



The Integrated Effect of Organic Manure, Biofertilizer and Inorganic Fertilizer on Soil Properties, Yield and Quality in Sugarcane Plant-ratoon System under Calcareous Soil of Indo-gangetic Plains of India

**S.K. Sinha ^{a++}, Ajeet Kumar ^{b#*}, Amrita Kumari ^{ct}
and A.K. Singh ^{d‡}**

^a Department of Soil Science, Regional Research Station, Madhopur, West Champaran, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa (Samastipur)-848125, Bihar, India.

^b Department of Soil Science, Sugarcane Research Institute, Pusa (Samastipur), Bihar-848125, India.

^c Bihar Agricultural University, Sabour, Bhagalpur, -813210, India.

^d Sugarcane Research Institute, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa (Samastipur)-848125, Bihar, India.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration among all authors. Author SKS proposed the idea and executed the field experiment. Author Ajeet Kumar did the laboratory analysis, data interpretation, guided the study and wrote original manuscript. Author Amrita Kumari did the field soil sampling and data collection. Author AKS critically reviewed the manuscript and gave idea of the work. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/JSRR/2024/v30i51934

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/114404>

Original Research Article

Received: 08/01/2024

Accepted: 11/03/2024

Published: 16/03/2024

⁺⁺ Associate Professor;

[#] Assistant Professor-cum-Scientist;

[†] Assistant Professor-cum-Jr. Scientist;

[‡] Director;

*Corresponding author: E-mail: ajeet.sri@rpcau.ac.in;

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was conducted at the Research Farm of Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa, Bihar, to devise nutrient management strategies aimed at sustaining soil health, quality and sugarcane production within the sugarcane plant-ratoon system. The experiment evaluated the efficacy of various fertilizers on the solubility of applied inorganic fertilizer during the spring season in calcareous soil. Results from the combined data analysis showed significant variations in the number of millable cane (NMC), cane yield, and sugar yield due to the integrated application of organic and inorganic fertilizers along with bio-fertilizers in both the plant and ratoon crops. Treatments combining organic and inorganic fertilizers with bio-fertilizers demonstrated a noteworthy increase in NMC, cane yield, and sugar yield compared to the control group. The treatment that received 75% NPK of recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF) along with *Acetobacter*, PSB, and Bio-compost at a rate of 7.5 t ha⁻¹ exhibited the highest NMC (103.0 × 10³ ha⁻¹), cane yield (85.8 t ha⁻¹), and sugar yield (11.21 t ha⁻¹). Furthermore, the residual effect of the treatment combining organic and inorganic fertilizers with bio-fertilizers showed a pronounced impact on NMC (92.4 × 10³ ha⁻¹), yield (79.6 t ha⁻¹), and sugar yield (9.36 t ha⁻¹) in the ratoon crop under treatment T9. Bio-compost notably enhanced the overall performance of sugarcane. Nutrient uptake by both plant and ratoon followed a similar trend as cane yield. Application of RDF alongside various bio-fertilizers significantly enhanced sugarcane productivity compared to the control group. Notably, the efficacy of bio-fertilizers was more pronounced when used in conjunction with inorganic treatments. Treatment with organic inputs through bio-compost resulted in reduced pH and increased electrical conductivity (EC), organic carbon, and available nutrients (N,P, and K) in post-harvest soil. Enzymatic activities including glycosidase, urease, acid phosphatase, and dehydrogenase were also recorded.

Keywords: Bio-compost; PSB; nutrient uptake; microbial population; enzymes; sugarcane.

1. INTRODUCTION

“Sugarcane is widely cultivated throughout the Indo-Gangetic plains of India. More than 4.2 million hectares are under sugarcane cultivation in India alone, with an average cane yield of 60 t ha⁻¹. Sugarcane (*Saccharum* species hybrids) is a very exhaustive and extracting crop that removes about 205 kg N, 55 kg P₂O₅, 275 kg K₂O, 30 kg S, 3.5 kg Fe, 1.2 kg Mn, 0.6 kg Zn and 0.2 kg Cu from the soil for a cane yield of 100 t ha⁻¹, [1]. Out of the total phosphorus (P) fertilizers applied to the crop, only 15-20% can be used and the rest is fixed in the soil as phosphates of Ca, Al or Fe depending on the soil reaction. A considerable amount of P is rapidly transformed into less available forms by forming a complex with Al or Fe in acid soils or Ca in calcareous soils [2] before plant roots had a chance to absorb it [3]. “Consequently, due to the nature of this crop as extensive excavation of nutrient, the soils are becoming nutrient-deficient. In order to sustain productivity, the nutrients are applied each year at the recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF), which in the sub-tropical part of Bihar are 150 kg N ha⁻¹ for the sugarcane main crop, 85 kg of P₂O₅ and 60 kg of K₂O ha⁻¹ while 170 kg N ha⁻¹ as well as 50 kg of P₂O₅ and 60 kg of K₂O ha⁻¹ for ratoon crop. The efficiency of

sugarcane to utilize applied nitrogen ranges between 16% to 45%, as large quantities of applied N leached through the soil due to the percolating irrigation water. Besides, the continuous use of chemical fertilizers causing deficiency in other micronutrients. In recent years, the yield have stagnated and factor productivity has declined with decrease in soil organic matter (SOM) content and deterioration in the physico-chemical and biological properties of the soil is the prime reasons for the declining yield” [4]. “Sugarcane farmers are switching over to alternative practices to make sugarcane cultivation more sustainable and productive. Such farming practices, combined with the management of the farm and concurrently available renewable resources, results in the rejuvenation of the soils. The application of organic matter from such resources as animal manures, crop residues and green manuring has been shown to replenish organic carbon and improve soil structure and fertility” [5,6]. “Moreover, several kinds of microbial agents capable of fixing nitrogen or solubilising and mobilizing P and other nutrients are becoming an integral component. *Gluconacetobacter diazotrophicus* (GD) (Earlier known as *Acetobacter diazotrophicus*), a nitrogen-fixing bacteria associated with sugarcane as an

endophyte, is present in high numbers (As high as 10^6 counts g^{-1} plant tissue). The exact role of such endophytic colonization, has not yet been elucidated, but the few inoculation experiments have been carried out which suggest that positive colonization contributes to plant in terms of improved plant height, nitrogenase activity, leaf nitrogen, biomass and yield. Field trials conducted have shown that inoculation by *GD* together with other diazotrophs can match yield equal to the application of 275 kg Nha^{-1} [7,8]. In contrast, high levels of N fertilization negatively affect the population of endophytic bacteria in sugarcane. Apart from N fixation, other properties associated with *GD* are P-solubilization, production of plant growth hormone Indole acetic acid [9] and the suppression of red rot disease [10], they reported that the native occurrence of *GD* in sugarcane varieties of sub-tropical India is very low, which may be enhanced through the inoculation of efficient isolates [11]. "Some sugarcane varieties have been found to derive up to 70% of their nitrogen requirement through biological nitrogen fixation" [12] "Various kinds of bacteria such as *GD*, *Herbaspirillum* spp., *Azospirillum amazonense*, *Burkholderia* spp., capable of fixing nitrogen have been reported to colonize the epidermis of sugarcane stem and roots, of which *Gluconacetobacter* seems to contribute appreciable amount of nitrogen for nutrition of the plant" [9]. "Sugarcane respond positively to organic sources to meet its nutrient requirements; however, the effect of organic sources together with *GD* on yield and the availability and balance of nutrients in the soil along with biological and physical status and overall sustainability of the system need to be ascertained. Furthermore, it has been reported regarding its availability to solubilise insoluble inorganic phosphates from the soil and make available P for the inoculated crops. The indiscriminate use of chemical fertilizer, apart from their high cost often leads to nutritional imbalance which causes deterioration in soil health and decreases the yield. The present study designed to evaluate the effect of manures with bio-inoculants on the sugarcane and its subsequent ratoon in terms of the productivity of the sugarcane crop and subsequent ratoons as well as availability, uptake and balance of soil nutrients. Thus maintenance of fertility and productivity through combination of organics, inorganic and bio-fertilisers to harness maximum advantage. Manure has been considered as a value input to the soil. No single source of plant nutrients i.e. chemical fertilizers, manures or bio-

fertilizers can meet the entire nutrient requirement of crop in intensive cultivation. It is a need for nutrient replenishment through organic waste, fertilizer and bio-fertilizer. For sustainability in sugarcane yield and sugar production, the integrated nutrient use has been observed highly beneficial" [13]. "Phosphorus is the second most plant nutrient after nitrogen. Phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB), phosphate solubilizing fungi (PSF) and Actinomycetes has a greater potential for conversion of insoluble phosphate to soluble phosphate ions by many investigators" [14]. Thus, keeping in view the above all facts, a field experiment was conducted to study the integrated effect of manure, biofertilizer and inorganic fertilizer on soil properties, yield and quality in sugarcane plant-ratoon system under calcareous soil.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Description of the Study Area

The study was carried out in the Bihar state of India. Bihar is situated in the eastern part of India in between latitudes $24^{\circ}20'10''\text{N}$ and $27^{\circ}31'15''\text{N}$ and longitudes $83^{\circ}19'50''\text{E}$ and $88^{\circ}17'40''\text{E}$. It is an entirely land-locked state, in a subtropical region of the temperate zone. The experimental site situated on the bank of the river Burhi Gandak at Pusa located in Samastipur, district of Bihar. The experimental research farm is situated at $25^{\circ}08'\text{N}$ latitude, $85^{\circ}07'\text{E}$ longitude and at an altitude 52.0 m above mean sea level and annual rain fall is about 1000 mm.

2.2 Soil Condition of Experimental Site

The field experiment was conducted for three consecutive years first year as main plant crop followed by two years in ratoon-crop at Research Farm of Dr. Rajendra Prasad Central Agricultural University, Pusa (Samastipur) Bihar. The experiment was executed on medium upland having uniform in topography. The experimental site comes under Ustic moisture regime. The experimental soil belongs to Entisols soil order, Fluvents suborder and great group Typic Ustifluent. The climate of Pusa belongs to subtropical climatic region of India. The experimental soil had sandy loam textural class as per whitney's textural triangle. Soil is calcareous in nature and the soil contains free calcium carbonate approximately 34%. Soil is moderately fertile in nature, with bulk density of 1.39 Mg m^{-3} . The analysis of initial experimental

soil indicates slightly alkaline having pH (1:2.5) 8.25, EC 0.29 dsm⁻¹, CaCO₃ 31.63%, low in organic carbon 4.5g ha⁻¹, medium in available N 228.0 kgha⁻¹, medium in P₂O₅ 22.2 kg ha⁻¹, and low in K₂O 112.1 kg ha⁻¹.

2.3 Climate Requirement

Sugarcane is a tropical plant. It grows successfully in regions where the climate is more or less tropical but it may also grow in sub tropics too as in north India. **Rainfall:** A total rainfall between 1100 and 1500 mm is required during the months of vegetative growth followed by a dry period for ripening. **Temperature:** Growth of sugarcane is closely related to temperature. It requires a wide temperature range from over 38°C. Optimum temperature required for germination is 27° to 33°C. Temperature below 27°C is injurious to the cane, reduce tillers and above 38°C adversely affect the sprouting. **Ideal temperature:** Requires for Carbon assimilation: 30°C; Sugar synthesis: 30°C; Sugar transport: 30-35°C; Tillering: 33.3-34.4°C; Root growth: 36°C; Shoot growth: 33°C. **Relative humidity:** Growth of sugarcane requires high humidity (80-85%) during grand growth period. Above 40% humidity coupled with warm weather favours vegetative growth of cane. A moderate value of humidity 45-65% coupled with limited water supply is required during the ripening phase. **Sunshine hour:** it requires at least Sunshine of 7-9 hrs./day. **Frost:** Severe cold weather inhibits bud sprouting in ratoons and arrest cane growth; at temperature 1°C to 2°C the cane leaves and meristem tissues are killed. **Wind:** High velocity winds exceeding 60 km/hr are harmful for canes leading to lodging and cane breakage.

2.4 Treatment Details

The research work was planned and conducted in Randomised Block Design with nine treatments and three replications. Plot size was 9.24 m x 5.40 m. Test crop was sugarcane (cv. B.O.154). BC was applied one month before sugarcane crop planting. The treatments included: T₁: RDF for main plant: 150:85:60; RDF for Ratoon crop: 170:50:60; T₂: 100% NPK + *Acetobacter* ; T₃: 100% NPK + PSB ; T₄: 100% NPK + Bio-Compost (@5 t/ha⁻¹) ; T₅: 100% NPK+ *Acetobacter* + PSB + Bio-Compost (5 t/ha); T₆: 75% NPK + *Acetobacter*; T₇: 75% NPK + PSB ; T₈: 75% NPK + Bio-Compost (7.5 t/ha); T₉: 75% NPK + *Acetobacter* + PSB +Bio-Compost (7.5 t/ha). Note: *Acetobacter* (10⁹ cell/ml culture) and PSB (10⁸ cell/ml culture)

applied @ (5kg/ha); *Trichoderma* (10⁶ cell/ml culture) applied uniformly in all treatments except control plot

2.5 Input Details

Recommended dose of fertilizer (RDF): The RDF for main crop is N: P₂O₅: K₂O: : 150: 85: 60 and for ratoon crop it was 170:50:60, were applied through Urea, DAP and MOP. The T₁ contains only RDF while from treatment T₂ to T₅ contains 100% NPK along with different Biofertilizer and bio compost. The treatment T₆ to T₉ contains 25 % reduced dose of 100% NPK along with Biofertilizer. Half of N and whole K were applied through inorganic fertilizer at the time of planting of sugarcane and the rest half N was top dressed at the time of earthing up. **Bio-Compost:** The BC was brought from New Swadeshi Sugar Mill, Narkatiyaganj, Bihar. The BC used in this experiment was characterized as per the standard procedure and found that it contains 36% C, 1.53 % N, 1.50% P, and 3.10% K as well as micronutrients contents as Zn 102.3 (mg kg⁻¹); Mn 19.64 (mg kg⁻¹), Cu 11.5 (mg kg⁻¹) and Fe 46 (mg kg⁻¹). **Acetobacter culture:** It works as endophytic nitrogen fixer which contains 10⁶Cell/mL of culture. **PSB culture:** it contains 10⁶Cell/mL of culture. **Freshly prepared PSB cultures** were taken from the Biofertilizer unit of Sugarcane Research Institute, Pusa. Five kilograms of compost based bio-fertilizer (PSB) hectare⁻¹ was applied in the furrow before plantation of the sugarcane clumps in the field. The bio-fertilizer was covered with soil by light earthing up followed by irrigation. **Trichoderma culture:** *Trichoderma* culture was directly applied in soil. The 2.5 Kg of *Trichoderma* powder was mixed with 50 Kg of dried cow dung powder and the mixture was broadcasted in furrow.

2.6 Growth and Yield Parameters

The data related with cane height, cane girth and cane yield was recorded at the harvesting stage and cane yield was computed to tonne per hectare. The data of juice quality was recorded for brix, pol and purity %, from composite cane sample juice from each treatments as per standard procedures described [15]. "Brix was measured by polarimeter. The clarified juice was analysed with Sucromat (digital automatic saccharimeter) for pol % and purity %. Commercial Cane Sugar per cent (CCS %) was calculated by using winter's formula. Sugar yield (CCS t/ha) was obtained by multiplying cane yield (t/ha) with CCS%. The crop was harvested

and plant samples were analyzed for N, P and K by the standard procedure" [16].

2.7 Soil Analysis

Soil samples were analyzed for pH and EC in 1:2 soil suspension ratios. The organic carbon was estimated [17]. The available N was determined by using alkaline permanganate method [18], available P was analyzed by method described [19], and available K was determined by flame photo metrically as described [20]. The soil physical properties were analyzed by method described [21]. The available micronutrients cations were analysed method describe [22]. The quality of juice was determined using procedure outlined [23]. Soil microbial colonies were determined using the methods of plate culture count as described [24].

2.8 Plant Analysis (N, P, K Content and Uptake)

"The canes sampled for dry matter determination at harvest were utilized for chemical estimation. The dried samples were ground to fine powder (100 mesh sieves) and about ten g of representative sample from the powdered material was preserved in labeled brown paper bags for chemical estimation. The nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium content were determined by Microkjeldahl method, molybdovanadate phosphoric acid method and flame photometric method, respectively. The uptake of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium (kg ha^{-1}) was worked out by multiplying the percentage of the nutrient in cane with the corresponding dry yields of the respective constituent" [16].

2.9 Soil Microbiological Analysis

The populations of bacteria, fungi and Actinomycetes were quantified by dilution plate-count techniques on a range of culture media for microorganisms. Ten grams of rhizospheric soil were aseptically weighed and transferred to flasks containing 95 mL sterile water, which were shaken for 10 min at 200 rpm on a rotary shaker. While the suspension was in motion, 1 mL were withdrawn and added to 9 mL sterile water in a screw-cap flask and shaken for 1 min; 1 mL of this suspension were transferred to 9 mL sterile water, and the process was repeated to a final dilution of 10^{-6} , 10^{-4} , 10^{-2} for bacteria, fungi and Actinomycetes respectively. The dilutions from 10^{-2} to 10^{-6} were spread on petriplates containing

Thornton's Medium [25], Rose-bengal Agar [26] and Kenknight and Munaier's medium, for bacteria, fungi and Actinomycetes, and incubated at $28 \pm 2^\circ\text{C}$ for 4, 3 and 5 d, respectively. After the incubation, colonies were counted. The microbial populations were determined for five replicates.

2.10 Soil Enzyme Activities

"The β -glucosidase activity was estimated by using p-nitrophenyl- β -D-glucoside (PNG) as a substrate and incubating 1 g of soil with 0.25 ml toluene, 4 ml modified universal buffer (pH 6), and 1 ml PNG solution (25 mM) for 1 h at 37°C [27]. After incubation, 1 ml of CaCl_2 solution and 4 ml Tris buffer (pH 12) were added, and absorbance was taken at 400 nm using a spectrophotometer. The activity of β -glucosidase was expressed as $\mu\text{g PNG g}^{-1} \text{dwt h}^{-1}$ at 37°C ". [28] The urease activity was determined by using urea as a substrate as described by Yao et al. [29]. "Five grams of moist soil was incubated with 1 ml methylbenzene, 10 ml of 10% urea 20 ml citrate buffer (pH 6.7) for 24 h at 37°C . One milliliter of filtered soil solution, 1 ml of sodium phenolate, and 3 ml of sodium hypochlorite were added and diluted to 50 ml, and absorbance was determined at 578 nm using a spectrophotometer. The activity of urease was expressed as $\text{NH}_3\text{-N g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ at 37°C . Acid phosphatase activity was analyzed using p-nitrophenyl phosphate (p-NPP) as substrate" Schneider et al. [30]. "Five grams of moist soil was mixed with 20 ml acetate buffer (pH 5.2) and 100 mM p-NPP and incubated at 30°C for 30 min. After incubation, 1 ml of CaCl_2 and 4 ml of 0.2 M NaOH were added after incubation in order to terminate the reaction. The absorbance was determined using the spectrophotometer at 405 nm. The activity of AP was expressed as $\mu\text{g p-NPP g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ at 30°C . Dehydrogenase activity was measured using triphenyl tetrazolium chloride (TTC) as a substrate [31], where the TTC solution (0.3–0.4 g/100 ml) was mixed with 5 g of moist soil and incubated for 24 h at 30°C . After incubation, 40 ml of acetone was added, and absorbance was determined at 546 nm using a spectrophotometer. The activity of dehydrogenase was expressed as $\mu\text{g TTC g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$ " [28].

2.11 Statistical Analysis

Analyses of variance (AVOVA) and standard deviations were performed separately at individual sampling dates, using measurements within each plot. All statistical analyses were

performed using SPSS version 11.5. The data obtained were analyzed statistically after harvest of second ratoon crops. Data pertaining to different parameters is presented in Tables.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Effect on NMC, Yield and Sugar Yield

Integrated nutrient application had significant impact on number of millable cane, yield and sugar yield of plant and ratoon of sugarcane (Table 1). "The significant increase in cane yield was recorded in the treatments receiving organic manure in combination with bio-fertilizer over control. The treatment T₉ receiving 75 % NPK of RDF + *Acetobacter* + PSB along with Bio-compost @7.5t/ha produced highest NMC (103.0 x10³/ha) and yield (85.8 t/ha) of plant crop. Similarly, residual effect of treatment T₉ was more pronounced on NMC (92.4 x 10³/ha) and yield (79.6 t/ha) of ratoon crop. The result indicated that application of NPK through both from organic and inorganic sources along with bio-fertilizer were found beneficial for obtaining higher yield of plant and ratoon crop. However, difference in yield was significantly at par with treatment T₅ and T₈ receiving bio-compost @ 5t ha⁻¹ and 7.5 t ha⁻¹ respectively. The results are in agreements with findings of many scientists" [32,33,34] reported that addition of 10 t ha⁻¹ FYM/compost along with inorganic fertilizers on the basis of soil test + bio fertilizers (*Azotobacter* + PSB) @ 12.5 kg ha⁻¹ each had a positive effect on sugarcane growth and yield in both plant and ratoon crops.

3.2 Sugar Yield

"The effect of bio-fertilizer and bio-compost along with inorganic fertilizer slightly improved sugar yield in plant and ratoon crop. The highest sugar yield (11.21 t ha⁻¹) in treatment T₉, which was at par with T₅ and T₈ receiving biocompost and lowest was observed in control. A field study to evaluate the response of sugarcane varieties to application of nitrogen fixing diazotrophs viz., *Azotobacter*, *Azospirillum* and *Gluconacetobacter* under different levels of fertilizer nitrogen, reported significant improvement in yield and sugar content of bio-fertilizer inoculated sugarcane plants compared to un inoculated control", Hari and Srinivasan [35]. The use of different bio-fertilizers like *Azotobacter*, *Azospirillum* and Phosphorus fixing bacteria (*Bacillus mangatherium*) alone or in

combined use of these micro-organisms significantly increased the sugar yield.

3.3 Nutrient Uptake

The nutrient uptake by plant and ratoon (Table 2) significantly increased due to application of organic manure and bio-fertilizer along with inorganic fertilizer over control. The highest uptake was recorded in treatment T₉ and lowest was recorded in control. The data further revealed that among major nutrients relatively higher K uptake was recorded which was followed by N and P. The higher yield coupled with management of nutrients through organic and inorganic sources in T₉ resulting more nutrients uptake Bhalerao, et al. [36]. The use of phosphate solubilising bacteria as inoculants simultaneously increase P uptake by the plant and crop yield. The principal mechanism for mineral phosphate solubilisation is the production of organic acid and acid phosphatases play a major role in the mineralization of organic phosphorus in soil. Ratoon cultivation requires more nitrogen in comparison to main crop because the activity of bacteria in ratoon crop is more in rhizospheric zone especially for mineralization of crop residues and other dissected root parts. Chemical fertilizers should be applied only after 3 weeks of stubble shaving.

3.4 Soil Properties

Addition of organic manure with bio-fertilizer in combination with inorganic fertilizer significantly improved the soil fertility in terms of organic carbon in particular and availability of macro and micro nutrients (N, P, K, Zn, Cu, Mn and Fe) in general with reduction in bulk density of post-harvest soil (Table 3). The application of organics in combination with inorganic fertilizer and bio-fertilizer significantly decreased pH and lowest being in T₉ (7.69) and highest in control (8.29). In contrast, significant increase in EC was recorded in bio-compost treated plot with maximum increase in T₉ (0.39 dSm⁻¹). The reduction in pH might be due to production of organic acids due to decomposition of biocompost followed by increase in salt content of soil due to mineralization, which increase EC of soil. The soil pH reduced while EC increased due to application of biocompost as reported by Bhalerao, et al. [36]. There was significant effect of treatments receiving biocompost on organic carbon and available N, P₂O₅, K₂O and micro nutrient of soil after harvest of crop over control.

The highest (7.3 g ha⁻¹) organic carbon was observed in T₉ over control. The treatments varied significantly for available nutrients with N (226.4 to 265.4 kg ha⁻¹), P₂O₅ (23.4 to 37.9 kg ha⁻¹) and K₂O (114.8 to 136.6 kg ha⁻¹). The increase in soil nitrogen reserve under sugarcane crop by 50% of the initial value due to the nitrogen fixation by root associated diazotrophs helping sustained production of sugarcane [37]. “The buildup of soil available nutrient could be attributed to greater multiplication of microbes due to addition of organic manure, which helps in mineralization as well as solubilization of native nutrients. The data also indicated that cations especially Ca²⁺+Mg²⁺ content of soils significantly increased in treatments of bio-compost. This might be resulted due to solubilization of nutrients by complexation of nutrients by humic and fulvic acid present in biocompost”. [16] The result also indicated that application of only inorganic fertilizer (T₁) was not effective for maintenance of soil health in sugarcane plant as reflected from initial value. Soil available nutrients and organic carbon sustained in all the organic manure and bio-fertilizer treated plots. The bulk density of post-harvest soil varied significantly (1.32 to 1.38 g/cm³) with addition of organic manure and bio-fertilizer (Table 3). The reduction in bulk density resulted in increased pore space of soil with increasing level of organic manure. The reduction in bulk density may be attributed to the buildup of organic carbon content of soil in Biocompost treated plots. The maximum reduction (1.32 g/cm³) in bulk density was recorded in treatment T₉ as compared to control. Beneficial effect of Biocompost in improvement of physical and chemical condition of soil may be attributed to improvement in organic matter status in organic manure treated soil resulted in buildup of soil fertility for sustainable sugarcane production [38,39]. The Table 4, reflects the Effect of biofertilizer with biocompost on soil micro nutrients at harvest in sugarcane plant-ratoon system. The Fe, Zn, Cu, And Mn contents varies from 6.5 - 8.50; 0.66 - 0.79; 0.76 - 0.89 and 2.10 - 2.89 mg/kg, respectively.

3.5 Microbial Populations

The microbial population viz. bacteria, fungi, Actinomycetes, and Acetobacter significantly increased with addition of organic manure and bio-fertilizer over control. The highest population of bacteria (42.8 x 10⁶), fungi (29.3 x 10⁴), Actinomycetes (28.7 x 10²) and Acetobacter (34.8 x 10⁶) were observed in treatment T₉ and lowest microbial count observed in control

(Table 5). These results explained the improvement in microbial population of soil due to application of organics. Kumar et al. [40] reported that in both plant and ratoon crops enumeration of *Azotobacter*, PSB, Fungi, Bacteria, Actinomycetes in rhizosphere indicated that the population of all the groups was higher when bio-fertilizers were applied in combination with inorganic fertilizers. Microorganism utilized organic carbon as a source of energy for nourishment which resulted in proliferation of soil microorganism. The increased activity of microflora in organic manure and biofertilizer treated soil may be due to high organic matter build up with application of organic manure. The shift in microbial population signifies the maintenance of soil fertility and productivity due to faster rate of decomposition and speedy mineralization of organic materials.

3.6 Soil Enzyme Activity

“Soil enzyme activity is influenced by the soil characteristics related to nutrient availability and soil microbial activity processes which modified the potential soil enzyme mediated substrate catalysis. In this study, the activity of all the enzymes was higher under T₉, the soils were applied with bio-compost having high carbon content and added greater SOM. This suggests that the enzyme activities are governed by the availability of carbon sources and SOM decomposition. The presence of *Trichoderma* in all the treatments helps in rapid decomposition of soil organic matter. The intensive management practices under sugarcane cultivation constantly disturb the soil and regular removal of organic layer restricted the supply of substrate for microbes present in rhizosphere, thereby reduces the enzyme activities”. [31] Kotroczo et al. [41] reported that “under different treatments of detritus input and removal, the enzyme activities were more influenced by root activity rather than aboveground organic matter availability”. “In this case, the higher activity of rhizosphere in sugarcane cultivation increased the enzyme activities. Previous studies reported a reduction in soil enzyme activities following the conversion of forests into cultivated lands observed by several workers” [42,43]. “Urease regulates the transformation of soil nitrogen and is involved in the hydrolysis of urea into ammonia and CO₂” [44]. “The urease activity is influenced by various soil properties including pH, soil nutrient supply, soil nitrogen, and N fertilizers” [45]. “In this study, the highest urease activity (44 (NH₃-N g⁻¹ h⁻¹)) was evaluated in T₉ which is at.

Table 1. Effect of biofertilizer with bio-compost on NMC, yield and sugar yield in sugarcane plant- ratoon system (*pooled data of two years for Ratoon crop)

| Treatments | NMC(000/ha) | | Yield(t/ha) | | Cane yield Response over control (%) | | Sugar yield(t/ ha) | | Sugar Yield Response over control (%) | |
|--------------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|---------|--------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------|
| | Plant | Ratoon* | Plant | Ratoon* | Plant | Ratoon* | Plant | Ratoon* | Plant | Ratoon* |
| T ₁ | 69.0 | 59.1 | 53.8 | 53.2 | - | - | 6.28 | 5.29 | - | - |
| T ₂ | 75.0 | 73.5 | 62.6 | 60.2 | 16.36 | 13.15 | 7.40 | 6.60 | 17.83 | 24.76 |
| T ₃ | 78.0 | 76.6 | 66.9 | 65.4 | 24.34 | 22.93 | 7.80 | 7.00 | 24.20 | 32.33 |
| T ₄ | 93.0 | 88.1 | 80.5 | 73.8 | 49.63 | 38.72 | 10.18 | 8.62 | 62.10 | 62.94 |
| T ₅ | 96.0 | 89.5 | 81.7 | 77.5 | 51.86 | 45.67 | 10.69 | 9.28 | 70.22 | 75.43 |
| T ₆ | 89.8 | 88.8 | 77.9 | 74.7 | 44.80 | 40.41 | 9.58 | 9.16 | 52.55 | 73.16 |
| T ₇ | 71.0 | 68.2 | 58.2 | 57.8 | 8.18 | 8.64 | 6.52 | 6.23 | 3.82 | 17.77 |
| T ₈ | 95.4 | 89.3 | 82.4 | 78.5 | 53.15 | 47.55 | 10.32 | 9.31 | 64.33 | 75.99 |
| T ₉ | 103.0 | 92.4 | 85.8 | 79.6 | 59.48 | 49.62 | 11.21 | 9.36 | 78.50 | 76.93 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 8.01 | 11.12 | 5.89 | 6.20 | - | - | 0.90 | 0.90 | - | - |
| SEm± | 2.57 | 3.98 | 2.53 | 3.79 | - | - | 0.29 | 0.28 | - | - |

Table 2. Effect of biofertilizer with bio-compost on uptake of nutrients in sugarcane plant-ratoon system (*pooled data of two years for Ratoon crop)

| Treatments | Uptake of macro nutrient (kg/ha) | | | | | | Uptake of micro (g/ha) | | | | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|--------------|------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| | Plant | | | Ratoon* | | | Plant | | | Ratoon | | |
| | N | P | K | N | P | K | Zn | Fe | Mn | Zn | Fe | Mn |
| T ₁ | 121.5 | 11.34 | 129.6 | 107.0 | 8.99 | 114.2 | 42.04 | 548.3 | 192.7 | 37.38 | 490.7 | 183.6 |
| T ₂ | 146.9 | 13.38 | 152.6 | 141.4 | 12.40 | 144.5 | 49.48 | 561.4 | 253.8 | 42.83 | 610.6 | 215.4 |
| T ₃ | 155.1 | 14.50 | 165.1 | 149.6 | 13.52 | 157.2 | 50.94 | 564.4 | 228.6 | 44.84 | 625.8 | 217.3 |
| T ₄ | 187.6 | 17.59 | 183.3 | 177.1 | 16.79 | 180.2 | 48.30 | 652.4 | 227.6 | 48.45 | 637.3 | 221.6 |
| T ₅ | 191.8 | 19.43 | 213.14 | 182.1 | 17.69 | 186.8 | 51.10 | 673.82 | 235.4 | 50.82 | 643.5 | 227.4 |
| T ₆ | 172.4 | 12.76 | 199.3 | 162.3 | 17.06 | 184.1 | 47.30 | 605.6 | 211.8 | 43.28 | 570.5 | 215.6 |
| T ₇ | 133.5 | 17.96 | 145.5 | 120.9 | 11.38 | 133.7 | 45.50 | 562.4 | 195.8 | 39.32 | 516.3 | 183.4 |
| T ₈ | 192.6 | 18.71 | 206.1 | 178.7 | 16.97 | 179.7 | 54.22 | 669.8 | 232.68 | 49.69 | 598.27 | 224.3 |
| T ₉ | 196.9 | 20.89 | 221.92 | 195.40 | 19.93 | 198.5 | 56.13 | 679.61 | 239.96 | 53.24 | 657.40 | 237.5 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 13.38 | 1.64 | 17.69 | 14.04 | 2.41 | 12.25 | 3.17 | 6.36 | 5.05 | 2.98 | 14.38 | 10.6 |
| SEm± | 4.18 | 0.46 | 4.86 | 4.62 | 0.71 | 3.79 | 1.30 | 2.41 | 2.81 | 1.05 | 3.93 | 3.14 |

Table 3. Effect of biofertilizer with bio-compost on soil properties (0-30 cm depth) after harvest in sugarcane plant- ratoon system

| Treatment | pH | EC (dS/m) | Organic Carbon (g/kg) | Bulk density (g/cm ³) | Ca ² + Mg ⁺ (m/L) | Available Nutrients (kg/ha) | | |
|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| | | | | | | N | P ₂ O ₅ | K ₂ O |
| T ₁ | 8.29 | 0.28 | 4.4 | 1.38 | 10.25 | 226.4 | 23.4 | 114.8 |
| T ₂ | 8.17 | 0.28 | 4.6 | 1.37 | 10.36 | 252.7 | 26.7 | 119.5 |
| T ₃ | 8.16 | 0.29 | 4.7 | 1.36 | 10.37 | 250.9 | 29.8 | 123.3 |
| T ₄ | 8.09 | 0.32 | 6.5 | 1.34 | 12.10 | 253.2 | 34.3 | 129.3 |
| T ₅ | 7.76 | 0.34 | 6.6 | 1.33 | 12.07 | 256.6 | 36.5 | 132.5 |
| T ₆ | 8.11 | 0.33 | 6.2 | 1.34 | 11.57 | 246.8 | 34.9 | 126.7 |
| T ₇ | 8.10 | 0.34 | 6.3 | 1.35 | 11.42 | 235.3 | 35.2 | 124.4 |
| T ₈ | 7.85 | 0.38 | 6.7 | 1.33 | 11.83 | 243.8 | 29.9 | 129.4 |
| T ₉ | 7.69 | 0.39 | 7.3 | 1.32 | 12.85 | 265.4 | 37.9 | 136.6 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 0.03 | 0.05 | 0.60 | 0.01 | 0.75 | 09.39 | 1.99 | 4.32 |
| SEm± | 0.01 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.002 | 0.24 | 3.22 | 0.64 | 2.08 |

Table 4. Effect of biofertilizer with bio-compost on soil micro nutrients at harvest in sugarcane plant-ratoon system.

| Treatment | Soil Micro Nutrients (mg/kg) | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Fe | Zn | Cu | Mn |
| T ₁ | 6.50 | 0.66 | 0.76 | 2.10 |
| T ₂ | 6.80 | 0.68 | 0.77 | 2.21 |
| T ₃ | 7.21 | 0.71 | 0.78 | 2.31 |
| T ₄ | 8.40 | 0.75 | 0.85 | 2.60 |
| T ₅ | 8.11 | 0.73 | 0.87 | 2.70 |
| T ₆ | 8.10 | 0.73 | 0.86 | 2.50 |
| T ₇ | 7.70 | 0.72 | 0.84 | 2.51 |
| T ₈ | 8.26 | 0.74 | 0.83 | 2.80 |
| T ₉ | 8.50 | 0.79 | 0.89 | 2.89 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 0.06 | 0.05 | 0.02 | 0.17 |
| SEm± | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.05 |

Table 5. Effect of biofertilizer with bio-compost on microbial population of soils after harvest in sugarcane plant-ratoon system

| Treatments | Total microbial counts | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|--------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| | Bacteria(cfu×10 ⁶ g ⁻¹) | Population increase over control (%) | Fungi Fungi (cfu×10 ⁴ g ⁻¹) | Population increase over control (%) | Actinomycetes (cfu ×10 ² g ⁻¹) | Population increase over control (%) | Acetobacter (cfu×10 ⁶ ml ⁻¹) | Population increase over control (%) |
| T ₁ | 23.2 | - | 13.3 | - | 11.8 | - | 17.7 | - |
| T ₂ | 26.9 | 15.95 | 14.7 | 10.53 | 13.7 | 16.10 | 26.2 | 48.02 |
| T ₃ | 27.8 | 19.83 | 20.2 | 51.88 | 14.9 | 26.27 | 24.8 | 40.11 |
| T ₄ | 32.5 | 40.09 | 20.3 | 52.63 | 20.4 | 72.88 | 29.9 | 68.93 |
| T ₅ | 37.7 | 62.50 | 26.8 | 101.50 | 22.6 | 91.53 | 31.2 | 76.27 |
| T ₆ | 34.9 | 50.43 | 20.6 | 54.89 | 20.3 | 72.03 | 28.9 | 63.27 |
| T ₇ | 33.9 | 46.12 | 19.5 | 46.62 | 19.5 | 65.24 | 28.0 | 58.19 |
| T ₈ | 36.3 | 56.37 | 26.4 | 98.49 | 23.1 | 95.76 | 28.2 | 59.32 |
| T ₉ | 42.8 | 84.74 | 29.3 | 120.30 | 28.7 | 143.22 | 34.8 | 96.61 |
| CD(P=0.05) | 5.92 | - | 3.04 | - | 6.32 | - | 4.33 | - |
| SEm± | 1.94 | - | 1.33 | - | 2.33 | - | 1.67 | - |

Table 6. Effect of biofertilizer with bio-compost on soil enzyme activities of β-glucosidase, Urease, Acid phosphatase activity and Dehydrogenase activity, after harvest in sugarcane plant-ratoon system

| Treatments | Soil enzyme activities | | | |
|--------------------|--|--|---|---|
| | β-glucosidase(μg PNG g ⁻¹ dwt h ⁻¹) | Urease (NH ₃ -N g ⁻¹ h ⁻¹) | Acid phosphatase activity (μg p-NPP g ⁻¹ h ⁻¹) | Dehydrogenase activity(μg TTC g ⁻¹ h ⁻¹) |
| T ₁ | 218 | 15 | 319 | 0.20 |
| T ₂ | 345 | 26 | 428 | 0.96 |
| T ₃ | 389 | 32 | 457 | 1.08 |
| T ₄ | 540 | 37 | 850 | 1.20 |
| T ₅ | 576 | 39 | 993 | 1.93 |
| T ₆ | 365 | 30 | 443 | 0.98 |
| T ₇ | 397 | 35 | 469 | 1.18 |
| T ₈ | 403 | 36 | 561 | 1.21 |
| T ₉ | 760 | 44 | 1100 | 1.98 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 123.18 | 6.30 | 174.19 | 0.06 |
| SEm± | 43.69 | 2.16 | 53.72 | 0.18 |

par with T₅. Our findings were similar to previous findings indicating greater urease activity under higher level of bio-compost than lower level of biocompost, indicating that the availability of fresh SOM for microbial decomposition enhances the microbial activity in soil and increases the enzyme activity" [46]. "Contrastingly, in cultivated fields, high urease activity was found despite low values of soil carbon and soil nitrogen. This can be explained by the regular supply of urea fertilizer in the field. Also, a strong positive correlation of urease activity with soil organic matter supported its increased activity" [47]. "Dehydrogenase activity in soil serves as an indicator of the microbiological redox system and microbial oxidative activities in soil. It indicates the respiratory activity of the soil and can be used as a measure of microbial activity in semiarid climates" [48]. "The reduced content of labile carbon and soil carbon are suggested to decrease the activity". [31] Bonanomi et al. [49] reported "a reduction by 84% in dehydrogenase activity in a low-input management regime as compared with the high-input management regime". de Medeiros et al. [46] reported "the dehydrogenase activity in soils under different intercropping areas found the lowest activity in *Cajanus cajan*, *Vigna unguiculata* monoculture. The study reported that soil disaggregation and weeding along with low vegetation cover attributed to reduced enzyme activity". "Further, in dry climate conditions the abiotic stress to microbial activity due to high temperature and low soil moisture influence the organic matter oxidation by dehydrogenase" [50]. "In addition, β -glucosidase activity in soil is linked to the release of carbohydrates in soil, which provides a major substrate for soil microorganisms. The positive impact of the soil carbon with β -glucosidase activity indicated that soil organic matter content is the major factor in its activity" [42]. Corroborating with our results, Silva et al. [43] evaluated " β -glucosidase activity under tropical native forest, protected area, reported reduced activity under the cultivated field; and suggested a closed linking of β -glucosidase with soil organic carbon and soil organic matter content". de Medeiros et al. [46] demonstrated "similar β -glucosidase activity among tropical dry forest and intercropping soils with less aggressive management practices. Similarly, the acid phosphatase activity was also higher under T₉ (1100 $\mu\text{g p-NPP g}^{-1} \text{h}^{-1}$) as compared to other treatments, which is at par with T₅". "The activity of acid phosphatase activity is also influenced by soil pH, nutrients, soil carbon, soil nitrogen, soil phosphorus, soil organic matter quality and

quantity, microbial community structure, soil moisture, and soil temperature as mentioned by many scientist" [51,52]. Raiesi and Beheshti [53] indicated that "soil pH is the main regulator of acid phosphatase activity, and narrow pH ranges attributed to no significant changes after natural forest conversions"

4. CONCLUSION

The results suggested that the application of nitrogen fixer like *Acetobacter*, organic matter decomposer like *Trichoderma* and PSB used in cultivation of sugarcane have significantly reduced the application of 25% recommended dose of NPK. Hence, integrated use of bio-compost and inorganic fertilizer along with PSB and *Acetobacter* improved the soil health, which ultimately enhances productivity of sugarcane and sugar recovery with improvement in microbial community structure and enzymatic activity in the rhizospheric zone. Thus it is concluded that integrated use of bio-compost along with various bio-fertilizer improved fertility status of soil with improvement in enzymatic activities and population of microbes.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA AND MATERIALS

The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Singh KP, Suman A, Singh PN, Lal M. Yield and soil nutrient balance of a sugarcane plant-ratoon system with conventional and organic nutrient management in sub-tropical India. *Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst.* 2007;79:209-219.
2. Lindsay WL, Vlek PLG, Chien SH. Phosphate Minerals. In: *Minerals in Soil Environment*, Dixon, J.B. and S.B. Weed, (Ed.). Soil Science Society of America, Madison, USA. 1989;1089.
3. Vikram A. Efficacy of phosphate solubilizing bacteria isolated from vertisols on growth and yield parameters of sorghum. *Res. J. Microbiol.* 2007; 2:550-559.

4. Speir TW, Horswell J, McLaren RG, Fietje G, VanSchalk AP. Composted bio-solids enhance fertility of a sandy loam soil under dairy pasture. *Biol Fertility Soils*. 2004;40:349-358.
5. Parham JA, Deng SP, Raun WR, Johnson GV. Long term cattle manure application in soil. Effect on soil phosphorus levels, Microbial biomass C and dehydrogenase and phosphatase activities. *Boil Fertility Soils*. 2002;35:328-337.
6. Saviozzi A, Bufalino P, Levi-Minzi R, Riffaldi R. Biochemical activities in a degraded soil restored by two amendments: A laboratory study. *Biol Fertility Soils*. 2002;35:96-119.
7. Sevilla M, Burris RH, Gunapala N, Kennedy C. Comparison of benefit to sugarcane plant growth and ¹⁵N₂ incorporation following inoculation of sterile plants with *Acetobacter diazotrophicus* wild-type and nif-mutant strains. *Mol Plant Microbe Interact*. 2001;14:358-366.
8. Oliveira ALM, Urquiaga S, Dobereiner J, Baldani JL. The effect of inoculating endophytic N₂-fixing bacteria on micropropagated sugarcane plants. *Plant Soil*. 2002;242:205-215.
9. Kumar A, Meena SK, Sinha S, Singh AK, Minnatullah, Singh SK. Isolation and biochemical characterization of endophytic bacterium *Gluconacetobacter diazotrophocus* from native sugarcane cultivar of middle gangetic plains of India. *Indian Journal of Ecology*. 2024;51(1):104-112.
DOI:<https://doi.org/10.55362/IJE/2024/4202>
10. Suman A, Shasany AK, Singh M, Shahi HN, Gaur A, Khanuja SPS. Molecular assessment of diversity among endophytic diazotrophs isolated from subtropical Indian sugarcane. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology*. 2001;17:39-45.
11. Suman A, Gaur A, Shrivastava AK, Yadav RL. Improving sugarcane growth and nutrient uptake by inoculating *Gluconacetobacter diazotrophicus*. *Plant Growth Regulation*. 2005;47:155-162.
12. Boddey RM, Polidoro JC, Resende AS, Alves BJR, Urquiaga S. Use of the ¹⁵N natural abundance technique for the quantification of the contribution of N₂ fixation to sugarcane and other grasses. *Aust. J. Plant Physiol*. 2001;28:889–895.
13. Chaudhary CN, Sinha UP. Effect of concentrated organic manure, nitrogen and sulphur on the productivity and economics of sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*). *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 2001;46(2): 354-360.
14. Pal SS. Interaction of an acid tolerant strain of phosphate solubilizing bacteria with a few acid tolerant crops. *Plant Soil*. 1998;198:167-77.
15. Chen, James CP. Cane sugar handbook, 11th ed., 788-790. New York: Willey Inter science Publication; 1985.
16. Sinha SK, Kumar V, Prasad RK. Integrated effect of organic manure and *Azotobacter* with inorganic fertilizer on soil properties, yield and quality of sugarcane plant-ratoon system under calcareous soil. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2019;8(5S):321-6.
17. Walkley A, Black CA. An examination of the digestion method for determining soil organic matter and proposed modifications of the chromic acid titration method. *Soil Science*. 1934;37:29-38.
18. Subbiah BV, Ashija GL. A rapid procedure for the estimation of available nitrogen in soils. *Current Science*. 1956;25:259-266.
19. Olsen SR, Coles CV, Watanabe PS, Dean LN. Estimation of available Phosphorus in soil by Extraction with sodium bicarbonate, USDA Circular. 1954;939.
20. Jackson ML. *Soil Chemical analysis*, Ed. Prentices Hall of India Pvt. Ltd. New Delhi; 1973.
21. Black CA. *Methods of soil Analysis, Part 1, physical properties*. American Soc. Agronomy. Inc. Madison, Wisconsin, USA. 1965;1-768.
22. Lindsay WL, Norvell WA. Development of DTPA soil test for zinc, iron, manganese and copper. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 1978;42:421-428.
23. Spencer EF, Meade GP. *Cane sugar hand book*, 7th Ed. John Willey and sons, Inc., New York; 1964.
24. Li ZG, YM Luo, Teng Y. *Research methods of soil and environmental microbe*. Beijing : Science press; 2008.
25. Thornton HG. On the Development of a Standardized Agar Media for Counting Soil Bacteria with a Special Regards to the Repression of Spreading Colonies. *Annals of Applied Biology*. 1922;9:241-274.
Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7348.1922.tb05958.x>.

26. Martin JP. Use of acid, rose bengal, and streptomycin in the plate method for estimating soil fungi. *Soil Sci.* 69:215-32. [Univ. California Citrus Experiment Station, Riverside, CA; 1950.
27. Eivazi F, Tabatabai MA. Glucosidases and galactosidases in soils. *Soil Biol Biochem.* 1988;20:601-606.
28. Archana Meena, Rao KS. Assessment of soil microbial and enzyme activity in the rhizosphere zone under different land use/cover of a semiarid region, India. Article number. 2021;16.
29. Yao Xh, Min H, Lu Zh, Yuan HP. Influence of acetamiprid on soil enzymatic activities and respiration. *Eur J Soil Biol.* 2006;42(2):120-6.
30. Schneider K, Turrión MB, Gallardo JF. Modified method for measuring acid phosphatase activities in forest soils with high organic matter content. *Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal.* 2000;31(19-20):3077-3088.
31. Thalmann A. Zur Methodik der Bestimmung der De-hydrogenase aktivität im Boden mittels Triphenyl tetrazolium chloride (TTC). *Landwirtsch Forsch.* 1968;21:249-58.
32. Nagaraju MS, Shankariah C, Ravindra U. Effect of integrated use of fertilizers with sulphitation pressmud and PSB on sugarcane growth and yield. *Cooperative Sugar.* 2000;3(5):391-395.
33. Virdia HM, Patel CL. Integrated nutrient management for sugarcane (*Saccharum spp.* hybrid complex) plant- ratoon system. *Indian Journal of Agronomy.* 2010;55(2):147-151.
34. Yadav SP, Singh SC, Yadav S, Yadav SK, Tiwari AK, Sharma BL. Integrated nutrient management approaches for enhancing production potential and sustainability of sugarcane (*Saccharum spp.* hybrid) plant-ratoon system in north region of India. *Sugar Tech* published online; 2018. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12355-018-0641-z> 28 July, 2018.
35. Hari K, Srinivasan TR. Response of sugarcane varieties to application of nitrogen fixing bacteria under different nitrogen levels. *Sugar Tech.* 2005;7(2&3): 28-31.
36. Bhalerao VP, Jadhav MB, Bhoi PG. Effect of spent wash, press mud and compost on soil properties, yield and quality of seasonal sugarcane. *Indian Sugar.* 2006;6(9):57-65.
37. Suman A. Biological nitrogen fixation in relation to improving sugarcane productivity. In Summer School held at I.I.S.R., Lucknow. 2003;15:61-64.
38. Sinha SK, Jha CK, Kumar Vipin, Kumari G, Alam M. Integrated effect of bio-methanated distillery effluent and bio-compost on soil properties, juice quality and yield of sugarcane in Entisol. *Sugar Tech.* 2014;16(1):75-79.
39. Jha CK, Sinha SK, Alam M, Pandey SS. Effect of bio-compost and zinc application on sugarcane (*Saccharum* species hybrid complex) productivity, quality and soil health. *Indian Journal of Agronomy.* 2015;60(30):450-456.
40. Kumar, Vijay, Yadav KS, Chand Mehar. Effect of integrated use of various bio-fertilizers and chemical fertilizers on sugarcane production and soil biological fertility. *Indian Journal of Sugarcane Technology.* 2015;30(02):98-103.
41. Kotroczó Z, Veres Z, Fekete I, Krakomperger Z, Toth JA, Lajtha K, Tothmeresz B. Soil enzyme activity in response to long-term organic matter manipulation. *Soil Biol Biochem.* 2014;70:237-243.
42. Vinhal-Freitas IC, Correa GF, Wendling B, Bobulska L, Ferreira AS. Soil textural class plays a major role in evaluating the effects of land use on soil quality indicators. *Ecol Indic.* 2017;74:182-190.
43. Silva EO, de Medeiros EV, Duda GP, Junior MAL, Brossard M, de Oliveira JB, dos Santos UJ, Hammecker C. Seasonal effect of land use type on soil absolute and specific enzyme activities in a Brazilian semi-arid region. *Catena.* 2019;172:397-407.
44. Kong CH, Wang P, Zhao H, Xu XH, Zhu YD. Impact of allelochemical exuded from allelopathic rice on soil microbial community. *Soil Biol Biochem.* 2008;40(7):1862-1869.
45. Moghimian N, Hosseini SM, Kooch Y, Darki BZ. Impacts of changes in land use/cover on soil microbial and enzyme activity. *Catena.* 2017;157:407-414.
46. de Medeiros EV, Notaro KA, de Barros JA, Moraes WS, Silva AO, Moreira KA. Absolute and specific enzymatic activities of sandy entisol from tropical dry forest, monoculture and intercropping areas. *Soil Tillage Res.* 2015;145:208-215.
47. Zeng DH, Hu YL, Chang SX, Fan ZP. Land cover change effects on soil chemical and

- biological properties after planting Mongolian pine (*Pinus sylvestris* var. *mongolica*) in sandy lands in Keerqin, north-eastern China. *Plant Soil*. 2009;317:121-33.
48. Bastida F, Moreno JL, Hernandez T, García C. The long-term effects of the management of a forest soil on its carbon content, microbial biomass and activity under a semi-arid climate. *Appl Soil Ecol*. 2007;37(1-2):53–62. Available:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.apsoil.2007.03.010>.
49. Bonanomi G, D'Ascoli R, Antignani V, Capodilupo M, Cozzolino L, Marzaioli R, Puopolo G, Rutigliano FA, Scelza R, Scotti R, Rao MA, Zoina A. Assessing soil quality under intensive cultivation and tree orchards in Southern Italy. *Appl Soil Ecol*. 2011;47(3):184-194.
50. Li X, Sarah P. Enzyme activities along a climatic transect in the Judean Desert. *Catena*. 2003;53:349-363.
51. Hendriksen N, Creamer R, Stone D, Winding A. Soil exo-enzyme activities across Europe-the influence of climate, land-use and soil properties. *Appl Soil Ecol*. 2016;97:44–48.
52. Maharajan M, Sanallah M, Razavi BS, Kuzyakov Y. Effect of land use and management practices on microbial biomass and enzyme activities in subtropical top- and sub-soils. *Appl Soil Ecol*. 2017;113:22-28.
53. Raiesi F, Beheshti A. Microbiological indicators of soil quality and degradation following conversion of native forests to continuous croplands. *Ecol Indic*. 2015;50:173-185.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:
<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/114404>