

## Soil Sulfur Deficiency Indices Assessment for Wheat Production in Ethiopia

Assefa Menna<sup>1\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Debre Zeit Research Center, Ethiopian Institute of Agricultural Research (EIAR), P.O.Box-2003, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

### Author's contribution

The sole author designed, analyzed and interpreted and prepared the manuscript.

### Article Information

DOI: 10.9734/AJSSPN/2017/37480

#### Editor(s):

(1) Prabhakar Tamboli, Adjunct Professor & Director International Training Program, Department of Environmental Science & Technology, University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742, USA.

#### Reviewers:

(1) Zainal Muktamar, University of Bengkulu, Indonesia.

(2) Anibal Condor Golec, Peru.

(3) Ahmet Esen Celen, Ege University, Turkey.

(4) Ade Onanuga, Lethbridge College, Canada.

Complete Peer review History: <http://www.sciencedomain.org/review-history/22104>

Original Research Article

Received 18<sup>th</sup> October 2017  
Accepted 8<sup>th</sup> November 2017  
Published 30<sup>th</sup> November 2017

### ABSTRACT

Sulfur (S) deficiency is becoming one of the soil health challenges in the Ethiopian crop production systems. However, visual identification of its deficiency, especially in cereals is difficult, because the symptoms are nearly identical with those of nitrogen. Hence, deficiency indicators are necessary for balancing fertilizer use. For this purpose, 18 sulfur response experiments conducted in 2012-14 were considered. Major aim was identifying more suitable indices of S supply and setting their critical thresholds. The treatments were: absolute control (CK); nitrogen (N); nitrogen and sulfur (NS); and nitrogen, phosphorus and sulfur (NPS). The levels of nutrients tested were: S (0 and 20 kg S/ha), P (0 and 20 kg P/ha) and N (0 and 69 kg N/ha) in the form of gypsum, triple-super phosphate (TSP) and urea, respectively. Treatments were arranged in randomized complete block (RCB) design and replicated 3 times. In the study, from the selected indices: N/S-ratio and S concentration in wheat at booting showed better sensitivity as indicators of S deficiency than the organic carbon (OC) in native soils. Critical levels (CLs) were set at 90% relative yield (RY), using the Cate and Nelson model, and estimated to be 16.5:1(N/S-ratio), and 0.16% (S concentration); and 2.07% (for the soil OC). Therefore, sulfur responsive soils/treatments in wheat at booting can be separated from un-responsive ones, in which case much sulfur response is expected for sites/treatments with N/S-ratio >16.5:1; TS <0.16%; and the soil OC <2.07%. This study further

\*Corresponding author: Email: assefams@yahoo.com;

affirmed that, plant analysis could be used as a better tool for assessing sulfur deficiency in wheat than soil analysis. Thus, the results could be used as provisional recommendations for wheat growing and as the basis for further sulfur research in Ethiopia. However, differences between the estimated values and those reported in literature have been observed. Therefore, the follow-up research should focus in identifying/standardizing a more reliable index of S deficiency and CLs, through a more reliable research condition.

*Keywords: Sulfur deficiency indices; total sulfur; N/S-ratios; wheat shoot; booting; plant analysis.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Continuous removal of plant nutrients from native soils through plant uptake without replenishment, coupled with different losses has led to sulfur(S) deficiency, particularly in annually cropped-lands in Ethiopia, and affecting soils sulfur budget [1,2,3,4]. However, visual identification of S deficiency in cereals, (e.g., wheat) under field conditions is difficult, since the deficiency symptoms are nearly identical with those of nitrogen(N). As a result, yield losses may occur with marginal deficiency showing no visual symptoms. Consequently, sulfur availability indicators are required to balance fertilizer recommendations in order to avoid or reduce yield and quality losses due to visible or hidden S deficiency.

To diagnose the deficiencies of S in crops, methods based on soil and plant analysis including simulations models have been used [5,6]. Among others, such indices may include organic carbon(OC), total sulfur(TS), organic sulfur(OS) and  $\text{SO}_4\text{-S}$  in soils; and  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}\text{S}$ , TS, N/S-ratio,  $\text{SO}_4^{2-}\text{S}:\text{TS}$  ratio, malate: $\text{SO}_4^{2-}\text{S}$  ratio and glutation etc. at various stages of plants growth [7,8]. The critical values determined for those indices, however, show a range of variations depending on factors including experimental conditions and method of analysis. For instance, according to [9,10], N/S-ratio in wheat showed better sensitivity at one distinguishable node and visible flag leaf ligule stages. Consequently, N/S-ratio was suggested to be a useful method from the end of tillering to flag leaf in spring red wheat. But, the same authors reported, lack of stability of N/S-ratio in the stages between 2-4 tillers. Regardless, of these disparities, for spring red wheat, the authors recommended, N/S-ratio in advanced stages of crop cycle. In line with this, [11] made reviews on various S deficiency indices, and concluded that plant analysis was better than soil-testing for predicting the need of S application and several diagnostic indices have been suggested, but no general consensus has been reached.

A. Menna et al. [2] considered  $\text{SO}_4\text{-S}$  in native soils; TS and N/S-ratio in wheat grain and indicated that, plant variables showed better correlation with S-uptake than soil variables. The authors concluded that, TS in wheat seed followed by its N/S-ratio was found to be a better tool of S supply than  $\text{SO}_4\text{-S}$  in soils. However, [12] recommended the youngest fully-developed leaves, if critical S concentrations in plant are to be developed for wheat. That was the most likely growth stage to produce satisfactory results, because leaf tissues contain the highest nutrient concentrations, which facilitate analysis. Furthermore, the deficiency symptoms are suggested to be more pronounced in younger developing leaves.

Also, according to [13] S deficiency was best identified by determining the total N/S-ratio followed by S concentration in vegetative tissue in wheat. The authors further noted that, S content in the whole plant tissue was not as reliable as N/S-ratio for determining S deficiency, because S content declined rapidly with growth, (0.25% at tillering to 0.12% at heading). This was also reported to vary significantly between years at a comparable growth stage and as a result, determination of critical S concentration was reported to be difficult.

Based on the above backgrounds, therefore, the objectives of this work were: 1) correlate some selected indices of S deficiency with yield, and 2) to estimate critical levels(CLs) for the selected indices: OC in soils; N/S-ratio and TS in wheat. The possible questions intended by this set of experiment were: a) Is OC in native soils; TS and N/S-ratios in wheat at booting, best correlate with S-uptake data? If so, b) what are the CLs for those indices?

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 Description of the Study Areas

The study was conducted in Arsi (Ar), East Shewa (ES) and Oromia Liyuu (OL) zones, in the

Central Highlands (HLs) of Ethiopia. The areas cover different agro-ecological zones (AEZs) and soil types. Some specific locations and salient features of the study areas are presented in Table 1.

## 2.2 Methodology

Eighteen explorative sulfur response field experiments were conducted in 2012-14 cropping-seasons in the central HLs of Ethiopia, representing major cereals (e.g., wheat) and legumes growing three representative locations, namely Ar, ES and OL zones. Soil-types in the studied areas are typically vertisols and nitisols. The pH (1:2.5, soil:water ratio) of soils ranged from 5.1 (strongly acidic) in OL followed by a pH near neutral in Ar; to 8.1 (moderately alkaline, with the observed gray nodules of  $\text{CaCO}_3$  (calcareous) in ES. The Calcium-orthophosphate ( $\text{Ca}(\text{H}_2\text{PO}_4)_2$ ) extractable  $\text{SO}_4\text{-S}$  range was 1.30–24.18 mg/kg. The total nitrogen (TN), determined by micro-Kjeldahl digestion as described in [14] ranged, 0.06-0.25%. Available P extracted by [15] for ES ranged from 7.55 to 10.99 mg/kg; and the Bray-I P, [16] for Ar and OL, ranged 0.22–5.12 mg/kg. The OC contents of soils ranged from 0.90% to 2.99% [1].

The test crop used was, "Kekeba", a newly released wheat cultivar. The treatments were combined by omitting some nutrient elements as: absolute control/check (CK); nitrogen (N) only; nitrogen plus sulfur (NS); and nitrogen, phosphorus plus sulfur (NPS). Two levels of each nutrient element tested were: S (0 and 20 kg S/ha), P(0 and 20 kgP/ha) and N (0 and 69 kgN/ha). Nutrient sources were gypsum, triple-super phosphate (TSP) and urea. The treatments were arranged in randomized complete block (RCB) design and replicated 3 times. Each replication was sub-divided into a 3m x 5m =15m<sup>2</sup> experimental units, and there were 4 plots per block. One third of N was incorporated into soils within rows before seeding to enhance its use efficiency, whereas the remaining 2/3 was top-dressed at tillering, a stage where wheat is considered to be in greater N demand. Entire sources of SP were drilled within rows and incorporated into the soils just before planting, as both SP deficiencies affect plant development in its early stages of growth. The agronomic spacing for wheat 25 (rows) x 5 cm (plants) was used. There were 12-rows of wheat per plot, two borders and one row next to a border was used for plant sampling. The remaining rows were used for agronomic/yield data collection.

## 2.3 Plant Tissue Sampling and Analysis

At booting stage 54 representative healthy wheat plant samples were collected from each plot (cutting at basal) from a row next to one of the borders for laboratory (Lab) analysis. The samples were collected with clean hands, by cutting with scissors to avoid contaminations. Samples were rinsed quickly using distilled water and shaken to dry right in fields and thereafter put in paper bags. The sampling points were geo-referenced using Global Positioning System (GPS) assisted by Google earth–(2011), and were classified by elevation and soil-type when known. The GARMIN model number GPS-60 made in USA in 2007 was used. Then in the Labs, samples were oven-dried at 65-70°C for 48hrs. On dry-weight basis the RY% and S-uptake were calculated. Finally, 27 plants were selected randomly and cut at the upper 1/3 part of each of the plants and ground using Tecator-CYCLOTEC-1093 sample mill.

In Labs, finely ground materials were wet-digested using 68% $\text{HNO}_3$ -30% $\text{H}_2\text{O}_2$  for TS determination (turbidimetric). The contents were then read using spectrophotometer. The TN was determined by stem distillation [17] after extracting by micro-Kjeldahl wet-digestion (using conc. $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$ ) in digestion tubes [18] and back-titrated against 0.05N: $\text{H}_2\text{SO}_4$ , from which S-uptake and N/S-ratios were calculated. The relative yield (RY) was calculated with levels of S as percentage.  $\text{RY} = [\text{N}/(\text{N}+1)] * 100$  [19]. Where: N is wheat yield from treatments without sulfur; and (N+1) is the yield of wheat at next higher level treatments containing S fertilizer.

## 2.4 Data Analysis

For augmenting the work of [2] three more sulfur supply indices: OC in native soils; and TS and N/S-ratio in wheat at booting stage were correlated with S-uptake and the slopes were compared through parallelism and coincidence test using PROC-REG for SAS statistical package [20]. Based on the coefficients of determination ( $R^2$ ) for the indices, CLs were set at the RY of 90%, using the Cate and Nelson model [19]. The method involved plotting of the values for the indices against RY. The horizontal and vertical lines were then positioned on scatter-diagram points to maximize the number of points in positive quadrants for S and OC (1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> quadrants); and in the negative quadrants for N/S-ratio. This can be verified statistically from the values of total variance ( $R^2$ ) of the observed

**Table 1. Geographic locations of the selected study sites for sulfur response trial**

Farmer field/Sites	Latitude(N)		Longitude(E)		Altitude	Soil type
	Degree	mm.mm	Degree	mm.mm	m	
Abosara-Alko (A/Alko),(AA)	7	49.454	39	1.661	2297.02	Chromic Vertisol
Dosha,(Do)	7	53.813	39	6.176	2418.32	Nitosol
Gora-Silingo (G/Silingo),( GS)	8	0.792	39	8.436	2151.10	Chromic Vertisol
Chefe-Misoma (C/Misoma),CM	7	59.067	39	3.964	1768.98	Nitosol
Boneya-Edo (B/Edo),BE	8	3.507	39	17.184	2359.95	Chromic Vertisol
Boru Lencha (B/Lencha),(BL)	8	7.476	39	17.722	2186.37	Nitosol
Chefe Donsa (C/Donsa),CD	8	57.113	39	6.087	2426.53	Pellic Vertisol
Keteba(Ke)	8	53.553	39	1.913	2224.37	Pellic Vertisol
Ude(Ud)	8	40.767	39	2.197	1873.86	Pellic Vertisol
Bekejo(Bk)	8	38.376	38	55.322	1874.16	Pellic Vertisol
Insilale(In)	8	51.647	38	53.214	2211.30	Chromic Vertisol
Kilinto(Ki)	8	54.099	38	49.133	2204.00	Pellic Vertisol
Nano-Kersa (N/Kersa),(NK)	8	55.605	38	31.062	2123.74	Chromic Vertisol
Nano-Suba (N/Suba),(NS)	8	57.287	38	29.756	2229.54	Nitosol
(Berfeta-Tokofa) B/Tokofa,(BT)	8	59.605	38	30.98	2252.64	Nitosol
Dawa-Lafto, (D/Lafto),(DL)	8	59.147	38	26.92	2173.60	Nitosol
Wajitu-Harbu (W/Harbu),(WH)	9	1.457	38	28.731	2335.63	Nitosol
Tulu-Harbu (T/Harbu),(TH)	9	2.571	38	28.817	2349.62	Nitosol

**Table 2. Some more selected indices of sulfur supply in wheat at booting (native soil conditions)**

<b>Study area/zone</b>	<b>Farmer field</b>	<b>SO<sub>4</sub>-S in soil (mg/kg)</b>	<b>OC in Soil (%)</b>	<b>Total N in Soil (%)</b>	<b>Total N in Wheat (%)</b>	<b>Total S in wheat (%)</b>	<b>N/S-ratio in wheat</b>	<b>S-uptake in wheat (kg/ha)</b>	<b>RY of wheat (%)</b>
Arsi	A/Alko	6.94	1.11	0.126	2.618	0.11	23.80	2.28	68.40
Arsi	Dosha	10.44	2.04	0.252	2.705	0.15	18.03	4.58	91.36
Arsi	G/Silingo	7.77	1.17	0.14	2.467	0.11	22.43	2.52	74.43
Arsi	C/Misoma	22.13	2.75	0.133	2.131	0.18	11.84	3.99	97.48
Arsi	B/Edo	21.50	2.77	0.203	2.311	0.18	12.84	3.75	98.22
Arsi	B/Lencha	4.32	1.07	0.105	2.594	0.11	23.58	1.46	62.46
E.Shewa	C/Donsa	15.37	0.90	0.063	3.103	0.18	17.24	3.15	88.46
E/Shewa	Keteba	5.78	1.06	0.056	3.056	0.13	23.51	1.83	69.56
E/Shewa	Ude	12.37	1.23	0.098	2.793	0.15	18.62	2.19	89.17
E/Shewa	Bekejo	1.30	1.31	0.07	2.635	0.11	23.95	1.79	71.65
E/Shewa	Insilale	6.62	1.35	0.098	2.646	0.12	22.05	1.35	68.54
E/Shewa	Kilinto	8.27	1.39	0.056	1.624	0.08	20.30	1.66	70.93
O/Liyuu	N/Kersa	11.89	1.41	0.07	2.010	0.12	16.75	3.75	88.33
O/Liyuu	N/Suba	5.64	1.47	0.126	2.557	0.12	21.31	1.98	72.83
O/Liyuu	B/Tokofa	3.82	1.69	0.119	1.823	0.09	20.26	1.55	70.26
O/Liyuu	D/Lafto	10.83	1.71	0.14	2.603	0.11	23.66	1.86	80.10
O/Liyuu	W/Harbu	23.02	2.99	0.154	2.541	0.16	15.88	2.79	91.09
O/Liyuu	T/Harbu	24.18	1.31	0.14	2.386	0.16	14.91	4.78	93.69

**Table 3. Pearson correlation coefficients (r), between S-uptake and different indices of S availability in wheat at booting, (N =18)**

	Site	Village	SO <sub>4</sub> -S	OC	TN (soil)	TN	TS	NS-ratio	S-uptakes
<b>Site</b>	1.00000	0.00000	0.06135	-0.03656	-0.28725	-0.16471	-0.18006	0.00447	-0.11813
		1.0000	0.8089	0.8855	0.2478	0.5137	0.4746	0.9860	0.64060
<b>Village</b>	0.00000	1.00000	0.25918	0.29265	0.08469	-0.33936	-0.03766	-0.14146	-0.09846
	1.0000		0.2990	0.2386	0.7383	0.1683	0.8821	0.5755	0.69750
<b>SO<sub>4</sub>-S (soil)</b>	0.06135	0.25918	1.00000	0.62671	0.37945	-0.07343	0.80584	-0.87894	0.74266
	0.8089	0.2990		0.0054	0.1204	0.7722	<.0001	<.0001	0.00040
<b>OC (native soil)</b>	-0.03656	0.29265	0.62671	1.00000	0.60892	-0.30129	0.48091	-0.66597	0.40798
	0.8855	0.2386	0.0054		0.0073	0.2244	0.0433	0.0026	0.0928
<b>TN (native soil)</b>	-0.28725	0.08469	0.37945	0.60892	1.00000	0.00407	0.37197	-0.36552	0.53809
	0.2478	0.7383	0.1204	0.0073		0.9872	0.1285	0.1358	0.0212
<b>TN (at booting)</b>	-0.16471	-0.33936	-0.07343	-0.30129	0.00407	1.00000	0.37362	0.28074	-0.04774
	0.5137	0.1683	0.7722	0.2244	0.9872		0.1267	0.2591	0.8508
<b>TS (at booting)</b>	-0.18006	-0.03766	0.80584	0.48091	0.37197	0.37362	1.00000	-0.77604	0.70675
	0.4746	0.8821	<.0001	0.0433	0.1285	0.1267		0.0002	0.0010
<b>NS ratio (at booting)</b>	0.00447	-0.14146	-0.87894	-0.66597	-0.36552	0.28074	-0.77604	1.00000	-0.78397
	0.9860	0.5755	<.0001	0.0026	0.1358	0.2591	0.0002		0.0001
<b>Uptakes (at booting)</b>	-0.11813	-0.09846	0.74266	0.40798	0.53809	-0.04774	0.70675	-0.78397	1.00000
	0.6406	0.6975	0.0004	0.0928	0.0212	0.8508	0.0010	0.0001	

values with postulated critical values, where  $R^2$  peaks at CLs. The analysis of variance (ANOVA) for yield and yield components data was done using PROC-MIXED of generalized linear model (GLM) of SAS protocols [20] to evaluate the differences between treatments. When the differences between treatments were significant, least significant difference (LSD) was used to separate the means, with a significant level of 0.1%, 1% and 5%.

### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Using high-analysis fertilizers lacking adventitious sulfur coupled with traditional farming and cropping systems that mine plant nutrients, particularly S from native soils is becoming one of the soil health problems in the agricultural crop production systems in Ethiopia. To reduce yield and quality loss of crops due to S deficiency, therefore, S supply indices are necessary. Table 2 presents some more selected indices: TN and OC in native soil; and TS and N/S-ratio in wheat shoot at booting for investigating against yield.

#### 3.1 Relation of Selected Indices

The relationships between S-uptake and S supply indices are presented in Table 2. It is shown that, the indices under investigation are positively related to S-uptake in the order of importance as: N/S-ratio >TS >OC with the coefficients of correlations, 0.78, 0.71 and 0.41 respectively. As shown, the S and OC contents had direct relationships, whereas, N/S-ratio had an inverse relationship. Indeed, the N/S-ratios and S concentration were relatively more strongly related with yield than the OC, based on the criteria set in literature [21]. Details of the results are discussed in the following subsections.

##### 3.1.1 Soil organic carbon

The soil OC is positively related to S-uptake, with coefficient of correlation( $r$ ), 0.41. But it is weak as compared to the N/S-ratio and TS (Table 3). The organic carbon's weak correlation is not unexpected, because of its unpredictable quantity of nutrients that can be released through mineralization.

Sulfur in soils is usually associated with organic fractions, and its supply to crops is largely regulated by soil organic matter (SOM). It is reported that the amount of labile OC is

considered to be a good indicator of plant available S [22]. It is also widely recognized that, OC is not only the indicator of the supply of essential elements like C, N, P, K and S, but also considered to be one of the key indicators of soil health or quality [23,24,25]. However, controversies exist in quantifying the amount of S that is released through mineralization and in setting its CLs for sustained soil functions. This can hold true, because during various growth stages of crops, the mineralization can be slow or late and the amount of S released during critical stages of plant growth, may not be sufficient enough to meet S demand, especially when accounting for the different losses. In line with this [11] reported the difficulty of predicting the amount of  $SO_4$ -S that can come from added OM, because of the complicated dynamics in the soil system.

This can especially hold true, under tropical climatic/soil conditions. In addition, the organic resources, in the studied areas have alternative uses and not returned into soils [4]. Furthermore, the quantity of OC itself, including nitrogen in the studied soils was critically low for sustaining soil quality (Table 1).

##### 3.1.2 Total sulfur

The total sulfur (TS) content in wheat was also positively related to S-uptake with the coefficient of correlation ( $r$ ), 0.71 and level of significance, ( $P<0.0010$ ) (Tables 2 through 4). But, it is less strongly related to yield compared to the N/S-ratio, as its  $r$  value is lower. This may suggest that, the S content at vegetative stage is less reliable diagnostic tool of S deficiency than N/S-ratio. Indeed, this is in agreement with the works of [13]. The authors suggested determining the total N/S-ratio followed by S content in vegetative tissue as a better tool for identifying S deficiency in wheat. The authors further noted that, sulfur concentration is less reliably indicated S-deficiency as compared to N/S-ratio in vegetative stage, because of the differences in S levels between S-deficient and S-sufficient wheat. According to, [13], sulfur distribution among various plant organs suggests that critical S levels might best be obtained by utilizing green leaf tissue, as vegetative stages are in greatest nutrients demand and with higher S content in tissues.

##### 3.1.3 N/S-ratio in wheat

The N/S-ratio in wheat at booting was better correlated with yield than both sulfur and OC

contents. Its  $r$  value is -0.78 and significant at  $P < 0.001$  (Tables 2 through 4). It is known that, useful diagnostic tools for S deficiency are the soil and plant variables. Further, it is well recognized that, the S status of plants is assumed to be a suitable parameter to calibrate soil-test methods and its suitability should depend on the degree of its association with yield. However, its coefficient of correlation determined is slightly lower than the minimum data set by [21], i.e. greater or equals to 0.84.

In accordance, [13] suggested determining the total N/S-ratio followed by S concentration in vegetative tissue as a better tool for identifying S deficiency. But, [8] opposed the idea. The authors reported, that N/S-ratio is not an appropriate diagnostic tool for S deficiency in the early stages of wheat growth, and affirmed that in the appropriate nitrogen and sulfur availability conditions, the N/S-ratio is not stable during, the beginning of tillering to stem elongation end in wheat. According to these authors, this lack of stability was attributed to the lower S dilution in relation to N, which is related to the lower initial accumulation rate of S. In any case, however, from the present study it is learnt that, plant analysis offered a better tool than soil-testing (in this case, the OC) in predicting S deficiency in wheat and/or the studied soils.

#### 4. ESTIMATION OF CRITICAL LEVELS

Critical values for the TS, N/S-ratio and OC contents were derived from yield-composition curves fitted by eye and represent the value of the index corresponding to 90% of maximum yield. The horizontal lines depict 90% maximum dry-matter yield and vertical lines depict the critical thresholds. However, it should be noted that, critical values are only useful for differentiating between deficiency and sufficiency levels, and does not describe the degree of deficiency, as there are no exact break points between a nutrient being sufficient, deficient, or toxic. Further, it is important to note that, as CLs separates only the lows and highs, marginal levels can go some points above or below the values that are being estimated.

##### 4.1 Nitrogen to Sulfur Ratio

The scatter diagram for relative yield (RY) and N/S-ratios in wheat at the booting stage of growth are shown in Fig. 1. This relationship was used to determine the critical levels using the Cate and Nelson model [19]. As shown, the N/S-

ratios varied over sites depending on native soil conditions (Fig. 1 and Table 3). Unlike the S and OC contents, N/S-ratio was inversely related to the RY. All the scatter diagram points lie in a straight line and all are in negative quadrants, except only for one point, indicating that the RY was behaving normally in relation to S status of soils. Its regression equation is,  $Y = -2.6781X + 132.61$  with the coefficient of regression ( $R^2$ ), 81%. The regression line indicates that, maximum RY, 90% was obtained when the N/S-ratio was nearly 16.5:1; and as the S deficiency becomes more sever, the ratio is increased to above 24:1. In general, this critical threshold, 16.5:1, could be used to distinguish S responsive sites/soils or treatments from non-responsive ones. Wheat is likely to suffer from sulfur deficiency when the N/S-ratio goes above this CL. This is nearly close to the value reported by [26], 17:1, in the upper fully developed leaves at flag leaf stage to anthesis. But, the obtained value in the present study is higher than that reported by [27], 14.9. It agrees also with a range reported by [28] for the total N/S-ratio in wheat, that varied between 14.8:1 to 16:1, during tillering to heading. Reussi et al. [28] reported that, between 90 and 100% of wheat samples were correctly diagnosed by total N/S-ratio during tillering and the critical N/S-ratio varied from 14.8:1 to 16:1.

Rasmussen, et al. [13] also suggested 17 as a CL for the N/S-ratio in the early stages of wheat growth. The authors further noted that, vegetative growth generally decreased from tillering to booting, when the whole plant N/S-ratio exceeded 17. According to their report, the N/S-ratio in S-sufficient plants declined gradually with age, implying that the critical N/S-ratio may decline with advancing growth up to harvest. Also, both N and S concentrations in the advanced stages of growth, including grain were reported to be low, due to dilution effects. The authors, further stressed that, the changes in stem:leaf ratio could have been responsible for the decline, since the N/S-ratio in stem tissue at heading was less than that of the green leaf.


In any case, however, the suitability of N/S-ratio as indicator of S supply in wheat is still subject to strong debate. For instance, [10] questioned the usefulness of N/S-ratio concept, as it reflects the relative proportions than the actual magnitude of either of the elements. According to the authors, low N/S-ratio suggests S sufficiency when both nutrients might be deficient, whereas high N/S-ratio might mean excessive N instead S



**Table 4. Simple Statistics for the variables considered in correlation (N=18)**

Variable	N	Mean	SD	Sum	Min	Max	R
Site	18	2.00000	0.84017	36.00000	1.00000	3.00000	2.00
Village	18	3.50000	1.75734	63.00000	1.00000	6.00000	5.00
SO <sub>4</sub> -S(soil) (mg/kg)	18	11.23278	7.16712	202.19000	1.30000	24.18000	22.88
OC (soil) (%)	18	1.59611	0.63195	28.73000	0.90000	2.99000	2.09
TN (soil) (%)	18	0.11939	0.05118	2.14900	0.05600	0.25200	0.196
TN (in wheat at booting) (%)	18	2.47794	0.38513	44.60300	1.62400	3.10300	1.479
TS (in wheat at booting) (%)	18	0.13167	0.03111	2.37000	0.08000	0.18000	0.10
NS ratio in wheat at booting	18	19.49778	3.91614	350.96000	11.84000	23.95000	12.11
S uptake	18	2.62556	1.10833	47.26000	1.35000	4.78000	3.43

Where: SD =Standard deviation; min =Minimum, max =Maximum, and R =Range



**Fig. 1. The relationship between RY and N/S-ratio in wheat at booting (native soil)**

deficiency. Furthermore, S concentration is less sensitive to S availability variations in soil, in relation to plant sulfur levels at early stages of growth [29], which would further limit its use at that stage. For this reason, the authors suggested determining the CLs for the N/S-ratio empirically or to be reviewed cautiously. According to [11], one of the problems of using N/S-ratio is that a surplus of one element may be interpreted as a deficiency with the other. Another problem with N/S-ratio is that, S is a rather immobile nutrient in plants and older leaves tend to have higher S than the young ones, while N is mobile and young leaves tend to have higher N than old leaves.

#### 4.2 Total Sulfur Content

The scatter diagram for RY% and S contents in wheat at booting are presented in Fig. 2. This relationship was used to determine CL using the

Cate and Nelson procedure [19]. As depicted, the CL for the S content was estimated to be about, 0.158 =0.16%. This falls in a range for the TS content, 0.23 to 0.08% between the first and third harvests, reported by [27]. But, it is much lower than that reported by [26], 0.20% below which the wheat crop is reported to suffer from S deficiency. Ryan et al. [30], also reported a much closer value. Based on the report, for young wheat plants, 0.15-0.40% is considered to be the sufficiency range, with concentrations below 0.15% suggesting deficiency.

In general, from the results thus obtained, following the N/S-ratio, the S content in wheat at the early flowering stage was found to be a better index of S deficiency. Its coefficient of regression ( $R^2$ ) is 83% (Fig. 2). As can be seen in the figure, the RY is always increasing with sulfur content in native soils, with the regression equation,  $Y = 369.5X + 31.153$ . More

interestingly, all the scatter diagram points lie in a straight line and all fallen in the positive quadrants, which means that the behavior of RY in relation to the soil's S supply was normal.

In general, from the study, it is noted that, the CL thus estimated for the TS in wheat at booting, could be used as a provisional recommendation for wheat growing in Ethiopia. As this critical level determined by [19] model, separates only the low and high levels, the marginal or medium levels

can stretch up some point above or below 0.16%.

### 4.3 Organic Carbon

The scatter diagram for the RY% and organic carbon (OC) contents in the native soils just before planting wheat are presented in Fig. 3. The Cate and Nelson model [19] identified the critical threshold for the OC to be, about 2.07%. The regression equation was,  $Y = 11.316X + 61.354$ , with the coefficient of




Fig. 2. The Relationship between RY and TS in wheat at booting (native soil)




Fig. 3. The relationship between RY and OC% in wheat at booting (native soil)

regression ( $R^2$ ), 37%. Indeed, this value is in accordance with that reported by other workers [31,32]. From the coefficient of regression ( $r$ ) value, however, the OC is not a better index of S deficiency based on the criteria set in literature [21]. Furthermore, the  $r$  value was the least when compared with N/S-ratio and the S concentration. Similar to the other indices considered in this study, all the scatter diagram points lie in a straight line except for one point, and all are in positive quadrants, indicating that there were no abnormal cases in the behavior of RY vis-à-vis the OC contents in the studied areas soils.

The OC contents of studied soils ranged from 0.90% to 2.99% (Table 2). From the data presented, in about, 83.3% of the soils, the SOC content was very low, far below the CLs suggested by [31,32,33]. This may indicate that, some of the key soil quality indicators like structural stability could be at risk, because up to 98% of the total soil S in the sub-humid Ethiopian highlands is considered to be present as the organic S compounds. It is worth mentioning that, soil OC is also reported to be a promising indicator for guiding N fertilizer management under the challenges of soil heterogeneity among smallholder farming systems, given its integrative benefits that are leading to a high N supply and soil health.

According to [4], the root causes for the alarmingly low levels of soil OC in the studied soils was the traditional farming and cropping systems of the areas. Therefore, it is not surprising that, the soils in the studied areas are regarded as deficient in the major plant nutrients, notably nitrogen, phosphorus and sulfur.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the indices evaluated, owing to their relative higher degree of correlation with yield, the N/S-ratio followed by S concentration in wheat during the field growth stage of booting, gave better sensitivity as an index of S deficiency than the soil OC. Their critical thresholds were estimated to be 0.16% for the TS content; 16.5:1 for the N/S-ratios; and 2.07% for the soil OC. Thus, for the wheat plant at its early flowering or booting stage, sulfur responsive soils or treatments can be separated from non-responsive ones, in which case much sulfur response is expected for sites or treatments with the N/S-ratio > 16.5, S content < 0.16%, and the soil OC < 2.07%. The results, thus obtained

could be used as provisional recommendations for wheat growing in Ethiopia, and as the basis for further S research in the country. However, it is noted that, the indices of sulfur availability considered in this study as well as the various candidates suggested in literature have comparative usefulness or limitations. Furthermore, disparities between the CLs determined in the present study as well as those reported in literatures have been observed. So, the follow-up research agendas should focus on identifying and/or standardizing a more reliable index of S supply and their CLs by installing a more reliable research condition (e.g., at lath house or green-house level). Furthermore, as this CL approach is the first work, only one cereal cultivar was considered; therefore, much is expected to be done to locate the most suitable indicator of S deficiency for wheat or other crops in the country.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

AGRA-Soil Health Programme at Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Tanzania; & CASCAPE (funding by Government of The Netherlands, made available through Embassy of the Kingdom of The Netherlands in Addis Ababa) are acknowledged for financial supports. Pawe research center & EIAR are acknowledged for allowing the study. Kulumsa, Debre Zeit & Holeta research centers under EIAR are acknowledged for in-kind supports and hosting field activities. Finally, the department of Soil & Geological Sciences in SUA & its Lab are acknowledged for allowing soil & plant Analysis.

## COMPETING INTERESTS

Author has declared that no competing interests exist.

## REFERENCES

1. Assefa Menna, Nyambilila Amuri, Tekalign Mamo and Johnson MR Semoka. Wheat response to applied nitrogen, sulfur and phosphorus in three representative areas of Central Highlands of Ethiopia-I. IJPSS. 2015;8(5):1-11.
2. Assefa Menna, Nyambilila Amuri, Tekalign Mamo and Johnson MR Semoka. Evaluation of different Indices of sulfur availability in soils for wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) production in Ethiopia-II. IJPSS. 2015;8(4):8-9.

3. Assefa Menna, Johnson MR Semoka, Tekalign Mamo and Nyambilila Amuri. Estimation of Optimum Rate of Sulfur for Application in Soils for Wheat Production in Ethiopia–III. JAERI. 2016;7(1):1-13.
4. Assefa Menna. Assessment of sulfur deficiency in soils through plant analysis in three representative areas of the central highlands of Ethiopia-IV. JAERI. 2017; 12(2):1-13.
5. McGrath SP, Zhao FJ. A risk assessment of sulfur deficiency in cereals using soil and atmospheric deposition data. *Soil Use and Management*. 1995;11:110-114.
6. Blake Kalff MMA, Zhao FJ, Hawkesford MJ and McGrath SP. Using plant analysis to predict yield losses caused by sulfur deficiency. *Annals of Applied Biology*. 2001;138:123-127.
7. Pinkerton A. Critical sulfur concentrations in oilseed rape (*Brassica napus* L.) in relation to nitrogen supply and to plant age. *Australian Journal of Agricultural Research*. 1998;32:203-212.
8. Reussi N, Echeverría HE, Rozas HS. Stability of foliar N/S-ratio in spring red wheat and sulfur dilution curve. *Journal of Plant Nutrition* 2012;35(7):990-1003. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org>
9. Calvo NIR, Echeverría HE, Rozas HS. Usefulness of foliar N/S ratio in spring red wheat. *Journal of Plant Nutrition*. 2008; 31(9):1612-1623. DOI:<http://dx.doi.org>
10. Blake Kalff MMA, Zhao FJ, McGrath SP. Sulfur deficiency diagnosis using plant tissue analysis. *Proceedings of Fertilizer Society*. 2002;503:1-23.
11. Scherer HW. Sulfur in crop production. Institute of Agricultural Chemistry, University of Bonn, Karlrobert-Kreiten-Strajße 13, D-53115 Bonn, Germany. *European Journal of Agronomy*. 2001;14: 81-111.
12. Krantz BA, Melsted SW. Nutrient deficiencies in corn, sorghum and small grains. In: H.B Sprague (Ed.) *Hunger signs in crops*, (3<sup>rd</sup> Eds.) David Mckay Co., New York, N.Y. 1964;25-27.
13. Rasmussen PE, Ramig RE, Skin LG, Rohde CR. Tissue analyses guidelines for diagnosing sulfur deficiency in white wheat. *Plant and Soil*. 1977;46:153-163. DOI: 10.1007/BF00693122
14. Okalebo JR, Gathua KW, Woomer P. Laboratory methods for soil and plant analysis. A work manual 2<sup>nd</sup> (eds.) TSBCIAT and SACRED Africa, Nairobi, Kenya. 2002;128.
15. Olsen SR, Cole CV, Watanabe FS, Dean LA. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. USDA Circular 939, US. Government Printing Office, Washington DC; 1954.
16. Bray HR, Kurtz LT. Determination of total, organic, and available forms of phosphorus in soils. *Soil Science*. 1945;59: 39-46.
17. Bremner JM, Edwards AP. Determination and isotope ratio analysis of different forms of N in soils. I. Apparatus and procedures for distillation and determination of ammonium. *Soil Science Society of America Proc*. 1965;29:504-507.
18. Nelson DW, Sommers LE. Determination of total N in plant material. *Agronomy Journal*. 1973;65:109-112.
19. Cate Jr. RB, Nelson LA. A rapid method for correlation of soil test analyses with plant response data. North Carolina agricultural experiment station, International soil testing Series, Bulletin-I. Raleigh, NC: North Carolina State University; 1965.
20. SAS Institute Inc. SAS statistical users guide. (Version 9 Eds.), SAS software. Cary, North Carolina, USA. 2012;5136.
21. Finck A. Pflanzenernaehrung in Stichworten. Verlag Ferdinand Hirt, Kiel, BRD. 1976;200.
22. Verma B, Datta S, Rattan R, Singh A. Monitoring changes in soil organic carbon pools, NPS under different agricultural management practices in the tropics. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*. 2011;171:579-593.
23. Larson WE, Pierce FJ. The dynamics of soil quality as a measure of sustainable management. 1994;37-51.
24. Loveland P, Webb J. Is there a critical level of organic matter in the agricultural soils of temperate regions: A review. *Soil and Tillage Research*. 2003;70:1-18.
25. Brevik EC. Soil Health and Productivity. In: *Soils, plant growth and crop production. life support systems: Encyclopedias of Life Support Systems (EOLSS) Developed under the Auspices of UNESCO*. EOLSS publishers, Oxford, UK. 2009;1:2-37. Available:<http://www.eolss.net>
26. Munier D, Kearney T, Pettygrove GS, Brittan K, Mathews M, Jackson L. Fertilization of small grains: Small grains

- production manual part 4. Regents of the University of California, Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources. Publication 8167. 2006;8.  
Available:<http://anrcatalog.ucdavis.edu>
27. Freney JR, Spencer K, Jones MB. The diagnosis of sulfur deficiency in wheat. Australian Journal of Agricultural Research. 1978;29:727-38.
  28. Reussi N, Echeverría HE, Rozas HS. Diagnosing Sulfur deficiency in spring red wheat through plant analysis. Journal of Plant Nutrition. 2011;34(4):573-589.
  29. Blake-Kalff MMA, Hawkesford MJ, Zhao FJ, McGrath SP. Diagnosing sulfur deficiency in field grown oilseed rape (*Brassica napus* L.) and wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Plant and Soil. 2000;225:95-107.
  30. Ryan JS, Garabet K. Harmsen, Rashid A. A soil and plant analysis manual adapted for the west Asia and North Africa region. ICARDA, Aleppo, Syria. 1996;140.
  31. Horneck DA, Sullivan DM, Owen JS, Hart JM. Soil test interpretation guide. EC1478, OR: Oregon state University ES; 2011.
  32. Patrick M, Tenywa JS, Ebanyat P, Tenywa MM, Mubiru DN, Basamba TA, Leip A. Soil OC thresholds and nitrogen management in tropical agro-ecosystems: Concepts and prospects. JSD; Kampala, Uganda. 2013;6:12.
  33. Thiagalingam K. Soil and plant sample collection, preparation and interpretation of chemical analysis in Australia. A training manual and guide. Australian Contribution to a NAR System in PNG (ACNARS), Adelaide, Australia. 2000;49.

© 2017 A. Menna; This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:  
<http://sciencedomain.org/review-history/22104>