



Response of Organic Manures and Rice Residues on Physical Soil Health Parameters

Rohan Serawat ^a, Arun Alfred David ^{a*}, Tarence Thomas ^a,
Ram Bharose ^a, Narendra Swaroop ^a, Alok M. Lall ^a,
Amreen Hasan ^a, Iska Srinath Reddy ^a, Anil Kumar ^a
and Neha Toppo ^a

^a Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj (Allahabad), 211 007 U.P., 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/IJPSS/2023/v35i173221

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/102179>

Original Research Article

Received: 24/04/2023

Accepted: 28/06/2023

Published: 09/07/2023

ABSTRACT

The trial carried on topic "Response of organic manures and rice residues on soil physical health parameters" for the two repeated years, start from *winter* seasons of the years 2021-22 at research farm, department of soil science and agricultural chemistry. Total 54 soil samples were taken from the site from different depths *i.e.*, 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm. Among nine treatments, during field experimentation, the conjunctive use of NPK and different organic manures [FYM, vermicompost, rice residues and jeevamrutha] levels, together come with best results significantly. The excavated soil sample from experimental site before conducting research operation, mentioned that, the land topography range was nearly levelled with 1-3% slope. Soil is of sandy loam texture. Significantly,

*Corresponding author: E-mail: arun.david@shiats.edu.in;

with regard to physical soil parameters, cumulative mean value for bulk density 1.31 Mg m^{-3} , percent pore space 49.25 %, particle density 2.55 Mg m^{-3} and percent maximum water holding capacity 43.27 %, physical properties were found to be significant in terms soil health. This study includes awareness about the role about importance of physical properties for maintaining soil health.

Keywords: FYM; vermicompost; rice residues; jeevamrutha; soil health; cumulative etc.

1. INTRODUCTION

“Soil testing makes complete nutrient control possibility fertilizer experiments are being patterned to determine economically optimum rates of nutrients application high yields with low production costs per unit are a must in modern farming. However, the capacity of soil to produce is limited and limits to production and set by intrinsic characteristics, agroecological setting” [1]. “Soil is the most valuable natural resource. It is at the heart of terrestrial ecology, but it is finite and non-renewable” [2,3]. “As we have to meet the changes of this century, new understandings and new technologies will be needed to protect the environment and at the same time, produce food and biomass to support society” [4]. “The Indo-Gangetic Plains (IGP) with about 13% geographical coverage of India produces nearly 50% of food grains to feed 40% of the total population of India. The IGP is an important agricultural region of the country with total area of about 44 m ha^{-1} represented by well classified agro-ecological sub-regions and covers the states of Punjab, Haryana, Delhi, Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, West Bengal and parts of a few other states” [5].

“Physical properties play an important role in determining soil’s suitability for agricultural, environmental and engineering uses. The supporting capability; movement, retention and availability of water and nutrients to plants; ease in penetration of roots, and flow of heat and air are directly associated with physical properties of the soil. Physical properties also influence the chemical and biological properties. The most pertinent physical properties of soil relevant to its use as a medium for plant growth” [6].

“Soil aggregate stability is a fundamental property that determines its productivity through influencing a wide range of soil properties, including carbon stabilization, soil porosity, water infiltration, aeration, water retention, hydraulic conductivity, resistance to erosion and degradation” [7].

“This demand systematic appraisal of our soil resources with respect to their extent, distribution, characteristics, behaviour and use potential, which is a very important for developing an effective land use system for augmenting agricultural production on sustainable basis” [11].

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Site Details

The field experiment which was carried out at the research farm of soil science and agricultural chemistry, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj during in *rabi* season 2021-22. The maximum temperature of the location ranges between $46.0\text{-}48^{\circ}\text{C}$ and seldom falls below $4^{\circ}\text{C}\text{-}5^{\circ}\text{C}$. The relative humidity ranges between 20-94%. The average rainfall of this area is around 1100 mm annually. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design (RBD) with 9 treatments. The treatments have been replicated three times. The different treatments were employed randomly in each replication and detailed treatments are given in Table 2.

2.2 Soil Sampling and Laboratory Testing

Soil sampling was done with the standard sampling tools from two depths *i.e.* 0-15cm and 15-30 cm. Analysis of the soil samples were under the methods, the physical parameters include bulk density, particle density, pore space, water holding capacity.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Soil Bulk Density

The maximum bulk density was found in 2021-22 and 2022-23 at different depth at 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm were in T_1 were 1.36 Mg m^{-3} and 1.35 Mg m^{-3} found to be significant followed by in T_9 *i.e.*, 1.29 Mg m^{-3} and 1.37 Mg m^{-3} , minimum was found T_6 *i.e.*, 1.25 and 1.34 Mg m^{-3} . The maximum bulk density in year 2022-23 were

Table 1. Protocols for different soil physical parameters

S. No.	Particulars	Scientist Name	Methods	Unit
Physical Properties				
1.	Bulk density	Black (1965)	Pycnometer	Mg m ⁻³
2.	Particle density	Black (1965)	Pycnometer	Mg m ⁻³
3.	Pore space	Black (1965)	-	(%)
4.	Water holding capacity	Muthuval et al. (1992)	Graduated measuring cylinder	(%)

found in T₁ were 1.32 Mg m⁻³ and 1.37 Mg m⁻³ found to be significant followed by in T₉ *i.e.*, 1.27 Mg m⁻³ and 1.36 Mg m⁻³, minimum was found T₆ *i.e.*, 1.24 and 1.34 Mg m⁻³ respectively. Higher bulk density may be due to less organic matter in T₁. Similar results were reported by [8].

3.2 Soil Particle Density

The maximum particle density of soil were found in treatment T₆ *i.e.*, the particle density was 2.57 Mg m⁻³ at 0-15 cm depth and 2.59 Mg m⁻³ at 15-30 cm depth during 2021-22 while in 2022-23, it was 2.55 Mg m⁻³ at 0-15 cm depth and 2.58 Mg m⁻³ at 15-30 cm depth of soil, in comparison with T₁ where minimum values of the result were found *i.e.* 2.51 Mg m⁻³ at 0-15 cm depth and 2.53 Mg m⁻³ at 15-30 cm depth of soil during 2022 while in 2023 it was 2.50 Mg m⁻³ and 2.52 Mg m⁻³ at both 0-15 cm and 15-30 cm depth of soil, respectively. Higher Particle density was found due to lack of incorporation of FYM, vermicompost, jeevamrutha and rice residue and organic matter. Similar results were reported by (Chaudhari et al., 2013).

3.3 Soil Porosity

As showed that maximum pore space (%) of soil in treatment T₆ *i.e.*, 49.88 and 49.4% at 0-15 and

15-30 cm of soil depth during 2022 and for 2023 it was 49.70 and 49.18% at soil depth 0-15 and 15-30 cm, respectively. The minimum values of the result were found be significant in treatment T₁, which was 46.66 and 44.66% at 0-15 and 15-30 cm of soil depth during 2021-22 while during year 2022-23 it was 47.33 and 46.99% at soil depth 0-15 and 15-30 cm respectively. There is almost a linear increase in porosity with increase in doses of FYM, vermicompost, jeevamrutha and rice residue. Similar results were reported by [8].

3.4 Soil Water Holding Capacity

As observed maximum water holding capacity (%) of soil found in treatment T₆ *i.e.*, which was 44.37% at 0-15 cm depth and 42.99% at 15-30 cm soil depth during 2022 while during 2023 it is observed as 44.27% at 0-15 cm and 42.41% at 15-30 cm soil depth. Timely the minimum values of the result were found in treatment T₁ which was 37.12% at 0-15 cm and 37.32% at 15-30 cm soil depth during 2021-22 similarly, 37.12% and 36.32% at 0-15 and 15-30 cm soil depth during 2022-23, respectively. There is increase in water holding capacity with increase in doses of FYM, vermicompost, jeevamrutha and rice residue. Similar results were reported by [10,11].

Table 2. Treatment combination of taramira

Treatment	Treatment combination
T ₁	[NPK @ 25 % + FYM @ 25 % + @ R @ 25 % + Zn @ 25 %]
T ₂	[NPK @ 50 % + FYM @ 50 % + @ R @ 50 % + Zn @ 50 %]
T ₃	[NPK @ 100 % + FYM @ 100 % + @ R @ 100 % + Zn @ 100 %]
T ₄	[NPK @ 25 % + VC @ 25 % + @ R @ 25 % + Zn @ 25 %]
T ₅	[NPK @ 50 % + VC @ 50 % + @ R @ 50 % + Zn @ 50 %]
T ₆	[NPK @ 100 % + VC @ 100 % + @ R @ 100 % + Zn @ 100 %]
T ₇	[NPK @ 25 % + JM @ 25 % + @ R @ 25 % + Zn @ 25 %]
T ₈	[NPK @ 50 % + JM @ 50 % + @ R @ 50 % + Zn @ 50 %]
T ₉	[NPK @ 100 % + JM @ 100 % + @ R @ 100 % + Zn @ 100 %]

Note: RDF, FYM, vermicompost (VC), rice residue (R), and jeevamrutha (JM)

RDF = NPK @ 100% (40:20:20 + Zn 25 kg ha⁻¹)

FYM @ 10 t ha⁻¹ @ VC 4 t ha⁻¹

R @ 5 t ha⁻¹; JM @ 500 ltr ha⁻¹

Table 3. Response of organic manure and rice residue on physical soil properties

S. No.	Soil bulk density (Mg m ⁻³)				Soil particle density (Mg m ⁻³)				Soil porosity (%)				Soil water holding capacity (%)			
	2021-22		2022-23		2021-22		2022-23		2021-22		2022-23		2021-22		2022-23	
	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm
T ₁	1.31	1.36	1.32	1.37	2.51	2.53	2.50	2.52	46.66	44.66	47.33	46.99	37.12	37.04	37.12	36.32
T ₂	1.28	1.35	1.28	1.35	2.55	2.55	2.53	2.56	47.87	45.87	48.54	47.2	38.04	37.45	38.04	39.71
T ₃	1.26	1.35	1.25	1.35	2.53	2.54	2.51	2.55	48.41	47.07	49.07	48.08	41.11	40.59	41.11	42.58
T ₄	1.24	1.34	1.23	1.34	2.55	2.57	2.50	2.52	47.73	45.73	48.4	47.06	39.25	38.88	39.25	40.65
T ₅	1.26	1.35	1.25	1.34	2.54	2.56	2.52	2.55	49.61	48.61	49.28	48.51	43.72	42.72	43.72	43.82
T ₆	1.25	1.34	1.24	1.34	2.57	2.59	2.55	2.58	49.88	49.44	49.70	49.18	44.27	42.99	44.37	43.41
T ₇	1.26	1.35	1.24	1.35	2.51	2.52	2.51	2.54	48.09	47.76	49.01	48.95	40.61	40.27	40.61	41.85
T ₈	1.29	1.36	1.28	1.36	2.53	2.57	2.54	2.55	49.05	48.59	48.25	47.00	42.31	42.25	42.31	42.31
T ₉	1.29	1.37	1.27	1.36	2.52	2.56	2.53	2.56	48.34	47.34	48.67	48.00	40.54	40.11	40.54	41.94
F- test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
S. Em. (±)	0.018	0.020	0.018	0.025	0.038	0.033	0.037	0.041	0.68	0.83	0.72	0.74	0.54	0.74	0.55	0.73
C. D. @ 5 %	0.055	0.060	0.055	0.077	0.115	0.101	0.113	0.125	2.05	2.50	2.18	2.24	1.64	2.24	1.67	2.20

4. CONCLUSION

It revealed from the trial that application of farm yard manure and vermicompost with inorganic fertilizers in treatment T₆ was found best in Since the results is based on one season physical properties. The T₁ shows the poor physical condition where FYM, vermicompost, jeevamrutha and rice residue was applied in least amount. This concludes that use of FYM, vermicompost has improved the physical health of soil which leads to overall better health of soil.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I would like to express my sincere thanks to my Advisor Dr. Arun A David, Associate Professor, department of soil science and agricultural chemistry, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, for his diligent guidance and constructive suggestions at every step during my work. I thank him for his priceless follow-up and valuable suggestions for improving the quality of this work. I got to learn a few from an ocean of knowledge and share my gratitude for his diligence, also extend my gratitude to all the teaching and non-teaching staff of our department because without them I would not be able to complete my work.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Deshmukh MS, Kachave TR, Kanase PM. Evaluation of macro and micronutrient status of pomegranate orchards from Maharashtra region by soil and leaf analysis, *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2020;9(1):1378- 1382.
2. Mustafa AA, Singh M, Sahoo RN, Ahmed N, Khanna M, Sarangi A, Mishra AK. Land suitability analysis for different crops: A multi criteria decision making approach using remote sensing and GIS. 2011a; 3:61-84.
3. Mustafa AA, Singh M, Sahoo RN, Ahmed N, Khanna M, Sarangi A, Mishra AK. Characterization and classification of soils of Kheragaragh, Agra and their productivity potential. *Journal of Water Management*. 2011b;19:1-19.
4. Brady NC, Weil RR. *The Nature and Properties of Soils*, 13th edition, Pearson Education (Singapore) Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India; 2004.
5. Velayutham M, Mandal DK, Mandal C, Sehgal J. *Agro-ecological Subregion of India for Planning and Development*, NBSS Publication 35, NBSS&LUP, Nagpur. 1999;1-372.
6. Hillel D. *Soil and Water - Physical Principles and Process*, Academic Press, Inc. New York; 1971.
7. Six J, Elliott ET, Paustian K. Soil structure and soil organic matter: II. A normalised stability index and the effect of mineralogy. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 2000;64:1042-1049.
8. Gajbhiye KS, Gaikawad ST, Challa O, Hazare TN, Deshmukh SN. Evaluation of optimum range of soil moisture stress for establishment of wheat crop in Vertisols. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2018;38 (1):139–141.
9. Ahad T, Kanth TA, Nabi S. Soil Bulk Density as Related to Texture, Organic Matter Content and Porosity in Kandi Soils of District Kupwara (Kashmir Valley), India. *International Journal of Scientific Research*. 2015;4(1):198-200.
10. Das A, David AA, Swaroop N, Thomas T, Rao S, Hasan A. Assessment of Physico-chemical properties of river bank soil of Yamuna in Allahabad city, Uttar Pradesh. *International Journal of Chemical Studies*. 2018;6(3):2412-2417.
11. Sharma PK. Emerging technologies of remote sensing and GIS for the development of spatial data structure. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2004;52:384-406.

Available:<http://www.sciencepub.net/researcher>