



Effect of Different Sources of Sulphur on Sulphur Fractions in a Calcareous Soil

Mangala Devi Perumal ^{a++*}, S. Soundharya ^{a#}, S. Yazhini ^{a#},
S. Samundeeswari ^{a#}, T. Nirosha ^{a#}, P. Sathana ^{a#},
K. Neelasri ^{a#} and P. Arun Prasad ^{a#}

^a Department Crop Management, Thanthai Roever Institute of Agriculture and Rural Development, Perambalur 621 115, 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/v35i32765

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/95139>

Original Research Article

Received: 08/11/2022
Accepted: 10/01/2023
Published: 25/02/2023

ABSTRACT

An incubation experiment was conducted to study the S release pattern by different S sources and grades. The bulk soils were collected from the Esanai village which has deficient in sulphur. The treatments were replicated thrice in completely randomized design. Treatment details are Ammonium sulphate, Single Super Phosphate, Gypsum were the three sources of sulphur applied at the intervals of 0, 20, 40 kg S ha⁻¹ along with the recommended dose of N, P and K. Destructive soil sampling was carried out at 15, 30, 60, 90 days after incubation and analyzed for S fractions as per standard procedures to understand the effect of S sources and S dynamics in those areas. Soil samples were analysed for sulphur fraction *i.e.* Water soluble sulphur fraction, Exchangeable sulphur fraction, CaCl₂ extractable sulphur fraction, Occuded sulphur fraction, Organic sulphur

⁺⁺ Assistant Professor

[#] UG Scholars

*Corresponding author: E-mail: mangala_agri@yahoo.com;

fraction and Total sulphur fraction. The soil sulphur fractions were arranged in the order of occluded sulphur > water soluble sulphur > exchangeable sulphur > CaCl₂ extractable sulphur > organic sulphur. The results emerged out in this experiment indicate that that application of sulphur in the form of Ammonium Sulphate @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹ was found to be applied for better release of available sulphur. The zero fertilization led to decline in the levels of all the forms of sulphur as compared to rest of treatments.

Keywords: Sulphur fraction; Ammonium sulphate; calcareous soil.

1. INTRODUCTION

“Among the major nutrients, sulphur as an essential nutrient to the plants. It also plays an important role in constituent of the proteinaceous amino acids such as methionine and cysteine, glutathione, vitamins (biotin and thiamine), phytochelatins, chlorophyll, coenzymes A and S-adenosyl – methionine” [1]. “In the absence of sufficient sulphur, several essential enzymatic activities and physiological functions are inhibited. Thus maintenance of an optimum level of sulphur in the soil is essential for maximum crop production and its quality aspects. Sulphur exists in soil as free and adsorbed sulphate and in diverse organic and inorganic compounds. In the humid region it is in the organic forms, while in arid soils the sulphate salts of calcium, magnesium, sodium and even potassium predominate” [2]. Incidental sulphur returns to soil is possible through farmyard manure and the use of conventional sulphur containing fertilizers, such as Ammonium sulphate (24 per cent S), Ammonium phosphate sulphate (14 per cent S), Elemental Sulphur (90-99 per cent), Gypsum (17 per cent S) and Potassium sulphate (12 per cent S). Before fertilizing, it is necessary to understand the knowledge of different forms of sulphur and factors affecting their distributions are essential in improving the sulphur nutrition of the crops.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

An incubation experiments was conducted in the department of Crop Management, Thanthai Roever Institute of Agricultural and Rural Development, Perambalur during May 2022 to study the S release pattern by different S sources and grades of S. Eight treatments were laid out in CRD with 3 replications. The treatments from T₁ to T₈ are absolute control, RDF alone, Gypsum @ 20 and 40 kg S, SSP @ 20 and 40 kg S and Ammonium sulphate @ 20 and 40 kg S. The bulk soils were collected from the surface layer (0-15cm) of soils situated in onion growing areas of Esanai was used for this

experiment which was deficient in S. The plastic containers filled with 100 grams of processed soils with adequate quantity of water to maintain field capacity. Destructive soil sampling was carried out at 15, 30, 60, and 90 days after incubation and analysed for S fractions. The prepared soil samples were analyzed for determining fraction of sulphur by adopting standard methods [3] as described below. The total sulphur was estimated using the method followed by Hesse, [4]. The results were statistically analysed using Aggress software at 5% level of significance.

2.1 Estimation of Sulphur Fractions

Water soluble sulphur: Soil sample was extracted with distilled water 1:10 (w/v) ratio for 30 minutes in mechanical shaker. Then it was centrifuged for ten minutes at 10000 rpm. 5 ml of the supernatant was pipetted out in 25 ml volumetric flask. 10 ml of sodium acetate- acetic acid buffer (pH 4.8) was added followed by 1 ml of gum acacia solution and 1 g of BaCl₂. The volume was made up to 25 ml with distilled water and the reading was taken in UV-VIS spectrophotometer at 420 nm wavelengths after adjusting the meter to zero per unit absorbance with the blank.

Exchangeable or adsorbed sulphur: After the centrifugation process, samples were extracted with 0.032 M NaH₂PO₄ at 1:10 (w/v) ratio after centrifugation. Following 30 minutes of shaking, each sample was again centrifuged at 10,000 rpm for about 10 minutes. The extracted supernatant was used to estimate S by turbidimetry method.

Occluded/ Precipitated sulphur: The residue of the previous fraction was extracted with 1M HCl with the ratio of 1:20 (w/v). Followed by 60 minutes of shaking, the samples were centrifuged for about 10 minutes at 10,000 rpm. The extracted S was estimated by using turbidimetry method.

Organic Sulphur: One gram of air dried (20 mesh) soil along with 1 g of NaHCO₃ was taken

in a silica crucible. The mixture was placed in a muffle furnace for 3 hours at 500° C. After cooling, the contents were transferred to a 100 ml conical flask to which 25 ml of extracting solution (Dissolve 4.6 g of $\text{NaH}_2\text{PO}_4 \cdot \text{H}_2\text{O}$ in 1 L of 2 N acetic acid) was added. After the reaction subsides, the contents of the flask were shaken for half an hour. Later the solution was filtered through a dry Whatman No. 1 filter paper. An aliquot of the filtrate was taken for the turbidimetric determination of sulphate.

Total Sulphur: 20 g of soil sample was taken in the silica crucible and ignited in the muffle furnace and was transferred to 250 ml conical flask. 60 ml of 1:1 HCl was added to the conical flask and kept in the sand digester until the solution turned colourless. At the end of digestion, the contents in the flask were diluted with 200 ml of distilled water and it was filtered through Whatman No. 3 filter paper and the filtrate was collected in 500 ml volumetric flask. The entire contents were washed with hot water by transferring into the filter paper until free of chloride was achieved. After free of chloride, the contents were cooled and the volume was made up to 500 ml with distilled water. 50 ml of sesquioxide extract was pipetted out in 500 ml beaker and 2 g of solid ammonium chloride was added for crystallization. The solution was heated and 10 ml of 10% barium chloride was added drop by drop with constant stirring and the boiling was continued for another 3 minutes. The beaker was kept in a sand bath for 30 minutes to promote granulation. After granulation, the contents were washed with hot water by transferring to Whatman No. 42 filter paper till free of chloride was achieved. The filter paper along with the precipitate was added to the weighed silica basin and dried in the oven. It was ignited over a low flame initially and the filter paper was made to ash completely. The weight of the barium sulphate obtained was considered as the sulphate content of the sample [4].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1 Initial Physico-Chemical Characteristics of Soil

The pH of the experimental soil was slightly alkaline in reaction (8.03). The soil was free from salinity with an electrical conductivity of 0.20 dS m^{-1} . The soil belonged to sandy clay loam in texture. The major nutrient status of the soils showed that low available N content (179 kg ha^{-1}), the high status of available P and Medium K

status (78 and 189 kg ha^{-1} respectively) The soil contains low available S (9.2 mg kg^{-1}).

3.2 Sulphur Fractions

The sequential extraction of various S fractions was determined and the data is presented in Tables 1 to 3. Among the different fractions, the water soluble contribution was found to be low followed by Exchangeable, CaCl_2 extractable, occluded and organic S. The contribution of total-S was the highest among all other zinc fractions studied.

3.3 Water Soluble S Fraction

The water soluble sulphur fractions of soil ranged from 6.75 mg kg^{-1} in control to 18.33 mg/kg in AS @ 40 kg S ha^{-1} . The highest value of water soluble sulphur in soil was registered with the application of AS @ 40 kg S ha^{-1} (15.45, 16.45, 18.33, 16.22 mg kg^{-1}) which was also on par with application of SSP @ 40 kg S ha^{-1} (14.5, 15.95, 17.25, 15.43 mg kg^{-1}) at 15, 30, 60 and 90 DAI, respectively (Table 1). The releasing pattern of water soluble sulphur from soil had increased till 60 DAI and then slightly decreased up to 90 DAI for all the sources and the levels of sulphur applied. But, the trend seemed to be in contrast to treatments with the control and RDF alone applied lots which were decreasing throughout the period of incubation. These results have been ascribed to finding of Rajani et al. [5] that the omission of S in the fertilizer has caused a continuous depletion in the available S status of soil.

3.4 Exchangeable S Fraction

“The soil exchangeable sulphur fraction ranged from 5.45 mg kg^{-1} in control to 12.57 mg kg^{-1} in AS @ 40 kg S ha^{-1} (Table 1). The highest value of soil exchangeable sulphur was recorded with the application of AS @ 40 kg S ha^{-1} (10.97, 11.19, 11.87, 12.21 mg kg^{-1}) and followed by application of SSP @ 40 kg S ha^{-1} (10.5, 10.53, 11.54, 11.13 mg kg^{-1}). The releasing pattern of exchangeable sulphur from soil had increased till 60 DAI and then slightly decreased at 90 DAI for all the sources and levels of sulphur applied. Higher S release in AS treated cups might be due to relatively higher solubility of AS as compared to SSP and gypsum” [6].

3.5 CaCl_2 Extractable S Fraction

The soil CaCl_2 extractable sulphur fraction ranged from 97.11 mg kg^{-1} in control to 27.84 mg

Table 1. Effect of sources and levels of sulphur on soil water soluble sulphur and Exchangeable sulphur fraction (mg kg⁻¹)

Treatments	Water Soluble Sulphur (mg kg ⁻¹)				Exchangeable Sulphur (mg kg ⁻¹)			
	15 DAI	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	15 DAI	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI
T ₁	6.75	6.23	4.73	3.08	5.45	5.21	4.22	3.56
T ₂	7.75	7.89	9.87	6.91	6.04	6.81	7.45	7.14
T ₃	13.75	14.75	15.5	12.42	10.15	10.32	11.21	11.27
T ₄	15.45	16.45	18.33	16.22	10.97	11.19	11.87	12.21
T ₅	11.85	12.5	11.75	10.33	8.25	8.12	9.69	10.42
T ₆	14.5	15.95	17.25	15.43	10.5	10.53	11.54	11.13
T ₇	10.35	10.35	11.67	9.07	7.5	7.75	8.57	9.15
T ₈	12.75	13.25	14.13	11.75	9.35	9.78	10.63	10.98
Mean	11.64	12.17	12.90	10.65	8.52	8.71	9.39	9.48
CD (p=0.05)	1.26**	1.30**	1.41*	0.72**	1.07**	1.09*	0.67*	0.64*
SEd	0.68	0.72	0.77	0.66	0.49	0.50	0.54	0.54

Table 2. Effect of sources and levels of sulphur on soil CaCl₂ extractable sulphur fraction (mg kg⁻¹) and Occluded Sulphur (mg kg⁻¹)

Treatments	CaCl ₂ Extractable Sulphur (mg kg ⁻¹)				Occluded Sulphur (mg kg ⁻¹)			
	15 DAI	30 DAI	60 DAI	90DAI	15 DAI	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI
T ₁	9.00	8.53	8.22	7.11	35.21	34.86	33.70	32.50
T ₂	9.43	8.23	8.49	7.35	36.65	36.32	35.19	34.21
T ₃	19.05	20.62	22.23	25.98	58.35	58.89	60.41	59.40
T ₄	26.22	27.58	29.75	32.55	65.74	65.90	67.50	66.35
T ₅	21.23	23.33	24.69	26.22	49.25	49.69	51.79	50.59
T ₆	22.04	23.11	25.72	27.84	61.12	61.50	63.40	62.45
T ₇	18.15	19.17	21.42	23.96	45.67	45.89	47.79	46.49
T ₈	24.52	25.15	27.04	29.63	53.12	53.65	55.43	54.81
Mean	18.70	19.46	20.94	22.58	50.63	50.83	55.27	50.85
CD(p=0.05)	0.90**	0.85*	0.85*	0.79**	1.91*	1.87*	1.89*	1.83**
SEd	1.11	1.16	1.26	1.37	2.86	2.90	2.91	2.92

Table 3. Effect of sources and levels of sulphur on soil Organic Sulphur and Total Sulphur fraction (mg kg⁻¹)

Treatments	Organic Sulphur (mg kg ⁻¹)				Total Sulphur Fraction (mg kg ⁻¹)			
	15 DAI	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI	15 DAI	30 DAI	60 DAI	90 DAI
T ₁	54.1	56.2	63.4	65.7	110.57	110.84	111.57	112.05
T ₂	52.7	54.4	59.34	61.9	110.85	111.01	112.81	113.93
T ₃	160.0	159.2	154.8	152.2	235.4	235.56	235.98	238.22
T ₄	155.6	154.5	147.2	147.2	238.45	238.91	239.89	241.01
T ₅	130.1	128.3	122.7	120.3	227.08	227.27	227.66	228.59
T ₆	125.9	122.5	116.9	114.4	229.21	229.41	229.77	230.32
T ₇	140.3	139.3	134.0	132.8	231.09	231.39	231.83	232.28
T ₈	137.9	135.0	129.9	128.3	233.08	233.56	233.86	234.89
Mean	119.6	118.6	116.2	115.3	201.96	202.24	202.92	203.91
CD(p=0.05)	2.41*	2.46*	4.41*	2.66*	3.47*	5.63*	3.49*	3.50*

kg⁻¹ in AS @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹. The highest value of soil CaCl₂ extractable sulphur was observed with the application of AS @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹ (26.22, 27.58, 29.75, 32.55 mg kg⁻¹) which was also on

par with the application of gypsum @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹ (24.52, 25.15, 27.04, and 29.63mg kg⁻¹) (Table 2). The lowest value of soil CaCl₂ extractable sulphur in soil was observed with control (9.0,

8.53, 8.22, 7.11 mg kg⁻¹). The soil CaCl₂ extractable sulphur fractions had shown a constant increase throughout the period of incubation for all the sources and levels of sulphur applied. The similar findings were found in Nivetha et al., [7].

3.6 Occluded S Fraction

The soil occluded sulphur fraction ranged from 32.21 mg kg⁻¹ in control to 67.50 mg kg⁻¹ (Table 2). The highest value of soil available sulphur was observed with the application of AS @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹ (67.74, 65.90, 67.50 and 66.25 mg kg⁻¹) and followed by application of SSP @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹ (61.12, 61.50, 63.40 and 62.45 mg kg⁻¹). The mean values of occluded sulphur were in line with the findings of Sankaran, [8].

3.7 Organic S Fraction

Organic sulphur was one of the dominant fraction of sulphur. It was ranged from 52.7 mg kg⁻¹ in RDF alone to 160.07 mg kg⁻¹ in AS @ 20 kg S ha⁻¹ (Table 3). The trend seemed to be constantly decreasing throughout the period of incubation for all the sources and levels of sulphur applied. The higher amount of organic sulphur was registered with the application of AS @ 20 kg S ha⁻¹ (160.07, 159.23, 156.2 and 152.22 mg kg⁻¹) and the lowest values were observed with control (54.16, 56.28, 60.64 and 65.73 mg kg⁻¹). Similar results were reported by Singh et al. [9] that the buildup in S status was mostly through organic sulphur fraction.

3.8 Total S Fractions

The soil total sulphur ranged from 110.57 mg kg⁻¹ in control to 241.01 mg kg⁻¹ in AS @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹ (Table 3). The studies on total sulphur revealed that, all the sources and levels of sulphur applied were on par and superior to the control and RDF alone throughout the period of incubation. Setia and Sharma [10] that the amount of all the fraction of S increased with the application of AS @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹.

4. CONCLUSION

The results can be summarized that application of sulphur in the form of Ammonium Sulphate @ 40 kg S ha⁻¹ was found to be applied for better release of available sulphur. The zero fertilization

led to decline in the levels of all the forms of sulphur as compared to rest of treatments.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Nakai Y, Maruyama - Nakashita A. Biosynthesis of sulfur -containing small biomolecules in plants. International Journal of Molecular Science. 2020;21(10):3450 -3470.
2. Kanwar. Extractable Fraction of Sulphur in Major Soil of India. Martinus Nijhoff/ Dr. W. Junk publisher; 1986.
3. Chesnin L. Yien CH. Turbidimetric Determination of available sulphates, Soil Science Society of American Proceedings. 1950;15:149- 151.
4. Hesse PR. A Text Book of Soil chemical Analysis. Juhn Murry Publishers Ltd., London, England. 1971;520.
5. Rajani AV, Patil DV, Naria JN, Butani BM, Gilakiya BA. Dynamics of sulphur fraction in calcareous vertic Haplustepts under AICRP-LITE soil. An Asian Journal of soil science. 2010;5(1):122- 127.
6. Scherer HW. Physiological functions and environmental relevance of sulphur containing secondary metabolites. In: Sulphur Nutrition and Assimilation in Higher Plants (Ed.: L. Dekok). The Hague, the Netherlands: SPB Academic Publishing. 2001;179-90.
7. Nivetha E. Chandra Sekaran N, Meena S, Irene Vethamoni P, Kalaiselvi T. Effects of levels of sulphur from various sources on sulphur transformations in onion growing soils. International Journal of Chemical Studies. 2019;7(5):2229- 2234.
8. Sankaran K. Investigations on the sulphur status of Tamil Nadu soils. Doctoral Thesis Submitted to Tamil Nadu Agricultural University. Department of soil science and Agricultural Chemistry. TNAU, Coimbatore; 1989.
9. Singh et al., Soil sulphur fraction and their relationship with soil properties under long term integrated nutrient management. Journal of Indian Society of Soil science. 2014;27:738- 745.

10. Setia RK, Sharma KN. Effect of long term differential fertilization on depth-distribution of form of sulphur and their relationship with sulphur nutrition. Journal of Indian Society of Soil science. 2005;53(1): 91-96.

© 2023 Perumal 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/95139>