



Volume 34, Issue 24, Page 1084-1092, 2022; Article no.IJPSS.96127 ISSN: 2320-7035

Impact of Rice Residue Management Practices on Growth and Productivity of Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.)

Kanhaiya Lal Maurya^a, Alok Kumar Pandey^a, Kumar Anshuman^{a*}, Sandeep Yadav^a and Sugandha Chauhan^a

^a Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Ayodhya (U.P.) 224229, 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/2022/v34i242739

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/96127

Original Research Article

Received: 23/10/2022 Accepted: 30/12/2022 Published: 31/12/2022

ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted during Rabi season 2020-21 at Instructional Farm of Acharya Narendra Deva Univ. of Agric. & Technology, Narendra Nagar, Kumarganj, Ayodhya (U.P.) to evaluate the effect of different nutrient management practices on growth and yield attributes of wheat. The experiment consisting of 11 treatments, T_1 (Control); T_2 (chemical fertilizers at 100% RDF); T_3 (chemical fertilizers at 75% RDF); T_4 (T_3 + paddy straw); T_5 (T_3 + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 100 ml/plot); T_6 (T_3 + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot); T_7 (T_3 + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 500 ml/plot); $T_8[T_3$ + (PSB + Mycorrhiza) at 50 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_{10}[T_3$ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot]; $T_$

Int. J. Plant Soil Sci., vol. 34, no. 24, pp. 1084-1092, 2022

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

(RBD).Wheat variety PBW-373 was taken as test crop. The results revealed that the application of chemical fertilizersat 75% RDF paddy straw + microbial decomposer at at 250 ml/plot + (PSB + Mycorrhiza) at at 50 ml/plot (T_{10}) recorded significantly higher growth attributes *viz*. Plant height dry matter accumulations, leaf area index, and yield attributes *viz*. number of grains per spike, weight of spike, test weight, grain yield, straw yield also biological yield along with harvest index.

Keywords: Paddy straw; chemical fertilizer; mycorrhiza; microbial decomposer.

1. INTRODUCTION

Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) is the most widely grown crop across the globe and is the second most important food crop in India (after rice), occupying about 27 million hectares of area and contributing about 34% of the total food grain production in India. Wheat constitutes about 20% of all human calories and protein intake throughout the world [1]. Excessive use of chemical fertilizers harms the biological power of soil which must be prevented as transformations of all the nutrients are negotiated by soil micro flora. An optimum soil microorganism population must be maintained in the soil for higher nutrient use efficiency [2-4]. No single source of plant nutrients can meet the entire nutrient need of crops in modern agriculture, rather they need to be used in an integrated manner following a management technology that is appropriate, economically viable, and socially acceptable and ecologically sound [5]. The use of microbial inoculants as bio fertilizers and/or antagonists of phytopathogens provide a promising alternative to chemical fertilizers and pesticides. Bacteria inhabiting plant roots and influencing plant growth positively by any direct or indirect mechanism (s) are referred to as Plant Growth Promoting Rhizobacteria [6]. Plant growth promoting rhizobacteria are commonly used as inoculants for improving the growth and yield of agricultural crops, however screening for the selection of effective PGPR strains is of critical importance. PGPR activity has been reported in strains belonging to several genera such as Azotobacter. Azospirillum, Pseudomonas, Acetobacter, Burkholderia and Bacillus [6,7]. On the other hand incorporation of crop residues is reported to increase the organic C and nutrient contents of soils and to increase crop yields [8,9] However, inhibition of plant growth due to immobilization of nutrients [10] and toxicity due to organic acids produced from decomposing residues in cooler regions are problems associated with crop residue incorporation. The present study was undertaken to study the effects of residue management practices on the growth and yield of wheat crop.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

An experiment was conducted during Rabi season 2020-21 at Instructional Farm of Acharya Narendra Deva University of Agriculture & Technology, Narendra Nagar, Kumargani, Ayodhya (U.P.) to evaluate the effect of different nutrient management practices on growth and vield attributes of wheat. The soil was partially reclaimed sodic soil with silt loam texture slightly alkaline in reaction (pH 8.22) with low available nitrogen (147.16 kg ha⁻¹), medium in available phosphorus (14.36 kg ha⁻¹), and high in available potassium (257.28 kg ha⁻¹).The experiment consisting of 11 treatments T_1 ; T_2 (chemical fertilizers at 100% RDF); T₃ (chemical fertilizers at at 75% RDF); T_4 (T_3 + paddy straw); T_5 (T_3 + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at at 100 ml/plot); T₆ (T₃ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot); T₇ (T₃ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 500 ml/plot); T₈[T₃ + (PSB + Mycorrhiza) at at 50 ml/plot]; T₉[T₃+ (PSB + Mycorrhiza) at 100 ml/plot]; T₁₀[T₃ + paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot + (PSB + Mycorrhiza) at 50 ml/plot]; T₁₁[paddy straw + microbial decomposer at 250 ml/plot + (PSB + Mycorrhiza) at 50 ml/plot) were laid down in triplicate plots in Randomized block design (RBD).Wheat variety PBW-373 was taken as test crop. The straw management practices were imposed one month before sowing of the wheat crop, except the straw mulch treatment, which was applied on the soil surface just after sowing of wheat. In case of incorporation, rice straw was chopped into small pieces and incorporated into the soil with spades up to a depth of 20 cm. The rice straw which was used as mulch in the wheat crop, was incorporated as such in the same plot during the following rice crop. In all the straw management practices (except straw mulch) straw or animal manure were applied and mixed thoroughly with the soil up to a depth of 20 cm. After this, the field was irrigated to field capacity and kept as such for one month before sowing of wheat. At the time of sowing, the soil was again mixed thoroughly. Nitrogen was applied as urea. Uniform doses of P and K at the rate of 60 and 40 kg ha⁻¹, respectively, were applied in all the

plots for wheat and rice. The fertilizers were applied in rows along-side the seed at time of sowing of wheat. Nitrogen was applied in three splits. The seed rate of wheat used was 100 kg ha⁻¹, whereas, rice seedlings were transplanted at a spacing of 20 x 15 cm. All the standard cultural practices were followed during wheat periods. In each year, wheat was given three irrigations, viz. first at crown root initiation, second at late jointing and third at late flowering stage. The plant height (cm) and tiller count (No. m⁻²) were recorded at 30 day interval and at harvest and are presented in the form of graphs. The yield attributes viz., number of spikes (m⁻²), spike length, grains per spike (No.), grain weight per spike (g) and 1000-grain weight were recorded at harvest. Biological (bundle weight) and grain yield was recorded from the net plot size and expressed as q ha-1. Straw yield was calculated by subtracting the grain yield from biological yield. Harvest index was calculated by dividing the grain yield with biological yield (grain + straw). Statistical analysis was done as per randomized block design [11] and treatment means were compared at 5% level of significance.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Growth Attributes

Plant height, in grain crops, indicates the effect of various nutrients on plant metabolism. Data pertaining to plant height of wheat recorded at 30, 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stage has been presented in Table 1 Based on the data, the growth rate increased gradually with a slow rate up to 30 DAS followed by a rapid increase in growth recorded till 90 DAS, which further increased till harvest stage. A successive increase in Plant height was observed which appeared relatively slower after 90 DAS till the harvest stage. On the basis of data presented in Table 1, it was found that beyond 30 DAS, the effect of different treatments on plant height have been observed to be statistically significant at all the following stages of crop growth till harvest. At 60 DAS, 90 DAS and at harvest stage, the maximum plant height was recorded in treatment T₁₀ [RDF at 75% of full dose + Paddy Straw at 5 t + Microbial Decomposer consortium at ha⁻¹ 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10^8 propagules or sfu mL⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)]. The second best treatment, T_{7_1} comprising of 75% RDF + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha + Microbial Decomposer consortium@ 500mL

per Plot} was found to be at par with T₂ [RDF 100%], T₆ [75% RDF + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot], and T₉ which were further significantly superior over rest of the treatments. Treatment T₁ (Control) produced lowest plant height at all the stages of crop growth. Plant height may have increased in response to the combined application of organic and inorganic fertilizers due to improved macronutrient and micronutrient availability. The quick conversion of carbohydrates into protein produced and subsequent increase in the quantity and size of developing cells, which ultimately leads to higher plant height of wheat, are the causes of the enhancement in plant height with increasing dose of organic manure. The findings of Sarwer et al. [12], who claimed that the application of organic manures in conjunction with mineral fertilizers increased plant development, are consistent with these results. Findings on growth characteristics of wheat reported by Kale et al. [13] support the results obtained in this study.

The data for dry matter accumulation at different stages of crop growth as affected by the applied treatments is presented in Table 2. Based on the observed that dry matter data, it was accumulation increased gradually with crop age advancement with a very slow increase up to 30 days followed by a faster rate from 30 days till maturity of the crop. At 60, 90 DAS and at harvest stages the dry matter accumulation was found maximum in T_{10} (T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10⁸ propagules or sfu mL⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza). Value for DMA in T_{10} was significantly higher than T_7 (T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 500mL per Plot) recorded maximum dry matter accumulation g/m^2 followed by T₂ (RDF 100%) and T₆ which were at par with each other but significantly better than the rest of the treatments The lowest value of dry matter accumulation g/ m^2 was obtained with the T₁ (control) treatment. Similar results were reported by EI-Temsah et al. [14].

The data on leaf area index for different treatments at 30, 60 and 90 DAS have been presented in the Table 3. The data indicate that leaf area index during initial stage was rather slow and thereafter, increased rapidly from 30 to 60 DAS followed by a decline afterwards indicating that between 30 to 60 DAS of the crop,

the grand growth period line is observed. The data suggests that with increasing nutrient supply there has been a successive increase in leaf area index. Although nutrients are an essential component of plants, they have a significant impact on every growth parameter (number of tillers, dry matter accumulation, etc.) due to their balancing effect on the compatibility of various nutrients in soil solution, which leads to greater uptake and utilization of all crucial nutrients. The physical characteristics of soil that were enhanced by the addition of organic matter are strongly related to tilling. This is consistent with past research by Singh et al. [15].

S.	Treatments	Plant height (cm)				
No.		30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest	
T1	Control	23.40	56.40	62.00	63.00	
T2	RDF (100%) [N, P_2O_5 , and K_2O at 120:60:60 Kg/ha respectively]	24.60	68.70	81.00	82.60	
Т3	RDF (75%) [N, P_2O_5 , and K_2O at 90:45:45 Kg/ha respectively]	23.70	61.00	72.00	73.40	
T4	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹	23.90	61.30	72.30	73.80	
T5	T ₃ + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 100mL per plot	24.00	61.90	73.00	74.50	
T6	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot	24.40	64.70	76.40	77.90	
Τ7	T ₃ + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium@ 500mL per Plot	24.60	68.80	81.20	82.80	
Т8	T_3 + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 50 mL / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	24.20	62.40	73.60	75.00	
Т9	T_3 + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	24.30	64.20	75.80	77.40	
T10	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	24.80	70.50	83.20	84.90	
T11	Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	23.80	58.40	67.20	68.50	
SEm		1.11	1.38	1.61	2.08	
CD (P =0.05)		NS	3.92	4.76	6.17	

Table 2. Effect of treatments on dry matter accumulation of wheat crop

S. No. Treatments		Dry matter accumulation (m ⁻²)				
		30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest	
T1	Control	62.80	429.00	660.00	776.00	
T2	RDF (100%) NPK@ 120:60:60 Kg/ha (as N, P_2O_5 and K_2O) respectively	64.00	667.20	1026.35	1207.50	
T3	RDF (75%) NPK at 90:45:45 Kg/ha respectively	64.80	544.20	837.25	985.00	
T4	T ₃ + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹	65.60	567.70	873.46	1027.60	
T5	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 100mL of Formulation per plot	66.40	592.00	910.75	1071.50	

S. No. Treatments		Dry matter accumulation (m ⁻²)				
			60 DAS	90 DAS	At harvest	
T6	T₃ + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial	68.00	634.50	976.20	1148.50	
	Decomposer consortium at 250mL of					
	Formulation per Plot					
T7	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial	67.60	675.15	1038.70	1222.00	
	Decomposer consortium@ 500mL per Plot					
T8	T_3 + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 50 mL / Plot	64.80	610.50	939.25	1105.00	
	(containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of					
	formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)					
Т9	T_3 + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot	66.80	629.60	968.60	1139.50	
	(containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of					
	formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)					
T10	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial	68.80	704.70	1084.20	1275.50	
	Decomposer consortium at 250mL of					
	Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer					
	consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸					
	propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB +					
	Mycorrhiza)					
T11	Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer	64.00	494.20	760.20	894.50	
	consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot +					
	Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot					
	(containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of					
	formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	0.40	00.00	40.00	10.00	
SEm (±)		2.48 NS	20.36	43.62	40.98	
<u>CD (P</u>	CD (P =0.05)		7.05	128.69	120.90	

Table 3. Effect of different treatments on leaf area index at various growth stages of the wheat crop

S. No. Treatments		Leaf area index		
		30 DAS	60 DAS	90 DAS
T1	Control	1.57	3.75	3.90
T2	RDF (100%) N, P_2O_5 , and K_2O at 120:60:60 Kg/ha respectively	1.60	4.90	5.15
Т3	RDF (75%) N, P_2O_5 , and K_2O at 90:45:45 Kg/ha respectively	1.62	4.35	4.58
T4	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹	1.64	4.40	4.60
T5	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer	1.66	4.42	4.65
	consortium at 100mL of Formulation per plot			
T6	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer	1.70	4.62	4.85
	consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot			
T7	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer	1.69	4.91	5.15
	consortium@ 500mL per Plot			
T8	T ₃ + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 50 mL / Plot (containing	1.62	4.46	4.70
	10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)			
Т9	T ₃ + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing	1.67	4.58	4.82
	10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)			
T10	T ₃ + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer	1.72	5.02	5.28
	consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient			
	mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules			
	or sfu mL ¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)			
T11	Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at	1.60	3.88	4.10
	250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium			
	at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of			
	formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)			
SEm±		0.06	0.21	0.18
CD (P	=0.05)	NS	0.63	0.52

3.2 Yield and Yield Attributes

The maximum number of grains spike⁻¹ (38.8) was found with the treatment T_{10} (T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10⁸ propagules or sfu mL⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza). Number of grains spike⁻¹ recorded in Treatments T_7 (T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 500mL per Plot), T_2 (RDF 100%) and T_6 were at par with each other but were found to be significantly higher over rest of the treatments. A similar trend was observed with the grain weight spike⁻¹. The maximum grain weight spike⁻¹ (1.59 g) was found with treatment T_{10} . Values for grain weight spike⁻¹ recorded for T_7 , T_2 and T_6 were at par with each other and were

found to be significantly higher over rest of the treatments Lowest number of grain weight spike (1.38 g) was found with treatment T_1 (control). The data pertaining to test weight (1000-grain weight) presented in Table 4 and revealed that test weight of wheat grain was not significantly affected by various treatments. Yield attributes are the resultant of vegetative growth which thereby determines plant yield. The number of grains per spike and test weight is major contributing characters governing the yield. The number of grains per spike and test weight increase upon addition of nutrients in the form of NPK which further increases upon supplementation with organic sources such as FYM and decomposing microbes or nutrient mobilizing microorganisms. The results are in conformity with the findings of Sharma and Singh, [16].

S. No.	Treatments	No. of effective tillers (m ²)	No. of grains /spike	Weight of spike	Test Weight (g)
T1	Control	236.00	35.00	1.38	36.00
T2	RDF (100%) N, P_2O_5 , and K_2O at 120:60:60 Kg/ha respectively	346.00	38.00	1.55	37.00
Т3	RDF (75%) N, P ₂ O ₅ , and K ₂ O at 90:45:45 Kg/ha respectively	287.00	37.40	1.50	36.55
T4	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹	298.00	37.50	1.51	36.70
T5	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decompo-ser consortium at 100mL of Formulation per plot	307.00	37.60	1.53	37.01
T6	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot	331.00	37.80	1.54	36.90
T7	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium@ 500mL per Plot	348.00	38.20	1.56	37.05
Т8	T_3 + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 50 mL / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	319.00	37.70	1.53	36.80
Т9	T_3 + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	329.00	37.80	1.54	36.86
T10	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	357.00	38.80	1.59	37.10
T11	Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10 ⁸ propagules or sfu mL ⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza)	264.00	36.20	1.44	36.30
SEm±	· · · ·	10.67	1.73	0.06	1.31
CD (P	=0.05)	31.47	5.11	0.17	3.88

3.3 Yield

The data for grain yield of wheat crop as affected by different treatments have been presented in Table 5. The yield was recorded highest (51.40 qha^{-1}) with the treatment $T_{10}(T_3 + Paddy Straw at$ 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10^8 propagules or sfu mL⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza) which was found to be at par with Treatments T_7 (T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium@ 500mL per Plot) recorded higher yield (49.20qha⁻¹), T₂ (RDF and T₆. These treatments were 100%) significantly superior to rest of the treatments. The lowest yield was recorded (29.80qha⁻¹) with T₁ (control) treatment. Application of nutrients in the form of RDF has caused a general improvement in plant growth causing increase in grain and straw yield. Significant increase in yield parameters in this study corroborates the findings of Pandey et al. [17].

The data presented in Table 5 revealed that the straw yield was affected by various treatments. The straw yield was recorded significantly higher (76.15 gha⁻¹) with T₁₀ (T₃ + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100 ml / Plot (containing 10^8

propagules or sfu mL⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza) which was at par with T₇ (T₃ + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium@ 500mL per Plot) recorded highest straw yield (73.00 qha⁻¹), T₂ (RDF 100%) and T₆. Whereas the lowest straw yield (47.80 qha⁻¹) was recorded with T₁ (control) treatment. Similar results of increase in yield parameters upon nutrient fortification and supplementation with organic inputs were reported by Singh et al. [18] and Pandey et al. [17].

The biological yield is (G+S) in (q ha⁻¹) presented in Table 5 revealed that the biological yield was significantly affected by various treatments. The maximum biological yield (127.55q ha⁻¹) was obtained under the treatment T_{10} (T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha^{-1} + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10^8 propagules or sfu mL⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza). Among the treatments $T_7 (T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha^1 +$ Microbial Decomposer consortium@ 500mL per Plot) recorded maximum biological yield $(122.20q ha^{-1})$ followed by T₂ (RDF 100%) and T_6 . The minimum biological yield (77.60q ha⁻¹) was recorded in T₁ (control) treatment. Similar findings have been reported by Sheykhbaglou et al. [19].

Table 5. Effect of treatments on yield of wheat crop

S. No.	Details		Yield (q ha ⁻¹)		
		Grain	Straw	Biological	index (%)
T1	Control	29.80	47.80	77.60	38.40
T2	RDF (100%) N, P_2O_5 , and K_2O at 120:60:60 Kg/ha respectively	48.60	72.15	120.75	40.25
Т3	RDF (75%) N, P_2O_5 , and K_2O at 90:45:45 Kg/ha respectively	39.20	59.30	98.50	39.80
T4	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹	41.00	61.76	102.76	39.90
Т5	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decom. Consort. at 100mL of Formulation per plot	42.80	64.35	107.15	39.94
Т6	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decom. Consort.@ 250mL of Formulation per Plot	46.20	68.65	114.85	40.23
T7	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium@ 500mL per Plot	49.20	73.00	122.20	40.26
T8	T ₃ + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 50 mL/ Plot	44.20	66.30	110.50	40.00
Т9	T ₃ + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml/Plot	45.80	68.15	113.95	40.19
T10	T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomp. Consort. at 250mL of Form. per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot	51.40	76.15	127.55	40.30
T11	Paddy Straw at 5 t ha ⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot	34.70	54.75	89.45	38.79
SEm±		2.06	2.35	3.68	1.84
CD (P	=0.05)	6.07	6.94	10.87	NS

The information regarding the impact of appropriate doses with properly formulated soil and grain on the wheat harvest index makes this clear. It was noted that the harvest index for wheat ranged from 38.40 to 40.30% (Table 5). These results back up Rahimi's findings [20].

4. CONCLUSION

From the above it may be concluded that, application of T_{10} (T_3 + Paddy Straw at 5 t ha⁻¹ + Microbial Decomposer consortium at 250 mL of Formulation per Plot + Nutrient mobilizer consortium at 100ml / Plot (containing 10⁸ propagules or sfu mL⁻¹ of formulation (PSB + Mycorrhiza) considered to be most effective for sustainable wheat production and residue management practices.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- 1. Shiferaw B, Smale M, Braun HJ, Duveiller E, Reynolds M, Muricho G. Crops that feed the world 10. Past successes and future challenges to the role played by wheat in global food security. Food Security. 2013;5:291-317.
- Klepper B. Development and growth of crop root system. In: Hatfield JL, Stewart BA. (eds.). Limitations to plant root growth. Springer-Verlag, Germany. 1992:1-25.
- Kumar P, Pannu RK, Khokhar SK. Effect of organic sources of nutrition and irrigation levels on growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Int. J. Life Sci. Bt. & Pharm. Res. 2012;1(4):178-186.
- 4. Sidhu BS, Beri V. Effect of crop residue management on the yields of different crops and soil properties. Biol. Wastes. 2008:27:15-27.
- 5. Finck A. Integrated nutrient management an overview of priencpals, probles and possibilities. Annals of Arid Zone. 1998;37:1-24.
- Kloepper JW. Plant growth-promoting rhizobacteria as biological control agents. In: Metting FB Jr (ed) Soil micrcrobial ecology-applications in agricultural and environmental management. Dekker, New York, 1993:255-274.
- 7. Khalid A, Arshad M, Zahir ZA. Screening plant growth promoting rhizobacteria for

improving growth and yield of wheat. J Appl Microbiol. 2004:96(3):473–480.

- 8. Hooker ML, Herron GM, Penas P. Effect of residue burning, removal and incorporation on irrigated cereal yields and soil chemical properties. Soil Science Society of America Journal 1982:46:122-126.
- Bhatnagar VK, Choudhary TN, Sharma BR. Effect of tillage and residue management on properties of two coarse textured soils and yield of irrigated wheat and groundnut. Soil Tillage Research. 1983;3:27-37.
- 10. Rao DN, Mikkelsen DS. Effect of rice straw incorporation on rice plant growth and nutrition. Agronomy Journal 1976:68:752-755.
- Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical Procedure for Agricultural Research. 2nd. Wiley, N. York, USA. 1984:680.
- 12. Sarwar GH, Schmeisky N, Hussain S, Muhammad M, Ibrahim, Safdar E. Improvement of soil physical and chemical properties with compost application in ricewheat cropping system *Pak. J. Botany.* 2008:40(1):275-282.
- Kale ST, Kadam SR, Gokhle DN, Waghmare PK. Response of wheat varieties to different levels of fertilizer on growth and yield under late sown condition. Int. J. of Agri. Sci. 2015;11(1):77-80.
- 14. EI-Temsah ME, Fergany MA, EI-Habbal MS. Effect of sowing date on dry matter accumulation and nitrogen partitioning efficiency of some wheat cultivars. Asian Journal of Crop Science. 2014;6:150-157.
- 15. Singh CM, Sharma PK, Kishor P, Mishra PK, Singh AP, Verma R, Raha P. Impact of integrated nutrient management on growth, yield and nutrient uptake by wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Asian J. Agric. Res. 2011:5(1):76-82.
- 16. Sharma SN, Singh RN. Seed rate and weed management on yield and nutrient uptake of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*). Indian J. Agric. Sci. 2011;81(12):1174–1179.
- 17. Pandey AK, Gaind S, Ali A, Lata. Effect of bioaugmentation and nitrogen supplementation on composting of paddy straw. Biodegradation. 2009:20:293-306.
- Singh R, Yadav DS. Effect of rice (*Oryza sativa*) residue and nitrogen on performance of wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) under rice-wheat cropping system. Indian J. of Agronomy. 2006:51(4):247-250.

Maurya et al.; Int. J. Plant Soil Sci., vol. 34, no. 24, pp. 1084-1092, 2022; Article no.IJPSS.96127

- Sheykhbaglou R, Sedghi M, Shishevan MT, Seyed-Sharifi R. Effects of nano iron oxide particles on agronomic traits of soybean. Notulae Scientia Biologicae. 2010;2(2):112-113.
- 20. Rahimi A. Effect of potassium and nitrogen on yield and yield components of dry land wheat in Boyerahmad region of Iran. Annals Biol. Research. 2012;3(7):3274-3277.

© 2022 Maurya 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/96127