# Effect of humic acid on the yield and nutrient uptake of rice

## K. Sivakumar \*, L. Devarajan, K. Dhanasekaran, D. Venkatakrishnan and U. Surendran

Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, Faculty of Agriculture, Annamalai University, Annamalai Nagar-608002, Tamil Nadu, India

### ABSTRACT

The response of humic acid (HA) on the yield and nutrient uptake of rice (ADT-39) was study. The application of humic acid upto 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> along with 100 per cent (150:50:50 NPK ha<sup>-1</sup>) recommended dose resulted in highest grain yield (4253 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) as well as highest total uptake of nitrogen (132.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), phosphorus (20.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and potassium (86.98 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The total N uptake significantly increased from 20.3 (control)) to 132.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> to (100 per cent NPK + 20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup>)). The total P and K uptake also increased from 5.82 (control) to 20.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (100% NPK + 20 kg HA) and 28.97 (control) to 86.98 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (100% NPK + 20 kg HA) respectively.

*Key words: K* – *humate, Lignite, humic acid, rice and nutrient uptake* 

Soil organic matter supports the plant nutrients through decomposition and mineralization. Humic acid, a component of soil organic matter has the ability to continue with metal ions so as to smoothly interact with clay minerals. Indiscriminate use of chemical fertilizers depletes the soil organic matter and humus content. Humic acid extracted from lignite could be added externally as a source of organic matter to enhance total NPK uptake. The present study was taken up to evaluate the response of rice to humic acid as K – humate.

A field experiment was carried out at the Central Farm, Agricultural College and Research Institute, Killikulam. The farm is situated in southern agro-climatic zone of Tamil Nadu (8° 46 N, 77° 42 E and 40 m attitude. The soil belongs to Manakkarai series with fine, non acid, kaolinitic, isomegathermic family of typic Rhodustalf.

Lignite comprising 25-65 per cent humic acid is available in the open mines at Neyveli, Tamil Nadu. The extracted humic acid was converted to potassium humate (K– humate) in Neyveli Lignite Corporation. This was added externally as a source of organic matter to evaluate its efficacy in enhancing the soil fertility and productivity of rice.

The initial soil properties were viz., pH 7.7, EC

0.3 dSm<sup>-1</sup>, OC 6.20 g kg<sup>-1</sup>, KMnO<sub>4</sub> – N -176.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, Olsen – P -19.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, NH<sub>4</sub> OAc – K -160.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Jackson, 1973). The experiment was conducted in split plot design with three replications. The main plot treatment consisted of M<sub>1</sub> – Control, M<sub>2</sub> – 75 per cent NPK and M<sub>3</sub>–100 per cent NPK. The subplots included eight treatments S<sub>1</sub> - No HA; S<sub>2</sub> 10 kgha<sup>-1</sup> HA as soil application (SA); S<sub>3</sub> - 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> HA (SA); S<sub>4</sub> - 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> HA (SA);S<sub>5</sub> - 40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> HA (SA); S<sub>6</sub> was S<sub>2</sub> + 0.1 per cent Foliar spray (FS); S<sub>7</sub> was S<sub>2</sub> + 0.3per cent Root dipping (RD) and S<sub>8</sub> was S<sub>2</sub> + 0.1per cent FS+ 0.3 per cent RD. The yield of rice was recorded at harvest. Grain and straw samples were analysed for NPK contents and their uptake was also computed.

The grain yield increased from 2667 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (control) to 3956 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (100 per cent NPK) and the straw yield increased from 4030 (control) to 5935 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (100 per cent NPK). The soil application of humic acid at different levels enhanced the yield compared to control but at20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> highest grain yield of 4253 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and highest straw yield of 6380 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> was obtained.

Beyond 20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> there was a marginal decline in the yield. With regard to the mode of application of humic acid, it showed that the humic acid applied @ 10 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> coupled with FS or RD or both

Effect of humic acid on rice yield

 $(S_6)$ , registered a significant increase in the grain yield than in 10 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> of soil application (Table 1.). The interaction of fertilizer with humic acid on grain yield was also significant. The highest grain yield of 4253 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>was recorded with the combined application of 100 per cent NPK and 20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> (M<sub>3</sub>S<sub>3</sub>) which excelled among all the treatments.

Haripriya *et al.*, (2002) reported the increased yield might be due to the efficient utilization of nutrients, improved aeration and water holding capacity in the humic acid applied treatments. The favourable effect of foliar spraying of humic acid on increasing yield (Nair, 1995) was attributed to increased levels of chlorophyll in the leaves and enhanced photosynthetic activity and higher uptake of nutrients like P (Senthil kumar, 1995).

Fertilizer levels significantly increased the N uptake from 27.2( $M_1$ ) to 119.7 ( $M_3$ ) kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The treatments receiving 0.1 per cent HA+FS or 0.3 per cent HA+RD alone or in combination recorded higher total N uptake of 82.5, 83.6 and 93.8 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> in S<sub>6</sub>,S<sub>7</sub> and S<sub>8</sub> separately (Table 2.). The interaction of fertilizer and humic acid was also significant with regard to N uptake. The N uptake increased from 20.3 ( $M_1S_1$ ) to 132.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>( $M_3S_3$ ). The combined effect of 100 per cent NPK and 10 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> along with 0.1 per cent

Table 1. Effect of humic acid and fertilizers on yield of rice

#### K. Sivakumar et al

HA FS and 0.3 per cent HA RD  $(M_3S_8)$  recording 129.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> yield was found statistically on par with the treatment receiving 100 per cent NPK and 20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> $(M_2S_2)$  recording 132.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> yield.

The increase in nitrogen uptake by humic acid application was noticed upto 20 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Humic acid might have influenced the plant growth directly through its effects on ion uptake or by the effects on the plant growth regulators. (Satishkumar 1997).

The perusal of the data on P uptake showed that the fertilizer application significantly increased the P uptake from 6.87 to 18.97 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The highest P uptake of 16.05 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> proved the superiority of treatment receiving 20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> as soil application. The treatments  $S_6$ ,  $S_7$  and  $S_8$  receiving 0.1 per cent HA FS or 0.3 per cent HA RD alone or in combination besides 10 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> recorded higher P uptake of 14.13, 14.29 and 15.62 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>(Table 2) respectively. The combined application of 10 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> along with 0.1 per cent HA FS and 0.3 per cent HA RD ( $S_8$ ) were statistically on par with the soil application of 20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> alone. The uptake of P in the presence of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients was reported by Mishra and Srivastava (1988).

The fertilizer application exerted a significant increase in total K uptake from  $31.98 (M_1)$  to 83.62

Treatment	Grain yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )				Straw yield (kg ha-1)				
	M 1	M 2	M <sub>3</sub>	Mean	M 1	M <sub>2</sub>	M <sub>3</sub>	Mean	
	Control	112.5:37.5: 37.5 NPK				112.5:37.5: 37.5 NPK	150:50:5 NPK	0	
S <sub>1</sub> -No humic acid	2337	3127	3786	3083	3506	4691	5679	4625	
$S_2$ -10 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> as soil application humic acid	2407	3482	3907	3265	3611	5223	5861	4898	
$S_3^{-20}$ kg ha <sup>-1</sup> as soil application humic acid	2897	3767	4253	3639	4346	5651	6380	5459	
$S_4$ -30 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> as soil application humic acid	2850	3558	4038	3482	4275	5337	6057	5223	
$S_5$ -40 kg ha <sup>-1</sup> as soil application humic acid	2623	3362	3887	3290	3935	5043	5831	4936	
$S_6 - S2 + 0.1\%$ foliar spray	2705	3458	3803	3322	4058	5187	5705	4983	
S <sub>7</sub> -S2+0.3% root dip	2733	3487	3850	3357	4100	5231	5775	5035	
$S_8 - S2 + 0.1\%$ foliar spray+0.3% root dip	2781	3717	4118	3539	4412	5591	6192	5398	
Mean	2667	3495	3956	3373	4030	5245	5935	5070	
	SEd	SEd $CD (P = 0.05)$		= 0.05)	SEd		CD (P = 0.05)		
М	34.00		94		56.76		157		
S	52.06		105		35.99		72		
M at S	90.06		193		81.38		194		
S at M	90.18		182		62.34		125		

Treatment N		Ν	N P						Κ			
M <sub>1</sub>	M 2	M <sub>3</sub>	Mean	<b>M</b> <sub>1</sub>	M 2	M <sub>3</sub>	Mean	<b>M</b> <sub>1</sub>	M 2	M <sub>3</sub>	Mean	
20.3	85.4	96.8	67.5	5.82	16.18	17.04	13.01	28.97	74.36	79.31	60.88	
23.8	99.8	110.9	78.2	6.15	16.99	17.86	13.67	30.66	76.09	81.13	62.63	
32.6	124.2	132.0	96.3	8.18	19.22	20.75	16.05	34.89	82.05	86.98	67.97	
30.7	120.0	128.9	93.2	7.42	18.89	19.52	15.28	33.52	81.04	85.01	66.52	
29.3	116.7	123.9	90.0	7.11	18.48	18.96	14.85	32.54	79.44	84.39	65.46	
26.0	105.3	116.2	82.5	5.99	17.82	18.59	14.13	31.22	77.02	82.46	63.57	
25.5	107.8	117.6	83.6	6.37	17.97	18.54	14.29	31.78	78.00	84.41	64.73	
30.6	121.3	129.6	93.8	7.8	19.99	20.54	15.62	32.26	79.73	85.26	65.75	
27.2	110.3	119.7	85.6	6.87	18.40	18.97	14.75	31.98	78.47	83.62	64.69	
	SEd		CD (P = 0.05)			SEd	CD (P = 0.05)		SEd	CD (P	CD (P = 0.05)	
	0.60		1.7			0.04	0.10		0.61	1.69		
	1.80		3.6			0.13	0.27		1.46	2.96		
	2.97		6.1			NS	NS		NS	NS		
	3.11		6.3			NS	NS		NS	NS		
	20.3 23.8 32.6 30.7 29.3 26.0 25.5 30.6	20.3         85.4           23.8         99.8           32.6         124.2           30.7         120.0           29.3         116.7           26.0         105.3           25.5         107.8           30.6         121.3           27.2         110.3           SEd           0.60           1.80           2.97	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$M_1$ $M_2$ $M_3$ Mean           20.3         85.4         96.8         67.5           23.8         99.8         110.9         78.2           32.6         124.2         132.0         96.3           30.7         120.0         128.9         93.2           29.3         116.7         123.9         90.0           26.0         105.3         116.2         82.5           25.5         107.8         117.6         83.6           30.6         121.3         129.6         93.8           27.2         110.3         119.7         85.6           SEd         CD (P = 0)           0.60         1.7         1.80         3.6           2.97         6.1         1.7         1.80         3.6	$M_1$ $M_2$ $M_3$ Mean $M_1$ 20.3         85.4         96.8         67.5         5.82           23.8         99.8         110.9         78.2         6.15           32.6         124.2         132.0         96.3         8.18           30.7         120.0         128.9         93.2         7.42           29.3         116.7         123.9         90.0         7.11           26.0         105.3         116.2         82.5         5.99           25.5         107.8         117.6         83.6         6.37           30.6         121.3         129.6         93.8         7.8           27.2         110.3         119.7         85.6         6.87           SEd         CD (P = 0.05)           0.60         1.7         1.80         3.6           2.97         6.1         1.7         1.80         3.6	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$M_1$ $M_2$ $M_3$ Mean $M_1$ $M_2$ $M_3$ 20.3         85.4         96.8         67.5         5.82         16.18         17.04           23.8         99.8         110.9         78.2         6.15         16.99         17.86           32.6         124.2         132.0         96.3         8.18         19.22         20.75           30.7         120.0         128.9         93.2         7.42         18.89         19.52           29.3         116.7         123.9         90.0         7.11         18.48         18.96           26.0         105.3         116.2         82.5         5.99         17.82         18.59           25.5         107.8         117.6         83.6         6.37         17.97         18.54           30.6         121.3         129.6         93.8         7.8         19.99         20.54           27.2         110.3         119.7         85.6         6.87         18.40         18.97           SEd         CD (P = 0.05)         SEd         0.04         1.80         3.6         0.13           2.97         6.1         NS         13.6	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	

Table 2. Effect of humic acid and fertilizers on total N, P and K uptake (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of rice

 $(M_3)$  kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The soil application of humic acid @ 20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> proved to be most effective than in rest of the treatments with regard to K uptake (67.97 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in  $M_3S_3$ . The treatments  $S_6$ ,  $S_7$  and  $S_8$  recorded higher K uptake of 63.57, 64.73 and 65.75 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> (Table 2.) respectively.

Rice, being a monocot, could have taken up more amount of K by virtue of its high root CEC (Tisdale *et al.*, 1997). This might be the reason for the marked increase in K uptake with the increase in the fertilizers dose from 75 per cent NPK ( $M_2$ )to 100 per cent and (M3)upto 20 kg HA ha<sup>-1</sup> ( $M_3 S_3$ ).

### REFERENCES

Haripriya KS, Kamalakannan CT, Sathappan T, Umamaheswari and Poonkodi P 2002. Influence of humic acid on flower production in tuberose. In: National Seminar on recent trends on the use of humic substances for sustainable agriculture, Feb, 27-28: 2002, Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu.

- Jackson ML 1973. Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall of India Private Limited, New Delhi.
- Mishra B and Srivastava LL 1988. Physiological properties of humic acids isolated from some major soil associations of Bihar. J Ind Soc Soil Sci 36: 83-89.
- Nair MR 1995. Studies on the influence of foliar application of humic acid on soil fertility attributes and response of ADT36 rice in Periyar Vagai command area. M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis. Tamil Nadu Agricultural University, Tamil Nadu, India
- Satishkumar B 1997. Extraction and characterization of humic acids and their effect on the performance of soybean, M.Sc. (Ag.) Thesis, Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu.
- Senthilkumar K 1995. Studies on the effect of lignite derived humic substances and nitrogen on low land rice. M.Sc. (Ag.) Annamalai University, Tamil Nadu.
- Tisdale SL, Nelson WL Beaton JD and Havlin JL 1997. Soil fertility and fertilizers. (5<sup>th</sup> ed.) Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi.