

International Journal of Plant & Soil Science

Volume 36, Issue 3, Page 59-68, 2024; Article no.IJPSS.112332 ISSN: 2320-7035

Residual Effect of Humic Acid, PSB and Phosphorus Nutrition on Soil Chemical Properties after Harvest of Rice Crop under the Subtropical Condition of Jammu

Kanik Kumar Bansal ^{a++*}, Ashwani Kumar Sharma ^{b#}, Anil Sharma ^{c†}, Vijay Bharti ^{b‡}, Vikas Sharma ^{d^}, Manish Kumar Sharma ^{e^} and Tuhina Dey ^{f^}

^a Division of Agronomy, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Science and Technology of Jammu, Chatha, Jammu and Kashmir, India.

^b Water Management Research Centre, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Science and Technology of Jammu, Chatha, Jammu and Kashmir, India.

^c Faculty of Agriculture, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Science and Technology of Jammu, Chatha, Jammu and Kashmir, India.

^d Division of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, FSR, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Science and Technology of Jammu, Chatha, Jammu and Kashmir, India.

^e Division of Statistics and Computer Science, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Science and Technology of Jammu, Chatha, Jammu and Kashmir, India.

^f Division of Plant Breeding and Genetics, Sher-e-Kashmir University of Agricultural Science and Technology of Jammu, Chatha, Jammu and Kashmir, 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/2024/v36i34398

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/112332

++ Ph.D., Scholar;

[#] Chief Scientist and Head;

[†] Dean;

[‡] Professor (Agronomy);

[^] Professor and Head;

^{*}Corresponding author: E-mail: kanikbansal09@gmail.com;

Int. J. Plant Soil Sci., vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 59-68, 2024

Bansal et al.; Int. J. Plant Soil Sci., vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 59-68, 2024; Article no.IJPSS.112332

Original Research Article

Received: 28/11/2023 Accepted: 02/02/2024 Published: 05/02/2024

ABSTRACT

Field experiments were conducted during Kharif season of 2022 at the Research Farm, WMRC, SKUAST- J, Chatha. The soil of the experimental site was sand clay loam in texture, slightly alkaline in reaction, low in organic carbon and available nitrogen but medium in phosphorus and potassium. The experiment was laid out in Factorial RBD with three factors replicated thrice. Twenty treatment combinations comprising of five Humic acid treatments (Control, Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha & 5kg/ha (Market ready), and Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha & 5kg/ha (FYM), two PSB treatments (With and without PSB) and two levels of Phosphorus nutrition (100% Recommended N:100% Recommended P - 15:40 kg/ha and 100% Recommended N:75% Recommended P - 15:30 kg/ha). The utilization of Humic acid at a rate of 5 kg/ha, sourced from both Market Ready and Farm Yard Manure (FYM), combined with seed treatment employing (PSB) and a nutrient application of 100% recommended nitrogen (N): 100% recommended phosphorus (P) - 15:40 kg/ha, exhibited a more pronounced and favorable residual impact on soil properties. This was evidenced by notable improvements in organic carbon, available nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium levels, surpassing their initial values but shows in non-significant results. Furthermore, this treatment employing humic acid application, PSB & Phosphorous nutrition showed improvement in seed yield and straw yield but failed to show significant results in residual rice crop.

Keywords: Residual effect; humic acid; PSB; phosphorus nutrition; soil properties yield.

1. INTRODUCTION

The ongoing expansion of industrial operations, urbanization, and infrastructure development is progressively encroaching upon substantial land previously allocated for agricultural, areas forestry, and pasture purposes. This encroachment disrupts the physical, chemical, and biological characteristics of the soil, leading to soil degradation. Consequently, preserving organic matter in the soil becomes imperative to enhance soil fertility and optimize crop yield per unit area. In this context, the application of plant growth-promoting substances, such as humic acid, represents an innovative and promising strategy to confer significant advantages to agriculture.

Humic substances, encompassing humic and fulvic acids, play a crucial role in soil fertility and plant nutrition. Plants cultivated in soil enriched with sufficient humic and fulvic acids demonstrate reduced stress levels, improved growth, and increased yields. Humic acids act as stimulants for root development, fostering root growth. Moreover, they serve as soil conditioners, enhancing aggregate stability, aeration, and improving the soil's water-holding

and nutrient-supplying capacity [1]. "Humic acid stimulates plant growth, thereby increasing yields by facilitating the uptake of plant nutrients and influencing various mechanisms such as cellular respiration, photosynthesis, protein synthesis, and enzyme activities. Additionally, this substance regulates plant growth hormones through the production of indole acetic acid or its precursors. Humic acid also acts as an effective adsorption and retention complex for inorganic plant nutrients" [2].

PSB play an important role in solubilization of soil P through secretion of various organic acids and make it available to plant" [3]. "Application of P along with PSB, improved phosphorus uptake by plants and yields equally indicating that the PSB was able to solubilize phosphates and to mobilize phosphorus in residual crop plants" [4].

Inadequate nutrient availability during the crucial phases of crop development results in nutrient stress, contributing to suboptimal crop yield and productivity. Humic acid functions as an inert nutrient reservoir, facilitating the mobilization of soil nutrients and potentially exerting residual effects. Against this backdrop, the current study was conducted to assess the residual impact of humic acid on enhancing both yield and soil chemical properties in rice cultivation.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiments were conducted during the Kharif seasons of 2022 to investigate the enduring impact of Humic acid, PSB and phosphate nutrition on the physio-chemical characteristics of soil subsequent to the harvest of rice crops in subtropical conditions at the Research Farm, WMRC, SKUAST-J, Chatha. The experimental site, located at 32.6529° N latitude and 74.8071° E longitude, with an elevation of 332 meters above mean sea level. featured sandy loam textured soil that was slightly alkaline. Initially, soil exhibited low organic carbon content (5.01), as well as low levels of available nitrogen (214.12), but medium levels of available phosphorus (10.78) and potassium (158.01), maintaining an electrical conductivity within the acceptable range at the start of the experiment.

The experimental design employed a Factorial Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three factors replicated thrice. Twenty treatment combinations. including five Humic acid treatments (Control, Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha & 5kg/ha (Market ready), and Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha & 5kg/ha (FYM), two PSB applications (With and without PSB) and two levels of Phosphorus (100% nutrition Recommended N:100% Recommended P - 15:40 kg/ha and 100% Recommended N:75% Recommended P - 15:30 kg/ha). The main crop i.e. black gram, was sown with a spacing of 30×10 cm in summer season (march 2022) and seed rate of 15 kg/ha. The full dose of nitrogen (16 kg/ha) and a uniform basal application of 40 kg/ha P2O5 per hectare were applied to all treatments through urea and DAP. Subsequently, puddled transplanted rice crops were sown after black gram to evaluate the residual effects of treatments applied to black gram. Rice was sown at a spacing of 20 cm with two plants per hill in kharif season (June 2022). The recommended NPK dose for rice crops was 50:30:20 with urea, diammonium kg/ha, phosphate, and muriate of potash serving as sources for nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium, respectively. Half of the nitrogen, along with the full dose of phosphorus and potassium, was applied at sowing as a basal dose. The remaining nitrogen was top-dressed in two equal splits - at the tillering stage and 60

days after transplanting (DAT) of the rice crop. The experiment was conducted at the same site without changing the randomization of treatments to assess residual effects (Blackgram-rice cropping system). Black gram (cv. PU-31) was sown in the third week of March, and the residual crop, rice, was sown in mid-June and harvested in September 2022.

Soil samples were randomly collected from five different spots in the field after harvesting the residual rice crop. The composite soil sample was air-dried, ground, and passed through a 2 mm sieve for analysis of various chemical properties. The initial soil analysis indicated that the experimental field's soil was sandy clay loam, slightly alkaline, low in organic carbon and available nitrogen, but medium in available phosphorus and potassium. Post-harvesting of the black gram crop, treatment-wise soil samples were taken from all plots at the surface (0-15 cm) for pH, organic carbon (OC), available nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium determination. The samples were dried, ground, and sieved before analysis. The available nitrogen was determined using the modified alkaline permanganate method. Available phosphorus was determined using the method defined by Olsen et. al. (1954), with color intensity measured at 660 nm and expressed. Available potassium was extracted with neutral normal ammonium acetate solution. determined by a flame photometer.

Statistical analysis involved the use of analysis of variance (ANOVA), and F-tests of significance were applied to treatment means based on the null hypothesis (Cochran and Cox, 1957). Standard errors, along with critical differences at 5% significance, were computed where necessary to discern treatment effects for chance effects. The degrees of freedom used in ANOVA were determined as part of the key for statistical analysis.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Chemical Properties of Soil after Harvest of Residual Rice Crop

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that different treatments and their interaction showed a non-significant influence on soil chemical properties such as pH and organic carbon in rice after harvest stage.

Among Humic acid applications, the Numerically higher value of organic carbon & EC was

recorded with the treatment of H₂ & H₄ (Soil Application of Humic acid @ 5kg/ha (Market ready & FYM) respectively, followed by H1 and H₃ (Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha (Market ready & FYM) respectively. while the lowest organic carbon & EC was recorded under control. Among PSB Applications, the highest value of organic carbon & EC was recorded in the soil application of PSB as compared to the treatment without PSB. Between phosphorus Nutrition treatments, a numerically higher value of organic carbon & EC was recorded under Treatment N₁, while the lowest organic carbon & EC was recorded under N₂. However, among Humic acid application, the Numerical higher value of pH was recorded with the treatment of H5 followed by H1 and H3 H2 & H4 respectively while the lowest pH was recorded under control. between PSB Application treatments, the highest value of pH was recorded in seed treatment with PSB as compared to the treatment without PSB. Between phosphorus Nutrition, a numerically higher value of organic carbon was recorded under Treatment N1, while the lowest organic carbon was recorded under N₂.

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that different treatments and their interaction showed a non-significant contribution on soil chemical properties *viz.* pH, EC and organic carbon of soil after harvest of rice. Among Humic acid levels, pH ranged from 7.30 to 7.36 and reported a 1.781% dip in values of pH to initial levels (H₂), EC ranged from 0.29 to 0.31 and reported 3.226 % dip in values of EC to initial levels (H₂) and OC ranged from 0.54-0.58 and reported 3.448% dip in values of OC to initial levels (H₂) respectively.

Among PSB levels, pH ranged from 7.32 to 7.33 and reported a 1.639% dip in values of pH to initial levels (H₂), OC ranged from 0.57 to 0.58 and reported 3.226 % dip in values of OC to initial levels (P₁) and EC was about 0.30 and reported 3.333% dip in values of EC to initial levels (P₁) respectively.

Among Phosphorous nutrition, pH ranged from 7.32 to 7.33 and reported a 1.639% dip in values of pH to initial levels (H₂), OC ranged from 0.57 to 0.58 and reported 1.754% dip in values of OC to initial levels (P₁) and EC was about 0.30 and reported 3.333% dip in values of EC to initial levels (P₁) respectively.

Changes in soil physiochemical properties might be due to build up of soil fertility due to the growing of legume crops & implementation of different treatments and which contributed for the improvement of soil properties [5].

3.2 Available Nitrogen, Phosphorus & Potassium of Soil After Harvest of Residual Rice Crop

The data concerning the available nitrogen in the soil is presented in Table 1 which revealed nonsignificant results the Numerically higher value of available nitrogen was recorded with the treatment of H_2 followed by H_4 , H_1 and H_3 respectively while the lowest available nitrogen was recorded under control (H_5). Among PSB applications, the highest value of available nitrogen was recorded in the soil application of PSB as compared to the treatment without PSB. Between phosphorus nutrition treatments, a numerically higher value of available nitrogen was recorded under Treatment N₁, while the available nitrogen was recorded under N₂.

The data concerning the available phosphorus in the soil is presented in Table 1 which revealed non-significant results the Numerically higher value of available phosphorus was recorded with the treatment of H_2 followed by H_4 , H_1 and H_3 respectively while the lowest available phosphorus was recorded under control (H₅). Among PSB applications, the highest value of available phosphorus was recorded in the soil application of PSB as compared to the treatment without PSB. Between phosphorus nutrition treatments, a numerically higher value of available phosphorus was recorded under Treatment N₁, while the available phosphorus was recorded under N₂.

The data concerning the available potassium in the soil is presented in Table 1 which revealed non-significant results the Numerically higher value of available Potassium was recorded with the treatment of H₂ followed by H₄, H₁ and H₃ respectively while the lowest available Potassium was recorded under control (H₅). Among PSB applications, the highest value of available Potassium was recorded in the soil application of PSB as compared to the treatment without PSB. Between phosphorus nutrition treatments, a numerically higher value of available Potassium was recorded under Treatment N₁, while the available Potassium was recorded under N₂.

The data presented in Table 1 indicated that different treatments and their interaction showed a non-significant contribution on soil available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium after harvest of residual rice. Among Humic acid levels, available nitrogen ranged from 232.95 to 251.33 and reported a 2.523% dip in values of available nitrogen to initial levels of black gram crop (H₂), Available phosphorus ranged from 11.63 to 12.5 and reported 8.692% dip in values of available phosphorus to initial levels (H₂) and available potassium ranged from 148.88-159.61 and reported 14.20% dip in values of available potassium to initial levels (H_2) of black gram crop respectively. Among PSB levels, available nitrogen ranged from 7.32 to 7.33 and reported a 2.52% dip in values of available nitrogen to initial levels (H₂), available phosphorus ranged from 0.57 to 0.58 and reported 8.618 % dip in values of available phosphorus to initial levels (P1) and available potassium was about 0.30 and reported 7.21% dip in values of available potassium to initial levels (P1) of black gram crop respectively. Among Phosphorous nutrition, available nitrogen ranged from 7.32 to 7.33 and reported a 2.523 % dip in values of available nitrogen to initial levels (H₂) of black gram crop, available phosphorus ranged from 0.57 to 0.58 and reported 7.141% dip in values of available phosphorus to initial levels (P1) and available potassium was about 0.30 and reported 6.61% dip in values of available potassium to initial levels (P1) of black gram crop respectively. Rice being a heavy feeder of nutrients depletes the Available Nitrogen, Phosphorus & Potassium present in soil. The residual effects observed in the experiments were lower with control for the preceding crop. This could be due to lesser nutrient availability in the plots due to nutrient losses and or mining of soil nutrient pool by the preceding crop caused much poorer effect on the residual crop. "the maximum improvement in seed and Stover yield might be associated with increased vield attributes due to a concomitant increase in dry matter accumulation". Kumawat et. al. [5].

Among the various applications of humic acid, its soil application resulted in the highest recorded nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium content, outcome could be attributed to increased nutrient mineralization, enhanced nutrient availability, and elevated microbial activity in the soil [6,7]. Similarly, the use of Phosphorous Solubilizing Bacteria (PSB) contributed to comparable outcomes in parameters such as available nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium. Similar results was reported by Biswas et. al. [8] & Ghosal et. al. [9]. However, statistical significance was not achieved, possibly due to unfavourable temperature conditions during the

kharif season in specific subregions of Jammu, which may have adversely affected microbial populations. The practice of puddling soil for rice cultivation in the plot could also contribute to reduced nutrient mineralization. While the phosphorus dose applied to the black gram crop was deemed sufficient, it failed to yield a significant difference, possibly indicating limited availability in the puddled soil. Similar results was reported by Bochalya *et. al.* [10] & Ghosal et. al. [9].

3.3 Seed Yield & Stover Yield of Residual Rice Crop

A perusal of the data depicted in Table 1 & Fig 1 reveals that different treatment combinates nonsignificantly influenced the seed vield of rice crop. Treatment H₂ (Soil Application of Humic 5kg/ha (Market ready) recorded acid 0 numerically highest seed yield (757.78 kg/ha) followed by treatment H₄ [Soil Application of Humic acid @ 5kg/ha (FYM)], treatment H1 & H₃[Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha (Market ready and FYM respectively)]. Whereas, the lowest seed yield was observed with treatment H5 (control). Among phosphorus solubilizing bacteria application (PSB), treatment P1 (with PSB) recorded a numerically higher seed vield than treatment P_2 (without PSB). Among phosphorus nutrition, treatment N₁ [100%] Recommended N:100% Recommended P (15:40 kg/ha)] recorded a numerically higher seed yield (706.71and kg/ha) than treatment N₂ [100% Recommended N:75% Recommended P (15:30 kg/ha)]. The data presented on the interaction effect for all factors viz. humic acid source and dose, phosphorus solubilizing bacteria and phosphorus nutrition, showed a non-significant effect on the seed yield was observed.

A perusal of the data depicted in Table 1 & Fig 2 reveals that different treatment combinates nonsignificantly influenced the straw yield of rice crop. Treatment H₂ (Soil Application of Humic 5kg/ha (Market ready) recorded acid @ numerically highest straw yield (757.78 kg/ha) followed by treatment H₄ [Soil Application of Humic acid @ 5kg/ha (FYM)], treatment H₁ & H₃[Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha (Market ready and FYM respectively)]. Whereas, the lowest straw yield was observed with treatment H₅ (control). Among phosphorus solubilizing bacteria application (PSB), treatment P1 (with PSB) recorded a numerically higher straw yield than treatment P₂ (without PSB). Among phosphorus nutrition, treatment N₁ [100%

Treatments	рН	EC (dS/m)	Organic Carbon (g/kg)	Available Nitrogen (kg/ha)	Available Phosphorous (kg/ha)	Available Potassium (kg/ha)	Seed yield (kg/ha)	Straw yield (kg/ha)
H ₁ Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha (Market ready)	7.32	0.29	0.57	244.52	11.94	152.68	4132.37	7790.57
H₂ Soil Application of Humic acid @ 5kg/ha (Market ready)	7.30	0.31	0.58	251.33	12.54	159.61	4186.03	8005.35
H ₃ Soil Application of Humic acid @ 2.5kg/ha (FYM)	7.33	0.29	0.56	242.99	11.76	151.53	4123.29	7722.24
H ₄ Soil Application of Humic acid @ 5kg/ha (FYM)	7.32	0.31	0.58	249.20	12.50	158.11	4179.30	7958.48
H ₅ Control	7.36	0.29	0.54	232.95	11.63	148.88	4082.90	7611.26
SEm±	0.17	0.01	0.01	5.33	0.26	3.53	97.17	169.85
CD (0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
P ₁ With PSB	7.32	0.30	0.57	245.60	12.30	154.64	4145.55	7864.54
P ₂ Without PSB	7.33	0.29	0.56	242.80	11.84	153.68	4136.01	7770.62
SEm±	0.11	0.00	0.01	3.37	0.16	2.23	61.45	107.42
CD (0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
N ₁ 100% Recommended N:100% Recommended P (15:40 kg/ha)	7.32	0.30	0.57	246.11	12.28	155.98	4145.81	7847.57
N ₂ 100% Recommended N:75% Recommended P (15:30 kg/ha)	7.33	0.30	0.56	242.28	11.87	152.34	4135.74	7787.59
SEm±	0.11	0.00	0.01	3.37	0.16	2.23	61.45	107.42
CD (0.05)	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
HxP	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
P×N	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
N×H	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
H×P×N	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

Table 1, Effect of humic acid source and dose, PSB and	phosphorus nutrition on soil pr	operties & vield of residual rice crop
	phosphoras nathation on son pr	operates a yield of residual fibe of op



Fig. 1. Effect of humic acid source and dose, phosphorus solubilising bacteria (PSB) and phosphorus nutrition on Seed yield (kg/ha) of rice crop



Fig. 2. Effect of humic acid source and dose, phosphorus solubilising bacteria (PSB) and phosphorus nutrition on straw yield (kg/ha) of rice crop

Recommended N:100% Recommended P (15:40 kg/ha)] recorded a numerically higher straw yield (706.71and kg/ha) than treatment N₂ [100% Recommended N:75% Recommended P (15:30 kg/ha)]. The data presented on the interaction effect for all factors *viz.* humic acid source and dose, phosphorus solubilizing bacteria and phosphorus nutrition, showed a non-significant effect on the straw yield was observed.

The residual effects observed in the experiments were lower with control for the preceding crop. This could be due to lesser nutrient availability in the plots due to nutrient losses and or mining of soil nutrient pool by the preceding crop caused much poorer effect on the residual crop. the maximum improvement in seed and Stover vield might be associated with increased vield attributes due to a concomitant increase in drv matter accumulation. This is in accordance with the findings of Kumawat et. al. [5].

Among the various applications of humic acid, its soil application resulted in seed and stover yield, in comparison to the control group. Similarly, the use of Phosphorous Solubilizing Bacteria (PSB) contributed to comparable outcomes in parameters such as seed and stover yield [8,9]. However. statistical significance was not achieved. possibly due to unfavourable temperature conditions during the kharif season in specific subregions of Jammu, which may have adversely affected microbial populations. The practice of puddling soil for rice cultivation in the plot could also contribute to reduced nutrient mineralization. While the phosphorus dose applied to the black gram crop was deemed sufficient, it failed to vield a significant difference. possibly indicating limited in the availability puddled soil. Similar results was reported by Bochalya et. al. [10].

4. CONCLUSION

The utilization of Humic acid at a rate of 5 kg/ha, sourced from both Market Ready and Farm Yard Manure (FYM), combined with PSB seed treatment employing and а nutrient application of 100% recommended 100% nitroaen (N): recommended phosphorus (P) - 15:40 kg/ha, exhibited a more pronounced and favorable residual impact on soil properties and yield of rice crop.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- 1. Pettit RE. Organic matter, humus, humate, humic acid, fulvic acid and humin: their importance in soil fertility and plant health. CTI Research. 2004;10:1-7.
- Mayhew L. Humic substances in biological agriculture. Acres, 34, 54-61. Cochran WG, Cox GM. Experimental Designs. Asia Publishing House, Bombay, India. 2004; 1957.
- Iftikhar A, Aijaz N, Farooq R, Aslam S, Zeeshan A, Munir M, Irfan M, Mehmood T, Atif M, Ali M, Shiraz A. Beneficial role of phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB) in enhancing soil fertility through a variety of actions on plants growth and ecological perspective: an updated review; 2023.
- Wahid F, Fahad S, Danish S, Adnan M, 4. Yue Z, Saud S, Datta R.. Sustainable management with mycorrhizae and phosphate solubilizing bacteria for enhanced phosphorus uptake in calcareous soils. Agriculture. 2020;10(8): 334.
- Kumawat N, Sharma O P and Kumar R Effect of organic manures, PSB and phosphorus fertilization on yield and economics of mungbean [Vigna radiata (L.)Wilczek]. Environ. Ecol. 2009;27(1):5-7.
- Spier TW, Ross DJ. Studies on aclimo sequence of soils in tussock grassland. 9. Influence of organic matter on age of Chionocho larigida leaves on enzyme activities. New Zealand J. Sci. 1976;19: 389-396.
- Chaitra P, Math KK. Effect of Humic Acid on Soil Microbial Population and Enzymatic Activity. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 2018;7(11):1729-1733.
- Biswas SS, Biswas DR, Purakayastha T.J., Sarkar A, Kumar R, Das TK, Barman M, Pabbi S, Ghosh A, Pal R. Residual effect of rock-phosphate and PSB on rice yield and soil properties. Indian J Agric Sci. 2021;91:440-444.
- Ghosal PK, Bhattacharya B, Bagchi DK, Chakraborty T. Direct and residual effect of rock phosphates on rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) productivity and soil phosphorus status in Alfisols of Eastern Plateau of India. African

Journal of Agricultural Research. 2018;8: 4748–54.

10. Bochalya RS, Gupta AK, Sharma BC, Puniya R, Thakur NP, Singh MSP. Residual effect of biofertilizer consortium and foliar nutrition on soil chemical properties after harvest of black gram crop as affected by different fertility levels under subtropical condition of Jammu; 2021.

© 2024 Bansal 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/112332