KINETICS OF SILICON IN RELATION TO DIFFERENT LEVELS OF MAJOR NUTRIENTS IN THE LATERITIC FLOODED RICE SOILS

cilicon is the most abundant element Din the earth's crust which contains 59% SiO₂ (Jackson, 1964). Silicon has been reported to benefit rice by improving the solar energy utilization, increasing the water use efficiency, increasing the strength of straw and increasing resistance against pests and diseases (Elawad and Green, 1979). Silicon is present in soil entirely as a simple molecule, monosilicic acid - ortho silicic acid, Si(OH)₄, which is in equilibrium with quartz. The concentration of silicon in the solutions of flooded soils increases slightly after flooding and then decreases gradually. After several months of submergence the silicon concentration may be lower than at start (Ponnamperuma, 1972).

A field experiment was conducted in a well drained lateritic sandy loam soil (pH 4.70, CEC 3.40 me/100 g, EC 0.23 dS/m, organic carbon 0.82%, available N 0.020%, available P 10.55 ppm, available K 18.25 ppm, available silicon 88.98 ppm). Different levels of N, P₂O₅ and K₂O were applied to the soil (Table 1). Piezometers were installed at 20 cm depth in every plot for the collection of soil solution. The test variety used was IR 42. Soil solution, wet soil and plant samples were collected from 13th day of transplanting to 50% flowering. The available silicon in wet soil samples was estimated by using normal sodium acetate (pH 4.0) and plant- content of silicon was estimated by triple acid digestion method suggested by Imaizumi and Yoshida (1958).

Table 1 shows the chemical kinetics of silicon in the soil and soil solution during the different periods of rice growth as influenced by different levels of N, P and K. The average Si content of the various treatments in the soil varied between periods, with a initial increase followed by a decrease and then a progressive increase, the maximum value (143.7 ppm) being recorded at 75 days after transplanting whereas the average soil solution content of Si of the various treatments showed decreasing and increasing tendencies and finally at 75 days after transplanting it was found much less than that at 13 days after transplanting. The contents of silicon in soil and soil solution were not significantly influenced by the treatments except for soil samples collected at 65 days after transplanting where T_1 recorded the highest concentration of silicon (150.5 ppm). Waterlogging a soil is likely to increase its water soluble silicic acid presumably due to its release from hydrated ferric oxide surface (Elawad and Green, 1979). Decomposing rice straw with its high content of silicon may also contribute to the increased silicon content of the soil solution in flooded soils (Patrick and Reddy, 1978). The subsequent decrease may be the result of combination with alumino-silicates following the decrease in CO₂ (Ponnamperuma 1972). Further increase is probably due to release of absorbed and occluded silica from hydroxides of iron and aluminium (Mc-Keague and Cline, 1963). The concentration of silicon in the soil solution

Table 1. Silicon content of the soil and soil solution of wet soil samples (over dry basis) during the different stages of rice growth, ppm

13 DAT		23 DAT		33 DAT		44 DAT		54 DAT		65 DAT		75 DAT	
Soil	Soil solution	Soil	Soil solution	Soil	Soil solution	Soil	Soil solution	Soil	Soil solution	Soil	Soil solution	Soil	Soil solutio
150.9	2.5	122.9	0.9	115.5	1.0	110.5	1.5	133.9	1.5	150.5	1.0	143.7	0.9
138.4	3.4	147.6	1.5	113.3	1.1	105.8	1.1	137.4	1.4	122.8	1.0	153.9	1.1
131.1	4.3	129.6	1.2	116.2	0.9	107.1	1.0	129.1	1.6	130.1	1.1	134.0	1.0
124.8	4.3	127.4	1.4	120.0	1.1	109.3	2.2	127.9	1.7	138.9	1.0	149.7	1.0
115.2	2.7	135.7	1.1	110.7	0.8	103.7	1.3	130.3	1.3	144.8	0.9	137.3	0.7
NS	NS	NS	NS	NŠ	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	18.19	NS	NS	NS
132.1	3.4	132.2	1.2	115.1	1.0	107.3	1.4	131.7	1.5	137.4	1.0	143.7	0.9
	Soil 150.9 138.4 131.1 124.8 115.2 NS	Soil Soil 150.9 2.5 138.4 3.4 131.1 4.3 124.8 4.3 115.2 2.7 NS NS	Soil Soil Soil 150.9 2.5 122.9 138.4 3.4 147.6 131.1 4.3 129.6 124.8 4.3 127.4 115.2 2.7 135.7 NS NS NS	Soil Soil Soil Soil solution 150.9 2.5 122.9 0.9 138.4 3.4 147.6 1.5 131.1 4.3 129.6 1.2 124.8 4.3 127.4 1.4 115.2 2.7 135.7 1.1 NS NS NS NS	Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<>	Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<>	Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<>	Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<>	Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<>	Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<></td></th<></td></th<></td></th<>	Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<></td></th<></td></th<>	Soil Soil <th< td=""><td>Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<></td></th<>	Soil Soil <th< td=""></th<>

NS - Not significant

DAT - Days after transplanting

Table 2. Content and uptake of silicon during different stages of growth and yield of rice as influenced by different levels of N, P and K

Treatments	13 DAT 23 DAT		33 DAT		44 DAT		54 DAT		65 DAT		75 DAT		Grain		Yield (kg/ha)		:g/ha)	
	Cont- tent %	Up- take kg/ha	Grain	Straw														
T1	3.9	5.3	2.8	13.0	2.9	27.4	4.8	78.8	7.0	181.4	7.5	339.6	7.4	481.3	2.9	120.5	5208	3831
T ₂	4.1	7.0	3.1	12.1	3.6	37.7	6.6	141.5	7.7	244.9	6.8	278.7	8.6	502.9	2.0	98.1	5465	4519
T ₃	3.2	5.8	3.7	13.8	3.9	37.5	6.3	128.1	7.5	246.5	6.5	312.3	8.3	462.3	2.3	111.3	5559	4595
T ₄	3.3	4.6	3.1	13.5	3.5	30.6	5.2	142.8	8.0	237.6	6.8	321.3	8.5	534.0	2.9	140.2	5682	4380
T ₅	3.7	6.1	4.3	24.6	4.0	45,5	6.6	174.1	8.1	300.9	71	390.3	9.3	616.2	2.2	111.1	5691	5123
CD (0.05)	NS	NS	NS	7.93	0.60	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.93	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS

NS - Not significant

DAT - Days after transplanting

increases with **soil reduction**, apparently because of the reduction of Fe (III) oxide hydrate that sorbs silicon (Ponnamperuma, 1956; 1978).

The content of silicon and its uptake showed different patterns for the various treatments tried. However, for all the treatments the uptake of silicon followed a progressive increase from 13 days after transplanting to 75 days after transplanting. The silicon content of plant samples was found to be significantly different between treatments, at 33 days after transplanting and at 75 days after transplanting and also Si uptake at 23 days after transplanting (Table 2). The highest rate of uptake and the highest content (3.7 ppm to 9.3 ppm) of silicon was shown by T₅ receiving the maximum doze of NPK. A11 other treatments were on par. The

Regional Agricultural Research Station Pattambi 679 306 Kerala, India highest rate of uptake and content of silicon in T₅ might have been due to the influence of applied K (Elawad and Green, 1979). The content and uptake of Si by the grain did not produce significant variation between anv treatments and the grain and straw vields of the treatments were also on par. The early growth stages of rice recorded lower values of silicon content up to 33 days after transplanting. sharp increase of silicon content of soil noticed from 44 days after transplanting may be the reason for the high content of silicon in the plant tissues. Almost a similar trend was observed for uptake pattern also.

The authros are greateful to the Indian Council of Agricultural Research for providing finance for the conduct of this study.

> K. Anilakumar I. Johnkutty M.A. Hassan P.K.G. Menon

REFERENCES

- Elawad, S.H. and Green, V.E. Jr. 1979. Silicon and rice plant environment: A review of recent research. IL RISO. 28 (3): 235- 253
- Imaizumi, K. and Yoshida, S. 1958. Edaphological sutudies on silicon supplying power of paddy fields. Bull. nat. Inst. agric. Sci. Ser. B. 8: 261-304
- Jackson, M.L. 1964. Chemical composition of the soil. Chemistry of the Soil, Bear, F.E. (Ed.) 2nd ed. Von Nostrand Reimhold Co., p. 71-141
- McKeague, J.A. and Cline, M.G. 1963. Silica in soils, Adv. Agron. 15: 339-396
- Patrick, W.H. Jr. and Reddy, C.N. 1978. Chemical changes in rice soils. Soils and Rice. International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, Philippines, p. 361-379
- Ponnamperuma, F.N. 1965. Dynamic aspects of flooded soils. The Mineral Nutrition of the Rice Plant. The John Hopkins Press, Baltmore, USA, p. 295-328

Ponnamperuma, F.N. 1972. The chemistry of submerged soils Adv. Agoron. 24: 29-96

Ponnamperuma, F.N. 1978. Electro-chemical changes in submerged soils and the growth of rice. Soils and Rice, International Rice Research Institute, Los Banos, Philippines, p. 421-448