International Journal of Chemical Studies

P-ISSN: 2349–8528
E-ISSN: 2321–4902
IJCS 2018; 6(4): 2798-2803

Received: 18-05-2018
Accepted: 27-06-2018

Raghvendra Singh
Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Prabhat Singh
Department of Soil Science & Agricultural Chemistry, Sardar Vallabhbhai Patel University of Agriculture and Technology, Meerut, Uttar Pradesh, India

Vipul Singh
Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

RA Yadav
Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Correspondence
Raghvendra Singh
Department of Agronomy, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Faizabad, Uttar Pradesh, India

Effect of phosphorus and PSB on growth parameters, yield, quality and economics of summer greengram (*Vigna radiata* L.)

Raghvendra Singh, Prabhat Singh, Vipul Singh and RA Yadav

Abstract
A field experiment was conducted at Agronomy Research Farm of Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Kumarganj, Faizabad (Uttar Pradesh) during the *zaid* season of 2016. The experiment comprised of nine treatments *viz.* T_1 : Control, T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$,T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$,T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$,T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$,T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB,T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB,T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB,T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB tested in Randomized Block Design and replication three times. The basic information, on the physico-chemical properties of the soil indicated that the soil of the experimental field was classified as silty loam which was low in organic carbon, nitrogen and phosphorus and medium in potassium. The crop recorded normal recommended cultural practices and plant protection measures. Results revealed that all the growth, yield attributes and quality increased significantly under the integrated treatment (80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB). The growth characters *viz.,* plant height, leaf area index, dry matter accumulation and number of branches plant^{-1} and yield attributes like number of pod plant^{-1}, number of grain pod^{1}, 1000 - seed weight (g), biological yield, seed yield, stover yield (q ha^{-1}), harvest index (%) and NPK uptake of mung crop. On the basis of economics of different treatment, the maximum gross returns (Rs. 72371.00 ha^{-1}), net returns (Rs. 50873.00 ha^{-1}) and B: C ratio (2.37) was recorded under treatment (P + PSB) for mung crop.

Keywords: Effect of phosphorus, PSB, growth parameters, economics of summer

Introduction

Pulse crops are important source of dietary and calories in food and feed products throughout the world. The production of pulses is not sufficient to ensure per capita per day availability of 80 g, which is the minimum requirement recommended by the World Health Organization (WHO) and FAO. In fact, the availability of pulses declined from >70g in mid- fifties to >35g in 1990's (Singh, 1994).

Pulses are important in agriculture system because their multiple role in dry farming which is well recognized, due to its availability to tap moisture from deeper layers of the soil by virtue of deep penetrating root system. The crop also possess unique quality of fixing atmospheric nitrogen with the help of symbiotic bacteria (Rhizobia) present in their root nodules. The fact that Pulses not only provide high nutritive value to our food and rich feed for cattle but also in some parts of the word (Middle East and West America) due to its religious preference and discourage meat production and consumption. The pulses makes diet balanced by supplying minerals and vitamins besides providing proteins as well as an abundance of food energy (Sajatia, 1997).

In our country the major area of pulses are under rainfed conditions. So that the production figures are often fluctuating because of changing environment. For example the production of pulses increased from 8.4 million tonnes in 1950-51 to 12.7 million tonnes in next decade but it dropped again to only 10.9 million in 1987-88. The production has exceeded 13 million tonnes after 1988 and productivity has increased over 10 % as compared to previous year. Annual production with an average yield of 576 kg ha^{-1} of pulses in India was 14.5 million tonnes and has the distinction of being world's largest producer of grain legumes.

It has been estimated that the Indian demand of total pulses would be around 30.3 MT by 2020 AD on the basis of food characteristics demand system, the demand projections for pulses for the years 2005 and 2010 are 20.0 and to 23.3 Mt, respectively (Chaturvedi and Ali. 2002).

Mungbean or greengram (*Vigna radiata L.*) is one of the important edible pulse crop. It belongs to family Papilionacea.

It is the third important pulse crop cultivated throughout India (after chickpea and pigeon pea) for its multipurpose uses as vegetable, pulse, fodder and green manure crop. It contains protein, carbohydrates fat and fibres in the range of 21-25%, 60-65%, 1-1.5% and 3.5-4.5% respectively. Its seed is more palatable, nutritive, digestible and non-flatulent than other pulses grownin country. It occupies as good position due to its high seed protein content and ability to store the soil fertility through symbiotic nitrogen fixation.

Among Pulses Mungbean (*Vigna radiata* (L.) Wilczek) is one of the most important crop in India as it is grown both in summer, as well as rainy season. In India mungbean is grown on 3.38 m ha with an average productivity of 474 kg ha^{-1} (Anonymous, 2001). In Uttar Pradesh mungbean is grown on 25.9 thousand ha with a productivity of 659 kg ha^{-1} (Anonymous 2014). The average yield of mungbean is quite low.

Mungbean grown in summer season gives better yield than grown in rainy season, as summer crop is almost free from infestation of insects, pest and diseases. Still productivity of summer mungbean is low for due to major constraint of nutrient availability.

Phosphorus helps in better nodulation and efficient functioning of nodule bacteria for fixation of N to be utilized by plants during grain- development stage, which in turn led to increase in green yield.

Plants acquire phosphorus from soil solution as phosphate and anion. It is the least mobile element in plant and soil contrary to other macronutrients. It precipitates in soil as orthophosphate or is adsorbed by Fe and AI oxides through legend exchange. Phosphorus solubilizing bacteria play important role in phosphorus nutrition by enhancing its availability to plants through release from inorganic and organic soil P pools by solubilization and mineralization. Principle mechanism in soil for mineral phosphate solubilization is lowering of soil pH by microbial production of organic acids and mineralization of organic Phosphorus by acid phosphatases. Use of phosphorus solubilizing bacteria as inoculants increases phosphorus uptake. These bacteria also increase prospects of using phosphatic rocks in crop production. Greater efficiency of phosphorus solubilizing bacteria has been shown through co-inoculation with other beneficial bacteria and mycorrhiza (Khan *et al*., 2009).

PSB inoculation: some heterotrophic bacteria and fungi have the ability to solubilizing inorganic phosphorus from insoluble sources, such as, tricalcium phosphate, ferric,aluminium and magnesium phosphate, rock phosphate and bone meal. Important phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB) are: *Pseudomonas striata, Bacillus polimixa, Aspergillusawamori*, *Penicilliumdigitatum*etc. Inoculation of seeds or seedlings with microphosbiofertilizers can provide 30 kg P_2O_5 per hectare equivalent of phosphorus applied at superphosphate (Gaur, 1990).

Keeping facts in view the present study entitled "Effect of phosphorus and PSB on growth, yield and quality of summer greengram (*Vigna radiata* L.)" will be under taken with the following objectives:

1. To study the effect of phosphorous, PSB on growth and yield of summer greengram.
2. To study the effect of phosphorous and PSB on quality of summer greengram.
3. To study the economics of various treatments.

Materials and Methods

The field experiment was conducted at Agronomy Research Farm, Narendra Deva University of Agriculture and Technology, Narendra Nagar (Kumarganj) Faizabad (U.P.) during *Zaid* season of 2016. The experimental sites falls under sub-tropical zone in Indo-gangetic plains and lies between 26.47º North latitude, 82.12º East longitudes, at an altitude of about 113.0 meter from mean sea level. The soil of experimental field was low in available nitrogen (210 kg/ha) and organic carbon (0.42%), medium inavailable phosphorus (11.71 kg/ha) and high in potassium (216.80 kg/ha). The reaction of the soil was slightly alkaline. The total rainfall during course of experimentation was 12.10 mm in the month of May 2016. During the crop season, the maximum temperature was recorded 41.6^0C in the month of April 2016 while lowest minimum temperature was recorded 14.1^0C in the month of March 2016. The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with four phosphorus levels (20 kg P ha^{-1}, 40 kg P ha^{-1}, 60 kg P ha^{-1} and 80 kg P ha^{-1}). After receiving a pre-sowing irrigation the field was ploughed once with tractor drawn soil turning plough followed by subsequent two harrowing by cultivator. The fine seed bed was prepared by harrowing followed by planking. A uniform dose of 20 kg N and 40 kg K_2O h^{-1} in the form of urea and murate of potash along with Single super phosphate as per treatment was applied just before sowing in furrow 5 cm below seed. The greengram variety Narendra Mung -1 was sown using seed rate 25 kg ha^{-1} behind desi plough in furrow-spaced at 30cm on 10 March 2016. To have uniform plant population the thinning was done after complete germination (15DAS) to maintain the plant to plant distance of 8-10 cm. Three irrigations including pre sowing irrigation were applied as per need of the crop. Two weedings were done after 25 and 45 days after sowing by mannual. After making net plot harvesting was done manually when the plants turned yellowish brown in colour. The weight of total biological produce of each net plot was recorded after sun drying before threshing. The threshing was done by wooden sticks. The cleaned seed weight of each net plot was recorded. To obtain straw yield the grain yield was subtracted from the total biological yield.

Result and Discussion

Growth Characters

Plant height (cm), Number of primary and secondary branches plant^{-1} and Number of leaves plant^{-1}

Plant height, number of primary & secondry branches plant^{-1} and number of leaves plant^{-1} increased significantly with increasing levels of phosphorus upto 80kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}+PSB. This increase might be due to the role of phosphorus in the plant activities of growing plant. PSB also play important role in nutrient availability to plant for various metabolic process. The phosphate being the constituent of energy bond compound as well as constituent of RNA and DNA, regulates cell multiplication and elongation. Increase in various growth parameters due to applying phosphorus with PSB inoculation in Mungbean was also reported by several workers Singh *et al.* (2008) [40], Kumar *et al.* (2003) & Mir *et al.* (2009) [23].

Number of nodules plant^{-1}

Number of nodules plant^{-1} increased significantly with phosphorus application upto 80 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1} with PSB at all the growth stages. However the differences between two consecutive level were not significant. This might be due to the application of phosphorus + PSB resulted growth of roots which ultimately resulted formulation of nodule in greater number and size. These results are in conformity with these observed by Ram and Dixit (2000) [32] and Mishra (2003) [24].

Dry Matter Accumulation

Dry matter accumulation was increased with the increase in the dose of phosphorus upto 60 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1} beyond which the differences were not significant at all the growth stages. This might be due to the fact that phosphorus being a energy bound compound which have great importance in the transformation of energy required in cell division, conversion of ADP to ATP, activation of amino acids for synthesis of protein and carbohydrate metabolism. The reason stated above are responsible for increase in plant height, number of branches, number of leaves $plant^{-1}$ which ultimately increased dry matter production. Increase in dry matter production with increasing levels of P_2O_5upto 60-80 kg ha^{-1} has been also reported by Patro and Sahoo (1994) [29], Bhattacharya and Pal (2001) and Prakash *et al*. (2002) [30].

Yield

Grain yield and straw yield (q ha^{-1})

Application of phosphorus increased grain and straw yield significantly upo 60 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1} though the maximum yields were obtained with 80 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}. Application of 80 kg P_2O_5 increased the grain yield by 12.25 over control. The increase in grain yield with P_2O_5application was due to (i) increase in source capacity viz., plant height, leaves $plant^{-1}$, branches plant $^{-1}$ and dry matter accumulation as well as sink capacity viz., pods $plant^{-1}$, grain number and size $plant^{-1}$ (ii) better utilization of photosynthate towards sink. Increase in translocation might have happened due to increase in potassium and phosphorus uptake which are responsible for quick and easy translocation of the photosynthates from source to sink.

Harvest Index

Increase in harvest index with phosphorus application is the indication of better translocation of photosynthates from source to sink. These results are in conformity with the findings of Pandey& Singh (2001) [38], Khan *et al*. (2004) also reported increased biological yield of Mungbean with increasing level of P. Various treatments did not reflect the harvest index (HI) significantly although it increased with increasing level of phosphorus alone as well as Similar results in their experiments.

Quality

Protien Content

The protein content increased significantly with increasing doses of phosphorus upto 80 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}. Increase in protein content with increasing doses of phosphorus. These results are in conformity with those observed by Shahi (2002) [34] and Singh (2004) [46].

Nutrient Uptake

Uptake of nutreints followed the patterns of dry matter production as the nutrient content was not influenced by phosphours levels. Application of phosphorus accelerated the uptake of nutrients (N, P and K) significantly and higher values were recorded with highest levels of phosphorus 80 kg ha^{-1} followed by 60 kg ha^{-1}. It may be ascribed to (i) vigorous root growth which helped in more nutrient absorption (ii) to profuse shoot growth ie. Higher dry matter production. The results arein agreement with those of Singh *et al.* 2008 [40]. Shahi *et al.* 2003.

Economics

The cost of cultivation, gross return and net return increased with increase in each level of phosphorus. Application of 80 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1} + PSB recorded highest gross income of Rs. 72371 and net return of Rs. 50873. The net return Re^{-1} investment (B:C) increased uto 80 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1} + PSB recoding highest values of Rs. 2.37. This was attributed to greater increase in grain and straw yield as compared to cost of cultivation with increasing levels of phosphorus. These results are in conformity with those observed by Mitra*et al.* (2006) who reported increased benefit cost ration and net income with increasing levels of phosphorus.

Table 1: Plant height (cm) as affected by the phosphorus and PSB

Treatments	Plant height (cm)			
	20 DAS	40 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest
T_1 : Control	10.20	18.80	25.40	30.80
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	12.10	23.20	32.80	36.20
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	12.50	27.30	37.12	38.0
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	13.00	27.20	40.15	42.90
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	14.20	31.88	41.50	44.50
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	12.40	25.20	38.50	41.90
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	13.20	30.90	41.10	44.50
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	13.70	34.58	43.60	47.10
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	14.65	36.75	45.40	49.70
SEm±	0.47	1.06	1.18	1.02
C.D. at 5%	1.41	3.15	3.51	3.07

Table 2: Number of primary and secondary branches plant $^{-1}$as affected by the phosphorus and PSB

Treatments	Primary branch				Secondary branch			
	20 DAS	40 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest	20 DAS	40 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest
T_1 : Control	1.21	2.3	3.30	3.30	1.10	3.79	4.80	5.25
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	1.49	3.2	4.20	4.20	1.26	4.32	5.66	6.04
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	1.55	3.9	4.90	4.90	1.38	4.72	6.20	6.58
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	1.76	4.2	5.20	5.20	1.42	4.90	6.55	6.90
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	1.70	4.7	5.70	5.70	1.28	4.38	5.48	6.96
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	1.89	4.1	5.10	5.10	1.25	4.80	6.35	6.11
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	1.95	4.8	5.80	5.80	1.38	5.42	7.25	7.59
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	1.92	5.2	6.20	6.20	1.55	4.55	6.03	7.15

T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	1.98	5.4	6.40	6.40	1.33	5.22	6.78	7.92
SEm±	0.6	0.08	0.14	0.14	0.05	0.07	0.16	0.31
C.D. at 5%	0.18	0.24	0.39	0.39	0.15	0.19	0.46	0.90

Table 3: Number of nodules plant $^{-1}$ as influenced by the phosphorus and PSB

Treatments	Number of nodules per plant	
	40 DAS	60 DAS
T_1 : Control	10.72	38.71
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	12.7	39.12
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	14.3	39.23
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	15.1	39.81
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	15.6	40.62
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	14.45	40.92
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	15.3	42.30
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	15.8	43.60
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	16.5	44.82
SEm±	0.93	0.39
C.D. at 5%	2.76	1.19

Table 4: Dry matter accumulation plant $^{-1}$ as affected by the phosphorus and PSB

Treatments	Dry matter accumulation			
	20 DAS	40 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest
T_1 : Control	0.85	2.35	3.00	5.91
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	1.04	3.2	4.1	7.13
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	1.22	3.78	4.9	7.96
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	1.38	4.45	5.75	8.44
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	1.45	4.8	6.25	7.66
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	1.10	4.28	5.55	7.74
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	1.16	4.75	6.15	8.77
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	1.44	5.2	6.8	9.55
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	1.54	6.5	7.2	9.90
SEm±	0.04	0.23	0.42	0.37
C.D. at 5%	0.12	0.68	1.25	1.08

Table 5: Number of Leaves plant $^{-1}$as affected by the phosphorus and PSB

Treatments	Number of Leaves			
	20 DAS	40 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest
T_1 : Control	7.15	8.19	10.65	9.18
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	7.40	8.25	10.70	9.22
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	8.10	8.35	10.76	9.30
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	8.30	8.45	10.88	9.36
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	8.60	8.53	10.90	9.40
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	8.72	8.30	10.78	9.27
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	8.75	8.45	10.85	9.33
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	8.76	8.55	10.92	9.40
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	8.82	9.10	11.00	10.20
SEm±	0.05	0.08	0.23	0.12
C.D. at 5%	0.17	0.24	0.67	0.34

Table 6: Leaf area index as affected by the phosphorus and PSB

Treatments	Leaf area index			
	20 DAS	40 DAS	60 DAS	At harvest
T_1 : Control	0.46	1.35	2.45	2.40
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	0.52	1.38	2.60	2.42
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	0.55	1.45	2.62	2.48
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	0.56	1.53	2.70	2.54
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	0.60	1.58	2.74	2.60
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	0.62	1.44	2.80	2.45
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	0.64	1.48	2.90	2.50
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	0.60	1.55	2.92	2.56
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	0.70	1.66	2.96	2.63
SEm±	0.019	0.05	0.05	0.03
C.D. at 5%	0.057	0.15	0.17	0.11

Table 7: Grain yield (q/ha), Straw yield (q/ha) and harvest index as influenced by the phosphorus and PSB.

Treatments	Grain yield (q/ha)	Straw yield (q/ha)	Harvest index
T_1 : Control	4.65	11.25	29.24
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	6.75	15.55	30.30
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	8.45	19.15	30.61
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	10.37	23.45	30.70
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	11.60	25.86	30.96
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	7.93	17.57	30.35
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	9.45	21.26	30.77
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	11.78	26.45	30.81
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	12.25	27.36	30.92
SEm±	0.35	1.06	1.23
C.D. at 5%	1.05	3.19	3.68

Table 8: Protein Content as influenced by the phosphorus and PSB.

Treatments	Protein content
T_1 : Control	19.18
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	21.56
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	22.25
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	22.37
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	22.56
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	21.8
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	22.86
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	23.31
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	23.43
SEm±	0.02
C.D. at 5%	0.07

Table 9: NPK uptake in grain and straw as influenced by the phosphorus and PSB.

Treatments	Nitrogen			Phosphorus			Potassium		
	N up in grain	N up in straw	Total Uptake N	P up in grain	P up in straw	Total uptake P	K up in grain	K up in straw	Total Uptake K
T_1 : Control	14.27	11.73	26	2.51	5.28	7.79	3.53	14.57	18.1
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	23.28	18.66	41.94	4.18	9.64	13.82	7	26.43	33.43
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	31.50	26.68	58.18	5.66	13.34	19	9.6	35.86	45.46
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	37.12	33.08	70.2	6.84	16.79	23.63	11.4	44.53	55.93
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	41.87	47.04	88.91	7.77	21.01	28.78	12.9	56.13	69.09
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	27.67	33.27	60.94	5.47	14.9	20.37	8.9	38.91	47.81
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	33.35	41.39	74.74	6.61	17.88	24.49	11.15	46.75	57.9
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	43.93	53.75	97.68	8.36	23.13	31.49	14.25	60.27	74.52
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	45.93	57.55	103.48	8.82	24.09	32.91	14.94	62.57	77.51
SEm±	1.44	1.71	3.12	0.29	0.52	1.13	0.45	2.00	2.32
C.D. at 5%	4.33	5.12	9.35	0.87	1.56	3.39	1.34	5.98	6.96

Table 10: Economics of various treatment combination

Treatments	Total cost of cultivation	Gross Return (Rs.)	Net Return (Rs.)	B:C
T_1 : Control	17650	26741	9091	0.52
T_2 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	18607	39156	20549	1.10
T_3 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	19563	51454	31891	1.63
T_4 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	20521	60546	40025	1.95
T_5 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$	21478	68450	46972	2.19
T_6 : 20 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$+ PSB	18627	46839	28212	1.51
T_7 : 40 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	19583	55764	36181	1.85
T_8 : 60 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	20541	69696	49155	2.39
T_9 : 80 kg $P_2O_5ha^{-1}$ + PSB	21498	72371	50873	2.37

References

1. Ali MA, Abbas G, Mohy-ud-Din-Q, Ullah K, Abbas-Gand-Aslam M. Response of mungbean (*Vigna radiata*) to phosphorus fertilizer under arid climate. JAPS of Animal and Plant Sci. 2010; 20(2):83-86.
2. Arya MPS, Singh RV. Effect of sources and levels of phosphorus on the growth and nodulation behaviour of rice bean (*Vigna umbellata*). Legume Research, 1996; 19(3-4):227-229.
3. Baboo R, Mishra SK. Growth and pod production of cowpea (*Vigna sinensis* Savi) as affected by inoculation, nitrogen and phosphorus. Annals of agricultural Res. 2001; 22(1):104-106.
4. Balachandran Sripriya, Deotale RD, Hatmode CN, Titare Priyanka S, Thorat Archana W. Effect of biofertilizers (Pressmud, Rhizobium and PSB) and nutrient (NPK) on morphological parameters of greengram. J Soils and crops. 2005; 15(2):442-447.
5. Balyan SK, Chandra R, Pareek RP. Enhancing nodulawflfl in *Vigna mungo*by applying higher quantity of Rhia»thurr» in planting-furrow and PSB. Legume Research. 2002; 25(3):160-164.
6. Bansal RK. Synergistic effect of Rhizobium, PSB, and POPR on nodulation and grain yield of mungbean. Journal of food legumes. 2009; 22(1):37-39.
7. Chaudhary RP, Sharma SK, Dhama AK. Yield components of greengram *(Vigna radiata* L.) as influenced by phosphorus and thiourea. Annals of Agricultural Res. 2003; 24(1):203-204.
8. Dubey SK, Sinha AK, Yadav SR. Effect of sodic water and applied phosphorous on uptake of phosphorous and grain yield of green gram. J of Indian Society of Soil Science. 1993; 4(1):208-209.
9. Ghosh G, Poi SC. Response of Rhizobium, phosphate solubilizing bacteria and mycorrhizal organisms on same legume crops. Environment and Ecology. 1998; 16(3):607-610.
10. Ghosh MK, Joseph SA. Influence of biofertilizers, foliar application of DAP and sulphur sources on yield and yield attributes of summer greengram. Legume Research. 2008; 31(3):232-233.
11. Gupta Ajay, Sharma VK. Studies on the effect of biofertilizer and phosphorous levels on yield and economics of urdbean (*Vigna mungo* L. Hepper). Legume Res. 2006; 29(4):278-281.
12. Jose Mariano Igual, Angel Valverde, Emilio Cervantes, Gncama Velazquez. Agriculture: use of updated molecular techniques in their study. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 2007; 27(1):29-43.
13. Khan MA, Aslam M, Tariq Sultran, Mahmood IA. Response of phosphorus application on growth and yield of inoculated and un-inoculated mungbean (*Vigna radiata*). International J Agric. And Bio. 2002; 4(4):523-524.
14. Khatkar R, Abraham T, Joseph SA. Effect of Biofertilizers and sulfur levels on growth and yield of blackgram. Legume Research. 2007; 30(3):233-234.
15. Khursheed S, Najar GR. Investigation on phosphorus fraction and its use efficiency in rice (Oryza sativa L.) under intigrated phosphorus management system. University of Kashmir Digital Repository, 2012.
16. Kishto Kumar, Verma AK, Srivastava GP, Kumar K. Yield attributing character and grain yield of urdbean (*Vigna mungo* L. Hepper) as influenced by levels of phosphate application. J Res. BirsaAgril. Univ. 2000; 12(2):233-234.
17. Kumawat N, Sharma OP, Rakesh Kumar, Anupama-Kumai. Response of organic manures, PSB and phosphorus fertilization on growth and yield of molybdenum. Environment and Ecology. 2009; 27(4):2024-2027.
18. Kumpawat BS. Effect of phosphorus levels and phosphate solubilizing bacteria on cluster bean (*Cyamopsis tetragonal* Obd*)* and its residual effect on

wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) under limited water supply. Crop Res. 2006; 31(1):14-16.
19. Mandal S, Biswal KC. Jana PK. Yield, economics, nutrient uptake and consumptive use of water by summer green gram as influenced by irrigation and phosphorus application. Legume Res. 2005; 28(2):131-133.
20. Manpreet S, Singh J, Sekhan HS. Nutrient and quality studies of different mungbean (*Vigna radiata*L.Wilzeck) genotypes in relation to phosphorus application. Environment and Ecology. 2005; 23(2):408-411.
21. Maksood M, Mahmood-ul-Hasson, Hussain MI, Mahmood MT. Effect of different levels of phosphorus on agronomic traits of two mashbean genotypes. *(Vigna mungo*L.). Pak. of Agric. Sci. 2001; 38(1-2):81-83.
22. Mehra JP, Naik KR, Nayak S. Integrated nutrient management in summer moong bean. National Sym. New paradigms Agron. Res, 2008, 91.
23. Mir AH, Bhat JA, Lai SB. Effect of phosphorus, sulphur and PSB on black gram *(Phaseolus Mungo)* and its redidual effect on mustard *(Brassica juncia*) and soil properties. Environment and Ecology. 2009; 27(3):1365-1368.
24. Mishra SK. Effect of rhizobium inoculation, nitrogen and phosphorus onroot nodulation protein production andnutrient uptake in cowpea (*Vigna sinensis* Savi). Annals of Agril. Res. 2003; 24(1):139-144.
25. Mitra AK, Banerjee K, Pal AK. Effect of different levels of phosphorus and sulphur on yield attributes, seed yield, protein content of seed and economics of summer green gram. Res. On Crops. 2006; 7(2):404-405.
26. Pandey SP, Singh RS. Response of phosphorus and sulphur on yield and quality of summer mung(*Vigna radiata* L.). Crop Res. Hisar. 2001; 22(2):206-209.
27. Parashar A, Awasthi CP, Singh AB, Gupta MK. Effect of rhizobium inoculation and phosphorus application on yield and quality of broad bean. Legume Res. 1999; 22(3):162-166.
28. Patel SR, Thakur DS. Response of black gram (Phaseolus*mungd)* to levels of phosphorus and phosphate solubilizing bacteria. Annals of Agril. Res 2003; 24(4):819-823.
29. Patro, Sahoo PN. Response of moong bean genotypes to phosphorus. Indian J. Pulse Res. 1994; 7(2):191-192.
30. Prakash O, Sharma R, Singh BP. Effect of phosphorus and row spacing on yield attributes and yield of moong bean cultivars under rainfed condition. Indian J. Pulse Res. 2002; 15(2):142-144.
31. Prasad H, Chandra R, Pareek RP, Kumar N. Synergisamong phosphate solubilizing bacteria, rhizobium and rhizobium in urdbean. Indian J of pulse Res. 2002; 15(2):131-135.
32. Ram SN, Dixit RS. Effect of dates of sowing and phosphorus on nodulation, uptake nutrient and yield of summer green gram (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). Crop Res. (Hissar). 2000; 19(3):414-417.
33. Rao AS. Response of green gram cultivars to levels of phosphorus. Indian J. Agron. 1993; 38(2):317-318.
34. Shahi DK. Effect of fertilization and seed bacterization on yield and quality of mungbean *(Vigna radiata).* J Res., Birsa Agril. Univ. 2002; 14(1):21-24.
35. Sharma SN, Prasad Rajendra. Effect of different sources of Phosphorus on summer mungbean in alkaline soil of Delhi. Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences (India). 2009; 79(10):82-89.
36. Singh B, Pareek RG. Effect of phosphorus and biofertilizers on growth and yield of mungbean. Indian J Pulse Res. 2003; 16(1):31-33.
37. Singh Bharat, Singh CP, Singh Manish. Response of summer moong (*Vigna radiata* L.) to levels of phosphorus and PSB inoculation in sandy loam soil. Annals of AgriL Res. 2003; 24(4):860-866.
38. Singh DD, Sharma A. Response of black gram (*Phaseolus mungo*) to phosphorus fertilization and Rhizobium inoculation in the hill soil of Assam. Annals of Agric. Res. 2001; 22(1):151-153.
39. Singh Mukul, Namdeo KN, Saraiya AB. Effect of phosphorus, sulphur, growth regulators and biofertilizers on yield and nutrient uptake of black gram. Annals of Plant and Soil Res. 2004; 6(2).
40. Singh NB, Basna R, Verma KK, Yadav RS. Productivity and feasibility of black gram as influenced by integrated nutrient management inrainfed area of eastern U.P. National Sym. New paradigms Agron. Res. 2008, 87-89.
41. Suri VK Chander, Girish Choudhary, Anil K, Verma TS. Co-inoculation of VAM and PSB in enhancing phosphorus supply to lentil. Crop Res. 2006; 31(3):357-361.
42. Tanwar SPS, Sharma GL, Chahar MS. Effect of phosphorous and biofertilizers on yield, nutrients content and uptake by black gram. Legume Res. 2003; 26(1):39-41.
43. Tomar SS, Khankar UR, Sharma SK. Availability of phosphorus to black gram as influenced by phosphate solubilizing bacteria and phosphate levels. J.N.K. VV. Res. J. 2002; 36(1-2):98-100.
44. Vikram A, Hamzehzarghani H. Effect of Phosphate Solubili/.ittg Bacteria on nodulation and growth parameters of givengram. Research Journal of Microbiology. 2008; 3:62-72.
45. Vikrant H, rbir Singh, Singh KP, Malik CVS, Singh BP. Effect of PYM and Phosphorus application on the grain and protein yield of green gram (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilezek). *Haryana* J. Agron. 2005; 21(2):125-127.
46. Vikrant Singh, Harbir Malik CS, Singh BP. Response of mungbean to farmyard manure and phosphorous application. Indian J, of pulses Res. 2004; 17(2):136-137.
47. Yakadri M, Ramesh Thatikunta, Rao LM. Effect of nitrogen and phosphorous on growth and yield of green gram *(Vigna radiata).* Legume Res. 2002; 25(2):139-141.