

**Original Research Article**

**INFLUENCE OF SULPHUR AND ZINC LEVELS ON GROWTH, YIELD AND QUALITY  
OF SOYBEAN (*Glycine max* L.)**

**ABSTRACT**

Field experiments were conducted during *kharif* season of 2014 and 2015 to study the influences of sulphur and zinc levels on growth, yield and quality of soybean. The experiment comprised five sulphur levels viz. (S<sub>0</sub>- control, S<sub>1</sub>- 10 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub>- 20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>3</sub>- 30 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>4</sub> 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>; four zinc levels viz. Zn<sub>0</sub>- control, Zn<sub>1</sub>- 10 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>, Zn<sub>2</sub>- 20 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> and Zn<sub>3</sub>- 30 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>). Application of sulphur and zinc increased all the growth and yield attributes of soybean but significant increase up to 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> and 30 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> were observed in plant height, number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup> at all stages, seed yield and protein content in seed of soybean. The zinc level also had significant influence on the number of pods plant<sup>-1</sup>, number of grains pod<sup>-1</sup>, pod length, pod weight plant<sup>-1</sup>, test weight, grain weight plant<sup>-1</sup>. Highest level (Zn<sub>3</sub>) i.e. 30 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> was found at par with (Zn<sub>2</sub>) i.e. 20 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> during the investigation. Application up to 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> and 30 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> increased the uptake of sulphur and zinc significantly than control. Therefore, it can be concluded that application of 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> and 30 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> should be applied for better growth, yield and quality of soybean.

**Keywords:** Soybean, sulphur, zinc, protein, nutrient uptake

**INTRODUCTION**

Soybean [*Glycine max*. (L) Merrill] belongs to the family *Fabaceae* (*Leguminosae*). It is an important crop worldwide, because it has a wide range of geographical adaption, unique chemical composition, good nutritional value, functional health benefits and variety of end-uses (food, feed and non-edible). It is extremely resilient and performs even under severe water stress conditions. It fits well in cropping systems/rotations including inter/mixed cropping systems. It improves soil fertility by fixing atmospheric N<sub>2</sub> to the extent of 50-300 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, depending on the agro-climatic conditions, variety, strains etc. Keyser and Li (1992) and adds about 1.0-1.5 tons of leaf litter per season ha<sup>-1</sup>. Soybean is the world's first ranking crop as a source of vegetable oil and in India too (Oil world, 2012). It will continue to play a key role in fighting edible oil deficit in the country (Damodaran and Hegde, 2010). Soybean is well known for its nutritional and health benefits. It contains about 40% good quality protein, 20% oil having about 85% unsaturated fatty acids including 55% polyunsaturated fatty acids (PUFA), 25-30% carbohydrates and almost no starch (useful to diabetic patients), 4-5%

minerals, anti-oxidants, viz. ascorbic acid (9-10mg/100g sprouted soybean) and beta-carotene (0.2 mg/100g sprouted soybean) and about 0.3% is flavones(daidzein and genestein). That's why it is also known as a 'wonder crop', 'Miracle crop' and 'Golden bean'. India ranks fifth after USA, Brazil, Argentina and China in the production of soybean (FAOSTAT, 2017). India must increase indigenous production of vegetables oil and protein to meet its critical deficit. This would make one to think that adequate and balanced application to the soybean is must to increase productivity. The prospects of soybean expanding further into a major crop in India are good. Know-how to cultivate or soybean farming in India is already comparatively advanced and industry is becoming increasingly aware of the varied use of soybean. It appears that the importance of soybean is increasing with the availability of pulses, the natives cheapest source of protein is decreasing. The soybean production in India during 2014-15 has been about 10.528 mt in 11.086 mha area with average productivity of 950 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>(Anonymous, 2015). In India, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra and Rajasthan are the major soybean producing states, contributing about 95% of the total area and production of soybean in the country, Madhya Pradesh has 54% of the country's area and contributes 59% to the total production of soybean in the country and justifybeing called 'soya state'(Anonymous, 2015).The encouraging results of the new varieties, which take 100-130 days to maturity with the yield potential of 30-45 q ha<sup>-1</sup> contributes major role in enhancing soybean production in India. Sulphur plays multiple roles in the nutrition of soybean. It involves in the synthesis of amino acids, the building blocks of the proteins.Several studies (Lakshmanet al., 2017) have reported relatively high requirement of sulphur for soybean which could be attributed to its high protein and oil content. Sulphur also plays a vital role in chlorophyll formation and produces heavier seed and higher oil content. Use of cheap and effective source of sulphur in appropriate dose is necessary for augmenting the productivity as well as quality returns from the soybean cultivation.The favourable effect of zinc on soybean is also being reported now-a-days. Soybean is sensitive to zinc deficiency which is needed for protein metabolism and involved in the chlorophyll formation, growth hormone stimulators, enzymatic activity and reproductive processes.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

Field experiments were conducted during the *kharif* season of 2014 and 2015 at the research block of Aroma College Roorkee, Haridwar (U.K.), India. The farm is situated at 29.52° N latitude, 78.53° E longitude and at altitude of 270 meters above the mean sea level. The soil of the experimental site was sandy loam and slightly alkaline in reaction (pH 7.7),

68 organic carbon (0.58% and 0.56%), low in available nitrogen (265 and 268 kg N ha<sup>-1</sup>), low in  
69 available phosphorus (18.4 and 18.3 kg P ha<sup>-1</sup>) and medium in available potassium (259.4 and  
70 254.6 kg K ha<sup>-1</sup>) in 2014 and 2015, respectively. The initial sulphur status was 22.5 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>  
71 and 23.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and the available zinc was 0.54 and 0.56 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> soil, respectively during  
72 2014 and 2015 cropping seasons. The treatments consisted of five sulphur levels viz. (S<sub>0</sub>-  
73 control, S<sub>1</sub>- 10 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>2</sub>- 20 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>, S<sub>3</sub>- 30 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> and S<sub>4</sub> 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup>; four zinc  
74 levels viz. Zn<sub>0</sub>- control, Zn<sub>1</sub>- 10 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>, Zn<sub>2</sub>- 20 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> and Zn<sub>3</sub>- 30 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup>).The  
75 experiments were laid out in a factorial randomized block design and replicated thrice. The  
76 graded levels of sulphur and zinc were applied through elemental sulphur and zinc sulphate  
77 and mixed in soil after layout and before sowing. Healthy seeds of soybean cv. PK 1042 were  
78 used @ 80 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The sowing of soybean seed was done using the hand plough at 5 cm  
79 depth in last week of June. First thinning was done after full germination and after thinning  
80 the first-hand weeding was done at 30 days after sowing to remove the weeds. Five  
81 representative plants of soybean from each treatment were selected randomly at 30, 60, 90  
82 DAS and at maturity for recording biometric observations, as well as post-harvest studies on  
83 various aspects. The experimental data were statistically analysed by applying “Analysis of  
84 variance” technique for factorial randomized block design (Cochran and Cox, 1992). The  
85 standard error of mean (SEM<sup>±</sup>) and critical difference (CD) at 5% significance level were  
86 worked out for each parameter. Protein content in soybean grain was estimated by Kjeldhal  
87 method. The protein content in grain was obtained by multiplying the nitrogen content with  
88 the standard factor by 6.25 (AOAC, 1960). Oil content in grain of soybean was recorded with  
89 Nuclear Magnetic Resonance technique. Protein content in soybean seed was determined by  
90 under noted biuret method Williams (1961). Nutrient uptake from each sample S and Zn were  
91 determined separately as per standard procedures (Jackson, 1965; Tabatabai and Bremner,  
92 1970).

## 93 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 94 EFFECT OF SULPHUR ON SOYBEAN GROWTH AND YIELD ATTRIBUTES

95 The finding showed that the application of sulphur increased all the growth and yield  
96 attributes of soybean. Significant increase up to 40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> was observed in plant height,  
97 number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup>, dry weight plant<sup>-1</sup>, leaf area index (Table-1), no of pods plant<sup>-1</sup>,  
98 no of grains pod<sup>-1</sup>, pod weight plant<sup>-1</sup>, test weight (Table-2). The highest yield components  
99 were found with the application of 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> and control treatment produced lowest values.  
100 This could be function of various external and internal factors, nutrient supply being one of

101 the factor. It might be due to the improvement of sulphur in synthesis of amino acids. Soybean  
102 has been reported to be much responsive to sulphur in promoting growth characters as  
103 already reported by Sharma *et al.* (1991), Jayapaul and Ganeshareja (1990) and Dabhi *et al.*  
104 (2008), Ravikumar *et al.* (2016).

#### 105 **EFFECT OF SULPHUR ON SOYBEAN QUALITY**

106 This study found that increasing the sulphur levels increased the soybean seed protein  
107 content (Table-3) but different researchers have reported varied results on the effect of sulphur  
108 on soybean seed oil content (Ravikumar *et al.*, 2016, Legha and Gajendra Giri, 1999).  
109 Soybean seed contain Glycine protein, which is relatively rich in sulphur containing amino  
110 acid and makes up approximately 50 % seed protein (Coates *et al.*, 1985). Increasing in  
111 sulphur levels increased the protein and oil content in soybean seed has been reported by Gill  
112 and Sharma (2017), Singh and Thenua (2016), Kesare *et al.* (2015).

113 Besides oil and protein content, sulphur plays an important role in plant metabolism  
114 by virtue of being an essential constituent of diverse types of metabolically active compounds  
115 amino acids, proteins and nucleic acids. The biological role of chlorophyll in harvesting solar  
116 energy, phosphorylated compounds in energy transformation, nucleic acid in the transfer of  
117 genetic information and the relation of cellular metabolism and protein as structural units and  
118 biological catalyst is well known.

#### 119 **EFFECT OF SULPHUR ON SOYBEAN SEED YIELD**

120 Significant variation on seed yield were observed with the application of different  
121 sulphur levels (Table-2). Increasing the sulphur levels increased the grain yield of soybean  
122 significantly up to 40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> numerically superior to 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. Similar results were observed  
123 in the biological yield. These results were supported by significant increase in the number of  
124 pods plant<sup>-1</sup> up to 40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>, number of grain plant<sup>-1</sup>, grain weight plant<sup>-1</sup> and 1000-grain  
125 weight while no significant influences were observed between 30 & 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> in the  
126 number of grains pod<sup>-1</sup> (Table-2). Since, there was differential response to sulphur on the  
127 basis of yield attributes and also in the grain yield and straw yield. In the earlier work, also a  
128 dose of 30 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> or above has been recommended by Sharma *et al.* (1991) and Sonune *et*  
129 *al.* (2001), Longkumar *et al.* (2017), Kumar *et al.* (2017).

#### 130 **EFFECT OF ZINC ON SOYBEAN GROWTH AND YIELD ATTRIBUTES**

131 Application of zinc also have a significant effect on growth and yield attributes. Zinc  
132 significantly increased the plant height, number of branches plant<sup>-1</sup>, dry matter accumulation

133 plant<sup>-1</sup>, leaf area index (Table-1), no of pods plant<sup>-1</sup>, pod length, no of grains pod<sup>-1</sup>, pod  
134 weight plant<sup>-1</sup>, test weight,(Table-2). Similar effect of zinc, particularly up to 10 kg dose was  
135 recorded on the yield and yield attributes. The optimum dose 20 kg which is supported by  
136 Tripathi *et al.* (1999) and Huger and Kurdikeri (2000), Jyothi *et al.* (2013).

#### 137 **EFFECT OF ZINC ON SOYBEAN QUALITY**

138 Zinc also increased the oil and protein content of soybean. The result indicated that  
139 the application of 30 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> was recorded significantly higher seed oil (43.91%) and  
140 protein content (21.39%) in soybean. The increase in seed oil and protein content on addition  
141 of zinc has also been reported by Pable *et al.* (2010) and Husain and Kumar (2006), Chauhan  
142 *et al.* (2013).

#### 144 **EFFECT OF ZINC ON SOYBEAN SEED YIELD**

145 The zinc levels also increased the biological yield with their highest level with 30 kg  
146 Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> (Zn<sub>3</sub>). Likewise, application of zinc @ 30 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> (Zn<sub>3</sub>) recorded the highest  
147 harvest index as compared to their lower levels viz. Control (Zn<sub>0</sub>), 10 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> (Zn<sub>1</sub>) and 20  
148 kg Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> (Zn<sub>2</sub>) but the differences were found non-significant (Table-2). Same findings also  
149 reported by Huger and Kurdikeri (2000), Dabhi *et al.* (2008), Jyothi *et al.* (2013) Chauhan *et al.*  
150 *et al.* (2013).

#### 151 **UPTAKE OF SULPHUR AND ZINC BY SOYBEAN**

152 Increase in the uptake of sulphur and zinc significantly up to 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> and 30 kg  
153 Zn ha<sup>-1</sup> was observed (Table-3). It is well known that uptake of nutrients by a crop is  
154 associated with the crop vigour and productivity. Sulphur particularly at the desirable level of  
155 40 kg S ha<sup>-1</sup> improved the growth characters accompanied by yield attributes and yield.  
156 Therefore, finally increasing the uptake of not only sulphur but also zinc, effect of sulphur on  
157 increased uptake of sulphur by pulses and oilseed crops has been reported by Tomer *et al.*  
158 (2000), Sonune *et al.* (2001), Jyothi *et al.* (2013), Singh and Thenua (2016), Ravikumar *et al.*  
159 (2016).

#### 160 **CONCLUSION**

161 Based on our two years of study, it may be concluded that the application of sulphur  
162 40 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> and zinc 30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> increased the growth, yield attributes, yield, quality and uptake  
163 of sulphur and zinc in soybean compared with the other levels. Application of sulphur 40 kg

164 ha<sup>-1</sup> and zinc 20-30 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> is sufficient to sustain the productivity of soybean in Indo-gangatic  
165 plains.

166

167

## 168 REFERENCES

169 Anonymous (2015). Agricultural Statics at a Glance 2015 pp.123-122

170 AOAC (1960). Association of official Agricultural chemists. Official method of analysis.  
171 Washington D.C. 9th edition, pp. 15-16

172 Chauhan, S., Titov, A. and Tomar, D.S. (2013). Yield and oil content in soybean (*Glycine*  
173 *max* L) in Vertisols of India. *Indian Journal of Applied Research* 3, 489-491.

174 Coates, J.B., Medeiros, J.S., Thanh, V.H., Nielsen, N.C. (1985). Characterization of the  
175 subunits of  $\beta$ -conglycinin. *Arch Biochem Biophys* 243: 184-194

176 Cochran, W.G. and Cox, G.M. (1992). *Experimental design*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition Published by John  
177 Willey and Sons. U.S.A.

178 Dabhi, B.M.; Gabasavlag, S.S. and Polara, J.V. (2008). Effect of Potash, Sulphur and Zinc on  
179 yield and economics of soybean (*Glycine max*). In: National symposium on  
180 “New Paradigms in Agronomic Research”, Nov. 19-21, 2008, Navsari, Gujarat, pp.  
181 100-101

182 Damodaran T and Hegade D M (2010). Oilseed Situation: A Statistical Compendium.  
183 Directorate of Oilseed Research, Hyderabad. p 486.

184 Das, K.N. and K. Das (1994). Effects of Sulphur and nitrogen fertilization on yield and N  
185 uptake by rapeseed. *Journal Indian Society of Soil Science*, 42: 476-478.

186 FAOSTAT (2017). [http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#rankings/countries\\_by\\_commodity](http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#rankings/countries_by_commodity)

187 Gill, Gurpreet and Sharma, Sucheta (2017). Effect of sulphur supplementation on  
188 micronutrients, fatty acids and sulphur use efficiency of soybean seeds.  
189 *International Journal of Environment, Agriculture and Biotechnology* 2(4): 1476-  
190 1484

191 Huger, A.B. and Kurdikeri, M.B. (2000). Effect of application methods and levels of zinc and  
192 molybdenum of field performance and seed yield in soybean. *Karnataka Journal of*  
193 *agriculture Science*, 13(2): 439-441.

194 Husain, M. F. and Kumar, R. (2006). Influence of sowing dates and application of zinc on the  
195 performance of mustard in south-west semi-arid zone of Uttar Pradesh. *International*  
196 *Journal of Agricultural Sciences*, 2(2): 601-604.

197 Jackson; M.L. (1965). *Soil Chemical Analysis*, Advanced course, Madison, Wisconsin,  
198 U.S.A.

199 Jayapaul, P. And Ganesharaja, V. (1990). Studies on response of soybean varieties to  
200 nitrogen, phosphorus and sulphur. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*, 35(3): 329-330.

201 Jyothi, Ch. Naga; Ravichandra, K. and Babu, K. Sudhakara (2013). Effect of foliar  
202 supplementation of Nitrogen and Zinc on Soybean Yield, Quality and uptake. *Indian*  
203 *J. of Dryland Agriculture Research and Development*, 28(2): 46-48

204 Kesare, V.K.; Sakore, G.D. and Pharande, A.L. (2015). Effect of different levels of sulphur  
205 on yield and quality of Soybean in Inceptisol. *Trends in Biosciences*. 8(10): 2513-  
206 2516

207 Keyser Harold H. and Li Fudi (1992). Potential for increasing biological nitrogen fixation in  
208 soybean. *Plant and Soil*, 141: 119-135.

209 Kumar, Sandeep; Wani, Javeed Ahmad; Lone, Bilal Ahmad; Singh, Purshotam; Dar, Zahoor  
210 Ahmad; Qayoom, Sameera and Fayaz, Asma (2017). Effect of Different Levels of  
211 Phosphorus and Sulphur on Seed & Stover Yield of Soybean (*Glycine max* L.  
212 Merrill) under 'Eutrochrepts'. *Asian Research Journal of Agriculture*, 5(1): 1-7

213 Lakshman, K.; Vyas, A.K.; Shivkumar, B.G.; Rana, D.S.; Layek, J. and Munda, S. (2017).  
214 Direct and Residual Effect of Sulphur Fertilization on Growth, Yield and Quality of  
215 Mustard in a Soybean – Mustard Cropping System.  
216 *Int.J.Curr.Microbiol.App.Sci*, 6(5): 1500-1512

217 Legha, P. K., Gajendra Giri (1999). Influence of nitrogen and sulphur on growth, yield and  
218 oil content of sunflower grown in spring season. *Indian J. Agron.*, 44 (2): 408-412.

219 Longkumar, L.T.; Singh, A.K.; Jamir, Z. and Kumar, Manoj (2017). Effect of Sulfur and  
220 Boron Nutrition on Yield and Quality of Soybean (*Glycine max* L.) Grown in an  
221 Acid Soil. *Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis*, 48 (4): 405-411

222 Oil World. (2012). Annual Report, Hamburg: ISTA Mielke GmbH. PROLEA. 2011. *De la*  
223 *production à la consommation, France - Europe - Monde, Statistique des Oléagineux*  
224 *and Protéagineux* 2011-2012. Paris: PROLEA-Dokumentation.

225 Pable, D., Paul, D. B. and Deshmukh, P. W. (2010). Effect of sulphur and zinc on yield and  
226 quality of soybean. *Asian J. Soil Sci.*, 5(2): 315- 317.

227 Prasad, Rajendra; Shivay, Y.S. and Kumar, Dinesh (2016). Interactions of Zinc with Other  
228 Nutrients in Soils and Plants - A Review. *Indian Journal of Fertilisers*, 12 (5): 16-26

229 Ravikumar, C.; Ganapathy, M. and Vaiyapuri, V. (2016). Effect of sulphur fertilization on  
230 growth, yield and nutrient uptake of sunflower in north cauvery deltaic region. *Int J*  
231 *Cur Res Rev*, 8(22): 13-17

232 Singh, S.B. and Thenua, O.V.S. (2016). Effect of phosphorus and sulphur fertilization on  
233 yield and NPS uptake by mustard (*Brassica juncea* L.). *Progressive Research- An*  
234 *International Journal*, 11(1): 80-83.

235 Sonune, B.A.; Naphade, P.S. and Kankal, D.S. (2001). Effect of zinc and sulphur on protein  
236 and oil content of soybean. *Agriculture Science Digest*, 21(4): 259-260.

237 Tabatabai, M.A. and Bremner, J.M. (1970). A simple turbidometric method of determination  
238 of total sulphur in plant material. *Agronomy Journal*, 62: 805-806.

239 Tomar, U.S.; Badaya, A.K.; Tomar, I.S.; Vani, D.K. and Ambavatia, G.R. (2000). Influence  
 240 of different levels and sources of sulphur on growth and productivity of soybean.  
 241 *Crop Research Hisar*, 19(1): 142-143.

242 Tripathi, S.K.; A.K. Patra and S.C. Samui (1999). Effect of micronutrient on nodulation,  
 243 growth, yield and nutrient uptake by groundnut (*Arachis hypogaea*). *Indian Journal*  
 244 *of Plant Physiology*, 4: 207-209.

245 Williams, P.C. (1961). The determination of protein in whole wheat meal and flour by the  
 246 biurate method. *Journal of Science Food and Agriculture*, 12: 58-61.

247

248

249 **Table 1: Growth attributes of soybean as influenced by different levels of sulphur and**  
 250 **zinc**

251

Treatments	Plant height (cm)	No. of branches plant <sup>-1</sup>	No. of nodules	Dry wt. plant <sup>-1</sup>	LAI
<b>Sulphur level (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)</b>					
<b>S<sub>0</sub></b>	72.9	5.84	27.2	70.71	3.074
<b>S<sub>1</sub></b>	75.2	6.19	31.4	73.11	3.179
<b>S<sub>2</sub></b>	78.4	6.49	33.6	75.61	3.342
<b>S<sub>3</sub></b>	79.8	6.85	35.2	78.35	3.416
<b>S<sub>4</sub></b>	80.7	7.42	36.1	79.90	3.434
<b>SEm<sup>±</sup></b>	1.84	0.39	2.08	2.02	0.046
<b>CD at 5%</b>	5.74	1.29	6.49	6.30	0.152
<b>Zinc level (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)</b>					
<b>Zn<sub>0</sub></b>	73.3	5.81	26.2	70.24	3.105
<b>Zn<sub>1</sub></b>	75.6	6.22	32.9	74.59	3.211
<b>Zn<sub>2</sub></b>	78.9	6.67	35.7	76.65	3.309
<b>Zn<sub>3</sub></b>	81.7	7.48	36.2	79.41	3.411
<b>SEm<sup>±</sup></b>	1.68	0.39	1.43	1.95	0.041
<b>CD at 5%</b>	4.28	0.99	3.66	4.97	0.107

252



253

254 **Table 2: Yield attributes & Yield of soybean as influenced by different levels of sulphur**  
 255 **and zinc.**

Treatments	No. of pods plant <sup>-1</sup>	Pod length (cm)	No. of grains pod <sup>-1</sup>	Pods wt. Plant <sup>-1</sup>	Test wt. (g)	Grain wt. Plant <sup>-1</sup>	Grain yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Biological yield (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Harvest index (%)
<b>Sulphur level (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)</b>									
S <sub>0</sub>	112.50	11.10	2.24	47.29	93.72	23.14	1782	3680	0.332
S <sub>1</sub>	117.74	11.50	2.27	52.11	94.98	25.49	1842	3889	0.330
S <sub>2</sub>	122.79	11.82	2.34	55.04	97.78	27.32	1917	3943	0.334
S <sub>3</sub>	126.90	12.02	2.39	56.29	98.41	29.31	1952	3974	0.333
S <sub>4</sub>	131.31	12.25	2.42	57.15	99.58	29.49	1983	4031	0.349
SEm <sup>±</sup>	3.17	0.42	0.04	1.79	1.59	0.89	23.01	29.80	0.051
CD at 5%	9.89	NS	0.12	5.58	4.96	2.70	71.76	92.98	NS
<b>Zinc level (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)</b>									
Zn <sub>0</sub>	109.6	10.82	2.26	48.25	93.12	23.92	1834	3678	0.331
Zn <sub>1</sub>	119.1	11.72	2.26	51.31	95.37	25.71	1868	3880	0.333
Zn <sub>2</sub>	127.7	12.08	2.39	55.78	98.84	28.44	1918	3972	0.336
Zn <sub>3</sub>	132.4	12.26	2.41	57.59	99.91	29.88	1958	4075	0.339
SEm <sup>±</sup>	5.62	0.32	0.02	2.02	1.47	0.91	11.74	19.49	0.014
CD at 5%	14.33	0.82	0.05	5.17	3.76	2.32	30.05	49.89	NS

256

257

258 **Table3:Quality and uptake of nutrients by soybean as influenced by different levels of**  
 259 **sulphur and zinc.**

Treatments	Quality		Uptake	
	Protein content (%)	Oil content (%)	S-uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Zn-uptake (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> )
<b>Sulphur level (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)</b>				
S <sub>0</sub>	39.77	20.46	9.44	0.637

<b>S<sub>1</sub></b>	41.61	20.84	9.92	0.793
<b>S<sub>2</sub></b>	42.74	21.48	10.56	0.807
<b>S<sub>3</sub></b>	43.19	21.80	11.09	0.847
<b>S<sub>4</sub></b>	43.76	22.06	11.51	0.868
<b>SEm<sup>±</sup></b>	0.42	0.31	0.26	0.033
<b>CD at 5%</b>	1.31	0.96	0.81	0.103
<b>Zinc level (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>)</b>				
<b>Zn<sub>0</sub></b>	40.92	20.51	9.54	0.698
<b>Zn<sub>1</sub></b>	41.24	21.84	9.83	0.773
<b>Zn<sub>2</sub></b>	42.82	21.51	10.84	0.836
<b>Zn<sub>3</sub></b>	43.91	21.39	11.84	0.867
<b>SEm<sup>±</sup></b>	0.19	0.23	0.21	0.035
<b>CD at 5%</b>	0.49	0.59	0.53	0.093

260

261

262