

International Journal of Advanced Biochemistry Research



ISSN Print: 2617-4693
 ISSN Online: 2617-4707
 IJABR 2024; 8(6): 282-288
www.biochemjournal.com
 Received: 20-03-2024
 Accepted: 23-04-2024

Gagandeep Kaur
 Ph.D. Scholar, Department of
 Soil Science and Agricultural
 Chemistry, Sher-e-Kashmir
 University of Agricultural
 Sciences and Technology of
 Kashmir, Jammu and
 Kashmir, India

Kamini Kumari
 Professor, Department of Soil
 Science and Agricultural
 Chemistry, Lovely Professional
 University, Punjab, India

Corresponding Author:
Gagandeep Kaur
 Ph.D. Scholar, Department of
 Soil Science and Agricultural
 Chemistry, Sher-e-Kashmir
 University of Agricultural
 Sciences and Technology of
 Kashmir, Jammu and
 Kashmir, India

Effect of organic and inorganic sources on soil properties, yield and growth of spring maize (*Zea mays* L.)

Gagandeep Kaur and Kamini Kumari

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.33545/26174693.2024.v8.i6d.1322>

Abstract

A field experiment entitled was conduct under title as, “Effect of organic and inorganic sources on soil properties, yield and growth of spring maize (*Zea mays* L.)” at Research and Advance Studies Farm, Department of Agricultural Sciences, Sant Baba Bhag Singh University, Khiala, Jalandhar during spring 2023. The field experiment was designed in Randomized Block Design, with 7 treatments and 3 replications. The field experiment was designed to study the influence of biofertilizer on soil properties, yield and growth of maize.

It was observed that treatment T₄ (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) shows the superior after 90 DAS under growth parameters (plant height 160.6 cm, number of leaves 11.1, LAI 5.42) but it was statistically similar with the treatment T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P). T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) produced maximum grain yield of 61.5 q ha⁻¹. Similar results was observed for the number of cobs per plant, number of grains per cob, 1000-grain weight, cob length, cob girth, stover yield, etc. So, it was observed that growth parameters, grain yield and yield attributes was significantly increased with applications of biofertilizers. On the other hand applications of biofertilizer increase the available nutrients status in soil, but there is no significant effect on soil organic carbon percentage.

Keywords: Biofertilizers applications, soil properties, growth parameters, yield parameters

Introduction

Maize, scientifically known as *Zea mays* L, is an emerging crop renowned for its remarkable adaptability to diverse agro-climatic conditions. It holds the esteemed title of the "queen of cereals" globally, primarily due to its exceptional productivity potential, ranking third after wheat and rice. The demand for maize grains is continuously escalating, driven by factors like population growth and economic development. Consequently, maize plays a crucial role as a staple crop worldwide, catering to the increasing needs of food, animal feed, and various industries ^[1].

According to FAOStat, 2021, the total area of maize grown for dry grain is around 197 M hectares ^[3]. According to estimates from the International Grain Council, maize output is anticipated to reach 1178.6 million tonnes in 2022–2023 while demand is anticipated to continue at 1196.8 million tonnes for food, feed, and industrial use ^[4]. Recently, the FAO increased the overall area under global cereal production by 7.7 million tonnes (0.3 percent), bringing it to 2 785 million tonnes. The estimated worldwide production of coarse grains in 2023 is 1467 m t. With a total of 1.2 billion tonnes produced globally in 2020 (FAO 2022), maize output is around 12 percent ^[5]. The output of maize in the world increased by 31% in the United States, with China coming in second and Brazil third. By 2050, there will be 9.7 billion people on the planet (or 8.9 to 10.7 billion depending on expected growth rates; UN-DESA, 2019), a growth of 2 billion above the present 7.7 billion ^[6].

The ability to grow healthy crops depends on the condition of the soil. To boost the microbial biomass and soil enzymatic activity, the right proportion of organic and inorganic manures is needed ^[10]. It is vital to employ ecologically friendly fertilisers, such as bio fertilisers, because the continual use of chemical-based fertilisers is ineffective at promoting the development of healthy soil (Fitriati *et al.*, 2020) ^[11].

Bacteria that can dissolve phosphorus and fixed nitrogen, as well as supply macronutrients and break down organic materials, make up the native soil microorganisms. When applied to seeds, plant surfaces, or soil, bio fertilisers are compounds that include living organisms that colonise the rhizosphere or interior of plants and promote plant development through boosting the accessibility of primary nutrients and/or encouraging specific development in plants (Fitriatin *et al.*, 2020) ^[11]. The prolonged usage of chemical fertilisers without balancing it through the addition of organic matter can lead to significant challenges while having an effect on soil deterioration. Utilising ecologically friendly fertilisers, such as bio fertilisers, can assist improve the health of the soil and supply micronutrients that are unavailable to plants as a different approach to this issue ^[11]. Bio fertilisers can increase soil fertility, fertilisation effectiveness, and the condition of the soil. Increased food availability and maintenance of the nutritional N cycle are crucial functions of bacteria in the root system environment. To boost the population of nitrogen-fixing bacteria in the rhizosphere environment, which is anticipated to enhance soil nutrients, one method is to inject bio fertilisers made of nitrogen-fixing bacteria. The usage of bio fertilisers will not leave residues on crop yields, making them safe for both the ecosystem and the health of people ^[11].

Plant growth and yield are increased by using bio fertilisers. The bacteria that solubilize phosphate increase phosphatase activity, plant development, and maize production (Fitriatin *et al.*, 2020) ^[11]. The greatest microbial diversity was seen in soil treated with organic and NPK fertilisers. A less expensive, less costly to operate, and environmentally benign way to increase agricultural output is through a combined application of biofertilizers. *Azotobacter* is an autonomous, aerobic, diazotrophic bacterium that is typically found in soil and has the capacity to utilise N₂ as the only source of nitrogen. The most prevalent organisms in Indian soil, among other species, are *Azotobacter chroococcum*. Approximately 33 percent of the studies using *Azotobacter* inoculation on crops were carried out in India and showed positive responses ^[12].

Therefore, the goal of this study is to identify the best application technique that promotes maize development and production. It also aims to find the best treatment that may be used on the maize crop to produce a high yield of high-quality maize. The current study's objective is to assess the effectiveness of using PSB in liquid form and soil application of *Azotobacter* in conjunction with nitrogen and phosphate fertiliser to grow maize.

Materials and Methods

The research experiment was conducted under title as, "Effect of organic and inorganic sources on soil properties, yield and growth of spring maize (*Zea mays* L.)" carried out at Main Agricultural Research Field, Department of Agriculture, Sant Baba Bhag Singh University, Khiala, Jalandhar during spring 2023. The experiment was conducted in Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications at the experimental Farm of main Agricultural Research Field, SBBSU, Punjab. The plot size for each treatment was 2.6 m x 4.7 m. The seeds of crop were placed manually in the ridges at a plant to plant distance of 20 cm with a seed rate of 10 kg/ha and sown on 13 February 2023, while harvested on 6th June 2023.

Table 1: Soil physical and chemical properties of experimental field

| Sr. No. | Particulars | Soil Depth (0-15cm depth) |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|
| I Physical properties | | |
| 1 | Sand (%) | 81.6 |
| 2 | Silt (%) | 10.7 |
| 3 | Clay (%) | 7.7 |
| II Chemical properties | | |
| 1 | pH (1:2) | 7.1 |
| 2 | Electrical conductivity (dS/m) | 0.20 |
| 3 | Organic Carbon (%) | 0.30 |
| III Available nutrient status | | |
| 1 | Available N (kg ha ⁻¹) | 140.2 |
| 2 | Available P (kg ha ⁻¹) | 17.5 |
| 3 | Available K (kg ha ⁻¹) | 90.6 |

Table 2: Treatment Details

| | |
|----------------|---|
| T ₁ | Control |
| T ₂ | Seed treatment with 120 ml of PSB + 100% N and P |
| T ₃ | Soil application of 200 g <i>Azotobacter</i> + FYM + 100% N and P |
| T ₄ | Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P |
| T ₅ | Soil application of 350 g <i>Azotobacter</i> + FYM + 100% N and P |
| T ₆ | Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P |
| T ₇ | Soil application of 450 g <i>Azotobacter</i> + FYM + 100% N and P |

Results and Discussion

The data recorded on different parameters of maize crop are discussed in this chapter under the following heads:

Growth Attributes

Seed germination percentage (%)

Seed germination percentage was increased with the application of biofertilizer along with inorganic fertilizer. The maximum seed germination percentage 99.4% was found under T₄ (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) and followed by T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) was 94.1%. The minimum seed germination percentage 51.8% were found under treatment T₁ (Control) and 58.7% under T₃ (Soil application of 200 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P). This is in conformity with the results of Umeha *et al.* 2014 ^[16] who observed such increased germination due to biofertilizers application. Babu *et al.*, 2017 ^[27] results also supported.

Plant height

The maximum plant height was observed with T₄ treatment (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) as 160.6 cm at 90 DAS respectively which in terms of statistics, was comparable to the T₆ treatment (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) and also significantly higher than the other biofertilizer application. The lowest plant height was observed in T₁ treatment (Control Plot) as 122.4 cm at 90 DAS as compared to other treatments. *Azotobacter*, a bacterium fixes N from the air, which is subsequently fixed in the soil, and produces phytohormones in the root zone of plants that can boost plant growth and production. The increase in is what causes plants to grow to their maximum height ^[11]. Fitriatin *et al.*, 2021 ^[11] stated that seed treatment and soil application of biofertilizer increase the plant height.

Number of leaves per plant

The data indicates that the number of leaves per plant increased with different biofertilizers application. The T₄ treatment (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N

and P) recorded the maximum number of leaves per plant at 90 DAS, as 11.1 respectively, which was statistically at par with the T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) which was statistically higher than other treatment. The lowest number of leaves per plant was recorded in T₁ treatment (Control Plot) as 8.1 after 90 DAS as compared to other treatment. Purwani *et al.*, 2020^[31] also state that combination of chemical fertilizers and biofertilizer produced higher number of leaf than control treatment.

Leaf area index (LAI)

The maximum LAI recorded after 90 DAS was under treatment T₄ (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) as 5.42 respectively, which was statistically at par with T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) but also significantly higher than the other treatment. Kouchebagh *et al.*, 2012^[23] revealed that interaction of seed inoculation (Biofertilizer *Pseudomonas*, *Azospirillum* and *Azotobacter*) and N fertilization could increase crop LAI (44%) significantly, as compared to non treated ones.

Table 3: Effect of different biofertilizer applications on Germination percentage, Plant height, Number of leaves per plant and Leaf area index

| Treatments | Mean | | | |
|----------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|
| | Germination percentage | Plant height (cm) | Number of Leaves per plant | Leaf Area Index (LAI) |
| T ₁ | 51.8 | 122.4 | 8.1 | 3.37 |
| T ₂ | 74.6 | 150.6 | 9.9 | 4.97 |
| T ₃ | 58.7 | 144.3 | 10.1 | 4.78 |
| T ₄ | 99.4 | 160.6 | 11.1 | 5.42 |
| T ₅ | 75.6 | 153.9 | 10.2 | 5.38 |
| T ₆ | 94.1 | 157.4 | 10.3 | 5.40 |
| T ₇ | 76.1 | 148.3 | 10.1 | 4.92 |
| CD(p=0.05) | NS | 5.25 | 1.13 | 1.21 |

Crop phenology

Days taken to 50% tasselling

The maximum numbers of days taken for 50% of tasselling is under T₁ (Control Plot) as 75.7 days. This treatment combination has no biofertilizer application and it was significantly more as compared to all other biofertilizer level combinations. The minimum number of days taken to 50% tasselling were recorded under treatment T₄ (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) as 72.5 days.

Days taken to 50% silking

The maximum number of days taken for 50% silking is under treatment T₁ (Control Plot) as 78.5 days and minimum number of days taken to 50% silking were recorded under treatment T₃ (Soil application of 200 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) as 75.1 days. Taipodia *et al.*, 2013^[85] seed inoculation with PSB along with 5t FYM ha⁻¹ has taken less number of days to 50% of silking as compared control where no use of biofertilizer with FYM.

Days taken to physiological maturity

The treatment T₁ (Control Plot) has taken significantly maximum number of 113 days to reach the stage of physiological maturity which was at par with the treatment. The shortest period of days was 104 days for physiological maturity was under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P). Latha *et al.*, 2018^[83] and Soleymanifard *et al.*, 2013^[81] also observed the similar result.

Yield attributes

Number of cobs per plant

The treatment T₃ (Soil application of 200 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) has significantly highest number of

cobs per plant as mean value 1.07 as compared to treatment T₁ (Control Plot). The minimum number of cobs 0.68 per plant was discovered under treatment T₁ (Control Plot). Similar result was also reported by Taipodia *et al.*, 2013^[85] and Choudhary *et al.*, 2012^[73].

Number of grains per cob

The maximum number of grains 499.2 per cob was observed as under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) which were at par with the treatment T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) and significantly higher as compared to other treatments. Umesha *et al.*, 2014^[16] observed that the higher number of grains per cob founded due to positive effect of biofertilizer.

1000-grain weight

The treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) produces maximum 1000-grains weight of 342.0 g and minimum 1000-grain weight of 233.5 g was observed under treatment T₁ (Control plot). Similar results were reported by Naseri *et al.*, 2013^[36] and Taipodia *et al.*, 2013^[85].

Cob length

The maximum cob length 18.7 cm was observed under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) which was at par treatment T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) and significantly higher as compared to other treatments. Minimum cob length of 15.2 cm was found under treatment T₁ (Control plot). The results are conformity with finding of Umesha *et al.*, 2014^[16] and Rina *et al.*, 2020^[44].

Table 4: Effect of different biofertilizer applications on Days taken to tasselling, Days taken to silking, Days taken to physiological maturity, Number of cobs per plant, Number of grains per plant, 1000-grain weight (g), Cob length, Cob girth, Number of grain rows per cob

| Treatments | Mean | | | | | | | | |
|----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------------------|
| | Crop Phenology | | | Yield attributes | | | | | |
| | Days taken to tasselling | Days taken to silking | Days taken to physiological maturity | Number of cobs per plant | Number of grains per cob | 1000-grain weight (g) | Cob length (cm) | Cob girth (cm) | Number of grain rows per cob |
| T ₁ | 75.7 | 78.5 | 113.0 | 0.68 | 304.4 | 233.5 | 15.2 | 12.2 | 11.9 |
| T ₂ | 73.5 | 76.4 | 108.8 | 0.94 | 363.1 | 250.8 | 17.5 | 14.8 | 13.6 |
| T ₃ | 73.8 | 75.6 | 109.3 | 1.07 | 419.6 | 261.0 | 16.8 | 14.7 | 14.5 |
| T ₄ | 72.5 | 75.1 | 107.3 | 1.00 | 411.4 | 252.5 | 17.8 | 16.2 | 14.6 |
| T ₅ | 73.6 | 76.8 | 107.1 | 0.89 | 447.9 | 270.1 | 18.4 | 15.8 | 14.1 |
| T ₆ | 74.3 | 76.2 | 104.3 | 0.84 | 456.0 | 322.4 | 18.5 | 16.1 | 15.1 |
| T ₇ | 73.3 | 75.2 | 104.0 | 1.04 | 499.2 | 342.0 | 18.7 | 16.4 | 15.3 |
| CD(p=0.05) | 0.572 | 0.654 | 2.00 | 0.242 | 3.493 | 2.757 | 1.80 | 1.15 | 0.76 |

Cob girth

The maximum cob girth 16.4 cm was observed under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) which were statistically at par with the treatment T₄ (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P), T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) where cob girth was 16.2, 16.1 cm and significantly higher as compared to other treatments. Minimum cob girth was found as 12.2 cm under treatment T₁ (Control plot). Similar positive results are found by Taipodia *et al.*, 2013^[85] and Latha *et al.*, 2018^[83].

Number of grain rows per cob

The maximum number of grain rows 15.3 per cob was observed under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) and Minimum number of grain rows per cob was observed as 11.9 under treatment T₁ (Control). The results of Naseri *et al.*, 2013^[36] are also supported.

Grain yield

The treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) produces maximum grain yield of 61.5 q ha⁻¹. Minimum grain yield of 27.1 q ha⁻¹ was recorded under treatment T₁ (Control Plot). Meena *et al.*, 2013^[12] also observed that combine application of inorganic fertilizers, FYM and *Azotobacter* inoculation produced high maize yield.

Stover yield

The maximum stover yield 148.9 q ha⁻¹ was recorded under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) which was statistically at par with the treatment T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) but significantly higher as compared to other treatments. Minimum stover yield of 82.3 q ha⁻¹ was recorded under treatment T₁ (Control Plot). Rina *et al.*, 2020^[44] and Singh L *et al.*, 2017^[54] also reported about increased of stover yield with the application of biofertilizers.

Table 5: Effect of different biofertilizer applications on Grain yield, Stover yield, Shelling %, Harvesting index (%)

| Treatments | Means | | | |
|----------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| | Grain yield (q ha ⁻¹) | Stover yield (q ha ⁻¹) | Shelling (%) | Harvesting Index (%) |
| T ₁ | 27.1 | 82.3 | 55.9 | 24.0 |
| T ₂ | 41.1 | 101.9 | 70.0 | 27.1 |
| T ₃ | 42.1 | 124.6 | 68.6 | 25.8 |
| T ₄ | 53.8 | 137.6 | 74.6 | 28.1 |
| T ₅ | 47.7 | 134.7 | 84.4 | 26.6 |
| T ₆ | 57.3 | 144.2 | 76.3 | 28.4 |
| T ₇ | 61.5 | 148.9 | 86.7 | 29.1 |
| CD(p=0.05) | 6.59 | 7.25 | 1.938 | 2.15 |

Shelling %

The maximum shelling percentage (86.7%) was under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) and Minimum shelling percentage was observed as 55.9% under treatment T₁ (Control Plot). Singh L *et al.*, 2017^[54] also observed higher shelling percentage obtain with the combine application of organic and inorganic fertilizers.

Harvesting index

The maximum harvesting index of 29.1% was recorded under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) and the minimum harvesting index 24.0% was observed in treatment T₁ (Control Plot). Naserirad *et al.*, 2011^[22] also found that maximum harvesting index because usage of bio-fertilizers increased

the harvest index through affecting dry weight and assigning more photosynthetic matter to grain.

Chemical properties of soil**Soil pH**

The maximum pH were discovered in treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) 7.8 and the minimum value of pH was discovered in treatment T₁ (Control Plot), but it was at par treatment T₂ (Seed treatment with 120 ml of PSB + 100% N and P). Taipodia *et al.*, 2013^[85] also found that biofertilizer application had significant impact on soil pH.

Soil electrical conductivity (dSm⁻¹)

The maximum electrical conductivity were observed in treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) 0.24 dSm⁻¹ which was at par with T₂ (Seed

treatment with 120 ml of PSB + 100% N and P). The minimum electrical conductivity was found in treatment T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) 0.10. Similar finding was observed by Manohar *et al.*, 2021^[64].

Soil organic carbon (%)

The maximum organic carbon (%) were found in treatment T₁ (Control Plot) 0.40% which was statistically at par with treatment T₄ (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) 0.39%. The minimum organic carbon (%) were found in treatment T₃ (Soil application of 200 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) 0.22%. The results of Manohar *et al.*, 2021^[64] and Ahmad *et al.*, 2013^[60] were also supported.

Available nutrients status of soil

Available Nitrogen (Kg ha⁻¹)

The maximum values of available N were found in treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) 196 kg ha⁻¹. The minimum values of available N were found in treatment T₁ (Control Plot) and T₃ (Soil application of 200 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) were 154, 158 kg ha⁻¹ respectively. Ahmad *et al.*, 2013^[60] also found that available N were increases with the applications of biofertilizers along with chemical fertilizers.

Available Phosphorous (Kg ha⁻¹)

The maximum values of available P were found in treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) 27.68 kg ha⁻¹, which was significantly at par with treatment T₃ (Soil application of 200 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) and T₅ (Soil application of 350 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P). The minimum values of available P were found in treatment T₆ (Seed treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P) and T₁ (Control Plot) were 16.91, 17.22 kg ha⁻¹ respectively. Manohar *et al.*, 2021^[64] found the similar results because bio-fertilizers effectively solubilise native phosphorus (P) in the soil by releasing a variety of organic acids.

Available Potassium (Kg ha⁻¹)

The highest value of available K observed with treatment T₅ (Soil application of 350 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) 122.12 kg ha⁻¹ which was at par with treatment T₄ and T₇ respectively. The lowest value of available K observed with treatment T₃ (Soil application of 200 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P). Manohar *et al.*, 2021^[64] found the similar results. Similar results were also found by Ahmad *et al.*, 2013^[60].

Table 6: Effect of different biofertilizer applications on Chemical properties and Available nutrients status of soil

| Treatments | Mean | | | | | |
|----------------|---------------------|--|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| | Chemical properties | | | Available nutrients | | |
| | pH (1:2) | Electrical conductivity (dSm ⁻¹) | Organic carbon (%) | Available N (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available P (kg ha ⁻¹) | Available K (kg ha ⁻¹) |
| T ₁ | 7.2 | 0.20 | 0.40 | 154 | 17.22 | 92.35 |
| T ₂ | 7.3 | 0.22 | 0.37 | 167 | 20.78 | 89.04 |
| T ₃ | 7.4 | 0.18 | 0.22 | 158 | 27.05 | 78.82 |
| T ₄ | 7.7 | 0.12 | 0.39 | 179 | 18.00 | 105.79 |
| T ₅ | 7.5 | 0.14 | 0.34 | 192 | 26.52 | 122.12 |
| T ₆ | 7.6 | 0.10 | 0.32 | 174 | 16.91 | 79.25 |
| T ₇ | 7.8 | 0.24 | 0.36 | 196 | 27.68 | 105.77 |
| CD (p=0.05) | NS | NS | 0.02 | 1.04 | 0.79 | 1.249 |

Economic Analysis

Gross returns

The maximum gross returns of Rs. 128535 ha⁻¹ is found under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P). The minimum gross return is Rs. 56639 ha⁻¹ under treatment T₁ (Control Plot), because of no application of organic and inorganic fertilizers. Similarly, Singh *et al.*, 2019^[75] found significantly increase of gross returns with combine use of organic and inorganic fertilizers.

Net returns

The treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) produces maximum net returns of Rs.79981 ha⁻¹, but it was at par with the treatment T₆ (Seed

treatment with 220 ml of PSB + 100% N and P), T₄ (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P). The minimum net returns of Rs.27321 ha⁻¹ is found under treatment T₁, because no application of organic and inorganic fertilizers. Similar finding were also found by Tomar *et al.*, 2017^[69] and Singh *et al.*, 2019^[75].

Benefit cost ratio (B:C Ratio)

The maximum benefit cost ratio of 2.64 was found under treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) and minimum benefit cost ratio of 1.93 found under treatment T₁ (Control Plot). Similar observations were also observed by Rachana *et al.*, 2018^[15], Singh S *et al.*, 2018^[79] and Suryavanshi *et al.*, 2017^[71].

Table 7: Effect of different biofertilizer applications on gross returns, net returns, benefit cost ratio of spring maize

| Treatments | Gross Returns (Rs/ha) | Net Returns (Rs/ha) | B:C Ratio |
|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------|
| T ₁ | 56639 | 27321 | 1.93 |
| T ₂ | 85899 | 48166 | 2.27 |
| T ₃ | 87989 | 50657 | 2.36 |
| T ₄ | 112442 | 69382 | 2.61 |
| T ₅ | 99693 | 56093 | 2.54 |
| T ₆ | 119757 | 73675 | 2.59 |
| T ₇ | 128535 | 79981 | 2.64 |

Conclusion

The results obtained from research experiment showed that the maximum performance in growth parameters (plant height, number of leaves per plant, LAI) was observed in treatment T₄ (Seed treatment with 160 ml of PSB + 100% N and P). In terms of grain yield and yield parameters (number of cobs per plant, number of grains per cob, 1000-grain weight, cob length, cob girth, number of grain rows per cob) treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) produces maximum grain yield and yield parameters. The available nutrients status in soil was also increases with the applications of biofertilizer. Therefore, it may be concluded that treatment T₇ (Soil application of 450 g *Azotobacter* + FYM + 100% N and P) produces the most during the *spring* season in Punjab's central plain.

References

- Marnagar E, Dawson J. Effect of biofertilizers, levels of nitrogen and zinc on growth and yield of hybrid maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci.* 2017;6(9):3614-22.
- Erenstein O, Jaleta M, Sonder K, *et al.* Global maize production, consumption and trade: trends and R&D implications. *Food Sec.* 2022;14:1295-1319. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12571-022-01288-7>
- Anonymous. Maize Price Forecasting (Oct-Nov 2022) [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Jun 15]. Available from: http://www.aau.in/sites/default/files/31_maize_pf_post_harvest_2022_eng.pdf
- Anonymous. FAO Cereal Supply and Demand Brief | World Food Situation [Internet]. 2022 [cited 2024 Jun 15]. Available from: <https://www.fao.org/worldfoodsituation/csdb/en/>
- Anonymous. Maize Outlook Report- January To December 2020 [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2024 Jun 15]. Available from: https://angrau.ac.in/downloads/AMIC/OutlookReports/2020/6-MAIZE%20OUTLOOK%20REPORT_January%20to%20December%202020.pdf
- Brar A, Gosal SK, Walia SS. Effect of biofertilizers and farm yard manure on microbial dynamics and soil health in maize (*Zea mays* L.) rhizosphere. *Chem Sci Rev Lett.* 2017;6(23):1524-9.
- Fitriatin BN, Yusuf MIM, Sofyan ET, Nurbaity A. Biofertilizers application to improve growth of maize and soil nutrients. *E3S Web Conf.* 2021;316:03020.
- Meena MD, Tiwari DD, Chaudhari SK, Biswas DR, Narjary B, Meena AL, *et al.* Effect of biofertilizer and nutrient levels on yield and nutrient uptake by maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Ann Agric Bio Res.* 2013;18(2):176-81.
- Singh V, Mithare P. Effect of different levels of phosphorus and biofertilizers (PSB and VAM) on growth and yield of hybrid maize (*Zea mays* L.). *J Pharmacogn Phytochem.* 2018;7(4):1076-80.
- Umesha S, Srikanthiah M, Prasanna KS, Sreeramulu KR, Divya M, Lakshmiopathi RN. Comparative effect of organics and biofertilizers on growth and yield of maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Curr Agri Res J.* 2014;2(1):55-62.
- Naserirad H, Soleymanifard A, Naseri R. Effect of integrated application of bio-fertilizer on grain yield, yield components and associated traits of maize cultivars. *Am Eurasian J Agric Environ Sci.* 2011;10(2):271-7.
- Kouchebagh SB, Mirshekari B, Farahvash F. Improvement of corn yield by seed biofertilization and urea application. *World Appl Sci J.* 2012;16(9):1239-42.
- Purwani J, Nurjaya N. Effectiveness of inorganic fertilizer and biofertilizer application on maize yield and fertilizer use efficiency on Inceptisol from West Java. *J Trop Soils.* 2020;25(1):11-20.
- Naseri R, Moghadam A, Darabi F, Hatami A, Tahmasebei GR. The effect of deficit irrigation and *Azotobacter chroococcum* and *Azospirillum brasilense* on grain yield, yield components of maize (SC 704) as a second cropping in western Iran. *Bull Environ Pharmacol Life Sci.* 2013;2(10):104-12.
- Rina L, Singh V, Dawson J. Effect of row spacing with different levels of phosphorus and biofertilizer on growth and yield of maize (*Zea mays* L.). *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci.* 2020;8(3):1171-3.
- Singh L, Kumar S, Singh K, Singh D. Effect of integrated nutrient management on growth and yield attributes of maize under winter season (*Zea mays* L.). *J Pharmacogn Phytochem.* 2017;6(5):1625-8.
- Ahmad W, Shah Z, Khan F, Ali S, Malik W. Maize yield and soil properties as influenced by integrated use of organic, inorganic and bio-fertilizers in a low fertility soil. *Soil Environ.* 2013;32(2).
- Dalavi VM, Swaroop N, Thomas T, David AA. Effect of NPK levels and micronutrients with and without liquid biofertilizer on physico-chemical properties of soil in maize. *Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci.* 2021;10(02):3214-27. Available from: <https://www.ijcmas.com/10-2-2021/Dalavi%20Vishal%20Manohar.%20et%20al.pdf>
- Tomar SS, Singh A, Dwivedi A, Sharma R, Naresh RK, Kumar V, *et al.* Effect of integrated nutrient management for sustainable production system of maize (*Zea mays* L.) in Indo-Gangetic plain zone of India. *Int J Chem Stud.* 2017;5(2):310-6.
- Suryavanshi P, Sharma M, Singh Y, Mazeed A, Lothe NB. Role of bio-fertilizers in enhancing productivity and profitability of fodder maize-berseem (*Trifolium alexandrinum*) cropping sequence.
- Choudhary M, Verma A, Singh H. Productivity and economics of maize (*Zea mays* L.) as influenced by phosphorus management in southern Rajasthan. *Ann Agric Res New Ser.* 2012;33:88-90.
- Singh KK, Adarsh A, Kumari S, Shahi B, Kumari A. Nutrient management in maize (*Zea mays* L.) through varying NP level and bio-fertilizers. *J AgriSearch.* 2019;6(Special):14-7.
- Singh S, Singh V, Shukla RD, Singh K. Effect of fertilizer levels and bio-fertilizer on green cob yield of corn (*Zea mays* L.). *Int J Chem Stud.* 2018;6(2):2188-90.
- Soleymanifard A, Piri I, Naseri R. The effect of plant growth promoting bacteria on physiological and phenological traits of maize (*Zea mays* L.) at different levels of nitrogen fertilizer. *Bull Environ Pharmacol Life Sci.* 2013;2(9):55-64.
- Latha B, Shivaprakash MK, Devakumar N, Mallikarjuna N. Evaluation and effect of microbial inoculants for production of growth hormones and organic formulations on growth of baby corn (*Zea mays*

- L.) under green house condition. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci. 2018;7(10):2167-2179.
26. Taipodia R, Yubbey D. Application of phosphate solubilizing bacteria and its ecological effect on growth and yield of winter maize (*Zea mays* L.). IOSR J Agric Vet Sci. 2013;4:71-75.
27. Babu SV, Triveni S, Reddy RS, Sathyanarayana J. Persistence of PSB-fungi biofilmed biofertilizer in the soils and its effect on growth and yield of maize. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci. 2017;6(12):1812-1821.