

Effect of Soil Amendments and Bio-Inoculants on Growth Performance of *Flemingia semialata* under Field Conditions

R. K. Kar, K. Upadhyaya, P. C. Panda

Received 25 November 2017; Accepted 27 December 2017; Published on 16 January 2018

Abstract A field experiment was laid with *Flemingia semialata* Roxb. Consisting of 14 treatments namely, T₁=Control, T₂=FYM, T₃=FYM + *Rhizobium*, T₄=FYM + N₁P₁K₁ + *Rhizobium*, T₅=FYM + N₂P₂K₂ + *Rhizobium*, T₆=FYM + N₃P₃K₃ + *Rhizobium*, T₇=FYM + Mycorrhizae, T₈=FYM + N₁P₁K₁ + Mycorrhizae, T₉=FYM + N₂P₂K₂ + Mycorrhizae, T₁₀=FYM + N₃P₃K₃ + Mycorrhizae, T₁₁=FYM + Mycorrhizae + *Rhizobium*, T₁₂=FYM + N₁P₁K₁ + *Rhizobium* + Mycorrhizae, T₁₃=FYM + N₂P₂K₂ + *Rhizobium* + Mycorrhizae and

T₁₄= FYM + N₃P₃K₃ + *Rhizobium* + Mycorrhizae in RBD having 3 replications to study their effect on plant growth performance under field conditions. T₁₄ recorded maximum number of branches (31), petiole length (9.1 cm), branch diameter (2.36 cm) and leaf width (5.3 cm), T₁₃ recorded maximum plant height (2.38 m), shoot spread (2.21 m), T₁₂ recorded highest branch length (85.3 m), number of leaves (158), collar diameter (3.68 cm) and T₃ maximum angle of branch emergence (82°). It infers that both bioinoculants and NPK application on *Flemingia* affects more the vertical growth than the horizontal growth.

Keywords *Rhizobium*, Mycorrhizae, Amendments, Lac, *Flemingia semialata*.

Introduction

Lac is the protective covering and resin secreted by lac insects namely *Kerria lacca* and has possessed commercial value providing the subsidiary source of income mainly for tribals over a large of India. The conventional hosts followed are kusum (*Schleichera oleosa*), palas (*Butea monosperma*), ber (*Zizyphus mauritiana*), *Flemingia semialata* Roxb. called winged-stalk *Flemingia* belongs to family fabaceae, available in North Eastern part, Uttaranchal and Andaman in India and in Pakistan, Myanmar and China [1]. It has been potentially exploited due to nutritive fodder, deep rooting, nitrogen fixing and drought with standing ability. This species of late became exploited by farm-

R. K. Kar*, K. Upadhyaya
 Department of Forestry,
 School of Earth Science and Natural
 Resources Management,
 Mizoram University, Tanhril 796004,
 Aizawl, Mizoram, India

P. C. Panda
 Regional Plant Resources Center,
 Bhubaneswar 751003, Odisha, India
 e-mail : ranjankumarouat@gmail.com
 *Correspondence

ers as best lac insect shrub host, due to its insect compatibility, short gestation, strong coppicing ability and acclimatization in wastelands to farmlands which could safe guard big trees in natural forests [2]. Apart from lac production, it has gained popularity in view of its medicinal, nutritive, good calorific value, brows ability, deep rooting, soil binding, nitrogen fixing, drought bearing, fertilizer and bio-inoculations responding tendencies. For which it has been grown in block plantations or introduced in crop lands to design various agroforestry models. Besides, *Flemingia semialata* has been used in soil and water conservation works. For both the purposes application of less expensive bio-inoculants is very much vital to increase productivity without affecting system sustainability.

Flemingia being a nitrogen fixing one, artificial inoculation of Rhizobia can boost nodulation potential under nursery and plantations. Mycorrhizae is an integral part of both forest and agro-ecosystems as it absorbs minerals N, P, K, Ca, S, Zn, Cu, Sr from soil and simultaneously produce enzymes, hormones, vitamins apart from translocation of water during scarcity in plants. Endomycorrhizae or Vesicular Arbuscular Mycorrhizae (VAM) through astro-metrical mycelium infect root system of hosts [3]. Thus, there is urgent need to integrate chemical, organic and biofertilizers in order to enhance productivity and safeguard environment which can provide balanced nutrient management for growth of *Flemingia semialata*.

Since, research in this direction of *Flemingia semialata* is meager, thus present investigations have been designed to study effect of bionoculants (Mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium*) with soil amendments (nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium based fertilizers) on plant growth characters of *Flemingia semialata* under plantation in Mizoram University campus, Aizawl.

Materials and Methods

The study has been carried out in a 1.5 year old established plantation in the instructional farm of Department of Forestry, School Earth Sciences and Natu-

ral Resources Management, Mizoram University, Tanhril, Aizawl, Mizoram during year 2014 to 2016. The experimental site has latitude 23°43'37" N and longitude 92°40'23" E and altitude 780 m above mean sea level, temperature range 13° C to 30°C, rainfall 1820 mm and soil clay loam. The plantation was established in August, 2014 using 4 months old seedlings which had been raised using seeds brought from Indian Institute of Natural Resin and Gum (IINRG), Namkum, Ranchi, Jharkhand.

The inoculums (broth) of *Rhizobium* were prepared using pink and healthy root nodules after separating these from the root systems of seedlings of same species in nursery which passed through standard inoculum procedures. Inoculation made through dipping root systems of seedlings in broth prior bare root planting. Endomycorrhizae (*Glomus fasciculatum*) were brought from Division of Microbiology, Indian Agricultural Research Institute, New Delhi of spore form which had been developed using activated charcoal. VAM inoculums of 10 g per pit were applied after mixing these thoroughly with soil at the time of planting. The spacing maintained for plantation was 1 m × 2 m and pit size was 1 ft × 1 ft × 1 ft. Design followed was RBD with 3 replications. Besides normal fertilizer doses, fertilizer applied at the age of 1 year of planting as per treatment schedule. Treatment details were T₁=Control virgin soil, T₂=FYM, T₃=FYM + *Rhizobium*, T₄=FYM + N₁P₁K₁ + *Rhizobium*, T₅=FYM + N₂P₂K₂ + *Rhizobium*, T₆=FYM + N₃P₃K₃ + *Rhizobium*, T₇=FYM + Mycorrhizae, T₈=FYM + N₁P₁K₁ + Mycorrhizae, T₉=FYM + N₂P₂K₂ + Mycorrhizae, T₁₀=FYM + N₃P₃K₃ + Mycorrhizae, T₁₁=FYM + Mycorrhizae + *Rhizobium*, T₁₂=FYM + N₁P₁K₁ + Mycorrhizae + *Rhizobium*, T₁₃=FYM + N₂P₂K₂ + Mycorrhizae + *Rhizobium* and T₁₄=FYM + N₃P₃K₃ + Mycorrhizae + *Rhizobium* where N₁P₁K₁ means 10 g N₂, 10 g P₂O₅ and 25 g K₂O, N₂P₂K₂ means 20 g N₂, 20 g P₂O₅ and 50 g K₂O and N₃P₃K₃ means 30 g N₂, 30 g P₂O₅ and 75 g K₂O. Various parameters namely plant height, shot spread number of branches, branch angle, number of leaves, petiole length, leaf width, leaf area, collar diameter and average branch diameter were recorded and compared. For variance ratio comparison in ANOVA *F* test and treatment means comparison *t* rest and Duncan's Multiple Range Test (*p* < 0.05) were followed.

Table 1. Development of aerial parts of *Flemingia semialata* after 1.5 years of plantation. The figures in the parentheses are standard deviation from mean. Means with the same letter are not significantly different of Duncan test ($p \leq 0.05$).

Treatments	Angle of emergence (deg)	Average branch diameter (cm)	Branch length (cm)	Collar diameter (cm)	Leaf width (cm)
T ₁	81 (±4.68) ^{ab}	1.12 (±0.07) ^c	61.4 (±1.33a) ⁱ	2.72 (±0.17) ^d	3.0 (±0.18) ^e
T ₂	74 (±3.22) ^d	1.18 (±0.04) ^c	63.8 (±1.12) ^h	2.84 (±0.11) ^{cd}	3.42 (±0.09) ^d
T ₃	82 (±4.79) ^a	1.21 (±0.12) ^e	66.8 (±0.99) ^g	3.29 (±0.10) ^{abcd}	3.52 (±0.14) ^d
T ₄	78 (±2.46) ^{bc}	1.25 (±0.02) ^{de}	67.9 (±1.15) ^g	3.53 (±0.14) ^{ab}	3.45 (±0.12) ^d
T ₅	78 (±2.10) ^{bc}	1.4 (±0.10) ^{cde}	72.5 (±1.33) ^f	3.04 (±0.11) ^{bcd}	3.31 (±0.10) ^d
T ₆	71 (±1.86) ^{ef}	1.24 (±0.04) ^{de}	73.6 (±1.11) ^f	2.93 (±0.13) ^{bcd}	3.41 (±0.15) ^d
T ₇	75 (±2.35) ^{cd}	1.26 (±0.05) ^{de}	78.2 (±1.44) ^d	2.84 (±0.85) ^{cd}	3.75 (±0.07) ^{cd}
T ₈	81 (±2.48) ^{ab}	1.52 (±0.10) ^{bcd}	75.9 (±1.14) ^e	3.01 (±0.08) ^{bcd}	4.01 (±0.16) ^{bc}
T ₉	68 (±3.19) ^g	1.61 (±0.10) ^{bc}	80.6 (±1.48) ^c	3.08 (±0.09) ^{abcd}	4.23 (±0.14) ^{ab}
T ₁₀	73 (±2.01) ^{de}	1.31 (±0.10) ^{de}	81.6 (±1.26) ^{abc}	3.26 (±0.08) ^{abcd}	4.35 (±0.13) ^{ab}
T ₁₁	69 (±3.05) ^{fg}	1.18 (±0.04) ^e	83.2 (±1.31) ^a	3.41 (±0.10) ^{abc}	4.41 (±0.11) ^{ab}
T ₁₂	75 (±3.35) ^{cd}	1.26 (±0.05) ^{de}	85.3 (±1.31)	3.68 (±0.07) ^a	4.53 (±0.08) ^a
T ₁₃	81 (±2.91) ^{ab}	1.76 (±0.08) ^b	82.6 (±1.40) ^{ab}	3.32 (±0.13) ^{abcd}	4.62 (±0.11) ^a
T ₁₄	68 (±3.10) ^g	2.36 (±0.10) ^a	81.2 (±1.26) ^{bc}	3.12 (±0.36) ^{abcd}	5.3 (±0.31)
SEm	1.28	0.12	1.28	0.25	1.28
CD 0.05	2.63	0.24	2.63	0.52	0.38
CD 0.01	3.56	0.33	3.56	0.71	0.51

Results and Discussion

Angle of branch emergence

Maximum angle of branch spread was observed in T₃ (82°) followed by T₁ (81°) and T₈ (81°), T₄ (78°) and T₅ (78°), T₇ (75°) and T₁₂ (75°), T₂ (74°), T₁₀ (73°), T₆ (71°), T₁₁ (69°) and least with T₉ (68°) and T₁₄ (68°) (Table 1). There was significant difference among the treatments observed except at par relations among few treatments. Relation was at par among the treatment combinations namely, T₃ and T₁₃, among T₁, T₈, T₁₃, T₄ and T₅, among T₄, T₅, T₇ and T₁₂, among T₇, T₁₂, T₂ and T₁₀ and between T₁₀ and T₆, between T₆ and T₁₁ and among T₁₁, T₉ and T₁₄.

Average branch diameter

Average branch diameter was observed to be significant among the treatments with maximum value T₁₄ (2.36 cm) followed by T₁₃ (1.76 cm) then T₉ (1.61 cm), T₈ (1.52 cm), T₅ (1.40 cm), T₁₀ (1.31 cm), T₇ (1.26 cm) and T₁₂ (1.26 cm), T₄ (1.25 cm), T₆ (1.24 cm), T₃ (1.21 cm), T₂ (1.18 cm) and T₁₁ (1.18 cm) and least with T₁ (1.12 cm) (Table 2). Among few treatment combina-

tions at par relations were observed namely, T₁₃, T₉ and T₈, among T₉, T₈ and T₅, among T₈, T₅, T₁₀, T₇, T₁₂, T₄ and T₆ and among T₅, T₁₀, T₇, T₁₂, T₄, T₆, T₃, T₂, T₁₁ and T₁.

Branch length

Maximum branch length was observed with T₁₂ (85.3 cm) followed by T₁₁ (83.2 cm), then T₁₃ (82.6 cm), T₁₀ (81.6 cm), T₁₄ (81.2 cm), T₉ (80.6 cm), T₇ (78.2 cm), T₈ (75.9 cm), T₆ (73.6 cm), T₅ (72.5 cm), T₄ (67.9 cm), T₃ (66.8 cm), T₂ (63.8 cm), T₁ (61.4 cm). However, the at par relations were observed among the treatments as T₁₁, T₁₃ and T₁₀; among T₁₃, T₁₀ and T₁₄; among T₁₀, T₁₄ and T₉, between T₆ and T₅ and between T₄ and T₈.

Collar diameter

Among the treatments significant difference was observed with maximum collar diameter in treatment T₁₂ (3.68 cm) followed by T₄ (3.53 cm), then T₁₁ (3.41 cm), T₁₃ (3.32 cm), T₃ (3.29 cm), T₁₀ (3.26 cm), T₁₄ (3.12 cm), T₉ (3.08 cm), T₅ (3.08 cm), T₈ (3.01 cm), T₆ (2.93 cm), T₂ (2.84 cm) and T₇ (2.84 cm) and the least collar diameter with T₁ (2.72 cm). At par relation was observed

Table 2. Height, spread, branches and leaves of *Flemingia semialata* of 1.5 years planting. The figures in the parentheses are standard deviation from mean. Means with the same letter are not significantly different of Duncan test ($p \leq 0.05$).

Treatments	Number of branches	Number of leaves	Petiole length (cm)	Plant height (m)	Shoot spread (m)
T ₁	20 (± 0.89)	94 (± 1.49)	7.2 (± 0.46) ^f	1.54 (± 0.07) ^g	1.31 (± 0.51) ^d
T ₂	21 (± 0.79) ^h	97 (± 1.89) ⁱ	7.6 (± 0.40) ^{def}	1.78 (± 0.03) ^f	1.4 (± 0.44) ^d
T ₃	22 (± 0.79) ^{gh}	112 (± 1.76) ⁱ	7.4 (± 0.27) ^{ef}	1.81 (± 0.25) ^f	1.42 (± 0.32) ^d
T ₄	23 (± 1.00) ^{gh}	119 (± 2.30) ^h	7.4 (± 0.32) ^{ef}	1.89 (± 0.07) ^f	1.36 (± 0.35) ^d
T ₅	24 (± 1.97) ^{fg}	125 (± 2.36) ^g	8.1 (± 0.28) ^{cde}	2.18 (± 0.08) ^{de}	1.52 (± 0.34) ^{cd}
T ₆	24 (± 0.85) ^{fg}	117 (± 2.00) ^h	8.8 (± 0.25) ^{abc}	2.11 (± 0.06) ^e	1.38 (± 0.32) ^d
T ₇	26 (± 2.91) ^{def}	132 (± 2.29) ^f	7.6 (± 0.18) ^{def}	2.14 (± 0.06) ^e	1.78 (± 0.25) ^b
T ₈	26 (± 0.85) ^{def}	117 (± 1.89) ^h	7.3 (± 0.40) ^f	2.31 (± 0.08) ^{bcd}	2.15 (± 0.45) ^a
T ₉	27 (± 0.86) ^{cde}	138 (± 2.32) ^e	7.5 (± 0.25) ^{ef}	2.36 (± 0.08) ^{ab}	1.67 (± 0.30) ^{bc}
T ₁₀	27 (± 1.03) ^{cde}	141 (± 2.18) ^{cd}	8.3 (± 0.28) ^{bcd}	2.22 (± 0.10) ^{cde}	1.68 (± 0.34) ^{bc}
T ₁₁	28 (± 1.08) ^{bcd}	149 (± 2.45) ^{ab}	8.9 (± 0.26) ^{ab}	2.24 (± 0.08) ^{cde}	1.38 (± 0.34) ^d
T ₁₂	29 (± 1.53) ^{abc}	158 (± 2.62)	8.3 (± 0.33) ^{bcd}	2.35 (± 0.08) ^{abc}	1.78 (± 0.38) ^b
T ₁₃	30 (± 0.85) ^{ab}	151 (± 2.55) ^a	8.4 (± 0.39) ^{abc}	2.38 (± 0.10) ^a	2.21 (± 0.44) ^a
T ₁₄	31 (± 0.86) ^a	143 (± 2.34) ^c	9.1 (± 0.39) ^a	2.31 (± 0.05) ^{bcd}	2.1 (± 0.44) ^a
SEm	1.12	1.24	0.30	0.06	0.10
CD 0.05	2.31	2.55	0.62	0.12	0.20
CD 0.01	3.12	3.44	0.84	0.16	0.29

among the treatments like T₁₂, T₄, T₁₁, T₁₃, T₃, T₁₀, T₁₄ and T₉; among the treatments T₄, T₁₁, T₁₃, T₃, T₁₀, T₁₄, T₉, T₅, T₈ and T₆, among the treatments T₁₁, T₁₃, T₃, T₁₀, T₁₄, T₉, T₅, T₈, T₆, T₂ and T₇ and among T₁₃, T₃, T₁₀, T₁₄, T₉, T₅, T₈, T₆, T₂, T₇ and T₁.

Leaves width

Maximum leaf width was with T₁₄ (5.30 cm) followed by T₁₃ (4.62 cm) then T₁₂ (4.53 cm), T₁₁ (4.41 cm), T₁₀ (4.35 cm), T₉ (4.23 cm), T₈ (4.01 cm), T₇ (3.75 cm), T₃ (3.52 cm), T₄ (3.45 cm), T₂ (3.42 cm), T₆ (3.41 cm), T₅ (3.31 cm) and least with T₁ (3.0 cm). Significant difference was observed among the treatments except at par relations observed among the treatments T₁₃, T₁₂, T₁₁, T₁₀ and T₉; among the treatments T₁₁, T₁₀, T₉ and T₈; between T₈ and T₉ and among T₇, T₃, T₄, T₂, T₆ and T₅.

Number of branches

Maximum number of branches observed with T₁₄ (31) followed by T₁₃ (30), T₁₂ (29), T₁₁ (28), T₉ (27) and T₁₀ (27), T₇ (26) and T₈ (26), T₅ (24) and T₆ (24), T₄ (23), T₃ (22), T₂ (21), and least with T₁ (20). Among treatments significant relations were observed except at par rela-

tion recorded among treatments namely, T₁₄, T₁₃ and T₁₂; among T₁₃, T₁₂ and T₁₁; among T₁₂, T₁₁, T₉ and T₁₀; among T₁₁, T₉, T₁₀, T₇ and T₈; among T₉, T₁₀, T₇ and T₈; among T₇ and T₈, T₅ and T₆, among T₅, T₆, T₄ and T₃ and among T₄, T₃ and T₂.

Number of leaves

Maximum number of leaves were present in T₁₂ (158) which was followed by T₁₃ (151) then T₁₁ (149), T₁₄ (143), T₁₀ (141), T₉ (138), T₇ (132), T₅ (125), T₄ (119), T₆ (117) and T₈ (117), T₃ (112), T₂ (97) and least with T₁ (94). Treatments were found to be significant among each other except at par relations observed between T₁₃ and T₁₁, between T₁₄ and T₁₀ and among T₄, T₆ and T₈.

Petiole length

Maximum petiole length was observed in T₁₄ (9.1 cm) which was followed by T₁₁ (8.9 cm) then T₆ (8.8 cm), T₁₃ (8.4 cm), T₁₀ (8.3 cm), T₁₂ (8.3 cm), T₅ (8.1 cm), T₂ (7.6 cm) and T₇ (7.6 cm), T₉ (7.5 cm), T₃ (7.4 cm), T₄ (7.4 cm), T₈ (7.3 cm) then lowest with T₁ (7.2 cm). Among the treatments significant relations were observed except at par relations recorded among T₁, T₂, T₃ and

T₄, among T₁₁, T₆, T₁₃, T₁₀ and T₁₂; among T₆, T₁₃, T₁₀, T₁₂ and T₅; among T₁₀, T₁₂, T₅, T₂ and T₇; among T₅, T₂, T₇, T₉, T₃ and T₄ and among T₂, T₇, T₉, T₃, T₄, T₈ and T₁.

Plant height

Maximum plant height was observed in T₁₃ (2.38 cm), which was followed by T₉ (2.36 cm), T₁₂ (2.35 cm), T₈ (2.31 cm), T₁₄ (2.31 cm), T₁₁ (2.24 cm), T₁₀ (2.22 cm), T₅ (2.18 cm), T₇ (2.14 cm), T₆ (2.11 cm), T₄ (1.89 cm), T₃ (1.81 cm), T₂ (1.78 cm), and T₁ (1.54 cm). Significant relations were observed among the treatments except at par relations observed among the treatments namely T₁₃, T₉ and T₁₂; among T₉, T₁₂, T₈ and T₁₄; among T₁₂, T₈, T₁₄, T₁₁ and T₁₀; among T₈, T₁₄, T₁₁, T₁₀, and T₅; among T₁₁, T₁₀, T₅, T₇ and T₆ and among T₄, T₃ and T₂.

Shoot spread

Among the treatments significant difference was observed with highest shoot spread with T₁₃ (2.21 cm), which was followed by T₈ (2.15 cm), then T₁₄ (2.10 cm), T₇ (1.78 cm), T₁₂ (1.78 cm), T₁₀ (1.68 cm), T₉ (1.67 cm), T₅ (1.62 cm), T₃ (1.42 cm), T₂ (1.40 cm), T₆ (1.38 cm) and T₁₁ (1.38 cm), T₄ (1.36 cm) and T₁ (1.31 cm). Among the treatments at par relations were observed among T₁₃, T₈ and T₃; among T₇, T₁₂, T₁₀ among T₉, among T₁₀, T₉ and T₅ and among T₅, T₃, T₂, T₆, T₁₁, T₄ and T₁.

Branch angle

Branch angle has relevance on tree longevity and intercropping. Plagiotropic branches should expanded horizontally to capture light efficiently. Branch angles were steeper in upper branches and were nearly horizontal in lower branches, irrespective of sapling height [4]. Under present condition only FYM gave highest angle i.e., branch appear to be more horizontal; whereas applying higher treatments combinations reduced the angle i.e., breaking horizontal branching. Stable non-vertical growth of shoot and root branches is sustained by an anti-gravitropic offset mechanism [5].

Average branch diameter and collar diameter

Combined application of all the applications namely, farm yard manure, Mycorrhizae, *Rhizobium* and N₃P₃K₃ gave maximum branch diameter whereas control gave minimum. Fertilization has better response than bio-inoculation. Collar diameter was maximum with farm yard manure, *Rhizobium*, Mycorrhizae with N₁P₁K₁ resulted maximum and control resulted minimum. Bioinoculants with minute fertilizer doses responded best to collar diameter which became sensitive to further NPK doses. Nitrogen fertilization in *Quercus ilex* sp. ballota (Desf.). Samp [6] and Aleppo pine (*Pinus halepensis* Mill.) and holm oak (*Quercus ilex* L.) [7] and phosphorus fertilization in *Dalbergia sissoo* [8], Mycorrhizal inoculation *Tecomella undulata* [9] and *Rhizobium* inoculation *Acacia catechu* and *Acacia mollissima* [10] and combined bio-fertilization in *Acacia nilotica* [11] and combination of bio-inoculation and fertilization in *Albizia procera* [12] have increased collar diameter as observed by previous workers.

Branch length and petiole length

Branch length was highest with combination of FYM, Mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium* and N₁P₁K₁, lowest was with control. Petiole length was maximum with FYM, Mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium* and N₃P₃K₃ and minimum with control. It makes it clear that branch length was best compatible with FYM, bio-inoculation and minute dose of fertilization, which became highly sensitive to further increase in doses of fertilization. On the other hand, petiole length was best compatible with FYM, Mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium* and higher doses of fertilization for which lower doses became unresponsive.

Leaf width

Maximum leaf width was observed with FYM, Mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium* and N₃P₃K₃ and minimum with control. It indicates that the combined effect of bio-inoculation along with highest dose of fertilization became best compatible to develop maximum leaf width. Previous workers also observed positive effect of biofertilizers on leaf width of *Spathiphyllum*

illusion [13]. In almond (*Prunus amygdalus*), biofertilizer application could bring leaf width higher in lettuce [14].

Number of branches and number of leaves

Number of branches was maximum with FYM, Mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium* and $N_3P_3K_3$ and minimum with control. In contrary to it, number of leaves was maximum with FYM, Mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium* and $N_1P_1K_1$ and minimum with control. It indicates that number of branches well responded to bioinoculation along with increasing levels of fertilization. Number of leaves well responded to bio-inoculation and lower level of fertilization which became sensitive to higher level of fertilization. Rhizobial inoculation has been observed to have increased number of branches in *Acacia catechu* and *Acacia mollissima* [10]. Previous workers found increase in number of leaves by combined application of phosphorus and mycorrhizal inoculation in *Prosopis juliflora* [15] and by combined application of PSB and AMF in young oil plam. [16].

Plant height and branch spread

Plant height and branch spread well responded to bio-inoculation and fertilization peculiarly. Maximum plant height and plant spread was observed with FYM, Mycorrhizae and *Rhizobium* and $N_2P_2K_2$ and minimum with control. Height growth and plant spread well responded to FYM, bio-inoculation and moderate dose of fertilization, further increase in fertilizer dose adversely affect height. Previous workers found increased plant height by use of *Azospirillum* in Beijernick-plant [17], phosphate fertilization in *Mimosa caesalpiniaefolia* [18] and nitrogenous fertilization in exotic almonds [19] and recorded increase in height and number of leaves by application of NPK and lime in baru (*Dipteryx alata*) plants [20].

Conclusion

The branches emerging from main stem became responsive of soil applications. Under applications of FYM and *Rhizobium*, branches tend to emerge hori-

zontally this horizontal nature decreased when soil becomes further added with Mycorrhizae and NPK. All aerial growth parameters of *Flemingia semialata* responded positive to bioinoculants but behaved differently towards quantum of amendments added. Collar diameter, branch length and number of leaves responded well to lower doses, plant height and plant spread to medium doses and number and diameter of branches, petiole length and leaf width to higher doses of soil amendments. This experiment may be further multiplied to higher ages and multiple locations to prove efficacy of the results prior introducing the species under various land use systems.

References

- Lewis G, Schrire B, Mac Kinder B, Lock M (2005) Legumes of the World. The Royal Botanic Gardens, pp 529.
- Indian Council of Agricultural Research (ICAR), (2008) Reported April–June, pp 9. ICAR, Pusa Campus, New Delhi.
- Chen JH (2005) The combined use of fertilizers and organic fertilizers and/or biofertilizer for crop growth and soil fertility. Research paper presented in International Workshop on Sustained Management of the Soil-Rhizosphere System for Efficient. Crop Production and Fertilizer Use, 16–20 October, 2006, Land Development Department, Bangkok 10900, Thailand.
- Osada N, Takeda H (2003) Branch architecture, light interception and crown development in saplings of a plagiotropically branching tropical tree, *Polyalthia jenkinsii* (Annonaceae). *Annals of Bot* 91 : 55–63.
- Roychoudhry S, Bianco DM, Kieffer M, Kepinski S (2003) Auxin controls gravitropic setpoint angle in higher plant lateral branches. *Curr Biol* 23 : 1497–1504.
- Andivia E, Fernández M, Vazquez-Piqué J (2011) Autumn fertilization of *Quercus ilex* ssp. *baliota* (Desf.) Samp. Nursery seedlings. Effects on morpho-physiology and field performance. *Annals For Sci* 68 : 543–553.
- Cuesta B, Villar-Salvador P, Puértolas J, Jacobs DF, Rey Benayas JM (2010) Why do large nitrogen rich seedlings better resist stressful transplanting conditions? A physiological analysis in two functionally contrasting Mediterranean forest species. *For Ecol Manag* 260 : 71–78.
- Hudai SMS, Sujauddin M, Shafinat S, Uddin MS (2007) Effects of phosphorus and potassium addition on growth and nodulation of *Dalbergia sissoo* in the nursery. *J For Res* 18 : 279–282
- Srivastava KK, Srivastava HP (2006) Selection of efficient isolate of VAM for *Tecomella undulata* (SM) SEEM. *Ind J For* 29 : 335–337.
- Banyal R, Bhardwaj SD ((2003) Effect of *Rhizobium*

- inoculation on growth, biomass and nutrient dynamics of *Acacia catechu* and *Acacia mollissima* seedlings. *J Tree Sci* 22 : 28—33.
11. Kumudha P (2005) Studies on the effect of biofertilizers on the germination of *Acacia nilorica* Linn. seeds. *Adv PI Sci* 18 : 679—684.
 12. Jamaluddin DVS, Gosewami MK (2004) Effect of different microorganisms and inorganic fertilizers on seedling growth of *Albizia procera*. *Mycorrhiza News* 16 : 14—16.
 13. Khadije S, Sedaghatoor AS, Dahkaei MNP (2012) Effect of biofertilizer application on growth parameters of *Spathiphyllum illusion*. *Am Euras J Agric Environm Sci* 12 : 1457—1461.
 14. Wei Liu C, Sing Y, Chen BC, Yu Lai H (2014) Effects of nitrogen fertilizers on the growth and nitrate content of Lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.). *Int J Environ Res Publ Hlth* 11 : 4427—4440.
 15. Aguiar RLF de, Maria LC, Salcedo IH, Samparo EV de SB (2004) Interaction between arbuscular mycorrhizal fungi and phosphorus on growth of *Prosopis juliflora* (SW) DC. *Revista Arvore* 28 : 589—598.
 16. Samanta MK, Laji S, Perria N, Chattopadhyay P, Hore JKM, Kabi MC (2003) Efficiency of biofertilizers with different levels of phosphorus on growth of young oil palm. *Biofert News Letter* 11 : 11—15.
 17. Saikia SP, Naidu VSGR, Panwar JDS (2001) *Azospirillum* Beijernick-plant interaction boon for sustainable agriculture. *Ind Famg*, pp 6—9.
 18. Marques VB, de Paiva HN, Gomes JM, Neves JCL (2006) Effects of nitrogen sources and levels on the growth of *sabi_a* (*Mimosa caesalpiniaefolia* Benth.) seedlings. *Scientia Forestalis* 71 : 77—85.
 19. Sousa AGO, Fernandes DC, Alves AM, Freitas JBE, Naves MMV (2011) Nutritional quality and protein value of exotic almonds and nut from the Brazilian Savanna compared to peanut. *Food Res Int* 44 : 2319—2325.
 20. Zuffo AM, Zuffo JM, Rezânio J, Sousa dos Santos MCA, Oliveira JBS, Fonseca WL (2017) Response of baru (*Dipterys alata* Vog.) seedlings to liming and NPK application. *J PI Nutri* 40 : 1332—1338.