



Studies of Phosphorus and Bio-fertilizers on Growth, Yield and Quality of Chick Pea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) in Eastern Uttar Pradesh

V. P. Dwivedi^{1*}, Pankaj Tripathi² and Ram Pyare³

¹Department of Agronomy, SDJ (Post Graduate) College Chandeshwar, Azamgarh U.P.

²JDA, U.P.

³C.S.A.U. A & T, Kanpur (U.P.)

*Corresponding author Email : vpdwivedi15@gmail.com

Received: 10 August 2021/Accepted: 05 November 2021

Abstract: A field experiment was conducted during the winter season (*Rabi*) at Research Farm of S D J Post Graduate College Chandeshwar, U.P. The objectives of the research to find out the suitable levels of phosphorus and bio-fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of chick-pea in eastern U.P. The treatments, comprising the four levels of phosphorus (0, 25, 50 and 75 kg ha⁻¹) and four levels of bio-fertilizers (untreated, Rhizobium, P.S.B. and V.A.M.) were evaluated against chick-pea variety (Awrothi). The results showed that the chick-pea variety "Awrothi" produced significantly higher growth, yield and quality. The application of 75 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ statistically at par with 50 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ along with P.S.B. and significantly higher than other treatments combinations in context to growth and yield attributing characters and yields. Quality parameters viz., protein content and protein yield kg/ha were higher in application of 75 kg P₂O₅ and P.S.B. than other treatments, respectively.

Key words: Rhizobium, Phosphate solubilizing bacteria (P.S.B.) Vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizae.

Introduction

Chick-pea has one of the highest nutritional composition of any dry edible legume and does not contain any specific major anti-nutritional factors, and contains proteins, carbohydrates, fat, crude fibre, soluble sugar and ash, chick-pea protein digestibility is highest among the dry edible legumes. Legumes are heavy feeders of phosphorus and less responsive to nitrogen and potash because of their capacity to meet their own nitrogen requirement through symbiotic fixation (114 kg N/year), and reduce fertilizer cost to the farmer and improves the texture and structure of soil. The help in mobilizing insoluble soil nutrients and bringing qualitative changes in physical properties of the soil. Phosphate fertilization of chick-pea promotes growth, nodulation and enhance yield and improves grain quality, regulate the photosynthesis, govern physio-bio-chemical process, enlargement root and nodules production and thereby increase nitrogen fixation (Singh and Ram 1990). Bio-fertilizer has been proved as the cheapest source of nitrogen and phosphorus for major crop yield, particularly in legumes. Indian soil in

general are lacking in effective and specific strains of Rhizobium which are responsible for symbiotic nitrogen fixation. Information regarding its effect on some other aspects, particularly quality characteristics under varied soil types and sporadic soil fertility. Considering these above facts, adoption of nutrients management fertilizers levels in conjunction with bio-fertilizers to improve production, productivity and efficient utilization of nutrients are the need of the hour. Hence an attempt was made to assess the response of phosphorus and bio-fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of chick-pea in eastern U.P.

Materials And Methods

The study was undertaken during winter season (*Rabi*) of 2015-16 and 2016-17 at Agricultural Research Farm in the department of Agronomy S D Post Graduate College Chandeshwar, Azamgarh (26°47'N and 82°12'E and 84 meter above the mean sea level) U.P. Sixteen treatment combination comprising four phosphorus levels (0, 25, 50,

and 75 kg ha⁻¹) and four bio-fertilizers (control, Rhizobium, P.S.B. and V.A.M.) were evaluated. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with four replications. The soil was sandy loam in texture, normal in reaction (pH 7.9), low in nutrients availability nitrogen 165 kg ha⁻¹, P₂O₅ 15.65 kg ha⁻¹, and K₂O 237.50 kg ha⁻¹. The crop variety Awroddhi was sown with the seed rate of 80 kg ha⁻¹ during the third week of October in respective year. The bio-fertilizer as per treatment treated seed was sown in furrow opened by Kudal at the depth of 5-6 cm. and furrow spacing was maintained 45 cm apart. The required amount of N and K nutrients as basal and P was applied as per treatment. Other management practices were adopted as per recommendation of the crop grown under irrigated conditions.

Results and Discussion

(a) Growth Attributes

The data related to plant height (cm), No. of branching plant⁻¹, no. of nodules plant⁻¹, fresh shoot weight plant⁻¹ and dry shoot weight plant⁻¹ (g) have been presented in Table—1). All the above mentioned characters continuously with advancement under all treatments, and maximum was observed application of 75 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ and significantly superior over rest doses of kg P₂O₅. Application of 75 kg P₂O₅ produced statistically at par to 50 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ and significantly higher than rest application of P₂O₅. The data presented in Table-1 regarding the days taken to 50% flowering indicated the various level of phosphorus and bio-fertilizers treated did not cause significant variation during the both years. It was due to the pronounced effect of highest levels of phosphorus enable the plant growth faster, increased root growth as well as no. of nodules plant⁻¹, fresh and dry weight. It is a being and energy bond compound, have greater importance in the transformation of energy required for almost all metabolic process. Similar results have been reported by Singh et al (2005). Singh and Singh 1997, Sarkar *et al* 1995 and Saraf *et al* 1997.

The various seed inoculation by bio-fertilizers affected the plant height, no. of branches, no. of nodules, fresh and dry weight and yield contributing characters of chick-pea. P.S.B. inoculated seeds statistically at par to Rhizobium treated seed and significantly superior to other rest inoculated seeds (Table-1). This might be due to application of P.S.B. increase the availability of N.P.K.

resulted on increase in physiological process which ultimately enhanced the growth and yield contributing characters Meena *et al* (2005).

(b) Yield attributes

The data presented in (Table-2) showed that the yields parameters viz., seeds/pods, pods/plant, grains/plant and test weight used of biofertilizer as PSB during both the year except test weight, respectively. This might be due to applied of PSB increase the availability of NPK resulted on increase in yield attributing characters Meena *et al*. (2005).

The results of the present study indicated that the yield contributing characters viz., of seeds pods⁻¹, Pods plant⁻¹, no. of grains plant⁻¹, and 100 grain weight (g), were consistently with increasing levels of phosphorus to 75 kg P₂O₅ during both the years in (Table-2). Application of 75 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ which was at par with 50 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ but significantly higher in no. of grains plant⁻¹. The application of phosphorus accelerated the production of photosynthetic and their trans location from source to sink, which ultimately gave the higher values of yield contributing characters. These results are in agreement with the findings of Khan et al (2005), Meena *et al* (2006), Kumar *et al* (2007), with increasing levels of phosphorus.

(c) Yields and Quality of Chickpea

The yields and quality of chickpea were significantly with increasing doses of phosphorus of 75 Kg P₂O₅ during both the years. Applied of 75 Kg P₂O₅/ha which was at par with 50 kg/ha. The data presented in table-2 showed that the use of 75 kg P₂O₅/ha enhanced grain yield by 89.63 and 89.34% over control, 14.91 and 14.71% over 25 kg P₂O₅/ha and 1.72% and 1.56% over 50 kg P₂O₅/ha during respective years, respectively in (Table-2). These results were supported by Khan et al. 2005 and Kumar et al. 2007.

The different seed inoculation by bio-fertilizer affected the yields and quality of chickpea. PSB inoculated seeds statistically at par to Rhizobium treated seed and significantly superior to other rest inoculation seeds (Table-2). The PSB enhance the grain yield of chickpea 25.95 and 25.78%, straw yield 15.62 & 20.74% and maximum protein content 21.96 and 22.02% and protein yield 43.01 and 42.84% over un-inoculated treatments during both the years, respectively. The similar results were reported by Meena et al. (2005).

Table-1. Growth attributes of chick-pea as influence by phosphorus and bio-fertilizers.

| Treatments | Plant height(cm) 75 D.A.S. | | No. of branching plant ⁻¹ 90 D.A.S | | No. of nodules plant ⁻¹ 90 D.A.S | | Fresh shoot weight plant ⁻¹ (g) 90 D.A.S. | | Dry shoot weight plant ⁻¹ (g) 90 D.A.S. | | 50% Days to flowering | |
|---|----------------------------|---------|---|---------|---|---------|--|---------|--|---------|-----------------------|---------|
| | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 |
| P ₂ O ₅ level kg/ha | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 68.85 | 71.01 | 13.50 | 13.92 | 17.50 | 17.88 | 28.60 | 28.99 | 13.50 | 13.92 | 73.00 | 73.35 |
| 2.5 | 79.56 | 81.90 | 15.60 | 16.06 | 26.80 | 27.38 | 35.64 | 36.09 | 15.60 | 16.06 | 73.80 | 74.16 |
| 50 | 86.70 | 89.25 | 17.00 | 17.50 | 32.50 | 33.20 | 40.47 | 40.95 | 17.00 | 17.50 | 74.30 | 74.65 |
| 75 | 93.84 | 96.60 | 18.40 | 18.94 | 34.00 | 34.74 | 42.27 | 42.77 | 18.40 | 18.94 | 74.65 | 75.00 |
| SEM [±] | 1.35 | 1.16 | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.49 | 0.61 | 0.59 | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.99 | 1.27 |
| C.D. at 5% | 2.85 | 3.29 | 0.63 | 0.84 | 1.44 | 1.39 | 1.74 | 1.67 | 0.63 | 0.80 | N.S. | N.S. |
| Bio-fertilizer | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control (untreated) | 77.78 | 80.07 | 15.25 | 15.70 | 32.20 | 23.70 | 35.80 | 34.26 | 15.25 | 15.70 | 73.45 | 73.80 |
| Rhizobium | 82.37 | 84.92 | 16.17 | 16.65 | 29.20 | 28.93 | 37.57 | 38.01 | 16.15 | 16.65 | 74.13 | 74.48 |
| P.S.B. | 76.45 | 88.99 | 16.95 | 17.45 | 30.60 | 31.26 | 39.99 | 40.44 | 16.95 | 17.45 | 74.30 | 74.65 |
| V.A.M. | 82.37 | 84.39 | 16.15 | 16.63 | 27.80 | 28.40 | 35.68 | 36.09 | 16.15 | 16.63 | 73.88 | 74.24 |
| SEM [±] | 1.35 | 1.16 | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.50 | 0.49 | 0.61 | 0.59 | 0.22 | 0.28 | 0.99 | 1.27 |
| C.D. at 5% | 2.85 | 3.29 | 0.63 | 0.84 | 1.44 | 1.39 | 1.74 | 1.67 | 0.63 | 0.80 | N.S. | N.S. |

Table-2: Yield attributes, yield and quality of chick-pea as influence by phosphorus and bio-fertilizers.

| Treatments | No. of seed pod ⁻¹ | | No. of pods plant ⁻¹ | | No. of grains plant ⁻¹ | | 100 grain weight | | Grain yield q/ha | | Straw yield q/ha | | Protein content in seed % | | Protein yields (kg/ha) | |
|---|-------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------|-----------------------------------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|---------|---------------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|
| | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2016-17 |
| P ₂ O ₅ level kg/ha | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 | 1.16 | 1.18 | 56.80 | 58.43 | 66.09 | 66.12 | 13.45 | 13.57 | 12.15 | 12.39 | 23.48 | 26.84 | 18.10 | 18.14 | 219.90 | 224.75 |
| 25 | 1.36 | 1.38 | 62.25 | 64.30 | 85.25 | 89.17 | 17.00 | 17.14 | 20.05 | 20.46 | 30.88 | 36.42 | 20.09 | 20.14 | 402.80 | 412.06 |
| 50 | 1.42 | 1.44 | 71.50 | 73.56 | 106.83 | 106.51 | 20.15 | 20.31 | 22.65 | 23.11 | 34.44 | 39.59 | 21.84 | 21.90 | 494.67 | 506.10 |
| 75 | 1.45 | 1.47 | 73.60 | 75.72 | 107.04 | 111.96 | 20.97 | 21.13 | 23.04 | 23.47 | 34.70 | 36.38 | 22.15 | 22.21 | 510.34 | 521.27 |
| SEm [±] | 0.02 | 0.02 | 1.04 | 1.16 | 1.54 | 1.26 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.40 | 0.58 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 56.75 | 32.51 |
| C.D. at 5% | 0.06 | 0.07 | 2.97 | 3.30 | 4.40 | 3.60 | 0.85 | 0.86 | 0.93 | 0.90 | 1.13 | 1.64 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 162.64 | 93.01 |
| Bio-fertilizer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control(untreated) | 1.20 | 1.22 | 62.50 | 64.30 | 75.50 | 79.07 | 17.17 | 17.32 | 17.34 | 17.69 | 28.48 | 32.59 | 19.34 | 19.39 | 335.36 | 343.00 |
| Rhizobium | 1.36 | 1.38 | 66.80 | 68.72 | 91.58 | 95.78 | 18.14 | 18.29 | 19.90 | 20.30 | 31.50 | 36.90 | 20.59 | 20.65 | 409.74 | 419.20 |
| P.S.B. | 1.50 | 1.53 | 69.50 | 71.50 | 105.19 | 109.91 | 18.31 | 18.45 | 21.84 | 22.25 | 32.93 | 36.35 | 21.96 | 22.02 | 479.61 | 489.95 |
| V.A.M. | 1.33 | 1.35 | 65.60 | 67.49 | 87.95 | 91.99 | 17.95 | 18.09 | 18.81 | 19.20 | 30.59 | 34.07 | 20.38 | 20.33 | 383.35 | 390.34 |
| SEm [±] | 0.02 | 0.02 | 1.04 | 1.16 | 1.54 | 1.26 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.33 | 0.31 | 0.40 | 0.58 | 0.16 | 0.19 | 27.96 | 27.25 |
| C.D. at 5% | 0.06 | 0.07 | 2.97 | 3.30 | 4.40 | 3.60 | N.S. | N.S. | 0.93 | 0.90 | 1.13 | 1.64 | 0.46 | 0.53 | 69.13 | 68.86 |

References

- Khan M.S.S., Abdul L. Mohammad R. Tahir S., and Lalfat P.(2005). Effect of seed inoculation and phosphorus fertilizer on yield of chick-pea. In semi-arid areas of N.W.F.P. Indian J. Plant Sci. (4): 591-594.
- Kumar B. Chauhan R.S. Yadav A.S, Upadhyay M.K. and Rajput R.K.(2007). Effect of rhizobium and phosphorus application on growth yield and economic of chick-pea(*Cicer arietinum* L) Advances Plant Sci.20(2) 89-90.
- Meema L.R., Singh R.K., and Gautam R.C.(2006). Effect of moisture conservation practices phosphorus level and bacterial inoculation on growth, yield and economics of chick-pea(*Cicer arietinum* L). Legume Research. (29) 68-72.
- Saraf, C.S.; Shiv Kumar, B.G. and Patil, R.R.(1997) Effect of phosphorus, sulphur and seed enaculation of performance chick-pea(*Cicer arietinum* L). Indian J.Agron,42(2) 323-328.
- Sarkar, R.K.,Shit,D and Chakraborty.A.(1995) Response of chick-pea to levels of phosphorus in rainfed upland of Chhotanagpur, Plateau. Indian J.Agron,40(2) 309-311.
- Singh A.K., Singh B. and Singh H.C.(2005) Response of chick-pea(*Cicer arietinum* L) to fertilizer phosphorus and zinc application under rain fed condition of Eastern U.P. Indian J.Dryland Agric Res and Deve. 20(2) 114-117.
- Singh P.N. and Ram H.(1991) Effect different levels of phosphorus and sulphur on seed yield and nutrient content in chick-pea. J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci. 40(2) 307-312.
- Singh, B.D. and Singh B.P.(1997) Effect of weed control measures and phosphatic fertilizer on growth and yield of chick-pea with mustard(*Brassica juncea* L coss) in inter cropping under seyland condition. . Indian J.Agron,42(3) 414-418.