



EFFECT OF VAM FUNGI AND APPLIED PHOSPHORUS THROUGH STCR PRECISION MODEL ON GROWTH, YIELD AND NUTRIENT DYNAMICS IN MAIZE IN ACID ALFISOL

V.K. Suri, Anil K. Choudhary¹ and Girish Chander²

Department of Soil Science, CSK Himachal Pradesh Krishi Vishvavidyalaya, Palampur (HP)-176062, INDIA.

¹CSK HPKV, Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Sundernagar (HP)

²International Centre for Research in Semi Arid Tropics (ICRISAT), Hyderabad (AP)

ABSTRACT

The inoculation of three VAM cultures viz. local culture (*Glomus mosseae*), VAM culture from IARI, New Delhi (*Glomus mosseae*) and a culture from The Energy Research Institute (TERI), New Delhi (*Glomus intraradices*) alone or with increasing applied phosphorus levels from 25 to 75% of recommended P₂O₅ based on soil test crop response (STCR) precision model improved the plant height, shoot and root dry matter accumulation, root length and root weight density as well as yield attributes of rainfed maize in an acid alfisol of NW Himalayas. It was revealed that sole application of any of 3 VAM fungi did not have pronounced effect on phenological stages though combined application of VAM cultures with increasing P levels from 25 to 75% of recommended P₂O₅ reduced the days to various phenological stages. It was reported that sole application of these 3 VAM cultures improved the maize grain yield by 17.10 to 25.36 % over control. Increase in P levels from 25 to 75% of recommended P₂O₅ besides VAM inoculation resulted in consistent and significant improvement in grain, stover and biological yield of maize. 75% of recommended P₂O₅ alongwith VAM cultures achieved the goal of targeted yield (40 q ha⁻¹) of maize, thus, saving the applied P to the tune of about 25% without impairing the soil fertility in the present study.

Key words: Vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizae, phosphorus, maize, growth, targeted yield, nutrient dynamics.

Maize is one of the major cereal crops in north-western Himalayas particularly wet temperate region of Himachal Pradesh having acidic alfisol (2, 15). The availability of phosphorus in these acidic soils is very less due to fixation of soluble P into insoluble soil phosphate complexes due to high fixation power of these soils as a result of excessive presence of Fe and Al ions (14). Under such conditions, vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizae (VAM) can play a key role in phosphorus mobilization and absorption (4). Most of the hill farmers of Himachal Pradesh are poor and can't afford the use of recommended doses of chemical fertilizers particularly expensive phosphatic fertilizers. The P deficient acidic soils of Himachal Pradesh are best suited to the use of VAM fungi (15). Thus, VAM fungi can play an important role in such low input intensive farming systems of hill farmers which rely less on chemical fertilizers than conventional farming. Maize is an important food crop of the region, thus, it is imperative to generate information on effect of VAM fungi and applied phosphorus on growth, development and productivity of rainfed maize besides nutrient dynamics in acid alfisol of wet temperate NW Himalayas.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field studies were conducted on rainfed maize during Kharif 2002 in a P deficient silty clay loam acid alfisol at Experimental Farm of CSK HPKV, Palampur (31°6' N 76°3' E, 1291 m above mean sea level) in a randomized block design (RBD) replicated thrice. Treatments were viz. absolute control, farmers' practice (N @ 30 kg ha⁻¹), and three VAM fungi cultures i.e., VAML (Local VAM culture - *Glomus mosseae*, developed by CSK HPKV, Palampur), VAMT (VAM culture-*Glomus intraradices*, developed by Centre for Mycorrhizal Research, The Energy Research Institute (TERI), New Delhi) and VAMI (VAM culture-*Glomus mosseae*, developed by Indian Agricultural Research Institute (IARI), New Delhi) alone or with 25, 50 and 75% of recommended P₂O₅ dose to rainfed maize based on targeted yield concept following soil test crop response (STCR) precision model (9) as well as one treatment with sole application of 100% of recommended P₂O₅ dose based on STCR precision model. 100% of recommended N and K fertilizers were added in 25, 50, 75 and 100% of recommended P₂O₅ supplied treatments based on STCR model.

N, P and K were supplied through Urea (46% N), Single Super Phosphate (16% P₂O₅) and Muriate of Potash (60% K₂O), respectively. Whole of the P and K were supplied basally at the time of sowing while N was supplied in 3 equal splits i.e. one part at the time of sowing, one part at the time of knee high stage and one part at the silking stage. In case of farmers practice, 30 kg N ha⁻¹ was supplied to the crop in 3 splits described above. The fertilizer N, P₂O₅ and K₂O were applied on the basis of STCR model (9) through following fertilizer adjustment equations:

$$FN = 5.67 T - 0.17 SN$$

$$FP_{2O_5} = 4.38 T - 5.26 SP$$

$$FK_{2O} = 2.29 T - 0.10 SK$$

Where, FN, FP₂O₅ and FK₂O are the fertilizer N, P₂O₅ and K₂O in kg ha⁻¹, respectively. T is the targeted yield of maize (40 q ha⁻¹). SN, SP and SK are the soil available N, P and K in kg ha⁻¹, respectively in their elemental form.

Maize crop was sown on June 21, 2002 and harvested on Oct. 14, 2002. The plot size was 9 m² and plant spacing was 60 × 20 cm. Maize cv. Early Composite was grown with recommended package of practices. Standard procedures were used for chemical analysis of soil and plant samples (5). Before sowing, the initial organic carbon content in the soil were 14 g per kg soil. The soil pH was 5.6 while available N, P and K were 251, 15 and 250 kg ha⁻¹, respectively. Rainfall received during the crop season was 898 mm.

Data on phenological stages was taken at 50% expression of each stage in the concerned treatments and the plant height was also taken at these stages on marked 10 plants in each net plot. Shoot, root and total dry matter production was also taken at flowering stage in maize besides root length and root weight density from the sampling row comprising of 2 sampled plants from each plot. Statistical analysis was done by the standard procedures (3).

VAM inoculation

Soil mixed VAM cultures having VAM spores and fungal hyphae were used in the study. In all the 3 VAM cultures viz. Local, TERI and IARI cultures, the spore count was 110, 500 and 400 per 250 g air dry soil, respectively. The VAM cultures were used @ 12 kg ha⁻¹. These VAM cultures were used on spore equivalent basis taking TERI VAM

culture into consideration while using the VAM cultures. Local VAM culture was prepared by the investigating scientists (authors) themselves by raising the target crop (maize) till maturity in pots containing 7 kg sterilized soil + 2 kg FYM and 1 kg mother culture. After harvest, rhizosphere soil of pot as well as root biomass constituted the local VAM culture. The actual inoculation of maize seeds with above cultures was performed by preparing soil slurry of cultures and dipping the seeds into it for half hour followed by shade drying for making seed pallets and then sowing in the field.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Growth and development

Data in Table 1 reveals that increase in phosphorus levels from 25 to 75% of recommended P₂O₅ dose based on STCR model alongwith either of the 3 VAM cultures resulted in reduction in days to knee high stage, tasseling, silking as well as physiological maturity though the results were not statistically so contracting. Similarly, all the 3 VAM cultures remained statistically at par in phenological stage expression without or with inorganic P fertilization. Plant height on the other hand was significantly improved with the application of either of the 3 VAM cultures over control and farmers' practice at all the phenological stages under study (Table 1), thereby, indicating the positive effect of VA-mycorrhizae on growth and development of rainfed maize (1, 6). Similarly, increase in P levels from 25 to 75 % alongwith either of 3 VAM cultures resulted in consistent and significant improvement in maize plant height. It was also observed that plant height of maize with the application of 50 to 75% of recommended P₂O₅ dose alongwith either of 3 VAM cultures remained statistically at par with sole application of 100% of recommended P₂O₅ dose in maize which again indicate that VAM fungi has positive bearing on plant growth beside inorganic P fertilizer economization. Similar results have also been reported by (6, 16).

Data presented in Table 2 on dry matter production and root studies at silking stage reveal that shoot, root and total dry matter, root length and root weight density of rainfed maize was significantly higher with the use of either of the 3 VAM cultures (12) without NPK fertilization over control and quite comparable with farmers' practice, thus, indicating positive effect of mycorrhizal biofertilizer on root and shoot growth parameters (1, 7). Increase in phosphorus levels from 25 to 75% of recommended

P_2O_5 does with either of the 3 VAM cultures were almost comparable to sole use of 100% of recommended P_2O_5 dose particularly with use of TERI VAM culture which was proved to be superiormost than other 2 VAM cultures with or without P application; though the differences among the 3 VAM cultures were non-significant at each level of P fertilization in the present study. These results reveal that VAM fungi improved the plant growth in terms of biomass production as well as root length and root weight density (7, 12).

Yield Attributes and Yield

Yield attributes in table 3 reveals that cob length, number of grain rows per cob, grains per cob row, grains per cob as well as 1000-grain weight in maize with either of the 3 VAM cultures alone were higher over control and farmers/Æ practice (N_{30}). Either of the 3 VAM cultures with increase in P levels from 25 to 75% of recommended P_2O_5 dose resulted in consistent improvement in these yield attributing characters (16), though the differences were not statistically contrasting with each incremental increase in P levels alongwith mycorrhizal biofertilizers. The application of 75% of recommended P_2O_5 in combination with either of the 3 VAM cultures exhibited statistically similar magnitude of yield attributes compared to sole application of 100% of recommended P_2O_5 dose. The TERI VAM culture remained superior in yield attributes over other 2 cultures though the differences were non-significant among themselves alone or with each P level (15, 16).

Grain, stover and biological yields of maize (Table 3) followed the similar trend as that of yield attributing characters. It was observed that the grain and stover yield as well as biological yield of maize (Table 3) with the application of either of the 3 VAM cultures was higher over control and farmers' practice. Data also revealed that sole use of either of these 3 VAM cultures resulted in 17.10 to 25.36% increase in grain yield of maize over control thereby suggesting its positive bearing on yield expression (4, 12). These 3 VAM cultures alongwith 25 to 75% of recommended P_2O_5 dose resulted in consistent and significant improvement in maize grain, stover and biological yields of maize. These VAM cultures alongwith 75% P_2O_5 level produced statistically equal yields as produced by sole use of 100% P_2O_5 dose and TERI culture alongwith 75% P_2O_5 dose even outyielded the sole use of 100% P_2O_5 dose in terms

of stover and biological yields. It is also reported that either of these 3 VAM cultures alongwith 75% of recommended P_2O_5 on targeted yield concept basis achieved the goal of target yield of 40 q ha^{-1} thereby saving 25% phosphatic fertilizers. Thus, it can be inferred that we can economize the use of inorganic P fertilizers by 25% with application of mycorrhizal biofertilizers without affecting our yield targets (4, 15). The treatment effects on harvest index in the present study were non-significant. Overall, it was observed that use of mycorrhizal cultures resulted in significant improvement in the yield attributes and yield of maize crop (4, 12). These results are also supported by the findings of (6 and 13).

Nutrient Dynamics

Data presented on soil available NPK after harvest of maize (Table 4) reveals that either of the 3 VAM cultures *i.e.*, VAML, VAMT and VAM₁ alone or in combination with 25 to 75% of recommended P_2O_5 dose based on targeted yield concept (STCR) resulted in consistent and significant improvement in soil available P and K. There was slight increase in soil available N with the application of 25% P_2O_5 dose with VAM cultures over VAM cultures alone but further increase in P fertilization resulted in decrease in soil available N upto 75% P_2O_5 dose though the differences were non-significant. Similarly, P and K content in soil were lower with either of the 3 VAM cultures alone over control except soil N. On the other hand, available N content in soil at 50 and 75% P_2O_5 dose, and available K content at 75% P_2O_5 dose were at par with sole application of 100% of recommended P_2O_5 dose. These results show that VA-mycorrhization resulted in increased uptake of P and K from the soil at lower soil P levels while at high P fertilization rates N and K content were improved in the soil (4), thereby, suggesting that VAM might have mobilized the non-available complex native N and K pool thus improving the soil available N and K pool which indicates that VAM have some role in nutrient dynamics in soil plant system (8). These observations are also supported by (10, 11). Results of the above experiment, overall, suggest that VA-mycorrhizal fungi has positive effect on growth, development, yield attributes and yield of maize as well as soil fertility status. Besides, it is possible to economize chemical fertilizer use to the tune of at least by 25 % by resorting to VAM inoculation in rainfed maize *vis-vis* yield target of 40 q ha^{-1} . It is notable that above technology leads to improvement in the soil fertility.

Table 1 : Effect of VAM cultures and applied P on phenological stages and plant height at various phenological stages of maize.

| Treatments | Days taken to various phenological stages | | | | Plant height (cm) at various phenological stages | | | |
|--|---|-----------------|--------------|------------------------|--|-----------------|--------------|------------------------|
| | knee high stage | tasseling stage | siking stage | physiological maturity | knee high stage | tasseling stage | siking stage | physiological maturity |
| | | | | | | | | |
| Control | 38 | 64 | 74 | 111 | 47.4 | 231.5 | 240.6 | 240.7 |
| Farmers' practice | 38 | 53 | 74 | 111 | 47.5 | 232.2 | 241.2 | 241.4 |
| VAM _L alone | 38 | 63 | 73 | 111 | 48.0 | 236.4 | 243.7 | 244.0 |
| VAM _T alone | 38 | 63 | 73 | 111 | 50.1 | 235.4 | 243.8 | 244.2 |
| VAM _I alone | 38 | 62 | 72 | 111 | 50.3 | 235.2 | 244.0 | 244.4 |
| VAM _L + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 36 | 61 | 72 | 110 | 51.8 | 236.4 | 246.7 | 247.0 |
| VAM _T + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 36 | 61 | 72 | 111 | 51.9 | 236.7 | 246.4 | 246.6 |
| VAM _I + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 36 | 61 | 71 | 111 | 51.9 | 236.4 | 246.3 | 246.6 |
| VAM _L + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 34 | 59 | 70 | 110 | 56.5 | 238.1 | 249.3 | 249.8 |
| VAM _T + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 34 | 59 | 71 | 110 | 56.5 | 238.1 | 250.9 | 251.4 |
| VAM _I + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 33 | 59 | 68 | 110 | 56.4 | 238.1 | 249.3 | 249.7 |
| VAM _L + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 34 | 57 | 71 | 109 | 58.6 | 240.1 | 250.4 | 251.0 |
| VAM _T + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 34 | 58 | 69 | 109 | 58.6 | 239.7 | 251.1 | 251.7 |
| VAM _I + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 34 | 58 | 70 | 109 | 58.7 | 239.7 | 250.7 | 251.3 |
| 100% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 34 | 59 | 70 | 109 | 58.4 | 241.3 | 250.6 | 251.2 |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 2.0 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 1.3 | 2.5 | 4.7 | 4.1 | 4.1 |

Table 2 : Effect of VAM cultures and applied P on dry matter accumulation and root parameters of maize at silking stage.

| Treatments | Root dry matter accumulation (g/plant) | | | Total dry matter accumulation (g/plant) | | | Root length (cm) | | Root weight density (g/cm ³) | |
|--|--|-------------|-------------|---|---------------|--|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control | 98.4 | 10.7 | 109.8 | 64.3 | 0.0081 | | | | | |
| Farmers' practice | 107.7 | 11.4 | 119.1 | 69.8 | 0.0086 | | | | | |
| VAM _L alone | 103.2 | 11.1 | 116.9 | 69 | 0.0084 | | | | | |
| VAM _T alone | 104.9 | 11.0 | 115.9 | 70.7 | 0.0083 | | | | | |
| VAM _I alone | 103.3 | 11.0 | 114.3 | 69.0 | 0.0083 | | | | | |
| VAM _L + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 122.8 | 14.5 | 137.3 | 78.9 | 0.0110 | | | | | |
| VAM _T + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 129.6 | 15.3 | 144.9 | 78.4 | 0.0116 | | | | | |
| VAM _I + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 127.7 | 14.9 | 142.6 | 79.1 | 0.0113 | | | | | |
| VAM _L + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 135.6 | 17.4 | 153.0 | 92.2 | 0.0132 | | | | | |
| VAM _T + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 140.7 | 18.0 | 158.7 | 95.0 | 0.0137 | | | | | |
| VAM _I + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 137.5 | 17.8 | 155.3 | 93.0 | 0.0135 | | | | | |
| VAM _L + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 148.9 | 19.1 | 168.1 | 95.0 | 0.0145 | | | | | |
| VAM _T + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 152.8 | 19.8 | 172.6 | 96.7 | 0.0149 | | | | | |
| VAM _I + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 150.9 | 18.7 | 169.6 | 97.0 | 0.0141 | | | | | |
| 100% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 157.3 | 20.7 | 181.3 | 101.3 | 0.0156 | | | | | |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 3.43 | 1.66 | 4.31 | 4.50 | 0.0013 | | | | | |

Table 3 : Effect of VAM cultures and applied P on yield attributes, yield and harvest index of maize.

| Treatments | Cob length (cm) | Cobs/plant | Number of grain rows/cob | Number of grains/row | Number of grains/cob | 1000-grain weight (g) | Grain yield (q ha ⁻¹) | Stover yield (q ha ⁻¹) | Biological yield (q ha ⁻¹) | Harvest index (%) |
|--|-----------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|-------------------|
| Control | 10.2 | 1.0 | 10.0 | 18.3 | 185.0 | 190.44 | 18.65 | 40.10 | 58.75 | 0.32 |
| Farmers' practice | 10.5 | 1.0 | 11.3 | 26.3 | 303.3 | 191.06 | 23.48 | 49.94 | 73.42 | 0.32 |
| VAM _L alone | 11.0 | 1.0 | 12.7 | 25.3 | 320.0 | 188.40 | 21.84 | 44.58 | 66.42 | 0.33 |
| VAM _T alone | 12.2 | 1.0 | 12.7 | 31.7 | 393.3 | 190.10 | 23.38 | 45.96 | 69.32 | 0.34 |
| VAM _I alone | 12.3 | 1.0 | 12.7 | 32.3 | 401.7 | 190.72 | 21.97 | 43.82 | 65.78 | 0.33 |
| VAM _L + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 13.0 | 1.0 | 12.7 | 31.0 | 396.7 | 195.50 | 30.80 | 59.33 | 90.13 | 0.34 |
| VAM _T + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 15.7 | 1.0 | 14.0 | 34.3 | 467.3 | 195.51 | 34.82 | 67.10 | 101.92 | 0.34 |
| VAM _I + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 14.0 | 1.0 | 14.0 | 32.0 | 438.3 | 191.52 | 35.72 | 71.76 | 107.47 | 0.33 |
| VAM _L + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 14.7 | 1.0 | 14.0 | 31.0 | 426.7 | 192.98 | 44.42 | 87.51 | 131.92 | 0.34 |
| VAM _T + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 15.2 | 1.0 | 14.0 | 35.3 | 483.7 | 196.02 | 44.13 | 76.23 | 120.36 | 0.37 |
| VAM _I + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 14.0 | 1.0 | 13.3 | 34.0 | 456.7 | 194.86 | 43.09 | 73.48 | 116.59 | 0.37 |
| VAM _L + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 16.0 | 1.0 | 13.3 | 37.0 | 485.0 | 194.46 | 49.66 | 89.73 | 139.38 | 0.36 |
| VAM _T + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 16.3 | 1.3 | 14.0 | 39.0 | 531.7 | 199.46 | 53.75 | 99.91 | 153.66 | 0.37 |
| VAM _I + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 16.3 | 1.0 | 14.0 | 37.7 | 525.0 | 196.9 | 49.84 | 86.05 | 135.89 | 0.38 |
| 100% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 17.8 | 1.3 | 14.7 | 40.0 | 570.0 | 199.50 | 58.51 | 93.05 | 151.56 | 0.9 |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 4.2 | NS | 2.3 | 5.4 | 84.8 | 6.4 | 6.54 | 16.02 | 20.69 | NS |

Table 4 : Effect of VAM cultures and applied P on plant nutrient content and nutrient uptake after harvest of maize.

| Treatments | N content (%) | | N uptake (kg ha ⁻¹) | | P content (%) | | N uptake (kg ha ⁻¹) | | K content (%) | | K uptake (kg ha ⁻¹) |
|--|---------------|-------------|---------------------------------|--------------|---------------|--------------|---------------------------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|---------------------------------|
| | Grain | Straw | Grain | Straw | Grain | Straw | Grain | Straw | Grain | Straw | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Control | 1.45 | 0.47 | 46.1 | 0.67 | 0.22 | 0.067 | 6.8 | 0.55 | 0.29 | 0.55 | 27.3 |
| Farmers' practice | 1.48 | 0.47 | 57.5 | 0.068 | 0.22 | 0.068 | 8.5 | 0.55 | 0.30 | 0.55 | 34.5 |
| VAM _L alone | 1.49 | 0.48 | 53.9 | 0.070 | 0.22 | 0.070 | 7.9 | 0.56 | 0.31 | 0.56 | 31.5 |
| VAM _T alone | 1.48 | 0.49 | 57.1 | 0.071 | 0.22 | 0.071 | 8.5 | 0.56 | 0.31 | 0.56 | 33.2 |
| VAM _I alone | 1.47 | 0.49 | 53.8 | 0.070 | 0.22 | 0.070 | 8.0 | 0.56 | 0.31 | 0.56 | 31.4 |
| VAM _L + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.49 | 0.49 | 76.2 | 0.074 | 0.23 | 0.074 | 11.4 | 0.61 | 0.34 | 0.61 | 46.8 |
| VAM _T + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.51 | 0.51 | 86.4 | 0.073 | 0.23 | 0.073 | 12.9 | 0.64 | 0.35 | 0.64 | 55.3 |
| VAM _I + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.48 | 0.51 | 88.7 | 0.074 | 0.23 | 0.074 | 13.4 | 0.64 | 0.34 | 0.64 | 58.4 |
| VAM _L + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.50 | 0.50 | 111.5 | 0.077 | 0.23 | 0.077 | 17.0 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 0.63 | 71.6 |
| VAM _T + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.50 | 0.51 | 105.9 | 0.078 | 0.23 | 0.078 | 16.2 | 0.65 | 0.37 | 0.65 | 65.7 |
| VAM _I + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.50 | 0.52 | 102.6 | 0.077 | 0.23 | 0.077 | 15.6 | 0.63 | 0.37 | 0.63 | 62.0 |
| VAM _L + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.51 | 0.51 | 121.0 | 0.084 | 0.24 | 0.084 | 19.3 | 0.64 | 0.37 | 0.64 | 75.7 |
| VAM _T + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.52 | 0.53 | 134.1 | 0.086 | 0.24 | 0.086 | 21.3 | 0.66 | 0.39 | 0.66 | 86.3 |
| VAM _I + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.51 | 0.53 | 121.0 | 0.085 | 0.24 | 0.085 | 19.2 | 0.65 | 0.38 | 0.65 | 74.6 |
| 100% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 1.53 | 0.55 | 140.3 | 0.089 | 0.24 | 0.089 | 22.6 | 0.66 | 0.39 | 0.66 | 84.5 |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 0.04 | 0.03 | 16.43 | 0.006 | 0.01 | 0.006 | 2.42 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 12.24 |

Table 5 : Effect of VAM cultures and applied P on available nutrient status (kg ha^{-1}) after harvest of maize.

| Treatments | Available N | Available P | Available K |
|--|--------------|-------------|--------------|
| Control | 226.7 | 12.7 | 240.4 |
| Farmers' practice | 234.7 | 13.0 | 243.1 |
| VAM _L alone | 261.8 | 12.6 | 238.3 |
| VAM _T alone | 227.9 | 12.5 | 236.7 |
| VAM _I alone | 229.4 | 12.6 | 237.0 |
| VAM _L + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 262.3 | 16.3 | 246.3 |
| VAM _T + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 262.2 | 16.2 | 245.8 |
| VAM _I + 25% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 259.9 | 16.2 | 246.2 |
| VAM _L + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 258.9 | 22.1 | 250.4 |
| VAM _T + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 260.5 | 21.7 | 247.8 |
| VAM _I + 50% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 259.3 | 21.9 | 249.5 |
| VAM _L + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 256.5 | 25.5 | 253.5 |
| VAM _T + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 252.5 | 25.4 | 253.2 |
| VAM _I + 75% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 254.4 | 25.7 | 253.4 |
| 100% P ₂ O ₅ based on STCR Model | 253.3 | 32.0 | 253.6 |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 25.93 | 0.97 | 3.45 |
| Initial status | 251.4 | 14.6 | 250.9 |

REFERENCES

1. Aguilera, G.L., Davies, F.T., Olalde, V. and Duray, S.A. 1999. Influence of phosphorus and endomycorrhiza on gas exchange and plant growth of Chile ancho pepper. *Photosynthetica*, **36**:441-449.
2. Anonymous 1997. Soils of Himachal Pradesh for optimizing land use. National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning (ICAR), Nagpur and Department of Agriculture, Govt. of H.P., Shimla.
3. Gomez, K.A. and Gomez, A.A. 1984. *Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research*. A Wiley-Interscience Publication, John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, USA.
4. Harrier, L.A. and Watson, C.A. 2003. The role of arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi in sustainable cropping systems. *Advances in Agronomy*, **79**:185-225.
5. Jackson, M.L. 1967. *Soil Chemical Analysis*. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, pp. 331-334.
6. Mukherjee, P.K. and Rai, R.K. 2000. Effect of VAM and PSB on growth, yield and phosphorus uptake by wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) and chickpea (*Cicer arietinum*). *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, **45**:602-607.
7. Nadian, H., Hashemi, M. and Herbert, S.J. 2009. Soil aggregate size and mycorrhizal colonization effect on root growth and phosphorus accumulation by berseem clover. *Communications in soil Science and Plant Analysis*, **40**:2413-2425.
8. Narsian, V.T. and Patel, H.H. 2009. Relationship of physicochemical properties of rhizosphere soils with native population of mineral phosphate solubilizing fungi. *Indian Journal of Microbiology*, **49**:60-67.
9. Ramamoorthy, B., Narasimham, R.L. and Dinesh, R.S. 1967. Fertilizer recommendations based on fertilizer application for specific yield target of Sonora-64. *Indian Farming*, **17**:443-451.
10. Shirani Rad, A.H. and Alizadeh, A. 2000. Study on the effects of VAM-fungi, *Bradyrhizobium japonicum* and phosphorus on nutrient uptake efficiency in soybean. *Seed and Plant*, **16**(2):172-191.
11. Shirani Rad, A.H., Alizadeh, A. and Hashemi, D.A. 2000. The study of VAM fungi, phosphorus and drought stress effect on nutrient uptake efficiency in wheat. *Seed and Plant*, **16**(3):327-349.
12. Singh, S.K. and Srivastava, J.S. 2007. Response of pea cultivars to rhizobia and mycorrhizal fungi. *Journal of Food Legumes*, **20**(1):87-89.
13. Singh, S. and Kapoor, K.K. 1999. Inoculation with phosphate solubilizing microorganisms and a VAM fungus improves dry matter yield and nutrient uptake by wheat grown in a sandy soil. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*, **28**:139-144.
14. Sharma, P.K., Verma, S.P. and Bhumbra, D.R. 1980. Transformation of added phosphorus into inorganic phosphorus fractions in some acid soils of Himachal Pradesh. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*, **28**:450.
15. Suri, V.K., Choudhary, A.K., Chander, G. and Verma, T.S. 2006. Studies on VAM fungi as a potential biofertilizer in an acid alfisol of NW Himalayas. In: 18th World Congress of Soil Science, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, USA. 18th WCSS Congress Abstracts p 515.
16. Suri, V.K., Chander, G., Choudhary, A.K. and Verma T.S. 2006. Co-inoculation of VAM and phosphate solubilizing bacteria in enhancing phosphorus supply to wheat in Typic Hapludalf. *Crop Research* **31**(3):357-361.