

E-ISSN: 2278-4136 P-ISSN: 2349-8234 www.phytojournal.com JPP 2020; 9(5): 2450-2453

JPP 2020; 9(5): 2450-2453 Received: 19-07-2020 Accepted: 21-08-2020

Naveen Kumar Department of Agronomy, CSK HPKV, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh, India

SR Kantwa Division of Crop Production, IGFRI, Jhansi, Uttar Pradesh,

GD Sharma

India

Department of Organic Agriculture and Natural Farming, CSK HPKV, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh, India

Sukhchain Singh Department of Agronomy, CSK HPKV, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh, India

Priyanka Kumari Department of Agronomy, CSK HPKV, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh, India

Corresponding Author: Naveen Kumar Department of Agronomy, CSK HPKV, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh, India

Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry

Available online at www.phytojournal.com

# Effect of biofertilizers and inorganic nutrients management on the productivity and soil properties of setaria (*Setaria anceps* Stapf.) – white clover(*Trifolium repens* L.) system under sub-temperate climatic conditions

Journal of Pharmacognosy and

Phytochemistry

## Naveen Kumar, SR Kantwa, GD Sharma, Sukhchain Singh and Priyanka Kumari

#### Abstract

An experiment was conducted at Fodder Farm of Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh (India) for five years to evaluate the effect of biofertilizers and nutrient management on the productivity and soil properties of setaria grass (Setaria anceps) - white clover(Trifolium repens L.) system under sub-temperate climatic conditions. The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design with three replications and comprised of seven treatments viz., T1- Control (no use of biofertilizers and NPK), T2- Biofertilizer (Azotobactorin setaria/Rhizobiumin white clover), T3- 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizer, T4- Biofertilizer (Azotobactor in setaria/Rhizobiumin white clover)+50% NPK through inorganic fertilizers, T5-75% NPK through inorganic fertilizers, T<sub>6</sub>- Biofertilizers (Azotobactor in setaria/Rhizobiumin white clover)+75% NPK through inorganic fertilizer, T7- 100% NPK through inorganic fertilizer. Application of biofertilizers along with NPK through inorganic fertilizers proved better for sustaining round the year forage production. Significantly higher green and dry fodder yields of both setaria and white clover was obtained with combined application of biofertilizers and 75% of recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers. Application of biofertilizers and 75% of recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers resulted in better system productivity and economic returns while, application of sole biofertilizers gave maximum benefit cost ratio. Application of 100% of recommended NPK resulted in betterbuildup of available soil nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium while application of biofertilizers with 75% of recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers improved soil organic carbon, cation exchange capacity and pH over initial values.

Keywords: Biofertilizers, setaria grass, white clover, green and dry fodder yields

#### Introduction

Livestock have important role in overall growth of agriculture and gross domestic product (GDP) of Indian economy. In India, Total livestock population increased to 536.76 million from 512.05 million during the period of 2012 to 2019 with an increase of 4.8 per cent. Rural areas account for 95.75 per cent of total livestock population (Anonymous, 2019)<sup>[2]</sup>. Available fodder sources viz.; cultivated fodder crops, pastures and grasslands, crop residues, fodder trees and cultivable wastelands etc. are not sufficient to meet the fodder requirement of livestock in the country It is estimated that by 2050 the demand for green fodder will reach to 1012 million tonnes and current level of growth in forage resources a deficit of 18.4% in green fodder and 13.2% in dry fodder by 2050 (Anonymous, 2015)<sup>[3]</sup>. In the country fodder crops occupy 5 per cent of grossed cropped area and it is static since last few decades (Roy et al. 2019)<sup>[17]</sup> The situation in hilly areas states of north-western Himalayas is more worse. In the region farming is dominated by small and marginal farmers and fodder cultivation is their least priority as their focus is on grain crops, pulses and some cash crops (Kumar el al. 2019)<sup>[10]</sup> Hence, Improvement in forage production and productivity per unit land area along with fodder grasses and legumes could be a breakthrough to address this problem (Kumar et al. 2012) [11]. Several directions have been proposed to move towards sustainable forage production *i.e.* agroecology, ecological intensification, eco-efficient agriculture and sustainable intensification (Martin et al. 2020)<sup>[12]</sup>.

Setaria(*Setaria anceps* Stapf.) a perennial grass used as soilage, hay and grazing as well, has good digestibility, palatability and is a good source of crude protein (11.5%), neutral detergent fibre (NDF, 75.5%), acid detergent fibre (ADF, 40.8%) and improves the animal performance

(Jank et al. 2007)<sup>[9]</sup>. This grass has varied range of adaptability among all the tropical grasses and can perform well in high rainfall areas (900-1285 mm) and can also withstands in drought and longer flooding as well (TOF, 2019)<sup>[19]</sup>. White clover (Trifolium repens L.) a stoloniferous perennial legume is most important forage in temperate and sub-temperate zones and contributes to a more sustainable forage production system (Elgersma and Hassink, 1997)<sup>[6]</sup>. Grasses and legume mixture appear a viable option for producing quality fodder for the livestock. Use of biofertilizer in forage based system could be viable options to sustain both yield and quality of forages as well as minimum the use of inorganic fertilizers. Root dipping of perennial grasses and seed treatment of legumes with biofertilizers ensure better establishment and survival of species under varied growing conditions and better yield of forage crops (Parera and Cantliffe, 1994)<sup>[14]</sup>. The information on performance of setaria grass-white clover system under biofertilizers and nutrient management is not available. Therefore, study was undertaken to find out the suitability of nutrient management practices on the productivity of setaria grass-white clover system as well as soil properties.

#### Materials and methods

An experiment was conducted at Fodder Farm of Chaudhary Sarwan Kumar Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur, Himachal Pradesh (India) for five years. Geographically, the experimental site was located at 32° 6' N latitude and 76°3' longitude at an elevation of 1290.8 m mean sea level in North-Western Himalayas. Agro-climatically experimental site falls under sub-temperate and sub-humid zone, characterized by high annual rainfall (2200-2500 mm) with mild summers (19-31 °C) and extreme winters (3.5-1.4 °C). The experiment was laid out in a randomized block design with three replications and comprised of seven treatments viz., T1- Control (no use of biofertilizers and inorganic fertilizers), T2- Biofertilizer (Azotobactor in setaria/Rhizobium in white clover), T<sub>3</sub>- 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizer, T<sub>4</sub>- Biofertilizer (Azotobactor in setaria/Rhizobium in white clover) + 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizers, T<sub>5</sub>- 75% NPK through inorganic fertilizers, T<sub>6</sub>-Biofertilizers (Azotobactor in setaria/Rhizobium in white clover) + 75% NPK through inorganic fertilizer, T7- 100% NPK through inorganic fertilizer. Setaria grass rooted plant slips were dipped for half an hour in Azotobactor culture and thereafter planted in Kharif season at 40 x 40 cm crop geometry and was maintained to end of the experiment. White clover seeds were treated with Rhizobium culture following standard procedure of seed inoculation and sown in between the setaria grass using seed rate of 6 kg/ha. Bio-inoculants i.e. Azotobactor for setaria and Rhizobium for white clover were applied in year of establishment. Recommended N, P and K was 120, 60 and 40 kg/ha for setaria grass and 20, 60 and 40 kg/ha for white clover were applied through urea, single super phosphate and muriate of potash. First year was considered as the year of establishment of crops and in subsequent years four cut of setaria grass during Kharif season and three cut of white clover during Rabi season were taken in each year. Herbage yield of all the cuts was sum up for each crop and expressed as total yield of crop. Fresh samples were oven dried at 72 °C till constant weight was obtained and dry matter content was used to obtained dry matter yield in each treatment. The gross returns, net returns and benefit cost ratio (B:C) of different treatments was computed based on cost of various inputs and

price of output. Before the start of experiment composite soil sample and after the completion of the experiment treatment wise soil samples at 0-15 cm depth were collected from the experiment field. The soil samples were dried, ground, passed through 2 mm sieve and analyzed for various soil physico-chemical properties following standard procedures.Data followed the homogeneity test, hence pooling was done over the seasons and mean data has been presented. Data collected on various parameters were statistically analyzed following the standard analysis of the variance technique (ANOVA) as described by Gomez and Gomez (1984)<sup>[7]</sup>.

#### **Result and Discussion Green Fodder Yield**

Green fodder yield of setaria grass and white clover as well as total system productivity was significantly increased by different treatments over control (Table 1). Application of biofertilizers+75% of recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers proved more efficient to sustain the forage yield and produced significantly higher green fodder yield of setaria, white clover and total green fodder of the system, but remained statistically at par with the application of 100% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers, 75% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers and application of biofertilizer+50% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers. Application of 75% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers, 100% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers, biofertilizer+50% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers+75% of recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers produced 30.81%, 31.90%, 29.97% and 37.48% more total green fodder yield of system over control, respectively. Application of biofertilizers+50% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers produced total green fodder yield equal to application of 75% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers and integration of biofertilizers and 75% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers produced more total green fodder yield than application of 100% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers. Improvement in green fodder yield with the application of biofertilizers might be due to favorable environment in rhizosphere for better expression of physiological growth parameters. Azotobactor and Rhizobium fixed atmospheric nitrogen through asymbiotic and symbiotic mechanism, respectively which ultimately reflect into higher green fodder yield. Azotobactor and Rhizobium also known to promote root growth of crops and results in more above ground dry matter of crops. Chaichi el al. (2015)<sup>[4]</sup> observed significant increase in green forage yield of berseem with combined application of biofertilizer and inorganic fertilizers. Similarly, better effect of biofertilizers and inorganics integration on productivity of forage crops were also reported by Aditi et al. (2019) <sup>[1]</sup>; Patel et al. (2018)<sup>[15]</sup> and Patidar and Mali, (2004)<sup>[16]</sup>.

## **Dry Fodder Yield**

Integrated nutrient management *i.e.* biofertilizers+inorganic fertilizers had significant effect on dry fodder yield of setaria grass- white clover forage system (Table 1). Combined application of biofertilizer+75% of recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers appeared efficient for sustaining yield over the period and recorded significantly higher dry fodder yield of setaria grass, white clover as well as total system productivity and remained statistically at par with the application of 100% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers 75% recommended NPK through inorganic

fertilizers and combined application of biofertilizer+ 50% of recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers. The magnitude of increase in total dry fodder yield of system was 32.20%, 34.62%, 35.94% and 40.34% with the application of biofertilizers+50% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers, 75% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers, Biofertilizers+75% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers, 100% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers+75% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers over control, respectively. Integration of biofertilizers and 75% recommended through inorganic fertilizers produced 6.86% more total green fodder vield over 100% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers. The improvement in morphological growth attributes by biofertilizer and inorganic fertilizer application might have resulted in better interception and utilization of radiant energy leading towards higher photosynthesis and finally more accumulation of dry matter of individual plants. The results are in close proximity of Singh et al. (2005) [18]. Meena et al. (2013) [13]; Deva (2015) [5] and Verma et al. (2016) <sup>[20]</sup>, who reported about the positive effect of biofertilizers with chemical fertilizers in increasing dry matter accumulation in different fodder crops.

#### Economics

The economic indicators *viz.;* gross returns, net returns and B:C ratio have a great impact on practical utilization and acceptance of any technology. The effect of different treatments on the economic indicators (Table 3) revealed

highest gross and net returns were with the combined application of biofertilizer+75% of recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers however, maximum B:C was obtained with the application of sole biofertilizers. Increase in gross returns and net returns were mainly attributed to higher green forage yield while lower cost of cultivation with sole biofertilizers reflected its effect on higher B:C in this treatment.

## **Soil Properties**

The data on soil physico-chemical properties (Table 4) indicated buildup of available soil nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium, soil organic carbon and improvement in cation exchange capacity (CEC) and soil pH over initial value in all treatments except control. Maximum buildup in available soil nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium was observed with the application of 100% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers while maximum improvement in soil organic carbon, cation exchange capacity and soil pH were observed with combined application of biofertilizers+75% recommended NPK through inorganic fertilizers followed by sole biofertilizer application. The more increment of soil organic carbon over initial value in fertilized plots as compare to control might be due to application of biofertilizers in fertilized plots increased the microbial population and results in more soil aggregation and decomposition lead to build up of organic carbon in soil. Similar results were also reported by Gundler et al. (2015)<sup>[7]</sup>.

Table 1: Effect of different treatments on green fodder and dry fodder yields of setaria grass-white clover system

	Green	fodder yield	(q/ha)	Dry fodder yield (q/ha)		
	Setaria	White clover	Total	Setaria	White clover	Total
T <sub>1</sub> - Control (no use of biofertilizers and NPK)	222.72	71.51	294.22	40.47	13.40	48.81
T <sub>2</sub> - Biofertilizer (Azotobactor/Rhizobium)	251.14	82.92	334.06	46.67	15.60	55.03
T <sub>3</sub> - 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	270.77	95.94	366.72	50.12	19.09	63.13
T4- Biofertilizer (Azotobactor/Rhizobium) + 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizers	288.77	113.87	402.64	54.29	21.12	71.99
T <sub>5</sub> - 75% NPK through inorganic fertilizers	303.90	121.77	425.66	55.78	22.94	74.66
T <sub>6</sub> - Biofertilizers (Azotobactor/Rhizobium) + 75% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	328.06	142.56	470.61	60.88	26.74	81.81
T <sub>7</sub> - 100% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	307.90	124.11	432.01	56.64	23.79	76.20
SEm <u>+</u>	18.75	9.56	22.63	2.26	1.89	3.34
CD5%	55.75	29.35	69.45	6.95	5.80	10.28

Table 2: Effect of different treatments on economics and resources use efficiency of setaria grass-white clover cultivation

Treatment	Cost of cultivation (Rs. /ha)	Gross returns (Rs. /ha)	Net returns (Rs. /ha)	B:C
T <sub>1</sub> - Control (no use of biofertilizers and NPK)	13757	34475	20718	1.47
T <sub>2</sub> - Biofertilizer (Azotobactor/Rhizobium)	14058	38372	24314	1.74
T <sub>3</sub> - 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	18172	42163	23991	1.33
T4- Biofertilizer (Azotobactor/Rhizobium) + 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizers	19145	46673	27528	1.47
T <sub>5</sub> - 75% NPK through inorganic fertilizers	20955	49579	28624	1.40
T <sub>6</sub> - Biofertilizers ( <i>Azotobactor/Rhizobium</i> ) + 75% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	22207	55234	33027	1.52
T <sub>7</sub> - 100% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	22184	50154	27969	1.30

Treatments	pН	N (kg/ha)	P (kg/ha)	K (kg/ha)	OC %	CEC C mol (P <sup>+</sup> ) kg <sup>-1</sup>
T <sub>1</sub> - Control (no use of biofertilizers and NPK)	5.6	201	5	245	0.56	11
T <sub>2</sub> - Biofertilizer (Azotobactor/Rhizobium)	5.6	226	6	275	0.58	12
T <sub>3</sub> - 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	5.7	228	8	272	0.56	13
T4- Biofertilizer (Azotobactor/Rhizobium) + 50% NPK through inorganic fertilizers	5.6	215	9	268	0.57	11
T <sub>5</sub> - 75% NPK through inorganic fertilizers	5.8	316	13	325	0.56	12
T <sub>6</sub> - Biofertilizers (Azotobactor/Rhizobium) + 75% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	5.6	325	13	330	0.59	12
T <sub>7</sub> - 100% NPK through inorganic fertilizer	5.7	335	16	351	0.58	12
Initial value	5.6	225	8	285	0.56	10

## Conclusion

The study conclusively indicated that integration of biofertilizers with chemical fertilizers appeared suitable nutrient management system to sustain the productivity of setaria grass-white clover forage system with improvement in physico-chemical properties of soil.

## References

- Aditi C, Tripathi S, Singh N, Saini L, Govind. Effect of fertilizer levels, biocompost and biofertilizer on growth and yield attributes of fodder sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* [L.] Moench). Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2019; 8(6):617-620.
- 2. Anonymous. Basic animal husbandry government of India ministry of agriculture department of animal husbandry, dairying and fisheries krishi bhawan, New Delhi, 2019, 81-93.
- 3. Anonymous. Vision 2050, ICAR- Indian Grassland and Fodder Research Institute, Jhansi, Jhansi-284 003, Uttar Pradesh, India, 2015, 5-8
- 4. Chaichi MR, Shabani G, Noori F. Response of berseem clover (*Trifolium alexandrinum* L.) to chemical, biological and integrated use of fertilizers. Agronomic Research in Moldavia. 2015; 161(1):77-88.
- 5. Deva S. Effect of tillage practices and nutrient management on fodder yield of oat, soil fertility and microbial population. The Bioscan- An International Quarterly Journal of Life Sciences. 2015; 10(1):173-176.
- 6. Elgersma A, Hassink A. Effect of white clover (*Trifolium repen* L.) on plant and soil nitrogen and soil organic matter in mixture with perennial ryegrass (*Lolium perenne* L.). Plant and soil. 1997; 197(2):177-186.
- Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research. 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Wiley Inter Science, New York, USA, 1984.
- Gundlur SS, Patil PL, Rajkumara S, Ashoka P, Neelakanth JK. Influence of integrated nutrient management on yield and uptake of nutrients by maize and soil fertility under irrigated conditions in Vertisol. Karnataka Journals of Agricultural Science. 2015; 28(2):172-175.
- Jank L, Quesenberry KH, Sollenberger LE, Wofford DS, Lyrene PL. Selection of morphological traits to improve forage characteristics of *Setaria sphacelata* grown in Florida. New Zealand Journal of Agriculture Research. 2007; 50(1):73-83.
- Kumar N, Sood VK, Banyal DK, Katoch R. Fodder and Livestock Scenario in Himachal Pradesh. In: Indian Fodder Scenario: Redefining State Wise Status (eds. A. K. Roy, R. K. Agrawal, N. R. Bhardwaj). ICAR- AICRP on Forage Crops and Utilization, Jhansi, India, 2019, 53-62.
- 11. Kumar S, Agrawal RK, Dixit AK, Rai Arvind K, Singh JB, Rai SK. Forage Production Technology for Arable Lands. Indian Grassland and Fodder Research Institute, Jhansi-284 003, Uttar Pradesh, India, 2012, 1-6.
- 12. Martin G, Durand JL, Duru M, Gastal F, Julier B, Litrico I, *et al.* Role of ley pastures in tomorrow's cropping systems. A review Agronomy for Sustainable Development. 2020; 40(3):17-42.
- 13. Meena RM, Dashora LN, Dhaker RC, Meena BP. Effect of integrated nutrient management on quality parameters of fodder yield in sorghum *(Sorghum bicolor* [L.] Moench). Annals of Agri-bio Research. 2013; 18(3):325-32.

- 14. Parera AC, Cantliffe DJ. Pre-sowing seed priming. Horticultural Reviews. 1994; 16(1):109-148.
- Patel KM, Patel DM, Gelot DG, Patel M. Effect of integrated nutrient management on green forage yield, quality and nutrient uptake of fodder sorghum *(Sorghum Bicolor* [L.] Meonch). International Journal of Conservation Science. 2018; 6(1):173-176.
- Patidar M, Mali A. Effect of farmyard manure, fertility levels and bio-fertilizers on growth, yield and quality of sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*). Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2004; 49(2):117-120.
- 17. Roy AK, Agrawal RK, Bhardwaj NR, Mishra AK, Mahanta SK. Revisiting National Forage Demand and Availability Scenario. In: Indian Fodder Scenario: Redefining State Wise Status (eds. A. K. Roy, R. K. Agrawal, N. R. Bhardwaj). ICAR- AICRP on Forage Crops and Utilization, Jhansi, India, 2019, 1-21.
- Singh MM, Maurya ML, Singh SP, Mishra CH. Effect of nitrogen level and biofertilizer inoculation on productivity of forage sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*[L.] Moench). Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2005; 75(3):167-168.
- 19. TOF- the organic farmer. The magazine for sustainable agriculture in Kenya. 2019; 170(1):1-2
- Verma, Chanchal, Thanki JD, Singh, Deshraj, Chaudhari SN. Effect of nitrogen, biofertilizer and farm yard manure on yield and nutrient uptake in oat (*Avena sativa* L.). The Bioscan-An International Quarterly Journal of Life Sciences. 2016; 11(1):499-501.