

Managing soil acidity through liming and organic nutrients for optimizing crop production in Sikkim

Shaon Kumar Das*¹, R. K. Avasthe¹, Aniruddha Roy², Ashish Yadav¹ and Matber Singh

¹ICAR-National Organic Farming Research Institute, Tadong, Gangtok, Sikkim-737102

² ICAR Research Complex for North-Eastern Hill Region, Umiam-793103, Meghalaya

Soil acidity may be defined as soil system's proton donating capacity (H^+ ions) during its transition from a given state to a reference state. Acid soil is base unsaturated soil which has got enough of adsorbed exchangeable H^+ ions to give a pH lower than 7.0. There are five major reasons for soils to become acidic: leaching due to heavy rainfall, acidic parent material, organic matter decay and release of organic acids, harvest of high-yielding crops and presence of alumina-silicate minerals.



Nutrient imbalance in acid soil

Iron, aluminium and manganese are usually present in higher concentrations under moderate to strong acid soils. Phosphorus reacts with these ions and produces insoluble P-complex and hence, rendering availability to plants. Al, Fe, Mn and Cu are abundant, but N, P, S, Mo and B are very limited and become less available in an acid soil having pH less than 5.5.

Objectives of acid soil management

Maintain appropriate soil pH in order to assure multi condition favorable to plants. Increase availability of plant essential nutrients. Increase activity of favorable microorganisms in soils.

Management practices

There are two approaches: (1) plants can be selected that grow well at the existing soil pH, or (2) the pH of the soil can be altered to suit the needs of the plants. The former practice is rather risky than latter. As most soil pH changes are directed towards reduced soil acidity and increased pH by liming and intensive cropping system without liming in humid regions increase soil acidity, judicious use of organic fertilizers and liming in combination is the best practice. Application of liming materials cause reduced exchangeable aluminium in soil solution, increased soil pH. Application of organic matter improves buffer capacity of soil and reduces Al toxicity. Fresh mulches (weed biomass) reduce the adverse effect of soil acidity substantially. Location specific crop diversification with acid tolerant crops should be followed. Cultivation of highly sensitive (towards soil acidity) crops like soybean, French bean, pigeon pea *etc.* should be tuned accurately to liming. Wood ash can also be used to increase soil pH.



Lime requirement

Lime requirement of an acid soil may be defined as amount of liming material that must be added to raise pH to some prescribed value. Although harvested crops remove copious lime-like elements each year, the soil pH does not change much from year to year, meaning the soil is buffered, or resistant to change. The greater the amount of moisture are, more rapid is the rate of reaction. Lime and liming materials react more rapidly at high than that at low temperature. The correct pH depends on the crop being produced. Grasses tend to tolerate acidic soils better than legumes.

Field crops	Preferred pH range	Field crops	Preferred pH range
Maize	5.0-6.5	Pea	5.5-7.0
Rice	4.0-6.5	Lentil, gram	5.5-7.0
Soybean	5.5-7.0	French bean	5.5-7.0
Millets	4.0-6.0	Cowpea	5.0-6.5
Potato	5.0-5.5	Oats	5.0-7.5

Lime requirement of an acid soil

The desirable soil pH range for most of the field crop is 6.0-7.0. SMP buffer method is used for determination of lime requirement of an acid soil. Lime requirement in terms of pure calcium carbonate can be observed from the following table:

pH of soil buffer suspension (field soil sample)	Lime required to bring soil to indicated pH (tonnes of CaCO ₃ per acre)		
	<i>pH 6.0</i>	<i>pH 6.4</i>	<i>pH 6.8</i>
6.7	1.0	1.2	1.4
6.6	1.4	1.7	1.9
6.5	1.8	2.2	2.5
6.4	2.3	2.7	3.1
6.3	2.7	3.2	3.7
6.2	3.1	3.7	4.2
6.1	3.5	4.2	4.8
6.0	3.9	4.7	5.4

Efficiency of liming materials

Efficiency of liming materials can be judged by calcium carbonate equivalent (CCE) or neutralizing value (NV), purity and degree of fineness of liming materials. The more pure the liming material, the higher will be its effectiveness for amelioration. If the liming materials are finer, the effectiveness will be higher (materials passing through 60 mesh sieve is called as 100 percent efficiency rating). Higher CCE/NV value indicates higher effectiveness of liming materials. CCE/NV values of some liming materials are:

Liming materials	CCE %
Calcium oxide/burned lime (CaO)	179

Calcium hydroxide/slaked lime [Ca(OH) ₂]	136
Dolomite [CaMg(CO ₃) ₂]	109
Calcite/limestone (CaCO ₃)	100
Basic slag (CaSiO ₃)	86

Response of maize to liming

Lime rates based on exchangeable aluminium have been found adequate for maize production and considerably less than those required to bring the soil pH to 6.5. Depending on soil characteristics maize responded well to dolomitic limestone, when lime doses were 1 to 2 equivalent of exchangeable aluminium (2 to 4 t limestone/ha) and pH raised to around 5.5. The application of limestone equivalent to 2 exchangeable aluminium (4 t limestone/ha) gave the optimum yield of wheat and maize in a sequence for two years and thereafter half the amount of limestone is needed for sustained crop production.



Furrow application of limestone

The limestone rates based on exchangeable aluminium cannot become popular in the hilly terrain of the state, because here inputs are carried manually to the distant fields. This problem can be overcome by furrow application (require less amount and very effective) of small doses of limestone every year to achieve optimum productivity than a relatively higher dose once in three to four years. Furrow application of lime (80 mesh size) @ 250-400 kg/ha every year to maize and soybean is economical than a relatively higher dose based on exchangeable Al.

Organic manure as an amendment

Farmers in Sikkim commonly use cattle manure for maize production. Benefit of organic fertilizers could be increased by continuous application of FYM to each crop on aluminium toxic soil. However, higher yield can be achieved by the application of 1 t/ha limestone or dolomite with 10 t FYM/ha by increasing base status and surface charge of soil where it is possible.

Effects of lime on soil properties

Concentration of hydrogen and hydroxyl ion, solubility of iron, aluminium and manganese will decline. The availability of phosphates and molybdates will increase. Toxicity effect of aluminium can be reduced. Reduced uptake of calcium and magnesium in soil solution can be alleviated. Nitrification is enhanced by liming to a pH of 5.5-6.5. Nitrogen fixation both symbiotic and non-symbiotic is favoured by adequate liming. Club root disease of cole crops can be reduced with liming. Liming decreases bulk density of soils, increases infiltration and percolation rate of water.



Crop responses to lime application

Most of the agricultural crops grow well in between pH range 6.0-7.0. On the basis of experiments carried out in different parts of India and differential responses of crops to liming, upland crops are grouped as- i) high response groups- pigeon pea, soybean; ii) medium response groups- maize, gram, lentil, peas, groundnut; iii) low/no response groups- , rice, millets, potato, buckwheat.



Effect of overliming

Deficiency of iron, copper, boron and zinc will occur. P and K availability will be reduced. Incidence of scab in root crops will be increased. Root development will be inhibited in association with tip swelling brought about by hydration.

References

1. Das SK, Avasthe RK, Gopi R. 2014. Vermiwash: use in organic agriculture for improved crop production. Popular Kheti 2: 45-46.
2. Roy A, Das S K, Tripathi AK and Singh NU. 2015. Biodiversity in North East India and their Conservation. Progressive Agriculture 15 (2): 182-189 (2015).
3. Barman H, Roy A, Das S K. 2015. Evaluation of plant products and antagonistic microbes against grey blight (*Pestalotiopsis theae*), a devastating pathogen of tea. African Journal of Microbiology Research 9 (18): 1263-1267.
4. Das SK. 2014. Scope and Relevance of using Pesticide Mixtures in Crop Protection: A Critical Review. International Journal of Environmental Science and Toxicology 2(5): 119-123.
5. Das SK, Mukherjee I and Kumar A. 2015. Effect of soil type and organic manure on adsorption-desorption of flubendiamide. Environmental monitoring and assessment 187 (7): 403.
6. Das SK. 2013. Mode of action of pesticides and the novel trends-a critical review. International Research Journal of Agricultural Science and Soil Science. 3(11): 393-403.
7. Das SK. 2014. Recent development and future of botanical pesticides in India. Popular Kheti 2 (2): 93-99.
8. Mate CJ, Mukherjee I and Das SK. 2014. Mobility of spiromesifen in packed soil columns under laboratory conditions. Environmental monitoring and assessment 186 (11): 7195-7202.
9. Das SK, Avasthe RK, Singh M and Sharma K. 2015. Biobeds: on-farm biopurification for environmental protection. Current Science 109 (9): 1521-1521.
10. Das SK and Avasthe RK. 2015. Carbon farming and credit for mitigating greenhouse gases Current Science 109 (7), 1223.

11. Mukherjee I, Das SK and Kumar A. 2012. A Fast Method for Determination of Flubendiamide in Vegetables by Liquid Chromatography. *Pesticide Research Journal* 24 (2): 159-162.
12. Das SK, Avasthe RK, Singh R and Babu S. 2014. Biochar as carbon negative in carbon credit under changing climate. *Current Science* 107 (7): 1090-1091.
13. Das SK and Mukherjee I. 2011. Effect of light and pH on persistence of flubendiamide. *Bull Environ Contam Toxicol*, 87: 292–296.
14. Das SK and Mukherjee I. 2012. Effect of moisture and organic manure on persistence of flubendiamide in soil. *Bulletin of Environmental Contamination Toxicology* 88: 515–520.
15. Das SK, Mukherjee I and Das SK. 2012. Dissipation of flubendiamide in/on Okra [*Abelmoschus esculenta* (L.) Moench] Fruits. *Bulletin of Environmental Contamination Toxicology* 88: 381–384.
16. Das SK and Mukherjee I. 2012. Flubendiamide transport through packed soil columns. *Bulletin of Environmental Contamination Toxicology* 88: 229–233.
17. Das SK and Mukherjee I. 2014. Influence of microbial community on degradation of flubendiamide in two Indian soils. *Environmental Monitoring & Assessment*, 186: 3213–3219.
18. Das SK, Mukherjee I and Kumar A. 2015. Effect of soil type and organic manure on adsorption–desorption of flubendiamide. *Environmental Monitoring & Assessment* 187:403. DOI 10.1007/s 10661-015-4623-2.
19. Das SK. 2014. Role of micronutrient in rice cultivation and management strategy in organic agriculture-A reappraisal. *Agricultural Sciences* 5 (09): 765.
20. Das SK. 2014. Recent developments in clean up techniques of pesticide residue analysis for toxicology study: a critical review. *Universal Journal of Agricultural Research* 2 (6): 198-202.
21. Das SK, 2017. Nanoparticles advanced characterization techniques: A view point. *Journal of Atoms and Molecules* 7 (4): 1091-1098.
22. Das SK, Mukherjee I, Das SK. 2017. Metsulfuron-methyl Herbicide on Dehydrogenase and Acid Phosphatase Enzyme Activity on Three Different Soils. *International Journal of Bio-Resource & Stress Management* 8 (2): 236-241.
23. Das SK, Roy A and Barman H. 2016. Fungi toxic efficiency of some plant volatile essential oils against plant pathogenic fungi *African Journal of Microbiology Research* 10 (37), 1581-1585.
24. Mukherjee I, Das SK, Kumar A. 2016. Degradation of flubendiamide as affected by elevated CO₂, temperature, and carbon mineralization rate in soil. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research* 23 (19), 19931-19939.
25. Das SK, Mukherjee I and Roy A. 2016. Alachlor and Metribuzin Herbicide on N₂-fixing Bacteria in a Sandy Loam soil. *International Journal of Bio-Resource & Stress Management* 7 (2): 334-338.

26. Barman H, Roy A, Das SK, Singh NU, Dangi DK, Tripathi AK. 2016. Antifungal properties of some selected plant extracts against leaf blight (*Alternaria alternata*) in tomato. *Research on Crops* 17 (1): 151-156.
27. Das SK, Avasthe RK, Singh M. 2015. Buckwheat: the natural enhancer in rhizosphere phosphorus. *Current Science* 109 (10): 1763.