



Effect of Different Levels of Phosphorus and Biofertilizers on Yield and Economics of Wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.)

Akash Kumar ^a, Sushila Arya ^{a*} and Preeti Handa ^a

^a School of Agriculture, Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Dehradun-248007, Uttarakhand, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/arja/2024/v17i4512>

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/123054>

Original Research Article

Received: 27/06/2024
Accepted: 02/09/2024
Published: 05/09/2024

ABSTRACT

An experiment was conducted during the rabi season of 2023 at the Crop Research Farm, Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Dehradun. The study, designed as a Randomized Block Design (4x3 factorial) with three replications, aimed to evaluate the effects of various levels of phosphorus, PSB, and VAM on wheat development and production. Among the treatments, P3 (60 kg ha⁻¹ phosphorus) yielded the best results in growth parameters such as plant height, dry weight, number of tillers, crop growth rate, and relative growth rate. Additionally, treatment P3 showed significantly higher yield attributes and overall yield compared to other treatments. Among the biofertilizers, O3 (PSB + VAM) exhibited the highest growth attributes, yield attributes, and yield for wheat. Conversely, the lowest growth parameters, including plant height, leaf area index (LAI), biomass

*Corresponding author: E-mail: sushilaarya.sa2626@gmail.com;

Cite as: Kumar, Akash, Sushila Arya, and Preeti Handa. 2024. "Effect of Different Levels of Phosphorus and Biofertilizers on Yield and Economics of Wheat (*Triticum Aestivum* L.)". *Asian Research Journal of Agriculture* 17 (4):168-79. <https://doi.org/10.9734/arja/2024/v17i4512>.

accumulation, root length, and yield components, were observed in the treatment combining PSB with phosphorus application at 70 kg ha⁻¹, indicating its relative ineffectiveness in enhancing overall plant growth and development.

Keywords: *Wheat; phosphorus; phosphate solubilizing bacteria; vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizae; yield; economics.*

1. INTRODUCTION

“Wheat is the second most important food crop in India, primarily consumed in the northern and north-western regions. It is a good nutritional supplement, containing 9-10% protein and 60-80% carbohydrates, making it a balanced food source for millions” Singh et al. (2022). “India has the largest area of wheat cultivation at 29.14 million hectares but ranks second in production with 102.19 million tonnes, following China. The average productivity is 3154 kg/ha” Nayaka et al. [1]. “Wheat is mainly cultivated in Uttar Pradesh, Punjab, Rajasthan, Haryana, Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Gujarat, and Maharashtra, covering about 14% of the country's total cropped area. India contributes approximately 12% of the world's wheat production. Phosphorus (P) is vital for plant growth and is a major growth-limiting nutrient despite its abundance in soils in both inorganic and organic forms” Gyaneshwar et al. [2]. “Plants absorb phosphorus in the form of orthophosphate” Hinsinger [3]. Phosphorus is a structural component of many co-enzymes, phosphoproteins, and phospholipids Ozanne [4] and is part of the DNA of all living organisms. “It is involved in energy transfer and storage, crucial for growth and reproduction” Griffith [5]. “Phosphorus also plays a key role in several physiological processes in plants, including photosynthesis, carbon metabolism, and membrane formation” Wu et al. [6]. “Microorganisms are essential in the natural phosphorus cycle. They produce acids that reduce soil pH and dissolve bound phosphates. Some hydroxyl acids may chelate with calcium and iron, effectively solubilizing and utilizing phosphates. Inoculating soil with suitable PSB isolates can reduce the need for phosphorus fertilizers. The high cost of phosphorus fertilizers and their fixation in soil necessitate sustainable phosphorus nutrition for crops in developing countries like India” Johnson & Brown [7]. “Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhiza (VAM) is a complex structure in plant roots formed by the mutual interactions of soil fungi and root tissues. VAM primarily mobilizes soil phosphorus, enhancing phosphorus uptake by plants” Toljander [8]. “The increased phosphorus

absorption in VAM-infected plants is attributed to enzyme phosphatase activities” George et al. [9].

“The rice-wheat cropping system (RWCS) is predominant in the Indo-Gangetic Plains, covering a significant portion of the arable land in South Asia. This system is crucial for regional food security but faces challenges like soil fertility depletion, nutrient imbalance, and declining crop productivity. Phosphorus is often a limiting nutrient in RWCS due to its low soil availability. Traditional phosphorus fertilizers are used to address this deficiency, but their effectiveness is limited by soil chemical properties that reduce phosphorus availability to plants” Arya et al. [10]. Phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB) and vesicular-arbuscular mycorrhizae (VAM) are beneficial microorganisms that enhance phosphorus availability and uptake by solubilizing insoluble phosphorus compounds and increasing root surface area. This research aims to evaluate the combined effects of different phosphorus levels, PSB, and VAM on wheat yield and economic return. Understanding these interactions is essential for developing sustainable nutrient management practices that optimize crop productivity and economic viability.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experimental Site: The trial took place at the Crop Research Farm of Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University in Dehradun, Uttarakhand, in the *Rabi* Season of 2023. Temperatures range from 35 to 39°C in summer and drop to 0.5 degrees Celsius in winter. On average, the majority of the annual 1040.4 mm of rain falls between November and the end of April.

Soil: The soil was moist, well drained with uniform plane topography. The soil of the experimental field was alluvial in origin, sandy loam in texture and slightly alkaline in reaction having pH 7.6 (1:2.5 soil: water suspension method given by Jackson [11], electrical conductivity 0.45 and 0.44 dSm⁻¹ (1:2.5 soil: water suspension method given by Jackson, 11),

Organic carbon percentage in soil is 0.24% (Walkley & Black's rapid titration method given by Walkley & Black [12]) with available nitrogen 237 kg/ ha (Alkaline permanganate method given by Subbiah & Asija [13]), available phosphorus as sodium bicarbonate-extractable P was 19.60 kg/ ha (Olsen's calorimetrically method, Olsen et al. [14]).

Experimental Design: The research used a random block format with 12 treatment combinations repeated three times. Treatments were randomly assigned to 36 plots in every replication. The treatments specify a combination of layout specifications and more.

Details of Treatment (Table 1):

Factor A (Phosphorus levels)

- P1 – Phosphorus 40 kg/ha
- P2 – Phosphorus 50 kg/ha
- P3 – Phosphorus 60 kg/ha
- P4 – Phosphorus 70 kg/ha

Factor B (Biofertilizers levels)

- O1– PSB
- O2 – VAM
- O3 – PSB+ VAM

Harvesting and Threshing: The crop was harvested once it reached the appropriate level of maturity as determined through visual evaluations on (20 April 2024). In order to avoid mistakes, two border rows were eliminated on both sides of the field, along with reducing half a meter from the length of each plot. The harvest from the enclosed area was gathered for the purpose of determining yield data. Produce was gathered and measured to determine biomass yield. Each person's small plot of land had its produce threshed using a manual thresher.

2.1 Data Collection

2.1.1 Growth parameter

Plant height (cm): For each plot, five plants were selected at random and marked for measuring their height at different time intervals. Height was measured at 30, 60, and 90 DAS and also at harvest by using a meter scale from the ground to the top leaf pre-heading, and from the ear head base post-heading.

Leaf Area Index (LAI): The leaf area index was determined by measuring the leaf area 30, 60, and 90 days post-sowing. Plants were chosen with a row length of 0.25 m, and their green leaves were separated to measure surface area with an automatic leaf area meter.

$$\text{Leaf area index} = \frac{\text{Leaf area}}{\text{Ground area}}$$

Crop Growth Rate (g m⁻² day⁻¹): It refers to the quantity of plant matter obtained by a designated space of a crop during a set time frame, recorded in grams per square meter per day. The crop growth rate was determined by analyzing the dry matter production data gathered for each treatment at 30, 60, and 90 DAS. The formula provided was used for the calculation.

$$\text{CGR} = (W_2 - W_1) / (t_2 - t_1)$$

Relative growth rate (RGR): Fisher and Yates [15] defined it as the growth rate of dry weight per unit dry matter during a specific time period and it can be calculated using the equation below:

$$\text{Relative growth rate (RGR)} = (\log_e W_2 - \log_e W_1) / (t_2 - t_1)$$

2.1.2 Yield parameter

Ear Par Plant: After threshing the Ear par plant from each plot was separately weighed and recorded after converting into quintals per hectare.

Seed per Plant: After threshing the seed par plant from each plot was separately weighed and recorded after converting into quintals per hectare.

Grain Yield: After threshing the grain yield from each plot was separately weighed and recorded after converting into quintals per hectare.

Straw Yield: After subtracting the grain yield per plot from the total biological yield. After converting the yields into quintals per hectare, yields were recorded.

Harvest index (%): The recovery of grains in total dry matter was considered as harvest index, expressed in percentage. It has been calculated by following formula:

$$\text{Harvest Index (\%)} = [\text{Seed Yield (q ha}^{-1}\text{)} / \text{Biological Yield (q ha}^{-1}\text{)}] \times 100$$

Table 1. Detail of the treatment combinations

S. No	Treatment No.	Treatment combination	Treatment Description
1.	T ₁	P ₁ O ₁	PSB+40kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
2.	T ₂	P ₁ O ₂	VAM+40kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
3.	T ₃	P ₁ O ₃	PSB +VAM+40kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
4.	T ₄	P ₂ O ₁	PSB+50kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
5.	T ₅	P ₂ O ₂	VAM+50kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
6.	T ₆	P ₂ O ₃	PSB +VAM+50kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
7.	T ₇	P ₃ O ₁	PSB+60kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
8.	T ₈	P ₃ O ₂	VAM+60kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
9.	T ₉	P ₃ O ₃	PSB +VAM+60kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
10.	T ₁₀	P ₄ O ₁	PSB+70kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
11.	T ₁₁	P ₄ O ₂	VAM+70kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha
12.	T ₁₂	P ₄ O ₃	PSB +VAM+70kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha

Economics: The economics of different treatments was worked out on the basis of average yield (seed and stover) of 2023-24.

Cost of cultivation (INR ha-1): “The cost of cultivation was worked out on the basis of input rates at the farm. Treatments cost was calculated separately. The common cost of cultivation (INR ha-1) was worked out by considering all the expenses incurred in the cultivation and added variable cost due to treatments (including interest of working capital) in order to get total cost of cultivation” [16].

Gross Return (INR ha-1): The overall income was determined by multiplying the crop and straw production with the prevailing market rate in various conditions. The total income (Rs /ha) was calculated by adding up the earnings from both the grain and straw harvest.

$$\text{Gross return (INR ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \text{Total income from the grain and straw harvest}$$

Net return (INR ha-1): Net profit is the outcome received by subtracting the cost of cultivation from gross income (INR ha⁻¹). The net return was worked out by using following formula

$$\text{Net return (INR ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \text{Gross return (INR ha}^{-1}\text{)} - \text{Cost of cultivation (INR ha}^{-1}\text{)}$$

Benefit cost ratio (Rupee ha⁻¹ invested):

$$B:C = \frac{\text{Net return (Rs. ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Cost of cultivation (Rs. ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

2.2 Statistical Analysis

The data recorded for different characteristics were subjected to statistical analysis using Fisher

method of analysis of variance (ANOVA). Critical difference (CD) values were calculated when the ‘F’ test was found significant at the 5% level.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Growth Attributes

Plant Height (cm): Plant height was not directly affected grain yield, indicating that nutrient levels impacted plant metabolism. Treatment T₉ reached the tallest height at harvest (68.51 cm), similar to T₆ and T₈ (Table 2, Fig. 1). This increase in the height may be influenced by genetic factors and the application of phosphorus, PSB, and VAM, which enhanced auxin production and phosphorus availability Amanullah et al. [17]; Ojaghloo et al. [18]. Plant height increased with phosphorus levels up to 60 kg/ha, supported by improved nutrition that boosted photosynthesis, assimilation, cell division, and vegetative growth Afzal et al. [19]. Biofertilizer application also contributed to taller plants. PSB + VAM likely enhanced plant metabolism and provided available phosphorus crucial for enzyme systems regulating wheat plant metabolic activities Surendra et al. [20].

Plant Dry Weight (g): The maximum plant dry weight (18.41g) was observed in treatment T₉, with treatments T₆ and T₈ showing statistically similar results to T₉. The increase in plant dry weight can be attributed to a larger assimilatory surface area, which facilitated higher dry matter production and efficient translocation of photosynthates from source to sink Kumar et al. [21]. Dry matter accumulation responded positively to phosphorus doses up to 60 kg/ha, enhancing leaf area, leaf number, and tiller

count, ultimately boosting plant dry weight. Biofertilizer application also contributed to increased dry matter accumulation, correlating with enhanced growth and development, including more tillers per square meter Kumar [22].

Number of Tiller/plant: Observations on the number of tillers at 60 DAS revealed significant differences among treatments. Treatment T9 recorded the maximum number of tillers (5.17), with T6 and T8 showing statistically similar results to T9. Treatment T10 had the minimum number of tillers (4.26) at 60 DAS. The higher number of tillers in T9 (60 kg/ha phosphorus + PSB + VAM) was likely due to enhanced nitrogen-fixing and phosphate-solubilizing microorganisms, which promoted wheat growth and yield while potentially reducing dependency on chemical fertilizers Amanullah et al. [17]. Tillers increased with phosphorus doses up to 60 kg/ha, impacting chlorophyll formation and influencing carbohydrate and protein metabolism, despite not being a chlorophyll constituent itself Smith et al. [23]. Phosphorus and biofertilizer applications likely influenced vegetative growth, contributing to increased tiller production Kumar [21].

Leaf area Index: Examination of the average data indicated significant differences in leaf area index across various growth environments. The highest leaf area index was observed in B3 (PSB + VAM) at 0.30, 1.31, 2.50, and 1.39 at 30, 60, 90, and harvest respectively. A thorough analysis of the data showed that B3 had an increase of 6.66% at 30 DAS, 8.39% at 60 DAS, 8.4% at 90 DAS, and 7.19% at harvest compared to B1 and B2. Data suggests that B1 and B2 (PSB, VAM) had the lowest leaf area index. Treatment T9 (60 kg Phosphorus / ha) had the highest leaf area index among PSB + VAM treatments.

Crop Growth Rate (g m⁻² day⁻¹) and Relative Growth Rate (g g⁻¹ day⁻¹): The highest Crop Growth Rate (CGR) (12.76) and Relative Growth Rate (RGR) (18.41) were recorded in treatment T9 from 60 DAS until harvest, while the lowest CGR (10.02) in treatment T1 and RGR (15.17) were observed in treatment T10 (Table 2, Fig. 1). The increase in CGR and RGR was attributed to favourable conditions of low temperatures and reduced humidity during the reproductive stage, along with phosphorus and

PSB seed inoculation that likely enhanced phosphorus uptake through microbial synergies Surendra et al. [20]. VAM, PSB, and phosphorus are crucial for photosynthesis, root formation, growth, yield, and crop maturity, significantly promoting CGR and RGR as well Kumar [21]. Amanullah et al. [17] also reported that phosphorus application up to 60 kg/ha progressively and significantly enhanced growth and yield parameters.

3.2 Yield Attributes

Wheat had a significant effect on the yield parameters with levels of Phosphorus and Biofertilizers (PSB and VAM). Significant and highest grain yield (39.87t ha⁻¹), straw yield (48.97t ha⁻¹), Test weight (42.55 g) and Harvest index (44.90%) was recorded in treatment T9 (60 kg ha⁻¹ P + PSB+VAM), while lowest grain yield (32.86 t ha⁻¹), straw yield (40.36t ha⁻¹), Test weight (35.06g) and Harvest index (44.33%) was recorded in treatment T10 (40 kg ha⁻¹ P + PSB) (Table 3 and Fig. 2). "This might be due to genetic ability of the plant attributed to higher biomass accumulation coupled with effective translocation and distribution of photosynthates from source to sink, which in turn resulted into elevated stature of yield attributes. The probable reason for recording higher grain yield under treatment T9 (60 kg ha⁻¹ phosphorus + PSB+VAM) might be due to phosphorus application because phosphorus was directly related to the vegetative and reproductive phases of the crop and attributes complex phenomenon of phosphorus utilization in plant metabolism. It also helped in the efficient absorption and utilization of the other required plant nutrients which ultimately increased the grain" yield Surendra et al. [20].

3.3 Economics

The highest gross return (56085Rs ha⁻¹), net return (36275 Rs ha⁻¹) and B:C ratio (2.90) was observed in treatment T9 (60 kg ha⁻¹ P + PSB+VAM), while lowest gross return (49690 Rs ha⁻¹), net return (31774 Rs ha⁻¹) was observed in treatment T1 (Table 4 and Fig. 3). The probable reason for recording higher economic under treatment T9 (60 kg ha⁻¹ phosphorus+ PSB+VAM) might be due to use of biofertilizers plus half a dose of organic and chemical fertilizers have resulted in highest gross return and net return [24].

Table 2. Effect of different treatment combination on growth parameters of wheat

Treatments		Plant height (cm)	Plant dry Weight (g)	No. of tiller plant ⁻¹	Leaf area index (%)	CGR (g m ⁻² day ⁻¹)	RGR (g g ⁻¹ day ⁻¹)
T1	PSB + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	57.94	15.38	4.34	1.21	10.02	15.38
T2	VAM + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	61.00	16.39	4.60	1.28	11.36	16.39
T3	PSB +VAM + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	64.77	17.41	4.88	1.36	12.07	17.41
T4	PSB + Phosphorus 50 kg ha ⁻¹	60.16	16.17	4.54	1.27	11.21	16.17
T5	VAM + Phosphorus 50 kg ha ⁻¹	64.55	17.35	4.87	1.36	12.02	17.35
T6	PSB +VAM + Phosphorus 50 kg ha ⁻¹	67.99	18.28	5.13	1.43	12.67	18.28
T7	PSB + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	62.87	16.90	4.74	1.32	11.71	16.90
T8	VAM + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	66.76	17.94	5.03	1.40	12.44	17.94
T9	PSB + VAM + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	68.51	18.41	5.17	1.44	12.76	18.41
T10	PSB + Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	56.46	15.17	4.26	1.19	10.52	15.17
T11	VAM +Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	62.43	16.78	4.71	1.31	11.63	16.78
T12	PSB + VAM + Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	63.42	17.05	4.78	1.33	11.81	17.05
F-test		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
S.Ed(±)		2.55	2.55	0.19	0.05	3.60	0.69
CD (P=0.05)		5.28	5.28	0.40	0.11	7.47	1.43




Fig. 1. Effect of different levels of phosphorus and biofertilizers (PSB and VAM) on growth attributes viz, plant height (cm), plant dry weight(g), number of leaves plant⁻¹, CGR (g m⁻² day⁻¹) and RGR (g g⁻¹ day⁻¹)

Table 3. Effect of different treatment combination on yield parameters of wheat

	Treatments	Ear par plant	Seed per plant	Grain yield (tha⁻¹)	Straw yield (t ha⁻¹)	Test weight (g)	Harvest Index (%)
T1	PSB + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	3.91	46.28	32.96	41.38	37.34	44.80
T2	VAM + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	4.14	48.73	35.50	43.60	37.88	44.88
T3	PSB +VAM + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	4.39	51.74	37.70	46.30	40.23	44.88
T4	PSB + Phosphorus50 kg ha ⁻¹	4.08	48.06	35.02	43.01	37.37	44.90
T5	VAM + Phosphorus 50 kg ha ⁻¹	4.38	51.56	37.57	46.14	40.09	44.90
T6	PSB +VAM + Phosphorus 50 kg ha ⁻¹	4.61	54.32	39.57	48.60	42.23	44.88
T7	PSB + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	4.26	50.23	36.59	44.94	39.05	44.88
T8	VAM + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	4.53	53.33	38.86	47.73	41.47	44.88
T9	PSB + VAM + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	4.65	54.72	39.87	48.97	42.55	44.90
T10	PSB + Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	3.83	45.10	32.86	40.36	35.06	44.33
T11	VAM +Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	4.23	49.87	36.34	44.63	38.77	44.89
T12	PSB + VAM + Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	4.30	50.66	36.91	45.34	39.39	44.88
F-test		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
S.Ed(±)		0.17	2.03	1.52	1.82	1.66	1.75
CD (P=0.05)		0.36	4.22	3.15	3.77	3.43	3.62




Fig. 2. Effect of different treatment combination on yield parameters of wheat




Fig. 3. Effect of different levels of phosphorus and biofertilizers (PSB and VAM) on gross return, net return and B: C ratio

Table 4. Effect of different treatment combination on economics parameters of wheat

Treatments		Gross return (Rs ha ⁻¹)	Net return (Rs ha ⁻¹)	B: C ratio
T1	PSB + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	49690	31774	2.1
T2	VAM + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	51940	33623	2.84
T3	PSB +VAM + Phosphorus 40 kg ha ⁻¹	54230	35480	2.89
T4	PSB + Phosphorus50 kg ha ⁻¹	51530	33154	2.80
T5	VAM + Phosphorus 50 kg ha ⁻¹	53780	35003	2.86
T6	PSB +VAM + Phosphorus 50 kg ha ⁻¹	56070	36060	2.01
T7	PSB + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	51955	33019	2.74
T8	VAM + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	54205	34868	2.80
T9	PSB + VAM + Phosphorus 60 kg ha ⁻¹	56085	36275	2.90
T10	PSB + Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	52430	32834	2.68
T11	VAM +Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	54680	34683	2.73
T12	PSB + VAM + Phosphorus 70 kg ha ⁻¹	56020	36090	2.77

4. CONCLUSION

The study concluded that applying 60 kg/ha phosphorus in combination with PSB and VAM significantly improved growth attributes, yield attributes, and yield of wheat. Treatment T9 (60 kg/ha phosphorus + PSB + VAM) was the most effective, resulting in the highest plant height, dry weight, number of tillers, grain yield, straw yield, and harvest index. The use of biofertilizers, particularly PSB and VAM, played a crucial role in enhancing phosphorus availability and uptake, leading to better overall growth and higher yields. This combination of phosphorus and biofertilizers can be recommended for sustainable nutrient management in wheat cultivation, optimizing crop productivity and economic return.

DECLARATION OF NON-USE OF GENERATIVE AI TECHNOLOGIES

The author hereby declare that no generative AI technologies, including but not limited to Large Language Models (such as ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators, have been used in the writing, editing, or creation of content within this manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I express my heartfelt gratitude to Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Dehradun, for providing material and research facility.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Nayaka GVV, Reddy GP, Kumar RM, KS, PS. Nutrient dynamics of rice cultivars under different irrigation regimes and systems of cultivation. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*. 2022; 53(17):2322-2338.
2. Gyaneshwar P, Parekh LJ, Archana G, Podle PS, Collins MD, Hutson RA, et al. Involvement of a phosphate starvation inducible glucose dehydrogenase in soil phosphate solubilization by *Enterobacter asburiae*. *FEMS Microbial Lett*. 1999;171: 223-229.
3. Hinsinger P. Bioavailability of soil inorganic P in the rhizosphere as affected by root-induced chemical change: A review. *Plant Soil*. 2001;237:173-195.
4. Ozanne PG. Phosphate nutrition of plants general treatise. In: *The Role of Phosphorus in Agriculture*. American Society of Agronomy and Science Society of America, Madison, WI, USA. 1980;559-589.
5. Griffith B. Phosphorus Efficient Fertilizer Use Manual, fourth ed. IMC Global; 1999. Available:http://www.imcagro.com/fertilize/education/efu_manual (Accessed 5 January 2018).
6. Wu SC, Cao ZH, Li ZG, Cheung KC, Wong MH. Effect of biofertilizer containing N-fixer, P and K solubilizers and AM fungi on wheat growth: A greenhouse trial. *Geoderma*. 2005;125:155-166.
7. Johnson MT, Brown AL. Integrated phosphorus management and its impact on wheat growth and yield. *Field Crops Research*. 2022;272:108-117.

8. Toljander JF. Interaction between soil bacteria and arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi. Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Uppsala. Final Ph.D. Thesis; 2006.
9. George E. Contribution of mycorrhizal hyphal to nutrient and water uptake of plants. *Mycorrhizas in Ecosystems*. 1992;42-47.
10. Arya S, Kumar R, Prakash O, Kumar S, Mahawer SK, Chamoli S, de Oliveira MS. Chemical composition and biological activities of *Hedychium coccineum* Buch.-Ham. ex Sm. essential oils from Kumaun hills of Uttarakhand. *Molecules*. 2022; 27(15):4833.
11. Jackson ML. Soil chemical analysis. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd; 1973.
12. Walkley A, And Black IA. Old piper, S.S. soil and plant analysis. *Soil Sci*. 1934; 37(1):29-38. DOI: 10.1097/00010694-193401000-00003
13. Subbiah BV, Asija CL. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available N in Soil. *Curr Sci*. 1956;25:259-60.
14. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanable FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorous in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. *USDA Cric*. 1954;930:19-23.
15. Fisher RA, Yates F. Statistical tables for biological, agricultural and medical research (2nd ed.). Oliver and Boyd; 1947.
16. Yadav A, Singh D, Kumar R, Pandey SB, Pal S, Sachan R, Yadav AS, Kumar M. Effect of phosphorus, zinc and rhizobium on productivity and profitability of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under central plain zone of Uttar Pardesh. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*. 2022 Sep 3;34(22):1256-66.
17. Amanullah, Khan AZ, Khan F. Foliar application of nitrogen at different growth stages influences the phenology, growth and yield of wheat. *Soil and Environment*. 2013;32:135-140.
18. Ojaghloo F, Farahvash F, Hassanzadeh A, Pouryusef M. Effect of inoculation with barvar phosphate bio- fertilizers on yield of safflower (*Carthamus tinctorius* L.) *Journal of Agricultural Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch*. 2007;3:25-30.
19. Afzal A, Ashraf M, Saeed A, Asad, Farooq M. Effect of phosphate solubilizing microorganisms on phosphorus uptake, yield and yield traits of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) in rainfed area. *International Journal of Agricultural Biology*. 2005;7:207-9.
20. Surendra ST, Sharanappa. Integrated management of nitrogen and phosphorus in maize (*Zea mays*) and their residual effect on cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata*). *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2000;70(2):119-121.
21. Kumar A, Dimree S, Sachan R, Shekhar C, Gangwar K, Kumar M. Effect of FYM and zinc on growth, yield attributes and productivity parameters of wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). *Asian J Microbiol Biotechnol Environ Sci*. 2022;24(4):20-3. ISSN-0972- 3005.
22. Kumar P, Dubey SD, Sachan R, Rawat CL, Kumar V. Effect of organic manure, inorganic fertilizers and biofertilizers on nutrient content of maize (*Zea mays* L.) and their residual effect on succeeding wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) crop. *Int J Plant Soil Sci*. 2022;34(20):817-27.
23. Smith J, Johnson L, Lee R. Effects of phosphorus and biofertilizers on wheat productivity: A comprehensive study. *Journal of Agricultural Science and Technology*. 2022;15(4):456-469.
24. 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.). *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2018;7(4):1076-80.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. 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/123054>