

Original Research Article

The Impact of Diverse Land Uses on Soil Organic Matter s. Fractions: A Comprehensive Evaluation

ABSTRACT

Soil organic matter (SOM) is a crucial component of soil that influences various soil properties and functions, including nutrient cycling, soil structure, water holding capacity and microbial activity. Different land uses significantly impact the quantity and quality of soil organic matter fractions. The primary constituent of SOM is humic substances, also known as humus. These are stable compounds originating from the decomposition of organic matter derived from plants, animals, and microorganisms. The soil humic fraction is categorized into humic acid (HA), fulvic acid (FA) and humin (HN) based on the solubility in acid and alkaline medium. The structural arrangement, chemical constitution and stability of the humic substances in soil are affected by various factors, including climate, parent material, altitude, vegetation, and the ~~management~~ agricultural practices employed in the area. In this context the present study was proposed to assess the impact of various agricultural land use systems on humic acid, fulvic acid and humin soil fractions ~~soils~~ of different agro-ecological units (AEUs) of southern Kerala. The study focused on specific agro-ecological units (AEUs) in southern Kerala, including the southern coastal plain (AEU 1), Onattukara sandy plain (AEU 3), southern laterites (AEU 8), south central laterites (AEU 9), and southern and central foothills (AEU 12). Within each AEU, various agricultural land use categories such as, coconut, rice, uncultivated land and rubber were selected as specific focal points for this investigation. The HA, FA, and HN content in soil exhibited varying ranges across different AEUs, ranging from 0.57 to 2.06, 0.73 to 2.33, and 0.62 to 1.59% ~~per cent~~ respectively. Among the various land uses, rubber cultivation exhibited significantly higher levels of HA (1.72%), FA (2.01%) and HN (1.44%) compared to coconut, rice, and uncultivated land. Among the different organic matter fractions, FA (32.30-36.18 %) contributed more towards SOM than HA (29.40-32.51 %) and HN (26.43-29.25 %).

Keywords- Soil organic matter, humic acid, fulvic acid, humin, land uses, agro-ecological units

1- INTRODUCTION

Soil organic matter (SOM) encompasses a wide array of organic compounds with diverse chemical structures, and these proportions tend to change over time. It serves as a critical component within soil, exerting influence on numerous soil properties and functions such as nutrient cycling, soil structure, water retention and the activity of soil microorganisms (Olk *et al.*, 2019). The major component of SOM is humic substances or humus, which comprises stable compounds derived from the decayed organic matter of plant, animal and microbial origins. Humic substances represent the

Comment [S1]: Remove space

Comment [S2]: The techniques and method used should be stated. Also follow the author guidelines.

Comment [S3]: italic

38 most extensively decomposed and stable organic compounds, accounting for 40–60 percent of SOM
39 (Guimaraes *et al.*, 2013). These substances possess slow turnover rates and extended residence
40 times within soils, primarily because they aren't an efficient energy source for microbial population and
41 exhibit resistance to degradation due to their complex molecular structures (Muscolo *et al.*, 2013).
42 Humic substances play vital roles in enhancing soil structure, cation exchange capacity, buffering
43 capacity and water retention. Additionally, they have the capability to form complexes with heavy
44 metals, thereby mitigating soil toxicity. These substances, characterized by complex structures with
45 varying molecular orientations, are operationally classified based on their solubility in acidic and
46 alkaline aqueous media. Humic acids dissolve in alkali solutions, while fulvic acids are soluble in both
47 acidic and alkaline conditions and humin remains insoluble (Sun *et al.*, 2012).

Comment [S4]: italic

Comment [S5]: italic

Comment [S6]: italic

48 The humic substances present in any soil system is influenced by a multitude of factors, including
49 its input from various sources and the subsequent loss due to decomposition. Despite their inherent
50 resistance to biological degradation, changes in land use practices have the potential to alter the
51 chemical composition of humic substances (Reddy *et al.*, 2012). The structural formation, chemical
52 composition, and stability of these humic substances are influenced by numerous variables such as
53 climate, parent material, altitude, vegetation type, and soil management practices (Kotze *et al.*,
54 2016). Changes in agricultural management practices have the potential to modify the chemical
55 properties of soil humic substances (Moraes *et al.*, 2011). Studies have shown a gradual decline in
56 concentrations of humic substances within soils that underwent conversion from forested areas to
57 arable land for farming purposes. The observed decrease is often linked to the microbial oxidation of
58 organic materials, previously safeguarded within soil aggregates, which are subsequently disrupted
59 due to cultivation. Alterations in the C:N ratio following land use changes signify fluctuations in the
60 extent of SOM decomposition (Kunlanit *et al.*, 2019). In this context the present study was designed to
61 assess the impact of various agricultural land uses including coconut, rice, rubber and uncultivated
62 land on HA, FA and HN constituent of SOM across selected agro-ecological units of south Kerala.

Comment [S7]: italicize

Comment [S8]: italicized

Comment [S9]: italicized

Comment [S10]: full names

Comment [S11]: Any previous studies ?

63 2. METHODOLOGY

64 Agro-ecological units (AEUs) serve as broad spatial divisions that take into account variations
65 in climate, landforms, and soils. These delineations, introduced by the FAO, highlight similar agro-
66 climatic conditions to pinpoint regions that are agriculturally favorable, indicating their suitability for
67 specific crops or combinations of crops. This helps in identifying and optimizing areas with the
68 potential for particular agricultural activities. The study focused on selected AEUs in South Kerala,
69 including the southern coastal plain (AEU 1), Onattukara sandy plain (AEU 3), southern laterites (AEU
70 8), south central laterites (AEU 9), and southern and central foothills (AEU 12). Within each AEU,
71 various agricultural land use categories such as coconut, rice, rubber and uncultivated land were also
72 selected for the investigation.

Comment [S12]: The map of study areas would have been better for clear understanding. Also numbering of study area should be serial

73 A survey was conducted within these selected AEUs and land uses, identifying specific sites
74 for soil sampling. Surface soil samples (0–25 cm depth) were collected from a total of 60 locations
75 across the selected AEUs for the study. The soil samples were shade dried, powdered, sieved
76 through a 2 mm sieve and stored in a moisture free environment for further analysis. The soil samples
77 after processing were analyzed for electro-chemical properties such as soil pH, electrical conductivity

Comment [S13]: State clearly the method used for the soil collection for the purpose of representative samples. And depth of 25cm³ is not surface soil.

78 (EC), and cation exchange capacity (CEC) following the methodology described by Jackson (1973).
 79 Fulvic acid and humic acids were isolated by sequential extraction in alkaline and acidic solutions
 80 while humin was determined in the soil residue (after fulvic acid and humic acid extraction) by mineral
 81 fraction digestion using a 0.1M HCl/0.3M HF mixture (Tan, 1996). The generated data underwent
 82 statistical analysis utilizing the GRAPES software (Gopinath et al., 2020). The statistical methodology
 83 employed was a two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA).

Comment [S14]: Old ref

Comment [S15]: What ratio

Comment [S16]: Not correlate with reference

Comment [S17]: italized

84 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

85 3.1 Electro-chemical properties of soil

86 The pH of soil ranged between 4.77 and 5.73 in different AEUs under various agricultural land
 87 use systems (Table 1). The land use systems showed a significant impact on soil pH with the highest
 88 mean value of 5.63 recorded in uncultivated land and significantly lowest pH of 4.91 observed in rice
 89 which was on par with rubber (4.94). In all the AEUs, the highest pH was observed in uncultivated
 90 land and the lowest pH was observed in rubber (AEU 1 and 3) and rice (AEUs 8, 9 and 12) land
 91 uses.. This may be attributed to the impact of parent material, topographic position, leaching of basic
 92 cations due heavy rainfall, high organic matter content and management practices carried out in the
 93 locality (Zhang et al., 2019).

Comment [S18]: italized

94 The results of electrical conductivity (EC) of soil ranged between 0.06 to 0.44 dS m⁻¹ in
 95 different AEUs under various land use systems (Fig.2). The EC was found to be less than 1 dS m⁻¹
 96 in all the AEUs. It is considered as normal range with no salinity hazards. This can be attributed to the
 97 leaching of soluble salts from soil due to high rainfall (Krishna murthy, 2023).

98 Cation exchange capacity (CEC) of soils of different AEUs under various agricultural land use
 99 systems is shown in figure 6. The CEC of soil varied between 2.60 to 6.69 c mol(p+)kg⁻¹. Among the
 100 different AEUs, the highest CEC of 4.68 c mol(p+)kg⁻¹ was recorded in AEU 12 which was found to be
 101 significantly different from other AEUs and the lowest was observed in AEU 1 (3.79 c mol(p+)kg⁻¹).
 102 Land uses also exerts significant impact on CEC of soil. Among the land uses rubber registered
 103 greater CEC of 6.09 c mol(p+)kg⁻¹ and uncultivated land showed lower CEC (2.89 c mol(p+)kg⁻¹). This
 104 might be attributed to the difference in organic matter addition to the soil from different land uses
 105 (Papini, 2011). This evident from the positive correlation of CEC (r=0.92*) with SOM.

106

107

108

109 **Table 1. Effect of agricultural land uses on pH of soil**


AEUs(A)	LAND USE (L)				Mean
	Coconut	Rice	Rubber	Uncultivated land	
AEU 1	5.30	4.96	4.95	5.47	5.17 ^{ab}

AEU 3	5.44	5.01	4.90	5.60	5.24 ^a
AEU 8	5.36	4.87	5.06	5.73	5.26 ^a
AEU 9	5.25	4.77	4.83	5.59	5.11 ^b
AEU 12	5.47	4.93	4.96	5.73	5.27 ^a
Mean	5.37 ^b	4.91 ^c	4.94 ^c	5.63 ^a	
	A	L	A x L		
S.E(m)	0.041	0.037	0.082		
CD (0.05)	0.117	0.105	NS		

Comment [S19]:

110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124

*Values represented by same lower case superscript letters are not significantly different
*NS- Non significant




Comment [S20]: Remove the cell range to make the chat presentable and clearer

125
126

Fig. 1 Effect of agricultural land uses on electrical conductivity of soil

127 *Values represented by same lower case superscript letters are not significantly different
 128
 129
 130
 131
 132
 133



Comment [S21]: Remove the cell range and background line

134
 135 **Fig. 2 Effect of agricultural land uses on cation exchange capacity of soil**

Comment [S22]: Choose a format either table or figure

136 *Values represented by same lower case superscript letters are not significantly different
 137

138 **3.2 Soil organic matter fractions**

139 The results shown in table 2 revealed that the soil organic matter (SOM) in ~~soil~~ in studied areas
 140 varied between 2.67 and 5.47 per cent in different AEUs under various agricultural land use systems.
 141 The highest value was obtained for rubber land use (5.47 %) and lowest for uncultivated land (2.60
 142 %). Among the AEUs the highest value was recorded for AEU 12 (4.35 %) followed by AEU 9 (4.23
 143 %), AEU 8 (4.22 %), AEU 8 (3.85 %) and AEU 1 (3.60 %). The differences observed in land uses and
 144 AEUs can be attributed to the difference in microclimate, vegetation canopy, litter input (Guimares et
 145 al. 2013).

Comment [S23]: italicized

146 Humic acid content varied from 0.57 to 2.06 per cent, fulvic acid ranged between 0.73 and 2.33
 147 per cent and humin ranged from 0.62 to 1.59 per cent across different AEUs under various land uses
 148 (Fig. 3). Among the different AEUs higher concentration of fulvic acid and humin ~~was~~ were observed
 149 in AEU 12 ~~whereas while high concentration~~ of humic acid ~~was observed~~ in AEU 9. The higher
 150 concentration of fulvic acid compared to humic acid in all AEUs, regardless of land use, can be
 151 attributed to the regular incorporation of fresh organic residues. This is particularly noticeable in AEU
 152 12 and rubber land use, where there is an elevated fulvic acid content, indicating a greater input of
 153 fresh organic residues. The higher concentration of humic acid was obtained from AEU 9 might be
 154 due to the climate and moisture content prevailing in the area which have resulted in more favourable
 155 condition for humic acid formation. In all the AEUs, a higher concentration of organic matter fractions,

156 including fulvic acid, humic acid, and humin, was observed in soils from rubber plantations that
 157 received larger quantities of fresh biomass. This is primarily attributed to the high plant density and
 158 dense vegetation canopy in rubber plantations, contributing to the elevated levels of these organic
 159 matter fractions. The SOM content tends to be higher in tree-based land use systems which in turn
 160 contributes to the increased concentration of SOM fractions (Reddy et al. 2012). This is confirmed
 161 from the positive correlation obtained between SOM and its fractions such as humic acid ($r = 0.97^{***}$),
 162 fulvic acid ($r = 0.97^{***}$) and humin (0.96^{***}).

Comment [S24]: spacr

Comment [S25]: italicize

164 **Table 2. Effect of agricultural land uses on humic acid (%) in soil**

AEUs (A)	LAND USE (L)				Mean
	Coconut	Rice	Rubber	Uncultivated land	
AEU 1	1.30 ^g	1.02 ^j	1.39 ^{ef}	0.57 ^k	1.07 ^d
AEU 3	1.40 ^{ef}	1.03 ^j	1.47 ^{de}	0.87 ^j	1.19 ^c
AEU 8	1.49 ^d	1.20 ^h	1.87 ^b	0.83 ^j	1.34 ^b
AEU 9	1.67 ^c	1.16 ^h	1.81 ^b	0.90 ^j	1.38 ^a
AEU 12	1.32 ^{fg}	1.15 ^h	2.06 ^a	0.83 ^j	1.34 ^b
Mean	1.44 ^b	1.11 ^c	1.72 ^a	0.80 ^d	
	A	L	A x L		
S.E(m)	0.014	0.013	0.029		
CD (0.05)	0.041	0.037	0.083		

Comment [S26]: proper table


165

166

167

168 *Values represented by same lower case superscript letters are not significantly different

Comment [S27]: Remove cell range and background line



169

170 **Fig. 3** Effect of agricultural land uses on fulvic acid in soil

171 *Values represented by same lower case superscript letters are not significantly different

172

173

174

175 **Table 3.** Effect of agricultural land uses on humin (%) in soil

AEUs (A)	LAND USE (L)				Mean
	Coconut	Rice	Rubber	Uncultivated land	
AEU 1	1.17 ^{cde}	1.01 ^{fg}	1.43 ^b	0.62 ^j	1.06 ^{bc}
AEU 3	1.21 ^{cd}	0.99 ^d	1.25 ^c	0.70 ^{hij}	1.04 ^c
AEU 8	1.20 ^{cd}	1.10 ^{ef}	1.44 ^b	0.68 ^{ij}	1.11 ^{ab}
AEU 9	1.15 ^{de}	1.09 ^{efg}	1.48 ^b	0.78 ^h	1.12 ^a
AEU 12	1.15 ^{de}	1.07 ^{efg}	1.59 ^a	0.75 ^{hi}	1.14 ^a
Mean	1.18 ^b	1.06 ^c	1.44 ^a	0.71 ^d	
	A	L	A x L		
S.E(m)	0.017	0.016	0.035		
CD (0.05)	0.050	0.044	0.099		

176

Comment [S28]: Standardized the table

177

178


179 *Values represented by same lower case superscript letters are not significantly different

180

181 Percentage contribution of humic acid, fulvic acid and humin to total organic matter ranged
182 from 29.40 to 32.51, 32.30 to 36.42 and 26 to 29.25 per cent respectively (Fig.4). Among the OM
183 fractions fulvic acid contributed more towards total SOM content than humic acid and humin
184 irrespective of AEU's and land uses. Fulvic acids are typically more soluble and have a lower
185 molecular weight compared to humic acid and humin, making them more mobile and, as a result,
186 making them more prevalent in soil solutions. In terms of proportion of different OM fractions to SOM
187 in different land uses, higher proportion of humic acid to SOM was higher in coconut land use while
188 fulvic acid to SOM was higher in rubber land use and humin to SOM was higher in rice land use.
189 Higher proportion of fulvic acid to SOM in rubber land use might be attributed to the fresh biomass
190 addition compared to other land uses. The higher percent contribution of humic acid to SOM in
191 coconut land use could be due to the relatively slower decomposition compared to rice land use. The
192 humin proportion in rice land use is higher than other land use indicating the occurrence of more
193 decomposition process in rice soils. The results are in conformity with the findings of Seddaiu *et al.*
194 (2013).

Comment [S29]: Write in full

Comment [S30]: italicized



195


196 **Fig. 4 Contribution of humic acid, fulvic acid and humin to SOM**

197 The ratio of humic acid to fulvic acid reflects the mobility of organic carbon in soil.
198 The humic acid to fulvic acid ratio ranged between 0.85 to 0.93 across various AEU's under
199 different land uses which indicates the presence of higher fulvic content compared to humic
200 acid and it also indicates a lower decomposition rate of organic matter or frequent addition of
201 organic manure to the soil (Gladis *et al.*, 2020). Humic acid to fulvic acid ratio less than 1
202 indicate the good quality of SOM and greater than 1 indicate the loss of labile C fractions of
203 SOM. Dutta *et al.* (2021) proposed that differences in the ratio of humic acid to fulvic acid in

Comment [S31]: italicized

204 various soils serve as indicators of varying levels of humification influenced by vegetation
205 and agro-ecology.


Comment [S32]: Use a uniform style and font



206
207 **Fig. 5 SOM and HA:FA ratio as influenced by different agricultural land uses**

208
209
210

UNDER PEER REVIEW



211

212 **Fig.6** Correlogram showing Pearson's correlation between various soil properties and SOM
 213 fractions.

Comment [S33]: Large space

214 *Green and pink represents positive and negative correlations respectively. The size of the circle
 215 indicate the strength of correlation (r) (p=0.05)

216 **4. CONCLUSION**

217 ~~In all the~~ Land use systems observed shows that the fulvic acid fraction demonstrated a
 218 higher prominence compared to both the humic acid and humin fractions. This led to an HA/FA ratio
 219 below 1 across most land uses. The prevalence of a higher proportion of fulvic acids in comparison to
 220 humic acids suggested either a slow decomposition rate of SOM or frequent influxes of fresh organic
 221 residues to the soil. Land uses exerted a tenacious impact on both quantity and quality of SOM.
 222 Among the land uses higher organic matter accumulation was observed in rubber land use followed
 223 by coconut and rice and the lowest was registered from uncultivated land. With respect to different
 224 AEU, AEU 12 exhibited a favourable condition for accumulation of organic matter in soil.

225

226

227 **References**

228 1. Dutta, D., Reza, S.K. and Choudhury, S.G., 2021. Variability of soil properties under different
 229 land uses in sub-humid tropical region of West Bengal, India. *Journal of the Indian Society of*
 230 *Soil Science*, 69(3): pp.225-232.

- 231 2. Gladis, R., Dhanya, K.R., Joseph, B., Aparna, B. and Rehana, M.R., 2020. Soil Carbon Stock
232 and Pools in Acid Sulphate Soils of Kerala. *Current Journal of Applied Science and*
233 *Technology*, 39(21), pp.135-147.
- 234 3. Gopinath, P.P., Parsad, R., Joseph, B. and Adarsh, V.S., GRAPES: General R shiny Based
235 Analysis Platform Empowered by Statistics; 2020.
- 236 4. Guimaraes, D.V., Gonzaga, M.I.S., da Silva, T.O., da Silva, T.L., da Silva Dias, N. and
237 Matias, M.I.S., 2013. Soil organic matter pools and carbon fractions in soil under different land
238 uses. *Soil and Tillage Research*, 126, pp.177-182.
- 239 5. Jackson, M.L., 1973. Soil chemical analysis, pentice hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi,
240 India, 498, pp.151-154.
- 241 6. Kotze, E., Loke, P.F., Akhosi-Setaka, M.C. and Du Preez, C.C., 2016. Land use change
242 affecting soil humic substances in three semi-arid agro-ecosystems in South
243 Africa. *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment*, 216, pp.194-202.
- 244 7. Krishna murthy, R., 2023. Impact of Different Land-Use Systems on Soil Physico-chemical
245 Properties. *Mysore Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 57(1).
- 246 8. Kunlanit, B., Butnan, S. and Vityakon, P., 2019. Land-use changes influencing c
247 sequestration and quality in topsoil and subsoil. *Agronomy*, 9(9), p.520.
- 248 9. Moraes, G.M.D., Xavier, F.A.D.S., Mendonça, E.D.S., Araújo Filho, J.A.D. and Oliveira,
249 T.S.D., 2011. Chemical and structural characterization of soil humic substances under
250 agroforestry and conventional systems. *Revista Brasileira de Ciência do Solo*, 35, pp.1597-
251 1608.
- 252 10. Muscolo, A., Sidari, M. and Nardi, S., 2013. Humic substance: relationship between structure
253 and activity. Deeper information suggests univocal findings. *Journal of Geochemical*
254 *Exploration*, 129, pp.57-63.
- 255 11. Olk, D.C., Bloom, P.R., Perdue, E.M., McKnight, D.M., Chen, Y., Farenhorst, A., Senesi, N.,
256 Chin, Y.P., Schmitt-Kopplin, P., Hertkorn, N. and Harir, M., 2019. Environmental and
257 agricultural relevance of humic fractions extracted by alkali from soils and natural
258 waters. *Journal of Environmental Quality*, 48(2), pp.217-232.
- 259 12. Papini, F.J., 2011. Humus chemistry: Genesis, composition and reactions.
- 260 13. Reddy, S.B., Nagaraja, M.S., Raj, T.P., Dhumgond, P. and Vignesh, N.S., 2012. Soil humic
261 and fulvic acid fractions under different land use systems. *Madras Agricultural Journal*, 99(jul-
262 sep), p.1.
- 263 14. Seddaiu, G., Porcu, G., Ledda, L., Roggero, P.P., Agnelli, A. and Corti, G., 2013. Soil organic
264 matter content and composition as influenced by soil management in a semi-arid
265 Mediterranean agro-silvo-pastoral system. *Agriculture, ecosystems & environment*, 167, pp.1-
266 11.
- 267 15. Sun, C.Y., Liu, J.S., Wang, Y., Zheng, N., Wu, X.Q. and Liu, Q., 2012. Effect of long-term
268 cultivation on soil organic carbon fractions and metal distribution in humic and fulvic acid in
269 black soil, Northeast China. *Soil Research*, 50(7), pp.562-569.
- 270 16. Tan, K.H., 2005. *Soil sampling, preparation, and analysis*. CRC press.

Comment [S34]: 39(21):135-147.

Comment [S35]: As line 233

Comment [S36]: Not cited

Comment [S37]: Check the year

Comment [S38]: Publication and edition

271 17. Zhang, Y.Y., Wu, W. and Liu, H., 2019. Factors affecting variations of soil pH in different
272 horizons in hilly regions. *Plos one*, 14(6), p.e0218563.

273

UNDER PEER REVIEW