International Journal of Plant & Soil Science

34(20): 248-258, 2022; Article no.IJPSS.88196
ISSN: 2320-7035

Effect of STCR-IPNS Based Nutrient Application on Soil Health, Yield, Nutrient Content and Uptake of Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) in Eastern Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh, India

Ravindra Sachan [a*], Tarence Thomas [b], Hanuman Prasad Pandey [a], Abhishek Tiwari [a], Avanish Kumar [c], Pratistha Yadav [d], Abhishek Yadav [a] and Mandeep Kumar [d]

[a] Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh-208 002, India.
[b] Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Naini Agricultural Institute, SHUATS, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh-211 007, India.
[c] Department of Agronomy, RCA, MPUAT, Udaipur-313001, Rajasthan, India.
[d] Department of Agronomy, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh-208 002, India.

Authors' contributions

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

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2022/v34i2031149

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/88196

Original Research Article

Received 06 April 2022
Accepted 12 June 2022
Published 16 June 2022

ABSTRACT

The improvement in grain yield characters was the manifestation of improved growth characters as a result of higher uptake of nutrients caused by balanced supply of nutrients in this regard soil test based nutrient management approaches aims provide a scientific basis for balanced fertilization to obtain more yield per unit of fertilizer investment. An experiment was conducted during kharif season 2017-18 in the Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry Research Farm, SHUATS, Prayagraj. The cursory glance of data revealed that the bulk density and particle density of soil was found to be non-significant in different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values. The maximum soil pore space (60.37%) and water retaining capacity (81.25 %) was recorded in

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

treatment T_4 [STCR + 5 t FYM]. The maximum available Nitrogen (305.82 kg ha^{-1}), available Phosphorus (26.90 kg ha^{-1}), available Potassium (205.07 kg ha^{-1}) and available Sulphur (14.23 ppm ha^{-1}) in soil was recorded in treatment T_8 [STCR + @ 50 % FYM + @ 50 % S]. The maximum seed yield of mustard (11.53 q ha^{-1}) and stover yield (16.03 q ha^{-1}) was associated with the treatment T_8 [STCR + @ 50 % FYM + @ 50 % S]. Result showed that that application of T_8 [STCR + @ 50 % FYM + @ 50 % S] significantly recorded maximum nutrient content viz. N (2.19%), P (0.23%), K (1.68%) and S (4.8%) content in grain N (1.73%), P (0.21%), K (1.47%) and S (3.9%) content in stover and maximum nutrient uptake viz. N (25.25 kg ha^{-1}), P (2.65 kg ha^{-1}), K (19.37 kg ha^{-1}) and S (55.34 kg ha^{-1}) uptake in grain is and N (27.73 kg ha^{-1}), P (3.36 kg ha^{-1}), K (23.56 kg ha^{-1}) and S (62.51 kg ha^{-1}) uptake in stover.

Keywords: Mustard; nutrient content; nutrient uptake; STCR and yield.

1. INTRODUCTION

Rapeseed-mustard (*Brassica campestris*) is a major oilseed crop contributing important share in oilseed production in the country. Production of rapeseed and mustard declined from 8.03 MT in 2012-13 to 6.82 MT in 2015-16 [1].

India is amongst the largest vegetable oil economic in the world. The present average per capita consumption of oils and fats has not been more than 11g day^{-1} as against the nutritional standard of 30g/day for a balanced diet. Mustard is rich in minerals like calcium, manganese, copper, iron, selenium, zinc, vitamin A, B, C and proteins. 100g mustard seed contains 508 kcal energy, 28.09 Mg carbohydrates, 26.08g proteins, 36.24g total fat and 12.2g dietary fiber [2].

The nutrient elements of major significance for yield and quality of yellow mustard are nitrogen, phosphorus sulphur and Zinc. Nitrogen is the most important which determines the growth of yellow mustard that increases the amount of protein, methionine, dry matter and yield. Phosphorus and potash are known to be efficiently utilized in the presence of nitrogen to promote flowering, setting of siliqua and increases the size of siliqua and yield [3].

Sulphur is considered to occupy fourth place among major plant nutrient after nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium. It increases phosphorus uptake by plant and nitrogen in protein synthesis and is indispensable for the synthesis of essential amino acid like cysteine and methionine. Besides, sulphur is also involved in various metabolic processes of plants. It is a constituent of glutathione, a compound supposed to be associated with the plant respiration and the synthesis of essential oils. Sulphur also plays a vital role in chlorophyll formation [4].

There are several reasons behind such yield reduction including poor soil nutrient status. Soil fertility declination under continuous cropping has been witnessed which need to be restored for sustaining and increasing crop yield. Soil fertility restoration can effectively be achieved by integrated management of nutrient sources [5] but due to lack of proper knowledge of method and time of manuring and fertilizer application; the cost of cultivation increased. Soil fertility maintenance required adequate knowledge of soil nutrient status, fertilizer efficiency soil efficiency, time and methods of fertilizer application. Adoption of soil test crop response (STCR) suggested by Ramamoorthy *et al*. [6] is efficient approach concerning all aspects of nutrient management. Supplying of plant nutrients based on STCR approach significantly improved crop yield as well as soil health [7] and is very important for yield sustainability and reducing fertilizer cost [8]. Implementation of inductive approach of STCR in Chhattisgarh may reduce cost of cultivation and may also encourage smart and strategic nutrient management practices.

In the targeted yield approach, it is assumed that there is linear relationship between grain yield (economic produce) and nutrient uptake by the crop. Targeted yield concept, thus strikes a balance between “Fertilizing the crop” and “Fertilizing the soil”. This approach can be used not only for individual field situations but also as a better approximation for planning the requirement of fertilizers on area basis for a given level of crop production. Fertilizer application and the yield targets chosen can be so manipulated that both high profits from fertilizer investment and maintenance of soil fertility can be achieved [9]. The targeted yield approach has been used to formulate fertilizer recommendations across the country [10-14].

2. RESOURCES AND METHODS

2.1 Soil of Experimental Field

The soil of experimental field is sandy loam in texture, good aeration (47.53 % porosity), alkaline in reaction (pH 7.58), low in organic carbon (0.45%), low in available N (238.21 kg ha^{-1}), medium in available P (20.73 kg ha^{-1}), high in available K (127.65 kg ha^{-1}) and low in available sulphur (9.82 ppm ha^{-1}).

2.2 Experimental Site

The experiment was conducted at research Farm of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry at Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj. The area is situated on the south of Prayagraj on the right side of the river Yamuna on the South of Rewa Road at a distance of about 6 Km from Prayagraj city. It is situated at $25^0 24' 23''$ N latitude, $81^0 50' 38''$ E longitude and at the altitude of 98 meter above the sea level.

2.3 Layout and Design of the Experiment

The experiment was laid out in randomized block design with three replications. The total numbers of unit plots were 27. The size of a unit plot was 2.0 m X 2.0 m. The width of the main irrigation channel is 1.0 m and the width of the sub-irrigation channel is 0.5 m.

2.4 Treatments of the Investigation

STCR approach: The following STCR equation developed for Mustard was used for achieving 25 q ha^{-1} yield target.

With FYM

1. Nitrogen dose (kg ha^{-1}) =12.27T-0.56SN-0.09FYM-N
2. Phosphorus dose (kg ha^{-1}) = 4.60T-3.29SP-0.06FYM-P
3. Potassium dose (kg ha^{-1}) = 4.69T-0.24SK-0.05FYM-K

Where, T = Yield target (q ha^{-1}), SN = Alkaline $KMnO_4$-N, SP= Olsen's P (kg ha^{-1}) and
SK =Ammonium Acetate - K (kg ha^{-1}).

The fertilizer adjustment equations were ready for determining requirement of fertilizer. Say for 25 q ha^{-1} the yield target of mustard with varying soil test values in table 3.5. These results were shows that the fertilizer requirement varies with the soil test values for a particular target yield. Similar result was also reported by Mishra *et al*. (2010) and Singh *et al.* [15].

Table 1. Treatment combination

S. No.	Symbol	Description
1.	T_0	[Control]
2.	T_1	[RDF + 5 t FYM]
3.	T_2	[STL + 5 t FYM]
4.	T_3	[FP + 5 t FYM]
5.	T_4	[STCR + 5 t FYM]
6.	T_5	[RDF + 5 t FYM + 50 % S]
7.	T_6	[STL + 5 t FYM + 50 % S]
8.	T_7	[FP + 5 t FYM + 50 % S]
9.	T_8	[STCR + 5 t FYM + 50 % S]

RDF- Recommended dose of fertilizers (80:40:40 kg ha^{-1}), STL- Soil Test Levels (80:28:28 kg ha^{-1})
FP- Farmer's Practice (50:30:30 kg ha^{-1}), STCR- Soil Test Crop Response (40:15:15 kg ha^{-1})

2.5 Nutrient Requirement

a. Kg N required per quintal of seed = $\frac{\text{Total uptake of N (kg ha}^{-1})}{\text{Seed yield (q ha}^{-1})}$ Production

b. Kg P required per quintal of seed = $\frac{\text{Total uptake of P (kg ha}^{-1})}{\text{Seed yield (q ha}^{-1})}$ Production

c. Kg K required per quintal of seed = $\frac{\text{Total uptake of K (kg ha}^{-1})}{\text{Seed yield (q ha}^{-1})}$ Production

2.6 Preparation and Analysis of Soil Samples

Soil samples from each plot at 0-15 cm depth were collected at different stages were air- dried, grind and passed through 2 mm sieve and finally stored in polythene bags for analysis of different physico-chemical parameters and changes in available N, P, K and % Organic carbon content. The soil sample was analyzed for Bulk density**,** particle density**,** % pore space [16], soil texture [17], pH [18], Available N [19], P [20], K [21] and S [22].

2.7 Plant Analysis for Content and Uptake of Nutrient

The chemical analysis of plants for the nutrient content was done when grain and straw samples were collected from each treatment at harvest to analyse nitrogen, phosphorous, potassium concentration (%) and sulphur concentration (ppm) and their uptake (kg ha^{-1}). The plant material was oven dried (70 ± 5^0C for 72 hours) and ground separately and then subjected to analysis. Plant analysis for the determination of nutrient content in grain and stover were done with the standard procedures viz., nitrogen concentration in plant (both grain and stover) was determined by micro-kjeldahl's method**,** phosphorus by vanado-molybdo phosphoric acid yellow colour method, potassium by flame photometer and sulphur by Turbidometric Method [18]. The uptake of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and sulphur were calculate by the following formulas:

$$\text{Nutrient uptake (N, P, K kg ha} - 1) = \frac{\text{Nutrient content in grain and straw (\%)} \times \text{Seed and Stover Yield(kg ha}-1)}{100}$$

Nutrient response ratio (kg yield kg nutrient^{-1})

It was calculated by using following equation **(Indian Society of Agronomy, New Delhi).**

$$\text{NRR} = \frac{\text{Yield (kg)}}{\text{Amount of nutrient applied (kg)}}$$

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Physical Properties of Soil

It is obvious from the data given in Table-2 and depicted in Fig.1 clearly shows that response Bulk density and Particle density of soil was found to be non-significant in different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values. The maximum Bulk density (1.09 Mgm^{-3}) and Particle density (2.73 Mgm^{-3}) of soil was recorded in treatment T_2 [STL + 5 t FYM] and minimum Bulk density (1.03 Mgm^{-3}) and Particle density (2.24 Mgm^{-3}) of soil was recorded in treatment [STCR + 5 t FYM + 50 % S]. Similar results were also reported by Nagar *et al.* [23] and Sahu *et al.* [24].

The response of soil pore space and water retaining capacity (WRC) was found to be significant in different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values. The maximum soil pore space (60.37 %) and maximum WRC (81.25%) was recorded in treatment T_4 [STCR + 5 t FYM] and minimum soil pore space (52.63 %) and minimum WRC (60.00%) was recorded in treatment T_7 [FP + 5 t FYM + 50 % S]. The results of the present investigation are also in agreement with the findings of Ahmadi and David [25] and Alam et al. [26].

3.2 Chemical Properties of Soil

An appraisal of the data given in Table 3 and depicted in Fig. 2 clearly shows that available N, P, K and S in soil increased significantly with the increase in different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values. The maximum available N (305.82 Kg ha^{-1}), available P (26.90 Kg ha^{-1}), available K (205.07 Kg ha^{-1}) and available S (14.23 ppm ha^{-1}) in soil was recorded in treatment T_8 [STCR + 5 t FYM + 50 % S] and the minimum available N (289.13 Kg ha^{-1}), available P (19.10 Kg ha^{-1}), available K (183.97 Kg ha^{-1}) and available S (10.43 ppm ha^{-1}) in soil was recorded in treatment T_0 [control]. The consequences of the current investigation are additionally in concurrence with the investigation of Upadhyay *et al.* [2], Rajput *et al.* [7] and P. Dey [27].

Table 2. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on physical properties of soil after crop harvest

Treatments	BD (Mg m^{-3})	PD (Mg m^{-3})	% PS	WRC (%)
T_0	1.04	2.35	53.62	73.33
T_1	1.07	2.45	55.45	75.00
T_2	1.09	2.73	60.04	61.11
T_3	1.09	2.52	56.33	69.23
T_4	1.04	2.62	60.37	81.25
T_5	1.05	2.36	54.58	68.75
T_6	1.05	2.45	56.16	62.50
T_7	1.05	2.35	52.63	60.00
T_8	1.03	2.24	53.51	75.00
F-test	NS	NS	S	S
S. Em±	0.025	0.171	0.169	1.38
C.D. (P= 0.05)	0.054	0.362	0.359	2.94



Fig. 1. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on physical properties of soil after crop harvest

Table 3. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on Chemical Properties of soil after crop harvest

Treatments	N (kg ha^{-1})	P (kg ha^{-1})	K (kg ha^{-1})	S (ppm ha^{-1})
T_0	289.13	19.10	183.97	10.43
T_1	299.46	23.95	196.63	11.40
T_2	302.51	25.03	202.50	13.40
T_3	297.46	22.90	192.43	10.73
T_4	300.52	24.11	197.07	12.30
T_5	303.86	25.75	203.47	13.47
T_6	298.83	23.93	193.07	10.97
T_7	301.16	24.70	198.20	12.87
T_8	305.82	26.90	205.07	14.23
F-test	S	S	S	S
S. Em±	0.980	0.311	0.430	0.060
C.D. (P= 0.05)	2.078	0.661	0.912	0.127



Fig. 2. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on Chemical properties of soil after crop harvest

3.3 Seed and Stover Yield (q ha^{-1})

It is visualized from the data given in Table-4 and depicted in Fig. 3 that Seed Yield and of Mustard was found to be increased significantly but stover yield of mustard was found to be non-significant with the increase in different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values. The maximum Seed Yield (11.53 q ha^{-1}) and maximum Stover Yield (16.03 q ha^{-1}) was recorded as in T_8 [STCR + 5 t FYM + 50 % S] and the minimum Seed Yield (9.33 q ha^{-1}) and Stover yield (13.77 ha^{-1}) was recorded as inT_0 [control]. Comparative findings were detailed by Kumar *et al.* [28] and Pal and Pathak [29].

3.4 Plant Nutrient Concentration

A critical perusal of the data given in Table-5 and depicted in Fig. 4 clearly shows the nutrient concentration (N, P, K and S) in Stover and grain increased significantly with the increase in different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values. The maximum N (1.73% in Stover and 2.19 % in grain), P (0.21% in Stover and 0.23 % in grain), K (1.47% in Stover and 1.68 % in grain) and S (3.9 % in Stover and 4.8 % in grain) in treatment T_8 [STCR + 5 t FYM + 50 % S] which was significantly higher than any other treatment combination and the minimum N (1.05% in Stover and 1.18 % in grain), P (0.12% in Stover and 0.14 % in grain), K (1.08% in Stover and 1.19 % in grain) and S (2.8 % in Stover and 4.0 % in grain) was recorded in treatment T_0 [control]. The results of the present investigation are also in agreement with the findings of Bharose *et al.* [30] and Chaurasia *et al.* [31].

3.5 Nutrient uptake by Grain and Stover of Mustard

At a glance over the data given in the Table-6 and depicted in Fig. 5 clearly shows the nutrient uptake (N, P, K and S) in Stover and grain increased significantly with the increase in different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values. The maximum uptake of N (27.73 kg ha^{-1} in Stover and 25.25 kg ha^{-1} in grain), P (3.36 kg ha^{-1} in Stover and 2.65 kg ha^{-1} in grain), K (23.56 kg ha^{-1} in Stover and 19.37 kg ha^{-1} in grain) and S (62.51 kg ha^{-1} in Stover and 55.34 kg ha^{-1} in grain) in treatment T_8 [STCR + 5 t FYM + 50 % S] which was significantly higher than any other treatment combination and the minimum uptake N (14.45 kg ha^{-1} in Stover and 11.00 kg ha^{-1} in grain), P (1.65 kg ha^{-1} in Stover and 1.30 kg ha^{-1} in grain), K (14.87 kg ha^{-1} in Stover and 11.10 kg ha^{-1} in grain) and S (38.55 kg ha^{-1} in Stover and 37.32 kg ha^{-1} in grain) was recorded in treatment T_0 [control]. The consequences of the current investigation are additionally in concurrence with the investigation of Raghvendra *et al.* [32] and Dhruw *et al.* [33].

Table 4. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on Seed Yield (q ha^{-1})

Treatment	Seed Yield (q ha^{-1})	Stover Yield (q ha^{-1})
T_0	9.33	13.77
T_1	9.53	15.13
T_2	9.83	15.33
T_3	9.47	14.90
T_4	11.13	15.53
T_5	9.67	15.20
T_6	9.50	15.10
T_7	9.70	15.23
T_8	11.53	16.03
F-test	S	NS
S. Em±	0.222	0.395
C.D. (P= 0.05)	0.472	0.836



Fig. 3. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on yield of mustard

Table 5. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on Nutrient Concentration in Stover and Grain

Treatments	N (%)		P (%)		K (%)		S (%)	
	Stover	Grain	Stover	Grain	Stover	Grain	Stover	Grain
T_0	1.05	1.18	0.12	0.14	1.08	1.19	2.8	4.0
T_1	1.17	1.44	0.14	0.16	1.11	1.21	3.1	4.2
T_2	1.40	1.59	0.15	0.18	1.15	1.30	3.0	4.1
T_3	1.14	1.70	0.14	0.17	1.17	1.27	3.4	4.3
T_4	1.61	1.99	0.17	0.21	1.39	1.57	3.7	4.6
T_5	1.50	1.82	0.16	0.18	1.32	1.37	3.5	4.4
T_6	1.53	1.77	0.15	0.15	1.21	1.44	3.2	4.3
T_7	1.57	1.82	0.16	0.19	1.26	1.51	3.6	4.6
T_8	1.73	2.19	0.21	0.23	1.47	1.68	3.9	4.8
F-test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
S. Em±	0.08	0.07	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.07	0.14	0.15
C.D. (P= 0.05)	0.25	0.21	0.03	0.03	0.19	0.20	3.15	3.19



Fig. 4. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on nutrient content in grain and stover



Fig. 5. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on nutrient uptake by grain and stover

3.6 Nutrient Response Ratio (kg kg^{-1})

It is apparent from the data given in Table-7 and depicted in Fig. 6 clearly shows that the nutrient response ratio (kg kg^{-1}) was found to be increased significantly with the increase in different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values. The maximum total nutrient response ratio was recorded as 436.36 kg kg^{-1} in T_8 [STCR + 5 t FYM + @ 50 % S] followed by T_4 [STCR + 5 t FYM] with the total NRR value 244.37 kg ka^{-1} and the minimum total nutrient response ratio was recorded as 146.22 kg kg^{-1} in T_3 [FP + 5 t FYM].

Table 6. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on Nutrient Uptake in Stover and Grain

Treatments	N (kg ha^{-1})		P (kg ha^{-1})		K (kg ha^{-1})		S (kg ha^{-1})	
	Stover	Grain	Stover	Grain	Stover	Grain	Stover	Grain
T_0	14.45	11.00	1.65	1.30	14.87	11.10	38.55	37.32
T_1	17.70	13.72	2.11	1.52	16.79	11.53	46.90	40.02
T_2	21.46	15.62	2.29	1.76	17.62	12.77	45.99	40.30
T_3	16.98	16.09	2.08	1.60	17.43	12.02	50.66	40.72
T_4	25.00	22.14	2.64	2.33	21.58	17.47	57.46	51.19
T_5	22.80	17.55	2.43	1.74	20.06	13.24	53.20	42.54
T_6	23.10	16.81	2.26	1.42	18.27	13.68	48.32	40.85
T_7	23.91	17.65	2.43	1.84	19.18	14.64	54.82	44.62
T_8	27.73	25.25	3.36	2.65	23.56	19.37	62.51	55.34
F-test	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S
S. Em±	0.05	0.10	0.04	0.07	0.36	0.29	1.01	0.17
C.D. (P= 0.05)	0.16	0.32	0.14	0.23	1.09	0.89	3.06	0.54

Table 7. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on Nutrient Response Ratio (kg kg^{-1})

Treatment	Nitrogen Response Ratio (kg kg^{-1})	Phosphorus Response Ratio (kg kg^{-1})	Potassium Response Ratio (kg kg^{-1})	Total Nutrient Response Ratio (kg kg^{-1})
T_0	-	-	-	-
T_1	30.83	61.65	61.65	154.13
T_2	31.45	89.85	89.85	211.15
T_3	48.74	48.74	48.74	146.22
T_4	66.65	88.86	88.86	244.37
T_5	31.08	62.17	62.17	155.42
T_6	30.82	88.07	88.07	206.96
T_7	49.86	83.10	83.10	216.06
T_8	68.90	183.73	183.73	436.36
F-test	S			
S. Em±	16.62			
C.D. (P= 0.05)	35.23			



Fig. 6. Effect of different levels of fertilizer recommendation based on soil test values on Nutrient Response Ratio (kg kg^{-1})

4. CONCLUSION

On the basis of results emanated from present investigation, it could be concluded that STCR based integrated nutrient management not only gave higher crop yield but also provide highest nutrient content and uptake in grain and stover of mustard which is subjected to nutrient enrichment in mustard seed. Our results also highlight that STCR-IPNM based nutrient application is effective tool of sustaining soil health. Therefore, STCR-IPNM based nutrient management can be recommended as an effective tool for balanced fertilization.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Anonymous. Agricultural Statistics at a glance. Directorate of Economics & Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture, Govt. of India; 2017.
2. Upadhyay Y, Swaroop N, Sahu YK, Dhruw SS, Verma PD. Interaction effects of different doses of sulphur and zinc with NPK on physico -chemical properties of soil in yellow mustard (*Brassica compestris L*.) Cv. Krishna Super Goldi. International Journal of Agricultural Science and Research (IJASR). 2016;(6)ISSN (P):2250-0057.
3. Singh J, Singh NSH, Bhadauria HS. Nitrogen and sulphur requirement of mustard under different crop sequences. Ann. Pl. Soil Res. 2012;14(2):113-115
4. Yadav R, Singh PK, Singh RK, Tiwari P, Singh SN. Impact of Sulphur Nutrition on Promising Mustard Cultivars in Eastern Uttar Pradesh. Int. J. Pure App. Biosci. 2017;(5) ISSN: 2320 – 7051:389-394.
5. Joshi SK, Nag GP, Singh DP, Sahu YK, Kumawat N. Long-term effect of nutrient management on active organic pools: A review. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2017;5(4):576-579.
6. Ramamoorthy B, Narasimhan RL, Dinesh, R. S. Fertilizer recommendations based on fertilizer application for specific yield of Sonara-64. Indian Farming. 1967;17(443): 51.
7. Rajput PS, Srivastava S, Sharma BL, Sachidanand B, Dey P, Aher SB, Yashona DS. Effect of soil-test-based long-term fertilization on soil health and performance of rice crop in Vertisols of central India. International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology. 2016;9(5):801-806.
8. Saxena AK, Singh S, Srivastava A, Gautam P. Yield target approach under integrated nutrient management for assessing fertilizer requirements of onion in Mollisols of Uttarakhand. Indian Journal of Horticulture. 2008;65(3):302-306.
9. Velayutham M. Fertilizer recommendation based on targeted yield concept problem and prospects. Fertiliser News. 1979;24: 12-17.
10. Puri G, Jaipurkar SA. Predication and optimization of soil test based fertilizer recommendation for safflower production in Vertisols of central India. In Third International Safflower Conference, held on June 14-18 at Institute of Botany at Beijing, China. 1993;45-51.
11. Puri G, Jaipurkar SA. Evaluating the effects of soil fertility variables on the yield of mustard (*Brassica compestris*) on swell shrink soil (Vertisol) of central India accepted for presentation. In 15th International Congress of Soil Science. 1994;45-49.
12. Verma TS, Bhagat RH. Nitrogen use efficiency as affected by time variant nitrogen application to wetland rice. Oryza. 1995;32:276-279.
13. Verma M, Singh YV, Dey P, Babu A. Soil test based fertilizer recommendation for mustard (*Brassica juncea L*.) in Eastern Plain Zone of Uttar Pradesh, India. International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Science. 2017;6(2):155-161.
14. Singh M, Dixit SP. Yield, profitability and nutrient uptake of wheat under soil test crop response based fertilizer application with different levels of lime in an acid Alfisol. Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry. 2017;6(6):1985-1988.
15. Singh M, Kumar M. Effect of nitrogen and sulphur levels on seed yield and some other characters in mustard [*Brassica juncea* (L.) Czern and Coss]. International Journal of Agricultural Sciences. 2014;(10):449-452.
16. Muthuval P, Udaysoorian C, Natesan R, Ramaswami PP. Introduction to Soil analysis, Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Coimbatore. 1992;641002.

17. Bouyoucos GJ. The hydrometer as a new method for the mechanical analysis of soil. Soil Sci. 1927;23343-353.
18. Jackson ML. Soil Chemical Analysis, Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi; 1973.
19. Subbiah BV, Asija CL. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available nitrogen in soil, Current Sci. 1956;25:259-260.
20. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watnahe FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorous in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate U.S. Dept. Agr. Cric. 1954;939.
21. Toth SJ, Prince AL. Estimation of cation exchange capacity and exchangeable Ca K and Na Content of Soil by Flame photometer technique. Soil Sci. 1949;67: 439-445.
22. Bardsley CE, Lancaster JD. Determination of reserve sulphur and soluble sulphates in soil. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer. Proc. 1960;24:265- 268.
23. Nagar KC, Meena H, Swaroop N. Effect of different levels of inorganic fertilizer and sulphur on physico-chemical properties of soil, and yield of mustard (*Brassica juncea L*.). An Asian Journal of Soil Science. 2015;(10):ISSN–0976–7231.
24. Sahu YK, David AA, Upadhyay Y, Dhruw SS, Sidar RS. Influence of organic manure and various level of NPK on soil physico-chemical properties of Mustard (*Brassica juncea L*.) cv. Euro Shakti. International Journal of Agricultural Science and Research (IJASR). 2015;(5),ISSN(P): 2250-0057.
25. Ahmadi SA, David AA. Effect of nitrogen and zinc on Physico-chemical properties of soil of Allahabad Uttar Pradesh India. International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Development. 2016;(3);5:288-290 ISSN: 2349-4182.
26. Alam, Md. S, Mishra AK, Singh K, Singh SK, David AA. Response of sulphur and FYM on soil physico-Chemical Properties and Growth, Yield and Quality of Mustard *(Brassica Nigra L*.) Journal of Agricultural Physics. 2014;(14), No. 2, ISSN 0973-032X:156-160.
27. Dey P. Soil health management. Soil Health. 2016;79.
28. Kumar V, Nath P, Kumar R, Kumar V, Verma JK, Naresh RK. Interactive effect of sulphur and nitrogen on growth, yield and quality of Indian Mustard (*Brassica juncea L*.). I.J.S.N. 2016;7 (1):57-61 ISSN 2229 – 6441.
29. Pal RL, Pathak J. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield and economics of mustard. Indian Journal of Science and Nature. 2016;(7) ISSN 2229 – 6441.
30. Bharose R, Chandra S, Thomas T, Dhan D. Effect of different levels of phosphorus and sulphur on yield and availability of NPK protein and oil content in Toria (*Brassica sp*.) VAR. P.T.–303. ARPN Journal of Agricultural and Biological Science. 2011;(6):2.
31. Chaurasia A, Singh SB, Namdeo KN. Integrated nutrient management in relation to nutrient contents and uptake of Ethiopian mustard (*Brassica carinata*). Research on Crops. 2009;10(2): 246-249.
32. Raghavendra Rao KN, Wani SP, Ravi MV, Veeresh H, Channabasavanna AS, Swamy M. Effect of soil test based nutrient management approaches on grain yield and nutrient uptake of Dry DSR-mustard cropping system. Agriculture Update Volume 12 | TECHSEAR-5 |. 2017; 1286-1290.
33. Dhruw TK, Sharma GK, Joshi SK. Effect of soil test based nutrient management on crop yield, nutrient requirement and relationship between nutrient uptake and yield of mustard (*Brassica campestris*) in Alfisol. IJCS. 2019;6(6):2022-2024.

© 2022 Sachan et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:
The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/88196