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A B S T R A C T

The present investigation was carried out to study the Effect of BBF and soil amendments on soluble cations and anions, available NPK and soybean yield in salt affected soils of Purna valley in Vidarbha region of Maharashtra. The treatments comprised of only BBF, BBF + FYM @5 t ha⁻¹, BBF + gypsum @ 2.5 t ha⁻¹ and BBF + FYM @ 5 t ha⁻¹ + gypsum @ 1.25 t ha⁻¹ combinely. Treatments replicated in six farmers’ fields one farmer as one replication with randomized block design. In this region shallow saline groundwater table, poor drainage and sub soil Sodicity are the main problems. In this context, BBF and soil amendments were drawn more attention to ameliorate these degraded soils. Under the study pHs was influenced slightly under all treatments and higher rate of decrease was noticed in treatment T₄ (8.24). By incorporating FYM @ 5 t ha⁻¹ highest ECₑ was noticed in T₂ (0.78 (dSm⁻¹)). It was significantly less (0.54 dSm⁻¹) in T₁ where only BBF was practiced. Use of FYM and gypsum recorded considerable increase in soluble Ca, Mg and K but decrease in Na. In respect of bicarbonates the significant reduction was observed in treatment T₃, BBF + gypsum@ 2.5tha⁻¹. Concentration of chlorides and sulphates also reduced in T₄ (1.06 (me L⁻¹)) due to combined application of FYM @ 5 t ha⁻¹ and gypsum @ 1.25 t ha⁻¹. InT₃ also observed remarkable reduction over T₁. However, the combined practice of BBF with organic and inorganic amendments reportedly profitable in amelioration, nutrient uptake and also a great advantage in straw and grain yield of soybean for salt affected soils of purna valley in vidarbha.
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Introduction

The Purna valley is the unique tract of Vertisols in Vidarbha region (M.S.) of India having combination of three fold problems, the native salinity, poor drainability and poor quality of ground water. The unique features of the salt affected soils of Purna valley is that though the salinity and sodicity is widely reported in this tract the presence of salt on surface is hardly seen. The Purna valley of Vidarbha region is an east-west elongated basin with slight covering to the south occupying the part of Amravati, Akola and Buldhana districts of Vidarbha and extends from 20°45' to 21°15' N latitude and 75°25' to 77°45' E longitude with east-west length of 100-150 km having width of about 10 to 60 km covering an area of about 4.69 lakh hectares distributed in Amravati (1738 sq. km), Akola (1939 sq. km) and Buldhana (1015 sq. km).(Anonymous, 2010). These soils of are developed on basaltic alluvium under arid and semi-arid conditions have clay mineralogy, high swell-shrink potential, slow permeability with very low hydraulic
conductivity and poor drainage conditions. Taxonomically these salt affected soils are classified as Sodic Haplusterts and Sodic Calciusterts (Padole et al., 1998).

The soil solution of a salty soil mainly contains cations like Na\(^+\), Ca\(^{2+}\), Mg\(^{2+}\) and K\(^+\) and anions like Cl\(^-\), SO\(_4^{2-}\), HCO\(_3^-\), CO\(_3^{2-}\) and NO\(_3^-\). The predominant cation in salty soils is Na\(^+\), which usually exceeds the concentration of Ca\(^{2+}\) and Mg\(^{2+}\). The predominant anions are Cl\(^-\) and SO\(_4^{2-}\) and some HCO\(_3^-\) at normal pH values of 6 to 8, while CO\(_3^{2-}\) is found at pH above 8.5. The solid phase (clay particles, humus) of the soil has a negative charge and it adsorbs positively charged cations from the soil solution in order of adsorption preference: NH\(_4^+\) > Ca\(^{2+}\) > Mg\(^{2+}\) > H\(^+\) > K\(^+\) > Na\(^+\). These cations are mutually replaceable or exchangeable. Soil colloids containing a high portion of Ca\(^{2+}\) and other divalent ions form strong bonds between mineral particles and, consequently, a stable structure. Soils rich in Na\(^+\) have loose bonds and a weak soil structure.

Soybean (Glycine max. L.) is one of the important oil seed as well as leguminous crop. It is originated in Eastern Asia/China. It is second largest oil seed crop in India after groundnut. Soybean as a miracle “Golden bean” of the 21st century mainly due to its high content protein - 40%, oil - 20%, carbohydrates - 30%, fibre - 0.5%, lecithin - 0.5%, Vitamin C - 10%, Calcium - 27%, Iron 87%, Vitamin B1 and B6 - 20%, Magnesium -70% and saponins - 4%, and it is now making headway in Indian Agriculture. Soybean has special qualities such as ease in cultivation, less fertilizer and labour requirement. It fixes nitrogen and leaves about 25% for succeeding crop. Soybean is cultivating in the world over an area of 71.85 million hectares with a production of 154.32 million tonnes. In India grown on an area of about 6 million hectare with production for Kharif 2014 is 104.36 Lakh MT as compared to 94.768 Lakh MT during Kharif 2013 indicating an increase of 10.12% over previous year.

In Maharashtra the area under Soybean Cultivation during Kharif 2014 was 38.704 Lakh hectare as compared to 38.00 Lac hectares during Kharif 2013. The yield was 808 Kg ha\(^{-1}\), resulting into a production of 30.721 Lac MT during Kharif 2014. In Vidarba the area under soybean during Kharif 2014 was 20.93 Lakh hectares as compared to 19.31 Lacs hectares while in 2013 it was less Rochester et al., (2001).

**Materials and Methods**

The experiment was conducted on six farmer’s field with soybean crop in Ramagarh located at Dharyapur tehsil of Amravati district of Vidarba region of Maharashtra during kharif, 2014 -15. The design of experiment was randomized block design (RBD), replicated six times, where each farmer was treated as one replication with four treatments comprised of only BBF, BBF + FYM @ 5 t ha\(^{-1}\), BBF + gypsum @ 2.5 t ha\(^{-1}\) and BBF + FYM @ 5 t ha\(^{-1}\) + gypsum @ 1.25 t ha\(^{-1}\) combined. Characteristics of the soils are comprised of clayey montmorillonitic, deep with soil order Vertisols. The initial physical and chemical properties of the experimental soils were analyzed and presented in table 1. Soil samples were collected before sowing and after harvest of soybean and analyzed for the soil for soluble cations and anions. The saturated paste was prepared and the extract was obtained. The method described by Richards (1954) was followed for the saturation extract preparation. These soil samples were analysed for pHs, electrical conductivity (ECe) and cations and anions as per the methods outlined by Richards (1954). Available Nitrogen was determined by
alkaline permanganate method as described by Subbiah and Asija (1956). Available phosphorus determined by Olsen’s method as described by Watanabe and Olsen using 0.5 M sodium bicarbonate pH (8.5) as an extractant. Darco-G-60 soluble phosphorus was used to absorb the dispersed organic matter and make the filtrate colourless for further colorimetric analysis. (Watanabe and Olsen, 1965). Available potassium was determined by the flame photometer using neutral N ammonium acetate (pH 7.0) as an extractant as described by Hanway and Heidel (1952). Similarly Seed and straw yields were recorded during the field experimentation. The data on different parameters were tabulated and analyzed statistically by the methods described by Panse and Sukhatme (1971).

**Results and Discussion**

The obtained by analysing saturated paste extract for different parameters are shown here under.

**pHS**

pHS was decreased slightly under all treatments and higher rate of decrease was noticed in treatment T4 (8.24) in which treatment organic and inorganic amendments are used combinedly. The reduction in pHS under organic amendments might be due to decomposition of organic amendments which produce organic acids there by solubilizing native calcium carbonate facilitating faster reclamation. Similar findings were also reported by Choudhary et al., (2011). In T3 also noticeable reduction was took place where gypsum as amendment used. Decrease in pHS of Sodic Haplusterts due to incorporation of gypsum could possibly be due to suppression of SAR/ESP of sodic Haplusterts. Similar findings were noticed by More et al., (1987) in respect of sodic Vertisols of Marathwada (Maharashtra) region. The descending order of pHS with increasing levels of gypsum applied in salt affected Vertisols was recorded by Tiwari et al., (1993). A significant positive correlation of pHS with gypsum requirement was stated by Manish and Chauhan (1983).

**ECe**

The electrical conductivity (EC) of a soil extract is an indirect expression of the total salt concentration in the soil, without reference to the nature and composition of the salts. The EC is expressed in dS/m (or mmhos/cm in older literature); it is measured at a standard temperature of 25 °C to avoid the influence of temperature.

The electrical conductivity of saturation paste extract was influenced slightly under all the treatments however, the increase in ECe was well within permissible limit of salinity hazards. The highest significant decrease in ECe was found under BBF+ FYM in T2 (0.78 dS m⁻¹) followed by BBF+ gypsum Incorporation in T3 (0.64 dS m⁻¹) and BBF+ gypsum + FYM incorporation in T4 (0.58 dS m⁻¹) over control (0.54 dS m⁻¹) (Table 2).

The slight increase in ECe due to application of gypsum and organic amendments were also reported by Choudhary et al., (2011) and Kaur (2008). Reclamation of alkali soils requires assured water supplies after incorporation of organic and chemical amendments; the raised and sunken bed system has been suggested for improving drainage and water storage under rainfed condition which may result into repression in ECe of sodic Vertisols Gupta et al., (1988). In this investigation, furrow acts as sunken bed, whereas raised portion between two furrows acts as raised beds. Bharambe et al., (2001). Stated that use of chemical and organic amendments for reclamation of sodic soils
was not found detrimental as per as electrical conductivity is concerned.

Soluble cations

Based on the data obtained in respect of calcium and magnesium, during examination, it was noticed that the highest value of soluble calcium (5.70 me L\(^{-1}\)) and magnesium (5.25 me L\(^{-1}\)) were found in treatment T\(_3\) in which gypsum @ 2.5 t ha\(^{-1}\) was incorporated. Similarly more or less closer values to the treatment T\(_3\) were also noted in the treatment T\(_4\), where gypsum @ 2.5 t ha\(^{-1}\) along with FYM @ 5 t ha\(^{-1}\). This may be due to application of organic amendments which released remarkable amounts of calcium to soil solution and which was located on exchangeable sites or was removed from the soil during reclamation process. The results are in conformity with the results of Dubey and Mondal (1994), while studying the effect of gypsum on rice and wheat in sodic soil observed an increase in the exchangeable Ca\(^{++}\), Mg\(^{++}\) with gypsum incorporation. In the leachate collected from amended soil, the calcium content was enhanced with increasing levels of applied gypsum (Shivakant and Rajkumar, 1992) (Table 3).

Table 1 Native status of the soil (2013-14)

| S.NO | Parameter               | REP I | REP II | REP III | REP IV | REP V | REP VI |
|------|-------------------------|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|--------|
| 1    | B D (Mgm\(^{-3}\))      | 1.88  | 1.85   | 1.84    | 1.80   | 1.81  | 1.87   |
| 2    | HC (cmh\(^{-1}\))       | 0.49  | 0.53   | 0.48    | 0.51   | 0.47  | 0.49   |
| 3    | MWD (mm)                | 0.58  | 0.57   | 0.63    | 0.65   | 0.63  | 0.59   |
| 4    | pH (1:2)                | 8.50  | 8.67   | 8.64    | 8.51   | 8.57  | 8.68   |
| 5    | Ec (dSm\(^{-1}\))       | 0.34  | 0.46   | 0.53    | 0.39   | 0.38  | 0.41   |
| 6    | OC (kg\(^{-1}\))        | 5.58  | 5.55   | 5.61    | 5.49   | 5.55  | 5.60   |
| 7    | CaCo\(_3\) (%)          | 9.87  | 9.84   | 9.77    | 9.82   | 9.80  | 9.86   |
| 8    | Exch.Ca (emol (p\(^{+}\))\(^{-1}\) kg\(^{-1}\)) | 29.66 | 29.48  | 29.69   | 29.60  | 29.73 | 28.88 |
| 9    | Exch.Mg                 | 16.13 | 15.33  | 16.27   | 16.08  | 16.05 | 15.21 |
| 10   | Exch.Na                 | 2.86  | 2.91   | 2.77    | 2.85   | 2.78  | 2.94   |
| 11   | Exch.K                  | 0.95  | 0.88   | 0.98    | 0.87   | 0.85  | 0.91   |
| 12   | CEC                     | 49.98 | 49.87  | 48.98   | 50.04  | 49.84 | 47.99 |
| 13   | pHs (1:2)               | 8.46  | 8.54   | 8.58    | 8.66   | 8.43  | 8.54   |
| 14   | ECE (dSm\(^{-1}\))      | 0.86  | 0.88   | 0.79    | 0.76   | 0.91  | 0.77   |
| 15   | Sol Ca(me L\(^{-1}\))   | 3.26  | 3.34   | 3.16    | 3.20   | 3.19  | 3.28   |
| 16   | SolMg(me L\(^{-1}\))    | 2.58  | 2.64   | 2.43    | 2.33   | 2.65  | 2.47   |
| 17   | SolNa(me L\(^{-1}\))    | 7.23  | 7.36   | 7.18    | 7.22   | 7.14  | 7.13   |
| 18   | Sol K(me L\(^{-1}\))    | 0.64  | 0.58   | 0.60    | 0.61   | 0.55  | 0.52   |
| 19   | HCO\(_3\) (me L\(^{-1}\)) | 7.32  | 7.41   | 7.30    | 7.29   | 7.26  | 7.22   |
| 20   | Cl\(^{-}\) (me L\(^{-1}\)) | 1.44  | 1.53   | 1.26    | 1.18   | 1.41  | 1.43   |
| 21   | So\(_4\) \(^{2-}\) (me L\(^{-1}\)) | 4.61  | 4.54   | 4.69    | 4.53   | 4.58  | 4.47   |
| 22   | Avail. N (Kg/ha)         | 176.65| 168.94 | 178.09  | 175.55 | 173.42| 177.88 |
| 23   | Avail. P(kg/ha)          | 18.98 | 18.86  | 18.91   | 18.95  | 18.90 | 18.99 |
| 24   | Avail. K (kg/ha)         | 324.65| 323.38 | 325.21  | 329.41 | 324.77| 325.36 |
Table 2 Effect of BBF and soil amendments on pHs and ECe (dSm⁻¹)

| Tr.No. | Treatments                             | pHs  | ECe (dSm⁻¹) |
|--------|----------------------------------------|------|-------------|
| T1     | BBF                                    | 8.39 | 0.54        |
| T2     | BBF + FYM @ 5 tha⁻¹                    | 8.32 | 0.78        |
| T3     | BBF + Gypsum @ 2.5 tha⁻¹               | 8.27 | 0.54        |
| T4     | BBF + FYM @ 5 tha⁻¹ + Gypsum @ 1.25 tha⁻¹ | 8.24 | 0.58        |
|        | SE(m) ±                                 | 0.02 | 0.13        |
|        | CD at 5 %                               | 0.06 | 0.38        |
|        |                                        | 8.54 | 0.83        |

Table 3 Effect of BBF and soil amendments on soluble cations

| Tr.No. | Treatments                             | Ca²⁺ (me L⁻¹) | Mg²⁺ (me L⁻¹) | Na⁺ (me L⁻¹) | K⁺ (me L⁻¹) |
|--------|----------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|
| T1     | BBF                                    | 3.98          | 2.67          | 0.67         |             |
| T2     | BBF + FYM @ 5 tha⁻¹                    | 4.72          | 3.97          | 6.25         | 0.74        |
| T3     | BBF + Gypsum @ 2.5 tha⁻¹               | 5.70          | 5.25          | 5.61         | 0.82        |
| T4     | BBF + FYM @ 5 tha⁻¹ + Gypsum @ 1.25 tha⁻¹ | 5.50  | 4.83          | 5.48         | 0.87        |
|        | SE(m) ±                                 | 0.09          | 0.21          | 0.12         | 0.03        |
|        | CD at 5 %                               | 0.25          | 0.62          | 0.34         | 0.09        |
|        | Initial status                          | 3.24          | 2.52          | 7.21         | 0.58        |

Table 4 Effect of BBF and Soil amendments on soluble anions

| Tr.No. | Treatments                             | HCO₃⁻ (me L⁻¹) | Cl⁻ (me L⁻¹) | SO₄²⁻ (me L⁻¹) |
|--------|----------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|----------------|
| T1     | BBF                                    | 7.28          | 1.95         | 4.92           |
| T2     | BBF + FYM @ 5 tha⁻¹                    | 5.55          | 1.65         | 4.41           |
| T3     | BBF + Gypsum @ 2.5 tha⁻¹               | 3.42          | 1.21         | 3.58           |
| T4     | BBF + FYM @ 5 tha⁻¹ + Gypsum @ 1.25 tha⁻¹ | 3.63  | 1.06         | 3.18           |
|        | SE(m) ±                                 | 0.24          | 0.07         | 0.16           |
|        | CD at 5 %                               | 0.71          | 0.20         | 0.45           |
|        | Initial status                          | 7.32          | 1.44         | 4.57           |
**Table 5** Effect of BBF and Soil amendments on available nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium

| Tr.No. | Treatments                        | N(kg ha⁻¹) | P(kg ha⁻¹) | K(kg ha⁻¹) |
|--------|-----------------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| T1     | BBF                               | 189.57     | 19.28      | 336.08     |
| T2     | BBF+ FYM @ 5 t ha⁻¹               | 193.31     | 22.49      | 340.53     |
| T3     | BBF+ Gypsum @ 2.5 t ha⁻¹          | 196.32     | 23.32      | 346.12     |
| T4     | BBF+ FYM @ 5 t ha⁻¹ + Gypsum @ 1.25 t ha⁻¹ | 198.30 | 24.50 | 344.35 |
|        | SE(m) ±                            | 0.69       | 0.22       | 0.87       |
|        | CD at 5 %                          | 2.03       | 0.67       | 2.56       |
|        | Initial status                     | 175.09     | 18.93      | 325.465    |

**Table 6** Effect of BBF and soil amendments on soybean yield

| Tr.No. | Treatments                        | Grain q ha⁻¹ | Straw q ha⁻¹ |
|--------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| T1     | BBF                               | 10.33        | 14.55        |
| T2     | BBF+ FYM @ 5 t ha⁻¹               | 12.05        | 18.47        |
| T3     | BBF+ Gypsum @ 2.5 t ha⁻¹          | 13.70        | 20.20        |
| T4     | BBF+ FYM @ 5 t ha⁻¹ + Gypsum @ 1.25 t ha⁻¹ | 14.03 | 23.10 |
|        | SE(m) ±                            | 0.27         | 0.56         |
|        | CD at 5 %                          | 0.78         | 1.62         |
|        | C.V                               | 4.30         | 6.33         |

The soluble sodium values varied from (5.48 me L⁻¹) in T₄ to (6.68 me L⁻¹) in T₁. The significant reduction of sodium was noticed in treatments T₄ and T₃. Reduction in soluble Na content in saturation paste extract under gypsum and FYM applied treatments, this might be due to removal of Na due as reclamation process. These results are in conformity with the findings of Singh et al., (1980). It is obvious to reduce the ionic Na due to addition of Ca through amendments, which replaces Na from the clay complex of surface soil, Na decreased with increasing levels of applied amendments (Patel and Singh, 1991).

The increase in soluble potassium all treatments except treatment T₁ The highest value of soluble K was noticed in treatment T₄ (0.87 me L⁻¹) where FYM and gypsum were combined @ 5 t ha⁻¹ and 1.25 t ha⁻¹ respectively. The soluble potassium in T₃ (0.82 me L⁻¹) also increased considerably. The increase of K in organic amendments is due to addition of potassium through biomass. These findings are resembles with the results of Kharche et al., (2010) studied integrated use of gypsum and organic amendments and bio-inoculants for reclamation of sodic swell shrink soils of Mula command area and reported that combined use of gypsum and organic amendments increased soluble K concentration Similar results were also reported by Murtaza et al., (1999) and Sharma et al., (2001).

**Soluble anions**

In respect of bicarbonates the highest significant reduction was observed in T₃ (3.42 me L⁻¹) where was gypsum applied @ 2.5 t ha⁻¹ while in treatment T₄ (3.63 me L⁻¹) also
remarkable reduction was noted in which farm yard manure and gypsum @ 5 t ha\(^{-1}\) and @ 1.25 t ha\(^{-1}\) was applied. The application of gypsum was found effective in removing soluble anions in soluble phase. The results are in conformity with findings of Patel and Singh (1991). The results of their findings showed that gypsum and press mud application were most effective in removing CO\(_2\)\(_3\) and HCO\(_3\) respectively. Similar findings with respect to gypsum application were also reported by Sharma et al., (2001). The excess chlorides increase the osmotic pressure of soil water and lower the water availability to plants. Some plants are sensitive to chloride and develop leaf burn symptoms when chloride concentration reaches about 0.5 %. In the present study noticed that chlorides significantly reduced in treatment T\(_4\) (1.06 me L\(^{-1}\)) where we have applied farm yard manure @ 5 t ha\(^{-1}\) and gypsum @ 1.25 t ha\(^{-1}\). The next considerable reduction was seen in the treatment T\(_3\) (1.21 me L\(^{-1}\)) where gypsum @ 2.5 t ha\(^{-1}\) was applied. With considering these reduction organic and in organic amendments are working very effectively in reducing soluble chlorides concentration. The Sulphates of saturation paste extract was influenced by various treatments. The significantly highest reduction was noticed in T\(_4\) (3.18 me L\(^{-1}\)). The reduction in gypsum and farm yard manure amended furrow might be due to fast reclamation of gypsum as against organic amendments. Similar findings were also reported by Kharche et al., (2010) (Table 4).

Available NPK

Incorporation of gypsum and farm yard manure were enhanced the availability if nitrogen phosphorus and potassium. These might be happened due to farm yard manure and gypsum which is useful for soil reclamation. Higher value 198.30 kg ha\(^{-1}\) of available nitrogen found in T\(_4\) where farm yard manure and gypsum were applied in integrated manner. In T\(_3\) also considerable improvement was seen when gypsum applied @ 2.5 t ha\(^{-1}\). Whereas in treatments T\(_1\) and T\(_2\). Improvement was comparatively less. These results are resembles with the findings of Vipin Kumar and Singh, (2010). Application of gypsum and FYM along with 100% NPK significantly enhanced available nitrogen content of soil over 100% NPK alone. The maximum value of phosphorus have been found in the T\(_4\) (24.50 kg ha\(^{-1}\)) in which treatment gypsum and farm yard manure were collaborated. Slight improvement was noted in treatments T\(_2\) and T\(_3\). The lowest values were noted in treatment T\(_1\) (19.28 kg ha\(^{-1}\)) where only BBF was practiced. These results are closely connected with the findings of Mauiya et al., (2009) stated that the increase in available phosphorus status is due to use of organic amendments, being direct source of phosphorus. The effect of various treatments on available potassium was found to be significantly highest in T\(_3\) (346.12 kg ha\(^{-1}\)) observed with gypsum application @ 2.5 tha\(^{-1}\). Similar findings are reported by Chhabra, (2002). He stated that the application of gypsum @ 2.5 t ha\(^{-1}\) significantly enhanced the available potassium status of soil. Addition of gypsum brought about remarkable improvement in the physical and chemical properties of soil. These findings were in conformity with Yaduvanshi and Sharma (2007) (Table 5).

Soybean yield

In respect yield of soybean as influenced by various treatments. The highest soybean yield (14.03 q ha\(^{-1}\)) was obtained with the application of gypsum @ 1.25 tha\(^{-1}\) + farm yard manure @ 5 t ha\(^{-1}\) on broad bed furrow system. Similarly considerable amount of yield was noticed in treatments where farm yard manure @ 5 tha\(^{-1}\) and gypsum 2.5 tha\(^{-1}\) were added separately. Similar enhancement observed in both cases grain and straw in same treatments. From the results of present investigation it becomes apparent that although gypsum is widely used as amendment for sodic soil on farm available organic amendments can be a better option for improving soil health as well as crop productivity. In view of the problems of availability of gypsum, the farm yard manure can serve as potential alternative for reclamation of calcareous sodic soil. The results...
are in conformity with the findings of Kumar et al., (2011) (Table 6).

In conclusion when considering improper drainage and salinity are the main constraints in Purna valley to mitigate these two barriers to obtain good yields in our experiment we imposed broad bed furrow and soil amendments. After determining the soil status before and after harvesting and comparing yields between with amendments and without amendments we came to know very clearly how our treatments were shown their potentialities in soil amelioration and soybean yield in salt affected soils of purna valley vidarbha. Combined utilisation of land configuration technique and soil amendments worked mutually when sodium is replaced by other cation, preferably calcium sodium was easily by drainage water which is facilitated by BBF. In other hand these BBF works as in situ soil moisture conservator and it provides congenial environments for the more root nodulation. Likewise we are concluding very confidently our treatments had played vital role in improving soil health especially with organic amendments and in soil reclamation as well as more yields of soybean in salt affected soils of purna valley in vidarbha.
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