



# **Effect of Integrated Nutrient Management Practices on Available Nutrient Status of Soil under Rice-Sorghum Cropping System in Clay Loamy Soils**

**G. K. Surya Krishna<sup>a++\*</sup>, Ch. Sujani Rao<sup>b#</sup>,  
P. Venkata Subbaiah<sup>ct†</sup>, M. Sree Rekha<sup>dt‡</sup>  
and V. Srinivasa Rao<sup>e^</sup>**

<sup>a</sup> Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Agricultural College, Bapatla, India.

<sup>b</sup> Technical Team of Subject Expert, Integrated Call Centre, Gannavaram, Vijayawada, India.

<sup>c</sup> Programme Coordinator, KVK, Garikapadu, NTR District, India.

<sup>d</sup> Professor (Agronomy) & Director (Polytechnics), ANGRAU, Lam, Guntur, India.

<sup>e</sup> Department of Statistics and Computer Applications, Agricultural College, Bapatla, 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/IJECC/2022/v12i121474

## **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/89267>

**Original Research Article**

**Received: 17/09/2022**

**Accepted: 19/11/2022**

**Published: 01/12/2022**

<sup>++</sup> Ph. D Scholar;

<sup>#</sup> Principal Scientist (Soil Science);

<sup>†</sup> Senior Scientist;

<sup>‡</sup> Professor (Agronomy) & TO to Hon'ble VC;

<sup>^</sup> Professor and University Head;

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [gksuryakrishna1995@gmail.com](mailto:gksuryakrishna1995@gmail.com);

## ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted for two consecutive years 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 on clay loam soil at Agricultural College Farm, Bapatla to study the direct and residual effect of integrated use of organics and inorganics on soil nutrient status under rice-sorghum cropping system. The results revealed that at all the growth stages of rice, the highest available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium were recorded with the application of 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM ( $T_8$ ) and this was on par with  $T_9$  (100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM),  $T_3$  (125% RDF through inorganic fertilizers) and  $T_7$  (100% RDF + 25% N through FYM, whereas the highest available sulphur was recorded in 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM ( $T_8$ ) and it was on par with  $T_9$  (100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM) and  $T_7$  (100% RDF + 25% N through FYM during 2020 and 2021. In succeeding sorghum, significantly highest soil available N,  $P_2O_5$ ,  $K_2O$  and sulphur were recorded in  $T_9$  (100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM) and it was on par with  $T_8$  (100% RDF + 25% N through GLM) and  $T_7$  (100% RDF + 25% N through FYM) during both the years of study. Irrespective of the treatments applied to rice crop, the sub plot that received 100% RDF ( $S_3$ ) in *rabi* recorded significantly highest soil available nutrients at all stages of crop which was on par with 75% RDF ( $S_2$ ) except available sulphur whereas increased NPK levels from 75% RDF ( $S_2$ ) to 100% RDF ( $S_3$ ) did not show any significant difference and lowest was recorded in control ( $S_1$ ) during both the years of study, respectively.

**Keywords:** Direct and residual effect; nutrient status; cropping system; available nutrients; fertilizer level.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Rice (*Oryza sativa* L.) is one of the most predominant cereal food crops in about 40 countries in the world. In India, it is grown in an area of 45.07 m ha with a total production of 122.27 m t and a productivity of 2713 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. In Andhra Pradesh, rice is cultivated in an area of 2.32 m ha with an annual production of 7.89 m t and productivity of 3395 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> [1]. Sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor* L. Moench) is a staple crop for millions of farmers in the semi-arid tropics and can be grown in different climates around the world in approximately 48 million ha area annually. In India, it is grown in an area of 4.24 m ha with a total production of 4.78 m t and a productivity of 1128 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. In Andhra Pradesh, sorghum is cultivated in an area of 0.12 m ha with an annual production of 0.37 m t and productivity of 3070 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> [1]. Continuous practice of rice-sorghum sequence is a point of concern as cultivation of two cereal crops in a year involves heavy removal of nutrients, which diminishes the soil health and inter-crop productivity. The cereal-cereal sequence for longer periods with low system productivity, and often with poor crop management practices, results in loss of soil fertility due to emergence of multiple nutrient deficiencies [2], deterioration of soil physical properties [3] and decline of crop yields in high productivity areas [4]. To compensate this, there is a need to develop Integrated Nutrient Management (INM) system. The concept of

integrated nutrient management seeks to sustain soil fertility through an integration of different nutrient sources and their application methods which produce maximum crop yield per unit input use [5]. A judicious combination of organic sources and inorganics has been found to mutually reinforce the efficiency of both the sources resulting in higher productivity and soil fertility.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiment were carried out during *kharif* and *rabi* seasons of 2020-21 and 2021-22 at Agricultural College Farm, Bapatla, geographically located at an altitude of 5.49 m above mean sea level, 15°54' North latitude, 80°30' East longitude and about 8 km away from Bay of Bengal. It is located in Krishna agro-climatic zone of Andhra Pradesh. The soil of experimental site was clay loam in texture, neutral in reaction (pH 7.41), low in electrical conductivity (0.45 dS m<sup>-1</sup>), low in organic carbon (0.49%), low in available nitrogen (224.46 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), medium in available phosphorus (42.93 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), high in available potassium (381.65 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and sufficient in available sulphur (13.51 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>).

## 3. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN AND TREATMENTS

During *Kharif*, the treatments consisted of  $T_1$ - Absolute Control,  $T_2$ - 100% RDF through

inorganic fertilizers, T<sub>3</sub>- 125% RDF through inorganic fertilizers, T<sub>4</sub>- 75% RDF + 25% N through FYM, T<sub>5</sub>- 75% RDF + 25% N through GLM, T<sub>6</sub>- 75% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM, T<sub>7</sub>- 100 % RDF + 25% N through FYM, T<sub>8</sub>- 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM, T<sub>9</sub>- 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM were imposed to rice crop during *kharif* season and replicated thrice. The *rabi* experiment was continued on the same site without disturbing the soil with sorghum as test crop to study the residual effect of different nutrient sources applied to preceding rice crop. During *rabi*, the treatments consisted of three levels of fertilizers viz., S<sub>1</sub>- Control, S<sub>2</sub>- 75% RDF and S<sub>3</sub>-100% RDF. Popular cultivars of rice and sorghum viz., BPT-5204 and MLSH-151 respectively, were chosen for the study.

#### 4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

##### 4.1 Effect of INM Practices on Available Nutrient Status of Soil in *Kharif* Rice

###### 4.1.1 Available nitrogen

Data pertaining to the soil available nitrogen (Table 1) indicated that various nutrient management treatments imposed under rice crop have shown significant effect on available nitrogen at all growth stages of rice and during both the years of study.

Significantly higher available nitrogen in soil was recorded in the treatment T<sub>8</sub> i.e., 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM (301.19, 278.46, 249.70 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 307.05, 284.46, 254.87 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in

2020 and 2021, respectively at active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest stages of rice crop and it was on par with the treatments that received 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM (T<sub>9</sub>- 294.52, 274.84, 246.58 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 299.25, 279.84, 250.25 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), 125% RDF through inorganic fertilizers (T<sub>3</sub>- 290.76, 270.07, 244.49 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 295.22, 276.84, 249.15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and 100% RDF + 25% N through FYM (T<sub>7</sub>- 287.68, 268.65, 242.94 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 292.41, 273.32, 247.98 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) during both the years of study, respectively. The lowest available nitrogen was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> i.e., control (217.42, 210.20, 204.80 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 222.65, 215.53, 206.47 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) which received no fertilizers at all the three stages of crop growth.

Combined application of organics and inorganics recorded the highest available nitrogen content. This might be due to positive response of green manuring with inorganic fertilizers on soil N status and may be attributed to N mineralization from organic sources or by retaining N in labile microbial pool with the changing microbial flush. The moist soil conditions might have helped the mineralization of soil N and greater multiplication of soil microbes, which could convert organically bound nitrogen into readily available form leading to building up of higher available N. The inclusion of green leaf manure (*Sesbania aculeata*) in rice based cropping sequence reduced the loss of native nitrate N accumulated during aerobic cycle of the rice based cropping sequence and also conserved nitrate nitrogen, which would be lost upon flooding [6].

**Table 1. Effect of integrated nutrient management practices on available nitrogen (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of rice**

Treatments	Kharif (2020)			Kharif (2021)		
	Active tillering	Panicle initiation	Harvest	Active tillering	Panicle initiation	Harvest
T <sub>1</sub>	217.42	210.20	204.80	222.65	215.53	206.47
T <sub>2</sub>	269.03	248.07	225.40	273.36	252.72	228.06
T <sub>3</sub>	290.76	270.07	244.49	295.22	276.84	249.15
T <sub>4</sub>	256.78	239.05	218.47	261.78	242.05	220.80
T <sub>5</sub>	264.07	244.51	221.16	269.65	247.51	224.16
T <sub>6</sub>	260.63	242.98	220.84	264.29	245.98	223.65
T <sub>7</sub>	287.68	268.65	242.94	292.41	273.32	247.98
T <sub>8</sub>	301.19	278.46	249.70	307.05	284.46	254.87
T <sub>9</sub>	294.52	274.84	246.58	299.25	279.84	250.25
<b>SEm ±</b>	9.60	9.29	8.81	9.71	10.02	8.16
<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>	29.04	28.11	26.67	29.38	30.34	24.69
<b>CV (%)</b>	6.30	6.43	6.62	6.50	6.74	6.04

#### 4.1.2 Available phosphorus

Close perusal of the data pertaining to available phosphorus in soil (Table 2) revealed that irrespective of the year of study, the available phosphorus at all growth stages of rice crop was significantly influenced by combined application of organics and inorganics.

At all growth stages of rice, among the different sources of organic manures,  $T_8$  i.e., 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM (75.18, 68.31, 62.72 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 77.64, 69.64, 64.08 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) recorded significantly highest available P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> however it was on par with the treatments that received 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM ( $T_9$ - 73.23, 66.75, 59.24 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 75.66, 68.50, 60.57 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), 125% RDF through inorganic fertilizers ( $T_3$ - 70.13, 64.24, 57.17 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 72.46, 65.03, 58.16 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and 100% RDF + 25% N through FYM ( $T_7$ - 68.36, 61.50, 56.46 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 70.59, 63.37, 57.32 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at tillering, panicle initiation and harvest stages of rice during 2020 and 2021, respectively. The lowest available P was recorded in the treatment  $T_1$  i.e., control (45.12, 43.84, 42.13 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 47.45, 44.67, 43.25 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) which received no fertilizers at tillering, panicle initiation and harvest stages of rice.

Increase in available P with FYM application and green manuring might be due to additional application of P and mobilization of P in the soil. This increase in P might also be attributed to the decomposition of organic manures accompanied by release of appreciable quantity of CO<sub>2</sub> and organic acids. Available P content of the soil increased with the incorporation of organic manures as compared to its initial status. These results were in conformity with the findings of Mallareddy and Devenderreddy [7] who reported that the build up of available P in soil was due to release of organic acids during microbial decomposition of green manures which might have helped in the solubility of native P.

The build up in available P may be due to the influence of organic manures in increasing the labile P in soil though complexing of cations like Ca<sup>+2</sup> and Mg<sup>+2</sup> which are mainly responsible for fixation of P [8,9] Tolanur and Badanur [10] also reported that organic manures like FYM and green manuring with inorganic fertilizers had the beneficial effect on increasing the phosphate availability. These results are in general agreement with the findings of Pattanayak et al.

[11], Parmer and Sharma [12], Singh et al. [13] and Verma et al. [14]. The maximum available P recorded in treatments with green leaf manuring may be due to the mobilization of soil P by the acidification of soil and the release of enzymes such as phosphatases and phytases of carboxylates such as gluconates and oxalates [15]. Similar results were observed by Hossain et al. [16] and Jemila et al. [17].

The soil available phosphorus was decreased with advancement of crop stage during both the years with the application of organic manures. This decrease in phosphorus might be attributed to absorption of P by the growing plants and/or due to refixation of solubilized phosphorus [18,19]

#### 4.1.3 Available potassium

The data presented in Table 3 indicated that, among the different treatments imposed to *kharif* rice, combined application of organics and inorganics have shown significant effect on available potassium in soil at all the stages of crop.

The results revealed that significantly highest available potassium in soil was recorded in the treatment  $T_8$  i.e., 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM (461.31, 443.61, 426.62 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 466.64, 448.12, 430.62 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) and it was on par with the treatments that received 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM ( $T_9$ - 456.73, 437.54, 422.64 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 460.06, 440.87, 425.13 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), 125% RDF through inorganic fertilizers ( $T_3$ - 453.79, 434.80, 420.40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 456.77, 438.13, 424.07 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and 100% RDF + 25% N through FYM ( $T_7$ - 450.52, 430.92, 417.13 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and 454.19, 434.56, 420.45 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest stages of rice crop during 2020 and 2021, respectively. The lowest available potassium was recorded in the treatment  $T_1$  i.e., control (376.15, 369.36, 361.53 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 378.48, 372.69, 363.20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) which received no fertilizers at all the three stages of crop growth.

The green manures registered significantly highest K availability in soil due to its easy decomposition of mineral constituents and their effect on dislodging the exchangeable K into the soil solution. These results were in conformity with the findings of Maiti et al. [20], Vinay [21] and Upadhyay et al. [22]. When acid forming compounds are added in the form of compost to the soil, these acids affect potassium availability.

The effect is positive resulting in more availability of K to the plants. The hydrogen ions released from organic materials are exchanged with K on exchange site or set free from the fixed site of the clay micelle.

Thus, the overall status of soil regarding availability of potassium content was improved [23-26,13]. Verma et al. [14] also reported that continuous use of FYM and green manures enhanced the potassium status in the soil. The beneficial effect of green leaf manuring and FYM on available potassium might be due to reduction of potassium fixation, solubilisation and release due to the interaction of organic matter with clay besides the direct potassium addition to the potassium pool of soil. Similar results were also observed by Sarkar et al. [27], Chettri et al. [28] Elayaraja and Senthilvalava [29] Sharma et al. [30] and Karunakaran et al. [31].

On the other hand, the available potassium content was gradually decreased with advancement of crop stage *i.e.*, from tillering to harvest stage in both the years. These results were in accordance with the findings of Subhalakshmi and Pratapkumarreddy [32]. This might be due to the continuous depletion of K by crop uptake and also due to potassium fixation in soils [18].

#### 4.1.4 Available sulphur

The data presented in Table 4 revealed that available sulphur in soil at different stages of rice was significantly influenced by the different treatments imposed during both the years of study.

Among the different treatments applied, the treatment that received T<sub>8</sub> *i.e.*, 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM (17.24, 17.11, 17.03 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 17.43, 17.18, 17.09 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) recorded significantly highest available sulphur and it was on par with the treatments that received 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM (T<sub>9</sub>- 17.05, 16.92, 16.84 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 17.22, 16.99, 16.88 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), 100% RDF + 25% N through FYM (T<sub>7</sub>- 16.96 16.81,

16.72 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 17.14, 16.88, 16.79 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), 75% RDF + 25% N through GLM (T<sub>5</sub>- 15.74, 15.60, 15.52 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 15.91, 15.68, 15.56 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and 75% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM (T<sub>6</sub>- 15.65, 15.52, 15.44 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 15.83, 15.59, 15.48 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) during 2020 and 2021, respectively at active tillering, panicle initiation and harvest stages of rice crop. The lowest available sulphur was recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> *i.e.*, control (13.47, 13.45, 13.42 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 13.42, 13.40, 13.39 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) at all the three stages of crop growth.

The treatments that received only inorganics *i.e.*, T<sub>2</sub> (14.10, 14.07, 14.05 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 14.05, 14.02, 14.00 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) and T<sub>3</sub> (14.25, 14.22, 14.19 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2020 and 14.21, 14.17, 14.14 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2021) recorded lower available sulphur than the combined treatments at all the growth stages of rice.

Combined application of organics with inorganics have shown a slight increase in available sulphur which might be due to mineralization of organic source that contributed to accumulation of more amount of sulphur in soil [33]. Thus, addition of farmyard manure and green leaf manure in soil might be the possible reason of enhancement of sulphur content. These results were in agreement with findings of Singh et al. [34] and this increase might be due to addition of farmyard manure and green leaf manure which contained sulphur as a constituent element and thus, mineralization of this organic source might have released proportionate amount of sulphate that was adsorbed by colloidal complex and contributed to accumulation of more amount of sulphur over inorganic treatments [35,36]

However, the soil sulphate sulphur content was decreased with advancement of crop stage during both the years and in all the treatments. This might be due to the uptake of SO<sub>4</sub><sup>-2</sup> by the growing plants leading to lowering the available sulphur content at harvest stage. The above statement was supported by Veeranagappa et al. [18].

**Table 2. Effect of integrated nutrient management practices on available phosphorus (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of rice**

Treatments	Kharif (2020)			Kharif (2021)		
	Active tillering	Panicle initiation	Harvest	Active tillering	Panicle initiation	Harvest
T <sub>1</sub>	45.12	43.84	42.13	47.45	44.67	43.25
T <sub>2</sub>	65.96	58.72	53.86	66.72	60.86	55.72

Treatments	Kharif (2020)			Kharif (2021)		
	Active tillering	Panicle initiation	Harvest	Active tillering	Panicle initiation	Harvest
T <sub>3</sub>	70.13	64.24	57.17	72.46	65.03	58.16
T <sub>4</sub>	58.70	53.36	49.23	60.50	55.69	50.45
T <sub>5</sub>	63.75	57.62	51.58	64.38	58.45	53.91
T <sub>6</sub>	60.78	55.49	50.85	62.08	57.75	51.60
T <sub>7</sub>	68.36	61.50	56.46	70.59	63.37	57.32
T <sub>8</sub>	75.18	68.31	62.72	77.64	69.64	64.08
T <sub>9</sub>	73.23	66.75	59.24	75.66	68.50	60.57
<b>SEm ±</b>	2.89	3.12	2.81	2.99	2.68	2.49
<b>CD(P=0.05)</b>	8.75	9.01	8.51	9.06	8.13	7.54
<b>CV (%)</b>	7.89	9.18	9.07	7.81	7.69	8.80

**Table 3. Effect of integrated nutrient management practices on available potassium (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of rice**

Treatments	Kharif (2020)			Kharif (2021)		
	Active Tillering	Panicle Initiation	Harvest	Active Tillering	Panicle Initiation	Harvest
T <sub>1</sub>	376.15	369.36	361.53	378.48	372.69	363.20
T <sub>2</sub>	419.16	402.81	386.32	422.50	405.34	388.79
T <sub>3</sub>	453.79	434.80	420.40	456.77	438.13	424.07
T <sub>4</sub>	408.45	392.83	379.14	407.61	395.20	381.45
T <sub>5</sub>	414.56	398.52	383.71	417.23	401.93	385.56
T <sub>6</sub>	405.94	395.60	381.25	410.21	399.64	384.40
T <sub>7</sub>	450.52	430.92	417.13	454.19	434.56	420.45
T <sub>8</sub>	461.31	443.61	426.62	466.64	448.12	430.62
T <sub>9</sub>	456.73	437.54	422.64	460.06	440.87	425.13
<b>SEm ±</b>	12.47	12.03	12.18	14.08	13.5	13.17
<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>	37.65	36.33	36.78	42.61	40.87	39.85
<b>CV (%)</b>	6.02	6.25	6.24	6.25	6.23	6.33

**Table 4. Effect of integrated nutrient management practices on available sulphur (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of rice**

Treatments	Kharif (2020)			Kharif (2021)		
	Active Tillering	Panicle Initiation	Harvest	Active Tillering	Panicle Initiation	Harvest
T <sub>1</sub>	13.47	13.45	13.42	13.42	13.40	13.39
T <sub>2</sub>	14.10	14.07	14.05	14.05	14.02	14.00
T <sub>3</sub>	14.25	14.22	14.19	14.21	14.17	14.14
T <sub>4</sub>	15.52	15.37	15.28	15.73	15.42	15.34
T <sub>5</sub>	15.74	15.60	15.52	15.91	15.68	15.56
T <sub>6</sub>	15.65	15.52	15.44	15.83	15.59	15.48
T <sub>7</sub>	16.96	16.81	16.72	17.14	16.88	16.79
T <sub>8</sub>	17.24	17.11	17.03	17.43	17.18	17.09
T <sub>9</sub>	17.05	16.92	16.84	17.22	16.99	16.88
<b>SEm ±</b>	0.55	0.55	0.57	0.55	0.54	0.54
<b>CD (P=0.05)</b>	1.66	1.65	1.64	1.62	1.63	1.64
<b>CV (%)</b>	6.11	6.13	6.39	6.06	6.03	6.10

## 4.2 Residual Effect of INM Practices on Available Nutrient Status of Soil under Sorghum in Rice-Sorghum Cropping System

### 4.2.1 Available Nitrogen

The data pertaining to available nitrogen was presented in the Tables 5 and 6. The various nutrient management treatments applied to preceding rice showed significant influence on available nitrogen by succeeding sorghum at all the stages during both the years of study.

The highest available nitrogen was recorded in the treatment T<sub>9</sub> (100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM) with 261.5, 254.6, 248.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 268.8, 261.0, 255.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22 at vegetative, flowering and harvest stages, respectively and it was on par with treatments T<sub>8</sub> which received 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM (258.2, 251.7, 246.2 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 265.0, 258.1, 252.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22), T<sub>7</sub> i.e., 100% RDF + 25% N through FYM (255.9, 249.0, 243.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 262.9, 255.5, 249.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22) and T<sub>3</sub> i.e., 125% RDF through inorganic fertilizers (252.6, 246.0, 240.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 259.6, 252.8, 246.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22). It indicates the prominent residual effect of farmyard manure and green leaf manure when compared to all other treatments. This benefit owes to low decomposition and mineralization of major and minor nutrients and their addition to soil nutrient pool left behind in sufficient quantities after their absorption by rice crop [37] Urea which is most available form of nitrogen when applied to rice is subjected to leaching and volatilization losses in addition to crop uptake. Therefore, this resulted in lower availability of nitrogen after *kharif* rice.

Application of manures over the years increases the level of N, P, K, S, Ca and Mg in the soil. Thus, creating a reservoir of soil nutrients for several years after application. Use of farmyard manure and green leaf manure might have attributed to the mineralization of N in soil and high enzyme activities in the soil amended with organic manures might have increased the transformation of nutrients to available form. Role of farmyard manure and green leaf manure in releasing N and improving N availability in soil was reported by Singh et al. [38]

At all the stages of crop growth, the lowest available nitrogen in soil was recorded in control i.e., T<sub>1</sub> (218.2, 212.9, 207.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21

and 222.7, 216.7, 210.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22) which received no fertilizers indicating its negligible residual effect.

Among the subplots, 100% RDF (S<sub>3</sub>) recorded significantly highest available nitrogen (261.6, 255.2, 248.7 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 267.3, 261.1, 254.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22) at vegetative, flowering and harvest stages, respectively which was on par with 75% RDF (S<sub>2</sub>) and superior over control (S<sub>1</sub>). Increase in available nitrogen with increase in the level of fertilizers might be attributed to the fact that with higher fertilizer dose, higher amount of fertilizer N could be converted into available form by the biochemical reaction of fertilizer N with soil organic matter [9] The above results were also corroborated with Katkar et al. [39] Gadhiya et al. [40], Jat and Nanwal [41] and Deekshitha et al. [42] The interaction between nutrient management treatments applied during *kharif* season and different levels of fertilizers during *rabi* season was found non-significant.

### 4.2.2 Available Phosphorus

The data presented in the Tables 7 and 8 revealed that different INM treatments adopted in *kharif* showed significant residual effect on available phosphorus by sorghum in *rabi*.

Significantly higher available phosphorus was recorded in the treatment T<sub>9</sub> i.e., 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM with 70.3, 63.3, 58.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 74.8, 67.7, 63.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22 at vegetative, flowering and harvest stages, respectively and it was on par with treatments T<sub>8</sub> which received 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM (67.2, 61.8, 56.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 71.4, 66.0, 61.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2022), T<sub>7</sub> i.e., 100 % RDF + 25% N through FYM (66.1, 60.6, 55.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 70.5, 64.6, 59.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22) and T<sub>3</sub> i.e., 125% RDF through inorganic fertilizers (64.8, 58.5, 53.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 69.0, 62.8, 57.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22). The lowest available phosphorus was recorded in T<sub>1</sub> i.e., control (49.9, 45.5, 42.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 53.1, 48.9, 46.2 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22) indicating its negligible residual effect at all the stages of crop growth, respectively.

Superiority of treatments which received farmyard manure and green leaf manure in terms of soil available phosphorus might be due to the persistent material in organic manures viz., cellulose. It requires more time for its decomposition, hence, about 25 to 33% of nitrogen and small fraction of phosphorus and

potassium may be available to immediate crop *i.e.*, rice and the rest to subsequent crop *i.e.*, sorghum [43,42] Mahala et al. [44] Mallareddy and Devenderreddy [7] and Subbaiah et al. [37] also noticed the significant residual effect of organics on succeeding crop in terms of the available phosphorus in soil. High analysis fertilizers might have provided N and P to meet the requirements of rice crop only. It is established that only 30 percent of N and 15 percent of P in inorganic fertilizers is utilized by *kharif* crop and the rest is subjected to loss thus reducing its use efficiency.

Irrespective of the INM treatments in *kharif*, application of 100% RDF ( $S_3$ ) in *rabi* recorded significantly highest available  $P_2O_5$  (70.1, 62.2, 56.7  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  and 74.5, 66.2, 60.8  $kg\ ha^{-1}$ ) at all stages of crop which was on par with 75% RDF ( $S_2$ ) *i.e.*, 65.2, 58.2, 52.6  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  and 69.8, 62.2, 57.1  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  and lowest was recorded in control ( $S_1$ ) during 2020-21 and 2021-22, respectively. The interaction between main plots and subplots was found non-significant.

However, the soil available phosphorus was decreased with advancement of crop stage during both the years and in all the treatments. This decrease in phosphorus might be attributed to absorption of P by the growing plants and/or due to refixation of solubilized phosphorus [18,19] Bhargavi et al. [45] reported that the highest available phosphorus was recorded with sunhemp- rice- rice and build up of available phosphorus in soil was due to release of organic acids during microbial decomposition of green manure which helped in the solubility of native phosphorus in soil. As the phosphorus requirement of rice was meagre, organic and inorganic additions increased the soil phosphorus content.

#### 4.2.3 Available potassium

Available potassium in sorghum at various growth stages was significantly influenced by various integrated nutrient management treatments imposed in preceding rice and levels of NPK applied to sorghum during both the years of experimentation (Tables 9 and 10).

Among the main plots, the treatment that received 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM ( $T_9$ - 447.9, 433.4, 424.7  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2020-21 and 457.0, 441.2, 433.1  $kg\ ha^{-1}$

<sup>1</sup> in 2021-22) recorded significantly highest available potassium in soil at vegetative, flowering and harvest stages, respectively and it was on par with treatments  $T_8$  which received 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM (445.3, 430.5, 422.2  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2020-21 and 453.7, 438.4, 430.7  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2022),  $T_7$  *i.e.*, 100% RDF + 25% N through FYM (442.7, 428.8, 419.4  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2020-21 and 451.1, 436.3, 427.9  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2021-22) and  $T_3$  *i.e.*, 125% RDF through inorganic fertilizers (438.0, 424.1, 416.1  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2020-21 and 446.9, 432.0, 424.8  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2021-22). The lowest available potassium was recorded in  $T_1$  *i.e.*, control (376.6, 366.0, 357.0  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2020-21 and 382.3, 371.5, 362.7  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2021-22) indicating its negligible residual effect.

Application of FYM and green leaf manure along with inorganics to preceding rice have improved the available  $K_2O$  content in soil under sorghum when compared to all other treatments. The buildup of soil available K due to FYM and green leaf manure application may be due to addition of K through solubilizing action of certain organic acids produced during decomposition of organics, reduction of potassium fixation, its greater capacity to hold K in the available form. Similar results were also observed by Sarkar et al. [27] Chettri et al. [28] Santhosh et al. [46] and Sankaramoorthy and Rangaswamy [47].

Irrespective of the integrated nutrient management practices followed in preceding rice crop, the application of 100% RDF ( $S_3$ ) recorded highest available K in soil under sorghum ( $S_3$ - 438.7, 421.2, 411.2  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2020-21 and 448.1, 429.8, 420.4  $kg\ ha^{-1}$  in 2021-22) and it was on par with 75% RDF ( $S_2$ ) but superior over control during both the years of study at vegetative, flowering and harvest stages, respectively. Interaction effect was found to be statistically insignificant.

On the other hand, the available potassium content gradually decreased with advancement of crop stage *i.e.*, from vegetative to harvest stage in both the years. This might be due to the continuous depletion of K by crop uptake and also due to potassium fixation in soils [18] These results were in coincidence with Subhalakshmi and Pratapkumarreddy and Deekshitha et al. [32,42].



**Table 5. Residual effect of INM practices in preceding rice and NPK levels on available nitrogen (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of sorghum (Rabi, 2020-21)**

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
T <sub>1</sub>	196.8	222.3	235.6	<b>218.2</b>	191.3	216.5	230.8	<b>212.9</b>	185.6	210.5	225.8	<b>207.3</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	214.5	239.4	251.7	<b>235.2</b>	207.7	235.4	247.1	<b>230.1</b>	201.4	229.7	238.2	<b>223.1</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	228.6	258.3	270.8	<b>252.6</b>	222	253.6	262.3	<b>246.0</b>	216.2	248.6	256.1	<b>240.3</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	216.3	242.9	253.5	<b>237.6</b>	209.8	237.3	249.5	<b>232.2</b>	202.3	231.5	241.8	<b>225.2</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	217.5	244.3	255.8	<b>239.2</b>	211.3	239.7	250.4	<b>233.8</b>	205.5	232.3	243.7	<b>227.2</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	221.1	247.3	258.6	<b>242.3</b>	214.8	241.4	252.6	<b>236.3</b>	207.4	236.3	246.6	<b>230.1</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	231.9	262.2	273.6	<b>255.9</b>	226.4	256.2	264.5	<b>249.0</b>	220.1	250.4	258.5	<b>243.0</b>
T <sub>8</sub>	234.2	264.6	275.8	<b>258.2</b>	228.4	258.6	268.1	<b>251.7</b>	222.9	253.6	262.2	<b>246.2</b>
T <sub>9</sub>	237.2	268.0	279.4	<b>261.5</b>	231.8	261	271.1	<b>254.6</b>	225.8	255.2	265.3	<b>248.8</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>222.0</b>	<b>249.9</b>	<b>261.6</b>		<b>215.9</b>	<b>244.4</b>	<b>255.2</b>		<b>209.7</b>	<b>238.7</b>	<b>248.7</b>	
	<b>SEm+</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm+</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm+</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>	
<b>M</b>	5.73	17.18	7.09		5.16	15.47	6.56		5.55	16.63	7.23	
<b>S</b>	3.81	11.97	7.74		3.95	11.33	8.48		3.80	10.86	6.54	
<b>M X S</b>	10.84	NS			11.56	NS			8.69	NS		
<b>S X M</b>	9.73	NS			10.12	NS			8.10	NS		

**Table 6. Residual effect of INM practices in preceding rice and NPK levels on available nitrogen (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of sorghum (Rabi, 2021-22)**

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
T <sub>1</sub>	200.5	226.8	240.9	<b>222.7</b>	194.7	220.8	234.5	<b>216.7</b>	188.1	214.8	229.4	<b>210.8</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	219.8	245.7	256.4	<b>240.6</b>	213.3	242.6	252.2	<b>236.0</b>	205.8	234.1	243.8	<b>227.9</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	235.9	265.6	277.2	<b>259.6</b>	227.5	260.2	270.7	<b>252.8</b>	220.5	255.2	263.6	<b>246.4</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	221.7	247.5	258.8	<b>242.7</b>	212.3	244.6	255.4	<b>237.4</b>	206.8	237.2	246.4	<b>230.1</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	222.8	249.7	260.3	<b>244.3</b>	215.7	244.4	254.6	<b>238.2</b>	209.2	239.6	248.2	<b>232.3</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	226.5	252.7	263.1	<b>247.4</b>	218.4	246.8	257.1	<b>240.8</b>	211.2	241.8	251.3	<b>234.8</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	238.7	269.6	280.3	<b>262.9</b>	231.7	263.5	271.3	<b>255.5</b>	225.8	257.6	265.1	<b>249.5</b>
T <sub>8</sub>	241.5	271.3	282.2	<b>265.0</b>	233.7	265.1	275.6	<b>258.1</b>	227.2	260.4	269.5	<b>252.4</b>
T <sub>9</sub>	244.4	275.2	286.8	<b>268.8</b>	236.4	268.2	278.5	<b>261.0</b>	230.5	262.9	272.6	<b>255.3</b>

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
<b>Mean</b>	<b>228.0</b>	<b>256.0</b>	<b>267.3</b>		<b>220.4</b>	<b>250.7</b>	<b>261.1</b>		<b>213.9</b>	<b>244.8</b>	<b>254.4</b>	
	<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>	
<b>M</b>	6.48	18.53	7.83		6.34	18.29	7.87		5.64	16.92	7.19	
<b>S</b>	4.38	12.52	7.08		4.21	12.04	6.26		4.05	11.62	6.74	
<b>M X S</b>	10.14	NS			8.73	NS			9.16	NS		
<b>S X M</b>	9.46	NS			8.42	NS			8.48	NS		

**Table 7. Residual effect of INM practices in preceding rice and NPK levels on available phosphorus (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of sorghum (Rabi, 2020-21)**

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
<b>T<sub>1</sub></b>	39.1	53.4	57.2	<b>49.9</b>	37.1	48	51.3	<b>45.5</b>	34.1	45.4	49	<b>42.8</b>
<b>T<sub>2</sub></b>	47.6	61.4	67.1	<b>58.7</b>	43.6	53.7	58.9	<b>52.1</b>	40.6	48.3	53.8	<b>47.1</b>
<b>T<sub>3</sub></b>	54.2	67.5	72.6	<b>64.8</b>	50.3	60.8	64.5	<b>58.5</b>	47.2	53.7	58.5	<b>53.1</b>
<b>T<sub>4</sub></b>	46.5	62.4	67.8	<b>58.9</b>	44.4	54.7	59.6	<b>52.9</b>	41.5	49.3	52.4	<b>48.2</b>
<b>T<sub>5</sub></b>	48.2	63.3	68.6	<b>60.0</b>	46.2	55.5	60.4	<b>54.0</b>	42.3	50.0	54.2	<b>48.8</b>
<b>T<sub>6</sub></b>	50.6	65.1	69.4	<b>61.7</b>	48.8	58.9	61.7	<b>56.5</b>	44.4	51.8	56.7	<b>51.0</b>
<b>T<sub>7</sub></b>	54.7	69.5	74.2	<b>66.1</b>	52.6	62.8	66.3	<b>60.6</b>	48.7	56.4	60.2	<b>55.1</b>
<b>T<sub>8</sub></b>	55.4	70.9	75.3	<b>67.2</b>	54	63.5	67.8	<b>61.8</b>	50.4	58.1	61.8	<b>56.8</b>
<b>T<sub>9</sub></b>	59.1	73.3	78.6	<b>70.3</b>	55.2	65.7	69	<b>63.3</b>	52.1	60.3	63.5	<b>58.6</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>50.6</b>	<b>65.2</b>	<b>70.1</b>		<b>48.0</b>	<b>58.2</b>	<b>62.2</b>		<b>44.6</b>	<b>52.6</b>	<b>56.7</b>	
	<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>	
<b>M</b>	2.48	7.16	9.76		2.07	6.02	10.11		2.13	6.17	11.33	
<b>S</b>	1.91	5.46	7.76		1.72	4.93	6.75		1.65	4.73	6.64	
<b>M X S</b>	3.39	NS			2.38	NS			2.15	NS		
<b>S X M</b>	3.23	NS			2.34	NS			2.09	NS		

**Table 8. Residual effect of INM practices in preceding rice and NPK levels on available phosphorus (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of sorghum (Rabi, 2021-22)**

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
T <sub>1</sub>	41.6	57.1	60.7	<b>53.1</b>	39.5	52.4	54.8	<b>48.9</b>	36.4	49.8	52.3	<b>46.2</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	49.3	64.8	70.5	<b>61.5</b>	45.1	56.4	61.5	<b>54.3</b>	42.5	51.7	55.3	<b>49.8</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	57.6	72.2	77.3	<b>69.0</b>	53.8	65.4	69.2	<b>62.8</b>	50.7	58.3	63.8	<b>57.6</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	48.2	66.7	71.5	<b>62.1</b>	46.8	58.4	62.2	<b>55.8</b>	43.4	53.8	56.2	<b>51.1</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	50.6	67.5	72.1	<b>63.4</b>	48.7	59.1	64.7	<b>57.5</b>	44.9	54.1	58.5	<b>52.5</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	52.1	70.5	74.9	<b>65.8</b>	50.6	62.5	65.1	<b>59.4</b>	46.6	55.5	60.6	<b>54.2</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	57.1	74.8	79.5	<b>70.5</b>	55	67.3	71.6	<b>64.6</b>	51.2	61.8	65.5	<b>59.5</b>
T <sub>8</sub>	58.2	75.5	80.6	<b>71.4</b>	57.4	68.2	72.3	<b>66.0</b>	53.6	63.3	66.4	<b>61.1</b>
T <sub>9</sub>	62.4	78.7	83.4	<b>74.8</b>	58.5	70.2	74.3	<b>67.7</b>	55.4	65.7	68.3	<b>63.1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>53.0</b>	<b>69.8</b>	<b>74.5</b>		<b>50.6</b>	<b>62.2</b>	<b>66.2</b>		<b>47.2</b>	<b>57.1</b>	<b>60.8</b>	
	<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>	
<b>M</b>	2.60	7.56	9.77		1.93	5.51	8.83		2.30	6.78	11.56	
<b>S</b>	2.02	5.79	8.24		1.62	4.83	6.04		1.72	4.91	6.88	
<b>M X S</b>	3.77	NS			2.27	NS			2.34	NS		
<b>S X M</b>	3.61	NS			2.23	NS			2.48	NS		

**Table 9. Residual effect of INM practices in preceding rice and NPK levels on available potassium (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of sorghum (Rabi, 2020-21)**

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
T <sub>1</sub>	353.5	379.8	396.5	<b>376.6</b>	346.1	368.3	383.5	<b>366.0</b>	340.4	358.2	372.5	<b>357.0</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	370.8	398.8	416.0	<b>395.2</b>	364.3	386.9	400.2	<b>383.8</b>	357.1	374.2	389.4	<b>373.6</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	405.3	446.7	462.1	<b>438.0</b>	395.9	432.7	443.5	<b>424.1</b>	392.2	421.5	434.8	<b>416.1</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	373.1	399.4	418.5	<b>397.0</b>	367.4	388.1	402.3	<b>385.7</b>	360.8	376.2	391.1	<b>376.0</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	374.4	401.7	421.5	<b>399.2</b>	366.6	389.5	404.0	<b>387.0</b>	362.0	378.6	394.3	<b>378.3</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	379.7	403.9	423.7	<b>402.4</b>	372.1	392.6	406.8	<b>390.5</b>	365.7	380.5	396.2	<b>380.8</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	410.5	450.7	466.8	<b>442.7</b>	402.1	436.7	447.5	<b>428.8</b>	394.2	425.7	438.4	<b>419.4</b>
T <sub>8</sub>	412.7	453.1	469.9	<b>445.3</b>	403.8	438.2	449.6	<b>430.5</b>	397.2	428.8	440.5	<b>422.2</b>
T <sub>9</sub>	415.2	455.3	473.1	<b>447.9</b>	405.7	441.6	452.9	<b>433.4</b>	399.6	430.9	443.8	<b>424.7</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>388.4</b>	<b>421.0</b>	<b>438.7</b>		<b>380.4</b>	<b>408.3</b>	<b>421.2</b>		<b>374.3</b>	<b>397.2</b>	<b>411.2</b>	

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
	SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)		SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)		SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)	
<b>M</b>	12.85	38.52	9.26		12.31	36.90	9.16		11.38	34.12	8.66	
<b>S</b>	6.58	18.86	8.21		4.89	14.02	6.30		5.54	15.90	7.31	
<b>M X S</b>	19.73	NS			14.67	NS			16.63	NS		
<b>S X M</b>	18.50	NS			14.80	NS			15.78	NS		

**Table 10. Residual effect of INM practices in preceding rice and NPK levels on available potassium (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of sorghum (Rabi, 2021-22)**

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
	SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)		SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)		SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)	
<b>T<sub>1</sub></b>	356.9	384.5	405.7	<b>382.3</b>	349.7	373.6	391.2	<b>371.5</b>	343.6	363.4	381.1	<b>362.7</b>
<b>T<sub>2</sub></b>	374.5	404.1	423.6	<b>400.8</b>	368.5	391.5	407.8	<b>389.3</b>	361.4	380.7	397.0	<b>379.7</b>
<b>T<sub>3</sub></b>	411.7	455.4	473.7	<b>446.9</b>	401.1	440.3	454.7	<b>432.0</b>	398.5	430.6	445.4	<b>424.8</b>
<b>T<sub>4</sub></b>	377.3	405.7	426.2	<b>403.1</b>	370.3	393.8	409.7	<b>391.3</b>	364.8	382.2	399.3	<b>382.1</b>
<b>T<sub>5</sub></b>	378.9	407.5	429.9	<b>405.4</b>	371.6	394.7	411.2	<b>392.5</b>	366.1	384.3	402.0	<b>384.1</b>
<b>T<sub>6</sub></b>	383.3	409.2	431.6	<b>408.0</b>	376.5	397.1	414.5	<b>396.0</b>	369.1	386.8	404.3	<b>386.7</b>
<b>T<sub>7</sub></b>	416.8	459.5	477.2	<b>451.1</b>	408.5	444.2	456.1	<b>436.3</b>	400.0	434.4	449.1	<b>427.9</b>
<b>T<sub>8</sub></b>	418.0	462.8	480.3	<b>453.7</b>	409.3	446.6	459.2	<b>438.4</b>	403.5	437.4	451.1	<b>430.7</b>
<b>T<sub>9</sub></b>	421.9	464.7	484.4	<b>457.0</b>	411.0	449.2	463.5	<b>441.2</b>	405.4	439.3	454.5	<b>433.1</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>393.3</b>	<b>428.1</b>	<b>448.1</b>		<b>385.2</b>	<b>414.6</b>	<b>429.8</b>		<b>379.2</b>	<b>404.3</b>	<b>420.4</b>	
	SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)		SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)		SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)	
<b>M</b>	10.58	31.71	7.50		10.32	30.95	7.56		10.83	32.46	8.10	
<b>S</b>	7.38	21.16	9.06		5.79	16.61	7.34		6.20	17.79	8.03	
<b>M X S</b>	22.13	NS			17.37	NS			18.60	NS		
<b>S X M</b>	19.56	NS			15.95	NS			17.01	NS		

**Table 11. Residual effect of INM practices in preceding rice and NPK levels on available sulphur (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of sorghum (Rabi, 2020-21)**

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
T <sub>1</sub>	13.37	13.38	13.40	<b>13.38</b>	13.34	13.36	13.38	<b>13.36</b>	13.31	13.34	13.36	<b>13.34</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	13.96	14.00	14.03	<b>14.00</b>	13.95	13.98	14.00	<b>13.98</b>	13.92	13.95	13.98	<b>13.95</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	14.08	14.13	14.17	<b>14.13</b>	14.07	14.11	14.14	<b>14.11</b>	14.06	14.08	14.11	<b>14.08</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	15.22	15.29	15.34	<b>15.28</b>	15.15	15.21	15.25	<b>15.20</b>	15.12	15.14	15.16	<b>15.14</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	15.24	15.31	15.37	<b>15.31</b>	15.17	15.24	15.28	<b>15.23</b>	15.14	15.16	15.19	<b>15.16</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	15.26	15.33	15.39	<b>15.33</b>	15.19	15.25	15.30	<b>15.25</b>	15.16	15.18	15.21	<b>15.18</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	16.62	16.68	16.74	<b>16.68</b>	16.52	16.57	16.62	<b>16.57</b>	16.46	16.49	16.54	<b>16.50</b>
T <sub>8</sub>	16.65	16.72	16.76	<b>16.71</b>	16.55	16.61	16.65	<b>16.60</b>	16.47	16.51	16.56	<b>16.51</b>
T <sub>9</sub>	16.67	16.74	16.79	<b>16.73</b>	16.57	16.63	16.67	<b>16.62</b>	16.49	16.54	16.58	<b>16.54</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>15.23</b>	<b>15.29</b>	<b>15.33</b>		<b>15.17</b>	<b>15.22</b>	<b>15.25</b>		<b>15.13</b>	<b>15.15</b>	<b>15.19</b>	
	<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>		<b>SEm±</b>	<b>CD (p=0.05)</b>	<b>CV (%)</b>	
<b>M</b>	0.40	1.20	7.85		0.35	1.06	6.94		0.35	1.04	6.85	
<b>S</b>	0.21	NS	7.26		0.19	NS	6.37		0.18	NS	6.33	
<b>M X S</b>	0.64	NS			0.56	NS			0.55	NS		
<b>S X M</b>	0.59	NS			0.52	NS			0.51	NS		

**Table 12. Residual effect of INM practices in preceding rice and NPK levels on available sulphur (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in soil at different stages of sorghum (Rabi, 2021-22)**

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
T <sub>1</sub>	13.30	13.33	13.39	<b>13.34</b>	13.26	13.31	13.33	<b>13.30</b>	13.25	13.28	13.31	<b>13.28</b>
T <sub>2</sub>	13.94	13.98	14.00	<b>13.97</b>	13.92	13.95	13.98	<b>13.95</b>	13.91	13.93	13.95	<b>13.93</b>
T <sub>3</sub>	14.07	14.10	14.13	<b>14.10</b>	14.04	14.08	14.11	<b>14.08</b>	14.04	14.07	14.09	<b>14.07</b>
T <sub>4</sub>	15.34	15.39	15.43	<b>15.39</b>	15.22	15.26	15.30	<b>15.26</b>	15.17	15.22	15.25	<b>15.21</b>
T <sub>5</sub>	15.36	15.42	15.45	<b>15.41</b>	15.24	15.29	15.32	<b>15.28</b>	15.19	15.23	15.27	<b>15.23</b>
T <sub>6</sub>	15.38	15.44	15.48	<b>15.43</b>	15.26	15.31	15.35	<b>15.31</b>	15.20	15.25	15.29	<b>15.25</b>
T <sub>7</sub>	16.73	16.77	16.83	<b>16.78</b>	16.59	16.64	16.69	<b>16.64</b>	16.55	16.59	16.62	<b>16.59</b>
T <sub>8</sub>	16.74	16.81	16.85	<b>16.80</b>	16.60	16.66	16.71	<b>16.66</b>	16.57	16.61	16.64	<b>16.61</b>
T <sub>9</sub>	16.76	16.83	16.88	<b>16.82</b>	16.62	16.68	16.73	<b>16.68</b>	16.59	16.63	16.66	<b>16.63</b>
<b>Mean</b>	<b>15.29</b>	<b>15.34</b>	<b>15.38</b>		<b>15.19</b>	<b>15.24</b>	<b>15.28</b>		<b>15.16</b>	<b>15.20</b>	<b>15.23</b>	

	Vegetative			Mean	Flowering			Mean	Harvest			Mean
	S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3		S1	S2	S3	
	SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)	SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)	SEm±	CD (p=0.05)	CV (%)			
<b>M</b>	0.37	1.11	7.25	0.36	1.09	7.18	0.37	1.11	7.30			
<b>S</b>	0.18	NS	6.11	0.19	NS	6.33	0.18	NS	6.08			
<b>M X S</b>	0.54	NS		0.56	NS		0.53	NS				
<b>S X M</b>	0.51	NS		0.52	NS		0.51	NS				

#### 4.2.4 Available Sulphur

Data pertaining to soil available sulphur was presented in Tables 11 and 12. The results revealed that irrespective of the year of study, the available sulphur status at vegetative, flowering and harvest stages of sorghum crop was significantly influenced by different nutrient management practices followed in *kharif* season.

The results revealed that, significantly highest available sulphur was recorded in treatment T<sub>9</sub> which received 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM (16.73, 16.62, 16.54 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 16.82, 16.68, 16.63 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and it was on par with treatments T<sub>8</sub> which received 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM (16.71, 16.60, 16.51 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 16.80, 16.66, 16.61 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and T<sub>7</sub> i.e., 100% RDF + 25% N through FYM (16.68, 16.57, 16.50 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 16.78, 16.64, 16.59 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) at vegetative, flowering and harvest stages in 2020-21 and 2021-22, respectively implies the better residual effect of integrated nutrient management treatments when compared to all other treatments. The lowest available sulphur was observed in T<sub>1</sub> i.e., control (13.38, 13.36, 13.34 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 13.34, 13.30, 13.28 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) during 2020-21 and 2021-22, respectively at all the three stages of sorghum.

The treatments that received inorganics i.e., T<sub>2</sub>- 14.00, 13.98, 13.95 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 13.97, 13.95, 13.93 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and T<sub>3</sub>- 14.13, 14.11, 14.08 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 14.10, 14.08, 14.07 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> recorded lower available sulphur compared to combined application of organics and inorganics at vegetative, flowering and harvest stages during 2020-21 and 2021-22, respectively.

Among the levels of fertilizers applied to sorghum, 100% RDF (S<sub>3</sub>- 15.33, 15.25, 15.19 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 15.38, 15.28, 15.23 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22) recorded significantly highest available sulphur when compared to 75% RDF (S<sub>2</sub>- 15.29, 15.22, 15.15 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and 15.34, 15.24, 15.20 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2020) and control (S<sub>1</sub>- 15.23, 15.17, 15.13 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2020-21 and 15.29, 15.19, 15.16 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> in 2021-22) during both the years of study at all the stages of crop growth, while the interaction between different nutrient management treatments and levels of fertilizers was found to be non-significant.

#### 5. CONCLUSION

Application of 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM in *kharif* improved soil available nutrient status

(N, P, K and S). Accordingly, Green leaf manure had shown better direct effect in *kharif* among the different organics applied to rice. Substitution of 100% RDF + 12.5% N through FYM + 12.5% N through GLM has shown better residual effect in *rabi* season. Thus, application of 100% RDF + 25% N through GLM in *kharif* and 100% RDF in *rabi* is optimum for improving soil nutrient status of sorghum crop in rice-sorghum cropping system. In succeeding *rabi* sorghum, the subplot that received 100% RDF was on par with 75% RDF in terms of soil available nutrient status except available sulphur during both the years of experimentation. From this study, it can be concluded that substitution of 25% nitrogen through FYM, GLM and their combination in *kharif* rice reduces 25% of recommended dose of fertilizers to the succeeding *rabi* sorghum crop during both the years of study.

#### COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

#### REFERENCES

1. Ministry of Agriculture, Government of India; 2020-21. Available: <https://www.indiastat.com/default.aspx>
2. Dwivedi BS, Shukla AK, Singh VK, Yadav RL. Development of Farmers' Resource-Based Integrated Plant Nutrient Supply Systems. IISS, Bhopal, India. 2001;50-75.
3. Tripathi RP. Physical properties and tillage of rice soils in rice-wheat system. PDCSR, Modipuram, India. 1992;53-67.
4. Yadav R L. Factor productivity trends in a rice-wheat cropping system under long-term use of chemical fertilizers. *Experimental Agriculture*. 1998;34:1-18.
5. Bastia DK. Effect of integrated nutrient supply on yield of rice and soil fertility. *Madras Agricultural Journal*. 2002;89 (7-9):383-385.
6. Alagappan S, Venkataswamy S. Performance of different sources of organic manures in comparison with RDF and INM on nutrient uptake, nutrient balance and soil properties in rice-green gram cropping sequence. *International Journal of Agricultural Science*. 2016;12(2):326-334.
7. Mallareddy M, Devenderreddy M. Integrated nutrient management for

- higher productivity and better soil health under rice (*Oryza sativa*) - based cropping systems. The Andhra Agricultural Journal. 2008;55(3):267-272.
8. Bajpai RK, Chitale S, Upadhyay SK, Urkurkar JS. Long-term studies on soil physico-chemical properties and productivity of rice-wheat system as influenced by integrated nutrient management in *Inceptisol* of Chhattisgarh. Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science. 2006;54: 24-29.
  9. Kamala K, Gupta CS, Paliyal SS. Effect of chemical fertilizers vis-a-vis organic manures (vermicompost, FYM) on wheat yield and soil health. Himachal Journal of Agricultural Research. 2005; 31(2):48-51.
  10. Tolanur SI, Badanur VP. Changes in organic carbon, available N, P and K under integrated use of organic manure, green manure and fertilizer on sustaining productivity of pearl millet- Pigeonpea system and fertility of an *Inceptisol*. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2003;5(1):37– 41.
  11. Pattanayak SK, Mishra KN, Jena MK, Nayak RK. Evaluation of greenmanure crops fertilized with various phosphorus sources and their effect on subsequent rice crop. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2001;49(2): 285-291.
  12. Parmer DK, Sharma V. Studies on long-term application of fertilizers and manure on yield of maize-wheat rotation and soil properties under rainfed conditions in western-Himalayas. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2002;50(3):311-312.
  13. Singh S, Singh RN, Prasad J, Kumar B. Effect of green manuring, FYM and biofertilizer in relation to fertilizer nitrogen on yield and major nutrient uptake by upland rice. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2002;50(3):313-314.
  14. Verma TS, Suri V, Kandpaul J. Prescription based fertilizer recommendations for rice, maize and wheat in different agro-climatic zones of Himachal Pradesh. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2002;50(3): 272-277.
  15. Jones DL, Oburger E. Solubilization of phosphorus by soil micro organisms In: EK Beunemann, A. Oberson, E. Froard, eds. Phosphorus in action. Springer, Newyork. 2011;169-198.
  16. Hossain AT, Rahman F, Saha PK, Solaiman ARM. Effects of different aged poultry litter on the yield and nutrient balance in boro rice cultivation. Bangladesh Journal of Agricultural Research. 2010;35(3):497-505.
  17. Jemila C, Bakiyathusaliha B, Udayakumar S. Evaluating the effect of phosphatic fertilizer on soil and plant P availability and maximizing rice crop yield. *Oryza*. 2017; 54(3):305-313.
  18. Veeranagappa P, Prakasha HC, Vijay Mahanthesh, Ashoka KR, Mahendra Kumar MB, Nagaraj. Impact of zinc enriched compost on availability of zinc and zinc fractions, nutrient uptake and yield of rice. Advanced Research Journal of Crop Improvement. 2011;2(2):203-207.
  19. Chikkaraju SN. Studies on impact of nitrogen management practices on Soil properties, growth and yield of rice. M.Sc. (Ag) Thesis, University of Agricultural Sciences, Bangaluru; 2012.
  20. Maiti S, Saha M, Banerjee, Handpal S. Integrated nutrient management under hybrid rice (*Oryza sativa*) - hybrid rice cropping sequence. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2006;51(3):157-159.
  21. Vinay S. Productivity and economics of rice (*Oryza sativa*) - wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) cropping system under integrated nutrient-supply system in recently reclaimed sodic soil. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2006;51(2):81-84.
  22. Upadhyay VB, Vikas Jain, Vishwakarma SK, Kumar AK. Production potential, soil health, water productivity and economics of rice (*Oryza sativa*) Based cropping systems under different nutrient sources. Indian Journal of Agronomy. 2011;56 (4):311-316.
  23. Selvakumari G, Baskar M, Jayanthi D, Mathan KK. Effect of integration of fly ash with fertilizers and organic manures on nutrient availability, yield and nutrient uptake of rice in Alfisols. Journal of Indian Society Soil Science. 2000;48(2):268-278.
  24. Swarup A, Yaduvanshi NPS. Effect of integrated nutrient management on soil properties and yield of rice in alkali soils. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2000;48(2):279-282.
  25. Singh M, Singh VP, Reddy KS. Effect of integrated use of fertilizer nitrogen and farm yard manure or green manure on



- transformation of N, K and S and productivity of rice-wheat system on a Vertisol. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2001;49(3):430-435.
26. Khoshgoftarmanesh AH, Kalbasi M. Effect of municipal waste leachate on soil properties and growth and yield of rice. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis, Tehran, 2002;33(13&14):2011-2020.  
Available:<http://www.dekker.com/servlet/product/productide/CSS>
  27. Sarkar S, Mandal M, Das DK. Effect of integrated application of green manure and biofertilizers on soil fertility in rice-pea cropping system. Environment and Ecology. 2014;32(3):1010-1015.
  28. Chettri P, Maiti D, Rizal B. Studies on soil properties as affected by integrated nutrient management practice in different cultivars of local scented rice. Journal of Crop and Weed. 2017;13(2):25-29.
  29. Elayaraja D, Senthilvalavan P. Soil properties, enzymatic activity, yield and nutrient uptake of groundnut as influenced by nutrient management practices in coastal sandy soil. Annals of Plant and Soil Research. 2019;21(1):87-92.
  30. Sharma V, Singh MJ, Khokhar AK. Productivity, nutrient uptake and soil properties as influenced by integrated nutrient management in maize-wheat cropping system under rainfed conditions of sub-montane Punjab. Agricultural Research Journal. 2020;57(6):839-847.
  31. Karunakaran V, Rammohan J, Chellamuthu V, Poonghuzhalan R. Integrated nutrient management on the performance of groundnut. Journal of Crop and Applied Sciences. 2021;1(1):35-39.
  32. Subhalakshmi C, Pratap Kumar Reddy A. Soil available nutrient status as influenced by organic sources and fertilizer levels in hybrid rice. International Journal of Science and Nature. 2017; 8(1):40-43.
  33. Gogoi B, Kalita B, Deori B, Paul SK. Soil properties under rainfed rice crop as affected by Integrated supply of nutrients. International Journal of Agriculture Innovations and Research. 2015;3(6): 1720-1725.
  34. Singh NAK, Basumatary A, Barua NG. Assessment of soil fertility under integrated nutrient management in rice-niger sequence. Journal of KrishiVigyan. 2014;3(1):5-9.
  35. Sharma MP, Bali SV, Gupta DK. Soil fertility and productivity of rice-wheat cropping system in an Inceptisol as influenced by integrated nutrient management. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2001;71(2):82-86.
  36. Tiryak Kumar Samant. Changes in soil chemical environment by Integrated Nutrient Management Practices and its effect on yield, economics under Rice-Fallow cropping system. Chemical Science Review and Letters. 2015;4(13):129-135.
  37. Subbaiah PV, Sairam A, Rao PC, Naidu MVS. Effect of integrated use of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients and biofertilizers on soil available nutrients in maize- onion cropping system. The Andhra Agricultural Journal. 2013;60(2):337-341.
  38. Singh F, Ravindra K, Samir P. Integrated nutrient management in rice-wheat cropping system for sustainable productivity. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2008;56(2):205-208.
  39. Katkar RN, Turkhede AB, Solanke VM, Wankhede ST, Patil MR. Effect of integrated management of organic manures and fertilizers on soil properties and yield of cotton. Journal of Cotton Research and Development. 2002;24:193-195.
  40. Gadhiya SS, Patel BB, Jadav NJ, Pavaya RP, Patel MV, Patel VR. Effect of different levels of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium on growth and quality of *Bt* cotton. Asian Journal of Soil Science. 2009;4(1):37-42.
  41. Jat RD, Nanwal RK. Growth, nutrient uptake and profitability of *Bt* cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) influenced by spacing and nutrient levels. Crop Research. 2013;45(1, 2 &3):248-252.
  42. Deekshitha DKD, Sujani Rao Ch, Subbaiah PV, Luther MM, Rao VS. Direct and residual effect of integrated nitrogen management nitrogen management on available macronutrient status of soil. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2020;8(6):2231-2235.
  43. Patel JV, Thanki JD, Desai LJ. Residual effect of integrated nutrient management in finger millet on growth and yield parameters of *rabi* green gram under finger millet-green gram cropping sequence. International Journal of Pure

- and Applied Bioscience. 2018;6(5): 564-568.
44. Mahala HL, Shakawat MS, Shivram RK. Direct and residual effect of organic sources and levels of P & N in maize-mustard cropping sequence. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 2006;51(1):10-13.
45. Bhargavi K, Raghavareddy C, Yellamandareddy T, Srinivasula Reddy D. The productivity and residual soil fertility status under different rice based cropping systems in scarce rainfall zone of Andhra Pradesh. *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2007;3(2):26-31.
46. Santhosh SJ, Sridhar VT, Ravindrababu P, Martinluther M. Integrated nitrogen management for enhancing productivity of maize. *The Andhra Agricultural Journal*. 2019;66(2):346-349.
47. Sankaramoorthy A, Rangasamy V. Impacts of different sources of organic manures on soil physico-chemical properties, nutrient balance and yield of rice-greengram cropping sequence under organic farming. *SSRG International Journal of Agriculture & Environmental Science (SSRG-IJAES)*. 2019;6(4): 65-85.

---

© 2022 Krishna 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/89267>