

## **BROCCOLI CULTIVATION WITH ORGANIC AND INORGANIC SOURCES OF NITROGEN AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE NUTRIENTS BALANCE**

M. J. HUSSAIN<sup>1</sup>, A. J. M. S. KARIM<sup>2</sup>, A. R. M. SOLAIMAN<sup>3</sup>  
M. S. ISLAM<sup>4</sup> AND M. RAHMAN<sup>5</sup>

### **Abstract**

The experiment was conducted on broccoli var. Premium Crop at Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University during the period from November, 2014 to March, 2015 with 24 treatment combinations (IPNS based) comprised with 4 inorganic sources of nitrogen as 140, 160 and 180 kg USG N ha<sup>-1</sup> and 180 kg PU N ha<sup>-1</sup> and 6 levels of organic nitrogen sources as i) 1 ton mustard oil cake ha<sup>-1</sup>; ii) 2 ton mustard oil cake ha<sup>-1</sup>; iii) 2 ton poultry manure ha<sup>-1</sup>; iv) 3 ton poultry manure ha<sup>-1</sup>; v) 3 ton cow dung ha<sup>-1</sup> and vi) 5 ton cow dung ha<sup>-1</sup> were considered. Results revealed that integration of organic and inorganic N sources have a little influence on soil physical and chemical properties of soil and its affects on soil nutrient balance. Post harvest soil organic carbon content was significantly influenced by the organic-inorganic N management approach, but no influence on soil pH, bulk density and partical density. However, a significant effect was found on post harvest soil nutrient balance where K showed a (-) ve balance but N with a little exception, P, S and B showed (+) ve balance which was affected by the organic-inorganic integrated N management approach. But better soil physical and chemical properties as well as higher (+) ve nutrient balance was found with higher rate of USG-organic manure as compared to that of PU-organic manure integration.

Keywords: Broccoli, Soil Nutrient Status, Nutrient Balance, Organic and Inorganic Nitrogen.

### **Introduction**

Integrated N management approach has a good positive response on improvement of soil fertility as well as soil physical and chemical properties. According to Mishra *et al.* (2014), integrated nutrient management aims to cultivate a land where the soil should remain sustainable with maximum production of quality crop. Soil organic matter is a key factor for sustainable soil

---

<sup>1</sup>Soil & Water Management Section, Horticulture Research Centre, BARI, Gazipur, Bangladesh. <sup>2-4</sup>Department of Soil Science, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University (BSMRAU), Gazipur, Bangladesh. <sup>5</sup>Department of Horticulture, BSMRAU, Gazipur, Bangladesh.

fertility and crop productivity. Reganold *et al.* (1990) showed that a suitable combination of organic and inorganic source of nutrients is necessary for sustainable agriculture that can ensure high quality food production. Ali *et al.* (2009) reported that organic matter undergoes mineralization with the release of substantial quantities of N, P, and S and smaller amount of micronutrients. Soil nutrient status was influenced by the application of both organic and inorganic sources of N. Bhandari *et al.* (1992) reported that a combined use of organic manure with chemical fertilizer increased organic carbon status of the soil. The 100% NPK fertilizers and their combined use with organic N sources also increased the available N and P by 5.22 and 0.8-3.8 kg

ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively from their initial values. Basel *et al.* (2008) observed that electrical conductivity of soil and organic matter were increased by increasing levels of organic fertilizer except soil pH. Priyanka *et al.* (2017) revealed that the integration of organic and inorganic fertilizers had a marked effect in enhancing yield as well as productivity of broccoli with maximum net returns. Nahar *et al.* (2021) reported that among different organic and inorganic sources of nutrients, application of litter showed the best performances regarding all the growth and yield contributing characters of Chinese broccoli. Sarker and Singh (1997) observed that alone or combined application of organic with inorganic fertilizers increased the level of soil organic carbon as well as the total N, P and K content. Hoque *et al.* (2007) reported that various organic manures influenced post-harvest soil pH, organic matter, total N, available P, exchangeable K and available S contents. As soil organic matter were increased by increasing organic fertilizer, efficient management through integrated plant nutrition system (IPNS) is a prerequisite to improve soil productivity for achieving higher yield of broccoli. Therefore, the experiment was undertaken to assess the effect of different levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on the post harvest soil nutrient status and nutrient balance in broccoli field.

## **Materials and Methods**

### ***Location and soil***

The experiment was conducted at Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University (BSMRAU), Bangladesh during November, 2014 to March, 2015. Soil texture of the experimental field is silty clay loam having a poor physical property (Table 1), that belongs to the agro-ecological zone Madhupur Tract (AEZ 28). Initial soil samples were collected from the experimental plots; analyzed to different physical and chemical properties in the laboratory of the Department of Soil Science, BSMRAU and the analytical results are presented in Table 1.

**Table 1. Physico-chemical properties of soil of the experimental field**

Physical properties of soil		Chemical properties of soil	
Soil properties	Analytical value	Soil properties	Analytical value
Particle size distribution	Sand (%) : 17.8	Soil pH	5.97
	Silt (%) : 45.6	Organic carbon (%)	0.96
	Clay (%) : 36.6	Total N (%)	0.083
Soil texture	Silty clay loam	Available P ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	15.14
Bulk density ( $\text{g cm}^{-3}$ )	1.34	Exchangeable K (meq $100\text{g}^{-1}$ soil)	0.298
Particle density ( $\text{g cm}^{-3}$ )	2.61	Available S ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	11.878
Porosity (%)	48.7	Available B ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	0.182
Field capacity (%)	28.67	CEC (meq $100\text{g}^{-1}$ soil)	12.67

Fully decomposed mustard oil cake, poultry manure and cow dung were used as organic sources of nitrogen and samples from these organic sources were collected and analyzed. Analytical values of these materials are presented in Table 2

**Table 2. Nutrient status and moisture content of cow dung, poultry manure and mustard oil cake**

Sample	Nutrient content (oven dry basis)				
	Moisture (%)	N (%)	P (%)	K (%)	S (%)
Mustard oil cake (OC)	18.88	5.32	0.83	0.71	0.66
Poultry litter (PM)	48.57	1.72	1.29	0.82	0.38
Cow dung (CD)	41.53	1.35	1.01	0.68	0.24

The experiment was designed in factorial randomized complete block (RCB) with three replications having 24 treatment combinations. Three doses of USG (@ 140, 160 and 180 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) and one dose of PU (@ 180 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>) as inorganic sources of nitrogen combined with 2 levels of 3 organics as i) 1 ton OC ha<sup>-1</sup>; ii) 2 ton OC ha<sup>-1</sup>; iii) 2 ton PM ha<sup>-1</sup>; iv) 3 ton PM ha<sup>-1</sup>; v) 3 ton CD ha<sup>-1</sup> and vi) 5 ton CD ha<sup>-1</sup> were considered. From these levels 24 (IPNS based) treatment combinations were comprised as- T<sub>1</sub>: USG-N<sub>140</sub>OC<sub>1</sub>; T<sub>2</sub>: USG-N<sub>140</sub>OC<sub>2</sub>; T<sub>3</sub>: USG-N<sub>140</sub>PM<sub>2</sub>; T<sub>4</sub>: USG-N<sub>140</sub>PM<sub>3</sub>; T<sub>5</sub>: USG-N<sub>140</sub>CD<sub>3</sub>; T<sub>6</sub>: USG-N<sub>140</sub>CD<sub>5</sub>; T<sub>7</sub>: USG-N<sub>160</sub>OC<sub>1</sub>; T<sub>8</sub>: USG-N<sub>160</sub>OC<sub>2</sub>; T<sub>9</sub>: USG-N<sub>160</sub>PM<sub>2</sub>; T<sub>10</sub>: USG-N<sub>160</sub>PM<sub>3</sub>; T<sub>11</sub>: USG-N<sub>160</sub>CD<sub>3</sub>; T<sub>12</sub>: USG-N<sub>160</sub>CD<sub>5</sub>; T<sub>13</sub>: USG-N<sub>180</sub>OC<sub>1</sub>; T<sub>14</sub>: USG-N<sub>180</sub>OC<sub>2</sub>; T<sub>15</sub>: USG-N<sub>180</sub>PM<sub>2</sub>; T<sub>16</sub>: USG-N<sub>180</sub>PM<sub>3</sub>; T<sub>17</sub>: USG-N<sub>180</sub>CD<sub>3</sub>; T<sub>18</sub>: USG-N<sub>180</sub>CD<sub>5</sub>; T<sub>19</sub>: PU-N<sub>180</sub>OC<sub>1</sub>; T<sub>20</sub>: PU-N<sub>180</sub>OC<sub>2</sub>; T<sub>21</sub>: PU-N<sub>180</sub>PM<sub>2</sub>; T<sub>22</sub>: PU-N<sub>180</sub>PM<sub>3</sub>; T<sub>23</sub>: PU-N<sub>180</sub>CD<sub>3</sub> and T<sub>24</sub>: PU-N<sub>180</sub>CD<sub>5</sub>. A blanket dose of other fertilizers were used as per recommendation of the crop @ 53, 83, 20, 2.0, 1 and 0.8 kg P, K, S, Zn, B and Mo ha<sup>-1</sup>, respectively in the form of TSP, MoP, gypsum, zinc oxide, boric acid and sodium molybdate.

Additional nutrients were supplied from inorganic sources adjusting per IPNS based recommendation after getting these from organic sources. Broccoli variety “Premium Crop” a hybrid variety of broccoli by TAKI Seed Company, Japan was used as a test crop. After proper land preparation, 25 day old seedlings were transplanted in lines with a distance from row to row and plant to plant 60 and 45 cm, respectively.

#### ***Soil sample collection and analytical procedure***

At the beginning of the experiment, soil samples were collected from each unit plots for analysis of both physical and chemical properties. For each plot 5 samples from 0-15 cm depth were randomly collected, mixed well, air-dried, ground and sieved through a 2 mm (10 mesh) sieve. At the same time, undisturbed soil samples from 0-15 cm depth were collected for determination of soil bulk density. Samples were analyzed for particle size distribution, particle density, bulk density, pH, organic C, total N, available P, exchangeable K, available S and B (Table 2). Similarly, post harvest soil samples of 0-15 cm depth were also collected from each plot and samples were air-dried, ground, sieved through a 2 mm (10 mesh) sieve and were analyzed for particle density, bulk density pH, organic matter, total N, available P, exchangeable K, available S and B. Particle size analyses of soil was done by Hydrometer Method (Black, 1965) and the textural class was determined by plotting the values of % sand, % silt and % clay to the Marshall’s triangular coordinate following the USDA system

Particle density of soil was determined by Pycnometer Method (Black, 1965) following the formula:

$$\text{Particle density } (\rho_s) = \frac{\text{Weight of oven dry soil}}{\text{Volume of soil (solid)}} \text{ g/cc}$$

Bulk density of soil was determined by Core Sampler Method following the formula

$$\text{Bulk density } (\rho_b) = \frac{\text{Weight of oven dry soil}}{\text{Total volume of soil}} \text{ g/cc}$$

Porosity of soil was calculated from the following formula:

$$\text{Total porosity } (\%) = 1 - \frac{\rho_b}{\rho_s} \times 100$$

Where,  $\rho_b$ =Bulk density (g/cc)

$\rho_s$ =Particle density (g/cc)

#### ***Analytical procedures of soil chemical properties***

Glass electrode pH meter was used to measure soil pH using soil-water suspension of 1: 2.5 as described by Jackson (1962). Soil organic carbon was determined

following the wet oxidation method according to Page *et al.* (1982) and the organic matter content was calculated by multiplying the % organic carbon with the Van Bemmelen factor 1.73 (Piper, 1950). Flame-photometer (Atomic absorption spectrophotometer, model No. Hitachi, Japan) was used to determine cation exchange capacity (CEC) followed by ammonium acetate extraction method. Total N of soil was estimated following the micro-Kjeldahl method (Jackson, 1973). Available P was determined colorimetrically followed by sodium bicarbonate extraction method (Olsen *et al.*, 1954). Exchangeable potassium of soil was determined from ammonium acetate (1N NH<sub>4</sub>OAC) extract as described by Jackson (1973) using flame-photometer (Atomic absorption spectrophotometer, model No. Hitachi, Japan). Available sulphur was determined by extracting the samples with CaCl<sub>2</sub> (0.15%) solution turbidimetrically (Page *et al.*, 1982). For determination of total B content dried plant materials were digested with concentrated HNO<sub>3</sub> and HClO<sub>4</sub> (Par-chloric acid) mixture followed by adding curcumin, H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> plus methanol solution (Hunter, 1980) and concentration was measured using double beam spectrophotometer (Model no. 200-20, Hitachi, Japan) at 555 nm wave length.

To calculate apparent or partial N, P, K and S balance a simplified method was used based on major inputs like fertilizer, manures etc and outputs (above ground plant uptake). Calculation of apparent or partial net nutrient balance was done using the following formula:

Apparent/partial nutrient balance (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) = Nutrient input (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) - Nutrient output (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)

According to experimental design treatmentwise data on different soil and plant parameters were recorded time to time throughout the cropping season. Collected data were tabulated with the help of Microsoft Office Excel (2010) and analyzed statistically using statistical program MSTATC. Variations among the treatment means were separated using Duncan Multiple Range Test (DMRT) at 5% levels of probability.

## Results and Discussion

### Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on head yield and post harvest soil physico-chemical properties in broccoli field

#### *Head yield*

The head yield was published earlier by Hussain *et al.* (2021). According to them the maximum head yield (14.75 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded with USG-N<sub>160</sub>× OC<sub>2</sub> followed by USG-N<sub>180</sub>× OC<sub>2</sub> (14.48 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>), USGN<sub>160</sub>× PM<sub>3</sub> (13.84 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) and PU-N<sub>180</sub>× PM<sub>3</sub> (13.72 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) and the lowest yield (11.87 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>) from USG-N<sub>140</sub>× CD<sub>3</sub>.

**Table 3. Effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on soil pH and organic carbon**

Treatment	Soil pH		Organic carbon (%)	
	Initial	Post harvest	Initial	Post harvest
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	5.86	5.75	0.95i	1.01c
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	5.91	5.78	0.97fgh	1.05bc
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	5.85	5.76	1.00bc	1.03c
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	5.84	5.81	1.01a	1.04bc
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	5.83	5.86	1.01ab	1.04bc
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	5.84	5.80	0.99c	1.09ab
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	5.83	5.80	0.96fgh	1.04bc
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	5.85	5.82	0.96hi	1.05bc
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	5.86	5.80	0.97fgh	1.03c
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	5.93	5.90	0.98cde	1.13a
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	5.96	5.87	1.00bc	1.01c
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	5.81	5.78	0.98def	1.11a
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	5.78	5.77	0.96ghi	1.01c
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	5.82	5.80	0.97efg	1.05bc
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	5.81	5.78	1.00bc	1.09ab
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	5.82	5.81	1.01ab	1.13a
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	5.85	5.82	1.00bc	1.04bc
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	5.84	5.77	0.97efg	1.11a
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	5.85	5.76	0.97efg	1.05bc
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	5.86	5.78	0.97fgh	1.04bc
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	5.86	5.79	0.94i	1.03c
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	5.95	5.89	0.98cde	1.04bc
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	6.04	5.85	0.99cd	1.01c
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	5.92	5.79	0.98def	1.03c
CV (%)	1.22	1.12	1.29	2.23
SE ± 0.05	0.041	0.037	0.005	0.016

Means followed by common letters are statistically similar to each other at 5% level of provability by DMRT

### **Soil pH**

Soil pH value at the beginning and after harvest are presented in Table 3. The post harvest soil pH showed a little variation among the treatments and it varied within the range of 5.75 to 5.90. The highest post harvest soil pH value (5.90) was recorded from the treatment USG-N<sub>160</sub>× PM<sub>3</sub> whereas the lowest value (5.75) in treatment USG-N<sub>140</sub>×OC<sub>1</sub>. The result revealed that the lower pH value was noticed

where inorganic nutrient was applied with mustard oil cake but with PM its pH increased slightly, whereas cow dung showed the intermediate pH value. The higher values of pH with PM may be due to more base cation ( $\text{Ca}^{+2}$ ). Sanwal *et al.* (2007) also reported that the application of farm yard, poultry and pig manure considerably reduced the soil acidity. This finding also supported by Pathak *et al.* (2005) who found the higher soil pH in organic plots as compared to combine dose of NPK with farm yard manure. Organic sources help in addition of basic cations on its decomposition and production of bi-carbonate ion due to root respiration. This might be due to relatively higher buffering capacity of soil based on its high carbonate contents that can fix any change in soil pH during organic matter decomposition (Wong *et al.*, 1999).

#### ***Organic carbon***

Data on organic carbon content of the initial and post harvest soil presented in Table 3. Effect of organic manures (CD, PM and OC) along with chemical fertilizers was found significant. The maximum organic carbon content (1.13%) in post harvest soil was found in the treatment USG-N<sub>180</sub>×PM<sub>3</sub> and USG-N<sub>160</sub>×PM<sub>3</sub> followed by USG-N<sub>160</sub>×CD<sub>5</sub> (1.11), but lowest (1.01 %) in USG-N<sub>140</sub>×OC<sub>1</sub> and USG-N<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>1</sub>. It was seen from the result that among the treatments receiving CD, PM and OC, poultry manure contributed for higher organic matter. Initial soil organic carbon status was ranged from 0.94 to 1.01 %, which increased due to the addition of organic manures. Application of different amounts of organic manure with or without inorganic fertilizer were significantly increased organic matter content in the soil. Similar informations were reported by (Al-Tarawneh, 2005).

#### ***Bulk density of soil***

Among the physical properties of soil, bulk density is slightly influenced by the applied organic manures. Bulk densities after harvesting of broccoli showed a little difference among the treatments of OC, PM and CD but it was insignificant (Table 4). Initial bulk density varied within the range of 1.33 to 1.36 g cm<sup>-3</sup>. At 0-15 cm soil depth bulk density of post harvest soil ranged from 1.35 to 1.38 g cm<sup>-3</sup>. The highest bulk density (1.38 g cm<sup>-3</sup>) was recorded with USG<sub>140</sub>×OC<sub>1</sub> and the lowest bulk density (1.35 g cm<sup>-3</sup>) was noted in treatment PU<sub>180</sub>PM<sub>3</sub> followed by USG<sub>160</sub>×PM<sub>3</sub> (1.35 g cm<sup>-3</sup>). It was observed that bulk density of soil reduced under higher rate of application of organic manures. This might be due to impact of addition of large amount of CD, PM and OC, which made the soil loose and friable, increased porosity resulting in decreased bulk density and improved soil physical environment. Swarup (2000) reported that long-term application of organic manures decreased soil bulk density, which was in agreement with this finding.

**Particle density of soil**

Variations in particle densities of post harvest soils were observed under different treatments of organic manures (Table 4), but it was insignificant and ranged from 2.55 to 2.61 g cm<sup>-3</sup>. The highest particle density (2.61 g cm<sup>-3</sup>) was recorded in the treatment USG<sub>140</sub> × OC<sub>1</sub> followed by USG<sub>160</sub> × OC<sub>1</sub> and USG<sub>180</sub> × CD<sub>3</sub> (2.60 g cm<sup>-3</sup>). The lowest particle density of soil (2.55 g cm<sup>-3</sup>) was found in the treatment of USG<sub>160</sub> × PM<sub>3</sub>. The treatment receiving higher amount of organic manures always exhibited lower particle density value in each form of organic manures. This result is in agreement with the findings of Anwar (2008).

**Table 4. Effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on bulk density and particle density of soil**

Treatment	Soil bulk density (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )		Soil particle density (g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	
	Initial	Post harvest	Initial	Post harvest
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	1.35	1.38	2.62	2.61
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	1.34	1.37	2.63	2.56
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	1.35	1.38	2.62	2.59
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	1.35	1.36	2.61	2.56
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	1.35	1.38	2.60	2.59
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	1.35	1.35	2.62	2.56
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	1.34	1.38	2.60	2.60
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	1.34	1.36	2.61	2.58
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	1.34	1.38	2.59	2.59
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	1.35	1.35	2.62	2.55
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	1.34	1.37	2.61	2.59
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	1.35	1.36	2.61	2.56
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	1.36	1.37	2.60	2.59
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	1.35	1.36	2.61	2.56
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	1.35	1.37	2.59	2.57
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	1.34	1.36	2.59	2.56
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	1.35	1.38	2.63	2.60
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	1.34	1.36	2.63	2.57
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	1.35	1.38	2.62	2.60
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	1.33	1.36	2.59	2.57
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	1.35	1.37	2.61	2.60
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	1.35	1.35	2.58	2.57
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	1.34	1.37	2.61	2.58
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	1.35	1.36	2.60	2.56
CV (%)	1.03	1.77	0.92	0.76
SE ± 0.05	0.005	0.006	0.018	0.006

Means followed by common letters are statistically similar to each other at 5% level of provability by DMRT

### Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on post harvest soil nutrient status in broccoli field

#### Soil N content

Variations among the initial soil N content were insignificant (0.073 to 0.09 %). The post harvest soil N was significantly affected by the treatment combinations (Table 5). The maximum N content (0.097 %) was recorded with the treatment combinations USG<sub>180</sub>×CD<sub>3</sub>, USG<sub>180</sub>×CD<sub>5</sub>, PU<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>1</sub>, PU<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub>, USG<sub>140</sub>×PM<sub>3</sub>, USG<sub>140</sub>×CD<sub>5</sub>, USG<sub>160</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub>, USG<sub>160</sub>×PM<sub>3</sub>, USG<sub>160</sub>×CD<sub>5</sub> and USG<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub>. For all the cases USG with 2 ton OC, 3 ton PM and 5 ton CD showed higher residual effect on post harvest soil. This indicated that the residual effect of N application in the form of USG combining with organic manure was higher than that of PU. This result was similar to the findings of Evaraats *et al.* (1999) who reported that the post harvest soil N content was increased with increasing amounts of N application. Nambiar (1991) observed that integrated use of organic manure with N, P and K fertilizers was quite promising providing greater stability in production as well as maintaining higher soil fertility status. Ali *et al.* (2009) reported that application of 3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> PM once in a year with 70% NPKS can reduce 30% of NPKS fertilizers.

**Table 5. Effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on soil nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium status in broccoli field**

Treatment	Initial soil N (%)	Post harvest soil N (%)	Initial soil P (µg g <sup>-1</sup> )	Post harvest soil P (µg g <sup>-1</sup> )	Initial soil K (meq 100g <sup>-1</sup> )	Post harvest soil K (meq 100g <sup>-1</sup> )
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	0.073	0.095b	19.5	20.8k	0.303	0.231e
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	0.080	0.095b	12.6	26.6b	0.298	0.298a-d
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	0.080	0.084bc	17.2	19.3l	0.303	0.270d
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	0.080	0.097a	14.7	22.7hi	0.303	0.287a-d
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	0.080	0.095b	13.2	23.2ghi	0.298	0.275cd
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	0.080	0.097a	13.7	25.3cd	0.287	0.312ab
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	0.087	0.095b	19.5	20.5k	0.298	0.287a-d
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	0.090	0.097a	12.6	24.1fg	0.296	0.278bcd
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	0.090	0.095b	17.2	24.6cde	0.303	0.287a-d
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	0.083	0.097a	14.7	21.3jk	0.303	0.292a-d
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	0.090	0.095b	13.2	22.2ij	0.298	0.298a-d
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	0.090	0.097a	13.7	26.7b	0.287	0.312ab
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	0.080	0.095b	19.5	21.1jk	0.298	0.278bcd
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	0.090	0.097a	12.6	24.1de	0.298	0.298a-d
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	0.087	0.095b	17.2	22.6i	0.303	0.289a-d
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	0.080	0.095b	14.7	23.4ghi	0.303	0.287a-d
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	0.083	0.097a	13.2	20.3kl	0.298	0.284a-d
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	0.080	0.097a	13.7	27.6a	0.289	0.315a

Treatment	Initial soil N (%)	Post harvest soil N (%)	Initial soil P ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	Post harvest soil P ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	Initial soil K (meq $100\text{g}^{-1}$ )	Post harvest soil K (meq $100\text{g}^{-1}$ )
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	0.077	0.093b	19.5	25.1cd	0.298	0.298a-d
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	0.080	0.097a	12.6	23.9f-h	0.298	0.289a-d
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	0.080	0.084bc	17.2	26.3cd	0.301	0.270d
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	0.080	0.095b	14.7	24.0ef	0.303	0.303a-d
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	0.080	0.084bc	13.2	22.2ij	0.298	0.298a-d
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	0.080	0.095b	13.7	25.5c	0.287	0.306abc
CV (%)	0.69	6.42	2.53	5.05	4.25	3.50
SE ± 0.05	-	0.005	-	0.402	-	0.010

Means followed by common letters are statistically similar to each other at 5% level of probability by DMRT

#### **Soil P content**

Initial soil available P content varied insignificantly within the range of 12.6 to 19.5  $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$  (Table 5). However, post harvest soil P content was significantly affected by the different organic and inorganic treatment combinations (Table 5). Maximum P content (27.6  $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ ) was found with the treatment USG<sub>180</sub> × CD<sub>5</sub> which was significantly higher than all other treatments. The lowest P content (19.3  $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ ) was recorded with USG<sub>140</sub> × PM<sub>2</sub>. Organic manures might have increased the microbial population and their solubilizing activities of insoluble phosphate. Sharma and Saxena (1985) explained that incorporation of poultry manure or FYM in to the soil increased maize yields through improving soil P indices which is also in accordance with the present study. Ali *et al.*, (2009) reported that application of 3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> PM once in a year with 70% NPKS can reduce the use of 30% NPKS as fertilizers.

#### **Soil K content**

Initial soil exchangeable K content was varied within the range of 0.287 to 0.303 meq  $100\text{g}^{-1}$  soil (Table 5). The post harvest soil exchangeable K was significantly affected by the treatment combinations and the maximum K content (0.315 meq  $100\text{g}^{-1}$  soil) was found from the treatment USG<sub>180</sub> × CD<sub>5</sub> which was statistically identical with all other treatment combinations except USG<sub>140</sub>×OC<sub>1</sub>, USG<sub>140</sub>×PM<sub>2</sub>, USG<sub>140</sub>×CD<sub>3</sub>, USG<sub>160</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub>, USG<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>1</sub> and PU<sub>180</sub>×PM<sub>2</sub>. The lowest K content (0.231 meq  $100\text{g}^{-1}$ ) was recorded in USG<sub>140</sub> × OC<sub>1</sub> treatment. This indicated that the effect of N on K uptake varied irrespectively with treatment combination. This result was supported by the findings of Zhang *et al.* (1996) where they showed that the contents of soil organic matter and total N, P and K were raised, soil nutrients were activated and soil fertility level was enhanced by the combined application

of organic and inorganic fertilizers. Ali *et al.*, (2009) reported that application of 3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> PM once in a year with 70% NPKS can reduce the 30% use of NPKS as fertilizers.

**Table 6. Effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on soil sulphur and boron status in broccoli field**

Treatment	Initial soil S ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	Post harvest soil S ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	Initial soil B ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )	Post harvest soil B ( $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ )
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	11.4	12.6e-h	0.228	0.171c
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	11.6	13.0d-g	0.124	0.171c
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	13.9	11.3h	0.228	0.285a
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	10.5	15.3a	0.124	0.228b
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	14.0	12.0gh	0.241	0.285a
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	10.6	15.3a	0.124	0.229b
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	10.8	13.1c-g	0.228	0.281a
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	10.8	13.1c-g	0.124	0.228b
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	13.5	12.0f-h	0.228	0.285a
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	10.8	14.7ab	0.124	0.285a
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	14.0	14.3a-d	0.241	0.228b
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	10.5	15.4a	0.124	0.171c
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	11.0	12.6e-h	0.228	0.171c
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	11.5	14.5abc	0.124	0.164d
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	13.9	12.7e-h	0.228	0.228b
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	10.8	15.1a	0.124	0.169c
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	14.0	11.4h	0.241	0.164d
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	10.5	15.0ab	0.124	0.164d
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	11.1	13.5b-f	0.228	0.285a
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	11.1	15.1a	0.124	0.229b
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	13.5	12.7e-h	0.228	0.285a
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	11.0	14.7ab	0.124	0.266a
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	13.6	13.9a-e	0.241	0.285a
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	10.6	14.8ab	0.124	0.228b
CV (%)	8.00	5.81	6.65	6.45
SE ±0.05	-	0.459	-	0.01

Means followed by common letters are statistically similar to each other at 5% level of probability by DMRT

### **Soil S content**

Initial soil available S content ranged from 10.5 to 14.0  $\mu\text{g g}^{-1}$  (Table 6). But post harvest soil S was significantly affected by the treatment combinations (Table 6).

Maximum S content ( $15.4 \mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ ) was recorded in the treatment combination of  $\text{USG}_{140} \times \text{CD}_5$  followed by  $\text{USG}_{140} \times \text{PM}_3$  ( $15.3 \mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ ),  $\text{USG}_{180}\text{PM}_3$ ,  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{OC}_2$ ,  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{CD}_5$ ,  $\text{USG}_{160} \times \text{CD}_3$ ,  $\text{USG}_{180} \times \text{OC}_2$ ,  $\text{USG}_{180} \times \text{CD}_5$ ,  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{PM}_2$ ,  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{CD}_3$  and  $\text{USG}_{160} \times \text{PM}_3$ , respectively. This indicated that the effect of N on the S uptake was irrespective to different treatment combination. This result was an accordance with the findings of Hoque *et al.* (2007) also found that the application of various organic manures significantly influenced the S uptake, soil pH, organic matter content, and the available S contents of the post-harvest soil.

### **Soil B content**

Initial soil B content of the experimental units ranged from 0.124 to  $0.241 \mu\text{g g}^{-1}$  (Table 6). The post harvest soil B content was significantly affected by the treatment combinations. Maximum B content ( $0.285 \mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ ) was noted in the treatments  $\text{USG}_{140} \times \text{PM}_2$ ,  $\text{USG}_{140} \times \text{CD}_3$ ,  $\text{USG}_{160} \times \text{PM}_2$ ,  $\text{USG}_{160} \times \text{PM}_3$ ,  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{OC}_1$ ,  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{PM}_2$ ,  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{PM}_3$  and  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{CD}_3$  followed by  $\text{PU}_{180} \times \text{PM}_3$  and  $\text{USG}_{160} \times \text{OC}_1$ . The lowest B content ( $0.164 \mu\text{g g}^{-1}$ ) was noted in  $\text{USG}_{180} \times \text{OC}_2$ ,  $\text{USG}_{180} \times \text{CD}_3$  and  $\text{USG}_{180} \times \text{CD}_5$ . This result is in agreement with the findings of Gaur and Verma (1991) and Rani Perumal *et al.* (1991) who depicted that combined application of organic manures and mineral fertilizers were promising in maintaining of lateral micronutrient like B for crop production stability and providing favorable physical, biological and soil ecological conditions.

### **Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on nutrient uptake by the broccoli plant**

#### ***Nitrogen uptake***

The nitrogen uptake by the broccoli plants was significantly affected by different organic and inorganic sources of N (Table 7). Maximum N uptake was found with the treatment  $\text{USG-N}_{180} \times \text{OC}_2$  ( $208.3 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ ) followed by  $\text{USG-N}_{160} \times \text{OC}_2$  ( $204.3 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ ). However,  $\text{USG-N}_{180} \times \text{PM}_3$  ( $202.8 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ ),  $\text{PU-N}_{180} \times \text{OC}_2$  ( $199.8 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ ),  $\text{USG-N}_{180} \times \text{CD}_5$  ( $198.1 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ ) and  $\text{PU-N}_{180} \times \text{PM}_3$  ( $193.3 \text{ kg N ha}^{-1}$ ) had higher levels of N uptake. Nitrogen uptake was increased with increasing levels of N applied and this amount was higher in the USG-applied plots with OC. This might be due to the high availability and uninterrupted supply of N with deep-placed USG in combination with OC. Here, organic manure might have acted as a slow-releasing N source which can supply N for a long period of time to the plant resulting higher N uptake. This finding was supported by Rickard (2008) as the plant N uptake was synergistically influenced by N application. Tremblay *et al.* (2001) also showed that the N uptake was approximately  $260 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$  for an average yield of field vegetables.

**Table 7. Effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on nutrient uptake by broccoli plant**

Treatment	N uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ±SE)	P uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ±SE)	K uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ±SE)	S uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ±SE)
USG <sub>140</sub> OC <sub>1</sub>	167.6±7.06hij	23.9±0.83cd	212.6±4.44a-e	2.38±0.10ef
USG <sub>140</sub> OC <sub>2</sub>	191.8±4.63b-e	30.8±1.45ab	238.3±6.82ab	3.02±0.14bcd
USG <sub>140</sub> PM <sub>2</sub>	139.4±2.36k	22.2±0.57d	187.2±3.91e	2.17±0.04f
USG <sub>140</sub> PM <sub>3</sub>	173.7±6.21f-i	25.1±1.09bcd	205.9±6.27b-e	2.68±0.19c-f
USG <sub>140</sub> CD <sub>3</sub>	143.3±7.33k	23.1±1.15d	206.1±3.25b-e	2.37±0.17ef
USG <sub>140</sub> CD <sub>5</sub>	173.7±4.79f-i	25.1±1.16bcd	216.0±2.76a-e	2.61±0.09c-f
USG <sub>160</sub> OC <sub>1</sub>	171.0±2.12g-j	25.7±0.90bc	215.5±3.38a-e	2.43±0.05ef
USG <sub>160</sub> OC <sub>2</sub>	204.3±4.17ab	33.0±2.15a	247.0±6.78a	3.24±0.21ab
USG <sub>160</sub> PM <sub>2</sub>	159.9±8.49ij	25.1±0.21bcd	193.9±5.63de	2.38±0.15ef
USG <sub>160</sub> PM <sub>3</sub>	188.8±8.59b-f	28.0±0.33ab	226.8±5.05a-d	2.73±0.13cde
USG <sub>160</sub> CD <sub>3</sub>	158.1±3.06j	24.8±0.23cd	200.5±6.04cde	2.45±0.11ef
USG <sub>160</sub> CD <sub>5</sub>	178.0±1.92d-h	26.4±1.70bc	212.9±3.87a-e	2.56±0.08def
USG <sub>180</sub> OC <sub>1</sub>	194.6±1.54abc	25.0±1.83bc	228.6±4.87a-d	3.00±0.15bcd
USG <sub>180</sub> OC <sub>2</sub>	208.3±7.39a	33.0±1.13a	247.3±8.05a	3.45±0.15a
USG <sub>180</sub> PM <sub>2</sub>	185.9±5.67c-g	28.3±0.82ab	214.9±5.52a-e	2.54±0.19def
USG <sub>180</sub> PM <sub>3</sub>	202.8±2.25ab	32.8±1.18a	238.3±7.36ab	3.10±0.16bcd
USG <sub>180</sub> CD <sub>3</sub>	185.2±6.86c-g	26.5±1.00bc	209.5±5.78b-e	2.45±0.15ef
USG <sub>180</sub> CD <sub>5</sub>	198.1±6.97abc	27.8±1.12bc	220.3±3.05a-e	2.60±0.09def
PU <sub>180</sub> OC <sub>1</sub>	168.6±6.12hij	24.3±1.30cd	202.5±5.65b-e	2.22±0.12ef
PU <sub>180</sub> OC <sub>2</sub>	199.8±4.56abc	28.5±0.87ab	234.9±5.90abc	2.66±0.12c-f
PU <sub>180</sub> PM <sub>2</sub>	172.7±2.31.g-j	22.7±0.79d	195.8±6.99de	2.30±0.17ef
PU <sub>180</sub> PM <sub>3</sub>	193.3±6.68a-d	26.1±1.29bc	211.1±4.07a-e	2.52±0.11def
PU <sub>180</sub> CD <sub>3</sub>	176.9±3.09-h	24.9±1.22cd	206.6±3.18b-e	2.46±0.09ef
PU <sub>180</sub> CD <sub>5</sub>	190.9±6.85b-e	26.5±1.03bc	219.1±4.58a-e	2.59±0.07def
CV (%)	5.33	7.61	3.95	9.31

Means followed by common letters are statistically similar to each other at 5% level of provability by DMRT

### ***Phosphorus uptake***

Application of nitrogenous fertilizer at higher rates significantly increased the P uptake and the highest value (33.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded with USG-N<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub> and USG-N<sub>160</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub> being at par to USG-N<sub>180</sub>×PM<sub>3</sub>, PU-N<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub> and USG-N<sub>140</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub>. The lowest P uptake (22.2 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded with USG-N<sub>140</sub>×PM<sub>2</sub>. However, P uptake was found higher in the treatment where USG was applied with organic manure (Table 7). The major cause of variation in P uptake is due to the variation in yield of broccoli (Hussain *et al.* (2021). Similar result was found by Yoldas *et al.* (2008) as they reported that P concentration in broccoli heads were

increased with increasing rates of N application. This higher P uptake might be the effect of N conversion to nitrate and subsequently this nitrate was absorbed by the root system creating a negative charge in root cells with charge equilibrium caused by cation absorption and consequently, P absorption by the plant increased (Moniruzzaman *et al.* (2007).

#### ***Potassium uptake***

Potassium uptake increased with the increasing rates of nitrogenous fertilizer but similar K uptake ( $247.3 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) was recorded with USG-N<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub> followed by USG-N<sub>160</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub> ( $247.0 \text{ kg}$ ). The lowest K uptake ( $187.2 \text{ kg}$ ) was noted with USG-N<sub>140</sub>×PM<sub>2</sub> treatment (Table 7). This was also due to the continuous supply and greater recovery percent of K fertilizer with USG-organic manure integration over PU. This result was supported by Yoldas *et al.* (2008) who reported that nitrogen application increased the K concentrations in broccoli heads. Similar results were also reported by Abdelrazzag (2002) and Magnusson (2002) with several vegetable crops. The possible reason for the higher K uptake was the conversion of N to nitrate in the soil solution and its absorption by the roots resulting a negative charge in root cells maintaining a charge equilibrium through cation absorption and consequently, K absorption by the plant increased (Moniruzzaman *et al.* (2007).

#### ***Sulfur uptake***

It was observed that increasing levels of nitrogenous fertilizer significantly increased S uptake and the maximum S uptake ( $3.45 \text{ kg ha}^{-1}$ ) was recorded with USG-N<sub>180</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub> followed by USG-N<sub>160</sub>×OC<sub>2</sub> ( $3.24 \text{ kg}$ ). Here, the higher S uptake was found in the USG-treated plots rather than PU (Table 7) and S uptake was found greater with higher amount of organic manure. This might be due to the random supply and the greater recovery percent of S with the integrated application of USG-organic manure than PU. The higher N supply from USG synergistically induced a higher S uptake by the broccoli plant. Ali *et al.* (2009) reported that the total uptake of S ranged from 6 to 21  $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$  with the application of dhaincha, mungbean residues, cowdung and poultry manure with 70% NPKS where higher uptake of nutrients by the crops was recorded compared to 70% NPKS application as fertilizer only.

#### **Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on soil nutrient balance**

Nutrient balance has an important implication to maintain the total soil nutrients status for long-time and sustainable soil fertility (BARC, FRG'2005). The apparent nutrient balance in all the treated plots was found negative for N and K but a positive balance was observed in P and S. Zaman *et al.* (2008) found that the negative apparent NPKS balance in all the treatments composed of both organic and inorganic combination in rice.

### *Nitrogen balance*

Nitrogen replenishment through chemical fertilizer and addition of organic manures either singly or in combination was not enough to balance N removal by crops because much of the applied N was lost from the soil. The N balance thus was very small but positive almost in all the treatment except treatment USG-N<sub>140</sub> × OC<sub>2</sub> and USG-N<sub>160</sub> × OC<sub>2</sub> which showed a little negative balance (Table 8). Nitrogen is subjected to loss through volatilization, denitrification, leaching and surface run-off during heavy rain; therefore, the theoretical balance of N in tropical soil may not be so useful, unless the subsequent crop utilizes the residual N of the previous crop. Non-symbiotic biological N fixation (BNF) was not taken under consideration. Without considering non-symbiotic BNF by the crop all treatments had more or less positive N balances except treatment USG-N<sub>140</sub> × OC<sub>2</sub> and USG-N<sub>160</sub> × OC<sub>2</sub> which showed a little negative balance. The negative N balances ranged between -3.8 to -11.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup> (Table 8). The highest negative balance (-11.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup>) was obtained from USG-N<sub>140</sub> × OC<sub>2</sub> with the higher initial crop growth followed by USG-N<sub>160</sub> × OC<sub>2</sub> (-3.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup>). The results are also well accordance with Saha *et al.* (2003). Ali *et al.* (2009) reported a negative balance for N and K with the highest mining of K, while the balances for P and S were positive.

**Table 8. Integrated effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on apparent nitrogen balance on broccoli field (Nutrient input-output system)**

Treatments	Input (N kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Output (N kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Apparent N balance (N kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	Inorganic source	Organic source	Total	Crop uptake	Loss	Total	
USG-N <sub>140</sub> × OC <sub>1</sub>	114.5	25.5	180.0	167.6	-	167.6	12.4
USG-N <sub>140</sub> × OC <sub>2</sub>	89.0	51.0	180.0	191.8	-	191.8	-11.8
USG-N <sub>140</sub> × PM <sub>2</sub>	117.0	23.0	180.0	139.4	-	139.4	40.6
USG-N <sub>140</sub> × PM <sub>3</sub>	105.5	34.5	180.0	173.7	-	173.7	6.3
USG-N <sub>140</sub> × CD <sub>3</sub>	126.5	13.5	180.0	143.3	-	143.3	36.7
USG-N <sub>140</sub> × CD <sub>5</sub>	117.5	22.5	180.0	173.7	-	173.7	6.3
USG-N <sub>160</sub> × OC <sub>1</sub>	134.5	25.5	200.0	171.0	-	171.0	29.0
USG-N <sub>160</sub> × OC <sub>2</sub>	109.5	51.0	200.5	204.3	-	204.3	-3.8
USG-N <sub>160</sub> × PM <sub>2</sub>	137.0	23.0	200.0	159.9	-	159.9	40.1
USG-N <sub>160</sub> × PM <sub>3</sub>	125.5	34.5	200.0	188.8	-	188.8	11.2
USG-N <sub>160</sub> × CD <sub>3</sub>	146.5	13.5	200.0	158.1	-	158.1	41.9
USG-N <sub>160</sub> × CD <sub>5</sub>	137.5	22.5	200.0	178.0	-	178.0	22.0
USG-N <sub>180</sub> × OC <sub>1</sub>	154.5	25.5	220.0	194.2	-	194.2	25.9
USG-N <sub>180</sub> × OC <sub>2</sub>	129.0	51.0	220.0	208.3	-	208.3	11.7
USG-N <sub>180</sub> × PM <sub>2</sub>	157.0	23.0	220.0	185.9	-	185.9	34.1
USG-N <sub>180</sub> × PM <sub>3</sub>	145.5	34.5	220.0	202.8	-	202.8	17.2
USG-N <sub>180</sub> × CD <sub>3</sub>	166.5	13.5	220.0	185.9	-	185.2	34.8

Treatments	Input (N kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Output (N kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Apparent N balance (N kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	Inorganic source	Organic source	Total	Crop uptake	Loss	Total	
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	157.5	22.5	220.0	198.1	-	198.1	21.9
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	154.5	25.5	220.0	168.6	-	168.6	51.4
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	129.0	51.0	220.0	199.8	-	199.8	20.2
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	157.0	23.0	220.0	172.7	-	172.7	47.3
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	145.5	34.5	220.0	193.3	-	193.3	26.7
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	166.5	13.5	220.0	176.9	-	176.9	43.1
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	157.5	22.5	220.0	190.9	-	190.9	29.1

Note: Other sources of inputs (Biological N fixation, rain and irrigation water etc.) and output (Leaching loss, run-off, volatilization and denitrification loss etc.) were not considered here.

### Phosphorus balance

The apparent P balance in soil resulting from different fertilizer management practices ranged from 20.0 to 30.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup> in different treatments (Table 9). The apparent P balance was found positive in all treatments. The highest apparent P balance (30.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in the treatment USG<sub>140</sub>×PM<sub>2</sub> due to lower uptake of nutrients as compared to other treatments. Basak (2002) also observed similar trend of nutrient balance in the groundnut - rice cropping pattern under irrigated nutrient management system. Ali *et al.* (2009) reported a negative balance for N and K with the highest mining of K, while the balances for P and S were positive with an application of 3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> PM once in a year.

**Table 9. Integrated effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on apparent phosphorus balance on broccoli (Nutrient input-output system)**

Treatments	Inputs (P kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Outputs (P kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Apparent P balance (P kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	Inorganic source	Organic source	Total	Crop uptake	Total	
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	49.0	4.0	53.0	23.9	23.9	29.1
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	45.0	8.0	53.0	30.8	30.8	22.2
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	32.0	21.0	53.0	22.2	22.2	30.8
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	21.5	31.5	53.0	25.1	25.1	27.9
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	48.5	4.5	53.0	23.1	23.1	29.9
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	45.5	7.5	53.0	25.1	25.1	27.9
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	49.0	4.0	53.0	25.7	25.7	27.3
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	45.0	8.0	53.0	33.0	33.0	20.0
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	32.0	21.0	53.0	25.1	25.1	27.9
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	21.5	31.5	53.0	28.0	28.0	25.0
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	48.5	4.5	53.0	24.8	24.8	28.2
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	45.5	7.5	53.0	26.4	26.4	26.6

Treatments	Inputs (P kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Outputs (P kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Apparent P balance (P kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	Inorganic source	Organic source	Total	Crop uptake	Total	
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	49.0	4.0	53.0	26.0	26.0	27.0
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	45.0	8.0	53.0	33.0	33.0	20.0
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	32.0	21.0	53.0	28.3	28.3	24.7
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	21.5	31.5	53.0	32.8	32.8	20.2
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	48.5	4.5	53.0	26.5	26.5	26.5
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	45.5	7.5	53.0	27.8	27.8	25.2
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	49.0	4.0	53.0	24.3	24.3	28.7
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	45.0	8.0	53.0	28.5	28.5	24.5
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	32.0	21.0	53.0	22.7	22.7	30.3
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	21.5	31.5	53.0	26.1	26.1	26.9
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	48.5	4.5	53.0	24.9	24.9	28.1
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	45.5	7.5	53.0	26.5	26.5	26.5

### Potassium balance

Unlike P, the apparent balance of K in soil was highly negative as influenced by the treatment combinations. The magnitude of the negative K balance ranged from -104.2 to -164.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup> (Table 10). Potassium replenishment through application of inorganic fertilizer and organic manures either singly or in combination was not enough to balance K removal by crops since the crops used much of the applied K and some of the K leached from the soil. This may lead to K depletion in the long run. These results confirmed the reports by Hunag Li. and Xie (1990), Prasad (1993) and Saha *et al.* (2003) indicating negative K balances and ongoing K depletion in many irrigated rice systems. Ali *et al.* (2009) reported that application of 3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> PM once in a year with 70% NPKS can reduce the use of 30% NPKS as fertilizers. There were negative balances for N and K with the highest mining of K, while the balances for P and S were positive. Ali *et al.* (2009) reported a negative balance for K with the highest mining of K with an application of 3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> PM.

**Table 10. Integrated effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on apparent potassium balance on broccoli (Nutrient input-output system)**

Treatments	Inputs (K kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Outputs (K kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Apparent K balance (K kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	Inorganic source	Organic source	Total	Crop uptake	Total	
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	78.0	5.0	83.0	212.6	212.6	-129.6
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	73.0	10.0	83.0	238.3	238.3	-155.3
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	69.0	14.0	83.0	187.2	187.2	-104.2
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	62.0	21.0	83.0	205.9	205.9	-122.9
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	68.0	15.0	83.0	206.1	206.1	-123.1

Treatments	Inputs (K kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Outputs (K kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Apparent K balance (K kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	Inorganic source	Organic source	Total	Crop uptake	Total	
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	58.0	25.0	83.0	216.0	216.0	-133.0
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	78.0	5.0	83.0	215.5	215.5	-132.5
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	73.0	10.0	83.0	247.0	247.0	-164.0
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	69.0	14.0	83.0	193.9	193.9	-110.9
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	62.0	21.0	83.0	226.8	226.8	-143.8
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	68.0	15.0	83.0	200.5	200.5	-117.5
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	58.0	25.0	83.0	212.9	212.9	-129.9
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	78.0	5.0	83.0	228.6	228.6	-145.6
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	73.0	10.0	83.0	247.3	247.3	-164.3
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	69.0	14.0	83.0	214.9	214.9	-131.9
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	62.0	21.0	83.0	238.3	238.3	-155.3
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	68.0	15.0	83.0	209.5	209.5	-126.5
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	58.0	25.0	83.0	220.3	220.3	-137.3
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	78.0	5.0	83.0	202.5	202.5	-119.5
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	73.0	10.0	83.0	234.9	234.9	-151.9
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	69.0	14.0	83.0	195.8	195.8	-112.8
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	62.0	21.0	83.0	211.1	211.1	-128.1
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	68.0	15.0	83.0	206.6	206.6	-123.6
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	58.0	25.0	83.0	219.1	219.1	-136.1

### *Sulphur balance*

The S balance was favorable as expected and considerable quantities of S were accumulated in the fertilized plots. The apparent positive S balance among the different treatments ranged from 16.5 to 17.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup> (Table 11). Treatments receiving both higher dose of organic manures and inorganic fertilizers showed higher nutrient uptake than that received lower organic and inorganic fertilizer. The highest positive S balance (17.83 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> season<sup>-1</sup>) was noted in treatment USG<sub>140</sub>×PM<sub>2</sub>. Basak *et al.* (2008) reported that S balance increased significantly in IPNS based treatment under Mustard - Boro rice - T. Aman rice cropping pattern. Ali *et al.* (2009) reported a positive balance for P and S with an application of 3 t ha<sup>-1</sup> PM once in a year.

**Table 11. Integrated effect of different forms and levels of organic and inorganic sources of nitrogen on apparent sulphur balance on broccoli field (Nutrient input-output system)**

Treatments	Inputs (S kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Outputs (S kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Apparent S balance (S kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	Inorganic + organic source	Total	Crop uptake	Total	
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.38	2.38	17.6
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	20.0	20.0	3.02	3.02	17.0

Treatments	Inputs (S kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Outputs (S kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		Apparent S balance (S kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
	Inorganic + organic source	Total	Crop uptake	Total	
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.17	2.17	17.8
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.68	2.68	17.3
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.37	2.37	17.6
USG-N <sub>140</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.61	2.61	17.4
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.43	2.43	17.6
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	20.0	20.0	3.24	3.24	16.8
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.38	2.38	17.6
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.73	2.73	17.3
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.45	2.45	17.6
USG-N <sub>160</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.56	2.56	17.4
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	20.0	20.0	3.00	3.00	17.0
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	20.0	20.0	3.45	3.45	16.6
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.54	2.54	17.5
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	20.0	20.0	3.10	3.10	16.9
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.45	2.45	17.6
USG-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.60	2.60	17.4
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>1</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.22	2.22	17.8
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×OC <sub>2</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.66	2.66	17.3
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>2</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.30	2.30	17.7
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×PM <sub>3</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.52	2.52	17.5
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>3</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.46	2.46	17.5
PU-N <sub>180</sub> ×CD <sub>5</sub>	20.0	20.0	2.59	2.59	17.4

### Conclusion

From the above discussion it could be concluded that integration of organic and inorganic N sources have a little influence on soil physical and chemical properties of soil and its effects on soil nutrient balance. Post harvest soil organic carbon content was significantly influenced by the integration of organic-inorganic N management approach, but soil pH, bulk density and particle density were influenced a little. However, a significant influence was found on post harvest soil nutrient balance where K balance showed (-) ve but N (except a little), P, S and B showed (+) ve balance as affected by the integrated nitrogen management through organic-inorganic sources of N. Soil physical and chemical properties were slightly increased under higher rate of USG-organic manure as compared to PU-organic manure integration.

### References

- Abdelrazzag, A. 2002. Effect of chicken manure, sheep manure and inorganic fertilizers on yield and nutrient uptake by onion. *Pak. J. Biol. Sci.* **5**: 266–268.

- Ali, M. E., Islam M. R and Jahiruddin, M. 2009. Effect of integrated use of organic manure with chemical fertilizers in the rice-rice cropping system and its impact on soil health. *Bangladesh J. Agril. Res.* **34(1)**: 81-90
- Al-Tarawneh, A. A. 2005. The effects of two types of organic manure and NPK on growth, yield and quality of lettuce and strawberry. M. Sc. Thesis, Mu'tah University, Jordan.
- Anwar, M. 2008. Efficacy of cow dung and poultry manure on hybrid cauliflower cultivation through IPNS approach. MS Thesis, Dept. Soil Science, Bangabandhu Sheikh Mujibur Rahman Agricultural University Gazipur.
- BARC, 2005. Fertilizer Recommendation Guide. Bangladesh Agricultural Research Council, Soils Pub. No. 45, 237-238 pp.
- Basak, N. C. 2002. Effects of groundnut crop residue and chemical fertilizers on the productivity of Groundnut-Rice-Rice pattern, Ph. D. Thesis, Department of Agronomy, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh, Bangladesh, 87 – 89 pp.
- Basak, N. C., Quayyum, M. A., Asaduzzaman, S. M., Sultana, N. and Khan, M. A. H. 2008. Integrated nutrient management in the Mustard - Boro rice-T.aman rice cropping pattern. *Bangladesh J. Agril. Res.* **33(1)**: 135-143.
- Basel A. O. and Atif Y. M. 2008. Effect of fertilizers on growth, yield, yield components, quality and certain nutrient contents in broccoli (*Brassica oleracea*). *Int. J. Agri. Biol.* **10(6)**: 627-632.
- Bhandari, A. L., Sood, A., Sharma, K. N. and Rana, D. S. 1992. Integrated nutrient management in rice-wheat system. *J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci.* **40**: 742-747.
- Bhuiyan, N. I., Shaha, A. L. and Panaullah, G. M. 1991. Effect of NPK fertilization on the grain yield of transplanted rice and soil fertility-A long-term study. *Bangladesh J. Soil Sci.* **22 (1 & 2)**: 41-50.
- Black, C. A. 1965. Methods of soil analysis, Part-I and II. Amer. Soc. Agron. Inc. Pub. Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A: 30-48.
- Everaarts A. P. and de Willigen P. 1999. The effect of the rate and method of nitrogen application on nitrogen uptake and utilization by broccoli (*Brassica oleracea* var. *Italica*). *Netherlands Journal of Agricultural Science.* **47**:201-214.
- Gaur, A. C. and Verma, L. N. 1991. Integrated plant nutrition in prevailing crop mixes in India. P. 60-79, In Asian experiences in integrated plant nutrition. Report of the expert consultation of the Asian network on bio and organic fertilizers. Bangkok. Thailand, 18-21 Sept. 1990, Regional office for Asia and pacific (RAPA) FAO, Bangkok RAPA report 1991/7.
- Hoque, T. S., Hashem, M. A. and Islam, M. R. 2007. Effects of differnt sources of nitrogen on the nutrient uptake by rice and on soil fertility. *J. Bangladesh Agri. Univ.* **5(1)**: 81-86.
- Huang, J. N., Li, J. P. and Xie, S. 1990. A Study of nutrient balance in different cropping systems on a laterite red soil. *J. South China Agric. Univ.* **13**: 7-14.

- Hussain, M. J., Karim A. J. M. S., Solaiman, A. R. M, Islam, M. S. and Rahman, M. 2021. Integrated effect of inorganic and organic nitrogen sources on nutrient uptake and crop quality of broccoli. *Agr. Nat. Resour.* **55**: 71–80.
- Jackson, M. L. 1962. Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall Inc. Engle Wood Cliffs, N. J., USA: 55-56.
- Jackson, M. L. 1973. Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi, India.
- Magnusson, M. 2002. Mineral fertilizers and green mulch in Chinese cabbage (*Brassica pekinensis* Rupr): Effect on nutrient uptake, yield and internal tipburn. *Acta Agr. Scand. B-S. P.* **52**: 25–35.
- Mishra, P. P., Das, A. K. and Mishra, N. 2014. Effect of integrated nutrient management on yield, quality and economics of knolkhol (*Brassica oleracea* L. cv gongylodes). *Asian J. Horticulture.* 9(2): 382-385.
- Moniruzzaman, M., Rahman, S. M. L, Kibria, M., Grahman, M. A. and Hossain, M. M. 2007. Effect of boron and nitrogen on yield and hollow stem of broccoli. *J. Soil Nature.* 1: 24–29
- Nahar, S., Karim, M. M., Polash, M. A. S., Juthee, S. A. Fakir, M. S. A. and Hossain, A. 2021. Influence of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients on the growth and seed yield of Chinese broccoli (*Brassica oleracea* L. var. alboglabra Baily). *Farm. Manage.* **6** (1): 8-14
- Nambiar, K. K. M. 1991. Long-term fertility effects on wheat productivity, wheat for the nontraditional warm areas: A Proceedings of the International Conference, Mexico, CIMMYT, 1991.
- Olsen, S. R., Cole, C. V., Watanable, F. S. and Dean, L. A. 1954. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. U.S. Dept. Agri. Cric: 929. pp. 516-521.
- Page, A. L., Miller, R. H. and Keeney, D.R. 1982. Methods of soil analysis. Part 2, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Amar. Soc. Agron., Inc. Madi, Wis, USA.
- Pathak, S. K., Singh, S. B., Jha, R. N. and Sharma, R. P. 2005 Effect of nutrient management on nutrient uptake and change in soil fertility in maize (*Zea mays* L.)-wheat (*Triticumaestivum*) cropping system. *Indian J. Agron.* **50**(4): 269-273.
- Piper, G. S. 1950. Soil and Plant Analysis. Adelaide University Press, Australia.
- Prasad, B. L. 1993. Effect Of continuous application of potassium on crop yields and potassium availability under different cropping sequences in calcareous soil. *J. Potassium Res.*, **9**: 48-54.
- Priyanka, L., Devi, S. and Anupam, T. 2017. Effect of inorganic and organic fertilizers on yield and economics of broccoli (*Brassica olerasia* var. italica). *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.* **6**(8): 562-566
- Rani P., Francis. H., Duraisamy, P., Kandaswamy, P. and Palaniappan, S. P. 1991. Integrated nutrient management in Tamilnadu. Technical bulletin. Dept of Soil science and Agricultural chemistry. Tamilnadu GDN Agric. Univ. Coimbatore, India.

- Reganold, J. P., I. P. Robert, and J. F. Parr. 1990. Sustainability of agriculture in the United States-An overview. Proc. Sustainable Agriculture, Issues, Prospectives and Prospects in Semi Arid Tropics. Singh, R.P. (ed.).
- Rickard, M. 2008. Effect of irrigation and nitrogen treatments on yield, quality, plant nitrogen uptake and soil nitrogen status and the evaluation of sap test, SPAD chlorophyll meter and Dualex to monitor nitrogen status in broccoli. M. Sc. thesis, Horticultural Science Programme, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, SLU. Alnarp, Sweden.
- Saha, P. K., Islam, R., Miah, M. A. M. and Bhuiyan, N. I. 2003. Integrated nutrient management for rice production in Old Meghna Estuarine Flood Plain. *Bangladesh J. Agric. Res.* **28** (4): 521-531.
- Sanwal, S. K., Lakminarayana, K., Yadav, R. K. Rai, N., Yaldav, D. S. and Mousumi, B. 2007. Effect of organic manures on soil fertility, growth, physiology, yield and quality of turmeric. *Indian Journal of Horticulture.* **64**(4): 444 – 449
- Sarkar, S. and Singh, S. R. 1997. Integrated nutrient management in relation to soil fertility and yield sustainability under dry land farming. *Indian J. Agri. Sci.* **67** (9): 431 – 433.
- Sharma, J. P. and Saxena, S. N. 1985. Utilization of phosphorus by maize as influenced by various source of organic matter and applied phosphorus. *J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci.* **33** (3): 315-322.
- Swarup, A. and Yaduvanshi, N. P. S. 2000. Effect of integrated nutrient management on soil properties and yield of rice in alkali soils. *J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci.* **48**(2): 279-282.
- Tremblay, N., Scharpf, H. C., Weier, U., Laurence, H. and Owen, J., 2001. Nitrogen Management in Field Vegetables: A Guide to Efficient Fertilization. Horticultural Research and Development Centre, Canada. Available at: <http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/A42-92-2001E.pdf> (accessed 8 November 2019).
- Wong, J. W. C., Ma, K. K. Fang, K. M. and Cheung, C. 1999. Utilization of manure compost for organic farming in Hong Kong. *Bio-resource Technol.*, 67: 43–46.
- Yoldas, F., Ceylan, S., Yagmur, B. and Mordogan, N. 2008. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer on yield quality and nutrient content in broccoli. *J. Plant Nutr.* **31**: 1333–1343.
- Zaman, S., Lippman S. I., Zhao, X. and Broach, J. R. 2008. How *Saccharomyces* responds to nutrients. *Annu Rev Genet.* **42**:27-81.
- Zhang, M., Gu, H, and Peng, P. 1996. Study on combined application of organic and inorganic fertilizers in dry and poor red paddy soils. Res. Agric. Modernization. 17 (10): 41-44. Cited from *Rice Abst.* 1997. **20** (1): 32.