

International Journal of Plant & Soil Science

Volume 35, Issue 19, Page 2027-2041, 2023; Article no.IJPSS.105846 ISSN: 2320-7035

# Fortified Organic Manure and NPK Fertilizer Levels: Influence on Soil Properties, Yield and Micronutrients Biofortification of Brinjal in Coastal Soil

# D. Elayaraja <sup>a\*</sup>, P. Senthilvalavan <sup>a</sup> and P. Kamalakannan <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar-608002 (Tamil Nadu), India.

#### Authors' contributions

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

#### Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/IJPSS/2023/v35i193754

#### **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/105846

**Original Research Article** 

Received: 29/06/2023 Accepted: 04/09/2023 Published: 12/09/2023

# ABSTRACT

Coastal saline soils are nutrient impoverished where nutrients are in starved state, thus applying increased rate of NPK along with micronutrients fortified organics would greatly improve the soil fertility as well as nutritional quality and yield of vegetable crops. Therefore, we examined the effect of micronutrients fortified organics and NPK levels on the soil properties, yield and quality of brinjal in coastal saline soil. A field experiment was conducted at Ponnanthittu coastal village, near Chidambaram, Cuddalore district, Tamil Nadu during August – December 2022 in sandy saline soil (EC-1.58 dSm<sup>-1</sup>; pH-8.54) nature with low organic carbon (2.31 g kg<sup>-1</sup>), available NPK of 135.56, 9.45 and 157.30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and the available zinc (0.69 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and iron content (3.87 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>). The treatments adopted in a Factorial Randomized Block Design (FRBD) with three

Int. J. Plant Soil Sci., vol. 35, no. 19, pp. 2027-2041, 2023

<sup>\*</sup>Corresponding author: E-mail: md.elayaraja@yahoo.in;

replications and different levels of NPK *viz.*, control, 100, 125 and 150% recommended levels as factor A and different micronutrients fortified organics viz., 100% Zn Fortified Composted Coir pith (Zn FCCP) @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>), 100% Fe Fortified Composted Coir pith (Fe FCCP) @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>) and 100% Zn + Fe Fortified Composted Coir pith (Zn + Fe FCCP) @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> as factor B were studied with brinjal. Study results indicated that application of 125 % NPK along with Zn + Fe fortified composted coir pith (Zn + Fe FCCP) was significantly increased the availability of major and micro nutrient status, nutritional quality and yield of brinjal over other treatments in coastal saline sandy soil.

Keywords: Biofortification; brinjal yield and quality; coastal soil; fortified organics; micronutrients; soil fertility.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

micronutrient deficiencies "Human are а widespread problem worldwide and mainly concern people whose diet (mainly of plant origin) consists of insufficient amounts of critical vitamins and minerals. Low levels of micronutrients in plants are linked *i.e.*, their decreasing concentration in soils and/or low bioavailability and presence of abiotic stresses which disturb the proper growth and development of plants under coastal salt affected soils. Agronomic biofortification of crops is a very promising way to improve the concentration of micronutrients in edible parts of without compromising yield and crops is recognized as the cheapest strategy to alleviate hidden hunger worldwide". (Prom-u-thai et al. 2020) Globally around 2 billion peoples suffers from micronutrient deficiencies, also documented as a "hidden hunger" (Prom-u-thai et al. 2020). "These deficiencies are usually prevalent in highly developed countries and are more common among growing and developina children, pregnant and lactating women, sports persons, and manual labor workers. Among the micronutrients, those most associated with micronutrient malnutrition worldwide are zinc (Zn) and iron (Fe). Proper micronutrient nutrition is key to good human health and according to the World Health Organization (WHO, it mainly depends on sustainable agriculture" (Athar et al., 2020). "Unfortunately, current agricultural systems are still mostly oriented toward achieving high crop yields rather than nutritional quality, thus enhancing the concentrations of mineral micronutrients fortified with organic manures has become a key task in sustainable agriculture production" (Prom-u-thai et al. 2020). However, it is challenging to simultaneously increase the production of food enriched with essential micronutrients which does not cause obvious negative symptoms for plants like, *i.e.*, limiting growth and productivity as well as increased the nutrient content in the edible parts of plant and sustainable soil fertility in coastal saline soil.

Eggplant or brinial (Solanum melongena L.) also known as "poor man's vegetable" is the fifth most important vegetable crop globally, grown on approximately 1.86 million hectares of land, with annual global production of around 54.1 million tonnes [1]. India is the second largest producer of brinjal next to China, generating 61 % and 23 %, respectively, of the total annual yield. It is also having medicinal properties such as the potential to reduce cholesterol levels, rich in minerals, vitamins and essential amino acids and provide valuable nutrient supplement in the tropical diet. In India, coastal area extends up to 8,129 km coastline of the country. Tamil Nadu alone occupies 6.80.622 ha of coastal area constituting 26.8 per cent of the total area of the coastal districts. Coastal soils are generally deficient in organic matter and nutrients, poor physical properties and saline in nature. Brinial is the heavy feeder of nutrients, deficiency of nutrient occurs due to continuous cultivation in coastal soils with imbalanced supply of nutrients to crop as they are poor nutrient supplying capacity in [2]. "Additionally, crop cultivation in nutrient-deficient results in foods with low nutrient soils concentrations, particularly of micronutrients, which contributes to malnutrition and hidden hunger in many emerging-economy countries" [3]. "Globally, micronutrient malnutrition arising either from inadequate consumption of fruits and vegetables or from consumption of foods which are low or deficient in essential micronutrients. Eating foods which have been biofortified to increase their micronutrient content is a useful pathway to overcome malnutrition for many. In order to reduce malnutrition, it is imperative to supply crops with micronutrients in addition to the macronutrients required for plant growth" [3].

"In sandy or sandy loam soils of coastal areas of Tamil Nadu, brinjal is the dominant vegetable crop. Low organic matter content, poor nutrient status, and loss of applied nutrients through leaching, there is a need to test the response of brinjal to increasing levels of NPK in these soils. Use of micronutrients (Zn and Fe) fortified organic manures to restore the soil fertility status has now been recognized. Addition of inorganic nutrients along with fortified organics in coastal saline soil not only full fill the nutrients demand, but also helps in preventing loss of applied nutrients and ensuring steady release. Hence, use of micronutrients like zinc and iron fortified organic manures and inorganic sources of nutrient as best option for maintaining soil fertility and to achieve higher brinjal production" [4]. Keeping the above facts in mind, this study was conducted to evaluate the response of brinjal (yield and quality) through biofortification by zinc and iron fortified organic manure with NPK and soil properties in coastal soil.

### 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted in the farmer's field at Ponnanthittu coastal village, near Chidambaram, Cuddalore district, Tamil Nadu August – December 2022. during The experimental site is geographically located at 11°24'N latitude, 79°44'E longitudes and altitude of 5.79 M above mean sea level (MSL). The climate is moderately warm with a hot humid summer. The experimental soil was sandy in texture and taxonomically classified as Typic Usticpsamments. The physicochemical characteristics of experimental soil was saline with pH of 8.54 and EC of 1.58 dS m<sup>-1</sup>. It was low in organic carbon (2.31 g kg<sup>-1</sup>), nitrogen (135.56 kg ha-<sup>1</sup>), phosphorus (9.45 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), zinc (0.69 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), iron (3.87 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and medium in potassium (157.30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The experiment consists of four levels of NPK (0, 100, 125, 150%) and three combination of Zn & Fe fortified organics (100% Zn Fortified Composted Coir pith (Zn FCCP), 100% Fe Fortified Composted Coir pith (Fe FCCP) and 100% Zn & Fe Fortified Composted Coir pith (Zn + Fe FCCP) @ 6.25 t ha-1 respectively) thus total of twelve treatment combinations was laid in randomized Block design (factorial). 35 days old seedling of Annamalai brinjal was used as test crop. Total Fruit yield was recorded at each harvest. Quality parameters and soil properties were estimated by the following methods viz., Ascorbic acid content [5], Total soluble solids, titrable acidity [5] Bulk density and particle density (Measuring cylinder method, Tan, 1996), pH (Potentiometric method, [5], EC Conductometric method, [5] organic carbon (Chromic acid wet digestion [6], available nitrogen (Alkaline potassium permanganate method, [7], available phosphorus (0.5 M NaHCO<sub>3</sub>, [8] available potassium (Neutral,

normal ammonium acetate [9], DTPA Zn and Fe (Atomic absorption spectrophotometer [10]. The data obtained were statistically analyzed as suggested by Gomez and Gomez [11]. For significant results, the critical difference was worked at five per cent probability level.3.

# 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

# 3.1 Soil Physical Properties (Table 1)

All the micronutrients fortified organics applied treatment proved efficient in influencing the soil physical properties *viz.*, bulk density, particle density and water holding capacity of the soil in the present investigation. While, the different levels of NPK and interaction effect between NPK levels along with fortified organics were not significant.

The application of different level of NPK does not exhibit any significant influence on soil physical properties. Though all the fortified organics, application of Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 (B<sub>3</sub>) performed well and registered the lowest bulk density (1.28Mg m<sup>-3</sup>), particle density (2.69 Mg m<sup>-3</sup>) and higher water holding capacity (29.87%) in soil. Addition of organic matter through organics provides organic binding agents which increase the aggregation, increase aeration and improve water holding capacity and decrease the water holding capacity. Saravaiya et al. [12] also reported that addition of organics improve the physical condition of soil. Addition of organic matter possess more negative charge which holds large number of cations and there increase in physical properties of soil. This is in corroborate with earlier findings of Thingujam et al. [13].

# 3.2 Soil Physico-Chemical Properties (Table 2)

# 3.2.1 Soil reaction (pH)

The effect of NPK levels in influencing the pH of the soil was not significant. The effect of different sources of micronutrients fortified organics application proved its worthiness in reducing the soil pH at post harvest stage. Among different micronutrients fortified organics evaluated, application of 100% recommended zinc and iron fortified composted coir pith (Zn + Fe FCCP) @  $6.25 \text{ t} \text{ ha}^{-1}$  significantly reduced the pH in post harvest soil. At harvest, this treatment recorded the lowest pH of 7.90. The other micronutrients fortified

organics viz., 100% Zn FCCP and 100% Fe FCCP also significantly reduced the pH of the soil to the tune of 7.96 and 8.02, respectively at harvest as compared to a pH of 8.04 in NPK applied treatments (without fortified organics).

The interaction effect of different levels of NPK fertilizer along with different micronutrients fortified organics was not significant. Application of various micronutrients fortified organics brought out a significant reduction in pH and EC of the soil. All the micronutrients fortified organics evaluated contributed for а favourable improvement in the soil physico-chemical properties of soil by way of reduction in soil reaction and salinity. However, among the organics, application of Zn and Fe fortified composted coir pith excelled all others in reducing the pH and EC of the soil. The decrease in soil pH may be attributed to the higher production of CO<sub>2</sub> and organic acids on the decomposition of applied organic wastes which favorably reduced the pH of soil. This was in agreement with the earlier findings of Vigneshvarraj (2020).

### 3.2.2 Electrical conductivity (EC)

All the micronutrients (Zn and Fe) fortified CCP application proved efficient in reducing the EC of soil at post harvest stages of brinjal. While, the interaction effect of NPK levels with micronutrients fortified composted coir pith were statistically not significant.

Though all the micronutrients fortified organic sources significantly reduced EC of soil, the lowest EC was recorded with treatment B<sub>3</sub>, the application of 100% Zn+ Fe fortified composted coir pith (Zn + Fe FCCP) @ 12.5 t ha-1 which recorded a EC value of 3.66 dSm<sup>-1</sup> at harvest stage. This was followed by treatment B<sub>1</sub>, 100% zinc fortified composted coir pith (Zn FCCP) @ 6.25 t ha-1 and B2, 100% iron fortified composted coir pith (Fe FCCP) @ 6.25 t ha-1 which recorded an EC value of 3.71 and 3.79 dSm-1 at post harvest soil, respectively. The highest EC was recorded in control (without fortified organics applied treatments). The increased permeability of soil and leaching of salts with the applied micronutrients fortified organics might have reduced the EC of soil. These results are in agreement with the earlier report of Vigneshvarraj (2020). Further, the better reduction in pH and EC with organics might be due to release of more organic acids during decomposition and also due to irrigation to crops

during their growth period, it is quite probable that appreciable amount of salts might have been leached down apart from the formation of organometal complexes as observed by Thingujam et al. [13].

#### 3.2.3 Soil Organic Carbon (SOC)

The coastal sandy soil shows poor organic carbon status. Application of various sources of micronutrients like Zn and Fe fortified composted coir pith significantly increased the organic carbon content of soil, while, inorganic NPK levels and their interaction effect were not significant.

Of the various micronutrients fortified composted coir pith studied, application of 100% Zn + Fe fortified composted coir pith @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>3</sub>) recorded the maximum organic carbon content of 2.87 g kg<sup>-1</sup>at harvest stage. This was followed by the treatment B<sub>1</sub>, application of 100% Zn FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 and treatment B<sub>2</sub>, application of 100% FeFCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1which registered 2.79 and 2.70 g kg<sup>-1</sup>, respectively at post harvest stage. The control registered the lowest organic carbon content 2.67 g kg-1at post-harvest soil. The organic carbon status of the soil is an essential factor for soil productivity was significantly increased with the application of various micronutrients fortified organics sources. With the application of various micronutrients fortified organics, the content of organic carbon in the soil. The effects of application of inorganic NPK fertilizers were not significant in influencing the status of organic carbon. The addition of fortified organics directly and also the improved crop vields, resulted in increased left over of root and plant biomass in the soil which have increased the organic carbon status. These results are in line with findings of Mohankumar and Gowda [14].

#### 3.2.4 Available major nutrients (Table 3)

In the present study, the application of different levels of NPK along with various combination of fortified organic fertilizer favorably influence in increasing the availability of nutrients in soil and it was slightly reduced at harvest stage due to the crop intake of nutrients.

Among the various NPK levels, the application of NPK @ 150% (A<sub>4</sub>) recorded the highest amount of alkaline KMnO<sub>4</sub>-N (158.15 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), Olsen-P (11.91 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and NH<sub>4</sub>OAC-K (172.87 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). However, it was found to be comparable with the treatment A<sub>3</sub>, the application of NPK @ 125%

(156.73 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of available nitrogen, 11.85 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of available phosphorus and 171.12 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> of available potassium). The lowest was observed with control (A<sub>1</sub>). Among the various combination of FCCP tried the highest available N (147.55 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), P (11.42 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and K (161.19 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) at harvest stages was recorded with the application of Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>3</sub>). This was followed by the application of Zn FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>1</sub>) and lowest was recorded with Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>2</sub>).

Regarding the interaction effect due to different levels of NPK and FCCP on major nutrient availability was significant. The highest alkaline KMnO<sub>4</sub>-N content of 165.26 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, Olsen-P content of 12.21 kg ha-1 and NH4OAC-K content of 181.65 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> were recorded in 150 % NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub>). This was equally efficacious with the application of 125% NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 (A<sub>3</sub>B<sub>3</sub>). The lowest available nutrient content was noticed in control. The availability of nutrients in coastal saline soils are very low due to poor crop residues and microbial activity and leaching of nutrients associated with poor structure and low use efficiency of applied nutrients. The enhancement in soil nutrient levels was observed after crop harvest due to the balanced essential nutrient supplies in plantavailable forms with organics, which also led to high rhizospheric biomass production, increasing soil organic matter and microbial activity, and ultimately improving soil fertility status. Similar findings reported by Suge et al. [15].

#### 3.2.5 Available micronutrients (Fig. 1)

From the perusal of data, it is clear that the available Zn and Fe content of soil were significantly influenced by application of Zn through FCCP along with different levels of NPK fertilizers. Application of increasing levels of NPK from 0 to 150% increased the DTPA Zn and Fe in post-harvest soil. Among the graded levels of NPK applied, addition of NPK @ 150% (A4) recorded the highest mean DTPA-Zn content of 1.19 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and Fe content of 34.08 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>. However, this was on par with the application of NPK @ 125% (A<sub>3</sub>). The least available Zn and Fe content was recorded in control. Among the various combination of FCCP tried, addition of Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>3</sub>) excelled over the other treatments. This was followed by the treatments Zn FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 (B1) and Fe FCCP @6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>2</sub>).

The Interaction between levels of NPK and FCCP on the available Zn and Fe content of soil was found to be significant. Application of 150% NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub>) registered the highest available Zn content of 1.91, 1.64 and 1.25 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>and Fe content of 87.86, 58.74 and 35.71 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>at flowering, fruit formation and at harvest stage, respectively. This was equally efficient with the treatment which received 125% NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (A<sub>3</sub>B<sub>3</sub>). This was followed by the treatment pairs  $A_4B_1$  and  $A_4B_2$ . The lowest DTPA Zn and Fe content was observed in control treatment (A1B2). The increased Zn availability might be attributed to the direct addition of these nutrients by fortified organic manures, which maintain maximum available Zn and Fe status in post-harvest soil. Further the complexation of micronutrients with applied organics might have mobilized and increased the availability of Zn and Fe in soil.

### 3.3 Soil Biological Properties

#### 3.3.1 Microbial populations (Table 5)

Microbial populations of soil microorganisms viz., bacteria, fungi and actinomycetes was also significantly increased with different combination of FCCP application along with different levels of NPK. Different levels of NPK show significant variation among the microbial populations in soil. The level which received NPK @ 150% (A<sub>4</sub>) recorded highest count of bacteria  $(20.00 \times 10^6),$ fungi (12.67× 10<sup>5</sup>) and Actinomycetes  $(7.34 \times 10^4)$  in soil. This was on par with the application of NPK @ 125% (A<sub>3</sub>) which registered a comparable bacterial count of 10<sup>6</sup>, fungi of 12.65× 10<sup>5</sup> 19.99 × and actinomycetes of  $7.33 \times 10^4$ . This was followed by the treatments  $A_2$  and  $A_1$ . The various combination of FCCP application significantly increased the microbial populations in soil. Among the three treatments tried, application of Zn+Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 (B<sub>3</sub>) performed well and registered the highest bacterial count of 19.73  $\times$  10<sup>6</sup>, fungi of 12.47 $\times$  10<sup>5</sup> and actinomycetes of  $7.07 \times 10^4$  in soil. The lowest microbial count was recorded with application of Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>2</sub>).

The interaction effect between levels of NPK and FCCP on the microbial count in soil was found to be significant. Application of 150% NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub>) recorded the highest microbial count of  $20.11\times$ 

 $10^6$ ,  $12.78 \times 10^5$  and  $7.45 \times 10^4$  by bacteria, fungi and actinomycetes, respectively. However, this was equally efficacious with the application of 125% NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (A<sub>3</sub>B<sub>3</sub>), while the lowest microbial count was recorded with control. Addition of organics creates a suitable environment for the survival of all microorganisms in soil. Decomposition of organics releases the acids and nutrients which regulate the soil pH and supply nutrients for the optimum growth of the microbes. Further, addition of fortified organics with NPK provides additional nutrients for the better proliferation of microbes [16].

#### 3.3.2 Enzyme activities (Fig 2)

The enzymatic activity of soil viz., dehydrogenase, phosphatase and urease was significantly increased with different combination of FCCP application along with different levels of NPK. Among the NPK levels application of NPK @ 150% (A4) recorded the highest mean urease activity (30.45µg NH4-N/g soil/24 h), alkaline phosphatase activity (13.44 µg p-nitrophenol/g soil/h) and dehydrogenase activity (72.61µg TTF/g soil/24 h) in the soil and this was comparable with the treatment A3. the application of NPK @ 125%. The lowest enzymatic activities were observed in control. Among the various combination of FCCP tried. the application of Zn + Fe FCCP@6.25 t ha-1 (B3) recorded the highest urease activity of 29.96µg NH4-N/g soil/24 h, alkaline phosphatase activity of 13.04 µg p-nitrophenol/g soil/hand dehydrogenase activity of 72.05µg TTF/g soil / 24 h in the soil. This was followed by the application of Zn FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 (B1) and lowest with treatment supplied with Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 (B2).





Fig. 1. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe through fortified organics along with NPK levels on the available micronutrients (mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) in coastal saline soil



Elayaraja et al.; Int. J. Plant Soil Sci., vol. 35, no. 19, pp. 2027-2041, 2023; Article no.IJPSS.105846





Fig. 2. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe through fortified organics along with NPK levels on the enzyme activities in post-harvest soil

The interaction effect between levels of NPK and FCCP on the enzyme activity in soil was observed to be significant. Application of 150% NPK along with Zn+Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 (A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub>) registered the highest enzymatic activity of 30.45µg NH<sub>4</sub>-N/g soil/24 h, 13.56 µg p-nitrophenol/g soil/h and 72.61µg TTF/g soil/24 h by bacteria, fungi and actinomycetes, respectively. This was equally efficient with the treatment (A<sub>3</sub>B<sub>3</sub>) which received 125% NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1. The lowest enzymatic activity was recorded in the control treatment. Addition of fertilizer and organics increased the enzymatic activity in soil. Urease is important enzyme required for hydrolysis of urea, to release the ammonium ion required for the plant growth. Addition of nitrogen fertilizers and organics supply nitrogenase substance and also increased microbial activity which leads to increased urease activity in soil. Soil phosphatase activity is increased is mainly due to addition of phosphorus fertilizer and also regulation of soil pH through soil organics. Dehydrogenase enzyme is mainly involved in biological oxidation of organic matter in the soil by hydrogen transfer from the organic substrate inorganic acceptors. Increase in to dehydrogenase indicates the increase in biological activity and increase in nutrient availability in soil. Addition of organics resulted in increase in organic matter with increase in dehvdrogenase activity. This is similar with findings of Ramamoorthy et al. [17]

# 3.4 Yield, Quality and Nutritional Quality of Brinjal Yield (Table 4)

#### 3.4.1 Yield

Application of different levels of NPK and different combinations of Zn and Fe fortified organic manure significantly enhanced the yield of brinjal. Among the different levels of NPK, application of NPK @ 150% (A4) recorded the highest fruit yield and stover yield of brinjal. However, it was found to be equally efficacious with application of NPK @ 125%. Sandy soils are generally low in nutrient content than critical concentration which affects the plant growth and vield. Addition of extra NPK than normal recommended dose provides an optimum nutrient for the growth and ultimately increases the yield of crop. This is similar with findings of Aminifard et al. [18] and Kasi et al. [19]. As the initially fertility is low and no nutrients are provided during the entire growth, plant might have exhausted of native nutrients from the soil

which leads to the lowest yield in control as compared to the other treatments.

Among the three different combinations of fortified organics tried, application of 100% Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>3</sub>) was significantly superior to other combination in increasing fruit yield and stover yield. This was followed by the application of Zn FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>1</sub>) and Fe FCCP@ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>(B<sub>2</sub>). Fortification of organic manure with the micronutrients improves the nutritional composition than normal content. Addition of fortified manures supplies the nutrient at steady rate throughout the growth of crop by decomposition, and improves physical condition of soil which increased the yield of crop. This is accordance with findings of Ramamoorthy *et al.* [17].

The interaction effect between NPK levels and fortification of both Zn and Fe or either Zn or Fe alone through CCP on yield of brinjal was significant. The treatment A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub>, which received 150% NPK along with 100% Zn & Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 recorded the higher fruit yield and stover yield of brinjal as compared to other treatment combinations. However, it was found to be on par with 125% NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (A<sub>3</sub>B<sub>3</sub>). The lowest yield of brinjal was registered in sole fortified treatment (A<sub>1</sub>B<sub>2</sub>).The superiority of combined application of NPK with fortified organics may be due to increased nutrient uptake, as it provides optimum amount nutrient at steady rate which increases the plant growth The increased plant growth led to better carbohydrate build up with which increased the plant fruit yield. Suge et al. [15] reported that addition of organic manure with inorganic fertilizer in the soil improves the soil physical and chemical properties which encourage better root development, increased nutrient uptake and water holding capacity which leads higher fruit yield.

#### 3.4.2 Quality parameters (Table 6)

The quality parameters of brinjal *viz.*, ascorbic acid content, crude protein content, titrable acidity and total soluble solid was statistically enhanced by application of different levels of NPK and Zn + Fe FCCP.

Among the different levels of NPK evaluated, application of 150% NPK (A<sub>4</sub>) recorded the highest mean ascorbic acid content, crude protein content, titrable acidity and total soluble solid in the brinjal. It recorded 15.79 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>

| Α              |                       | Bulk           | density        | (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> ) |        |            | Partic                | le densi   | ty (Mg m <sup>.</sup> | <sup>.3</sup> ) | Water holding capacity (%) |                |                |            |       |  |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------|------------|-----------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|----------------|----------------|------------|-------|--|
| В              | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub> | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> 4            | Mean   | <b>A</b> 1 | <b>A</b> <sub>2</sub> | <b>A</b> 3 | <b>A</b> 4            | Mean            | <b>A</b> 1                 | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> 4 | Mean  |  |
| B1             | 1.32                  | 1.32           | 1.33           | 1.34                  | 1.33   | 2.83       | 2.80                  | 2.76       | 2.74                  | 2.78            | 29.50                      | 29.59          | 29.61          | 29.66      | 29.59 |  |
| B <sub>2</sub> | 1.31                  | 1.32           | 1.32 1.31 1.31 |                       |        | 2.92       | 2.91                  | 2.87       | 2.84                  | 2.89            | 29.20                      | 29.30          | 29.31          | 29.35      | 29.29 |  |
| B <sub>3</sub> | 1.30                  | 1.29           | 1.26 1.27 1.28 |                       |        | 2.72       | 2.70                  | 2.67       | 2.65                  | 2.69            | 29.78                      | 29.85          | 29.92          | 29.94      | 29.87 |  |
| Mean           | 1.32                  | 1.31           | 1.30           | 1.30                  |        | 2.82       | 2.80                  | 2.77       | 2.74                  |                 | 29.49                      | 29.58          | 29.61          | 29.65      |       |  |
|                | SED                   |                |                | CD (p                 | =0.05) | SED        |                       |            | CD (                  | o=0.05)         | SED                        |                | CD (p=0.05)    |            |       |  |
| А              | NS                    |                | NS             |                       |        | NS         |                       |            | NS                    |                 | NS                         |                |                |            |       |  |
| В              | 0.01                  |                | 0.02           |                       |        | 0.02 0.05  |                       |            | 5 0.06                |                 |                            | 0.13           |                |            |       |  |
| ΑxΒ            | NS                    |                | NS             |                       |        | NS NS      |                       |            | NS NS                 |                 |                            |                |                |            |       |  |

Table 1. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe through fortified organics along with NPK levels on the physical properties of coastal saline soil

Table 2. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe through fortified organics along with NPK levels on the physio-chemical properties of coastal saline soil

| Α              | рН                    |                |                       |               |       |                       |                | EC (d          | Sm <sup>-1</sup> )    |      | Organic carbon (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |                       |                |                |      |  |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|---------------|-------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------|------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|------|--|
| В              | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub> | A <sub>2</sub> | <b>A</b> <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> 4    | Mean  | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub> | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> <sub>4</sub> | Mean | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub>                | <b>A</b> <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | A <sub>4</sub> | Mean |  |
| B <sub>1</sub> | 7.99                  | 7.96           | 7.97                  | 7.95          | 7.96  | 3.73                  | 3.71           | 3.71           | 3.70                  | 3.71 | 2.76                                 | 2.78                  | 2.80           | 2.81           | 2.79 |  |
| B <sub>2</sub> | 8.01                  | 8.03           | 8.04                  | .04 8.03 8.02 |       |                       | 3.78           | 3.79           | 3.77                  | 3.79 | 2.67                                 | 2.70                  | 2.70           | 2.72           | 2.70 |  |
| B <sub>3</sub> | 7.98                  | 7.90           | 7.89                  | 9 7.88 7.90   |       | 3.67                  | 3.66           | 3.65           | 3.64                  | 3.66 | 2.84                                 | 2.85                  | 2.88           | 2.89           | 2.87 |  |
| Mean           | 8.04                  | 7.96           | 7.97                  | 7.95          |       | 3.73                  | 3.72           | 3.72           | 3.70                  |      | 2.76                                 | 2.78                  | 2.79           | 2.81           |      |  |
|                | SED                   |                |                       | CD (p=        | 0.05) | SE                    | D              | CD (p=0.05)    |                       |      |                                      | SED                   | CD (p=0.05)    |                |      |  |
| А              | NS                    |                | NS                    |               |       | NS                    |                | NS             |                       |      |                                      | NS                    |                |                |      |  |
| В              | 0.01                  |                | 0.03                  |               |       | 0.0                   | 1              | 0.03           |                       |      | 0.02                                 |                       |                | 0.03           |      |  |
| AxB            | NS                    |                | NS                    |               |       | NS NS                 |                |                |                       | NS   |                                      |                       | NS             |                |      |  |

| Α              |                       | Availab        | le nitroger | n (kg ha⁻¹) |        | A          | vailable       | phospho        | rus (kg ha | a⁻¹)   | Available potassium (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) |                |                |            |        |  |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-------------|-------------|--------|------------|----------------|----------------|------------|--------|--|----------------|----------------|------------|--------|--|
| В              | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub> | A <sub>2</sub> | <b>A</b> 3  | $A_4$       | Mean   | <b>A</b> 1 | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | $A_4$      | Mean   | <b>A</b> 1                                 | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> 4 | Mean   |  |
| B1             | 112.15                | 134.44         | 157.09      | 158.24      | 140.48 | 9.84       | 10.87          | 11.86          | 11.92      | 11.12  | 120.54                                     | 145.83         | 170.48         | 172.63     | 152.37 |  |
| B <sub>2</sub> | 104.96                | 127.15         | 149.62      | 150.95      | 9.53   | 10.48      | 11.56          | 11.60          | 10.79      | 112.35 | 137.54                                     | 163.01         | 164.34         | 144.31     |        |  |
| B <sub>3</sub> | 119.16                | 142.29         | 163.47      | 165.26      | 147.55 | 10.13      | 11.20          | 12.14          | 12.21      | 11.42  | 128.55                                     | 154.68         | 179.86         | 181.65     | 161.19 |  |
| Mean           | 112.09                | 134.63         | 156.73      | 158.15      |        | 9.83       | 10.85          | 11.85          | 11.91      |        | 120.48                                     | 146.02         | 171.12         | 172.87     |        |  |
|                | SED                   |                | (           | CD (p=0.05  | )      | SED        |                |                | CD (p=0.0  | 5)     | SED  |                |                | CD (p=0.05 | )      |  |
| А              | 1.64                  |                | 3.39        |             |        | 0.06 0.13  |                |                | 0.13 1.93  |        |  |                |                |            |        |  |
| В              | 1.88                  |                | 3.90        |             |        | 0.07 0.15  |                |                | 0.15 2.21  |        |  | 4.58           |                |            |        |  |
| ΑxΒ            | 3.26                  |                | 6.74        |             |        | 0.13 0.26  |                |                | 3.83       |        |  | 7.93           |                |            |        |  |

Table 3. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe through fortified organics along with NPK levels on the available major nutrients in coastal saline soil

Factor – A (NPK Levels); A<sub>1</sub>– control; A<sub>2</sub> – 100% NPK; A<sub>3</sub> – 125% NPK and A<sub>4</sub> – 150% NPK Factor – B (Fortified CCP); B<sub>1</sub>– 100% Zn fortified composted coir pith (ZnFCCP) @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>; B<sub>2</sub> – 100 % FeFCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and B<sub>3</sub>–100% Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

| Table 4. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe throug | gh fortified organics alon | g with NPK levels on the | yield (t ha'' | ) of brinjal |
|---|----------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|--------------|

| Α              |                       |                | Fruit y        | /ield          |       | Stover yield |                |                |            |       |  |  |  |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-------|--------------|----------------|----------------|------------|-------|--|--|--|
| В              | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub> | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | A <sub>4</sub> | Mean  | <b>A</b> 1   | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> 4 | Mean  |  |  |  |
| B <sub>1</sub> | 40.57                 | 45.04          | 49.91          | 50.56          | 46.52 | 33.69        | 37.88          | 41.81          | 42.02      | 38.85 |  |  |  |
| B <sub>2</sub> | 39.09                 | 43.55          | 48.28          | 48.87          | 44.95 | 32.21        | 36.59          | 40.41          | 40.69      | 37.48 |  |  |  |
| B <sub>3</sub> | 42.04                 | 46.73          | 51.64          | 52.11          | 48.13 | 35.08        | 39.07          | 42.91          | 43.27      | 40.08 |  |  |  |
| Mean           | 40.57                 | 45.11          | 49.94          | 50.51          |       | 33.66        | 37.85          | 41.71          | 41.99      |       |  |  |  |
|                |                       | SED            |                | CD (p=0.       | .05)  | SED          |                |                | CD (p=0.0  | )5)   |  |  |  |
| А              | 0.34                  |                |                | 0.70           |       | 0.27         |                |                | 0.57       |       |  |  |  |
| В              | 0.39                  |                |                | 0.80           |       | 0.32         |                |                | 0.65       |       |  |  |  |
| AxB            | 0.67                  |                |                | 1.39           |       | 0.55         |                |                | 1.13       |       |  |  |  |

| Α              |                       | Bact           | erial (x 1          | 0º/g soi   | I)        |            | F              | ungi(x 1              | 0⁵/g soil)                  | )     |            | Actinomycetes(x 10⁴/g soil) |            |            |        |  |  |  |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|---------------------|------------|-----------|------------|----------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|------------|--------|--|--|--|
| В              | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub> | A <sub>2</sub> | <b>A</b> 3          | <b>A</b> 4 | Mean      | <b>A</b> 1 | A <sub>2</sub> | <b>A</b> <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> 4                  | Mean  | <b>A</b> 1 | A <sub>2</sub>              | <b>A</b> 3 | <b>A</b> 4 | Mean   |  |  |  |
| B <sub>1</sub> | 18.78                 | 19.61          | 19.99               | 20.01      | 19.60     | 11.88      | 12.27          | 12.66                 | 12.69                       | 12.38 | 6.64       | 6.95                        | 7.33       | 7.35       | 7.07   |  |  |  |
| B <sub>2</sub> | 18.59                 | 19.52          | 2 19.87 19.89 19.47 |            |           | 11.76      | 12.19          | 12.52                 | 12.55                       | 12.26 | 6.51       | 6.86                        | 7.21       | 7.23       | 6.95   |  |  |  |
| B <sub>3</sub> | 18.97                 | 19.73          | 20.1                | 20.11      | 19.73     | 11.97      | 12.38          | 12.76                 | 12.78                       | 12.47 | 6.75       | 7.07                        | 7.44       | 7.45       | 7.18   |  |  |  |
| Mean           | 18.78                 | 19.62          | 19.99               | 20.00      |           | 11.87      | 12.28          | 12.65                 | 12.67                       |       | 6.63       | 6.96                        | 7.33       | 7.34       |        |  |  |  |
|                |                       | SED            |                     | CD (p=     | :0.05)    | SED        |                |                       | CD (p=0.05) SE <sub>D</sub> |       |            |                             |            | CD (p=     | =0.05) |  |  |  |
| А              | 0.01                  | 0.01 0.03      |                     | 0.02       |           |            | 0.04 0.02      |                       |                             |       |            | 0.04                        |            |            |        |  |  |  |
| В              | 0.02                  | 0.02 0.03      |                     | 0.02 0.04  |           |            | 0.02           |                       |                             |       | 0.05       |                             |            |            |        |  |  |  |
| AxB            | 0.03                  | 0.03 0.06      |                     |            | 0.03 0.07 |            |                |                       |                             | 0.04  | 0.08       |                             |            |            |        |  |  |  |

Table 5. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe through fortified organics along with NPK levels on the microbial population in coastal saline soil

Factor – A (NPK Levels); A<sub>1</sub>– control; A<sub>2</sub> – 100% NPK; A<sub>3</sub> – 125% NPK and A<sub>4</sub> – 150% NPK Factor – B (Fortified CCP); B<sub>1</sub>– 100% Zn fortified composted coir pith (ZnFCCP) @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>; B<sub>2</sub> – 100 % FeFCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and B<sub>3</sub>–100% Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

| Table 6. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe through | gh fortified organics alon | g with NPK levels on the qu | ality parameters of brinjal |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|

| Α              | Asco       | rbic aci              | d conte        | nt (mg 1 | 00 g <sup>-1</sup> | Crude protein content (%) |                |                |             |      | Titrable acidity (%) |                |                |       |      | Total soluble solid (%) |                       |                |        |       |
|----------------|------------|-----------------------|----------------|----------|--------------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|-------------|------|----------------------|----------------|----------------|-------|------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|--------|-------|
|                |            |                       | fruit)         |          |                    |                           |                |                |             |      |                      |                |                |       |      |                         |                       |                |        |       |
| В              | <b>A</b> 1 | <b>A</b> <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | $A_4$    | Mean               | <b>A</b> 1                | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | $A_4$       | Mean | <b>A</b> 1           | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | $A_4$ | Mean | <b>A</b> 1              | <b>A</b> <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | $A_4$  | Mean  |
| B <sub>1</sub> | 10.66      | 13.25                 | 15.65          | 15.82    | 13.85              | 2.09                      | 2.88           | 3.71           | 3.77        | 3.11 | 0.84                 | 1.24           | 1.70           | 1.74  | 1.38 | 10.06                   | 12.32                 | 14.67          | 14.88  | 12.98 |
| B <sub>2</sub> | 9.78       | 12.56                 | 14.73          | 14.97    | 13.01              | 1.87                      | 2.63           | 3.51           | 3.55        | 2.89 | 0.67                 | 1.12           | 1.56           | 1.59  | 1.24 | 9.37                    | 11.57                 | 13.78          | 14.06  | 12.20 |
| B <sub>3</sub> | 11.59      | 13.96                 | 16.49          | 16.59    | 14.66              | 2.34                      | 3.17           | 3.92           | 3.95        | 3.35 | 0.94                 | 1.37           | 1.84           | 1.85  | 1.50 | 10.87                   | 13.01                 | 15.45          | 15.63  | 13.74 |
| Mean           | 10.68      | 13.26                 | 15.62          | 15.79    |                    | 2.10                      | 2.89           | 3.71           | 3.76        |      | 0.82                 | 1.24           | 1.70           | 1.73  |      | 10.10                   | 12.30                 | 14.63          | 14.86  |       |
|                |            | SED                   |                | CD (p=   | =0.05)             | SED                       |                |                | CD (p=0.05) |      | SED                  |                | CD (p=0.05)    |       | SED  |                         | CD (p=0.              |                | :0.05) |       |
| А              | 0.15       |                       |                | 0.31     |                    | 0.04                      |                |                | 0.08        |      | 0.02                 |                | 0.05           |       |      | 0.15                    |                       | 0.31           |        |       |
| В              | 0.17       | 0.17 0.35             |                |          |                    | 0.04 0.0                  |                |                | 0.09 0.03   |      | 0.05                 |                | 0.17           |       | 0.36 |                         |                       |                |        |       |
| ΑxΒ            | 0.29 0.61  |                       |                |          | 0.07 0.15          |                           |                |                | 0.04        | 1    | 0.09                 |                |                | 0.30  |      |                         | 0.62                  |                |        |       |

| Α              | Calci                 | um (m          | g 100 g               | g <sup>-1</sup> fruit) | )             | Phosphorus (%) |                          |                |            | Zinc content (%)  |            |                       |                             |           | Iron content (%) |             |                |                |            |      |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------------------|----------------|------------|-------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------|------------|------|
| В              | <b>A</b> <sub>1</sub> | A <sub>2</sub> | <b>A</b> <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> <sub>4</sub>  | Mean          | <b>A</b> 1     | <b>A</b> <sub>2</sub>    | A <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> 4 | Mean              | <b>A</b> 1 | <b>A</b> <sub>2</sub> | Â <sub>3</sub>              | $A_4$     | Mean             | <b>A</b> 1  | A <sub>2</sub> | A <sub>3</sub> | <b>A</b> 4 | Mean |
| B <sub>1</sub> | 6.54                  | 7.90           | 9.40                  | 9.51                   | 8.34          | 0.38           | 0.54                     | 0.67           | 0.69       | 0.57              | 15.89      | 18.86                 | 21.95                       | 22.26     | 19.74            | 3.35        | 4.27           | 5.14           | 5.22       | 4.50 |
| B <sub>2</sub> | 6.01                  | 7.48           | 8.95                  | 9.03                   | 7.87          | 0.33           | 0.33 0.48 0.63 0.64 0.52 |                | 0.52       | 14.84             | 17.79      | 21.12                 | 21.38                       | 18.78     | 2.99             | 3.93        | 4.86           | 4.92           | 4.18       |      |
| B <sub>3</sub> | 7.03                  | 8.49           | 9.88                  | 9.92                   | 8.83          | 0.44           | 0.58                     | 0.72           | 0.73       | 0.62              | 16.81      | 20.11                 | 23.08                       | 23.25     | 20.81            | 3.68        | 4.55           | 5.47           | 5.51       | 4.80 |
| Mean           | 6.53                  | 7.96           | 9.41                  | 9.49                   |               | 0.38           | 0.53                     | 0.67           | 0.69       |                   | 15.85      | 18.92                 | 22.05                       | 22.30     |                  | 3.34        | 4.25           | 5.16           | 5.22       |      |
|                | SED                   |                |                       | CD (p                  | <b>)=0.05</b> |                | SED                      |                | CD (p      | CD (p=0.05) SED C |            |                       | CD (p=0.05) SE <sub>D</sub> |           |                  | CD (p=0.05) |                |                | ).05)      |      |
| А              | 0.09                  |                |                       | 0.19                   |               |                | 0.01                     |                | 0.02       |                   | 0.21       |                       | 1 0.43                      |           |                  | 0.05        |                | 0.11           |            |      |
| В              | 0.11                  |                |                       | 0.22                   |               |                | 0.01                     | 0.01 0.02      |            |                   | 0.24       | 0.24                  |                             | 0.49      |                  | 0.06        |                | 0.12           |            |      |
| ΑxΒ            | 0.18                  |                |                       | 0.38                   |               |                | 0.01 0.03                |                |            | 0.41 0.85         |            |                       |                             | 0.10 0.21 |                  |             | .21            |                |            |      |

Table 7. Effect of biofortification of Zn and Fe through fortified organics along with NPK levels on the nutritional quality parameters of brinjal

Factor – A (NPK Levels); A<sub>1</sub>– control; A<sub>2</sub> – 100% NPK; A<sub>3</sub> – 125% NPK and A<sub>4</sub> – 150% NPK Factor – B (Fortified CCP); B<sub>1</sub>– 100% Zn fortified composted coir pith (ZnFCCP) @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>; B<sub>2</sub> – 100 % FeFCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> and B<sub>3</sub>–100% Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup>

fruit. 3.76. 1.73 and 14.86% respectively and this was comparable with the treatment A<sub>3</sub>, the application of 125% NPK recorded a ascorbic acid content, crude protein content, titrable acidity and total soluble solid of 15.62 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup> fruit, 3.71, 1.70 and 14.63%, respectively at the above said critical stages of brinjal. This was followed by the treatments A<sub>2</sub> and A1 (control). Among the various combination of fortified organic fertilizer tried, application of Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>3</sub>) recorded the highest ascorbic acid content, crude protein content, titrable acidity and total soluble solid of 14.66 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup> fruit, 3.35, 1.50 and 13.74%, respectively. However, this was followed by the application of sole fortified organics through zinc and iron (B<sub>2</sub>) and (B<sub>1</sub>).

The interaction effect between different levels of NPK and FCCP on the quality parameters of brinjal was significant. Application of 150% NPK along with Zn+Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub>) registered the highest ascorbic acid content, crude protein content, titrable acidity and total soluble solid of 16.59 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup> fruit, 3.95%, 1.85% and 15.63%, respectively. This was equally efficient with treatment (A<sub>3</sub>B<sub>3</sub>) which received 125% NPK along with Zn+Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1 and recorded the ascorbic acid content, crude protein content, titrable acidity and total soluble solid of 16.49 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>fruit, 3.92%, %, 1.84% and 15.45% of brinjal, respectively. This was followed by the treatments  $A_4B_1$  and  $A_4B_2$ . The lowest quality parameter of brinjal was recorded in Fe alone fortified treatment.

The quality parameters of brinjal obtained in presentation was due to the organic manures, during decomposition release nutrients, which became available to the plants and increased NPK concentration. The higher nutrients uptake with organic manure might be attributed to solubilisation of native nutrients through applied NPK fertilizers, chelation of micronutrient complex intermediate organic manures, their mobilization and accumulation of nutrients by crop plants. These results are in parity with results reported by Salwa et al. [20]; Grzebisz et al. [21] and Chesti et al. [22].

#### 3.4.3 Nutritional quality (Table 7)

The quality parameters of brinjal *viz.*, zinc and iron content was statistically enhanced by application of different levels of NPK and Zn + Fe FCCP. Among the different levels of NPK evaluated, application of 150% NPK (A<sub>4</sub>) recorded the highest mean calcium (9.49mg 100g<sup>-1</sup>fruit), phosphorus (0.69%), zinc (22.30%) and iron (5.22%) content and this was comparable with the treatment A<sub>3</sub>. Among the various combination of fortified organic fertilizer tried, application of 100% Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (B<sub>3</sub>) recorded the highest calcium, phosphorus, zinc content and iron content of 8.83mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>fruit, 0.62%, 20.81% and 4.80%, respectively. However, this was followed by the application of sole fortified organics through zinc and iron (B<sub>2</sub> and B<sub>1</sub>).

The interaction effect between different levels of NPK and FCCP on the quality parameters of brinjal was significant. Application of 150% NPK along with Zn + Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha<sup>-1</sup> (A<sub>4</sub>B<sub>3</sub>) registered the highest calcium, phosphorus, zinc content and iron content of 9.92 mg 100 g<sup>-1</sup>fruit, 0.73, 23.25 and 5.51%, respectively. This was equally efficient with treatment (A<sub>3</sub>B<sub>3</sub>) which received 125% NPK along with Zn +Fe FCCP @ 6.25 t ha-1. The lowest nutritional quality parameter of brinial was recorded in Fe alone fortified treatment. Supplementation of micronutrient with organics and additional macronutrient to crop supplies the entire essential nutrient for regulating all catalytic and enzymatic activities which improves the quality of fruit. This was accordance with the results of Bana et al. (2021) who reported that nutrient supplementation with micronutrientembedded fertilizer increases nutrient content in Eggplant Fruit.

# 4. CONCLUSION

From the results of the present investigation, it is concluded that application of increasing level of NPK fertilizer along with Zn and Fe fortified compost has improved the soil properties, yield and quality of brinjal. From the various combination tried, combined application of 150% NPK fertilizer and 100% zinc and iron fortified coir pith compost resulted better than other treatment combination. So, this treatment combination may be recommended to the coastal brinjal growers for getting better profit and come over the micronutrient malnutrition through vegetables.

# FUNDING AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors thank the authorities of Annamalai University for the financial support by RUSA 2.0 (R & I) Project, Department of Higher Education, and Government of Tamil Nadu for the successful completion of the experiment. They also thank the authorities of Annamalai University for providing necessary facilities to conduct the experiments at Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalainagar, Tamil Nadu, India.

## **COMPETING INTERESTS**

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

# REFERENCES

- FAO. FAOSTAT Production Databases; 2021. Available:http://www.faostat.fao.org (Accessed 2021). FAO, Rome (2021).
- 2. Dimkpa CO, Bindraban PS. Fortification of micronutrients for efficient agronomic production: a review. Agron. Sustain. Dev., 2016;36:7.
- Louhar G, Bana S, Kumar V, Kumar H Nutrient management technologies of millets for higher productivity and nutritional security. Indian J. Agric. Sci. 2020;90: 2243–50.
- Bana RS, Jat GS, Grover, M, Bamboriya SD, Singh D, Bansal R, Choudhary AK, Kumar V, Laing AM, Godara S, Bana RC. Foliar nutrient supplementation with micronutrient-embedded fertilizer increases biofortification, soil biological activity and productivity of eggplant. Sci. Rep. 2022;12(1):5146
- Jackson ML. Soil Chemical Analysis, Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi; 1973.
- 6. Walkley A, BlackI A. An examination of the Digestion method for determining soil organic matter and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration method. Soil Sci., 1934;34,29-38.
- 7. Subbiah BV, Asija GL. A rapid procedure for estimation of available nitrogen in soils. *Curr. Sci.*, 1956;25, 259-260.
- Olsen SR, Cole GV, Watanabe FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorus in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. U.S. Dept. Agric. Cir. No. 1954;939:19.
- 9. Stanford G, English L. Use of flame photometer in rapid soil test and for K and Ca. Agron. J. 1949;41:446-447.
- Lindsay WL, Norvell WA. Development of DTPA soil test for zinc, iron, manganese and copper. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J., 1978;42:421-28
- 11. Gomez AA, Gomez RA. Statistical procedure for agricultural research work

emphasize on rice. IRRI, Los Banos, Manila, Philippines. 1984;294.

- Saravaiya SN, Patel NB, Ahir MP, Patel NM, Desai KD, Patel JB Integrated Nutrient Management (INM) approach for brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.) and other solanaceous vegetables-A review. Agrl. Rev. 2010;31(2):79-92.
- Thingujam U, Pati SR, Pari A, Ray K, Phonglosa A, Bhattacharyya K. Effect of integrated nutrient management on the nutrient accumulation and status of postharvest soil of brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.) under Nadia conditions (West Bengal), India. J. Appl. Nat. Sci. 2016;8(1);321-328.
- 14. Mohankumar AB, Narase Gowda NC. Effect of different organic manures and inorganic fertilizers on available NPK, microbial density of the soil and nutrient uptake of brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.).Asian J. Soil Sci., 2010;5(2):291-294.
- Suge JK, Omunyin ME, Omami EN. Effect of organic and inorganic sources of fertilizer on growth, yield and fruit quality of eggplant (*Solanum melongena* L.). Arch. Appl. Sci. Res., 2011;3(6):470-479.
- 16. Nakhro, N, Dkhar MS. Impact of organic and inorganic fertilizers on microbial populations and biomass carbon in paddy field soil. J. Agr., 2010;9(3):102-110.
- Ramamoorthy P, Elayaraja D, Dhanasekaran K. Effect of saline water irrigation and organic amendments on the growth, yield and nutrient uptake by brinjal in coastal sandy soil. J. Sci. Agric. Eng. 2018;8:37-42.
- Aminifard NMH, Aroiee,H, Fatemi,H, Ameri,A, Karimpour,S (2010). Responses of eggplant (*Solanummelongena* L.) to different rates of nitrogen under field conditions. J. Central Europ. Agric., 11(4),453-458.
- Kasi MU, Gola AQ, Bhat RA, Durrani SMAS, Mandokhail AU (2018). Response of various varieties rate of NPK fertilizer on brinjal (*Solanum melongena* L.). *J.*Ent. Zoo. Studies, 6(6), 684-688.
- Salwa AR, Hammad KA, Tantauy,F (2010). Studies on salinity tolerance of two peanut cultivars in relation to growth, leaf water content and yield. J. Appl. Sci., 16, 21-30
- 21. Grzebisz W, Lukowiak R, Biber,M, Przygocka-Cyna.K. Effect of multimicronutrient fertilizers applied to foliage on nutritional status of winter oilseed rape and development of yield forming

Elayaraja et al.; Int. J. Plant Soil Sci., vol. 35, no. 19, pp. 2027-2041, 2023; Article no.IJPSS.105846

elements. J. Elementol. 2010;15(3): 477-491

22. Chesti MH, Kohli A, Mujtaba A, Sofi JA, NzirQadri T, Peer RJA, Dar MA, Bisati IA. Effect of integrated application of inorganic and organic sources on soil properties, yield and nutrient uptake by crops in intermediate zone of Jammu and Kashmir. J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci., 2015; 63:88-92

© 2023 Elayaraja et al.; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history: The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here: https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/105846