# Impact of Different Land - Use Systems on Soil Physico-chemical Properties

PRADEEP AND R. KRISHNA MURTHY

Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, College of Agriculture, UAS, GKVK, Bengaluru - 560 065 e-Mail : chikkanaragund3108@gmail.com

#### AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

PRADEEP : Carried out the experiment and participated in the sequence alignment and drafted the manuscript; R. KRISHNA MURTHY : Conceived the study, designing, coordination and drafting the manuscript

#### **Corresponding Author :** PRADEEP

Department of Soil Science and Agricultural Chemistry, College of Agriculturre, UAS, GKVK, Bengaluru

Received : August 2022 Accepted : November 2022

# Abstract

Changes in land use and improper soil management have led to severe land degradation around the globe through the modification in soil physico-chemical and biological processes. The study aimed to assess the soil properties of different land use system types. In this regard soil samples (0-30 cm, 30-60 cm and 60-90 cm depth) were collected from different land uses; Natural forest, teak plantation, horticulture (mango and guava) land use system, agriculture (Finger millet cropping system), agri-horti land use system (custard and amla) and agroforestry (melia dubia). Soil collected from different land use systems was analyzed for both physical and chemical properties. The present investigation revealed that the soil texture was sandy clay loam. The mean bulk density of the soils ranged from 1.28 and 1.38 g cm<sup>-3</sup> and the mean total porosity ranged from 35.54 - 42.71 per cent. The soil pH was acidic in agriculture (Finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer) land use and neutral in other land use systems and the mean electrical conductivity value ranged from 0.06-0.11 dSm<sup>-1</sup>. The highest mean value (1.11%) of organic carbon was recorded in natural forest and the lowest mean value (0.25%) was recorded in agriculture (Finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer) land use. However, the mean values of available N ranged from 141.32 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> to 260.02 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Higher mean available P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> (88.76 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and K<sub>2</sub>O (207.59 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) were recorded in agriculture land use (Finger millet cropping system-integrated nutrient management). The concentration of secondary and micronutrients were higher in natural forest and tree plantations. The study revealed that conversion of natural forest to different land use systems had adverse effects on soil physical and chemical properties. Therefore, land use systems in the region must adopt a suitable management practice to enhance soil fertility and productivity.

*Keywords* : Soil properties, Soil depth, Natural forest, Teak plantation, Horticulture land use system, Agriculture, Agri-horti land use system and agroforestry

CHANGING land use from forest to croplands leads to a change in the chemical, physical and biological properties of the soil. Deforestation increases soil erosion which leads to floods, drought and natural ecosystem degradation. Land use change to cropland have changed significantly from the twentieth century, it is estimated that 25 per cent of the Earth's surface will be occupied by cropland, shifting cultivation and livestock production in the twenty first century. Globally the decreasing rate of forest was about 10 million hectares per year between

2015 and 2020 (UN FAO forestry data 2020). In the Indian context, about 275 million people, comprising nearly 27 per cent of the country's population, depend on forests for their subsistence or livelihoods (CSE 2020). The increasing demand for forest resources from global markets have contributed to the increased rates of conversion of forests to plantation crops.

Soil is an important component of terrestrial ecosystems, which directly or indirectly influences the life on earth. Soil health is one of the important deciding factors in the success of human civilization. In the recent past, with population explosion and urbanization, the forest land is permanently converted to various other land use systems viz., agriculture, horticulture, plantations, agroforestry apart from various other uses. The intention of conversion of land is primarily to increase the production of food, fodder and wood to meet the increasing needs of burgeoning population. In the race to meet the production goals farming community has resorted to, inappropriate land use and soil management practices in terms of monoculture, intensive cropping patterns with heavy mechanization and injudicious usage of agri-chemicals (Chandel et al., 2018), rendering soil health and its sustainability completely out of context. In this context a study was conducted to know the Impact of different land use systems on soil physico-chemical properties'

#### MATERIAL AND METHODS

#### **Study Area**

The study was conducted in different land use systems at University of Agricultural Sciences, GKVK, Bengaluru, Karnataka. It is located in the Northern part of Bengaluru between Latitude: 13° 05' North and Longitude: 77° 34' East and Altitude: 924 m (above mean sea level). GKVK has a tropical climate with distinct wet and dry seasons. The maximum and minimum temperature recorded was 29.6 and 18.2° C respectively. The annual rainfall for the period 1986 to 2021 ranged from 461 mm to 1115.8 mm, with a mean of 712 mm. The average relative humidity at 7:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m. ranged from 89 - 47 per cent, respectively. The annual mean sunshine was 6.7 hours.

The study area comprised of different predominant land use systems such as agriculture (Finger millet), horticulture (Mango and Guava), agri-horti system (Custard apple and Amla) and plantation (Teak and Melia dubia.) which have widely replaced the natural forest of GKVK. Hence to assess the impact of different land use systems on soil physico-chemical properties among different land uses. Different-land uses were identified such as;

1) Natural Forest: An undisturbed forest area and it was classified as dry deciduous forest. The forest area mainly comprised of Acacia ferruginea, Ailanthus triphysa, Albizia amara, Albizia lebbeck, Albizia odoratissima, Azadirachta indica, Cassia siamea, Eucalyptus sp., Gliricidia sepium, Hardwickia binnata, Leucaena leucocephala, Pongamia pinnata, Santalum album, Swietenia macrophylla and Tamarindus indica etc. 2) Teak plantations: The plantation was established in the year of 1986, with a spacing of 2 m x 2 m spacing. 3) Mango land use system: The mango plantation was established over an area of 10 hectares between 1974 - 77 with a spacing of 10 m x 10 m. 4) Guava land use system: The guava plantation was established in 1994 with a spacing of 6 m x 3 m. 5) Custard apple land use system: The custard apple saplings were planted during 2009 with a spacing of 5 m X 5m and finger millet, field bean, cowpea, niger, foxtail millet and fodder maize were grown continuously as inter crops from 2012. 6) Amla land use system: The amla saplings were planted during 2009 with a spacing of 6 m x 6 m and finger millet, field bean, cowpea, niger, foxtail millet and fodder maize were grown continuously as inter crops from 2012.) 7) Finger millet cropping systemchemical fertilizer: The finger millet crop is being continuously fertilized 50:50:25 N:P:K kg/ha/year since 1978.8) Finger millet cropping system-organic manure: The finger millet crop is being continuously manured with FYM 10 t/ha/year since 1978.9) Finger millet cropping system-integrated nutrient management: The finger millet crop is being continuously manured with FYM 10 t/ha/year and 50:50:25 N:P:K kg/ha/year since 1978 and 10) Melia dubia land use system: Melia dubia plantation was established during 2012 with a spacing of 8 m x 5 m spacing.

# Soil Sampling and Analysis

In each land use system, five quadrats measuring 20 m x 20 m were randomly laid down in such a way that it represents the land use studied. Within each quadrat, soils were collected from ten points (5 in the corners and 5 in the center) at three depth classes *i.e.* 0-30, 30-60 and 60-90 cm. The five sub-

samples at each location and depth class were pooled to get one composite sample for each depth class per plot. The soils were mixed thoroughly and large plant debris, roots and stones were removed manually by hand. Equal number of soil samples from the same depths were collected from undisturbed plots separately for bulk density by using soil core of known volume. In the laboratory, the soil samples were homogenized, air-dried, grounded and passed through 2 mm sieve for further physical and chemical analysis.

# **Physico-Chemical Analysis of the Soils**

Air-dried soil samples were used for analysis of texture, bulk density, pH, electrical conductivity (EC), organic C, available N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>, K<sub>2</sub>O, exchangeable cations i.e. Ca and Mg, available S and micronutrients. Soil texture was estimated using an International pipette method as described by Black (1965). Bulk density was determined by the core (Grossman and Reinsch 2002). Soil pH and electrical conductivity in soil samples were measured in 1:2 soil: water extract as outlined by Jackson (1973). Organic C was estimated by Walkley and Black (1934) rapid titration method. The alkaline potassium permanganate method was adopted to analyse the available nitrogen content in soils (Subbaiah and Asija, 1956). The available phosphorus in the soil samples was determined by Bray's No.1 reagent (0.03  $NH_{4}F + 0.025 N HCl$ ) (Jackson, 1973). The available sulphur was determined as described by Black (1965). Available potassium was extracted with 1 M ammonium acetate at pH 7 and measured using a flame photometer (Page et al., 1982). Exchangeable calcium and magnesium were estimated by titrating suitable aliquot of ammonium acetate extract of soil against standard EDTA solution as described by Piper (1966) and The micro nutrients such as Zn, Cu, Mn and Fe were extracted by using DTPA (Diethylene tri amine penta acetic acid) and measured by using AAS (Lindsay and Norwell 1978).

# **Statistical Analyses**

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) at 95 per cent confidence level was analyzed taking sampling sites

as replicates (random effects) and land use types as treatments (fixed effects) using MS EXCEL and using SPSS for windows (IBM SPSS ver. 17.0).

#### **Results and Discussion**

# Effect of different Land-use Systems on Physical Properties of Soil

#### **Particle Size Distribution**

The soils of different land use systems were sandy clay loam in texture. Among different land use systems, the highest mean value of sand content (67.49%) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-organic manure and the lowest mean value (54.67%) was recorded in amla land use system. The highest mean value of silt content (12.55%) was recorded in natural forest and the lowest mean value (5.91%) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer. The highest mean value of clay content (34.43%) was recorded in amla land use and the lowest mean value (23.94%) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer (Table 1). This could probably due to soils which were derived from coarse grained parent materials. The soils were dominant in sand content but the accumulation of clay and silt were observed in the subsurface layer with decrease in sand content. Similar results have been reported. According to the results of analysis of variance (ANOVA) revealed that there was a significant difference of the sand and clay particle under different land use systems at different soil depths. The highest (73.18%) and the lowest (47.26%) value of sand was recorded on the surface (0-30 cm) soil layer of finger millet cropping systemchemical fertilizer and subsurface layer (60-90 cm) of teak plantation, respectively (Table 1). Whereas the highest (39.38%) and lowest (19.76%) values of clay content were recorded in the subsurface (60-90 cm) soil layer of the amla land use system and surface layer of guava land use, respectively (Table 1).

Under different soil depth, the higher sand content was obtained at the surface (0-30 cm) soil layer, whereas the higher silt and clay content was recorded in the subsurface (60-90 cm) soil layer (Table 1).

	sə
	пс
	iie
	Sc
	$\eta r$
	μL
	ıltı
	C1
	271
1	$A_{\mathbf{g}}$
	Ŀ.
	11
	па
	ш
	Jo
	è,
	10
1	<i>ty</i> s
	N
	0)

		Physica	al properties of	soils under diff	erent land us	e systems		
-	Depth	Ρ	article size (%)		Textural	BD	Total	
Land use systems	(cm)	Sand	Silt	Clay	class	(g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	Porosity (%)	MWHC (%)
Natural Forest	0-30	62.02	9.27	28.71	SCL	1.21	45.98	41.15
	30-60	58.78	11.92	31.3	SCL	1.29	42.41	35.24
	06-09	52.89	16.45	30.66	SCL	1.35	39.73	32.67
	Range	52.89-62.02	9.27-16.45	28.71-31.30		1.21-1.35	39.73-45.98	32.67-41.15
	mean	57.9	12.55	30.22		1.28	42.71	36.35
Teak	0-30	68.12	7.23	24.65	SCL	1.28	41.53	37.32
	30-60	57.15	10.18	32.67	SCL	1.33	39.41	33.96
	06-09	47.26	15.43	37.31	SCL	1.41	38.56	30.87
	Range	47.26-68.12	7.23-15.43	24.65-37.31		1.28-1.41	38.56-41.53	30.87-37.32
	mean	57.51	10.95	31.54		1.34	39.83	34.05
Mango	0-30	70.21	7.23	23.56	SCL	1.3	41.74	36.01
	30-60	68.45	8.28	23.27	SCL	1.36	39.78	31.23
	06-09	59.76	9.73	30.51	SCL	1.4	37.17	21.56
	Range	59.76-70.21	7.23-9.73	23.27-30.51		1.30-1.40	37.17-41.74	21.56-36.01
	mean	66.14	8.41	25.78		1.35	39.56	29.6
Guava	0-30	71.41	8.83	19.76	SCL	1.31	43.19	33.05
	30-60	65.76	11.28	22.96	SCL	1.35	38.72	28.01
	06-09	54.68	13.53	31.79	SCL	1.41	32.35	22.34
	Range	54.68-71.41	8.83-13.53	19.76-31.79		1.31-1.41	32.35-43.19	22.34-33.05
	mean	63.95	11.21	24.84		1.35	38.08	27.8
Finger Millet-	0-30	73.18	5.87	21.22	SCL	1.32	43.1	30.15
chemical fertilizer	30-60	69.12	4.98	23.45	SCL	1.38	35.12	22.43
	06-09	57.87	6.87	27.16	SCL	1.43	28.42	19.56
	Range	57.87-73.18	4.98-6.87	21.22-27.16		1.32-1.43	28.42-43.10	19.56-30.15
	mean	66.72	5.91	23.94		1.38	35.54	24.04

Mysore J. Agric. Sci., 57 (1) : 229-244 (2023)

PRADEEP AND R. KRISHNA MURTHY

Land use systems								
Land use systems	Depth	Pi	article size (%)		Textural	BD	Total	
	(cm)	Sand	Silt	Clay	class	(g cm <sup>-3</sup> )	Porosity (%)	
Finger Millet-organic	0-30	72.13	6.15	21.79	SCL	1.27	44.98	38.56
manure	30-60	69.32	6.01	24.18	SCL	1.33	38.34	22.26
	06-09	61.01	9.12	29.34	SCL	1.38	33.92	19.34
	Range	61.01-72.13	6.01-9.12	21.79-29.34		1.27-1.38	33.92-44.98	19.34-38.56
	mean	67.49	7.09	25.1		1.33	39.08	26.72
Finger Millet-integrated	0-30	72.2	5.69	20.96	SCL	1.28	43.05	31.78
nutrient management	30-60	65.13	6.23	22.87	SCL	1.35	37.52	25.12
	06-09	57.27	10.12	28.65	SCL	1.4	30.65	19.89
	Range	57.27-72.20	5.69-10.12	20.96-28.65		1.28 - 1.40	30.65-43.05	19.89-31.78
	mean	64.87	7.35	24.16		1.34	37.07	25.59
Custard apple	0-30	60.37	13.31	26.32	SCL	1.32	41.25	33.34
	30-60	55.37	8.87	35.76	SCL	1.34	38.35	29.57
	06-09	48.85	12.89	38.26	SCL	1.4	36.83	28.21
	Range	48.85-60.37	8.87-13.31	26.32-38.26		1.32 - 1.40	36.83-41.25	28.21-33.34
	mean	54.86	11.69	33.45		1.35	38.81	30.37
Amla	0-30	61.46	12.11	27.22	SCL	1.33	41.87	32.14
	30-60	54.75	9.87	36.69	SCL	1.36	38.73	29.23
	06-09	47.79	13.78	39.38	SCL	1.41	34.21	26.76
	Range	47.79-61.46	9.87-13.78	27.22-39.38		1.33-1.41	34.21-41.48	26.76-32.14
	mean	54.67	11.92	34.43		1.36	38.27	29.38
Melia dubia	0-30	65.21	8.23	26.56	SCL	1.31	43.05	36.34
	30-60	59.45	11.28	29.27	SCL	1.34	41.91	30.56
	06-09	50.26	15.43	34.31	SCL	1.38	40.25	29.89
	Range	50.26-65.21	8.23-15.43	26.56-34.31		1.31-1.38	40.25-43.05	29.89-36.34
	mean	58.31	11.65	30.05		1.34	41.74	32.26
	CD (P=0.	.05) 1.61	1.74	0.67		0.165	0.23	0.28
	SEm±	0.43	0.51	0.18		0.0068	0.07	0.1
	CV (%)	57.6	38.16	28.21		0.48	18.13	23.38

Mysore J. Agric. Sci., 57 (1) : 229-244 (2023)

PRADEEP AND R. KRISHNA MURTHY

The Mysore Journal of Agricultural Sciences

Wu

Generally, the clay content was higher in the subsurface layer of different land use systems due to the translocation of finer particles from the surface horizons and subsequent illuviation in subsurface horizons. Similar observations were reported by Dasog and Patil (2011).

#### **Bulk Density**

The soil bulk density was significantly affected by land use and soil depth at  $P \le 0.01$  (Table 1). Considering the land use types, the highest mean value of bulk density (1.38 g cm<sup>-3</sup>) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer and the lowest mean value (1.28 g cm<sup>-3</sup>) of bulk density was recorded in natural forest (Table 1). Bulk density is an indicator of soil compaction and soil health. It affects infiltration, rooting, water holding capacity, soil porosity, plant nutrient availability and soil microorganism's activity all of which are key to soil processes and productivity. Bulk density is found to decrease under natural forest and trees due addition of organic matter (litterfall, fine root recycling, twigs etc.) at regular intervals. The addition of litter increased the organic matter in soil and inverse relationship of bulk density and per cent OC is established by several workers (Gupta and Sharma, 2008 and Oyedele et al., 2009)).

# **Total Porosity**

The results of the analysis of variance (ANOVA) showed that the total porosity of soil was significantly affected by land use types and soil depth (Table 1). Considering the land use types with soil depth, the highest values of total porosity (45.98%) was recorded on the surface soil layer of natural forest while lowest values of total porosity (28.72%) was recorded in subsurface layer (60-90 cm) of the finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer (Table 1). The higher value of soil total porosity in natural forest was implied due to low bulk density of forest plantation. The mean total porosity of teak plantation, mango land use system, guava land use system, custard apple land use system, amla land use system, finger millet cropping system-organic manure and finger millet cropping system-integrated nutrient management were 39.83, 39.56, 38.08, 38.81, 38.27, 39.08 and 37.07 per cent respectively (Table 1). At different soil depths, the higher value of total porosity was recorded in the surface soil layer. The total porosity varies across the different land use types was implies to the bulk density values of that respective soil.

#### **Maximum Water Holding Capacity**

The soil moisture holding capacity is significantly influenced by varying land use systems (Table 1). Highest soil moisture content (36.35%) was recorded in natural forest followed by teak plantation (34.05%), agroforestry (32.26%), custard land use system (30.37%), mango (29.60%), amla land use system (29.38%) and least soil moisture was recorded in agriculture (finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer) (24.04%). Moisture holding capacity corroborates with other characteristics of land use systems. Soil bulk density was lowest in natural forest and tree plantations compared to agriculture and horticulture systems. Soil porosity and maximum water holding capacity were also recorded higher under natural forest and tree plantations. In tree plantations and natural forest higher amount of litter and organic matter were added, which has increased the soil organic carbon and thereby increased the soil moisture holding capacity of the soils, whereas in agriculture system there was no continuous addition of litter or organic matter. However, horticulture and agroforestry were also a tree based systems, but the tree spacing was larger in horticulture (10 m x 10 m) and agroforestry (8 m x 5 m) leading to less organic matter input and thereby less soil moisture holding capacity (Bhavya et al., 2018).

# Chemical Properties of Soils under different Land use Systems

# Soil pH

The soil pH was significantly influenced by different land use systems and soil depths (Table 2). The highest soil pH (6.80) was recorded in natural forest, which was followed by finger millet cropping system-organic manure and finger millet cropping system-integrated nutrient management having soil

Land use systems	Depth (cm)	pH	EC $(dSm^{-1})$	OC (%)
Natural Forest	0-30	6.67	0.099	1.57
	30-60	6.78	0.115	0.98
	60-90	6.96	0.125	0.77
	Range	6.67-6.96	0.099-0.125	0.77-1.57
	mean	6.8	0.11	1.11
Teak	0-30	5.48	0.063	0.99
	30-60	5.66	0.079	0.86
	60-90	5.83	0.093	0.59
	Range	5.48-5.83	0.063-0.093	0.59-0.99
	mean	5.66	0.08	0.81
Mango	0-30	5.59	0.061	0.81
	30-60	5.72	0.069	0.62
	60-90	5.98	0.078	0.49
	Range	5.59-5.98	0.061-0.078	0.49-0.81
	mean	5.76	0.07	0.64
Guava	0-30	5.78	0.064	0.69
	30-60	5.93	0.078	0.47
	60-90	6.03	0.083	0.39
	Range	5.78-6.03	0.064-0.083	0.39-0.69
	mean	5.91	0.08	0.51
Finger Millet-chemical	0-30	4.09	0.059	0.43
fertilizer	30-60	4.21	0.065	0.21
	60-90	4.35	0.07	0.11
	Range	4.09-4.35	0.059-0.070	0.11-0.43
	mean	4.22	0.06	0.25
Finger Millet- organic	0-30	6.01	0.077	0.53
manure	30-60	6.17	0.087	0.41
	60-90	6.32	0.09	0.32
	Range	6.01-6.32	0.077-0.090	0.32-0.53
	mean	6.17	0.08	0.42
Finger Millet- integrated	0-30	5.98	0.052	0.63
nutrient management	30-60	6.12	0.074	0.5
	60-90	6.22	0.086	0.38
	Range	5.98-6.22	0.052-0.086	0.38-0.63
	mean	6.11	0.07	0.50

TABLE 2 Chemical properties of soils under different land use systems

iWal

				Table 2 contd
Land use systems	Depth (cm)	pH	EC (dSm <sup>-1</sup> )	OC (%)
Custard	0-30	5.54	0.041	0.65
	30-60	5.78	0.058	0.53
	60-90	5.88	0.067	0.45
	Range	5.54-5.88	0.041-0.067	0.45-0.65
	mean	5.73	0.06	0.54
Amla	0-30	5.61	0.057	0.57
	30-60	5.72	0.068	0.41
60 Ra	60-90	5.85	0.071	0.36
	Range	5.61-5.85	0.057-0.071	0.36-0.57
	mean	5.73	0.07	0.45
Melia dubia	0-30	4.78	0.069	0.86
	30-60	4.87	0.072	0.71
	60-90	5.05	0.081	0.58
	Range	4.78-5.05	0.069-0.081	0.58-0.71
	mean	4.9	0.07	0.72
	CD (P=0.05)	0.33	0.023	0.142
	SEm±	0.10	0.004	0.035
	CV (%)	1.84	0.01	0.12

pH of 6.17 and 6.11 respectively. The low pH was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer (4.22). Soil pH or reaction indicates two important chemical properties (*i.e.* soil acidity and alkalinity) of soil, which are having profound influence on soil physical and biological properties and hence the plant nutrient availability. Soil pH regulates soil biogeochemical processes and has cascading effects on terrestrial ecosystem structure and functions.

The mean pH values of natural forest and tree based systems found to be neutral. This could be due to addition of litter in tree based land use systems. It can also be observed that, with the increase in the age of the tree based land use system, the soil pH is becoming more neutral. Verma *et al.* (2001) also found that soil pH increased under tree plantations. Whereas in melia dubia land use system recorded was slightly acidic, this might be due to the continuous addition of litter and subsequent release of organic acids, which tend to decrease the soil pH. These results are supported by Ananthkumar (2011). While in finger milletchemical fertilizer, applied acid forming fertilizers (Ammonical fertilizers) release of H<sup>+</sup> ions after mineralization and lack of addition of organic manures to soil, hence crop takes up secondary and micronutrient from soil results in soil acidity (Gajanana *et al.*, 2005).

Considering the interaction of land use types with soil depth, soil pH increased consistently with increased in soil depth in all land use systems due to leaching of basic cations due to high rainfall. These results are supported by Rudramurthy *et al.* (2007).

#### **Electrical Conductivity**

The electrical conductivity (EC) values of soils were significantly affected by land use types and soil depths (Table 2). Highest EC was recorded in natural forest (0.11 dSm<sup>-1</sup>), whereas lowest (0.06 dSm<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in custard land use systems and finger

millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer. Soil EC under natural forest was higher compared to other land use systems. This could be due to enrichment of soil mineral by basic salts due to weathering and decomposition of litter. Verma *et al.* (2001) reported that soil EC increased in tree plantations. The lowest mean value of EC was found at 0 to 30 cm depths in different land use systems this might be mainly due to variation in soluble salts in soils and variation in the degree of leaching loss of salts from soils due to the intensity of rainfall and restricted drainage. These results are in line with the findings of Nagaraj *et al.* (2002).

# **Soil Organic Carbon**

The analysis of variance revealed that the SOC (Soil Organic Carbon) content was significantly affected by land use types and soil depth (Table 2). Natural forest shows the highest mean value of organic carbon (1.11%). Similar result was observed by Govind et al. (2022). Followed by teak plantation (0.84%) and the lowest mean value observed in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer (0.25%). In all the land use systems the organic carbon content decreases with increasing soil depth. The highest value of SOC content was (1.57%) recorded at the depth of 0-30 cm (surface) in natural forest land and the least value of SOC (0.11%) was recorded at depth of 60-90 cm (subsurface) in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer (Table 2). However, the highest value of SOC on the surface layer of forest land use systems was attributed to the excessive amount of plant residues and biomass on surface land. The present research finding is in agreement with findings of Chibsa and Taa (2009), Iqbal et al. (2012) and Takele et al. (2014) in which they reported that the SOC decreases with increasing soil depth, with more accumulation on the upper surface soil layer. Singh and Sharma, 2012. Amanuel et al. (2018) also reported that overall mean soil organic carbon stock was higher under natural and mixed forest compared with other land use types and at all depths. The closer spacing of the plantation rendered thick and denser canopy and more is the litter biomass added. While the least mean soil organic carbon content was recorded in agriculture

based land use systems compared to tree based land use because of continuous disturbance of soil through tillage activities and less input of litter and plant residues in the agriculture systems. These results are in line with the findings of Shivakumar *et al.* (2020).

# Available Primary Nutrients in Soil under different Land Use Systems

The available nitrogen (N), phosphorous (P) and potassium (K) content of soils were significantly affected by land use types and soil depth (Tables 3). The highest mean value of available nitrogen (260.02 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-integrated nutrient management followed by mango (248.53 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), finger millet cropping system-organic manure (246.33 kg ha-1), agroforestry (melia dubia) with 241.58 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, natural forest (227.12 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and lowest mean (141.32 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was noticed in amla land use system. Highest available nitrogen was recorded in agriculture system due to application of chemical nitrogenous fertilizers and organic source. The combined application of organic and inorganic fertilizer in soil has led to increase in organic matter content in the soil which has direct relation with the availability of nitrogen content in the soil and this result was found to be in accordance with Hemalatha and Chellamuthu (2013). Among tree-based land use system, the higher soil available nitrogen was recorded in mango land use system, this might be due to higher litter fall (6243.15 kg/ha/ year) and also due to higher nitrogen concentration (1.34%) in leaf litter. Similar results were reported by Sushanta kumar et al. (2018). The Available nitrogen in soil decreased significantly with increasing soil depth. This can be attributed to more turn-over of organic residues in the top layer compared to deeper layers. The available phosphorus and potassium in soil were significantly differed among different land use systems. The highest mean value (88.76 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) of available phosphorus was recorded in finger millet cropping system-integrated nutrient management followed by finger millet cropping system-organic manure (78.32 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), agroforestry (melia dubia) with 73.11 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, mango (55.12 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>), natural forest (48.28 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and least

The Mysore Journal of Agricultural Sciences

AV	anable primary		inder different land use s	ystems
Land use systems	Depth (cm)	Available N (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Available $P_2O_5$ (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Available $K_2O$ (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
Natural Forest	0-30	245.65	70.72	173.15
	30-60	225.67	46.07	155.25
	60-90	210.05	28.05	131.47
	Range	210.05-245.65	28.05-70.72	131.47-173.15
	mean	227.12	48.28	153.29
Teak	0-30	178.34	54.15	141.14
	30-60	157.34	43.55	122.28
	60-90	131.45	29.14	110.15
	Range	131.45-178.34	29.14-54.15	110.15-141.14
	mean	155.71	42.48	124.52
Mango	0-30	276.25	76.44	166.45
	30-60	265.56	55.17	148.35
	60-90	203.78	33.75	122.49
	Range	203.78-276.25	33.75-76.44	122.49-166.45
	mean	248.53	55.12	145.76
Guava	0-30	171.24	65.46	155.38
	30-60	155.47	55.43	135.26
	60-90	142.47	23.47	119.67
	Range	142.47-171.24	23.47-65.46	119.67-155.38
	mean	156.39	48.12	136.77
Finger Millet-chemical	0-30	234.57	59.16	135.25
fertilizer	30-60	228.24	47.45	129.13
letunzei	60-90	178.11	30.56	114.76
	Range	178.11-234.57	30.56-59.16	114.76-135.25
	mean	213.64	45.72	126.38
Finger Millet-organic	0-30	289.26	86.35	145.53
manure	30-60	251.89	78.48	131.27
manure	60-90	199.35	70.13	119.28
	Range	199.35-289.26	70.13-86.35	119.28-145.53
	mean	246.33	78.32	132.03
Finger Millet-integrated	0-30	285.48	105.5	230.04
nutrient management	30-60	268.35	92.65	201.36
	60-90	226.24	68.13	191.38
	Range	226.24-285.48	68.13-105.5	191.38-230.04
	mean	260.02	88.76	207.59

TABLE 3

W.

T 1 1 2

. 1

				Table 3 contd
Land use systems	Depth (cm)	Available N (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Available $P_2O_5$ (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Available K <sub>2</sub> O (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
Custard apple	0-30	187.65	55.35	155.24
	30-60	142.87	46.25	138.12
	60-90	101.45	40.67	126.39
	Range	101.45-187.65	40.67-55.35	126.39-155.24
	mean	143.99	47.42	139.92
Amla	0-30	177.24	60.57	219.37
	30-60	137.67	47.85	178.25
60	60-90	109.05	31.05	145.16
	Range	109.05-177.24	31.05-60.57	145.16-219.37
	mean	141.32	46.49	180.92
Melia dubia	0-30	277.79	93.01	205.18
	30-60	237.49	74.54	186.35
	60-90	209.48	51.79	175.39
	Range	209.48-277.79	51.79-93.01	175.39-205.18
	Mean	241.58	73.11	188.97
	CD (P=0.05)	10.27	5.15	12.65
	SEm±	2.678	1.66	3.65
	CV (%)	142.77	121.32	148.26

available phosphorus (45.72 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer. The available phosphorous and potassium were higher in the surface soil layer than in the subsurface soil layer. Generally, variations in available phosphorous content in soils could be related to the intensity of soil weathering or soil disturbance under different land use systems. The buildup of available phosphorus in integrated treatments that is organic plus inorganic fertilizer treatment was mainly due to the increase in dissolution of native P compounds by the decomposition of FYM and the available P content in the soil and it was also contributed by the application of phosphorus through fertilizer and it was also due to increased phosphatase activity in the soil has led to increase in available phosphorus content in the soil. Similar results were reported by Hemalatha and Chellamuthu (2013).

The highest mean available potassium was recorded in finger millet cropping system-integrated nutrient management (207.59 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) followed by agroforestry (melia dubia) with 188.97 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, amla land use system with 180.92 kg ha-1, natural forest (153.29 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and mango (145.76 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The trends noticed in these land use systems may be due to regular and continuous application of inorganic fertilizers. Among tree based land use systems, in melia dubia higher soil available potassium was recorded due higher litter fall (1750.37 kg/ha/year) and in and this result was found to be in accordance with Ishwarya laxmi et al. (2021). The available K in soil decreased significantly with increase in soil depth. A decreasing trend was observed with successive increase in soil depth as a consequence of higher litter fall and fine root turnover at surface layer. Similar decrease with soil depths has also been reported by Bhardwaj et al. (2001), Swamy et al. (2006) and Mishra and Swamy (2007).

# Secondary Nutrients in Soil under different Land Use Systems

According to the analysis of variance results indicated that the exchangeable calcium (Ca),

$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Secondary nutrient status of soil under different land use systems					
Natural Forest   0-30   6.65   1.89   6.15     30-60   4.95   1.75   4.75     60-90   3.46   0.58   4.12     Range   3.46-6.65   0.581.89   4.12-6.15     mean   5.02   1.4   5.01     Teak   0-30   5.87   0.61   5.87     30-60   3.51   0.39   4.23     60-90   2.42   0.31   3.36     Range   2.42-5.87   0.31-0.61   3.36-5.87     mean   3.93   0.44   4.49     Margo   0-30   6.55   1.41   6.55     30-60   5.31   0.97   4.89     60-90   2.78   0.29   4.34     Range   2.78-6.55   0.29-1.41   4.34-6.55     mean   4.88   0.89   5.26     Guava   0-30   6.47   0.49   4.23     30-60   4.29   0.38   3.78     60-90   2.88   0.21 </th <th>Land use systems</th> <th>Depth (cm)</th> <th><math>Ca (cmol (p+) kg^{-1})</math></th> <th>Mg (cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>)</th> <th>S (cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>)</th>	Land use systems	Depth (cm)	$Ca (cmol (p+) kg^{-1})$	Mg (cmol (p+) kg <sup>-1</sup> )	S (cmol (p+) kg <sup>-1</sup> )		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Natural Forest	0-30	6.65	1.89	6.15		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		30-60	4.95	1.75	4.75		
Range   3.46-6.65   0.58-1.89   4.12-6.15     mean   5.02   1.4   5.01     Teak   0-30   5.87   0.61   5.87     30-60   3.51   0.39   4.23     60-90   2.42   0.31   3.36     Range   2.42-5.87   0.31-0.61   3.36-5.87     mean   3.93   0.44   4.49     Mango   0-30   6.55   1.41   6.55     30-60   5.31   0.97   4.89     60-90   2.78   0.29   4.34     Range   2.78-6.55   0.29-1.41   4.34-6.55     mean   4.88   0.89   5.26     Guava   0-30   6.47   0.49   4.23     30-60   4.29   0.38   3.78     60-90   2.88   0.21   3.54     mean   4.54   0.36   3.85     Finger Millet-chemical   0-30   1.46   0.09   0.47     Range   1.081.46		60-90	3.46	0.58	4.12		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Range	3.46-6.65	0.58-1.89	4.12-6.15		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		mean	5.02	1.4	5.01		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Teak	0-30	5.87	0.61	5.87		
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		30-60	3.51	0.39	4.23		
Range   2.42-5.87   0.31-0.61   3.36-5.87     mean   3.93   0.44   4.49     Mango   0-30   6.55   1.41   6.55     30-60   5.31   0.97   4.89     60-90   2.78   0.29   4.34     Range   2.78-6.55   0.29-1.41   4.34-6.55     mean   4.88   0.89   5.26     Guava   0-30   6.47   0.49   4.23     30-60   4.29   0.38   3.78     60-90   2.88   0.21   3.54     Range   2.88-6.47   0.21-0.49   3.54-4.23     mean   4.54   0.36   3.85     Finger Millet-chemical   0-30   1.46   0.48   2.24     fertilizer   30-60   1.22   0.15   1.67     60-90   1.08   0.09   0.47     Range   1.08-1.46   0.09-0.48   0.47-2.24     mean   1.25   0.24   1.46     Finger Millet-oregan		60-90	2.42	0.31	3.36		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Range	2.42-5.87	0.31-0.61	3.36-5.87		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		mean	3.93	0.44	4.49		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Mango	0-30	6.55	1.41	6.55		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30-60	5.31	0.97	4.89		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		60-90	2.78	0.29	4.34		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Range	2.78-6.55	0.29-1.41	4.34-6.55		
Guava $0-30$ $6.47$ $0.49$ $4.23$ $30-60$ $4.29$ $0.38$ $3.78$ $60-90$ $2.88$ $0.21$ $3.54$ Range $2.88-6.47$ $0.21-0.49$ $3.54-4.23$ mean $4.54$ $0.36$ $3.85$ Finger Millet-chemical $0-30$ $1.46$ $0.48$ $2.24$ fertilizer $30-60$ $1.22$ $0.15$ $1.67$ $60-90$ $1.08$ $0.09$ $0.47$ Range $1.08-1.46$ $0.09-0.48$ $0.47-2.24$ mean $1.25$ $0.24$ $1.46$ Finger Millet-organic $0-30$ $2.68$ $0.57$ $4.43$ manure $30-60$ $2.56$ $0.26$ $60-90$ $2.23$ $0.11$ $1.16$ Range $2.23-2.68$ $0.11-0.57$ $1.16-4.43$ mean $2.49$ $0.31$ $2.75$ Finger Millet- integrated $0-30$ $3.41$ $0.54$ $4.68$ nutrient management $30-60$ $3.01$ $0.32$ $3.74$ $60-90$ $2.78$ $0.17$ $1.39$		mean	4.88	0.89	5.26		
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Guava	0-30	6.47	0.49	4.23		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		30-60	4.29	0.38	3.78		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		60-90	2.88	0.21	3.54		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Range	2.88-6.47	0.21-0.49	3.54-4.23		
Finger Millet-chemical $0-30$ $1.46$ $0.48$ $2.24$ fertilizer $30-60$ $1.22$ $0.15$ $1.67$ $60-90$ $1.08$ $0.09$ $0.47$ Range $1.08-1.46$ $0.09-0.48$ $0.47-2.24$ mean $1.25$ $0.24$ $1.46$ Finger Millet-organic $0-30$ $2.68$ $0.57$ $4.43$ manure $30-60$ $2.56$ $0.26$ $2.68$ $60-90$ $2.23$ $0.11$ $1.16$ Range $2.23-2.68$ $0.11-0.57$ $1.16-4.43$ mean $2.49$ $0.31$ $2.75$ Finger Millet- integrated $0-30$ $3.41$ $0.54$ $4.68$ nutrient management $30-60$ $3.01$ $0.32$ $3.74$ $60-90$ $2.78$ $0.17$ $1.39$		mean	4.54	0.36	3.85		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Finger Millet-chemical	0-30	1.46	0.48	2.24		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	fertilizer	30-60	1.22	0.15	1.67		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		60-90	1.08	0.09	0.47		
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Range	1.08-1.46	0.09-0.48	0.47-2.24		
Finger Millet-organic $0-30$ $2.68$ $0.57$ $4.43$ manure $30-60$ $2.56$ $0.26$ $2.68$ $60-90$ $2.23$ $0.11$ $1.16$ Range $2.23-2.68$ $0.11-0.57$ $1.16-4.43$ mean $2.49$ $0.31$ $2.75$ Finger Millet- integrated $0-30$ $3.41$ $0.54$ $4.68$ nutrient management $30-60$ $3.01$ $0.32$ $3.74$ $60-90$ $2.78$ $0.17$ $1.39$		mean	1.25	0.24	1.46		
manure   30-60   2.56   0.26   2.68     60-90   2.23   0.11   1.16     Range   2.23-2.68   0.11-0.57   1.16-4.43     mean   2.49   0.31   2.75     Finger Millet- integrated   0-30   3.41   0.54   4.68     nutrient management   30-60   3.01   0.32   3.74     60-90   2.78   0.17   1.39	Finger Millet-organic	0-30	2.68	0.57	4.43		
60-90   2.23   0.11   1.16     Range   2.23-2.68   0.11-0.57   1.16-4.43     mean   2.49   0.31   2.75     Finger Millet- integrated   0-30   3.41   0.54   4.68     nutrient management   30-60   3.01   0.32   3.74     60-90   2.78   0.17   1.39	manure	30-60	2.56	0.26	2.68		
Range   2.23-2.68   0.11-0.57   1.16-4.43     mean   2.49   0.31   2.75     Finger Millet- integrated   0-30   3.41   0.54   4.68     nutrient management   30-60   3.01   0.32   3.74     60-90   2.78   0.17   1.39		60-90	2.23	0.11	1.16		
mean   2.49   0.31   2.75     Finger Millet- integrated   0-30   3.41   0.54   4.68     nutrient management   30-60   3.01   0.32   3.74     60-90   2.78   0.17   1.39		Range	2.23-2.68	0.11-0.57	1.16-4.43		
Finger Millet- integrated 0-30 3.41 0.54 4.68   nutrient management 30-60 3.01 0.32 3.74   60-90 2.78 0.17 1.39		mean	2.49	0.31	2.75		
nutrient management   30-60   3.01   0.32   3.74     60-90   2.78   0.17   1.39	Finger Millet- integrated	1 0-30	3.41	0.54	4.68		
60-90   2.78   0.17   1.39	nutrient management	30-60	3.01	0.32	3.74		
		60-90	2.78	0.17	1.39		
Range 2.78-3.41 0.17-0.54 1.39-4.68		Range	2.78-3.41	0.17-0.54	1.39-4.68		
mean 3.06 0.34 3.27		mean	3.06	0.34	3.27		

TABLE 4

W.

				Table 4 contd
Land use systems	Depth (cm)	Ca (cmol (p+) kg <sup>-1</sup> )	$Mg \pmod{(p^+) kg^{-1}}$	S (cmol (p+) kg <sup>-1</sup> )
Custard apple	0-30	4.15	1.25	6.12
	30-60	3.79	1.03	5.26
	60-90	2.54	0.89	1.33
	Range	2.54-4.15	0.89-1.25	1.33-6.12
	mean	3.49	1.05	4.23
Amla	0-30	4.19	0.68	5.95
	30-60	2.86	0.37	4.68
	60-90	2.45	0.01	1.06
	Range	2.45-4.19	0.01-0.68	1.06-5.95
	mean	3.16	0.35	3.89
Melia dubia	0-30	5.87	0.81	7.98
	30-60	4.53	0.59	5.62
	60-90	2.36	0.43	4.44
	Range	2.36-5.87	0.43-0.81	4.44-7.98
	mean	4.25	0.61	6.01
	CD (P=0.05)	0.812	0.094	0.921
	SEm±	0.173	0.031	0.258
	CV (%)	2.11	0.114	1.899

magnesium (Mg) and sulphur (S) of the study area was significantly affected by land use types and soil depth (Tables 4). The highest mean value  $(5.02 \text{ cmol } (p+) \text{ kg}^{-1})$  of available calcium was recorded in natural forest soil followed by mango (4.88 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>), guava (4.54 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>), agroforestry (melia dubia) with 4.25 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup> and lowest mean value  $(1.25 \text{ cmol } (p+) \text{ kg}^{-1})$  was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer. The highest mean value (1.40 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>) of available magnesium was recorded in natural forest soils followed by custard land use (1.05 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>), mango (0.89 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>), agroforestry (melia dubia) with 0.61 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>. teak plantation (0.44 cmol (p+) kg-1) and lowest mean (0.31 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>) was noticed in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer. Muche et al. (2015) found that, significantly higher exchangeable bases (Ca and Mg) were found in soil of the natural forest compared to the other land use

(5182.79 kg/ha/year) and higher leaf litter calcium and magnesium concentration (2.67% and 0.44%) respectively, result in soil enriched with calcium and magnesium upon decomposition of litter. This variation in exchangeable bases (Ca and Mg) might be attributed to leaching losses, low content in the parent rock and the proportion of clay minerals as well as the conversion of forest land into the other land use types. Aweto and Dikinya (2003) reported that calcium and magnesium were higher in soil under the tree canopies and it was mainly due to the accumulation of litter.

types. This higher litter fall in natural forest

The Mysore Journal of Agricultural Sciences

PRADEEP AND R. KRISHNA MURTHY

recorded at of 60-90 cm soil depth. The exchangeable calcium and magnesium decreased with increase in soil depth. This might be attributed to continuous addition of litter for several years and these soils remained undisturbed for many years.

The highest mean value (6.01 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>) of available sulphur was recorded in agroforestry (melia dubia) followed by mango (5.26 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>), natural forest soils (5.01 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>), teak plantation (4.41 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>) and lowest mean value was noticed in finger millet cropping systemchemical fertilizer (1.46 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>). The maximum available sulphur content of 7.98 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup> was recorded in the surface soil layer of melia dubia and a minimum available sulphur content of 0.47 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup> was recorded in the subsurface (60-90 cm) layer of finger millet cropping system). When compared to agriculture (finger millet) system, the available sulphur level in soils under agroforestry (melia dubia) was much higher followed by mango, natural forest (Table 4). The reason for this could be due to increasing soil organic carbon content which reduces sulphate ion leaching. Acid soils in Manipur have an inorganic sulphur level ranging from 10 to 70 ppm, according to Herojith Singh et al. (2007), with the higher available sulphur content ascribed to higher organic matter content.

# Micronutrients in Soil under different Land Use Systems

The DTPA extractable iron (Fe), manganese (Mn), zinc (Zn) and copper (Cu) content of soils were significantly affected by land use types and soil depth (Tables 5). The highest mean value (18.88 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) of DTPA extractable iron (Fe) was recorded in natural forest soils followed by teak plantation (15.25 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), agroforestry (melia dubia) with 14.17 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, mango (14.07 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and lowest mean value (8.19 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer. The highest mean value (32.74 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) of DTPA extractable manganese (Mn) was recorded in natural forest soils followed by teak plantation (25.79 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), mango (18.67 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), agroforestry (melia dubia) with 18.07 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and lowest mean value (7.78 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer. The highest mean value (1.53 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) of DTPA extractable zinc (Zn) was recorded in natural forest soil followed by teak plantation (1.31 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), agroforestry (melia dubia) with 1.22 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>, mango (1.16 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) and lowest mean value (0.38 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in finger millet cropping system-chemical fertilizer. The highest mean value (1.62 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) of DTPA extractable copper (Cu) was recorded in mango followed by natural forest soils (1.49 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), teak plantation (1.02 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>), agroforestry (melia dubia) with 0.86 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> and lowest mean value (0.41 mg kg<sup>-1</sup>) was recorded in finger millet-chemical fertilizer.

Iron (Fe), manganese (Mn), copper (Cu) and zinc (Zn) availability depends on soil pH, organic matter content, adsorptive surfaces, other physical, chemical and biological conditions in the soil rhizosphere (Kaur *et al.*, 2020). The difference in various micronutrients status under different tree species could be attributed to variation in concentration and rate of decomposition of micronutrients in the litter as well as the quantity of litter added. The DTPA extractable iron (Fe), manganese (Mn), zinc (Zn) and copper (Cu) content in soil was decreased with increasing soil depth.

The results showed a distinct change in soil properties of the different land use systems. The study area has low bulk density, which is indicating the higher soil OM. The soil pH was acidic in agriculture (finger millet) land use and it is neutral in natural forest. The soil electrical conductivity was normal in all the land use systems. The higher SOC was recorded in natural forest and higher available N was recorded in the cultivated (finger millet). The higher SOC and available N were observed in the surface soil layers and they found decreasing with increasing soil depth. The available P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O contents were higher in agriculture (finger millet) compared to other land use systems. Even higher concentration of secondary and micronutrients were recorded in natural forest, agroforestry, mango and teak plantation. These results demonstrate that conversion of natural forest into different land use

PRADEEP AND R. KRISHNA MURTHY

systems adversely affect the soil properties, but land restoration in the region by promoting specific management practice like application of organic residue and sustainable land management practice in land use systems will improve and maintain soil physical and chemical properties.

# References

- AMANUEL, W., YIMER, F. AND KARLTUN, E., 2018, Soil organic carbon variation in relation to land use changes: the case of Birr watershed, upper Blue Nile River Basin, Ethiopia, J. Ecol. Environ., 42 : 16.
- ANANTHKUMAR, M. A., 2011, Soil properties and dynamics of major nutrients in soils as influenced by shade trees, rainfall pattern and nutrient management in coffee growing areas of Karnataka. *Mysore J. Agric. Sci.*, 45 (3): 45 58.
- AWETO, A. O. AND DIKINYA, O., 2003, The beneficial effects of two tree species on soil properties in a semi-arid savanna rangeland in Botswana. *Land Cont. Rec.*, 11 (3): 339 344.
- BHARDWAJ, S. D., PANWAR. AND GAUTAM, S., 2001, Biomass production potential and nutrient dynamics of *Populus del-toides* under high density plantations. *Indian For.*, **127**: 144 - 153.
- BHAVYA, V. P., ANIL KUMAR, S., ASHOK ALUR, SHIVANNA, M., AND SHIVAKUMAR, K. M., 2018, Changes in soil physical properties as a result of different land use systems with Depth, *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci.*, 7 (01): 323 - 327.
- BLACK, C. A., 1965, Methods of Soil Analysis Part-I. Physical and mineralogical properties. Agronomy Monograph No. 9. Am. Soc. Agron. Inc. Madison, Wisconsin, USA, 18 - 25.
- CENTER FOR SCIENCE AND ENVIRONMENT (CSE) annual data. 2020.
- CHANDEL, S., HADDA, M. S. AND MAHAL, A. K., 2018. Soil quality assessment through minimum data set under different land uses of submontane, Punjab, *Communications in Soil Sci., Plant Ana.*, **49** (6) : 658 - 674, DOI: 10.1080/00103624.2018.1425424.

- CHIBSA, T. AND TAA, A., 2009, Assessment of soil organic matter under four land use systems in bale highlands, Southeast Ethiopia A. Soil organic matter contents in four land use systems: forestland, grassland, fallow land and cultivated land. *World Appl. Sci. J.*, 6 (9): 1231 - 1246.
- DASOG, G. S. AND PATIL, P. L., 2011, Genesis and classification of black, red and lateritic soils of north Karnataka. In: Special publ. on Soil Science Research in north Karnataka, 76<sup>th</sup> Annual Convention of ISSS, Dharwad chapter of ISSS (Eds.) C. V. Patil, S. C. Kotur, G. S. Dasog and H. T. Channal, pp. : 1 10.
- FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION of the United Nations annual data. 2020.
- GAJANANA, G. N., GANAPATHI AND SHANKAR, M. A., 2005, Relevance of organic matter for sustainable crop production in dryland - A success story for 25 years. *Tech. Bulletin*, AICRP for dryland Agriculture, GKVK, UAS, Bangalore, pp. : 66.
- GOVIND. K. AND KRISHNAMURTHY, R., 2022, Impact of different land-use systems on selected soil physicochemical properties in Biligirirangana Hills, Chamarajanagara district. *Mysore J. Agric. Sci.*, 56 (2) : 135 - 143.
- GROSSMAN, R. B. AND REINSCH, T. G., 2002, Bulk density and linear extensibility. *Methods of soil analysis: Part 4 physical methods*, **5**: 201 - 228.
- GUPTA, M. K. AND SHARMA, S. D., 2008, Effect of tree plantation on soil properties, profile morphology and productivity index in Uttarakhand. *Annl. For.*, **16** (2) : 209 224.
- HEMALATHA, S. AND CHELLAMUTHU, S., 2013, Impacts of long term fertilization on soil nutritional quality under finger millet: maize cropping sequence. J. Environ. Res., 7 (4A) : 1571 - 1576.

The Mysore Journal of Agricultural Sciences

HEROJIT SINGH ATHOKPAM, R. K., KUMARJIT SINGH, L. N., SINGH, N., GOPIMOHAN SINGH., NANDINI CHONGTHAM AND KUMAR SINGH, A. K., 2007, Sulphur status and forms in acid soils of Manipur. *Indian J. Agric. Res.*, **41 (3)** : 205 - 209.

- IQBAL, M., KHAN, A. G., HASSAN, A. U. AND AMJAD, M., 2012, Soil physical health indices, soil organic carbon, nitrate contents and wheat growth as influenced by irrigation and nitrogen rates. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.*, 14 : 20 - 28.
- ISHWARYA LAXMI, V., KRISHNA, A., MADHAVI LATA, A., MADHAVI, A. AND PARAMESWARI, Y. S., 2021, Evaluation of Melia Dubia for its biomass production, Carbon Stock, Carbon Sequestration and Economic Returns in Agroforestry System. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci.*, 33 (11) : 46 - 54.
- JACKSON, M. L., 1973, Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall of India (Pvt.) Ltd., New Delhi.
- KAUR, R., SINGH, B., DHALIWAL, S. S. AND DYNAMICS, 2020, of Soil cationic micronutrients in a chronosequence of poplar (*Populus deltoides* Bartr.), Based agroforestry system in India. J. Soil Sci. Plant Nutr. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s42729-020-00272-4
- LINDSAY, W. L. AND NORWELL, W. A., 1978, Development of a DTPA soil test for Zn, Fe, Mn and Cu. *Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.*, **42** : 421 - 428.
- MISHRA, A. AND SWAMY, S. L., 2007, Eco-physiology, productivity and nutrient uptake of soybean under *Populus deltoides* based agri-silviculture system. J. Soils & Crops, 17 (2): 217 - 214.
- MUCHE, M., KOKEB, A. AND MOLLA, E., 2015, Assessing the physicochemical properties of soil under different land use types. J. Environ. & Anal. Toxicol, 5:309.
- NAGARAJ, J. S., ASEEF, K. M., VIOLET D'SOUZA, M. AND JAYARAMA, 2002, Soil nutrient status of Chikmagalur district in Karnataka cropped to arabica coffee and their relationship with coffee yield. Proc. *15th Plantation Crops Symposium PLACROSYM*, **15**: 282 - 286.
- OYEDELE, D. J., AWOTOYEM, O. O. AND POPOOLA, S. E., 2009, Soil physical and chemical properties under continuous maize cultivation as influenced by hedgerow trees species on an alfisol in South Western Nigeria. *Afr. J. Agric. Res.*, **4** (7) : 736 - 739.
- PAGE, A. L., MILLER, R. H. AND KEENEY, D. R., 1982, Methods of soil and plant analysis, Part-2, *Soil Sci.*

Soc. Am. J., Inc. Publis., Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp.: 367.

- PIPER, C. S., 1966, *Soil and Plant Analysis*. Hans Publishers, Bombay.
- RUDRAMURTHY, H. V., PUTTAIAH, E. T. AND VAGEESH, T. S., 2007, Chemical properties of soils under different land use systems in Shimoga district of Karnataka. *J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci.*, **55** : 259 - 264.
- SUBBAIAH, B. V. AND ASIJA, G. L., 1956, A rapid procedure for the estimation of available nitrogen in soils. *Curr. Sci.*, 25 : 259 - 260.
- SUSHANTA KUMAR, N., SUDARSHAN, M., ARUN KUMAR, S. AND BHAGWATI, P. B., 2018, Rates of decomposition and nutrient mineralization of leaf litter from different orchards under hot and dry sub-humid climate. *Arch. Agron. Soil Sci.*, **37** : 340 - 365.
- SHIVAKUMAR, K. M., PRAKASH, S. S., NAGARAJA, M. S., VIJAY KUMAR, C. AND PRABHUDEV, D., 2020, Effect of Different land use systems on major nutrient statusmin soils of Westernghat-Chikamagalur, Karnataka, India. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. Appl. Sci., 9 (11): 3502 - 3510.
- SINGH, B. AND SHARMA, K. N., 2012, Depth wise distribution of soil organic carbon and nutrients under some tree species after seventeen years of plantation, *J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci.*, **60** (3) : 198 - 203.
- SWAMY, S. L., MISHRA, A. AND PURI, S., 2006, Comparison of growth, biomass and nutrient distribution in five promising clones of *Populus deltoides* under an agrisilviculture system. *Biore. Techn.*, 97: 57 - 68.
- TAKELE, L., CHIMDI, A. AND ABEBAW, A., 2014, Dynamics of soil fertility as influenced by different land use systems and soil depth in west Showa Zone, Gindeberet district, Ethiopia. *Agric. For. Fish*, **3** (6) : 489 - 494.
- VERMA, R. K., SHADANGI, D. K. AND TOTEY, N. G., 2001, Analysis of biodiversity and improvement in soil quality under plantations on degraded land. *Indian* J. For., 24 (1): 21 - 28.
- WALKLEY, A. AND BLACK, I. A., 1934, An examination of the digestion method for determining soil organic matter and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration method. *Soil Sci.*, **37** : 29 38.