



## **Effect of Inorganic Fertilizers, Organic Manure and Bioinoculant on Production and Economics of Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.)**

**Himani Verma<sup>a</sup>, R. K. Pathak<sup>a</sup>, Anil Kumar<sup>a</sup>, Ravindra Sachan<sup>a\*</sup>, Hanuman Prasad Pandey<sup>b<sup>o</sup></sup>, Abhishek Tiwari<sup>a</sup> and Abhishek Singh Yadav<sup>a</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> *Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur, (U.P.)-208002, India.*

<sup>b</sup> *Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Chandauli, (U.P.)-232104, India.*

### **Authors' contributions**

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

### **Article Information**

DOI: 10.9734/IJECC/2022/v12i111422

### **Open Peer Review History:**

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/93294>

**Original Research Article**

**Received 01 September 2022**

**Accepted 03 November 2022**

**Published 07 November 2022**

### **ABSTRACT**

Field experiments were conducted to study the effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and economics of wheat during Rabi season of 2020-21 and 2021-22 at student's instructional farm, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture & Technology, Kanpur. The experiment consists of 10 treatments combinations in randomized block design with three replications. Three replications consisted of different combinations of inorganic fertilizer, organic and biofertilizer. Wheat variety HD-2967 was grown with the recommended agronomic practices. On the basis of results emanated from investigation it can be concluded that among the productivity parameters viz. maximum grain yield was 53.79 and 54.21 q ha<sup>-1</sup>, straw yield was 80.76 and 81.35 q ha<sup>-1</sup> and biological yield was 134.55 and 135.56 q ha<sup>-1</sup> during the both years of experimentation are associated with the treatment T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +Azotobacter + PSB]. Similarly straw yield during first year is 80.6 q ha<sup>-1</sup> and second year is 81.35 q ha<sup>-1</sup> was associated with the treatment T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +Azotobacter + PSB]. Maximum gross return INR 158043 and INR 156367, net return INR 94499 and INR 97635 and benefit cost ratio (B:C ratio) 1.57 and 1.62 during the first year (2020-21) and second year (2021-22) of experimentation were recorded under treatment T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +Azotobacter + PSB] similarly the maximum cost of cultivation during first year is INR 60192 and second year is INR 60408 were recorded under treatment T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +Azotobacter + PSB].

<sup>o</sup> *Subject Matter Specialist (Soil Science);*

*\*Corresponding author: E-mail: ravindrasachankurmi@gmail.com;*

**Keywords:** *Azotobacter*; economics; FYM; phosphorous; PSB; wheat; yield.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

“Wheat being an energy rich winter cereal contributes around 35% to the food grain basket of the country. Globally wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is grown in 124 countries and occupied an area of about 215 million hectares with a production of 734.50 mt. of grain during 2019-20” (Anonymous, 2020). “In India the area under wheat increased since the start of green revolution in 1967 and the production and productivity also increased. The area under wheat increased from 12.8 mha. In 1966-67 to 31.45 mha. in 2019-20. In this period production has also increased from 11.4 to 107.59 mt. and the productivity was increased from 887 to 3421 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>” (Anonymous, 2020). “Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) is one of the major cereal crops with a unique protein, which is consumed by humans and is grown around the world in different environments” [1]. “Wheat is foremost among cereals as a main source of carbohydrates and protein for both human beings and animals; contains starch (60-90%), protein (11-16.5%), fat (1.5-2%), inorganic ions(1.2-2%) and vitamins (B complex and vitamin E)” [2].

“In recent year the food grain production have been stagnated or even declined for both rice and wheat crops” [3] and “there has been a wide gap between the target and actual production” [4]. “There are many reasons of low productivity of wheat out of which imbalance and excess fertilizer application is major one and changes in physico-chemical composition of the soil, a depletion and diminution in bioavailability of soil nutrients, a scarcity of good groundwater, buildup of pests and attack of various diseases of wheat greatly affected its yield and quality. Injudicious application of chemical fertilizers not only harms the biological power of soil but also decreases the soil fertility and crop productivity” [5]. “Thus, integrated nutrient management advocates balanced and conjoint use of inorganic fertilizer, organic manure, and bio-inoculants in order to maintenance or adjustment of soil fertility and plant nutrient supply to an optimum level for sustaining desired crop productivity” [6,5].

“Nitrogen (N) is major factor for yield of wheat. The efficiency of wheat cultivars to N use has become increasingly important to allow reduction in N fertilizer use without decreasing yield. Wheat is an important cereal crop and requires a good supply of nutrients especially nitrogen for its

growth” [7] and yield [8]. “Nitrogen rate, type of nitrogen, and timing of its application are important factors to increase wheat yield” [9]. “Some studies showed that N fertilization increases the total quantity of flour proteins, resulting in an increase in both gliadins and glutenin” [10].

“Phosphorus is essential for enhancing seed maturity and seed development” [11]. “Phosphorus plays a significant role in several vital functions such as photosynthesis, transformation of sugar to starch, protein information, nucleic acid production, nitrogen fixation and formation of oil. It is also, the part of all biochemical cycles in plants” [12].

“Potassium (K<sup>+</sup>) is of unusual significance because of its live role in biochemical functions of the plant like activating various enzymes, improvement of protein, carbohydrates and fat concentration, developing tolerance against drought and resistance to frost, lodging, pests and disease attack. Therefore, potassium known as “quality element” and it was considered as a key factor in crop production” [13]. “It is thus necessary to devise a fertilizer technology facilitating use of NPK in apt combination for enhancing wheat yield” [14].

“Zinc is also reported as an important micronutrient for wheat production because it is required in a large number of enzymes and plays an essential role in DNA transcription. . It is reported that high amount of zinc is contained in pollen and mostly zinc is inverted to seed only during seed formation and an application of zinc improves grain formation” [15].

“Generally, crops needs less sulphur like cereals, still start suffering more and more from sulphur deficiency even there are some crops which need more sulphur as well” [16]. “The baking properties of wheat and the biological value of proteins can also be improved by increasing sulphur fertilization which has reported many times” [17,18].

“Judicious use of FYM with chemical fertilizers improves soil physical, chemical and biological properties and improves the crop productivity” [19]. “Application of organic manures may also improve availability of native nutrients in soil as well as the efficiency of applied fertilizers” [20].

“The need of the hour is to evolve an integrated plant nutrient supply system, comprising balanced use of chemical fertilizer, organic manures and bio-fertilizers. An improvement in crop performance might be attributed to the N<sub>2</sub> - fixing and phosphate solubilising capacity of *Azotobacter* as well as the ability of these microorganisms to produce growth promoting substances. *Azotobacter* and graded doses of nitrogen increase phosphorus and potassium uptake by plants significantly. Wheat poses problem for the establishment of *Azotobacter* in its rhizosphere” [21,22]. “The inoculation of crop plants with bacterial preparation is recommended because a selective and compatible strain is supposed to accelerate plant growth” [23]. “Phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB) as bio-fertilizers have been found effective in solubilizing the fixed soil P and applied phosphates resulting in higher crop yields” (Panhwar et al., 2018).

## 2. METHODOLOGY

### 2.1 Experimental Site

The experiment was conducted during *rabi* season of 2020-21 and 2021-22 at student's Instructional farm, C.S.A. University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur Nagar (U.P.). The field was well levelled and irrigated by tube well. The farm is situated at main campus of the university, in the west northern part of Kanpur city under sub-tropical zone in v<sup>th</sup> agroclimatic zone (central plain zone of Uttar Pradesh).

### 2.2 Edaphic Condition

The soil was moist, well drained with uniform plane topography. The soil of the experimental field was alluvial in origin, sandy loam in texture and slightly alkaline in reaction having pH 8.14 and 8.13 (1:2.5 soil: water suspension method given by Jackson, [24], electrical conductivity 0.45 and 0.44 dSm<sup>-1</sup> (1:2.5 soil: water

suspension method given by Jackson, 1973), Organic carbon percentage in soil is 0.42 and 0.43 per cent (Walkley and Black's rapid titration method given by Walkley and Black, [25]), with available nitrogen 193.0 and 195.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Alkaline permanganate method given by Subbiah and Asija, [26]), available phosphorus as sodium bicarbonate-extractable P was 12.84 and 12.86 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Olsen's calorimetrically method, Olsen et al., [27]) available potassium was 146.76 and 148.52 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Flame photometer method given by Hanwey and Heidel, [28]) and available zinc was 0.53 and 0.54 ppm (DTPA extraction method given by [29]).

### 2.3 Detail of Treatments and Design

The 10 treatments combination of nutrient management practices of inorganic fertilizer (Urea, DAP and MOP), Organic manure (FYM) and Biofertilizer (*Azotobacter* and PSB). Experiment was laid out in randomized block design with three replications.

### 2.4 Crop Husbandry

A pre-sowing irrigation (Paleva) was done in the experimental field with an object to get optimum moisture conditions for attaining good germination. At proper tilth, one ploughing with tractor drawn mould bold plough was done followed by two ploughings by cultivator. Half dose of Nitrogen together with full dose of Phosphorus, Potash were applied as basal at the time of sowing in the form of Urea, DAP and MOP respectively. Remaining half dose of nitrogen was top dressed into two split doses at 30 and 55 days after sowing (DAS). The sowing of seeds of wheat cv. HD-2967 was done by line sowing by hand at 2-3 cm depth of soil and with line to line spacing of 22.5 cm to maintain uniform plant population. Application of FYM and Soil treatment with *Azotobacter* and PSB was done.

**Table 1. Analytical data of the experimental soil (pre-sowing)**

S. No.	Soil characters	Value	
		2020-21	2021-22
1.	pH (1:2.5 soil water suspension)	8.14	8.13
2.	EC (dsm <sup>-1</sup> ) (1:2.5 soil water suspension)	0.45	0.44
3.	Organic carbon (%)	0.42	0.43
4.	Available N (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	193.00	195.00
5.	Available P (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	12.84	12.86
6.	Available K (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	14.6	148.52
7.	Available S (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	8.5	8.6
8.	Available Zn (ppm)	0.53	0.54

**Table 2. Detail of the treatment combinations**

S.No.	Symbols	Treatment combinations
1.	T <sub>1</sub>	CONTROL
2.	T <sub>2</sub>	50%NPK OF R.D.F.
3.	T <sub>3</sub>	75%NPK OF R.D.F.
4.	T <sub>4</sub>	100% NPK OF R.D.F.
5.	T <sub>5</sub>	125% NPK OF R.D.F.
6.	T <sub>6</sub>	100%NPK+FYM
7.	T <sub>7</sub>	100%NPK+FYM+S <sub>30</sub>
8.	T <sub>8</sub>	100%NPK+FYM+S <sub>30</sub> +Zn <sub>5</sub>
9.	T <sub>9</sub>	100%NPK+FYM+S <sub>30</sub> +Zn <sub>5</sub> +Azotobacter
10.	T <sub>10</sub>	100%NPK+FYM+S <sub>30</sub> +Zn <sub>5</sub> +Azotobacter+ PSB

**Harvesting and threshing:** the crop was harvested at maturity and was allowed to dry in sun. Separate bundles were made for each plot and weighted. The after drying harvest was threshed manually.

## 2.5 Data Collection

### 2.5.1 Grain yield

After threshing the grain yield from each plot was separately weighed and recorded after converting into quintals per hectare.

### 2.5.2 Straw yield

After subtracting the grain yield per plot from the total biological yield. After converting the yields into quintals per hectare, yields were recorded.

### 2.5.3 Biological yield (q ha<sup>-1</sup>)

Seed yield and Stover yield together were regarded as biological yield. The biological yield was calculated with the following formula:

Biological yield = Seed yield + Straw yield

### 2.5.4 Harvest index (%)

The recovery of grains in total dry matter was considered as harvest index, expressed in percentage.

It has been calculated by following formula:

Harvest Index (%) = [Seed Yield (q ha<sup>-1</sup>) / Biological Yield (q ha<sup>-1</sup>)] x 100

### 2.5.5 Economics

The economics of different treatments was worked out on the basis of average yield (seed and stover) of 2020-21 and 2021-22.

### 2.5.6 Cost of cultivation (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>)

The cost of cultivation was worked out on the basis of input rates at the farm. Treatments cost was calculated separately. The common cost of cultivation (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>) was worked out by considering all the expenses incurred in the cultivation and added variable cost due to treatments (including interest of working capital) in order to get total cost of cultivation.

### 2.5.7 Gross return (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>)

It was calculated by taking the income from the grain and straw produced on the basis of market rates. The yield of chickpea crop was converted into gross return in rupees per hectare on the basis of current price of the produce.

Gross return (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>)  
= Total income from grain and stover yield

### 2.5.8 Net return (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>)

Net profit is the outcome received by subtracting the cost of cultivation from gross income (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>). The net return was worked out by using following formula-

Net return (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>) = Gross return (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>) - Cost of cultivation (INR ha<sup>-1</sup>)

### 2.5.9 Benefit Cost ratio (B:C)

Net income of each treatment was divided by cultivation cost of respective treatment and cost benefit ratio was recorded. There was calculated with the help of following formula.

Benefit: cost ratio =  $\frac{\text{Net Return (INR ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Cost of cultivation (INR ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$

## 2.6 Statistical Analysis

The growth parameters and yields were recorded and analyzed as per Gomez and Gomez (1984) the tested at 5% level of significance to interpret the significant differences.

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 3.1 Productivity Parameters

It is visualized from the data given in Table 3 clearly indicate that among the productivity parameters viz. grain yield ( $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ), straw yield ( $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ) and biological yield ( $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ) significantly increase due to the application of NPK, Zinc, Sulphur, FYM, *Azotobacter* and PSB. Grain yield varied from 30.73 to 50.54  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ , straw yield varied from 45.98 to 81.06  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$  and biological yield varied from 76.71 to 121.15  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$  on pooled basis. The maximum grain yield (54.21  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ), straw yield (81.35  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ) and biological yield (135.56  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +*Azotobacter* + PSB] during the second year (2021-22) of experimentation. The minimum grain yield (30.31  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ), straw yield (45.51  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ) and biological yield (75.82  $\text{q ha}^{-1}$ ) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> [control] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. The surge in seed and stover yields under adequate nutrients supply might be attributed to mainly to the collective effect of a greater number The spikelet ear<sup>-1</sup>, grain ear<sup>-1</sup> and 100 grain weight (gm), which was the result of improved translocation of photosynthates from source to sink ultimately yield is increased. The increase in productivity under adequate nutrients supply mainly due to more yield attributes ultimately resulted more grain yield. Grain, straw and biological yield of wheat significantly increased due to FYM application over their controls. Application of *Azotobacter* and PSB further increased grain & straw yield of wheat significantly over without application of *Azotobacter* and PSB. Inoculation of *Azotobacter* and PSB further increased grain & straw yield of wheat significantly over without inoculation. It may due to treatment of soil with bio-inoculant which fix atmospheric nitrogen and increased the supply of other nutrients to plants and ultimately increased grain and straw yield of wheat. These results also confirms the findings of Kumar et al. [30,31], Yadav et al. (2018), Yadav et al. [32], Kumar et al. [33] and Sachan et al. [34].

The integrated use of nutrient application did not significantly affect the harvest index. Harvest

index was varied from 39.83 - 42.34% on pooled basis. Maximum harvest index (42.34%) was associated with the treatment T<sub>6</sub> [100%NPK+FYM] during the second year (2020-21) of the experimentation. While the minimum harvest index (39.83%) was recorded under the treatment T<sub>9</sub> [100%NPK+FYM+S<sub>30</sub>+Zn<sub>5</sub>+*Azotobacter*] during the second year of experimentation. These results also confirms the findings of Afzal et al. [35], Rana et al. [36], Mohan et al. [37], Singh et al. [38,39], Sirohiya et al. [40] and Kumar et al. [30,31].

### 3.2 Economics

Economic viability is a function of gain or loss. Any practice in order to be economical viable must have a substantial balance over its cost. In order to assured profitability net return and B: C ratio was worked out. While we study the economics of the wheat cultivation during the both years of experimentation, it can be concluded that all the economics parameters such as gross return, net return and benefit cost ratio except cost of cultivation were significantly affected by the application of NPK, Zinc, Sulphur, FYM, *Azotobacter* and PSB. The data extracted from the Table 4 and Table 5 it can be resulted that the maximum gross return (INR 158043) was recorded in the treatment under T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +*Azotobacter* + PSB] during the second year (2021-22) of experimentation. The minimum gross return (INR 38660) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> [control] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. Maximum net return (INR 97635) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +*Azotobacter* + PSB] during the second year (2021-22) of experimentation. The minimum net return (INR48508) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> [control] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. Similarly, Maximum B:C ratio (1.62) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +*Azotobacter* + PSB] during the second year (2021-22) of experimentation. The minimum B:C ratio (1.25) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> [control] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. In the similar pattern, in case of cost of cultivation it can concluded that the maximum cost of cultivation (INR 60408) was found in the treatment T<sub>10</sub> [100%NPK + FYM + S<sub>30</sub>+ Zn<sub>5</sub> +*Azotobacter* + PSB] during the second year of experimentation and minimum cost of cultivation (INR 38660) was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> [control] during the

first year (2020-21) of experimentation. If it is economically viable in modern farming maximum profit is more important than maximum profit the real comparison of different treatment can only judge on the basis of economic viability. The cost and gross return varied markedly due different application of inorganic, organic and

bio-inoculant nutrients which ultimately influence the net return and B:C ratio [41-43]. The consequences of the current investigation are additionally in concurrence with the investigation of Ram et al. [44], Singh et al. [45], Maurya et al. [46], Patra et al. [47] and Gupta et al. [48].

**Table 3. Effect of different treatment combinations on productivity parameters of wheat**

Treatments	Grain Yield (q ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Straw Yield (q ha <sup>-1</sup> )		
	2020-21	2021-22	Pooled	2020-21	2021-22	Pooled
T <sub>1</sub>	30.31	31.15	30.73	45.51	46.45	45.98
T <sub>2</sub>	33.23	33.79	33.51	50.21	51.65	50.93
T <sub>3</sub>	36.12	36.95	36.15	53.13	54.19	53.66
T <sub>4</sub>	40.32	40.51	36.54	55.18	56.91	56.05
T <sub>5</sub>	42.15	42.46	40.42	59.23	60.25	59.74
T <sub>6</sub>	46.20	46.66	42.31	62.52	63.96	63.24
T <sub>7</sub>	47.82	48.21	46.43	65.25	66.56	65.91
T <sub>8</sub>	48.33	48.85	48.02	72.52	73.21	72.87
T <sub>9</sub>	50.13	50.94	48.59	75.85	76.86	76.36
T <sub>10</sub>	53.79	54.21	50.54	80.76	81.35	81.06
SE(m) ±	0.57	0.63	0.67	0.61	1.02	1.05
C.D. at 5 %	1.71	1.87	2.01	1.83	3.05	3.15

**Table 4. Effect of different treatment combinations on productivity parameters of wheat**

Treatments	Biological yield (q ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Harvest Index (%)		
	2020-21	2021-22	Pooled	2020-21	2021-22	Pooled
T <sub>1</sub>	75.82	77.60	76.71	39.98	40.14	40.06
T <sub>2</sub>	83.44	85.44	84.44	39.83	39.55	39.69
T <sub>3</sub>	89.25	91.14	76.71	40.47	40.54	40.51
T <sub>4</sub>	95.50	97.42	84.44	42.22	41.58	41.90
T <sub>5</sub>	101.38	102.71	90.19	41.60	41.33	41.47
T <sub>6</sub>	108.72	110.62	96.46	42.49	42.18	42.34
T <sub>7</sub>	113.07	114.77	102.05	42.29	42.01	42.15
T <sub>8</sub>	120.85	122.06	109.67	39.99	40.02	40.01
T <sub>9</sub>	125.98	127.80	113.92	39.79	39.86	39.83
T <sub>10</sub>	134.55	135.56	121.45	39.98	39.99	39.99
SE(m) ±	1.78	1.86	1.01	0.31	0.36	0.40
C.D. at 5 %	5.32	5.58	3.04	0.94	1.07	1.19

**Table 5. Economic study of wheat as affected by different treatment combinations**

Treatment	Cost of cultivation (INR/ ha)			Gross return (INR/ ha)		
	2020-21	2021-22	Pooled	2020-21	2021-22	Pooled
T <sub>1</sub>	38660	38876	38768	87168	90637	88903
T <sub>2</sub>	42326	42542	42434	95755	99077	97416
T <sub>3</sub>	44159	44375	44267	103215	106968	105092
T <sub>4</sub>	45992	46208	46100	112740	115774	114257
T <sub>5</sub>	47825	48041	47933	118785	121707	120246
T <sub>6</sub>	55992	56208	56100	128757	132396	130576
T <sub>7</sub>	58842	59058	58950	133595	137079	135337
T <sub>8</sub>	59192	59408	59300	138964	142359	140661
T <sub>9</sub>	59692	59908	59800	144517	148760	146639
T <sub>10</sub>	60192	60408	60300	154691	158043	156367

**Table 6. Economic study of chickpea as affected by different treatment combinations**

Treatments	Net return (INR/ ha)			B:C ratio		
	2020-21	2021-22	Pooled	2020-21	2021-22	Pooled
T <sub>1</sub>	48508	51761	50135	1.25	1.33	1.29
T <sub>2</sub>	53429	56535	54982	1.26	1.33	1.30
T <sub>3</sub>	59056	62593	60825	1.34	1.41	1.37
T <sub>4</sub>	66748	69566	68157	1.45	1.51	1.48
T <sub>5</sub>	70960	73666	72313	1.48	1.53	1.50
T <sub>6</sub>	72765	76188	74477	1.30	1.36	1.33
T <sub>7</sub>	74753	78021	76387	1.27	1.32	1.30
T <sub>8</sub>	79772	82951	81362	1.35	1.40	1.37
T <sub>9</sub>	84825	88852	86839	1.42	1.48	1.45
T <sub>10</sub>	94499	97635	96067	1.57	1.62	1.59

#### 4. CONCLUSION

The study showed that the application of NPK, Zinc, Sulphur, FYM, *Azotobacter* and PSB resulted in higher grain yield of wheat as well as higher net returns and B:C ratio; thus, it will help in uplifting the socioeconomic status of the farmers. Application of NPK, Zinc, Sulphur, FYM, *Azotobacter* and PSB deserves a special attention for increasing productivity and profitability of wheat.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

- Abedi T, Alemzadeh A, Kazemeini SA. Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on grain yield and protein banding pattern of wheat Australian J. of Crop Sci., AJCS. 2010;4(6):384-9.
- Rueda-Ayala VP, Rasmussen J, Gerhards R, Fournaise NE. The influence of post-emergence weed harrowing on selectivity, crop recovery and crop yield in different growth stages of winter wheat. Weed Res. 2011;51(5):478-88. DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-3180.2011.00873.x
- Dawe D, Dobermann A. Defining productivity and yield. In: IRRI Discussion paper series no. 33 Manila Philippines. 1999;13.
- Pathak H, Ladha JK, Aggarwal PK, Peng S, Das S, Singh Y, et al. Climatic potential and on-farm yield trends of rice and wheat in the Indo-Gangetic Plains. Field Crops Res. 2003;80(3):223-34. DOI: 10.1016/S0378-4290(02)00194-6
- Parewa HP, Yadav J, Rakshit A. Effect of fertilizer levels, FYM and bioinoculants on soil properties in inceptisol of Varanasi, Uttar Pradesh, India. Int J Agric Environ Biotechnol. 2014;7(3):517-25. DOI: 10.5958/2230-732X.2014.01356.4
- Rakshit A, Sarkar NC, Sen D. Influence of organic manures on productivity of two varieties of rice. J Cent Eur Agric. 2008; 9(4):629-34.
- Mandal NN, Chaudhry PP, Sinha D. Nitrogen, nitrogen and potash uptake of wheat. Environ Econ. 1992;10:297- (var. Sonalika).
- Krylov YAI, Pavlov, VD. Effect of fertilizer on yield and protein contents in wheat grain. Agrochimiya. 1989;1:49-51.
- Garrido-Lestache EL, López-Bellido RJ, López-Bellido L. Durum wheat quality under Mediterranean conditions as affected by N rate, timing and splitting, N form and S fertilization. Eur J Agron. 2005; 23(3):265-78. DOI: 10.1016/j.eja.2004.12.001
- Dupont FM, Altenbach SB. Molecular and biochemical impacts of environmental factors on wheat grain development and protein synthesis. J Cereal Sci. 2003; 38(2):133-46. DOI: 10.1016/S0733-5210(03)00030-4
- Ziadi N, Bélanger G, Cambouris AN, Tremblay N, Nolin MC, Claessens A. Relationship between phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations in spring wheat. Agron J. 2008;100(1):80-6. DOI: 10.2134/agronj2007.0119
- Mehrvarz S, Chaichi MR. Effect of phosphate solubilizing microorganisms and phosphorus chemical fertilizer on forage and grain quality of barely (*Hordeum vulgare*, L.). Am-Euros. J Agric Environ Sci. 2008;3(6):855-60.

13. Moussa BIM. Response of wheat plants growth in sandy soils to K and some micronutrients fertilization. *Egypt J Soil Sci.* 2000;40(4):481-93.
14. Jabbar AT, Aziz IH, Bhatti ZA, Virk MM. Khan and Wasl-u-Din. *Soil Environ.* Effect of potassium application on yield and protein contents of late sown wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under field conditions. 2009;28(2):193-6.
15. Chaudhary SK, Thakur SK, Pandey AK. Response of wetland rice to nitrogen and zinc. *Oryza.* 2007;44(1):31-4.
16. McGrath SP, Zhao FJ, Withers PJ. Development of sulphur deficiency in crops and its treatment. *Proceedings of the Fertilizer Society.* Peterborough, UK. 1996; 379:87-92.
17. Marschner H. Sulfur supply, plant growth, and plant composition. In *mineral nutrition of higher plants.* Cambridge: Academic Press. 1997;261-5.
18. Järvan ML, Lukme, Akk A. The effect of sulphur on biological quality of protein and baking properties of winter wheat. *Trans ERIA.* 2006;71:123-8.
19. Sharma A, Singh H, Nanwal RK. Effect of nutrient management on productivity of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) under limited and adequate irrigation supply. *Indian J Agron.* 2007;52:120-3.
20. Swarup A. Integrated plant nutrient supply and management strategies for enhancing soil quality, input use efficiency and crop productivity. *J Indian Soc Soil Sci.* 2010; 58:25-31.
21. Ahmad L, Rassol S, Habib K, Elamathi S. Effect of integrated nitrogen management on growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Sher Kashmir Univ Agric Sci Technol J Res.* 2006;8:131-4.
22. Chensin L, Yien CH. Turbidimetric determination of available sulphates. *Soil Sci Soc Am Proc.* 1951;15:149-51.
23. Apte R, Shende ST. Studies on *Azotobacter chroococcum* IV. Seed bacterization with strains of *A. chroococct-m* and their effect on crop yields. *Zentl-ahlatt Bakteriologie AhstractsII.* 1998;136:637.
24. Jackson ML. *Soil chemical analysis.* New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd; 1973.
25. Walkley A, Black IA. Old piper, S.S. soil and plant analysis. *Soil Sci.* 1934;37(1): 29-38.  
DOI: 10.1097/00010694-193401000-00003
26. Subbiah BV, Asija CL. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available N in Soil. *Curr Sci.* 1956;25:259-60.
27. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanable FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorous in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. *USDA Cric.* 1954;930:19-23.
28. Hanway JJ, Heidel H. *Soil analysis methods as used in Iowa State College, Soil Testing Laboratory.* Iowa Agric. 1952; 54:1-31.
29. Lindsay WL, Norvell WA. Development of a DTPA soil test for zinc, iron, manganese, and copper. *Soil Sci Soc Am J.* 1978; 42(3):421-8.  
DOI:10.2136/sssaj1978.03615995004200030009x
30. Kumar P, Dubey SD, Sachan R, Rawat CL, Kumar V. Effect of organic manure, inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers on nutrient content of maize (*Zea mays* L.) and their residual effect on succeeding wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) crop. *Int J Plant Soil Sci.* 2022;34(20):817-27: article no.IJPSS.89229 ISSN: 2320-7035.  
DOI: 10.9734/ijpss/2022/v34i2031227
31. Kumar A, Dimree S, Sachan R, Shekhar C, Gangwar K, Kumar M. Effect of FYM and zinc on growth, yield attributes and productivity parameters of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Asian J Microbiol Biotechnol Environ Sci.* 2022;24(4):20-3 ISSN-0972-3005.
32. Yadav KK, Raju N, Kumar PNS, Kumar S. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and availability of micronutrients in soil. *Bull Environ Pharmacol Life Sci.* 2017; 6:25-30.
33. Kumar V, Nikhil R, Singh RA. Effect of different combination of FYM and urea on growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *J Bull Environ Pharmacol Life Sci.* 2017;6(2):395-8.
34. Sachan K, Kumar A, Hasan A, Verma AK. Impact of different treatment on yield and yield attributes of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) in central Uttar Pradesh. *The Pharm Innov J.* 2022;11(5):2210-3.
35. Afzal A, Ashraf M, Saeed A, Asad, Farooq M. Effect of phosphate solubilizing microorganisms on phosphorus uptake, yield and yield traits of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) in rainfed area. *Int J Agric Biol.* 2005;7:207-9.
36. Rana A, Joshi M, Prasanna R, Shivay YS, Nain L. Biofortification of wheat through



- inoculation of plant growth promoting rhizobacteria and cyanobacteria. Eur J Soil Biol. 2012;50:118-26.  
DOI: 10.1016/j.ejsobi.2012.01.005
37. Mohan B, Pradeep K, Ram AY. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield attributes and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). J Pharmacogn Phytochem. 2018;7(1):1545-7.
  38. Singh V, Rana NS, Dhyani BP, Kumar R, Vivek Naresh RK, Kumar A. Influences of organic and inorganic fertilizers on productivity and soil fertility of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) in Typic Ustochrept soil of Uttar Pradesh. J Pharmacogn Phytochem. 2018;7(1):260-5.
  39. Singh G, Kumar S, Sindhu GS, Kaur R. Effect of nutrient management on yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under irrigated conditions. Int J Chem Stud. 2018;6:904-7.
  40. Sirohiya A, Kumar A, Pathak RK, Sachan R, Tiwari A, Nema S et al. Effect on organic manure and inorganic fertilizers on productivity parameters and quality traits of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under central plain zone of Uttar Pradesh. Int J Environ Clim Change. 2022;12(11):1197-202:article no.IJECC.90083 ISSN: 2581-8627.  
DOI: 10.9734/ijecc/2022/v12i1131097
  41. Panhwar QA, Shamshuddin J, Naher UR, Radziah O, Mohd Razi I. Biochemical and molecular characterization of potential phosphate solubilizing bacteria in acid sulfate soils and their beneficial effects on rice production. PLOS ONE. 2014a; 9(10):e97241.
  42. Patel TG, Patel KC, Patel VN. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield attributes and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Int J Chem Stud. 2017;5(4):1366-9.
  43. Tejalben P, Patel KC, Patel VN. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield attributes and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Int J Chem Stud. 2017; 5(4):1366-9.
  44. Ram M, Davari MR, Sharma SN. Direct, residual and cumulative effects of organic manures and biofertilizers on yields, NPK uptake, grain quality and economics of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) under organic farming of rice-wheat cropping system. J Org Syst. 2014;9:16-29.
  45. Singh BJ, Trivedi SK, Verma SK, Prajapati BL, Singh A, Khan S. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and nutrient uptake by wheat in alluvial soils of Madhya Pradesh. Int J Agric Sci. 2016; 8:2206-9.
  46. Maurya RN, Singh UP, Kumar S, Yadav AC, Yadav RA. Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Int J Chem Stud. 2019;7(1):770-3.
  47. Patra B, Singh J, Hooda VS, Kapoor A. Effect of seed priming, bio fertilizer inoculations and nitrogen levels on yield attributes, yield and economic returns of late sown wheat. Int J Chem Stud. 2019; 7(3):95-9.
  48. Gupta R, Yadav AS, Sachan R. Response of different varieties and sowing methods on yield and economics of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). The Pharm Innov J. 2022; 11(7):1880-3.

© 2022 Verma et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:  
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:  
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/93294>