



Effect of Phosphorous, Chloropyriphos and Rhizobium Inoculation on Production and Economics of Chickpea (*Cicer aretinum* L.)

Ravindra Sachan ^{a*}, S. B. Pandey ^a, Ravindra Kumar ^a, Devendra Singh ^a,
Sanjeev Sharma ^a, Kishan Kumar ^b, Anshul Singh ^a, Sudhir Pal ^a,
Ambrish Kumar Verma ^c and Harsh Sachan ^d

^a Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur, (U.P.)-208002, India.

^b Department of Agronomy, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur, (U.P.)-208002, India.

^c Department of Agricultural Economics and Statistics, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur, (U.P.)-208002, India.

^d Division of Computer Applications, ICAR-IARI, New Delhi-110012, 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/v34i2231511

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/91444>

Original Research Article

Received 12 July 2022
Accepted 03 September 2022
Published 07 September 2022

ABSTRACT

Field experiments were conducted to study the effect of Phosphorus, Chloropyriphos and Rhizobium inoculants on productivity parameter and economics of chickpea during rabi season of 2020-21 and 2021-22 at students instructional farm, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture & Technology, Kanpur. The experiment consists of 18 treatments combinations in factorial randomized block design with three replications consisted of three levels of phosphorous (30, 60 and 90 kg ha⁻¹), three chloropyriphos levels (0, 2.5 and 4.0 ml L⁻¹) and two rhizobium inoculation levels (with rhizobium and without rhizobium). Chickpea variety RVG-203 was grown with the recommended agronomic practices. On the basis of results emanated from investigation it can be concluded that among the productivity parameters viz. maximum grain yield was 19.76 and 19.88 q ha⁻¹ during the both years of experimentation are associated with the treatment T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml⁻¹

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

Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*]. Similarly stover yield during first year is 25.26 q ha⁻¹ and second year is 25.94 q ha⁻¹ was associated with the treatment T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*]. Maximum gross return Rs 103908 and Rs 110078, net return Rs 66686 and 72232 and benefit cost ratio (B:C ratio) 1.79 and 1.91 during the first year (2020-21) and second year (2021-22) of experimentation were recorded under treatment T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*], but the maximum cost of cultivation during first year is Rs 38734 and second year is Rs 39358 were recorded under treatment T₁₈ [90 kg P+ 4.0 ml⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*].

Keywords: Chickpea; chloropyriphos; economics; phosphorous; rhizobium; yield.

1. INTRODUCTION

Pulses are major sources of protein among the vegetarians in India and complement the staple cereals in the diets with protein, essential amino acids, vitamins and minerals. They contain 22-24% protein, which is almost twice the protein in wheat and thrice that of rice [1]. Chickpea is a very nutritious crop and also has many medicinal properties provide nutritionally balanced food. Chickpea has significant amounts of all the essential amino acids except the sulphur-containing and an affordable source of protein, carbohydrates, minerals and vitamins, dietary fiber, folate, beta-carotene, and health-promoting fatty acids [2]. Chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) is a major legume crop cultivated for its edible seeds legume of the genus *Cicer*, Tribe *Cicereae*, family *Fabaceae* (*leguminaceae*). Chickpea has many local names: hamaz (Arab world), shimbra (Ethiopia), nohud or lablabi (Turkey), chana (India) and garbanzo (Latin America) [3]. It is originated in south eastern turkey [4]. *Rhizobium* symbiosis with legume species is one of special importance, producing 50% of 175 million tons of total BNF annually worldwide. Chickpea and *Rhizobium leguminosarum subsp. ciceri* association annually produce upto 176 kg N ha⁻¹ depending on cultivar. India is the largest producer (25% of global production), consumer (27% of world consumption) and importer (14%) of pulses in the world. India ranks first in the world in terms of pulse production (25% of total worlds production) (FAOSTAT 2017). In India chickpea occupies 10.17 million ha area, with a production of 11.35 million tonnes registering the productivity of 1116 kg/ha. In Uttar Pradesh, chickpea crop occupied 0.62 million hectares area, 0.85 million tonnes production and 1371 kg/ha productivity [5]. More than 90 per cent of total pulse production has been the contributed from 10 states and Rajasthan has the highest area (24.21%) under chickpea, followed by Maharashtra (22.82%), Madhya Pradesh (18.94%), Karnataka (10.27%), Uttar Pradesh (6.10%) and Andhra Pradesh (4.56%) [5]. The

total world acreage under pulses is about 85.40 (M ha) with production of 87.40 (Mt) at 1023 kg/ha yields level.

Phosphorus is one of the essential nutrients for legume growth and BNF [6] Symbiotic nitrogen fixation has a high P demand because the process consumes large amounts of energy [7] and energy generating metabolism strongly depends upon the availability of P [8]. Singh and Sale [9] reported that P fertilization stimulates root growth, photosynthesis and increases hydraulic conductivity of roots. Nitrogen fixing plants have an increased requirement for P over dose receiving direct nitrogen fertilization, probability due to need for nodule development and signal transduction, and to P-lipids in the large number of bacterioids [10]. Legumes are heavy feeder of phosphorus and less responsive to nitrogen because of their capacity to meet their own nitrogen requirement through symbiotic fixation [11]. Phosphorus is connected with some plant growth factors that are root development, seed production, earlier and more uniform crop maturity, increase nitrogen fixing capacity of legumes, improvement in crop quality and resistance to plant diseases [12]. Phosphorus is second most critical plant nutrient, but for pulses, it assumes primary importance, owing to its important role in root proliferation and thereby atmospheric nitrogen fixation. Phosphorus is also an important fertilizer in chickpea production; it is a very important chemical fertilizer that can raise the water holding capacity of soil [13].

Rhizobium are symbiotic bacteria that facilitate formation of nodules on the roots of legume hosts, within which the bacteria fix atmospheric nitrogen into ammonia. The knowledge of the biodiversity of *Rhizobia* and of local populations is important for the design of successful inoculation strategies [14]. *Rhizobium* are either indigenous to the soil or inoculated for a particular legume. Adaptability of indigenous *Rhizobium* to their environment results in high levels of saprophytic competence [15]. Fields

which receive consistent fertility management and legume cropping host higher *Rhizobium* numbers and diversity [15]. Soil lacking native rhizobia of chickpea requires artificial seed inoculation for improving root nodulation and yield of the crop [16].

Pesticides are the important agrochemicals used for prevention of crops from pests. Their use has been largely increased in last few decades. The application of pesticides starts from the pre sowing stage. Different treatments include soil application, seed treatment, foliar spray, etc. Repeated applications of pesticides contaminate the soil [17].

Chlorpyrifos is an organophosphate insecticide. Pure chlorpyrifos is made up of white or colorless crystals. Chlorpyrifos is used to control many different kinds of pests, including termites, mosquitoes, and roundworms. Chlorpyrifos was first registered as an insecticide in 1965 and the United States Environmental Protection Agency (US EPA) re-registered it in 2006. Chlorpyrifos in the soil may be broken down by ultraviolet light and chemicals in the soil. Soil temperature and pH level may also affect how long chlorpyrifos stays in the soil. Chlorpyrifos will break down more slowly in acidic soils than in basic soils [18].

2. RESOURCES AND METHODS

2.1 Experimental Site

The experiment was conducted during *rabi* season of 2020-21 and 2021-22 at student's Instructional farm, C.S.A. University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur Nagar (U.P.). The field was well leveled and irrigated by tube well. The farm is situated at main campus of the university, in the west northern part of Kanpur city under sub-tropical zone in vth agroclimatic zone (central plain zone).

2.2 Edaphic Condition

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 7.97 and 7.92 (1:2.5 soil: water suspension method given by Jackson, [19]), electrical conductivity 0.36 and 0.35 dSm⁻¹ (1:2.5 soil: water suspension method given by Jackson, [19]), Organic carbon percentage in soil is 0.35 and 0.35 per cent (Walkley and Black's rapid titration method given by Walkley and Black, [20]), with available nitrogen 197.25 and 198.42 kg ha⁻¹ (Alkaline permanganate method given by Subbiah and Asija, [21]), available phosphorus as sodium bicarbonate-extractable P was 12.14 and 12.21 kg ha⁻¹ (Olsen's calorimetrically method, Olsen et al., [22]) available potassium was 265.15 and 266.68 kg ha⁻¹ (Flame photometer method given by Hanwey and Heidel, [23]).

2.3 Detail of Treatments and Design

The 18 treatments combination of nutrient management practices having three each phosphorus levels (30, 60 and 90 kg ha⁻¹) and Chlorpyrifos (20 EC) levels (0, 2.5, 4.0 ml L⁻¹) along with and without seed inoculation of *Rhizobium*. Experiment was laid out in Factorial Randomized Block Design with three replications.

2.4 Crop Husbandry

A pre-sowing irrigation (Paleva) was done in the experimental field with an object to get optimum moisture conditions for attaining good germination. At proper tilth, one ploughing with tractor drawn mould bold plough was done

Table 1. Analytical data of the experimental soil (pre-sowing)

| S. No. | Soil characters | Value | |
|--------|---|------------|------------|
| | | 2020-21 | 2021-22 |
| 1. | Texture | Sandy loam | Sandy loam |
| 2. | pH (1:2.5 soil water suspension) | 7.97 | 7.92 |
| 3. | EC (dsm ⁻¹) (1:2.5 soil water suspension) | 0.36 | 0.35 |
| 4. | Organic carbon (%) | 0.35 | 0.35 |
| 5. | Available N kg ha ⁻¹ | 197.25 | 198.42 |
| 6. | Available P kg ha ⁻¹ | 12.14 | 12.21 |
| 7. | Available K kg ha ⁻¹ | 265.15 | 266.68 |

Table 2. Detail of the treatment combinations

| S. No. | Treatment Details | Symbol |
|--------|---|--|
| 1. | 30 kg P+ 0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₃₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ |
| 2. | 30 kg P+ 2.5 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₃₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ |
| 3. | 30 kg P+ 4.0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₃₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ |
| 4. | 60 kg P+ 0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₆₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ |
| 5. | 60 kg P+ 2.5 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₆₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ |
| 6. | 60 kg P+ 4.0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₆₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ |
| 7. | 90 kg P+ 0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₉₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ |
| 8. | 90 kg P+ 2.5 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₉₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ |
| 9. | 90 kg P+ 4.0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₉₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ |
| 10. | 30 kg P+ 0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₃₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ |
| 11. | 30 kg P+ 2.5 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₃₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ |
| 12. | 30 kg P+ 4.0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₃₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ |
| 13. | 60 kg P+ 0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₆₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ |
| 14. | 60 kg P+ 2.5 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₆₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ |
| 15. | 60 kg P+ 4.0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₆₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ |
| 16. | 90 kg P+ 0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₉₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ |
| 17. | 90 kg P+ 2.5 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₉₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ |
| 18. | 90 kg P+ 4.0 ml L ⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with <i>Rhizobium</i> | P ₉₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ |

followed by two ploughings by cultivator. Nitrogen @ 20 kg ha⁻¹ and potash @ 40 kg ha⁻¹ applied uniformly through urea and murate of potash respectively. Phosphorus was apply as per treatment in the furrows, 5 cm below the seed at the time of sowing through single super phosphate. Chloropyriphos was sprayed before flowering as per treatment. Inoculation was done by soaking the surface sterilized seeds of chickpea (*Cicer. arietinum* L.) in the liquid culture medium for 1 h. Just before sowing sticker solution and culture suspension were taken in a 1000 ml beaker and mix thoroughly then healthy and bold seeds of chickpea were mixed with *Rhizobium* strains. The sowing of chickpea crop was done using a seed rate of 80 kg ha⁻¹ in furrows opened by plough in the furrows spaced at 45 cm apart. Planking was done to cover the seeds with fine soil after sowing.

2.5 Harvesting and Threshing

The crop was harvested at maturity and was allowed to dry in sun. Separate bundles were made for each plot and weighted. The after drying harvest was threshed manually.

2.6 Grain Yield

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

2.7 Stover Yield

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

2.8 Economics

The economics of different treatments was worked out on the basis of average yield (seed and stover) of 2020-21 and 2021-22.

2.9 Cost of Cultivation

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 (₹ 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.

2.10 Gross Return (₹ ha⁻¹)

It was calculated by taking the income from the grain and straw produced on the basis of market rates. The yield of chickpea crop was converted into gross return in rupees per hectare on the basis of current price of the produce.

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Gross return (₹ ha}^{-1}\text{)} \\ & = \text{Total income from grain and stover yield} \end{aligned}$$

2.11 Net Return (₹ ha⁻¹)

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

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

2.12 Benefit Cost Ratio (B:C)

Net income of each treatment was divided by cultivation cost of respective treatment and cost benefit ratio was recorded. There was calculated with the help of following formula.

$$\text{Benefit: cost ratio} = \frac{\text{Net Return (₹ ha}^{-1}\text{)}}{\text{Cost of cultivation (₹ ha}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

2.13 Statistical Analysis

The growth parameters and yields were recorded and analyzed as per Gomez and Gomez [24] the tested at 5% level of significance to interpret the significant differences.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Productivity Parameters

It is visualized from the data given in Table 3 and depicted in clearly indicate that among the productivity parameters viz. grain yield (q ha⁻¹) and stover yield (q ha⁻¹) significantly increase due to the application of phosphorous, chloropyriphos and rhizobium inoculation. Grain yield varied from 12.42 to 19.82 q ha⁻¹ and stover yield varied from 17.95 to 25.60 q ha⁻¹ on pooled basis. The maximum grain yield (19.88 q ha⁻¹) and stover yield (25.94 q ha⁻¹) was recorded in the treatment T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*] during the second year (2021-22) of experimentation. The minimum grain yield (12.25 q ha⁻¹) and stover was recorded in the treatment T₁ [30 kg P+ 0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without *Rhizobium*] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. The surge in seed and stover yields under adequate nutrients supply might be attributed to mainly to the collective effect of a greater number of pods plant⁻¹, grains pod⁻¹ and higher test weight, which was the result of improved translocation of photosynthates from source to sink ultimately yield is increased. The increase in grain yield under adequate nutrients supply mainly due to

more yield attributes ultimately resulted more grain yield. Grain, stover and biological yield of chickpea significantly increased due to phosphorus (60 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹) and chloropyriphos (4.0 ml L⁻¹) over their controls. Inoculation of rhizobium further increased grain & stover yield of chickpea significantly over without inoculation. Combine use of phosphorus 60 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ and chloropyriphos 4.0 ml L⁻¹ alone with rhizobium significantly increased grain 19.88 q ha⁻¹ and stover 25.94 q ha⁻¹ of chickpea recorded under T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*] over other treatments during second year. It may due to rhizobium which fix atmospheric nitrogen and increased the supply of other nutrients to plants and ultimately increased grain and stover yield of chickpea. These results also confirms the findings of Panigrahi [25], Sharma (2012), Kumar et al. [11], Ullah et al. [26], Kumar et al. [27], Suryavanshi et al. [28], Singh et al. [29], Patel et al. [30] and Yadav et al. [31].

3.2 Economics

Economic viability is a function of gain or loss. Any practice in order to be economical viable must have a substantial balance over its cost. In order to assured profitability net return and B: C ratio was worked out. While we study the economics of the chickpea cultivation during the both years of experimentation, it can be concluded that all the economics parameters such as gross return, net return and benefit cost ratio except cost of cultivation were significantly affected by the application of phosphorous, rhizobium and chloropyriphos. The data extracted from the Table 4 and Table 5 it can be resulted that the maximum gross return (₹ 110078) was recorded in the treatment T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*] during the second year (2021-22) of experimentation. The minimum gross return (₹ 65071) was recorded in the treatment T₁ [30 kg P+ 0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without *Rhizobium*] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. Maximum net return (₹ 72232) was recorded in the treatment T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*] during the second year (2021-22) of experimentation. The minimum net return (₹ 30889) was recorded in the treatment T₁ [30 kg P+ 0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without *Rhizobium*] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. Similarly, Maximum B:C ratio (1.91) was recorded in the treatment T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*] during the second year (2021-

22) of experimentation. The minimum B:C ratio (0.90) was recorded in the treatment T₁ [30 kg P+ 0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without *Rhizobium*] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. While, in case of cost of cultivation it can concluded that the maximum cost of cultivation (₹ 39358) was found in the treatment T₁₈ [90 kg P+ 4.0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with *Rhizobium*] during the second year of experimentation and minimum cost of cultivation was recorded in the treatment T₁ [30 kg P+ 0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos without *Rhizobium*] during the first year (2020-21) of experimentation. If it is economically viable in modern farming maximum

profit is more important than maximum profit the real comparison of different treatment can only judge on the basis of economic viability. The cost and gross return varied markedly due different levels of phosphorous and chloropyriphos along with seed treatment with rhizobium which ultimately influence the net return and B:C ratio. The consequences of the current investigation are additionally in concurrence with the investigation of Jain et al. [32], Kushwaha [33], Prasad et al. [34], Shivran and Prakash [35], Yadav et al. [36], Kumawat et al. [37], Yadav et al. [38], Patel et al. [19] and Yadav et al. [31,39].

Table 3. Effect of different treatment combinations on productivity parameters of chickpea

| Treatments | Grain Yield (q ha ⁻¹) | | | Stover Yield (q ha ⁻¹) | | |
|--------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|------------------------------------|---------|---------|
| | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Pooled | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Pooled |
| T ₁ | 12.25 | 12.58 | 12.42 | 17.84 | 18.06 | 17.95 |
| T ₂ | 13.44 | 13.86 | 13.65 | 18.56 | 18.84 | 18.70 |
| T ₃ | 13.92 | 14.12 | 14.02 | 19.42 | 19.67 | 19.55 |
| T ₄ | 15.56 | 15.70 | 15.63 | 20.46 | 20.63 | 20.55 |
| T ₅ | 16.65 | 16.81 | 16.73 | 22.49 | 22.69 | 22.59 |
| T ₆ | 17.72 | 17.85 | 17.79 | 23.42 | 23.71 | 23.57 |
| T ₇ | 14.42 | 14.61 | 14.52 | 19.54 | 19.72 | 19.63 |
| T ₈ | 15.53 | 15.94 | 15.74 | 21.89 | 22.14 | 22.02 |
| T ₉ | 16.68 | 16.89 | 16.79 | 22.59 | 22.89 | 22.74 |
| T ₁₀ | 13.46 | 13.55 | 13.51 | 19.45 | 20.32 | 19.89 |
| T ₁₁ | 14.38 | 14.67 | 14.53 | 20.67 | 20.67 | 20.67 |
| T ₁₂ | 15.10 | 15.84 | 15.47 | 21.52 | 21.56 | 21.54 |
| T ₁₃ | 16.68 | 16.76 | 16.72 | 22.81 | 22.79 | 22.80 |
| T ₁₄ | 17.87 | 17.96 | 17.92 | 24.68 | 24.38 | 24.53 |
| T ₁₅ | 19.76 | 19.88 | 19.82 | 25.26 | 25.94 | 25.60 |
| T ₁₆ | 16.21 | 16.49 | 16.35 | 21.86 | 21.62 | 21.74 |
| T ₁₇ | 17.68 | 17.89 | 17.79 | 23.19 | 24.26 | 23.73 |
| T ₁₈ | 18.94 | 19.01 | 18.98 | 24.72 | 24.18 | 24.45 |
| S.Ed± | P 0.56 | P 0.62 | P 0.41 | P 0.70 | P 0.90 | P 0.55 |
| | I 0.56 | I 0.62 | I 0.41 | I 0.70 | I 0.90 | I 0.55 |
| | Rh 0.46 | Rh 0.52 | Rh 0.33 | Rh 0.58 | Rh 0.73 | Rh 0.44 |
| C.D. at 5 % | P 1.13 | P 1.25 | P 0.83 | P 1.41 | P 1.81 | P 1.12 |
| | I 1.13 | I 1.25 | I 0.83 | I 1.41 | I 1.81 | I 1.12 |
| | Rh 0.93 | Rh 1.05 | Rh 0.68 | Rh 1.17 | Rh 1.47 | Rh 0.89 |

Table 4. Economic study of chickpea as affected by different treatment combinations

| Treatment | Treatment Combinations | Cost of cultivation (₹/ ha) | | | Gross return (₹/ ha) | | |
|----------------|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------|----------------------|---------|--------|
| | | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Pooled | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Pooled |
| T ₁ | P ₃₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ | 34182 | 34806 | 34494 | 65071 | 71270 | 68171 |
| T ₂ | P ₃₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ | 35047 | 35671 | 35359 | 71088 | 77920 | 74504 |
| T ₃ | P ₃₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ | 35566 | 36190 | 35878 | 73686 | 79558 | 76622 |
| T ₄ | P ₆₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ | 35678 | 36302 | 35990 | 81993 | 88046 | 85020 |
| T ₅ | P ₆₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ | 36543 | 37167 | 36855 | 87916 | 94264 | 91090 |
| T ₆ | P ₆₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ | 37062 | 37686 | 37374 | 93411 | 100114 | 96763 |
| T ₇ | P ₉₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ | 37190 | 37814 | 37502 | 76160 | 82078 | 79119 |
| T ₈ | P ₉₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ | 38055 | 38679 | 38367 | 82276 | 89785 | 86031 |
| T ₉ | P ₉₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ | 38574 | 39198 | 38886 | 88092 | 94602 | 91347 |

| Treatment | Treatment Combinations | Cost of cultivation (₹/ ha) | | | Gross return (₹/ ha) | | |
|-----------------|--|-----------------------------|---------|--------|----------------------|---------|--------|
| | | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Pooled | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Pooled |
| T ₁₀ | P ₃₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ | 34342 | 34966 | 34654 | 71453 | 75821 | 73637 |
| T ₁₁ | P ₃₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ | 35207 | 35831 | 35519 | 76304 | 81733 | 79019 |
| T ₁₂ | P ₃₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ | 35726 | 36350 | 36038 | 80069 | 88001 | 84035 |
| T ₁₃ | P ₆₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ | 35838 | 36462 | 36150 | 88158 | 93074 | 90616 |
| T ₁₄ | P ₆₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ | 36703 | 37327 | 37015 | 94520 | 99835 | 97178 |
| T ₁₅ | P ₆₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ | 37222 | 37846 | 37534 | 103908 | 110078 | 106993 |
| T ₁₆ | P ₉₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ | 37350 | 37974 | 37662 | 85582 | 91333 | 88458 |
| T ₁₇ | P ₉₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ | 38215 | 38839 | 38527 | 93147 | 99359 | 96253 |
| T ₁₈ | P ₉₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ | 38734 | 39358 | 39046 | 99749 | 105190 | 102470 |

Table 5. Economic study of chickpea as affected by different treatment combinations

| Treatments | Treatments Combinations | Net return (₹/ ha) | | | B:C ratio | | |
|-----------------|--|--------------------|---------|--------|-----------|---------|--------|
| | | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Pooled | 2020-21 | 2021-22 | Pooled |
| T ₁ | P ₃₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ | 30889 | 36464 | 33677 | 0.90 | 1.05 | 0.98 |
| T ₂ | P ₃₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ | 36041 | 42249 | 39145 | 1.03 | 1.18 | 1.11 |
| T ₃ | P ₃₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ | 38120 | 43368 | 40744 | 1.07 | 1.20 | 1.14 |
| T ₄ | P ₆₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ | 46315 | 51744 | 49030 | 1.30 | 1.43 | 1.37 |
| T ₅ | P ₆₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ | 51373 | 57097 | 54235 | 1.41 | 1.54 | 1.48 |
| T ₆ | P ₆₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ | 56349 | 62428 | 59389 | 1.52 | 1.66 | 1.59 |
| T ₇ | P ₉₀ I ₀ Rh ₀ | 38970 | 44264 | 41617 | 1.05 | 1.17 | 1.11 |
| T ₈ | P ₉₀ I ₁ Rh ₀ | 44221 | 51106 | 47664 | 1.16 | 1.32 | 1.24 |
| T ₉ | P ₉₀ I ₂ Rh ₀ | 49518 | 55404 | 52461 | 1.28 | 1.41 | 1.35 |
| T ₁₀ | P ₃₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ | 37111 | 40855 | 38983 | 1.08 | 1.17 | 1.13 |
| T ₁₁ | P ₃₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ | 41097 | 45902 | 43500 | 1.17 | 1.28 | 1.23 |
| T ₁₂ | P ₃₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ | 44343 | 51651 | 47997 | 1.24 | 1.42 | 1.33 |
| T ₁₃ | P ₆₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ | 52320 | 56612 | 54466 | 1.46 | 1.55 | 1.51 |
| T ₁₄ | P ₆₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ | 57817 | 62508 | 60163 | 1.58 | 1.67 | 1.63 |
| T ₁₅ | P ₆₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ | 66686 | 72232 | 69459 | 1.79 | 1.91 | 1.85 |
| T ₁₆ | P ₉₀ I ₀ Rh ₁ | 48232 | 53359 | 50796 | 1.29 | 1.41 | 1.35 |
| T ₁₇ | P ₉₀ I ₁ Rh ₁ | 54932 | 60520 | 57726 | 1.44 | 1.56 | 1.50 |
| T ₁₈ | P ₉₀ I ₂ Rh ₁ | 61015 | 65832 | 63424 | 1.58 | 1.67 | 1.63 |

4. CONCLUSION

The study showed that the application of phosphorous, chloropyriphos and rhizobium resulted in higher grain yield of chickpea as well as higher net returns and B:C ratio; thus, it will help in uplifting the socioeconomic status of the farmers. Application of phosphorous, chloropyriphos and rhizobium inoculation deserves a special attention for increasing productivity and profitability of chickpea.

It can be concluded that T₁₅ [60 kg P+ 4.0 ml L⁻¹ Chloropyriphos with Rhizobium]. increased productivity and profitability of chickpea during the both years of experimentation.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

- Shukla M, Patel R, H, Verma R, Deewan P, Dotaniya M, et al. Effect of bio organics and chemical fertilizers on growth and yield of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) under middle Gujrat condition. *Vegetos*. 2013; 26(1):183-7.
- Jukanti AK, Gaur PM, Gowda CLL, Chibbar RN. Nutritional quality and health benefits of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). *A Review*. *Br J Nutr*. 2012;108;Suppl 1: S11-26. DOI: 10.1017/S0007114512000797, PMID 22916806.
- Muehlbauer FJ, Tullu A. New crop fact sheet: chickpea *Cicer arietinum* L. *New York Times*; 1997. [Cited Nov 18]. Available: <http://hort.purdue.edu/newcrop/crops/cropfactsheets/chickpea.html>

4. Redden B, Furman B, J, Upadhyaya H, D, Pundir R, P, S, Gowda C, L, L., Coyne C, Enne King D. Biodiversity Management in Chickpea. In: Yadav, S, S., Redden R., Chen, W., Sharma, B., editors. Chickpea Breeding & Management. CABI, Wallingford, UK. 2007;355-368.
5. Anonymous. Agricultural statistics at a glance 2020. Directorate of economics & statistics, department of agriculture, cooperation and farmers welfare. New Delhi: Ministry of Agriculture & Farmers Welfare, Govt of India. 2021;63.
6. Mhango WG, Mughogho SK, Sakala WD, Saka AR. The effect of phosphorous and sulphur fertilizers on grain Legumes and maize productivity in Northern Malawi. Bunda Journal of agriculture. Environ Sci Technol. 2008;3:20-7.
7. Schulze J, Temple G, Temple SJ, Beschow H, Vance CP. Nitrogen fixation by white lupin under phosphorus deficiency. Ann Bot. 2006; 98(4):731-40.
DOI: 10.1093/aob/mcl154, PMID 16855013.
8. Plaxton WC. Plant response to stress: Biochemical adaptations to phosphate deficiency. In: Goodman R, editor Encyclopedia of plant and crop science. New York: Marcel Dekker. 2004;976-80.
9. Singh DK, Sale PWG. Growth and potentially conductivity of white clover roots in dry soil with increasing phosphorus supply and defoliation frequency. Agron J. 2000;92(5):868-74.
DOI: 10.2134/agronj2000.925868x
10. Graham PH, Vance CP. Nitrogen fixation in perspective, an overview of research and extension needs. Field Crops Res. 2000;65(2-3):93-106.
DOI: 10.1016/S0378-4290(99)00080-5
11. Kumar S, Tripathi DK, Bharose R, Kumar M, Kumar R. Effect of different fertility level and micronutrients on nodulation and nutrient uptake by chickpea. An Asian J Soil Sci. 2016;11(1):62-6.
DOI: 10.15740/HAS/AJSS/11.1/62-66
12. Rehan W, Jan A, Liaqat W, Jan FM, Ahmadzai MD, Ahmad H, et al. Effect of phosphorous, rhizobium inoculation and residue types on chickpea productivity. Pure Appl Biol. 2018;7(3):1203-13.
DOI: 10.19045/bspab.2018.700140
13. Dotaniya ML, Datta SC, Biswas DR, Kumar K. Effect of organic sources on P₂O₅ fraction and available P₂O₅ in typical Haplustept. J Indian Soc Soil Sci. 2014;62(1):80-3.
14. Lindström K, Murwira M, Willems A, Altier N. The biodiversity of beneficial microbe-host mutualism: the case of Rhizobia. Res Microbiol. 2010;161(6):453-63.
DOI: 10.1016/j.resmic.2010.05.005, PMID 20685242.
15. Zengeni R, Mpeperekwi S, Giller KE. Manure and soil properties affect survival and persistence of soybean nodulating Rhizobia in smallholder soils of Zimbabwe. Appl Soil Ecol. 2006;32(2):232-42.
DOI: 10.1016/j.apsoil.2005.06.001
16. Khattak SG, Khan DF, Shah SH, Madani MS, Khan T. Role of Rhizobial inoculation in the production of chickpea crop. Soil Environ. 2006;25(2):143-5.
17. Sarnaik SS, Kanekar PP, Raut VM, Taware SP, Chavan KS, Bhadbhade BJ. Effect of application of different pesticides to soybean on the soil microflora. J Environ Biol. 2006;27(2);Suppl:423-6. PMID 17436537.
18. Tomlin CDS. The pesticide manual, A world compendium. 14th ed. Alton, Hampshire, UK: British Crop Protection Council. 2006;186-7.
19. Jackson ML. Soil chemical analysis. New Delhi: Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd; 1973.
20. Walkley A, Black IA. Old piper, S.S. soil and plant analysis. Soil Sci. 1934;37(1):29-38.
DOI: 10.1097/00010694-193401000-00003
21. Subbiah BV, Asija CL. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available N in Soil. Curr Sci. 1956;25:259-60.
22. 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.
23. Hanway JJ, Heidel H. Soil analysis methods as used in Iowa State College, Soil Testing Laboratory. Iowa Agric. 1952; 54:1-31.
24. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical procedures for agricultural research. John wiley & sons; 1984.
25. Panigrahi D. Chemical seed treatment for management of termites in chickpea. Ann Plant Prot Sci. 2010;18(1):90-3.
26. Ullah S, Jan A, Ali M, Ahmad A, Ullah A, Ahmad G, et al. Effect of phosphorus and zinc under different application methods on yield attributes of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). IJAAER. 2018;3(1):79-85.

27. Kumari N, Mondal S, Mahapatra P, Meetei TT, Bijilaxmi Devi YB. Effect of biofertilizer and micronutrients on yield of chickpea. Int J Curr Microbiol Appl Sci. 2019;8(1): 2389-97.
DOI: 10.20546/ijcmas.2019.801.251
28. Suryavanshi P, Sharma M, Singh Y. Enhancing productivity and profitability of pulses through Rabi Farmer participatory action research. Indian J Ecol. 2020; 47(4):1164-7.
29. Singh AK, Dimree S, Kumar A, Sachan R, Sirohiya A, Nema S. Effect of rhizobium inoculation with different levels of inorganic fertilizers on yield, nutrient content & uptake of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Int J Plant Soil Sci. 2022;34(22):262-8:Article no.IJPSS.90247 ISSN: 2320-7035.
DOI: 10.9734/ijpss/2022/v34i2231376
30. Patel KK, Pandey AK, Baheliya AK, Rai R, Bhadauria S, Sachan R. Production and economic feasibility of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) by the diverse bioinputs and soil nutrients amendments. Int J Plant Soil Sci. 2022;34(21):15-24:Article no.IJPSS.89048 ISSN: 2320-7035.
DOI: 10.9734/ijpss/2022/v34i2131235
31. Yadav P, Yadav DD, Kumar A, Sachan R, Yadav S. Effect of fertility levels and bio-fertilizers application on yield, yield attributes, and economics of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Int J Plant Soil Sci. 2022;34(13):65-9:Article no.IJPSS.85129 ISSN: 2320-7035.
DOI: 10.9734/ijpss/2022/v34i1330975
32. Jain LK, Singh P, Balyan JK. Productivity and profitability of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L-) cultivation as influenced by bio-fertilizers and phosphorus fertilization. Indian J Dryland Agric Res Dev. 2006;21(1):82-4.
33. Kushwaha HS. Response of chickpea to biofertilizer, nitrogen and phosphorus fertilization under rainfed environment. J Food Legumes. 2007;20(2):179-81.
34. Prasad K, Sharma DK, Chandra S. Yield attributes, yield and economics of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) as influenced by manure, biofertilizer and DAP doses. Int J Agric Sci. 2008;4(1):246-8.
35. Shivran RK, Prakash C. Productivity, profitability and protein content of chickpea as influenced by farm yard manure, phosphorus and sulphur application. Trends Biosci. 2012;5(2):104-6.
36. Yadav PK, Singh VR, Prasad DA, Ruchi R. Effect of row ratio and phosphorus fertilizer in chickpea and mustard intercropping system. Indian J Agron. 2013;58(2):198-202.
37. Kumawat N, Yadav RK, Singh M, Dudwe TS, Tomar IS. Effect of phosphorus and bioinoculants and their residual effect on succeeding chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*). Indian J Agric Sci. 2020;90(2):320-5.
38. Yadav S, Kumar S, Anshuman K, Singh N, Srivastava A. Studies on effect of different biofertilizers on yield and economics chickpea. J Pharm Innov. 2021;10(4):541-5.
39. Kunal P, Sharma P. Influence of pesticide-treated seeds on survival of Mesorhizobium sp. *Cicer*, symbiotic efficiency and yield in chickpea. Plant Prot Sci. 2012;48(1):37-43.
DOI: 10.17221/54/2010-PPS

© 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/91444>