

# Effect of Sulphur, Potassium and PSB on Growth Parameters, Root Architecture and Quality of Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.)

## Abstract

Field experiments were conducted to study the effect of sulphur, potassium and PSB on growth parameters, root characteristics and quality of mustard during rabi season of 2019-20 and 2020-21 at students instructional farm, Chandra Shekhar Azad University of Agriculture & Technology, Kanpur. The experiment consists of 9 treatments combinations in randomized block design with three replications. Mustard variety *Varuna* (T-59) was grown with the recommended agronomic practices. On the basis of results emanated from investigation it can be concluded that among the growth parameters viz. The maximum plant height (137.72 cm) and number of leaves (8.62) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>9</sub> [K<sub>60</sub> + S<sub>40</sub> + PSB] during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation. Similarly among the root characteristics, maximum root depth (72.49 cm), no. of roots plant<sup>-1</sup> (14.92) and dry weight of roots (28.37 g) were associated with the treatment T<sub>9</sub> [K<sub>60</sub> + S<sub>40</sub> + PSB] during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation. Maximum oil content (38.65 %) and oil yield (841.80 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>9</sub> [K<sub>60</sub> + S<sub>40</sub> + PSB] during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation.

**Key Words:** Growth, Mustard, Potassium, Protein, PSB, Root and Sulphur

## Introduction

“Mustard is an important oil seed crop in India. It secures unique position in Indian farming system with an impressive acreage next to food crops. Despite the fact that nearly 33.8 per cent of the total cropped area in world (7.49 million ha) is under oil seeds, India is still facing a severe shortage of edible oils because the average productivity and yield in India is about 697.9 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> as against 917 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> yield of world” (Ikisan, 2018).

“In India oilseeds are the second largest agricultural commodity after cereals, occupying about 13.5 % of the gross cropped area in the country and according for 5 % of GNP and 10 % value of all agricultural products” (Rai *et al.*, 2002).

Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) crops are the major *rabi* oil seeds in India and stand next to groundnut in the oilseed economy. Rapeseed and mustard oil the most important edible oil of northern and eastern parts of India.

Rapeseed and mustard crop belongs to Cruciferae family which is preferentially need sulphur (S) for their growth and development. Sulphur is called as the fourth major essential element for plant. Sulphur plays a multiple role for better productivity as well as quality of

oilseeds (**Biswas *et al.*, 1995**). “Each unit of fertilizer S generates 3-5 units of edible oil. It is the major constituent of important amino acids like cystine, cysteine and methionine and helps in the formation of chlorophyll. Sulphur application also has marked effect on soil properties and is used as soil amendment such as gypsum and pyrite to improve the availability of other nutrients in soil. Between the two common sources of S, gypsum is available in India and is a cheaper source of S which may be used for oilseed crops” (**Rathore *et al.*, 2015**).

The lack of potassium is responsible for low yields and poor crop quality because, apart from other major physiological and biochemical requirements in growth, K is a key nutrient element in the biosynthesis of oil in oilseeds and protein.

Biofertilizers are known to play a vital role in soil fertility and crop productivity and considered as eco-friendly which can reduce the cost of chemical fertilizers to substantial amount. They supplement chemical fertilizers towards meeting the integrated nutrient demand of the crops. “Phosphate solubilizing bacteria (PSB) promote seed germination and initial vigour of the plants by producing growth promoting substances. Application of PSB results in increased mineral and water uptake, root development, vegetative growth and nitrogen (N) fixation” (**Gangwal *et al.*, 2011**)

## **Material and Methods**

### **Experimental Site**

The experiment was conducted during *rabi* season of 2019-20 and 2020-21 at student’s Instructional farm, C.S.A. University of Agriculture and Technology, Kanpur Nagar (U.P.). The field was well leveled and irrigated by tube well. The farm is situated at main campus of the university, in the west northern part of Kanpur city under sub-tropical zone in v<sup>th</sup> agroclimatic zone (central plain zone).

### **Edaphic Condition**

The soil was moist, well drained with uniform plane topography. The soil of the experimental field was alluvial in origin, sandy loam in texture and slightly alkaline in reaction having pH 7.8 and 7.7 (1:2.5 soil: water suspension method given by **Jackson, 1973**), electrical conductivity 0.35 and 0.34 dSm<sup>-1</sup> (1:2.5 soil: water suspension method given by **Jackson, 1973**), Organic carbon percentage in soil is 0.38 and 0.37 per cent (Walkley and Black’s rapid titration method given by **Walkley and Black, 1934**), with available nitrogen 167.4 and 168.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Alkaline permanganate method given by **Subbiah and Asija, 1956**), available phosphorus as sodium bicarbonate-extractable P was 16.8 and 17.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, Olsen’s

calorimetrically method (Olsen *et al.*, 1954), available potassium was 155.7 and 156.7 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Flame photometer method given by Hanwey and Heidel (1952) and available sulphur was 9.1 and 9.2 mg ka<sup>-1</sup>, Turbidimetric method given by Chesnin and Yien (1951) during before sowing of the crop first and second year, respectively.

### Detail of treatments and design

The experiment comprising nine treatment laid out in a randomized block design (RBD) with three replications. The treatment details are as under:

**Table -1: detail of the treatment combinations:**

Symbol (s)	Treatments
T <sub>1</sub>	Control
T <sub>2</sub>	K <sub>0</sub> + S <sub>20</sub> (RDF)
T <sub>3</sub>	K <sub>0</sub> + S <sub>40</sub> (RDF)
T <sub>4</sub>	K <sub>40</sub> + S <sub>0</sub>
T <sub>5</sub>	K <sub>40</sub> + S <sub>20</sub> + PSB
T <sub>6</sub>	K <sub>40</sub> + S <sub>40</sub>
T <sub>7</sub>	K <sub>60</sub> + S <sub>0</sub>
T <sub>8</sub>	K <sub>60</sub> + S <sub>20</sub> + PSB
T <sub>9</sub>	K <sub>60</sub> + S <sub>40</sub> + PSB

Where, K<sub>0</sub>: 0 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>, K<sub>20</sub>: 20 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup> and K<sub>60</sub>: 60 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>

S<sub>20</sub>: 20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>40</sub>: 20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>

PSB: Phosphate solubilizing bacteria

### Crop Husbandry

A pre-sowing irrigation (Paleva) was done in the experimental field with an object to get optimum moisture conditions for attaining good germination. At proper tilth, one ploughing with tractor drawn mould bold plough was done followed by two ploughings by cultivator. Nitrogen @ 100 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and phosphorous @ 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> applied uniformly through urea and DAP, respectively. Sulphur, potassium and PSB were apply through elemental sulphur and murate of potash as per treatment in the furrows, 5 cm below the seed at the time of sowing through single super phosphate. The sowing of mustard crop was done using a seed rate of 5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in shallow furrows opened by plough in the furrows spaced at 45 cm apart. Planking was done to cover the seeds with fine soil after sowing.

### Data Collection

### **Depth of root (cm)**

Roots of each plants were measured from ground level till the deepest root tip in cm with the help of meter scale. The total of two plant roots of each plant were taken and value so obtained was recorded as depth in cm.

### **Number of roots plant<sup>-1</sup>**

After measuring the root depth, each plant roots were cleared with the help of fine hair brush. The number of each plant roots were counted and mean of 2 plant roots in each plot was recorded as the number of roots plant<sup>-1</sup>.

### **Dry weight of roots plant<sup>-1</sup> (g)**

After counting the number of roots for each and crop, those were kept separately in Bamboo paper bags which were sun dried for few days and then transferred to oven at 50<sup>0</sup>C ± 1 for 2 hours. Then their weight was taken on electronic balance. The mean of 2 plants was computed in each case and recorded as dry weight of root plant (g<sup>-1</sup>)

### **Oil content**

The oil content of oven dried seeds was estimated by extracting oil using petroleum ether (60-80<sup>0</sup>C) as solvent and Soxhlet apparatus as given by Sadasivum and Manickam (1992). The oil yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was calculated by using following formulae:

$$\text{Oil yield (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)} = \text{Seed oil content (\%)} \times \text{Seed yield (kg ha}^{-1}\text{)}$$

**Statistical analysis:** The growth parameters and yields were recorded and analyzed as per Gomez and Gomez (1984) the tested at 5% level of significance to interpret the significant differences.

### **Result and discussion**

#### **Growth parameters**

It is visualized from the data given in Table-2 clearly indicate that among the growth parameters viz. plant height (cm) at harvest stage and number of leaves at harvest significantly increase due to the application of sulphur, potassium and PSB. Plant height at harvest stage varied from 107.75 to 135.28 cm and number of leaves at harvest stage varied from 6.65 to 8.45 during the first year of experimentation and plant height at harvest stage varied from 108.45 to 137.72 cm and number of leaves at harvest stage varied from 6.80 to 8.62 during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation. The maximum plant height (137.72 cm) and number of leaves (8.62) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>9</sub> [K<sub>60</sub> + S<sub>40</sub> + PSB] during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation. The minimum plant height (107.75 cm) and number of leaves (6.65) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> [Control] during the first year (2019-20) of experimentation. These results also confirms the findings of **Jamal *et al.* (2010)**, **Rajput *et al.* (2018)**, **Upadhyay *et al.* (2018)** and **Singh *et al.* (2018)**

**Table-2: Effect of different treatment combinations on growth parameters**

Treatments	Plant height at harvest		Number of leaves at harvest	
	2019-20	2020-21	2019-20	2020-21
T <sub>1</sub>	107.75	108.45	6.65	6.80
T <sub>2</sub>	109.30	115.78	7.06	7.25
T <sub>3</sub>	110.93	118.48	7.22	7.42
T <sub>4</sub>	114.26	121.41	7.45	7.60
T <sub>5</sub>	132.33	129.01	8.90	8.08
T <sub>6</sub>	114.35	116.67	7.26	7.30
T <sub>7</sub>	120.89	119.18	7.90	7.47
T <sub>8</sub>	128.09	128.68	8.21	8.06
T <sub>9</sub>	135.28	137.72	8.45	8.62
S.Ed±	3.46	4.06	0.44	0.21
C.D. at 5 %	7.35	8.61	0.95	0.46

**Root characteristics**

It is observed from the data given in Table-3 clearly indicate that among the root characteristics viz. root depth (cm), no. of roots plant<sup>-1</sup> and dry weight of roots (g) significantly increase due to the application of sulphur, potassium and PSB. Root depth varied from 56.43 to 70.83 cm, no. of roots plant<sup>-1</sup> varied from 11.61 to 16.15 and dry weight of roots varied from 22.15 to 28.30 g during the first year of experimentation and root depth varied from 57.15 to 72.49 cm, no. of roots plant<sup>-1</sup> varied from 11.75 to 14.92 and dry weight of roots varied from 22.35 to 28.37 g during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation. The maximum root depth (72.49 cm), no. of roots plant<sup>-1</sup> (14.92) and dry weight of roots (28.37 g) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>9</sub> [K<sub>60</sub> + S<sub>40</sub> + PSB] during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation. The minimum maximum root depth (56.43 cm), no. of roots plant<sup>-1</sup> (11.61) and dry weight of roots (22.15 g) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> [Control] during the first year (2019-20) of experimentation. These results also confirms the findings of **Ray *et al.* (2015)**, **Dhruw *et al.* (2017)** and **Masum *et al.* (2019)**

**Table-3: Effect of different treatment combinations on root characteristics**

Treatments	Root depth (cm)		No. of roots plant <sup>-1</sup>		Dry weight of roots (g)	
	2019-20	2020-21	2019-20	2020-21	2019-20	2020-21
T <sub>1</sub>	56.43	57.15	11.61	11.75	22.15	22.35
T <sub>2</sub>	61.54	60.98	13.15	12.53	23.05	23.84
T <sub>3</sub>	64.05	62.39	13.65	12.84	23.95	24.41
T <sub>4</sub>	66.71	63.93	14.15	13.15	24.83	25.01
T <sub>5</sub>	68.80	68.01	14.75	13.96	25.85	26.58
T <sub>6</sub>	62.65	61.37	13.25	12.63	23.25	24.04
T <sub>7</sub>	63.45	62.77	13.65	12.90	23.95	25.56

<b>T<sub>8</sub></b>	69.45	67.76	14.80	13.95	26.15	26.51
<b>T<sub>9</sub></b>	70.83	72.49	16.15	14.92	28.30	28.37
<b>S.Ed±</b>	1.35	1.62	0.69	0.47	1.48	0.81
<b>C.D. at 5 %</b>	2.88	3.44	1.48	1.00	3.15	1.71

## Quality parameters

### Oil content (%)

It is observed from the data given in Table-4 clearly indicate that among the quality parameters viz. oil content (%) and oil yield (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) significantly increase due to the application of sulphur, potassium and PSB. Oil content varied from 37.15 to 38.45 % and oil yield varied from 611.12 to 805.91 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> during the first year of experimentation and oil content varied from 37.35 to 38.65 % and oil yield varied from 640.55 to 841.80 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation. The maximum oil content (38.65 %) and oil yield (841.80 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>9</sub> [K<sub>60</sub> + S<sub>40</sub> + PSB] during the second year (2020-21) of experimentation. The minimum oil content (37.15 %) and oil yield (611.12 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) were recorded in the treatment T<sub>1</sub> [Control] during the first year (2019-20) of experimentation. These results also confirms the findings of Reddy *et al.* (2009), Singh *et al.* (2017), Sahoo *et al.* (2017) and Rathore *et al.* (2015)

**Table-4: Effect of different treatment combinations on quality parameters**

Treatments	Oil content (%)		Oil yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	
	2019-20	2020-21	2019-20	2020-21
<b>T<sub>1</sub></b>	37.15	37.35	611.12	640.55
<b>T<sub>2</sub></b>	37.41	37.61	641.58	688.26
<b>T<sub>3</sub></b>	37.75	37.95	673.84	711.56
<b>T<sub>4</sub></b>	37.95	38.15	702.08	732.48
<b>T<sub>5</sub></b>	38.12	38.32	734.19	781.73
<b>T<sub>6</sub></b>	37.80	38.00	652.48	701.10
<b>T<sub>7</sub></b>	37.93	38.13	578.95	718.75
<b>T<sub>8</sub></b>	38.15	38.35	742.02	780.42
<b>T<sub>9</sub></b>	38.45	38.65	805.91	841.80
<b>S.Ed±</b>	0.11	0.21	44.06	10.80
<b>C.D. at 5 %</b>	0.23	0.26	115.89	22.91

## Conclusion

The study showed that the application of sulphur and potassium along with PSB resulted in higher growth parameters, root characteristics and quality traits of mustard. It will help in uplifting the socioeconomic status of the farmers. Application of sulphur, potassium along with PSB deserves a special attention for increasing of production and quality of mustard.

## References

- Biswas, D. R., Ali, S. A., & Khera, M. S. (1995).** Response of Gobhi sarson (*Brassica napus* L., ISN-706) to nitrogen and sulphur. *JOURNAL-INDIAN SOCIETY OF SOIL SCIENCE*, 43, 220-222.
- Chesnin, L., & Yien, C. H. (1951).** Turbidimetric determination of available sulfates. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*, 15(C), 149-151.
- Dhruw, S. S., Swaroop, N., Swamy, A., & Upadhayay, Y. (2017).** Effects of different levels of NPK and sulphur on growth and yield attributes of Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) Cv. Varuna. *International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences*, 6(8), 1089-1098.
- Gangwal, T. V., Patel, M. V., & Jadav, N. J. (2011).** Effect of phosphorus, sulphur and phosphate solubilising bacteria on yield, nutrient uptake and soil fertility after harvest of mustard. *Indian Journal of Fertilisers*, 7(8), 32-40.
- Gomez, K. A., & Gomez, A. A. (1984).** *Statistical procedures for agricultural research*. John Wiley & sons.
- Hanway, J.J; and Heidel, H. (1952).** Soil analysis methods as used in Iowa State College, Soil Testing Laboratory. *Iowa Agriculture* 54: 1-31.
- Ikisan, (2018).** <http://www.ikisan.com/up-mustard-history>. Html. (accessed on 15 July, 2018)
- Jackson, M.L. (1973).** Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, New Delhi.
- Jamal, A., Moon, Y. S., & Zainul Abdin, M. (2010).** Sulphur-a general overview and interaction with nitrogen. *Australian Journal of Crop Science*, 4(7), 523-529.
- Masum, M. A., Miah, M. N. H., Islam, M. N., Hossain, M. S., Mandal, P., & Chowdhury, A. P. (2019).** Effect of boron fertilization on yield and yield attributes of mustard var. BARI Sarisha-14. *Journal of Bioscience and Agriculture Research*, 20(02), 1717-1723.
- Olsen, S.R, Cole, C.V., Watanable, F. S. and Dean, L. A. (1954).** Estimation of available phosphorous in soil by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. *USDA, Cric.* 930:19- 23
- Rai, M., Singh, H., and Hedge, D.M. (2002).** Oilseeds and Oils: Research and Development Needs. *Indian Society of Oilseeds Research, Hyderabad*.
- Rajput, R. K., Singh, S., Varma, J., Rajput, P., Singh, M., & Nath, S. (2018).** Effect of different levels of nitrogen and sulphur on growth and yield of Indian mustard (*Brassica*

*juncea* (L.) Czern and Coss.) in salt affected soil. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, 7(1), 1053-1055.

**Rathore, S. S., Shekhawat, K., Kandpal, B. K., Premi, O. P., Singh, S. P., & CHAND, G. (2015).** Annals of Plant and Soil Research 17 (1): 1-12 (2015) SULPHUR MANAGEMENT FOR INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY OF INDIAN MUSTARD: A REVIEW. *Annals of Plant and Soil Research*, 17(1), 1-12.

**Rathore, S.S., Shekhawat, K., Kandpal, B. K., Premi, O.P., Singh, S.P., Singh, G.C. And Singh, D. (2015)** Sulphur Management for Increased Productivity of Indian mustard: A Review. *Annals of Plant and Soil Research* 17 (1): 1-12 (2015)

**Ray, K., Sengupta, K., Pal, A. K., & Banerjee, H. (2015).** Effects of sulphur fertilization on yield, S uptake and quality of Indian mustard under varied irrigation regimes. *Plant, Soil and Environment*, 61(1), 6-10.

**Reddy, R.U., Reddy, S.N. and Reddy, M.S. (2009).** Yield, yield attributes and oil content of soybean as influenced by integrated nutrient management in soybean-maize cropping system. *International Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 5: 15-17.

**Sadasivam, S., & Manickam, A. (1992).** *Biochemical methods for agricultural sciences*. Wiley eastern limited.

**Sahoo, G.C., Biswas, P.K. and Santra, G.H. (2017)** Effect of Different Sources of Sulphur on Growth, Productivity and Oil Content of Brassica campestris var. toria in the Red Soil of Odisha. *IJAEB*: 10(6): 689-694

**Sinha, T., Mishra, A., Mishra, U. S., Sachan, R., & Singh, D., (2022).** Interaction Effect of Sulphur and Boron on Growth Characteristics, Yield Components and Productivity Parameters of Mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.) under Rainfed Condition of Chitrakoot Region. *International Journal of Plant & Soil Science*, 1329-1336.

**Singh, Amar and Meena N.L. (2004).** Effect of nitrogen and sulphur on growth, attributes and seed yield of mustard (*Brassica juncea*) in eastern plain of Rajasthan. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, 49: 186-188.

**Singh, M. K., Sirothia, P., Singh, J., & Upadhyya, P. K. (2018).** Effect of Sulphur Levels on Mustard Crops. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci*, 7(10), 481-490.

**Solanki, R. L., & Sharma, M. A. H. E. N. D. R. A. (2016).** Effect of phosphorus, sulphur and PSB on growth and yield of mustard in Southern Rajasthan. *Annals of Plant and Soil Research*, 18(1), 66-69.

**Subbiah, B.V. and Asija, C.L. (1956).** A rapid procedure for the estimation of available N in Soil. *Curr. Sci.* 25:259-260.

**Upadhyay, P. K., Singh, D. P., Singh, M. P., & Srivastava, A. (2018).** Effect of Phosphorus and Sulphur levels on plant growth and dry matter production of mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Int. J App. Biosci*, 6(6), 751-757.

**Walkley, A. and Black, C. S.A. (1934).** Old piper, S.S. soil and plant analysis. *Soil Sci.* 37:29- 38.

UNDER PEER REVIEW