

SULPHATE SORPTIVITY IN ALFISOLS UNDER P OPTIMIZED GROUNDNUT

CHITTARANJAN SARANGI^{1*} AND RAHUL DEV BEHERA²

¹Department of Soil Science, RRTS Ranital, Bhadrak - 754103, Odisha, INDIA

²Department of Soil Science KVK Malkangiri - 764 045, Odisha, INDIA

e-mail: crsarangi2014@yahoo.com

KEYWORDS

Sulphate
Sorptivity
Groundnut
Sorpton

Received on :

16.04.2016

Accepted on :

01.08.2016

*Corresponding author

ABSTRACT

Sorption phenomenon determines the solubility, availability, mobility and tendency of ion pollution of the environment. A field experiment was laid out in RBD with three replications and seven treatments using soluble and insoluble sources of phosphorus at different combinations and lime during 2014 and 2015 to study their effect on the sulphur sorption behavior under groundnut cropping system in *Alfisols*. Sulphate sorptivity was studied with shaking three grams soil for 24 hrs with 15 ml solution of K_2SO_4 varying in SO_4^{2-} concentrations from (0, 25, 50, 75, 100, 125 and 150 μg S g^{-1} of soil) in a 50 ml centrifuge tubes at 25°C for 2hrs. Sorption data were fitted in linear, Langmuir and Freundlich equations and sorption parameters especially Distribution coefficient or partition factor (Kd) was the maximum (1.0084) with full soluble source and liming, The MBC is related to the (Smax) as indicated by the order T7, affinity constant (k) ranged from 0.020531 in T6 to 0.061901 $L\ mg^{-1}$, Significant correlations were observed between S applied with P sources and Kd (0.71**, 0.85**), constants [(-)0.65*, (-)0.72**]. Smax (0.56*, 0.68**) and "C(0) of Freundlich model (0.56*, 0.65*) in 1st year and 2nd year respectively. Sulphate sorption process was favourable, spontaneous, exothermic and controlled by dissociative mechanism.

INTRODUCTION

Continuous use of high analysis fertilizers has widened the ratio of N: P_2O_5 : K_2O : S to 14.7:5.1:1.6:1 in India (TSI, 2014). There is urgent need to bring N: P_2O_5 : K_2O : S to desired level through adoption of advanced techniques developed for sustainable S management. Sulphur deficiency has been widely reported in most highly weathered and variable charged soils of 120 districts of India (Ghosh and Dash, 2012). Under acid conditions, surface charges of the soils become highly positive thereby depressing sulphur availability and mobility due to sorption reaction by the soil constituents. Sorption-desorption and retention are useful in describing, studying and managing the sulphur status in the soil solution surrounding the plant roots. High sorptivity of the soils has been ascribed to the nature of the dominant clay minerals particularly kaolinite, goethite, lepidocrocite, gypsum and sesquioxides known to have high surface area and sorption capacity. Mechanisms of sulphate sorption include ligand exchange in which SO_4^{2-} enters into direct coordination with Fe or Al ions of the oxide surfaces as OH groups are displaced, thus causing an alteration of the point of zero charge (PZC) of the oxide minerals.

The OH⁻ so displaced during SO_4^{2-} sorption is released into soil solution, causing an increase in soil pH and the CEC. Another mechanism could be electrostatic in which SO_4^{2-} is held as a counter ion in the diffuse double layer next to a positively charged colloid surface. Sorption isotherms particularly Freundlich and Langmuir isotherms amongst others yield parameters useful for description of ion sorption in soils. For instance the sorption maximum (b) explains the

maximum amount of sorbate that can be sorbed by a sorbent, factor related to the bonding energy (k) describes the tenacity with which sorbates are sorbed to the sorbents, bonding energy (k_f) determines the magnitude of the energy with which sorbates are bonded to the sorbent and equilibrium solution concentration (EPCo) determines the concentration of the sorbate in equilibrium solution concentration at which the amount sorbed is equal to that desorbed. Ion and in particular sulphate sorption reaction is driven by certain forces, the extent and spontaneity of which can be measured using thermodynamic principles (Uzoho *et al.*, 2014). For instance the Gibbs free energy measures the extension or force that guides sorption reaction or corresponds to the transfer of ions from bulk solution into appropriate site of the double layer or clay mineral lattice.

Sulphate sorption may be influenced by soil management practices. Effects of soil management on ion sorption have been reported by others and attributed to alteration in the soil physicochemical properties. Common soil properties affecting sulphate sorption include pH, organic matter, CEC, texture and presence of other ions (Ghosh and Dash, 2012). Influence of pH includes an increase in sulphate sorption with decreasing pH due to increased positive surface charge. Effect of organic matter has been reported to be an increased sulphate sorption due to formation of Al- and Fe- humus complexes and the inhibition of the crystallization of Fe and Al oxide by organic matter or a decrease due to competition between sulphate and organic anions for sorption sites. Sulphate sorption has been noted to increase with Ca sorption but depressed with P sorption. In Odisha Sarangi *et al.*, 2016

studied this phenomenon with various P sources. Limited information exists on soil sulphate sorption capacity and where available has been restricted to its relationship with soil parent materials. There appears a dearth of information on the influence of land use on sulphate sorption. The objectives of the present study was therefore, to determine the sulphate sorptivity of *Alfisols* under groundnut managed with P optimization.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiment

A field experiment was laid out in RBD with seven treatments and three replications in *Typic Haplustalf* of Ouat Bhubaneswar during *Rabi* and *pre kharif* 2014 and 2015. The composite initial and soil samples were analysed for fertility parameters like pH and EC, organic carbon, available N, available P, available K, available S, exchangeable Ca and Lime Requirement following routine procedures (Jackson 1973). Variety Tag 24 (120 days) of groundnut was grown with uniform recommended agronomic practices and fertilizer dose 20-40-40(N-P₂O₅-K₂O)kg/ha⁻¹ respectively except the source of P and lime which were as per the treatment. It received a dose of P fertilizer through various combinations of P sources @ 40 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹ along with 20 kg N and 40 kg K₂O ha⁻¹ in the form of Urea & MOP respectively. Two sources of Phosphorous - Rock Phosphate and Single Super Phosphate (SSP) were used in the present investigation. The nutritional composition of Rock Phosphate content were 16, 17 and 1 per cent P₂O₅, Ca, and S respectively. Soil samples were collected at 35 days after sowing. Air-dried soil samples after processing (<2mm) were analyzed for pH, organic carbon, available P, K and S and Exch Ca and Lime Requirement (Jackson 1973).

Sulphate sorption study

Sulphate sorption was studied in the laboratory following Ghosh and Dash 2012 with a little modification in concentrations of sulphate used. Three grams post harvest soil after both crops of each year was shaken for 24 hrs with 15 ml solution of K₂SO₄ varying in SO₄⁻ concentrations from

(0, 25, 50, 75, 100, 125 and 150 µg S g⁻¹ of soil). The sulphate sorption studies were carried out in triplicate. The suspension was filtered through Whatman No. 42 filter paper and the amount of S remaining in the solution was determined turbidimetrically (Jackson 1973). The amount of SO₄⁻ sorbed was estimated as the difference between equilibrium SO₄⁻ concentration and initial SO₄⁻ added. The sorption data was fitted to the Linear, Freundlich and Langmuir equations as given below:

Linear model

$S = K_d \cdot C + c$, where S, sorbed amount, K_d and c are empirical constants and

C = equilibrium concentration of SO₄-S in soil solution (mgL⁻¹) and c = constant

Freundlich equation

$S = K_f \cdot C^{1/n}$, where: S, sorbed amount, K_f and n are empirical constants. K_f = Energy of sorption or Partition coefficient or distribution coefficient (L kg⁻¹), n = dimensionless constant or correction factor. n and k are empirical constants in the Freundlich equation depending on the given adsorbate and the temperature (characteristics of the system).

Langmuir equation

$S = S_{max} \cdot K \cdot C / (1 + K \cdot C)$, Where, C = equilibrium concentration of SO₄-S in soil solution (mgL⁻¹),

S = the amount of SO₄-S sorbed (mg kg⁻¹), S_{max} or b = SO₄-S sorption maximum (mg kg⁻¹)

K = constant related to bonding energy (L mg⁻¹), Maximum buffering capacity (MBC) = S_{max} x k, The Freundlich K, Langmuir sorption maxima and the binding energy for the soils under, considerations are presented in Table 1. MS-Excel was programmed to solve the linear and non-linear models. For non-linear models MS-Excel solver was used. Non-linear models were fitted to the minimum SSE.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Soil characterization

Table 1: Effect of Phosphorus Sources on parameters of various sorption models Under Groundnut in *Alfisols*

Treatment	Year	Linear Model		Langmuir Model		MBC (mg kg ⁻¹ of soil)	Freundlich Model			ζG(0)
		Kd/C	c	K	Smax		G(0)	K	n	
T1(0,0)	1st	0.387	8.539754	0.027481	49.28571	1.35	-9203.87	0.762578	0.870039	-694.084
	2nd	0.525	8.514953	0.008354	125.9918	1.05	12252.93	2.231894	0.71156	-2055.87
T2(2.5,42.5)	1st	0.119	19.36694	0.061901	36.94774	2.287	12149.12	9.418641	0.870039	-5742.89
	2nd	0.332	17.91074	0.0087	70.00001	0.61	12149.12	2.231894	0.71156	-2055.87
T3(3,50)	1st	0.272	15.74472	0.05666	40.86361	2.32	-7351	5.530208	0.441669	-4379.39
	2nd	0.371	6.977308	0.009466	91.82593	0.87	11933.07	2.330422	0.643912	-2166.49
T4(8,44)	1st	0.698	2.898982	0.028708	55.79562	1.6	-9092.01	1.146866	0.89712	-350.902
	2nd	0.394	11.23247	3.44E-05	22423.55	0.77	26319.47	0.881028	0.967467	324.35
T5(16,46)	1st	0.779	-1.0971	0.027481	49.28571	1.35	-9203.87	0.027481	0.752093	-1428.85
	2nd	1.011	-2.3164	0.007029	144.5292	1.02	12695.35	0.007029	0.763864	-1543.88
T6(22.75,48)	1st	0.386	12.42447	0.000531	835.2031	0.44	-19309.5	3.503623	0.576752	-3210.61
	2nd	0.737	1.727445	0.01445	90.6675	1.31	10849.98	3.518085	0.597415	-3221.16
T7(30,56)	1st	1.009	-7.77601	0.20544	186.6058	38.34	-4052.58	0.330163	1.265527	2837.701
	2nd	1.11	-7.769	0.33	114934.1	0.97	29913.04	0.330163	1.265527	2837.701

*[Figures in parentheses include Applied S and Ca(kg/ha⁻¹) respectively while applying RP and SSP in various combinations].

The initial physico-chemical properties of experimental soil- the soil was loamy textured with pH 5.2, EC(salt free), available Bray's P (low), available Nitrogen low, available K medium, available S medium and Exchangeable Ca^{2+} [$\text{cmol}(\text{p}^+)\text{kg}^{-1}$] 0.89, Exchangeable Mg^{2+} [$\text{cmol}(\text{p}^+)\text{kg}^{-1}$] 0.13, Lime requirement [$\text{t CaCO}_3\text{ha}^{-1}$] 1.75.

Sulphate sorption characteristics

Sorbed and equilibrium S solution concentrations increased with added sulphur. Similar observations have been reported for S (Ghosh and Dash, 2012). Sorption data were fitted and sorption parameters obtained (Table 1) were used to describe S sorption characteristics of the soils.

Parameters of various sorption Models

Linear Model-In the first year the linear coefficient of proportionality of sorption with equilibrium concentration i.e. Distribution coefficient or partition factor (K_d) was the maximum (1.0084) with full soluble source and liming followed by 1:1 mixture of SSP and RP, which in turn was followed by 3:1 mixture of RP and SSP. The order varied as $T7 > T5 > T4 > T6 > T3 > T1 > T2$ indicating the order of availability of fixing sites. Less dissolution of Rock phosphate alone is the reason for availability of fixing sites in more amount than non application.

Langmuir Model-Affinity constant or factor related to the bonding energy (k) ranged from 0.020531 in T6 to 0.061901 L mg^{-1} in T2. The order varies as $T6 < T7 < T1 = T5 < T4 < T3 < T2$. The affinity of bonding to sulphate was the maximum with less availability of phosphorus from the source. Maximum buffering capacity (MBC) referred to the resistance to changes in soil solution ion concentration. The MBC is related to the (S_{max}) as indicated by the order $T7 > T3 > T2 > T4 > T1 = T5 > T6$. Liming released more positive sites for S adsorption. Distribution coefficient or partition factor (K_p) was higher as was the $b(S_{\text{max}})$ and MBC and thus indicating some close relationships amongst the factors (Uzoho *et al.*, 2014). The K_p estimates ion mobility and retention in soils, with high values indicating greater retention and low mobility. Best K_p was observed in T7 and T3 respectively. Thus S mobility will be greater in the liming with SSP and lone SSP application respectively whereas the retention will be greater in the T1 = T5 and T7 respectively. The maximum adsorption followed the trend $T6 > T7 > T4 > T5 = T1 > T4 > T2$. The energy of

formation " $G(0)$ " were in the order T2, T7, T3, T4, T1, T5, T6 in descending order. The more negative this number the more spontaneous was the formation of bonds.

(iii) Freundlich Model-Freundlich constant n referred to as sorption intensity (Nystrom 2012) followed the trend $T7 > T4 > T1 = T2 > T5 > T6 > T3$. Liming and full soluble source was the most effective. Similarity in n and Langmuir k distribution indicates a close relationship between the factors. High n values in the liming treatment indicate that the intensity of S sorption will be greatest. There was cooperative sorption in all the treatments except the liming one. There was spontaneous formation of bonds except the liming treatment which may be due to influence of more organic matter produced. By and large similar trends were observed in the second year with all the models. Significant correlations were observed between S applied with P sources and K_d (0.71**, 0.85**), constants [(-0.65*, -0.72**), S_{max} (0.56*, 0.68**) and " $G(0)$ of Freundlich model (0.56*, 0.65*)" in 1st year and 2nd year respectively. In case of Ca applied with P sources there was no significant correlation with any model parameter. From the R^2 values Langmuir Model was a better fit and Linear model was similar to this model.

REFERENCES

- Ghosh, G. K. and Dash, N. R. 2012. Sulphate sorption-desorption characteristics of lateritic soils of West Bengal, India. *International J. PAES.* **2(1)**: 167-176.
- Jackson, M. L. 1973. Soil Chemical Analysis. *Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd.*, New Delhi.
- Nystrom, S. D. 2012. Thermodynamic parameters of zinc sorption in some calcareous soils. *Int. J. Agr. and Env.* **(01)**: 1-7.
- Sarangi, C., Jena, B., Santra, G. H. and Ghosh, G. K. 2016. Effect of P Sources on the Sulfur Sorption Behavior in Alfisols under Groundnut *Environment and Ecology.* **34(4D)**: 2546-2550.
- TSI, 2014. Sulphur in Indian agriculture. Correction sulphur deficiency in Indian agriculture. The Sulphur Institute 1020, 19th Street, N.W., Suite 520 Washington, D.C., 20036, U.S.A.
- Uzoho, B. U., E.Ihem, S., Onwudike, L., Agim, U., Nkwopara, I.U., Opara, M., Okon, S. I., Nti and Orji, J. C. 2014. Phosphorus sorption capacity of soils in relation to land use types in Mbaise, Southeastern, Nigeria. *J. Chem, Bio. and Phy. Sc.* **4(2)**: 1710-1720.

