



ISSN (E): 2277-7695  
ISSN (P): 2349-8242  
NAAS Rating: 5.23  
TPI 2022; SP-11(5): 1464-1469  
© 2022 TPI  
[www.thepharmajournal.com](http://www.thepharmajournal.com)  
Received: 05-02-2022  
Accepted: 13-04-2022

#### Rahul Kumar

M.Sc. Scholar, Soil Science and  
Agricultural Chemistry, Naini  
Agricultural institute, SHUATS,  
Prayagraj Uttar Pradesh, India

#### Amreen Hasan

Department of Soil Science and  
Agriculture Chemistry, Sam  
Higginbottom University of  
Agriculture, Technology and  
Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

#### Tarence Thomas

Department of Soil Science and  
Agriculture Chemistry, Sam  
Higginbottom University of  
Agriculture, Technology and  
Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

#### Arun Alfred David

Department of Soil Science and  
Agriculture Chemistry, Sam  
Higginbottom University of  
Agriculture, Technology and  
Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

#### Iska Srinath Reddy

Department of Soil Science and  
Agriculture Chemistry, Sam  
Higginbottom University of  
Agriculture, Technology and  
Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

#### Corresponding Author

##### Amreen Hasan

Department of Soil Science and  
Agriculture Chemistry, Sam  
Higginbottom University of  
Agriculture, Technology and  
Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar  
Pradesh, India

## Assessment of physico-chemical properties in soils of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district of Bihar, India

Rahul Kumar, Amreen Hasan, Tarence Thomas, Arun Alfred David and Iska Srinath Reddy

#### Abstract

The present study was carried out in the Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry lab at Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture Technology and Sciences. The sampling location was Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district of Bihar. The objective of the study was to analyse the Physico-chemical properties in soils of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district of Bihar, India. Depth wise soil samples were collected from nine different village of 3 blocks of selected spots at 0-15, 15-30 and 30-45 cm. The total no of 27 samples were collected from several farmer's fields, and composite sampling was carried out. The results revealed that the texture of the soils varied from sandy loam to sandy clay loam with majority of them falling under sandy loam textural class. The bulk density ranged from 1.02 to 1.42 (Av. 1.18) ( $\text{Mg m}^{-3}$ ), particle density from 2.30 to 2.66 (Av. 2.51) ( $\text{Mg m}^{-3}$ ), pore space from 42.74 to 58.87 (Av. 52.93) (%), water holding capacity from 40.70 to 70.50 (Av. 54.86) (%), specific gravity from 1.90 to 2.41 (Av. 2.22). The pH ranged from 7.23 to 9.21 (Av. 8.04), E.C. ranged from 0.32 to 1.45 (Av. 0.74) ( $\text{dS m}^{-1}$ ). The soil organic carbon ranged from 0.22 to 0.76 (Av. 0.43) (%). Available nitrogen ranged from 250.9 to 315.82 (Av. 283.86) ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), available phosphorous ranged from 29.32 to 50.23 (Av. 35.72) ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), available potassium ranged from 89.20 to 180.20 (Av. 128.94) ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}$ ), free calcium carbonate ranged from 20.21 to 36.82 (Av. 27.88) (%), available sulphur ranged from 13.28 to 38.23 (Av. 18.24) (ppm). The Soil has acceptable BD, PD, pore space, and water holding capacity. As a result of the beneficial electrical conductivity for plants, the pH of the soil is neutral to alkaline. Nitrogen, Phosphorus, Potassium, and Available Sulphur are low to medium in macronutrients. The results indicated that overall soils were in moderate conditions and farmers required maintaining soil health card, adopting suitable management practices and providing proper nutrition to the soil to overcome the pollution effect.

**Keywords:** Samastipur, Muzaffarpur, Soil Physico-chemical properties, depth, Nutrients, *etc.*

#### Introduction

Soil health is the state of the soil being in sound physical, chemical, and biological condition, having the capability to sustain the growth of plants (Idowu *et al.*, 2019). Optimal physical and chemical soil properties will lead to optimal soil biological properties and ideal soil health and productivity (Soil Health Nexus, 2021). Healthy soils constitute the foundation of thriving ecosystems and societies and are directly tied to food and nutritional security, water quality, human health, climate change mitigation/adaptation, and biodiversity (Manter *et al.*, 2017). Recent media headlines state that —Healthy soils lead to healthy food, suggesting that Soil health practices will—produce crops that contain more nutrients for humans to consume (Latzke, 2020). The soil health and quality has consistently evolved with an increase in the understanding of soil and soil quality attributes (Chaudhary *et al.*, 2012) [25]. In soil-based agriculture, soil health is the most important foundation of a healthy farm ecosystem. Yet most of the common farming techniques employed in industrial crop production, such as synthetic fertilizer application and mono-cropping, can degrade soil over time, causing a cascade of problems necessitating the use of even more man-made inputs which in turn contribute to climate change (Food print.org, 2021). Yield outcomes of Soil Health management are of importance to ensure that future global food demands are met (Van Ittersum *et al.*, 2013). Improvements in Soil health via good management can promote crop yields in systems where nutrients or water are limiting via increased nutrient cycling, nutrient availability, and/or water capture (Foley *et al.*, 2011). Management practices posited to improve Soil health (*i.e.*, no-till, residue retention, cover crops, rotation) can influence both abiotic and biotic yield components, with subsequent positive, negative, or neutral yield impacts (Miner *et al.*, 2020). Four principles have been promoted for maximizing Soil health: (a) minimize disturbance (no-

till), (b) maximize plant diversity, (c) maintain living roots throughout the year, and (d) maximize soil coverage (USDA-NRCS, 2019). The industrialization and development in agriculture are necessary to meet the basic requirement of people, at the same time it is necessary to preserve the environment (Bansal *et al.*, 2016). For the high crop yield the farmers used the pesticides and fertilizers in excess amount causes serious environmental problems and also consider their possible impact on soil health. Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium ratio is an important indicator in crop production that identifies balanced and unbalanced fertilization. Hence, balanced fertilizer application are important for high crop yield (John *et al.*, 2010). The food productivity and environmental quality is dependent on the Physico-chemical properties of soil, so it is very important to know the basic knowledge about the Physico-chemical properties of soil (Tale *et al.*, 2015).

## Materials and Method

### Experimental site:

Bihar is located on the Gangetic Plain, which is the world's most fertile alluvial plain. Longitude 83°-19'-50" 88°-17'-40" E, latitude 24°-20'-10" 27°-31'-15" N. The experimental sites include the cultivation field of two different districts of Bihar state i.e., Samastipur and Muzaffarpur Samastipur: - The district of Samastipur is located in North Bihar and is bordered on the north by the Bagmati river, which divides it from Darbhanga district, on the west by Vaishali and some parts of Muzaffarpur districts, on the south by the Ganges, and on the east by Begusarai and some parts of Khagaria districts. The district covers a region of 2624.82 square kilometres and is located between 25° 46' - 26° 05' N latitudes and 85° 10' - 86° 23' E longitudes. It is situated at mean sea level of 52.18 metres.

### Muzaffarpur:

Being an important district of Bihar, Muzaffarpur is situated at north of Ganga. It has a 3132 km<sup>2</sup> geographical range and located between 25° 04' - 26° 07' N latitude and 84° 53' - 85° 45' E longitude and is situated at 70 meters above mean sea level. Muzaffarpur district is surrounded by Sitamarhi, East Champaran, Vaishali, Saran and Darbhanga district.

Soil samples were collected from 9 different villages of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district. Soil samples were collected from each farmer's field after harvest or before sowing. Three different sites were taken in each farmer's field represented three profile depths viz., 0-15 cm, 15-30 cm and 30-45 cm, totally 27 samples were collected with 9 samples representing one farmer's field. At sampling site, soil samples were collected separately by a random selection from field with help of khurpi, spade, digging bar and meter scale. Samples were collected from centre of the fields in order to avoid the edge effect. Each soil sample is about 500 mg collected from the 0-15 cm layer (which represented the plough layer), 15-30 cm and 30-45 cm depth.

### Analysis of physico-chemical parameters

Soil textural analysis of particles less than 2 mm was performed by the hydrometer method (Bouyoucos, 1927) (4). The bulk density, particle density, pore space and water holding capacity was determined by the graduated 100 ml measuring cylinder method (Muthuvel *et al.*, 1992) (14). Specific gravity of soil was determined by the relative density bottle or pycnometer method as laid out by Black (1965) [18].

The pH was determined by 1:2.5 soil-water suspension method using digital pH meter (Jackson, 1958). EC was determined by 1:2 soil-water suspension method using digital EC meter (Wilcox, 1950). Organic carbon was determined by the wet oxidation method (Walkley and Black, 1947) [18]. Available N was determined by alkaline potassium permanganate method (Subbiah and Asija, 1956). Available P was determined by colorimetric method (Olsen *et al.*, 1954). Available K was determined by flame photometer method (Toth and Prince, 1949). Exchangeable calcium and magnesium was determined by neutral ammonium acetate extraction method or EDTA method (Cheng and Bray, 1951). Available S was determined by turbidimetric method (Bardsley and Lancaster, 1960).

### Statistical analysis

The data recorded during the course of investigation was subjected to statistical analysis by the method of analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique (Fisher, 1960). The type of ANOVA adopted for the experiment was two-factor analysis without replication. The implemented design of experiment in the analysis done was Completely Randomized Design (CRD). It is used when experimental units are homogenous as it involves only two basic principles of the design of experiment, viz., replication and randomization. CRD is used for laboratory purpose only. The significant and non-significant treatment effects were judged on the basis of  $F^*$  (variance ratio) test.

## Result and Discussion

### Variation in Physical properties of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district at different depth.

The texture of these soils varied from sandy loam to sandy clay loam with majority of them falling under sandy loam textural class. The sand, silt and clay contents ranged between 48.30 to 76.93 (Av. 65.43) per cent, 8.86 to 35.59 (Av. 17.79) per cent, 6.87 to 25.06 (Av. 16.78) per cent, respectively. The bulk density ranged from 1.02 to 1.42 (Av 1.18) (Mg m<sup>-3</sup>). The maximum value is 1.42 (Mg m<sup>-3</sup>) which is found in two depths of B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub> at (15-30) and (30-45 cm depth) and the minimum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (15-30 cm depth) 1.02 (Mg m<sup>-3</sup>). The particle density ranged from 2.30 to 2.66 (Av 2.51) (Mg m<sup>-3</sup>). The maximum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>2</sub> (15-30 cm depth) 2.66 (Mg m<sup>-3</sup>) and the minimum value found in B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>3</sub> (30-45 cm depth) 2.30 (Mg m<sup>-3</sup>). The pore space (%) ranged from 42.74 to 58.87 (Av 52.93) (%). The maximum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (15-30 cm depth) 58.87 (%) and the minimum value found in B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub> (15-30 cm depth) 42.74 (%). The water holding capacity (%) ranged from 40.7 to 70.5 (Av 60.47) (%). The maximum value found in B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>3</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 780.5 (%) and the minimum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 40.7 (%). The specific gravity ranged from 1.9 to 2.41 (Av 2.22) The maximum value found in B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>3</sub> (15-30 cm depth) 2.41 and the minimum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>3</sub> (30-45 cm depth) 1.9.

### Variation in Chemical properties of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district at different depth.

The pH ranged from 7.23 to 9.21 (Av 8.04). The maximum value found in B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>3</sub> (15-30 cm depth) 9.21 and the minimum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 7.23, thereby indicating the soils are moderately alkaline. The electrical conductivity ranged from 0.32 to 1.45 (Av 0.74) dS m<sup>-1</sup>. The maximum value found in B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub> (30-45 cm depth) 1.45 dS m<sup>-1</sup> and the minimum value found in B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 0.32 dS m<sup>-1</sup>. It

indicates that these soils vary in their reaction from moderately to strongly alkaline and most of them are strongly alkaline. The soil organic carbon (%) ranged from 0.22 to 0.76 (Av. 0.43) (%). The maximum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (30-45 cm depth) 0.76 (%) and the minimum value found in B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 0.22 (%). The available nitrogen (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) ranged from 250.9 to 315.82 (Av. 283.86) (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The maximum value found in B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (30-45 cm depth) 315.82 (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and the minimum value found in B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 250.90 (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The available phosphorous (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) ranged from 29.32 to 50.23 (Av. 35.72) (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The maximum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>3</sub> (30-45 cm depth) 50.23 (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and the minimum value found in B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 29.32 (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The available potassium (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) ranged from 89.2 to 180.2 (Av. 128.94) (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The maximum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 180.2 (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and the minimum value found in B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 89.20 (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The free calcium carbonate (%) ranged from 20.21 to 36.82 (Av. 27.88) (%). The maximum value found in B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>3</sub> (30-45 cm depth) 36.82 % and the minimum value found in B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>3</sub> (15-30 cm depth) 20.21 %. The available sulphur (ppm) ranged from 13.28 to 38.23 (Av. 18.24) (ppm). The maximum value found in B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub> (30-45 cm

depth) 38.23 (ppm) and the minimum value found in B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub> (0-15 cm depth) 13.28 (ppm).

### Conclusion

It is concluded from the trial that the soils of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district village are sandy loam with adequate BD, PD and pore space. It is neutral to alkaline as favourable electrical conductivity for plant growth, fertile with high organic content and low to medium of macronutrients viz. nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium. The deficiency of the nutrients can be mitigate by the use of organic and inorganic fertilizers.

### Acknowledgement

The author expresses his gratitude to the HOD Sir, Advisor, Co-advisor, Co-author, seniors, and juniors of the Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Naini Agricultural Institute, Sam Higginbottom University of Agriculture, Technology and Sciences, Prayagraj, Uttar Pradesh, India, as well as the NAI, SHUATS for providing the opportunity to pursue a Master's degree.

**Table 1:** Representing the Sampling site of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur District

Sl. No.	Block's name(B)	Name of the Villages(V)	Latitude(N <sup>0</sup> )	Longitude (E <sup>0</sup> )
1	PUSA (Samastipur) (B <sub>1</sub> )	V <sub>1</sub> - DRPCAU Pusa farm	25°60'50.09"	85°40' 28.31 "
		V <sub>2</sub> - Pusa Bazar	25°59' 42.47 "	85°39' 35.07 "
		V <sub>3</sub> - Birauli	25°56' 35.93 "	85°46' 30.59 "
2	TAJPUR (Samastipur) (B <sub>2</sub> )	V <sub>1</sub> - Baghoni	25°52' 46.05 "	85°40' 31.13 "
		V <sub>2</sub> -Pusa Road, Quari	25°59' 13.48 "	85°40' 23.30 "
		V <sub>3</sub> - Hasanpur	25°44' 47.86 "	86°12' 8.84 "
3	DHOLI (Muzaffarpur) (B <sub>3</sub> )	V <sub>1</sub> - Dholi bazar	25°59' 49.85 "	85°36' 19.37 "
		V <sub>2</sub> -Balua	26°11' 6.85 "	85°37' 51.82 "
		V <sub>3</sub> -Dholi college	25°59' 43.63 "	85°35' 39.57 "

**Table 2:** Method of Analysis Pusa and Tajpur block comes Samastipur district whereas Dholi block comes under Muzaffarpur district

Parameters	Methods	Scientist (years)
Texture	Bouyoucos Hydrometer	Bouyoucos (1927)
Particle Density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )	Graduated measuring cylinder	Muthuaval <i>et al.</i> , (1992)
Bulk Density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )		
Pore Space (%)		
Water retaining capacity (%)		
Specific gravity	Pycnometer relative density bottle	Black, (1965)
Soil pH	Digital pH meter	Jackson, (1958)
Electrical Conductivity	Digital EC meter	Wilcox, (1950)
Organic Carbon (%)	Wet oxidation method	Walkley and Black, (1947) <sup>[18]</sup>
Available Nitrogen (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Kjeldahl method	Subbaiah, (1956)
Available Phosphorous (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Calorimetric method	Olsen <i>et al.</i> , (1954)
Available Potassium (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Flame photometer method	Toth and Prince, (1949)
Free Calcium carbonate	0.5N Sulphuric Acid method	Puri, (1930)
Available Sulphur(ppm)	Turbidimetric method	Bardsley and Lancaster, (1960)

**Table. 3** Assessment of Soil texture of Soil from different depth 0-15, 15-30 and 30-45 cm of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district

Blocks	Villages	Depth(cm)	%Sand	%Silt	%Clay	Textural class
PUSA	B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	0-15	64.40	18.80	16.80	Sandy loam
		15-30	65.50	17.80	16.80	Sandy loam
		30-45	66.80	18.90	14.30	Sandy loam
	B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	0-15	68.90	16.60	14.50	Sandy loam
		15-30	70.10	15.50	14.40	Sandy loam
		30-45	71.50	14.20	14.30	Sandy loam
	B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	0-15	70.10	15.60	14.30	Sandy loam
		15-30	69.20	16.50	14.30	Sandy loam
		30-45	68.20	15.50	16.30	Sandy loam
TAJPUR	B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	0-15	66.60	17.80	15.60	Sandy loam

		15-30	66.40	18.20	15.60	Sandy loam
		30-45	65.60	18.80	15.60	Sandy loam
	B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	0-15	62.60	19.80	17.60	Sandy loam
		15-30	64.60	19.80	15.60	Sandy loam
		30-45	65.50	18.90	15.60	Sandy loam
	B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	0-15	52.40	34.80	12.80	Sandy clay loam
		15-30	54.60	32.50	12.90	Sandy clay loam
		30-45	53.50	31.90	14.60	Sandy clay loam
	DHOLI	B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	0-15	66.60	17.80	15.60
		15-30	65.40	16.90	17.70	Sandy loam
		30-45	66.90	16.60	16.50	Sandy loam
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>2</sub>		0-15	48.50	15.10	36.40	Loam
		15-30	49.60	14.80	35.60	Loam
		30-45	47.90	16.10	36.00	Loam
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>3</sub>		0-15	62.30	20.80	12.50	Sandy loam
		15-30	64.60	19.90	15.50	Sandy loam
		30-45	65.90	18.70	14.40	Sandy loam

**Table 5:** Assessment of Physical properties *i.e* Bulk density, Particle density and pore space at different depth 0-15, 15-30 and 30-45 cm of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district

Treatment/ Farmer's site	Bulk density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )			Particle density (Mg m <sup>-3</sup> )			Pore space (%)		
	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	30-45 cm	0-15 cm	15-30cm	30-45 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	30-45 cm
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	1.11	1.23	1.09	2.65	2.64	2.60	58.11	53.4	58.08
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	1.17	1.25	1.25	2.42	2.52	2.49	51.65	50.39	49.79
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	1.06	1.07	1.21	2.40	2.49	2.52	55.83	57.02	51.98
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	1.11	1.05	1.11	2.32	2.39	2.30	52.15	56.06	51.73
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	1.33	1.42	1.42	2.42	2.48	2.59	45.04	42.74	45.17
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	1.05	1.21	1.21	2.50	2.52	2.52	58.00	51.98	51.98
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	1.17	1.02	1.23	2.49	2.48	2.48	53.01	58.87	50.4
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	1.17	1.24	1.26	2.60	2.66	2.62	55.00	53.38	51.9
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	1.25	1.11	1.18	2.61	2.64	2.65	52.10	57.95	55.47
	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed. (+)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed. (+)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed. (+)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>
<b>Due to depth</b>	S	0.030551	0.002876	S	0.024853	1.37306	S	0.953299	0.001799
<b>Due to site</b>	NS	0.089241	0.200559	NS	0.097612	0.056611	NS	3.613887	0.339078

**Table 6:** Assessment of Physical properties *i.e* Water holding capacity and Specific gravity at different depth 0-15, 15- 30 and 30-45 cm of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district

Treatment/ Farmer's site	Water holding capacity (%)			Specific gravity		
	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	30-45 cm	0-15 cm	15-30cm	30-45 cm
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	60.44	60.10	59.92	2.30	2.10	2.80
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	59.88	59.81	59.12	2.10	2.10	2.19
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	70.50	68.11	67.91	2.27	2.25	2.25
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	57.32	57.01	56.87	2.08	2.07	2.09
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	57.43	57.43	56.23	2.38	2.40	2.50
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	55.20	49.34	47.88	2.50	2.40	2.38
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	40.70	40.44	40.05	2.19	2.20	2.19
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	55.23	53.23	52.11	2.10	2.20	2.10
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	48.43	46.23	44.32	2.05	1.98	1.90
	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed. (+)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed. (+)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>
<b>Due to depth</b>	S	2.056704	4.61E-09	S	0.039226	0.004101
<b>Due to site</b>	S	8.638643	0.008018	NS	0.163589	0.461242

**Table7**Assessment of Chemical properties *i.e* pH, EC and Organic Carbon gravity at different depth 0-15, 15- 30 and 30-45 cm of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district

Treatment/ Farmer's site	pH			EC(Ds m <sup>-1</sup> )			Organic carbon (%)		
	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	30-45 cm	0-15 cm	15-30cm	30-45 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	30-45 cm
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	8.81	8.32	7.92	0.58	0.59	0.6	0.22	0.23	0.24
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	7.42	7.59	7.63	0.61	0.64	0.65	0.32	0.32	0.33
B <sub>1</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	9.00	9.21	9.18	0.8	0.84	0.96	0.25	0.29	0.31
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	7.72	7.52	7.66	0.92	0.98	1.2	0.4	0.42	0.49
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	7.82	7.93	7.64	0.32	0.4	0.42	0.6	0.62	0.69
B <sub>2</sub> V <sub>3</sub>	7.63	7.54	7.62	0.52	0.55	0.62	0.4	0.42	0.48
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>1</sub>	7.23	7.32	8.22	0.7	0.72	0.77	0.61	0.62	0.76
B <sub>3</sub> V <sub>2</sub>	8.01	8.23	8.38	1.1	1.23	1.45	0.42	0.46	0.48



<b>B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>3</sub></b>	8.42	8.59	8.69	0.7	0.69	0.68	0.48	0.47	0.49
	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed.(±)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed.(±)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed.(±)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>
Due to depth	S	0.051452	1.43E-05	S	0.061967	5.22E-10	S	0.03283	0.146884
Due to site	NS	0.554077	0.727608	S	0.266679	0.003151	S	0.146884	0.146884

**Table 8 :** Assessment of Chemical properties *i.e* Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Potassium at different depth 0-15, 15- 30 and 30-45 cm of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district

Treatment/ Farmer's site	Nitrogen(Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Phosphorus(Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )			Potassium(Kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )		
	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	30-45 cm	0-15 cm	15-30cm	30-45 cm	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	30-45 cm
<b>B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub></b>	250.90	252.94	255.94	29.32	30.30	32.40	138.40	139.99	140.22
<b>B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>2</sub></b>	260.72	265.79	269.82	30.20	30.80	31.20	140.20	138.20	137.81
<b>B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>3</sub></b>	272.80	275.81	276.89	32.40	33.45	34.55	170.80	168.90	162.81
<b>B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>1</sub></b>	305.62	310.72	315.82	31.20	32.95	33.45	89.20	90.20	88.00
<b>B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub></b>	292.51	299.7	302.82	31.90	32.60	33.72	89.20	92.20	99.80
<b>B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>3</sub></b>	266.72	268.4	272.8	32.80	33.72	34.52	110.20	115.23	120.42
<b>B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub></b>	272.80	275.8	295	34.70	36.72	38.42	115.92	114.20	120.82
<b>B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>2</sub></b>	290.80	294.82	294.53	40.20	42.80	44.92	125.82	122.30	126.32
<b>B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>3</sub></b>	305.21	308.22	310.52	46.20	48.82	50.23	180.20	175.80	168.23
	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed. (±)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed.(±)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed.(±)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>
<b>Due to depth</b>	S	0.03283	0.146884	S	1.362052	2.24E-15	S	0.414735	7.8E-14
<b>Due to site</b>	S	0.146884	0.146884	S	6.633659	6.81E-07	S	29.50423	0.90894

**Table 9 :** Assessment of Chemical properties *i.e* Free calcium carbonate and available sulphur at different depth 0-15, 15- 30 and 30-45 cm of Samastipur and Muzaffarpur district

Treatment/ Farmer's site	Free calcium carbonate (%)			Available sulphur(ppm)		
	0-15 cm	15-30 cm	30-45 cm	0-15 cm	15-30cm	30-45 cm
<b>B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>1</sub></b>	29.82	28.76	25.62	8.52	8.69	9.00
<b>B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>2</sub></b>	30.21	32.82	33.82	8.2	8.92	9.10
<b>B<sub>1</sub>V<sub>3</sub></b>	34.89	35.83	36.82	9.00	9.23	9.44
<b>B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>1</sub></b>	25.61	25.82	26.23	7.76	7.99	8.02
<b>B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>2</sub></b>	28.92	29.8	30.23	6.92	7.12	7.29
<b>B<sub>2</sub>V<sub>3</sub></b>	23.42	23.91	24.28	8.23	9.23	10.29
<b>B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>1</sub></b>	21.23	20.21	22.81	10.23	10.71	10.98
<b>B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>2</sub></b>	21.24	22.82	23.92	6.42	6.49	7.11
<b>B<sub>3</sub>V<sub>3</sub></b>	30.25	31.22	32.33	8.00	8.23	8.55
	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed. (+)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>	<b>F-test</b>	<b>S.Ed. (+)</b>	<b>C.D.@ 0.05%</b>
<b>Due to depth</b>	S	0.582138	8.57E-10	S	0.361148	4.25E-10
<b>Due to site</b>	NS	4.829219	0.151666	S	1.195697	0.000243

## References

- Adiga S, Ananthanarayana R. Vertical distribution of sulphur in base unsaturated rice fallow profiles of Karnataka. Journal of the Indian society of Soil Science. 1996;44:652-656.
- Aggarwal V, Nayyar VK. Available soil sulphur status and sulphur nutrient of wheat crop. Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science. 1998;46(1):71-75.
- Ajwa HA, Tabatabai MA. Metal-induced sulfate adsorption by soils: I. Effect of pH and ionic strength. Soil science. 1995;159(1):32-42.
- Ajwa HA, Tabatabai MA. Metal-induced sulfate adsorption by soils: iii. application of langmuir equations I. Soil science. 1997;162(3):169-180.
- Anandnarayan R, Reddy MN, Muthyantha MS, Perur NG. Studies on available secondary nutrients in arid soils of Karnataka. Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science. 1986;34:614-616.
- Arora BR, Aulakh MS, Ghai VK, Rosha NS. Profile distribution of sulphur in major soil series of Punjab. Journal of Research, Punjab Agricultural University. 1989;26(2):206-213.
- Athokpam HS, Singh RKK, Singh LN, Singh NG, Nandini C, Singh AKK. Distribution of different forms of sulphur in rice growing soils of Nadia District of West Bengal. Indian Journal of Agricultural Research. 2007;41:205-209.
- Aulakh MS, Dev G. Profile distribution of sulphur in some soil series of Sangrur district, Punjab. Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science. 1976;24:308-313.
- Aulakh MS, Chhibba IM. Sulphur in soils and responses of crops to its application in Punjab. Fertilizer News. 1992;37:33-45.
- Balanagoudar SR, Satyanarayana T. Depth distribution of different forms of sulphur in Vertisols and Alfisols. Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science. 1990;38:634-640.
- Bandyopadhyay PK, Chattopadhyay GN. Different forms of sulphur in relation to soil properties in some Alfisols and Inceptisols of Birbhum district of West Bengal. Agropedology. 2002;12(1):82-85.
- Basumatari A, Das KN, Borkotoki B. Interrelationships of sulphur with soil properties and its availability index in some rapeseed-growing Inceptisols of Assam. Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science. 2010;58(4):394-402
- Basumatary A, Das KN. Forms of sulphur and their

- relationship with soil properties in some soils of North Bank Plain zone of Assam. *Agropedology*. 2012;22(1):43-49.
14. Bhan C, Tripathi BR. The forms and contents of sulphur in some soils of U.P. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*. 1973;21(4):199-202.
  15. Bhogal NS, Choudhary KC, Sakal R. Distribution of different forms of sulphur in calciorthants of North Bihar. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*. 1996;44(1):65-69.
  16. Bhojar KD, Raut MM, Girdekar SB, Ghorpade PW. Status of different forms of sulphur under intensively soybean growing soils of Savner tehsil, district Nagpur. *International journal of Chemical Studies*. 2019;7(3):43-47.
  17. Biswas BC, Sarkar MC, Tanwar SPS, Das S, Kalwe SP. Sulphur deficiency in soils and crop response to fertilizer sulphur in India. *Fertilizer News*. 2004;49(10):13-33.
  18. Black CA. *Methods of Soil Analysis Part 2*. Madison, WI: American Society of Agronomy, 1965.
  19. Bowden JW, Posner AM, Quirk JP. Adsorption and charging phenomena in variable charge soils. *Soils with variable charge*, 1980, 147-166.
  20. Bremner JM, Steele CG. Role of microorganisms in the atmospheric sulfur cycle. In *Advances in microbial ecology*. 1978, (pp. 155-201). Springer, Boston, MA
  21. Chaitra BK, Dhananjaya BC, Gurumurthy KT, Soumya TM, Ashok LB. Distribution of secondary nutrients under different land use in Hebburu micro watershed of Chikkamagaluru district, Karnataka. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2019;8(3):3034-3037.
  22. Chang ML, Thomas GW. A suggested mechanism for sulfate adsorption by soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 1963;27(3):281-283.
  23. Chao TT, Harward ME, Fang SC. Movement of S35 tagged sulfate through soil columns. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 1962;26(1):27-32.
  24. Chaudhari HD, Jat JR, Kumar S, Malav JK, Pavaya RP, Patel JK. Distribution of different forms of sulphur and their relationship with properties of soils of Banaskantha district under groundnut cultivation. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*. 2020;9(3):422-427.
  25. Chaudhary DR, Shukla LM. Sulphur status of arid soils of Western Rajasthan. *Annals of Agriculture Research*. 2002;23(3):371-376.
  26. Cheema HS, Arora CL. Sulphur status of soils, tube well water and plants in some area of Ludhiana under groundnut-wheat cropping system. *Fertilizers News*. 1984;12(3):28-31.
  27. Chesnin L, Yein CH. Turbidimetric determination of available sulphur. *Soil Science Society of America proceedings*. 1950;15:149-151.
  28. Choudhary P, Jhaharia A, Kumar R. Influence of sulphur and zinc fertilization on yield, yield components and quality traits of soybean (*Glycine max L.*). *The bioscan*. 2014;9(1):137-142.
  29. Das KN, Basumatary A, Borkotoki B. Interrelationship of forms of sulphur with its availability indices and soil properties in Entisols of Assam. *Journal of the Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2011;59(2):134-140.
  30. Deshmukh AH, Ravankar HN, Hadole SS, Sarap PA, Nagone AH. Status of available sulphur in soils of Western Vidarbha. *Annals of Plant Physiology*. 2004;18(1):37-41.
  31. Dharkanath K, Mhite AV, Patil MD. Sulphur status of some important soil series of Vertisols of Maharashtra state. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*. 1995;43(3):364-367.
  32. Dolui AK, Bandyopadhyay A. Distribution of sulphur and carbon nitrogen-sulphur relationship of some coniferous forest soil profiles of North Bengal. *Indian Agriculture*. 1983;27(2):169-175.
  33. Dolui AK, Nayak AK. Distribution of different forms of sulphur in some red and lateritic soils profiles of west Bengal. *Indian Agriculture*. 1981;25(3):185-189.
  34. Edwards PJ. Sulfur cycling, retention, and mobility in soils: a review, 1998.
  35. Ensinger LE, Freney JR. Diagnostic techniques for determining sulphur deficiencies in crops and soils. *Soil Science*. 1966;101:283-291.
  36. Ensinger LE. Some factors affecting the adsorption of sulfate by Alabama soils. *Soil Science Society of America Journal*. 1954;18(3):259-264.
  37. Evans CA, Rost CC. Total organic sulphur and humus sulphur of Minnesota soils. *Soil Science*. 1945;59:125-135.
  38. Freney JR, Barrow NJ, Spencer K. A review of certain aspects of sulphur as a soil constituent and plant nutrient. *Plant and soil*. 1962;17(3):295-308.
  39. Freney JR. *Sulphur Containing Organics in A.D. Mcharen and H.G. Peterson Eds., Soil Biochemistry*, Dekker, New York, 1967, pp. 229-259.
  40. Ghosh GK, Chattopadhyay GN, Chattopadhyay S. Availability and forms of sulphur in red and lateritic soils of Birbhum district of West Bengal. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*. 2005;75(6):464-466.
  41. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. *Statistical procedures for agricultural research*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. John Wiley and Sons, New York, U.S.A, 1984.
  42. Gowrisankar D, Shukla LM. Sulphur forms and their relationship with soil properties in Inceptisols of Delhi. *Journal of Indian Society of Soil Science*. 1999;47(3):437-442.
  43. Graham RP, Thomas AW. The Reactivity of Hydrous Alumina toward Acids. *Journal of the American Chemical Society*. 1947;69(4):816-821.
  44. Han KW, Yoshida T. Sulfur mineralization in rhizosphere of lowland rice. *Soil Sci. Plant Nutrition*. 1982;28:379-380.