_9), respectively.
The decrease in soil pH in the FYM treated plots might be attributed to the production of organic acids and release of CO_2 during organic matter decomposition in presence of microbes. The results are in agreement with findings (Kumar and Singh, *et al.*, 2010).

The data pertaining to electrical conductivity of soil shows that, variation among the different treatments was also existed non-significant. The range of EC was observed from 0.26-0.30, 0.34-0.44 and 0.30-0.37 dS m^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis, are presented inTable 3. However, the treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, have got low EC, i.e. 0.30, 0.44 and 0.37 dS m^{-1}, when compared with chemically treated plot (T_3) consisting of 100% N, i.e. 0.27, 0.39 and 0.33 dS m^{-1}, over control plot (T_1), 0.26, 0.34 and 0.30 dS m^{-1}, respectively.

However, the treatment (T_9) followed by treatment (T_6)(0.28, 0.43 and 0.36 dS m^{-1})wasat par with each other and on par with treatment (T_8) (0.28, 0.42 and 0.35 dS m^{-1},) respectively, during both the years and on pooled basis. The reason beyond lowering the EC values in organic treated plots might be due to increasing in water retaining capacity, due to improvement in soil aggregation thus reducing the salt concentration (Duhan and Singh, 2002).

As per results concerned, the holding capacity of exchangeable cations by experimental soil, differs significantly among varied treatments and soil sample analysed which gave limit range of 11.35-16.32, 11.51-16.41 and 11.43-16.37 cmol (p^+)kg^{-1}, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis. Thus, it said that the treatment enriched in combination of sources like FYM, bio-fertilizer and N-levels, have evidenced higher CEC of soil i.e. T_9 consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobactor* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 16.32, 16.41 and 16.37 cmol $(p^+)kg^{-1}$, when compared with chemically treated plot, i.e. T_3 consisting of 100 % N alone, noting 14.74, 15.00 and 14.87 cmol $(p^+)kg^{-1}$, over control (T_1) i.e. 11.35, 11.51 and 11.43 cmol $(p^+)kg^{-1}$, respectively, are presented in Table 3.

In addition to this, treatment (T_9) followed by treatment (T_6)(16.05, 16.16 and 16.11 cmol $(p^+)kg^{-1}$) both stand at par with each other and on par with treatment (T_8) (15.97, 16.10 and 16.04 cmol $(p^+)kg^{-1}$) respectively, during both the years and on pooled basis.

Increasing in CEC of soil might be influenced by incorporation of organic material, in which soil build-up its capacity in holding nutrients through improving clay concentration by beneficial micro-organisms. Hence, exchange of cations take place in presence of clay, adsorption of clay site retains positively charged by electrostatic forces. Thus, improved soil aggregation and structural stability and increased CEC could have achieved. The results are in proximity with findings (Das, *et al.*, 2015 Verma, *et al.*, 2010 Sepehya, 2011).

Table 3 Effect of integrated nutrients onSoil pH, EC (dS m^{-1}) and CEC (cmol $(p^{+)}$ kg^{-1})of soil in wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) cultivation during experimental period 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.

T	Soil pH			EC(dS m^{-1})			CEC (cmol $(p^{+)}$ kg^{-1})		
	1st year	2nd year	Pooled	1st year	2nd year	Pooled	1st year	2nd year	Pooled
T_1	7.06	7.18	7.12	0.26	0.34	0.30	11.35	11.51	11.43
T_2	7.11	7.24	7.17	0.26	0.37	0.31	12.64	12.76	12.70
T_3	7.31	7.40	7.36	0.27	0.39	0.33	14.74	15.00	14.87
T_4	6.88	7.02	6.95	0.28	0.39	0.34	15.42	15.53	15.47
T_5	6.97	7.11	7.04	0.29	0.38	0.33	14.28	14.51	14.39
T_6	6.79	6.88	6.83	0.28	0.43	0.36	16.05	16.16	16.11
T_7	7.17	7.31	7.24	0.26	0.40	0.33	14.23	14.29	14.26
T_8	6.78	6.89	6.83	0.28	0.42	0.35	15.97	16.10	16.04
T_9	6.76	6.87	6.82	0.30	0.44	0.37	16.32	16.41	16.37
T_{10}	6.97	7.08	7.02	0.28	0.39	0.34	15.41	15.47	15.44
T_{11}	7.01	7.13	7.07	0.27	0.37	0.32	13.47	13.80	13.64
T_{12}	6.88	7.00	6.94	0.28	0.41	0.34	15.67	15.78	15.73

F- test	**NS**	**NS**	**NS**	**NS**	**NS**	**NS**	**S**	**S**	**S**
S. Ed.	0.182	0.286	0.209	0.012	0.049	0.026	1.090	1.11	5.51
C. D.	0.377	0.590	0.431	0.024	0.100	0.055	1.350	1.358	0.67

Note: CD at 0.05 level of significance (probability), T-Treatments, NS-Non-significant, S-Significant, EC-Electrical Conductivity, CEC-Cation Exchange Capacity.

The presence of free lime content in soil sample, which was ranged from 13.25-23.27, 13.86-24.11 and 13.55-23.69 %, respectively, during the study period 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis, respectively. In particularly, treatment falling under (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 13.25, 13.86 and 13.55 %, showed significantly lesser percentage of free lime present in soil, compared with chemically treated plot (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 18.17, 18.08 and 18.13 %, which was high, over control (T_1), i.e. 21.98, 22.60 and 22.29 %, respectively.

Further, treatment (T_9) followed by treatment (T_6) (14.69, 14.21 and 14.46 %) and treatment (T_8) (14.62, 15.33 and 14.98 %) both stand statistically similar and at par with treatment (T_9), are presented in Table 4.

The organically treated plot including bio-fertilizer and N-levels, marked significantly higher organic carbon content and it varied from 0.31-0.96, 0.37-1.02 and 0.34-0.99 %, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.In particular, with respect to various treatments, highest percentage of organic carbon labelled in the treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting 0.96, 1.02 and 0.99 %, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting 0.66, 0.74 and 0.70 %, which was very low, over control (T_1) i.e. 0.31, 0.37 and 0.34 %, respectively.Furthermore, the treatment (T_9) followed by treatment (T_6) (0.90, 0.96 and 0.93 %) in which both statistically at par with each other and on par with the treatment (T_8) (0.79, 0.91 and 0.85 %) and treatment (T_{12}) (0.82, 0.89 and 0.85 %), respectively, in which both are found statistically similar, during both the years and on pooled basis, are presented inTable 4.

Besides adding organic carbon, the added organic sources to the treatment plot itself influenced the soil root growth system, resulting in addition of greater root biomass and root exudates to the soil and also observed that It might be due to build up effect of organic matter in surface soil, over all led to ultimately increasing in soil organic carbon. (Mohammed *et al.*, 2014) (Eldardiry, *et al.*, 2013).

The observational studies after analysing soil samples from respective field, it was noticed that, integral effect of organics and inorganics found highest available N source in experimental site. The available N among the treatments ranged from 214.07-261.99, 217.21-262.25 and 217.07-262.12 kg ha^{-1}, respectively. In clarity, treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobactor* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 261.99, 262.25 and 262.12 kg ha^{-1}, evidenced significantly highest available N in soil, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 242.08, 242.37 and 242.22 kg ha^{-1}, both stand statistically at par with each other over control (T_1) i.e. 216.93, 217.21 and 217.07 kg ha^{-1}.Furthermore, treatment (T_9) stand statistically on par with the treatment (T_6)(234.74, 235.00 and 234.87 kg ha^{-1}), respectively, during both the years and on pooled basis,are presented inTable 4.

Increasing in available N observed under organically treated plot, which might be due to mineralization effect of organic sources (Tabassum, *et al.*, 2010). It might be also due to the favourable soil conditions provided by FYM addition might have helped in mineralization of additional soil N leading to build-up of higher available N and improved soil fertility (Santhy, *et al.*, 1998) (Sarin, *et al.*, 1991)(Kumar, 2014) (Davari, *et al.*, 2012) (Essan and Lattief , 2014).

Table 4Effect of integrated nutrients onfree lime (%), OC (%)and available N(kgha^{-1})of soil in wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) cultivation during experimental period 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.

T	Free lime (%)			OC (%)			Available N(kgha^{-1})		
	1st year	2nd year	Pooled	1st year	2nd year	Pooled	1st year	2nd year	Pooled
T_1	21.98	22.60	22.29	0.31	0.37	0.34	216.93	217.21	217.07
T_2	23.27	24.11	23.69	0.39	0.47	0.43	224.26	224.53	224.39
T_3	18.17	18.08	18.13	0.66	0.74	0.70	242.08	242.37	242.22
T_4	15.72	16.39	16.06	0.75	0.82	0.78	227.45	229.74	228.60
T_5	17.82	19.29	18.56	0.54	0.64	0.59	226.76	230.44	228.60
T_6	14.69	14.21	14.46	0.90	0.96	0.93	234.74	235.00	234.87
T_7	18.75	18.45	18.60	0.51	0.59	0.55	227.45	229.70	228.58
T_8	14.62	15.33	14.98	0.79	0.91	0.85	231.46	232.00	231.73
T_9	13.25	13.86	13.55	0.96	1.02	0.99	261.99	262.25	262.12
T_{10}	17.88	17.69	17.79	0.70	0.81	0.75	217.98	218.23	218.10
T_{11}	19.27	21.05	20.16	0.48	0.57	0.52	217.02	221.26	219.14
T_{12}	14.78	15.38	15.08	0.82	0.89	0.85	214.07	226.34	220.21
F- test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
S. Ed.	3.82	1.93	1.51	0.109	0.113	0.110	3.630	3.703	3.659

C. D.	4.688	2.378	1.839	0.225	0.233	0.227	7.493	7.643	7.553

Note: CD at 0.05 level of significance (probability), T-Treatments, S-significant, OC-Organic carbon

On the basis of research studies during the course of two years, it has come with output that, the organically treated plot including bio-fertilizer and N-levels, marked significantly highest available P in soil and it varied from 16.41-21.52, 16.88-21.98 and 16.75-21.75 kg ha^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis, are presented in Table 5.However, treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 21.52, 21.98 and 21.75 kg ha^{-1}, evidenced significantly highest available P in soil, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 19.41, 20.49 and 19.77 kg ha^{-1}, both stand statistically at par with each other, over control (T_1) i.e. 16.63, 16.88 and 16.75 kg ha^{-1}, respectively.Furthermore, treatment (T_9) stand slightly on par with the treatment (T_6) (19.51, 20.00 and 19.76 kg ha^{-1})and treatment (T_8)(19.50, 20.01 and 19.76 kg ha^{-1}) respectively, which are identically same, during both the years and on pooled basis.

The highest available P in FYM treated plot resulted, might be due to effective solubilization of native P in the soil through the release of various organic acids by FYM. On another side it may also influenced by release of carbon dioxide (CO_2), which plays a dominant role in enhancing the P availability, during the decomposition of organic matter which forms carbonic acids, solubilizing certain primary minerals (Singh and Wanjari 2007).

The organically treated plot having higher clay content, having higher persistence in soil including bio-fertilizer and N-levels, marked significantly highest available K in soil and it varied from 136.29-217.29, 136.76-223.73 and 136.52-220.51 kg ha^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis, are presented in Table 5.Among various treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 217.29, 223.73 and 220.51 kg ha^{-1}, evidenced significantly highest available P in soil, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 216.55, 217.02 and 216.79 kg ha^{-1}, both stand statistically at par with each other, over control (T_1), i.e. 136.29, 136.76 and 136.52 kg ha^{-1}, respectively. Furthermore, treatment (T_9) stand slightly on par with treatment (T_4) (205.35, 205.81 and 205.58 kg ha^{-1}) treatment (T_6) (205.35, 205.83 and 205.59 kg ha^{-1})and treatment (T_8) (204.35, 206.82 and 205.59 kg ha^{-1}) respectively, in which all three are identically same, during both the years and on pooled basis.

The higher amount of available K in the FYM treated plot might have resulted, due to the fact that FYM, on its application pronounced increased CEC in soil, which is mainly capable of holding large amount of exchangeable K. Further, it helped in releasing exchangeable K from non-exchangeable pool.

It could also ascribe due to the reduction in K-fixation and release of K from reserved non-exchange site, which is held between inter lattice layer of clay or due to the interaction of organic matter with clay besides the direct addition of K to available pool of the soil. The results are in agreement with findings (Kher and Minhas 1991).

On the basis of research studies during the course of two years, the outcome of the result says that, the organically treated plot including bio-fertilizer and N-levels, marked significantly highest available S in soil and it varied from 19.61-32.44, 19.86-32.71 and 19.73-32.57 kg ha^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis, are presented inTable 5.However, treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 32.44, 32.71 and 32.57 kg ha^{-1}, evidenced significantly highest available S in soil, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 29.78, 30.01 and 29.89 kg ha^{-1}, both stand statistically at par with each other, over control (T_1) i.e. 19.61, 19.86 and 19.73 kg ha^{-1}, respectively.

Furthermore, treatment (T_9) stand statistically on par with the treatment (T_6) (28.17, 28.43 and 28.30 kg ha^{-1})and treatment (T_8) (27.28, 27.52 and 27.40 kg ha^{-1}) respectively, during both the years and on pooled basis.Primarily, the increase in available S was due to use of single superphosphate (SSP) as a source of P, which contains appreciable amount of S. In addition to this, the highest available sulphur in organic treatment might be attributed to mineralization of available NPKS nutrients from FYM, another reason might be that, the suitable soil conditions under organic sources might have promoted for mineralization of nutrients and leading to build-up higher NPKS. Similar results are in conformity with authors. (Agarwal, *et al.*, 2010) (Ravankar, *et al.*, 2005).

Table 5 Effect of integrated nutrients on available PKS in wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) cultivation during experimental period 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.

T	Available P(kgha^{-1})			Available K(kgha^{-1})			Available S(kgha^{-1})		
	1st year	2nd year	Pooled	1st year	2nd year	Pooled	1st year	2nd year	Pooled
T_1	16.63	16.88	16.75	136.29	136.76	136.52	19.61	19.86	19.73
T_2	18.12	18.42	18.27	188.55	189.05	188.80	22.46	22.68	22.57

T_3	19.41	20.49	19.77	216.55	217.02	216.79	29.78	30.01	29.89
T_4	19.52	19.99	19.75	205.35	205.81	205.58	25.35	25.60	25.48
T_5	18.02	18.51	18.26	192.29	192.77	192.53	24.38	24.61	24.50
T_6	19.51	20.00	19.76	205.35	205.83	205.59	28.17	28.43	28.30
T_7	19.65	19.84	19.74	196.02	196.47	196.24	23.49	23.70	23.59
T_8	19.50	20.01	19.76	204.35	206.82	205.59	27.28	27.52	27.40
T_9	21.52	21.98	21.75	217.29	223.73	220.51	32.44	32.71	32.57
T_{10}	18.02	18.46	18.24	179.22	179.72	179.47	19.89	20.13	20.01
T_{11}	16.41	17.11	16.76	162.42	162.90	162.66	20.88	21.10	20.99
T_{12}	19.30	20.13	19.74	181.09	181.54	181.31	21.55	21.80	21.67
F- test	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**
S. Ed.	1.161	1.185	1.167	13.269	13.704	13.414	0.725	0.951	0.837
C. D.	2.397	2.446	2.409	27.388	28.285	27.687	1.496	1.962	1.728

Note: CD at 0.05 level of significance (probability), T-Treatments, S-significant

Outcome of the result says that, the organically treated plot including bio-fertilizer and N-levels, marked significantly highest available Fein soil and it varied from 3.12-3.84, 3.21-3.95 and 3.17-3.90 mg kg^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.However, the treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, have noted highest available Fe, i.e. 3.84, 3.95 and 3.90 mg kg^{-1}, when compared with chemically treated plot (T_3) consisting of 100% N, i.e. 3.32, 3.58 and 3.45 mg kg^{-1}, over control plot (T_1), i.e. 3.12, 3.21 and 3.17 mg kg^{-1}, respectively.The results further revealed that,the treatment (T_9) followed by treatment (T_6) (3.72, 3.84 and 3.78 mg kg^{-1}) andtreatment (T_8) (3.72, 3.81 and 3.77 mg kg^{-1}) and stand statistically at par with each, respectively, during both the years and on pooled basis, are presented inTable 6.

The data pertaining to Mn availability in soil shows that, significant variation existed among the different treatments. The range of available Mnwas ranged from 4.30-6.20, 4.39-6.32 and 4.35-6.24 mg kg^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis, are presented inTable 6 In contrast, treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 3.72, 3.81 and 3.77 mg kg^{-1}, evidenced significantly lowest available Mn in soil, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 6.20, 6.28 and 6.24 mg kg^{-1}, over control (T_1), i.e. 4.89, 4.98 and 4.94 mg kg^{-1}, respectively.

Furthermore, treatment (T_9) followed by treatment (T_6) (4.30, 4.39 and 4.35 mg kg^{-1}) stand statistically at par with each other, on par with treatment (T_8)(4.50, 4.58 and 4.54 mg kg^{-1}, respectively),during both the years and on pooled basis.

The data pertaining to Cu availability in soil shows that, significant variation existed among the different treatments. The range of available Cuwas observed from 0.28-0.98, 0.33-1.01 and 0.31-0.99 mg kg^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis. In contrast, from various treatments, (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 0.28, 0.33 and 0.31 mg kg^{-1}, evidenced significantly lowest available Cu in soil, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 0.98, 1.01 and 0.99 mg kg^{-1}, over control (T_1), i.e. 0.58, 0.62 and 0.60 mg kg^{-1}, respectively.Furthermore, treatment (T_9) followed by treatment (T_6) (0.52, 0.56 and 0.54 mg kg^{-1}) and treatment (T_8)(0.53, 0.55 and 0.54 mg kg^{-1}) both stand statistically similar and at par to treatment (T_9), are presented inTable 6

The reason for low Cu availability in soil, mainly depends on the functional groups of the soil reactive particles and their sorption capacity, which is a result of diverse factors. (McBride, 1994). However, soil belongs to organically treated plot having neutral to alkaline in reaction, may generally have lower Cu availability which is related to the presence of carbonates that favour Cu precipitation and adsorption (Bradl, 2004). In addition, organic matter restricts Cu availability, because of its high affinity sites and a binding energy capable of making strong complex with the copper metal. Hence its availability is very less. (Croue, *et al.*, 2003).

Outcome of the result from the two years says that, the organically treated plot including bio-fertilizer and N-levels, marked significantly highest available Znin soil and it varied from 1.13-1.78, 1.19-1.80 and 1.16-1.79 mg kg^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.However, the treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, have noted highest available Zn, i.e. 1.78, 1.79 and 1.79 mg kg^{-1}, when compared with chemically treated plot (T_3) consisting of 100% N, i.e. 1.42, 1.53 and 1.47 mg kg^{-1}, over control plot (T_1), i.e. 1.13, 1.19 and 1.16 mg kg^{-1}, respectively.

However, the treatment (T_9)followed by treatment (T_6),i.e. 1.77, 1.79 and 1.78 mg kg^{-1}, both stand statistically at par with each other, on par with treatment (T_8), i.e. 1.75, 1.78 and 1.76 mg kg^{-1}, respectively, during both the years and on pooled basis, are presented inTable 6.

The consequence of overall analysis of chemical parameters influenced well with respect to positive effect of amendment used as bio-fertilizer and FYM, might be attributed to increment in macro and micronutrients availability at the rhizosphere and also due to growing tissues and organs acquisition with higher amounts of nitrogen supported by N_2-fixing *Azospirillum* and *Azotobacter* on wheat plants.These results are in agreement with reporters (Madhu, *et al.*, 1993) (Amara, *et al.*, 1995), (Patel, *et al.*, 1996), (Panwar, *et al.*, 2000) (El-Bakry, *et al.*, 2001).

Table 6 Effect of integrated nutrients available soil micro-nutrients in wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) cultivation during experimental period 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.

T	Available micro-nutrients(mg kg^{-1}) in soil.											
	Available Fe			**AvailableMn**			**AvailableCu**			**Available Zn**		
	1st year	**2nd year**	**Pooled**	**1st year**	**2nd year**	**Pooled**	**1st year**	**2nd year**	**Pooled**	**1st year**	**2nd year**	**Pooled**
T_1	3.12	3.21	3.17	4.89	4.98	4.94	0.58	0.62	0.60	1.13	1.19	1.16
T_2	3.31	3.39	3.35	6.10	6.32	6.22	0.87	0.93	0.90	1.33	1.41	1.37
T_3	3.32	3.58	3.45	6.20	6.28	6.24	0.98	1.01	0.99	1.42	1.53	1.47
T_4	3.56	3.64	3.60	4.56	4.66	4.61	0.57	0.59	0.58	1.59	1.62	1.61
T_5	3.54	3.59	3.57	6.08	6.15	6.12	0.88	0.91	0.90	1.42	1.61	1.52
T_6	3.72	3.84	3.78	4.30	4.39	4.35	0.52	0.56	0.54	1.77	1.79	1.78
T_7	3.23	3.54	3.38	5.72	5.79	5.75	0.77	0.79	0.78	1.51	1.53	1.52
T_8	3.72	3.81	3.77	4.50	4.58	4.54	0.53	0.55	0.54	1.75	1.78	1.76
T_9	3.84	3.95	3.90	3.72	3.81	3.77	0.28	0.33	0.31	1.78	1.79	1.79
T_{10}	3.60	3.68	3.64	4.82	4.94	4.88	0.77	0.80	0.79	1.52	1.56	1.54
T_{11}	3.46	3.53	3.50	5.71	5.83	5.77	0.70	0.74	0.72	1.48	1.52	1.50
T_{12}	3.67	3.73	3.70	4.64	4.87	4.76	0.56	0.62	0.59	1.70	1.72	1.71
Ftest	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**
SEd	0.030	0.086	0.054	0.71	0.65	0.43	0.31	0.27	0.14	0.20	0.17	0.18
C.D.	0.062	0.178	0.112	0.54	0.80	0.535	0.23	0.24	0.17	0.25	0.22	0.23

Note: CD at 0.05 level of significance (probability), T-Treatments, S-significant, Fe- Iron, Mn-Manganese, Cu-copper, Zn-Zinc

The observations on biological soil properties with respect to enzyme activities showsthat, significantly higher dehydrogenase enzyme activity was marked in the organically treated plot including bio-fertilizer and N-levels and it varied from 0.84-1.42, 1.00-1.57 and 0.92-1.49 µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1}, respectively. The highest percentage of enzyme activity labelled in the treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobacter* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 1.42, 1.57 and 1.49 µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1}, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 1.24, 1.26 and 1.25 µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1}, which was low, over control (T_1), i.e. 0.84, 1.00 and 0.92 µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1}, respectively.

Furthermore, the treatment (T_9) followed by the treatment (T_6), i.e. 1.37, 1.52 and 1.44 µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1}, in which both was statistically at par with each other, on par with the treatment (T_8), i.e. 1.30, 1.46 and 1.38 µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1}, respectively, during both the years and on pooled basis, are presented inTable 7**.**

Among, different treatment combination, usage of both *Azotobacter* spp. and *Azospirillum spp*. as seed inoculant, during experimentation, might have found most effective and efficient, resulted in receiving maximum values of plant growth parameter, yield attributing characteristics, grain yield, soil microbial biomass carbon (SMBC) and dehydrogenase activities at all the growth stages of wheat crop. The work was in conformity with findings (Singh, *et al.*, 2015)

Similarly,alkaline phosphatase activityit varied from 148.44-185.97, 152.27-186.73 and 152.05-186.35 µg pNP g^{-1} hr^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.The highest percentage of phosphatase activity labelled in organically amended treatment (T_9) consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobactor* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 185.97, 186.73 and 186.35 µg pNP g^{-1} hr^{-1}, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 164.53, 165.25 and 164.89 µg pNP g^{-1} hr^{-1}, which was very low, over control (T_1), i.e. 151.81, 152.27 and 152.05 µg pNP g^{-1} hr^{-1}, respectively.Furthermore, the treatment (T_9) followed by and statistically at par with treatment (T_6) i.e. 183.20, 185.78 and 184.49 µg pNP g^{-1} hr^{-1},during both the years and on pooled basis, are presented inTable 7.

The microbial bio-mass carbon (MBC) in treated soil sample varied from 29.40-37.37, 30.66-37.87 and 30.42-37.59 gm kg^{-1}, respectively, during 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis and the highest percentage of MBC labelled in the treatment T_9 consisting of 75 % N + FYM @ 5 t ha^{-1} + *Azotobactor* + *Azospirillum* (3kg ha^{-1}) + Zn, noting, 37.37, 37.81 and 37.59 gm kg^{-1}, in comparison with chemical treatment (T_3) consisting of 100% N alone, noting, 34.86, 35.35 and 35.11 gm kg^{-1}, which was very low, over control (T_1), i.e. 30.19, 30.66 and 30.42 gm kg^{-1}, respectively, are presented inTable 7**.**

Furthermore, the treatment (T_9) followed by treatment (T_6) i.e. 36.96, 37.43 and 37.20, (in which both are statistically at par with each other), on par with the treatment (T_4) i.e. 36.24, 36.70 and 36.47 gm kg^{-1} and treatment (T_8) i.e. 36.24, 36.71 and 36.48 gm kg^{-1}, in which both are found statistically similar, respectively, during both the years and on pooled basis.

From the studies, higher microbial biomass carbon was observed in organic treated plot, which might be the result of cumulative effect of the amendments used and also left-over crop residues on the field after harvest during the previous seasons. Crop residues can have a large effect on soil microbial biomass and activity, which, in turn, affect the ability of soil to supply nutrients to plants through soil organic matter turnover. MBC have positively correlated with organic carbon content in soil. The work is in conformity with findings, (Beck, *et al.*, 1997) (Leiros, *et al.*, 2000).

Table 7 Effect of integrated nutrients on soil enzyme activities in wheat (*Triticumaestivum* L.) cultivation during experimental period 2018-2019, 2019-2020 and on pooled basis.

T	DHA (µg TPF g^{-1} day^{-1})			APA (µg pNP g^{-1} hr^{-1})			MBC (gm kg^{-1})		
	1st year	2nd year	Pooled	1st year	2nd year	Pooled	1st year	2nd year	Pooled
T_1	0.84	1.00	0.92	151.81	152.27	152.05	30.19	30.66	30.42
T_2	0.90	1.04	0.97	148.44	170.97	159.71	30.37	32.86	31.61
T_3	1.24	1.26	1.25	164.53	165.25	164.89	34.86	35.35	35.11
T_4	1.20	1.35	1.27	180.98	181.46	181.22	36.24	36.70	36.47
T_5	1.12	1.27	1.20	160.74	161.21	160.98	33.58	34.03	33.80
T_6	1.37	1.52	1.44	183.20	185.78	184.49	36.96	37.43	37.20
T_7	0.99	1.16	1.08	160.23	160.92	160.57	32.27	32.75	32.51
T_8	1.30	1.46	1.38	179.33	183.81	181.57	36.24	36.71	36.48
T_9	1.42	1.57	1.49	185.97	186.73	186.35	37.37	37.81	37.59
T_{10}	1.18	1.36	1.27	175.62	176.26	175.94	34.37	34.87	34.62
T_{11}	0.93	1.06	0.99	153.42	161.94	157.68	29.40	33.85	31.63
T_{12}	1.25	1.36	1.31	180.18	182.78	181.48	35.76	36.24	36.00
F- test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
S. Ed.	0.175	0.172	0.172	9.10	6.34	4.61	1.029	0.933	0.975
C. D.	0.360	0.355	0.355	11.294	10.312	5.66	2.124	1.927	2.013

Note: CD at 0.05 level of significance (probability), T-Treatments, S-significant, DHA-Dehydrogenase activity, APA-Alkaline phosphatase activity, MBC-Microbial biomass carbon

4.0 CONCLUSION:

The overall result, during two years (2018-2019 and 2019-2020) of research investigation, delivered to wheat growers that, for optimum requirement of farmers livelihood, the best alternative way to sound success in agriculture production is by effective utilization of higher organic resource during cultivation practices in combination with inorganics at lesser amount, in order to sustain soil health and economic productivity. However, Integrated treatments found better in organic ones in terms of soil dehydrogenase, phosphatase and urease and available nutrient status (NPKS), organic carbon and cation exchange capacity. Biofertilizers like *Azatobacter* spp and *Azospirilium* spp (as seed inoculation) @ 3 kg $ha^{-1}$and farmyard manure @ 5 tha^{-1}has proved potential organic inputs for yield sustenance under wheat crop cultivation.

5.0 REFERENCES:

AgarwalM, Ram N, Ram S. Long-term effect of inorganic fertilizers and manure on physical and chemical properties of soil after 35 years of continuous cropping of rice-wheat. *Pantnagar Journal of Research*. 2010;8(**1**) 76-80.

Amara MA, NasrSA, Rabie KAK. Phytohormonal interaction between *Pseudomonas, Fluorescens, Rhodium, Legumin Sarum and Triticum aestivum*. *Annals of Agricultural Science Cario*.1995;40(**1**): 81-97.

Beck T, Joergensen RG, Kandeler ME, Nuss F, Oberholzer HR, ScheuS. An inter-laboratory comparison of ten different ways of measuring soil microbial carbon. *Soil Biol. Bio-chem*. 1997;29:1023–1032.

Black CA. Method of Soil Analysis Part I and II. Agronomy Monograph 9.*American Soc. Agron.* Madison, Wisconsin, USA.1965.

Bradl HB. Adsorption of heavy metal ions on soils and soils constituents. *Journal ofColloid and Interface Science*.2004;277:1–18.

CasidaLE, Klein DA, Santoto T. Soil dehydrogenase activity. *Soil Sci.*1964;98: 371-376.

ChesninL, Yien CH. Turbidimetric determination of available sulphur in soil. *Soil. Sci. Amer. Proc.* 1950;15:149-151.

CroueJP, Benedetti MF, Violleau D, Leenheer JA.Characterization and copper binding of humic and non-humic organic matter isolated from the South Platte River: Evidence for the presence of nitrogenous binding site. *Environmental Science and Technology*.2003;37:328–36.

DasD, DwivediBS, MeenaMC. Integrated nutrient management for improving soil health and crop productivity. *Indian J. Fert.*2015;11(**4**):64-83.

DavariMR, SharmaSN, Mirzakhani M. Effect of combinations of organic materials and biofertilizers on productivity, grain quality, nutrient uptake and economics in organic farming of wheat. *Journal of Organic Systems*.2012;7(**2**):26-35.

Dotaniya ML, Meena VD, Basak BB, Meena RS. Potassium uptake by crops as well as microorganisms and potassium solubilizing microorganisms for sustainable agriculture. *Springer*.New Delhi.2016;267–280.

DuhanBS, Singh M. Effect of green manuring and nitrogen on yield and uptake of nutrients by rice. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*.2002;50:178-80.

El-BakryAA, Abd-Elmonhim M, El-Banna AM, Hassan HT, Massoud ON. Effect of *Azospirillum*, *Arbuscular-Mycorrhiza* and organic matter on growth and yield of wheat and sorghum. *Bull. Fac. Assiut Univ*.2001;30(**1-3**):53-66.

El-dardiry E, HellalF, Mansour H, Hady MAE. Assessment cultivated period and farm yard manure addition in some soil properties, nutrient content and wheat yield under sprinkler system. *Agricultural Sciences*.2013;4(**1**)14-22.

EssamA, Lattief AE. Influence of integrated nutrient management on productivity and grain protein content of wheat under sandy soils conditions. *Bio-life Journal*.2014;2(**4**): 1359-1364.

Gain Report.The report contains assessments of commodity and trade issues made by USDA staff and not necessarily statements of official U.S. government policy.*Grain and Feed Annual*.2019;1-42.

Jackson ML. *Soil Chemical Analysis*. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi.1973;52.

Kher D, Minhas RS. Effect of continuous liming, manuring and cropping on different forms of soil acidity in an *Alfisol.Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*.1991;39:169-171.

Kumar D. Influence of nutrient sources and inclusion of mung bean on productivity, soil fertility and profitability of organic rice-wheat cropping system. Building Organic Bridges at the Organic World Congress.2014;255-257.

KumarS, Singh OP. Response of wheat to different combination of integrated nutrient management under irrigated conditions. *Green Farming*.2010;1(**1**):27-29.

LindsayWL, Norvell WA. Development of DTPA-soil test for Zn, Fe, Mn and Cu. *Soil Sci. Soc. America J*.1978;42: 421-428.

Leiros MC, Trasar-Cepeda C, Seoane S, GilSotress F. Biochemical properties of acid soils under climax vegetation (*Atlantic oak wood*) in an area of European temperaturehumid zone (Galicia, NW Spain): General parameters. *Soil Biol. Bio-chem.* 2000;32: 733–745.

Madhu D, Upadhyay RM, Dwivedi GK, DwivediM. Effect of inorganic, organic and bio-fertilizers on yield and nutritional quality of black gram and wheat grown in sequence. *Indian Journal of Agricultural-Chemistry*.1993;26:111-122.

McBride MB. Trace and toxic elements in soils in environmental chemistry of soils. New York. EUA: Oxford University Press.1994;308–410.

MehranM, Ardakani MR, Madani H, Zahedi M. Response of sunflower yield and phytohormonal changes to *Azotobacter, Azospirillum, Pseudomonas* and animal manure in a chemical free agro-ecosystem. *Annals Biol. Res.*2011;2(**6**): 425-430.

MuhhammadH, Zaman A, Khalil SK, ShahZ. Effect of beneficial microbes (BM) on the efficiency of organic and inorganic N fertilizers on wheat crop. *Sarhad Journal of Agriculture*.2014;30(**1**):7-13.

Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watababe FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. U. S. Dept. of Agric. Circ. 1954;939.

Panwar JDS, Ompal S, Singh O. Response of *Azospirillum* and *Bacillus* on growth and yield of wheat under field conditions. *Indian Journal of Plant Physiology*. 2000;5:108-110.

PatelJG, Malvia DD, Kaneria BB, Khanpara VD, Mathukia RK. Effect of N, P and bio-fertilizers on yield, quality and nutrients uptake in wheat. *Gujarat Agricultural University Research Journal*.1996;22(**1**):118-120.

Piper CS. *Soil and Plant Analysis*. Hans Publishers. Bombay. India.2002.

Ravankar HN, Gajbhiye NN, SarapPA. Effect of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers on yield and availability of nutrients under sorghum– wheat sequence. *Indian Journal of Agriculture Research*.2005;39:142-145.

Santhy P, Muthuvel P, Murugappan V, Selvi D. Long-term effects of continuous cropping and fertilization on crop yields and soil fertility status. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*.1998;46:391-395.

Sarin T, Tanaka Y, Kitagawa. Utilization of organic matter for vegetable cultivation under a paddy upland rotation system. Nara Agricultural Experiment Station.1991;22:57-64.

Sepehya S. Long-term effect of integrated nutrient management on dynamics of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in rice-wheat system. Department of Soil Science. CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishwavidyalaya. Palampur. India.2011;179.

Singh, Ripudaman, Kumar H, Shweta, Kumar A. Growth and yield of late sown wheat as influenced by irrigation schedules and integrated nutrient management. *Research Environmental Life Science*.2015;8(**2**): 275-277.

Singh AP, Lal AK, Singh AP. Effect of FYM, potassium and zinc on yield, quality and uptake of nutrients in forage oat in alluvial soil. *Annals of Plant and Soil Research*.2016;18(**4**): 338-341.

Singh, Muneshwar, Wanjari RH. Research bulletin on lessons learnt from long-term fertilizer experiments and measures to sustain productivity in *Alfisols*. AICRP on LTFE to study changes in soil quality, crop productivity and sustainability.*Indian Institute of Soil Science*. Bhopal.2007.

SubbiahBV, Asija GL. A rapid procedure for determination of available nitrogen in soils. *Current sciences.*1956;25:259-260.

Tabassum S, Reddy KS, Vaishya UK, Singh M, Biswas AK. Changes in organic and inorganic forms of N in a *Typic Haplustert* under soyabean-wheat system due to conjoint use of inorganic fertilizers and organic manures. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science.* 2010;58(**1**): 76-85.

Tababtabai MA, Bremner JM. Use of p-nitro phenyl phosphate for assay of soil phosphatase activity. *Soil Biology Biochemistry*.1969;1:301-307.

Toth SJ, Prince AL. Estimation of cation exchange capacity and exchangeable calcium, available potassium and sodium content of soil by flame photometer technique. *Soil Sci.*1949;67:439-445.

VermaG, Mathur AK, Bhandari SC, KanthaliyaPC. Long-term effect of integrated nutrient management on properties of a *Typic Haplustept* under maize-wheat cropping system. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*.2010;58: 299-302.

Voroney RP, Winter JP, BeyartRP. Soil microbial biomass carbon and nitrogen. *Soil Sampling and Method of Analysis.* Lewis. Chelsea.1993;277-286.

WalkleyA, Black IA. Rapid titration method of organic carbon of soils. *Soil Science*.1947;37: 29-33.

Wilcox LV. Electrical conductivity Am. *Water works assoc. J.* 1950;42:775-776.

Wu F, Dong M, Liu Y, Ma X, An L, Young JPW, Feng H. Effects of long-term fertilizationon AM fungal community structure and glomalinrelatedsoil protein in the Loess Plateau of China.*Plant and Soil.* 2011;342:233-247.