

The periodic variation in iron availability in soils affected by saline water conditions

ABSTRACT

An incubation study was carried out at Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, College of Agriculture, AAU, Vaso for 60 days to find out the effect of Fe nanoparticles on periodical availability of iron in soil under saline water condition with different levels of Fe nanoparticle with two types of irrigation water in loamy sand soil. The treatments were repeated thrice adopting CRD factorial (2 factors) design. Irrigation water samples was drawn as per standard protocol and important chemical parameters were analyzed. The 100 g soils were treated in plastic beaker with seven levels of Fe nanoparticle (0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0 and 5.0 mg Fe/kg soil) and three level of FeSO_4 (2.5, 5.0 and 10.0 mg/kg) under saline water condition i.e (i) High saline water ($\text{EC} > 4\text{dSm}^{-1}$) and Low saline water ($\text{EC} < 1\text{dSm}^{-1}$). The four sampling was done at an interval of time i.e 10, 20, 40 and 60 days after treatment. Each set was completely withdrawn after 10, 20, 40 and 60 days and was analyzed for DTPA-Fe. The DTPA extractable Fe content after 10, 20, 40, 60 days of incubation in soil was significantly decreased due to high saline irrigation water ($\text{EC} > 4\text{dS m}^{-1}$) over low saline irrigation water ($\text{EC} < 1\text{dS m}^{-1}$). The significantly highest DTPA-Fe content (6.83, 7.58, 8.32 and 8.48 mg kg^{-1}) was recorded at 10, 20, 40 and 60, respectively days after incubation due to 10.0 mg kg^{-1} soil through FeSO_4 application, which was found at par with treatment 5.0 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through FeSO_4 or Fe nanoparticles. The DTPA-Fe availability adversely affected over the time under high saline irrigation water condition.

Keywords: Fe nanoparticles; FeSO_4 ; saline irrigation water condition

1. INTRODUCTION

The iron deficiency is widespread among many different crops. To alleviate Fe deficiency of plants, Fe application in conventional mixed fertilizers is still the most prevalent to improve crop yields; however, Fe applied with conventional fertilizers are often ineffective with a low nutrient-use efficiency [1][2]. Iron nanoparticles are being investigated as a substitution for Conventional and Chelated iron fertilizers. Several recent studies have reported that Fe nano fertilizer is more effective in supplying Fe to plants, compared to the commonly used Fe fertilizers/chemicals in agriculture production systems [3][2][4]. Soil salinization may be caused by natural processes (primary salinization) or human activities (secondary salinization). However, in cultivated lands, the most common origin of salts is the circulating water [5][6]. The mechanisms involved in Fe dynamics under saline conditions and the precise regulatory elements of these interactions are still poorly understood. Salinity decreases the solubility of trace elements, such as Fe [7], and recent studies suggest that salinity correlates negatively with Fe availability to plants [8][9]. Salinity has an additive effect on Fe deficiency in plants, and chlorosis, related to Fe deficiency, is enhanced [10][8]. It has been proposed that Fe limitation may develop from a downregulation of Fe transporters in response to salinity [11]. Iron availability in well-aerated soils is usually high. However, in these soils, Fe usually forms insoluble ferric compounds at neutral pH values, thus rendering it unavailable to plants. Several studies have reported that Fe nanoparticles are very effective to minimize leaching and volatilization and increase Fe availability to growing plants when compared to the commonly used traditional Fe fertilizers or chelated Fe fertilization [12][4]. The iron deficiency is widespread among many different crops. To alleviate Fe

deficiency of plants, Fe application in conventional mixed fertilizers is still the most prevalent to improve crop yields; however, Fe applied with conventional fertilizers are often ineffective with a low nutrient-use efficiency [13][2]. Iron nanoparticles are being investigated as a substitution for Conventional and Chelated iron fertilizers. Several recent studies have reported that Fe nano fertilizer is more effective in supplying Fe to plants, compared to the commonly used Fe fertilizers/chemicals in agriculture production systems [3][2][4]

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

2.1 Laboratory Study

An incubation study was carried out at Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, College of Agriculture, AAU, Vaso for 60 days to study the different levels of Fe nanoparticle and conventional FeSO_4 with two types of irrigation water i.e (i) High saline water ($\text{EC} > 4 \text{ dSm}^{-1}$) and Low saline water ($\text{EC} < 1 \text{ dSm}^{-1}$) in loamy sand soil of Vaso campus.

2.2 Methods of Analysis of Soil and Water Samples

Bulk soil samples were collected from the field at a depth of 0-15 cm before commencement of an incubation study and were analyzed for the various physical and chemical properties of the soil. The soil of experimental field was loamy sand in texture, having bulk density (1.53 Mg m^{-3}), Maximum Water Holding Capacity (40.0%), pH (8.21), EC (0.65 dS m^{-1}), low in organic carbon (0.42%) and DTPA - Fe (5.09 mg kg^{-1}) by following International Pipette method [14], Cylindrical core method [15], Brass Cup box [16], Potentiometry method [17], Conductometry method [17], Wet oxidation method [18], 0.005 M DTPA, pH 7.3, Atomic Absorption Spectrometry [19], respectively.

The high saline water was collected from College of Agriculture, Vaso campus bore well and low saline water from RO water from water purification system. Irrigation water samples was drawn as per standard protocol and important chemical properties like, pH, EC, Na^+ , K^+ , Ca^{++} , Mg^{++} , CO_3^{-2} , HCO_3^- , Cl^- , SO_4^{-2} , by following Potentiometric method [20] for pH, Conductivity method [20] for EC, Flame photometry [20] for Na^+ and K^+ , Versenate method [21] for Ca^{++} and Mg^{++} , Volumetric titration [20] for CO_3^{-2} and HCO_3^- , AgNO_3 precipitation method [20] for Cl^- , Turbidity method [22] for SO_4^{-2} , respectively. The values of high saline and low saline irrigation water were analyzed and recorded 7.6, 7.2 of pH, 4.96, 0.24 dS m^{-1} of EC, 35.5, 5.2 m.eq./L of Na^+ , 4.2, 0.1 m.eq./L of K^+ , 2.1, 0.6 m.eq./L of Ca^{++} , 7.8, 1.8 m.eq./L of Mg^{++} , 0.8, 0.0 m.eq./L of CO_3^{-2} , 9.2, 0.0 m.eq./L of HCO_3^- , 27.6, 2.5 m.eq./L of Cl^- and 2.4, 0.0 m.eq./L of SO_4^{-2} , respectively. The following water and soil quality indices were calculated by standard categorization purpose.

1) Sodium Adsorption Ratio

$$\text{SAR} = \frac{\text{Na}}{\sqrt{\frac{\text{Ca} + \text{Mg}}{2}}}$$

(Concentrations of all cations in me L⁻¹)

2) Residual Sodium Carbonate

$$\text{RSC} = (\text{CO}_3^- + \text{HCO}_3^-) - (\text{Ca}^{2+} + \text{Mg}^{2+})$$

(Concentrations of all cations in me L⁻¹)

2.3 Rating Used for Water Quality Appraisal

Sodium Adsorption Ratio [8]: The SAR is used to assess the suitability of water for agricultural irrigation and to evaluate the sodicity hazard of soils. It considers the concentrations of key cations (sodium, calcium, and magnesium) present in water. Here's how it works:

1. S1 (Low Na water): SAR values ranging from 0 to 10 fall into this category. Water with low sodium content is suitable for irrigation. Plants can thrive without adverse effects.
2. S2 (Medium Na water): SAR values between 10 and 18 indicate moderate sodium levels. While still manageable, it's essential to monitor soil health and consider amendments if needed.
3. S3 (High Na water): SAR values in the range of 18 to 26 signify high sodium content. Irrigation with such water may impact soil structure and permeability. Soil amendments become crucial to prevent long-term damage.
4. S4 (Very high Na water): When SAR exceeds 26, water becomes very saline. It can severely affect soil properties, leading to poor crop production. Mitigating measures are necessary.

Residual Sodium Carbonate [12]: The RSC index helps assess the alkalinity hazard associated with irrigation water or soil water. It considers the balance between bicarbonate (HCO_3^-) and carbonate (CO_3^{--}) anions relative to calcium (Ca^{++}) and magnesium (Mg^{++}) ions. Here's how the RSC value translates into practical classes:

1. Safe: When the RSC value is less than 1.25 me L-1, the water is considered safe. It poses minimal alkalinity risk for soil and is suitable for irrigation.
2. Marginal: An RSC value falling between 1.25 and 2.50 me L-1 indicates moderate sodium levels. While manageable, monitoring soil health and considering amendments is essential.
3. Unsafe: If the RSC value exceeds 2.50 me L-1, the water becomes very saline. It can severely affect soil properties, leading to poor crop production. Mitigating measures are necessary.

The values of high saline and low saline irrigation water of SAR were 15 and 3.4 and it was categorized in S2 (Medium Na water) and S1 (Low Na water), respectively. The values of high saline and low saline irrigation water of RSC values were 0.1 and -2.4 and was categorized in Safe class. The class of high saline irrigation water and low saline irrigation water was C_4S_2 and C_1S_1 as per the USSSL has prepared the diagram for use of water having different values of EC as well as SAR.

The 100 g soils were treated in plastic beaker with seven levels of Fe nanoparticle (0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0 and 5.0 mg Fe/kg soil) and three level of FeSO_4 (2.5, 5.0 and 10.0 mg/kg). The treatments were repeated thrice adopting CRD factorial (2 factors) design. The four sampling was done at an interval of time i.e 10, 20, 40 and 60 days after treatment. The soil moisture was maintained at field capacity (FC) i.e., 50% MWHC (Maximum water holding capacity) throughout the incubation period. Each set was completely withdrawn after 10, 20, 40 and 60 days and was analyzed for DTPA-Fe.

2.4 Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis was performed in the Department of Agricultural Statistics, BACA, AAU, Anand. The data were subjected to statistical analysis as per the methods suggested

by [23]. The value “F” was worked out and compared with value of “F” at 5% level of significance. The value of standard error (mean) (S.Em. \pm). Critical difference (C.D) and Coefficient of variation (C.V. %) were also calculated and appropriately used for the interpretation of data, which are presented in respective tables.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The results presented in Table 1 indicated the changes due to application of Fe sources on periodical availability of DTPA-Fe at 10, 20, 40 and 60 days after incubation in soil under saline water condition.

Table 1: Effect of Fe nanoparticles and ferrous sulphate on periodical availability of DTPA-Fe at 10, 20, 40 and 60 days after incubation in soil under saline water condition

Treatment details		DTPA-Fe (mg kg^{-1})			
		Days after Incubation			
		10	20	40	60
IW Level					
IW₁	High saline water ($\text{EC} > 4 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$)	5.73	6.41	6.97	7.25
IW₂	Low saline water ($\text{EC} < 1 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$)	5.95	6.95	7.42	7.56
S.Em.\pm		0.07	0.10	0.09	0.11
CD at 5%		0.20	0.28	0.26	0.31
Fe Level					
Fe₁	0.0 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through nanoparticles	5.08	5.28	5.38	5.44
Fe₂	0.2 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through nanoparticles	5.16	6.23	6.55	6.75
Fe₃	0.4 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through nanoparticles	5.40	6.44	6.80	6.94
Fe₄	0.6 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through nanoparticles	5.51	6.54	7.13	7.22
Fe₅	0.8 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through nanoparticles	5.61	6.66	7.30	7.39
Fe₆	1.0 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through nanoparticles	5.79	6.76	7.40	7.58
Fe₇	5.0 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through nanoparticles	6.50	7.18	7.76	8.19
Fe₈	2.5 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through FeSO_4	5.91	6.86	7.52	7.99
Fe₉	5.0 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through FeSO_4	6.59	7.30	7.82	8.11
Fe₁₀	10.0 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through FeSO_4	6.83	7.58	8.32	8.48
S.Em.\pm		0.16	0.22	0.20	0.24
CD at 5%		0.46	0.63	0.58	0.69
IW x Fe (Interaction)					
S.Em.\pm		0.22	0.31	0.28	0.33
CD at 5%		NS	NS	NS	NS
CV %		6.55	7.92	6.76	7.82

3.1 EFFECT OF SALINE IRRIGATION WATER

The DTPA-Fe content in soil was non-significantly affected by the application of saline irrigation water condition IW₁: High saline water ($\text{EC} > 4 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$). The significantly highest DTPA-Fe content (6.83, 7.58, 8.32 and 8.48 mg kg^{-1}) was recorded in IW₂: Low saline water ($\text{EC} < 1 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$) at 10, 20, 40 and 60, respectively. The extent of increase in DTPA-Fe content in soil under IW₂: Low saline water ($\text{EC} < 1 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$) was 3.8, 8.5, 6.5 and 4.2 per cent over IW₁: High saline water ($\text{EC} > 4 \text{ dS m}^{-1}$).

3.2 Effect of Fe Application

Various Fe applications in soil through Fe nanoparticles and ferrous sulphate (0.0, 0.2, 0.4, 0.6, 0.8, 1.0, 5.0 mg Fe kg^{-1} soil through Fe nanoparticles and 2.5, 5.0 and 10 mg through FeSO_4 kg^{-1} soil). Significantly higher DTPA-Fe content was recorded 6.83, 7.58, 8.32 and

8.48 mg kg⁻¹ in soil with application of Fe₁₀: 10.0 mg kg⁻¹ soil through FeSO₄ at 10, 20, 40 and 60, respectively. The treatment Fe₁₀: 10.0 mg kg⁻¹ soil through FeSO₄ application remained at par with treatments Fe₇: 5.0 mg Fe kg⁻¹ soil through nanoparticles and Fe₉: 5.0 mg Fe kg⁻¹ soil through FeSO₄. The maximum improvement in DTPA-Fe content in soil was 34.4, 43.5, 54.6 and 55.8 per cent observed under Fe₁₀: 10.0 mg kg⁻¹ soil through FeSO₄ application over Fe₁: 0.0 mg Fe kg⁻¹ soil through nanoparticles.

3.3 Interaction effect

Interactive effect among high and low saline water condition and various Fe applications in soil through Fe nanoparticles and ferrous sulphate on DTPA-Fe at 10, 20, 40 and 60 days after incubation in soil was found non-significant.

Overall, the changes due to application of Fe nanoparticles and ferrous sulphate on periodical availability of DTPA-Fe at 10, 20, 40 and 60 days after incubation in soil under saline water condition were found significant (Table 1 and Fig. 1).




Fig.1: The effect of Fe Nano particles on periodical availability of DTPA-Fe in soil under saline water condition

The Fig.1 showed that the soil DTPA-Fe content increased with the increasing in the level of Fe through nanoparticles and ferrous sulphate under low saline water (EC < 1dS m⁻¹) condition. The data pertaining to the DTPA-Fe in soil showed that the decreased DTPA-Fe content in soil in saline condition (High saline water: EC > 4dS m⁻¹). Therefore, result showed high salinity adversely affected DTPA Fe content in soil.

4. CONCLUSION

The DTPA extractable Fe content was adversely affected under high saline water condition at 10, 20, 40 and 60 days after incubation over the low saline water condition at 5.0 and 10.0 mg kg⁻¹ soil through FeSO₄ and 5.0 mg Fe kg⁻¹ soil through Fe nanoparticles.

Disclaimer (Artificial intelligence)

Option 1:

Author(s) hereby declare that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

Option 2:

Author(s) hereby declare that generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models, etc. have been used during the writing or editing of manuscripts. This explanation will include the name, version, model, and source of the generative AI technology and as well as all input prompts provided to the generative AI technology

Details of the AI usage are given below:

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

REFERENCES

1. Laurie, D. A., & Reymondie, S. (1991). High frequencies of fertilization and haploid seedling production in crosses between commercial hexaploid wheat varieties and maize. *Plant Breeding*, 106(3), 182-189.
2. Connorton, J. M., Balk, J., & Rodríguez-Celma, J. (2017). Iron homeostasis in plants—a brief overview. *Metallomics*, 9(7), 813-823.
3. Cheng, W., Xu, X. Y., Wu, F., and Li, J. J. (2016). Synthesis of cavity-containing iron oxide nanoparticles by hydrothermal treatment of colloidal dispersion. *Mater. Lett.* 164, 210–212. doi: 10.1016/j.matlet.2015.10.170
4. El-Desouky, H. S., K. R. Islam, B. Bergefurd, G. Gao, T. Harker, H. Abd-El-Dayem, F. Ismail, M. Mady, and R. M. Y. Zewail. (2021). Nano iron fertilization significantly increases tomato yield by increasing plants' vegetable growth and photosynthetic efficiency. *Journal of Plant Nutrition* 44 (11):1–15.
5. Aragüés, R., Medina, E. T., Martínez-Cob, A., & Faci, J. (2014). Effects of deficit irrigation strategies on soil salinization and sodification in a semiarid drip-irrigated peach orchard. *Agricultural Water Management*, 142, 1-9.
6. Wang, L., Xiong, Y., Wang, Z., & Qiao, Y. (2015). Towards good practices for very deep two-stream convnets. arXiv preprint arXiv:1507.02159.

7. Lesch, S. M., Wallender, W., & Tanji, K. (2012). Statistical models for the prediction of field-scale and spatial salinity patterns from soil conductivity survey data. *Agricultural salinity assessment and management*, 461-482.
8. Abbas, S. H., Ismail, I. M., Mostafa, T. M., & Sulaymon, A. H. (2014). Biosorption of heavy metals: a review. *J Chem Sci Technol*, 3(4), 74-102.
9. Purohit, M. R., Chandran, S., Shah, H., Diwan, V., Tamhankar, A. J., & Stålsby Lundborg, C. (2017). Antibiotic resistance in an Indian rural community: a 'One-Health' observational study on commensal coliform from humans, animals, and water. *International journal of environmental research and public health*, 14(4), 386.
10. Nenova, V. (2008). Growth and mineral concentrations of pea plants under different salinity levels and iron supply. *Gen. Appl. Plant Physiol*, 34(3), 189-202.
11. Cotsaftis, O., Plett, D., Johnson, A. A., Walia, H., Wilson, C., Ismail, A. M., ... & Baumann, U. (2011). Root-specific transcript profiling of contrasting rice genotypes in response to salinity stress. *Molecular Plant*, 4(1), 25-41.
12. Barzana, G., P. Garcia-Gomez, and M. Carvajal. (2022). Nanomaterials in plant systems: Smart advances related to water uptake and transport involving aquaporins. *Plant Nano Biology*, 1:100005.
13. Laurie, D. A., & Reymondie, S. (1991). High frequencies of fertilization and haploid seedling production in crosses between commercial hexaploid wheat varieties and maize. *Plant Breeding*, 106(3), 182-189.
14. Piper, C. S. (1966). Mechanical analysis of soil by International Robinson's Pipette method. *Soil and plant analysis*
15. Veihmeyer, F. J., & Hendrickson, A. H. (1949). Methods of measuring field capacity and permanent wilting percentage of soils. *Soil science*, 68(1), 75-94. Jackson, 1973
16. Chopra, S.L. and Kanwar, J.S. (1976). *Analytical Agricultural Chemistry*, Kalyani publications, New Delhi.
17. Jackson, M.L. (1973). *Soil Chemical Analysis*. Prentice Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.
18. Walkly, A.J. and Black, I.A. (1934). An examination of the Degtjareff method for determining soil organic matter and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration method. *Soil Sci.* 37: 29 – 38
19. Lindsay, W.L. and Norvell, W.A. (1978). Development of a DTPA soil test for zinc, iron, manganese and copper. *Soil Science Society of American Proc*, 42 (3): 421-428
20. Richards, L. A. (1954). *Diagnosis and Improvement of Saline and Alkali Soils*. Hand Book No. 60, Oxford and IBH publishing Company, Calcutta-16.
21. Chang, K. L. & Bray, R. H. (1951). Determination of calcium and magnesium in soil and plant material. *Soil Science*, 72, 449-458.
22. Chesnin, L. & Yien, C. H. (1950). Turbidimetric determination of available sulphates. *Soil Science Society of America* 15, 149-151.
23. Steel, R.G.D. & Torrie, J.H. (1960). *Principles and Procedures of Statistics* p. 90, (McGraw-Hill: New York)