



# An evaluation of mango cultivation soils and identification of potentially suitable lands upon conversion of agricultural crop land to mango plantations in semi-arid land of south Telangana plateau, Andhra Pradesh

M. Chandrakala<sup>1,\*</sup>, Sunil P. Maske<sup>1</sup>, K.S. Karthika<sup>1</sup>, S. Sheela Rani<sup>2</sup>, K.V. Niranjana<sup>1</sup>, R. Srinivasan<sup>1</sup>, S.C. Ramesh Kumar, B.P. Bhaskar<sup>1</sup>, V. Ramamurthy<sup>1</sup> and N.G. Patil<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning, Hebbal, Bangalore; <sup>2</sup>College of Horticulture, Mysore, Karnataka; <sup>3</sup>National Bureau of Soil Survey and Land Use Planning, Nagpur, Maharashtra.

\*Corresponding author:

E-mail: chandra.ssac@gmail.com (M. Chandrakala)

#### **ARTICLE INFO**

doi: 10.59797/ijsc.v51.i2.129

#### Article history:

Received : January, 2022 Revised : February, 2023 Accepted : February, 2023

### Key words:

Fertilizer recommendation Land capability Land suitability Mango plantations Nutrients mapping Potential cultivable land

# ABSTRACT

In the south Telangana plateau, Andhra Pradesh, due to low rainfall and high temperature which is limiting the agriculture crop production as the semi-arid climatic condition. Hence, the crop land is being converted to mango plantation/orchards in most of the areas. The soils of mango cultivation were assessed for their physicchemical properties as well as soil fertility status by studying two representative pedons from mango cultivated areas. Through a detailed soil survey, land capability classification was done and determined the suitability of land for mango production using GIS and RS. Results revealed that 53.57% area is moderately good cultivable (class III) land followed by class IV which is fairly good cultivable land (16.90%). Out of total geographical area (23240.7 ha), mango is marginally suitable (S3) in 42.71% area which is potential for mango production and 29.45% area is not suitable for mango cultivation. Gravelliness, soil fertility, drainage, root restriction, soil texture are the limiting factors for mango production in the region. Organic carbon (OC) content is low (0.32-0.40%), slightly acidic to neutral in reaction (pH: 6-6.83), non-saline, high base saturation (>50%), low CEC (3.1-6.1 cmol (p+) kg<sup>-1</sup>) and available water content is 4.47 to 7.86%, reddish-brown (5YR4/4) to dark brown (7.5YR4/3) in surface and 35-60% coarse fragments. However, two mango cultivating series are identified. The study helps to increase the area under mango plantations in potential areas and to adopt mango cultivation by addressing limitations in problematic soils.

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Land resources management particularly nonagricultural crop lands for their potentially suitable crop production / plantation / forest will keep pace with the country's food needs, sustain the environment, blunting impacts of climate change, conserving and protecting natural resources, and supporting the livelihood of farmers in the country. Mango (*Mangifera indica* L.) being the king of fruits, is a major fruit crop of the tropics and subtropics of Asian countries believed to have originated from northwestern Myanmar, Bangladesh, and north-eastern India and is a national fruit of India. The most expensive mango in the world is Taiyo no Tamago (Egg of the sun) grown in the Miyazaki province of Japan and then sold throughout the country at a rate of ₹ 300,000 kg (Shankar, 2021). In 2019, the production of mangoes was led by India with 46% (26 Mt) of the world's total (56 Mt), around half of the world's mangoes are being cultivated in India alone. Uttar Pradesh and Andhra Pradesh are having the largest area under mango each with around 23% of the total area followed by Karnataka, Bihar, Gujarat and Tamil Nadu (Anon., 2022). In Andhra Pradesh, mango is grown in an area of 2.85 lakh ha with a production of 20.95 lakh tonne and productivity of 7419 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. In the south Telangana plateau, the mango cultivation area is expanded due to its climatic condition. The mean annual precipitation is 638 mm and mean annual temperatures varies from 23°C to 34°C. Due to non-availability of irrigation facility and high temperature around the year limits the agricultural crop production in the semi-arid region hence, the small and marginal farmers of the semiarid region particularly in south Telangana plateau agricultural land is being converted into the mango fruit crop production. Soils are highly heterogeneous and differ in their morphological, physical, chemical and biological properties (Chandrakala et al., 2022a) which respond differently to management practices as well as their resilience to disturbance and vulnerability to degradation (FAO, 2017). Through characterization of soils, it's possible to classify the soils based on their properties which enable best management practices to specific land units (Chandrakala et al., 2018). Mango productivity is hampered due to imbalanced use of fertilizer and pesticides (Sultana et al., 2018). Nutrient imbalance in different agroecology of commercial fruit crops is of very important concern, as their sustainability for the long term is becoming a serious question (Adak et al., 2019). This imbalance poses a serious threat to the quality of the fruit as it's a serious matter as people get enriched through nutritive fruit sources (Rao and Swaminathan, 2017). The estimated total nutrient uptake (N, P2O5 and K2 O) by mango was 280 Mt with a nutrient wise uptake of 124 Mt N, 31 Mt P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and 124 Mt of K<sub>2</sub>O ha<sup>-1</sup> (Adak *et al.*, 2019). Nutritional security is the need of the hour apart from productivity. The nutrient content of fruits highly depending on the soil available nutrients status hence judicious use of fertilizers and manures is a must to maintain soil nutrient balance to sustain the fruit quality. With these above facts, the detailed soil survey was conducted on a 1:10000 scale using GIS and RS to study the soils of mango cultivation for their potential and their limitations in Rayachoty Mandal, YSR Kadapa district, Andhra Pradesh. Soils were characterised for available nutrients status and based on initial soil test values nutrients were recommended and mapped. The objectives of the study are i) to characterise and classification of mango production lands, ii) to identify the potential mango production lands and their limitations upon conversion of agricultural land to mango plantation iii) to map the organic carbon and initial soil phosphorus and potassium status of Rayachoty Mandal and iv) recommendation of nutrients to mango plants based soil fertility ratings and management of soils.

## 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A detailed soil survey was carried out at a selected Mandal *i.e.*, Rayachoty (TGA 23,240.7 ha (cultivated land is 16768.55 ha) belongs to YSR Kadapa district, Andhra Pradesh, south Telangana plateau, falls on north latitudes 13°59'45.28" and 14°7'12.263" and east longitudes 78°35' 24.85" and 78°54'5.608" (Fig. 1). South Telangana plateau is a hot, dry semi-arid eco-sub region (AESR 7.1). Rayachoty has a dry climate with tropical wet and high temperature around the year. Mean annual rainfall is 638 mm making the soil Ustic moisture condition and the mean annual tempera-



Fig. 1. Location map of Rayachoty Mandal, south Telangana plateau

ture ranges from 23°C to 34°C with iso-hyperthermic soil temperature condition. LGP is 145 days. Hills and ridges, isolated hillocks, gently sloping uplands, very gently sloping uplands, nearly level uplands and nearly level lowland / valleys are the six major landforms delineated in the Mandal.

Agriculture is the major livelihood activity of the small and marginal farmers in the region with major adopted crops are paddy, redgram, cowpea, groundnut, sunflower, sesamum, mulberry, and coconut and mango plantation (Chandrakala *et al.*, 2019b).

Using the survey of India toposheet (1:50,000 scale), sentinel-2 and google imagery, land use / land cover (LU / LC) digitised and prepared the map in a GIS environment. The LU/LC shows how much area is under mango plantation presently in the Mandal alongwith agriculture and forest land (map 1), these maps was finalised upon ground



Map 1. Land use land cover map of Rayachoty Mandal, south Telangana plateau

truth checking during field survey work which shows mango is cultivating in 1613.8 ha (6.94% of TGA). Similarly, landform mapping was also done and six landforms were established in the Mandal as mentioned above. With the help of landforms, seven transects were selected along the slope and contour, a total of 103 soil profiles were studied. Two master representative soil profiles were brought from the mango plantations and 87 surface soil samples were brought to the laboratory, air-dried, ground and sieved through a 2-mm sieve which was analysed for physicchemical properties in the laboratory using the following procedure. International pipette method (Piper, 1966) was used for particle size analysis. Gravel content was determined by the Gravimetry method (Govindarajan and Koppar, 1975), Soil pH and electrical conductivity (EC) were measured with a 1:2.5 soil: water ratio available  $P_2O_5$  (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) by Olsen's extractant for soils having pH < 6.5 and Bray's 1 extractant for soils pH was > 6.5 with colorimetry and available K<sub>2</sub>O (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) by N NH<sub>4</sub>OAC extractant and flame photometry (Jackson, 1973), organic carbon (OC) was determined by Walkley and Black (1934) method. Cation exchange capacity was determined by the NN ammonium acetate method (Schollenberger and Dreibelbis, 1930), calcium carbonate (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) equivalent (%) was determined by the Piper method (1966).

The land suitability evaluation for mango is done in the four hierarchies *i.e.*, orders, classes, sub-classes and units. Suitable or not suitable for cultivation of mango can be done at an order level, based on kinds of suitability for the identified land use and mapping unit. Orders are subdivided into classes based on degrees of suitability followed by classes are classified into sub-classes based on the kinds of limitations, based on the type of management required, subclasses are again categorised into land suitability units. Class S1, S2 and S3 represent highly suitable, moderately suitable, marginally suitable, respectively and class N1 and N2 represents currently not suitable and permanently not suitable, respectively. Classes S2 and S3 were further categorised into subclasses as per specific soil / climate limitations in the Mandal. Highly suitable land units have no subclasses. The limitations occurring in the Mandal for mango production area are Climate: temperature, rainfall total and distribution, dry months and growing period (c), topography (l), soil depth or rooting condition (r), soil texture (sandy or heavy clay) (t), coarse fragments (g), soil fertility (calcareousness) (n), drainage (w). Specific limitations are represented by lower case letters alongwith the class symbol (Chandrakala et al., 2019a).

The soils were classified according to soil taxonomy (Soil Survey Staff, 1999, 2003, 2014 and 2017) using morphological, physical and chemical properties. Based on identified landforms, LU/LC, GPS profiles location points soil boundaries were drawn and the identified mapping unit boundary were also drawn. By using soil and mapping unit boundaries the land capability map was prepared as per the guidelines of Klingebiel and Montgomery (1966). Using the soil site suitability criteria (NBSS&LUP, 1994 and Naidu *et al.*, 2006), land resources of the Rayachoty Mandal was assessed for the suitability of mango, then, using mapping units with assigned mango suitability class details, suitability map has been prepared and by krigging and interpolation method fertility maps have been prepared in the Arc-GIS environment.

#### 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

# Assessment of Soils of Mango Plantations and Their Classification

The soils of mango cultivation (Table's 1 and 2) are having depth 0-43 and 0-72 cm i.e., shallow and moderately shallow, respectively whereas moderately deep and deep soils are occupied by other agricultural crops (Chandrakala et al., 2019b, 2022b and 2022c), fairly good soils are put under mango cultivation which restricts mango roots to penetrate deeper thereby affects nutrients uptake results in low production and productivity. Soil colour is reddish brown (5YR4/4) to dark brown (7.5YR4/3) in surface to dark reddish brown to brown sub-surface which imparted by parent materials containing iron is oxidised more readily due to the higher oxygen content as the semi-arid climatic condition with low rainfall. Soil structure is weak to moderate and fine to medium subangular blocky. This structure of soils holds low content of water during the cropping period as the water holding capacity varies between 4.47 to 7.86% and the consistency of soil is loose to very friable and friable and non-sticky, non-plastic to slightly sticky and slightly plastic. To improve soil structure and consistency organic matter addition is recommended. Soils are gravelly i.e., coarse fragments are >35 to 60% hence tank silt application is recommended (Chandrakala et al., 2021). Soils are welldrained and moderate erosion as the slope of the land is nearly level (1-3%). Sand fraction (77.13 to 81.44% on the surface) is the dominant followed by clay content (5.77 to 10.52% on surface) which makes the soil loamy sand to sandy loam. However, sand content decreased whereas clay content increased in the subsurface which results in sandy clay to sandy clay loam subsurface texture showing that clay illuviation took place and also the presence of clay cutans developed the argillic (Bt) subsurface horizon which is good for mango cultivation as subsurface also recorded more water holding capacity compared to surface soils. OC content is low *i.e.*, <0.5% in surface (0.32 to 0.40%). Slightly acidic to neutral in soil reaction (ph: 6.00 to 6.83 in surface) and non-saline soils (EC is <2.00 dS m<sup>-1</sup>). The exchangeable Ca > Mg> K> Na contents are quite a good amount resulting in

| 'able: 1<br>1orphologic | al properties of m | ango cultivateo | l soils, Rayachoty | Mandal, south Telang | ana plateau |             |                     |         |                      |          |
|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------------|--------------------|----------------------|-------------|-------------|---------------------|---------|----------------------|----------|
| edons                   | Series name        | Depth<br>(cm)   | Colour<br>(moist)  | Texture<br>(USDA)    | Structure   | Consistence | Coarse<br>fragments | Special | Drainage<br>features | Erosion  |
| edon 1                  | Sibyala            | 0-16            | 5 YR4/4            | Loamy sand           | flsbk       | l, so, po   | 40                  | <br>  1 | Well                 | Moderate |
|                         |                    | 16-43           | 2.5 YR3/4          | Sandy clay           | m2sbk       | vfr, s, p   | 60                  | T Tn P  |                      |          |
| edon 2                  | Anumpalli          | 0-16            | 7.5 YR4/3          | Sandy loam           | flsbk       | vfr, so, po | 40                  | I       | Well                 | Moderate |
|                         |                    | 16-36           | 7.5 YR4/4          | Sandy clay loam      | m2sbk       | fr, ss, sp  | 40                  | T Tn P  |                      |          |
|                         |                    | 36-55           | 7.5 YR3/4          | Sandy clay loam      | m2sbk       | fr, ss, sp  | 50                  | T Tn P  |                      |          |
|                         |                    | 55-72           | 7.5 YR4/8          | Sandy clay loam      | m2sbk       | fr, ss, sp  | 50                  | I       |                      |          |

| Physical      | and chemica  | al properti  | ies of mang                  | o soils of R <sup>i</sup> | ayachoty M  | andal, so | uth Telanga                 | ına plateau | _                   |                                       |      |                                      |           |            |       |
|---------------|--------------|--------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-----------|-----------------------------|-------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------|
| Depth<br>(cm) | Horizon      | Partic<br>(% | tle size distr<br>% of <2 mm | ibution<br>()             | 0C<br>(%)   | Hq        | EC<br>(dS m <sup>-1</sup> ) |             | Exchange<br>(cmol ( | able bases<br>(p+) kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |      | CEC<br>(cmol (p+) kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | BS<br>(%) | CCE<br>(%) | AWC   |
|               |              | Sand         | Silt                         | Clay                      |             |           |                             | Ca          | Mg                  | К                                     | Na   |                                      |           |            |       |
| Pedon 1:      | Clayey skele | tal isohype  | erthermic Li                 | ithic Rhodus.             | talfs       |           |                             |             |                     |                                       |      |                                      |           |            |       |
| 0-16          | Ap           | 81.44        | 12.79                        | 5.77                      | 0.32        | 6.00      | 0.065                       | 1.32        | 0.70                | 0.40                                  | 0.02 | 3.10                                 | 79        | T          | 7.86  |
| 16-43         | Bt           | 51.92        | 12.85                        | 35.23                     | 0.44        | 5.66      | 0.066                       | 7.38        | 5.06                | 0.54                                  | 0.07 | 15.10                                | 86        | T          | 12.43 |
| Pedon 2:      | Loamy-skele  | tal mixed    | isohyperthe                  | rmic Typic L              | Taplustalfs |           |                             |             |                     |                                       |      |                                      |           |            |       |
| 0-16          | Ap           | 77.13        | 12.35                        | 10.52                     | 0.40        | 6.83      | 0.107                       | 3.49        | 1.84                | 0.58                                  | 0.03 | 6.10                                 | 76        | I          | 4.47  |
| 16-36         | Bt1          | 67.55        | 11.85                        | 20.60                     | 0.36        | 7.10      | 0.058                       | 6.25        | 3.16                | 0.43                                  | 0.16 | 10.10                                | 66        | ı          | 5.41  |
| 36-55         | Bt2          | 65.20        | 10.76                        | 24.03                     | 0.22        | 7.81      | 0.149                       | 16.21       | 3.14                | 0.50                                  | 0.53 | 20.40                                | 100       | 0.94       | 6.75  |
| 55-72         | Bt3          | 67.46        | 9.90                         | 22.64                     | 0.24        | 8.11      | 0.132                       | ı           | I                   | 0.51                                  | 0.21 | 18.50                                | 100       | 6.46       | 7.14  |
|               |              |              |                              |                           |             |           |                             |             |                     |                                       |      |                                      |           |            |       |

**Fable: 2** 

more than 79 to 100% base saturation. The sub-surface has got more cation exchange capacity (10.10 to 20.40 cmol (p+)kg<sup>-1</sup>) due to more clay content in the subsurface. Parts of the south Telangana plateau haves subsurface calcium carbonate accumulation (0.94 to 6.46%) presence of carbonates of Ca or Mg in the parent material or a layer of secondary accumulation of carbonates. The surface soils of pedons (Table 3) have low to medium available phosphorus (6.87 to 34.35 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and potassium (142.8 to 156 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> content, low in sulphur (2.50 to 5.00 ppm) and boron (0.06-0.09 ppm), sufficient in iron (5.38-12.60 ppm), manganese (6.28-16.86 ppm) and Cu (0.60 to 0.74 ppm) and deficient in zinc (0.28-0.58 ppm) content.

Based on these properties in soils of mango plantations, two soil series were established which are called Sibyala and Anumpalli series. Sibyala series is classified as clayey skeletal isohyperthermic Lithic Rhodustalfs whereas Anumpalli series is classified as loamy-skeletal mixed isohyperthermic Typic Haplustalfs as these series both have argillic horizon with >35% base saturation hence classified under the order Alfisols. Both the series are having moisture regimes intermediate between the aridic and udic regime hence classified as Ustalf. Since Sibyala series has 2.5 YR3/4 subsurface soil colour with shallow depth qualified under Lithic Rhodustalfs whereas Anumpalli series does not qualify under any suborder level hence classified under Haplustalfs. The difference between mean winter and mean summer temperature is >6°C and the mean annual soil temperature is more than 22°C hence both the series have been grouped under isohyperthermic temperature regime. Balakrishna et al. (2021) reported similar soil properties in mango plantations in the YSR Kadapa district including Rayachoty Mandal. Salunkhe et al. (2021) also studied the soil properties in mango orchards of the Ratnagiri district of the Konkan region.

#### **Identification of Potential Mango Cultivation Lands**

Agriculture land suitability assessment is a process of evaluation of land performance when used for alternative kinds of landuse / agriculture for specific crop cultivation (He et al., 2011). The study area Rayachoty Mandal is having TGA of 23,240.70 ha with cultivated land of 16768.55 ha, out of which mango plantation is under 1613.8 ha (6.94% of TGA-map 1). In the Mandal, 53 mapping units (mapping units with a number given in Table 4) were identified based on morphological, physical and chemical properties of soils. Out of 53 mapping units, the mapping units number 29 to 53 are potential lands for mango cultivation which comes under marginally suitable *i.e.*, class S3 which accounts for 42.71% of total geographical area (map 2). These units are class S3 due to the slight limitation of gravelliness, root restriction, soil texture, soil fertility and drainage (limitations are provided along with a class in Table 5). However, mapping units 1 to 28 which

| Pedons  | Depth (cm) | $P_2O_5(kg ha^3)$ | KO (kg ha <sup>-1</sup> ) | S (ppm) | B (ppm) | Cu (ppm) | Fe (ppm) | Mn (ppm) | Zn (ppm) |
|---------|------------|-------------------|---------------------------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Pedon 1 | 0-16       | 34.35             | 142.80                    | 2.50    | 0.06    | 0.60     | 12.60    | 16.86    | 0.28     |
|         | 16-43      | 2.29              | 169.20                    | 2.50    | 0.25    | 2.10     | 13.10    | 23.12    | 0.12     |
| Pedon 2 | 0-16       | 6.87              | 156.00                    | 5.00    | 0.09    | 0.74     | 5.38     | 6.28     | 0.58     |
|         | 16-36      | 2.29              | 109.20                    | 2.50    | 0.70    | 1.44     | 3.06     | 3.58     | 0.12     |
|         | 36-55      | 2.29              | 116.40                    | 5.00    | 0.42    | 1.08     | 1.64     | 1.90     | 0.04     |
|         | 55-72      | 11.45             | 138.00                    | 14.16   | 0.08    | 0.18     | 1.26     | 1.22     | 0.14     |
|         |            |                   |                           |         |         |          |          |          |          |

 Table: 3

 Soil available nutrients status of Mango soils, Rayachoty Mandal, south Telangana plateau



Map 2. Soil suitability for mango in Rayachoty Mandal, south Telangana plateau

occupies 29.45% of total area is non-potential lands for mango cultivation which falls under unsuitable lands with class N for mango cultivation due to the limitation of soil depth which restricts the root growth and development thereby crop cannot withstand due to poor root anchorage as the depth of these units is less than 75 cm. The land capability classification (map 3) in the Mandal shows that these identified potential mango suitable lands belong to Class III *i.e.*, moderately good cultivable lands except mapping units 39, 49, 50, 52 and 53 which belongs to Class IV *i.e.*, fairly good cultivable lands due to soil and wetness limitation. A similar study of the identification of mango suitable land and their capability was reported by Abdel Rahman, *et al.* (2016). Naidu *et al.* (2009) also reported shorter growing periods, poor fertility status, poor drainage, presence of calcium carbonate and gravels in the sub-soils are identified as major constraints for mango production in Andhra Pradesh. Rathi *et al.* (2021) also reported similar studies on land capability and land suitability for different crops including soil fertility status in Khandala village of Nagpur district, Maharashtra.

# Soil Fertility Status, Fertilizer Recommendation and Management

Delayed/unseasonal rainfall, temperature fluctuations, low soil fertility are the major constraints affecting mango production in Andhra Pradesh (Ganeshamurthy *et al.*, 2018) hence, available nutrients in the soil are important to be

| 138 | 3 |
|-----|---|
|-----|---|

| Table: 4   |                   |
|--|-------------------|
| Mapping units with descriptive legend in Rayachoty Mandal, south | Telangana plateau |

| Series name                                   | Mapping<br>unit No. | Mapping<br>unit  | Descriptive legend   |
|---|---------------------|------------------|--|
| Sibvala                                       | 1                   | SblbB2           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
| bioguiu                                       | 2                   | SblbB2g2         | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3% with surface very gravels of 35-60%  |
|   | 3                   | SblcA1           | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with nearly level slope of 0-1%   |
|   | 4                   | SblcB2           | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
| Varivapapireddypalli                          | 5                   | VprbB1           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
| · · · · · J · · F · · F · · · · · J F · · · · | 6                   | VprbB2           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
|   | 7                   | VprcA1           | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with nearly level slope of 0-1%   |
|   | 8                   | VprcC2           | Soils of sandy loan texture occurring on unlands with gentle slope of 3-5%   |
| Turnunalli                                    | 9                   | TppbB2           | Soils of loandy sould texture occurring on uplands with yery gentle slope of 1-3%  |
| Turpupum                                      | 10                  | TppbD2<br>TppbC2 | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on unlands with very genue of 3-5%   |
|   | 10                  | TppcA1           | So is of same value occurring on uplands with pearly level slope of $0-1\%$  |
|   | 12                  | TppcA1           | So is of sandy loan texture occurring on uplands with yeary gover slope of $1.20$  |
|   | 12                  | TppcB2           | So is of sandy loan texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of $1.20$ with surface   |
|   | 15                  | TppcB2g1         | gravels of 15-35%  |
|   | 14                  | TppcC2g1         | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with gentle slope of 3-5% with surface gravels of 15-35 %   |
|   | 15                  | TpphB2g1         | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3 % with surface gravels of 15-35%   |
|   | 16                  | TppiC2           | Soils of sandy clay texture occurring on uplands with gentle slope of 3-5%   |
| Anumpalli                                     | 17                  | AnpbB1           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
|   | 18                  | AnpbB2           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
|   | 19                  | AnpbC2           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with gentle slope of 3-5%   |
|   | 20                  | AnpcB2           | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
|   | 21                  | AnpcB2g1         | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3% with surface gravels of 15-35%   |
|   | 22                  | AnphB1           | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of $1-3\%$  |
|   | 23                  | AnpiA1           | Soils of sandy clay texture occurring on uplands with nearly level slope of 0-1%   |
| Madhavaram                                    | 24                  | MdvbC2           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on unlands with gentle slope of 3-5%   |
|   | 25                  | MdvcA1           | Soils of sandy loan texture occurring on unlands with nearly level slope of 0-1%   |
|   | 26                  | MdvhA1           | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on unlands with nearly level slope of 0.1%  |
|   | 20                  | MdvhB1           | So is of sandy clay four texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of $1-3\%$  |
|   | 27                  | Mdvi A 1         | Solis of sandy clay texture accounting on uplands with partly layer slope of $1.5\%$   |
| Kumaranalli                                   | 20                  | KmphD2           | Soils of heavy sand taxture occurring on uplands with yeary gords slope of 1.29/   |
| Kumarapam                                     | 29<br>30            | KmpbB2g1         | So is of loany sand texture occurring on uplands with very gente slope of $1-3\%$ with surface graved of $15,25\%$   |
|   | 21                  | VmnhC2           | glavels of $15-55/6$   |
|   | 22                  | KiiipoC2         | So its of roamy same texture occurring on uplands with genue stope of $3-5\%$  |
|   | 32                  | KmpcB2           | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
|   | 33                  | KmpcC2g1         | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with gentle slope of 3-5% with surface gravels of 15-35%  |
|   | 34                  | KmphB1           | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%   |
|   | 35                  | KmphC2           | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on uplands with gentle slope of 3-5%  |
| Balreddigaripalli                             | 36                  | BrpbC2           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with gentle slope of 3-5%   |
|   | 37                  | BrphB1           | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%   |
|   | 38                  | BrpfB1           | Soils of clay loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%   |
|   | 39                  | BrpiA1           | Soils of sandy clay texture occurring on uplands with nearly level slope of 0-1%   |
|   | 40                  | BrpiB1           | Soils of sandy clay texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
| Kondavandlapalli                              | 41                  | KvpbB1           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
| _   | 42                  | KvpbB2           | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
|   | 43                  | KvpbB2g2         | Soils of loamy sand texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3% with surface very gravels of 35-60%  |
|   | 44                  | KvpcA2g1         | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with nearly level slope of 0-1% with surface gravels of 15-35%  |
|   | 45                  | KvpcB2           | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3%  |
|   | 46                  | KvpcB2g1         | Soils of sandy loam texture occurring on uplands with very gentle slope of 1-3% with surface gravels of 15-35%   |
|   | 47                  | KvphB1           | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on unlands with very gentle slone of 1-3%   |
|   | 48                  | KvnhR?           | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on unlands with very gentle slope of 1-3%   |
| Navanurnalli                                  | 40                  | Nyph A 1         | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on lowlands with nearly level slope of 0.10/  |
| rayanarpani                                   | 50                  | NypiA 1          | Soils of sandy clay texture occurring on lowlands with nearly level slope of 0.1%  |
| Duganyandlanalli                              | 50                  | Dupo A 1         | Soils of sandy leave texture occurring on lowlands with nearly level slope of 0.10/  |
| Luganvanuiapann                               | 51                  | DyptA1           | Soils of sandy clay loam texture occurring on lowlands with nearly level slope of 0.10/  |
|   | 53                  | DvpiA1<br>DvpiA1 | Soils of sandy clay toam texture occurring on lowlands with hearly level slope of 0-1% Soils of sandy clay texture occurring on lowlands with nearly level slope of 0-1% |

| Tables 5  |
|---|
| Table: 5  |
| Soil suitability for manga in Davaabaty Mandal, south Talangana plataau |
| Soli suitability for mango in Kayachoty Manual, south Telangana plateau |

| Mapping unit no.  | Suitability classes | Description  | Area ha  | Area % |
|---|---------------------|--|----------|--------|
| 41, 42, 43, 44, 45,<br>46, 47, 48   | S3g                 | Marginally suitable land with slight limitation of gravelliness                      | 2945     | 12.67  |
| 51  | S3n                 | Marginally suitable land with slight limitation of soil fertility                    | 389.8    | 1.68   |
| 52, 53  | S3nw                | Marginally suitable land with slight limitation of soil fertility and drainage       | 833.19   | 3.59   |
| 36, 37, 40  | S3r                 | Marginally suitable land with slight limitation of root restriction                  | 1146.8   | 4.93   |
| 29, 30, 31, 32, 33,<br>34, 35   | S3rg                | Marginally suitable land with slight limitation of root restriction and gravelliness | 3718.06  | 16     |
| 39  | S3rw                | Marginally suitable land with slight limitation root restriction and drainage        | 514.02   | 2.21   |
| 49, 50  | S3t                 | Marginally suitable land with slight limitation of soil texture                      | 378.41   | 1.63   |
| $\begin{array}{c}1,2,3,4,5,6,7,\\8,9,10,11,12,13,\\14,15,16,17,18,\\19,20,21,22,23,\\24,25,26,27,28\end{array}$ | Ν                   | Currently not suitable land  | 6843.25  | 29.45  |
| Soil total  |                     |  | 16768.55 | 72.15  |
| Rock outcrops   |                     |  | 2840.9   | 12.22  |
| Forest  |                     |  | 1978.98  | 8.52   |
| Habitation  |                     |  | 911.61   | 3.92   |
| Waterbody   |                     |  | 740.66   | 3.19   |
| Total geographical  | area                |  | 23240.7  | 100    |

Note: Climatic limitation is commonly present in Rayachoty Mandal



Map 3. Land capability classification in Rayachoty Mandal, south Telangana plateau

mapped to investigate the state of nutrients present in specific site / soil. Randomly collected 87 surface soil samples were analysed for OC (map 4), available phosphorus (map 5) and potassium status (map 6) of Rayachoty Mandal and fertility status was mapped in Arc-GIS. Results show that the OC content of soils of Rayachoty Mandal ranged from 0.20 to 2.11%. However, 25.5% of the area is low in OC content followed by 24.98% of area is medium and 21.67% area is high. High OC in some areas might be due to the addition of a sufficient quantity of organic manure for cultivating crops. A similar result of low soil organic matter was reported in mango orchards of western Uttar Pradesh (Kumar et al., 2015). In soils of low OC status (map 4) it is recommended to apply organic manures such as FYM, vermicompost, liquid organic manures such as panchagavya and jeevamruth to enrich the soil organic nutrient source for elevated mango production and productivity. Higher levels of OC not only provides part of nitrogen requirement of the mango plants but also enhance the nutrient and water retention capacity of soils and create a favourable environment as it is semiarid lands (Rajasekharan et al., 2013).

Phosphorus is described as the second limiting nutrient for crop production after nitrogen. The available phosphorus status (map 5) varied from 2.0 to 54.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. About 66.46% of the area is under low and 5.69% area under

medium; hence it's very necessary to apply 125% of the recommended dose of phosphorus to mango plantations in the low phosphorus status soils and recommended dose of phosphorus to medium status soils. The available potassium status (map 6) in soils of Rayachoty Mandal varied from 36.0 to 442.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. About 54.70% of the area under low followed by 15.69% of the area under medium and 1.77% of the area under high. Similarly, to phosphorus, it is very necessary to apply 125% of the recommended dose of potassium in low potassium status soils and 75% of recommended dose in high status and recommended dose of potassium in medium status soils for better production and productivity of mango in order to maintain soil nutrient balance. Similar studies on soil fertility mapping have been done by Nalina et al. (2016) and Chandrakala (2020). Soil fertility / nutrient status is significantly varying due to natural factors like temperature, rainfall, soil erosion, weathering etc., and manmade factors such as land use, cultural operations, conservation practices and grazing etc. (Vishnoi et al., 2020). Correction of soil nutrient deficiency is very necessary as the mango yield was correlated with the potassium contents, the sum of bases and pH as the low yield was resulted due to low K content associated with the presence of gravel (Siqueira et al., 2019). Major nutrients need an optimum application in order to sustain the productivity as well as soil health of mango orchards (Adak et al., 2019). Application of soil test based nutrient recom-



Map 4. Soil organic carbon status of Rayachoty Mandal, south Telangana plateau



Map 5. Available phosphorus status of Rayachoty Mandal, south Telangana plateau



Map 6. Available potassium status of Rayachoty Mandal, south Telangana plateau

mendation is a must as the lower productivity of mango is linked to low to medium soil nutrients status hence, for ensuring better productivity, proper nutrition management systems should be adopted by the mango growers (Adak and Pandey, 2020).

Fertility capability classification of identified mango soils series is SCedhmr<sup>++</sup> (1-3) and Ldhr<sup>++</sup> (1-5) in Sibyala and Anumpalli series, respectively (Chandrakala et al., 2021). The Sibyala series has a sandy surface texture, it can be improved by the addition of mycorrhizae, cow dung, and biochar (Herawati et al., 2021). Slope of the mango plantation is very gently (1-3%) to gently sloping (3-5%), hence, graded bunding and ploughing and cultivating across the slope (Chandrakala et al, 2019b) and also contour cropping, stripcropping, inter cropping, mulch tillage, residue incorporation, vegetative barrier and contour barrier (Mandal et al., 2021) are recommended for managing the slope. Low cation exchange capacity (e) and low OC content (m) exist in Sibyala series hence, organic manures, FYM and compost is must be applied. Dry soil moisture regime (d) can be managed provided with artificial irrigation, however, the drip irrigation method saves water and increases water use efficiency in mango plantations which provides a consistent moisture regime in the soil hence, the root remains active throughout the season resulting in optimum availability of nutrient and proper translocation of food materials which accelerates the fruit growth and development in mango (Kumar et al., (2008); Bush (2020) and Taha, 2020). Acidity of soil (h) has to be managed by the application of burnt lime. Application of limestone enhanced the soil pH and base saturation status by adding Ca<sup>2+</sup> and Mg<sup>2+</sup> concentrations, in addition to decreasing H and Al thereby increasing the mango fruit yield in acid soils (Correia et al., 2018). Both the series have >35% gravel content (r<sup>++</sup>) hence, the addition of tank silt or black clayey soils is recommended.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

High temperature is not so injurious to mango, which can usually thrive well in the low rainfall and dry season. Hence, the identification of productive mango lands is urgently required in the semi-arid region for improving the socio-economical status, livelihood generation and creating employment for small and marginal farmers in the semi-arid region. Mango cultivation has the potential to provide food, nutrition, health security and livelihood opportunity in the south Telangana plateau. The present study identified the 42.71% area as potential for mango production with manageable soil and climatic limitations. Two soil series namely Sibyala and Anumpalli series were established in the mango plantations of Rayachoty Mandal, South Telangana plateau. Soils with low OC, available phosphorus and potassium status need to be applied with manures and fertilizers for elevated mango production and productivity apart from maintaining soil nutrient balance and soil

health to obtain the mango fruit quality for achieving nutritional security in the country.

#### REFERENCES

- Anonymous. 2022. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mango. Accessed on July 2022.
- Abdel Rahman, M.A.E., Natarajan, A., Hegde, R. 2016. Assessment of land suitability and capability by integrating remote sensing and GIS for agriculture in Chamarajanagar district, Karnataka, India. *Egypt. J. Remote. Sens. Space Sci.*, 19: 125-141.
- Adak, T., Kumar, K. and Singh, V.K. 2019. Assessment of soil micronutrients from a mango based agroecology of Malihabad, Uttar Pradesh, India. *Trop. Plant Res.*, 6(2): 176-182.
- Adak, T. and Pandey, G. 2020. Estimating soil nutrient index vis-à-vis mango orchard productivity of Lucknow region, Uttar Pradesh, India. *Trop. Plant Res.*, 7(3): 622-626.
- Adak, T., Mishra, D., Kumar, K. and Singh, V.K. 2019. Analysis of soil and tree productivity under high density planting system in mango cv. Dashehari (Mangifera indica L.). Trop. Plant Res., 6(1): 24-30.
- Bush, A. 2020. Water requirement of mango trees (*Mangifera indica*) under Sudan dry land conditions, PhD thesis, Department of Agricultural Engineering, Faculty of Natural Resources and Environmental Studies, Alsalam University of Sudan.
- Herawati, A., Mujiyo, J.S., Rochmadtulloh, M., Susila, A.A., Romadhon, M.R. 2021. Mycorrhizae and a soil ameliorant on improving the characteristics of sandy soil, SAINS *TANAH - J. Soil Sci. Agroclimat.*, 18(1): 73-80.
- Balakrishna, M., Krishna, T.G., Nagamadhuri, K.V., Naidu, M.V.S., Sudhakar, P., Reddy, B.R. and Yuwaraj, K.M. 2021. Assessment of physico-chemical properties in soil from mango orchards of YSR Kadapa district of Andhra Pradesh. *Int. J. Chem. Stud.*, 9(1): 347-350, doi: https://doi.org/10.22271/chemi.2021.v9.i1e.11252.
- Chandrakala, M. 2020. Mapping of soil nutrient status in Elamdesam block of tropical humid region, Kerala, India, Agriculture & Food: e-Newsletter, 2(4), www.agrifoodmagazine.co.in
- Chandrakala, M., Anil Kumar, K.S. and Sujatha, K. 2022a. Soil heterogeneity: A comparative assessment of soils from two different AESR, southern India. Ann. Plant Soil Res., 24(1): 29-35.
- Chandrakala, M., Prasad, Bhoora, Niranjana, K.V., Srinivasan, R., Sujatha, K., Basavaraj, B., Sunil P. Maske, Rajendra Hegde and Dwivedi B.S. 2022b. Paddy lands of south Telangana plateau (Rayalseema), Andhra Pradesh, India: A detailed assessment". *Indian J. Soil Cons.*, 50(1).
- Chandrakala, M., Prasad, B., Niranjana, K.V, Sujatha, K., Hegde, R. and Chandran, P. 2021. Application of soil fertility capability classification (FCC) in dry semi-arid land of south Telangana plateau, Andhra Pradesh. *Comm. Soi. Sci. Pl. Anal.*, 52(2): 161-171, doi.org/10.1080/ 00103624.2020.1854291.
- Chandrakala, M., Srinivasan, R., Anil Kumar, K.S., Sujatha, K., Ramesh, M., Rajendra Hegde, Singh, S.K. and Nirmala, H.R. 2018. Characterization and classification of rubber growing soils of Kerala, India. *Curr. J. Appl. Sci. Technol*, 32(1): 1-12, doi.org/10.9734/CJA ST/2019/44649.
- Chandrakala, M., Srinivasan, R., Anil Kumar, K.S., Sujatha, K., Hegde, R. and Singh, S.K. 2019a. Land suitability evaluation for major crops adopted to tropical humid region of Kerala, India. *Int. J. Chem. Stud.*, 7(4): 2446-2453.
- Chandrakala, M., Srinivasan, R., Bhaskar, B.P., Sunil, P. Maske, Ramesh Kumar, S.C., Srinivas, S. and Hegde, R. 2019b. Land Resource Inventory of Rayachoty Mandal, YSR Kadapa district, Andhra Pradeshon 1:10000 scale for optimal agricultural land use planning, using geospatial techniques. NBSS Publ. No. 1120, ICAR-NBSS& LUP, Nagpur.
- Chandrakala M., Srinivasan, R., Prasad, Bhoora, Niranjana, K.V, Sujatha, K., Hegde, R., Chandran, P., Dwivedi, B.S. and Maske, Sunil P., 2022c. Land suitability evaluation for pigeon pea in semi-arid land, south Telangana plateau, India, using GIS, remote sensing and detailed survey, *Comm. Soi. Sci. Pl. Anal.*, 53(6): 675-687, doi.org/ 10.1080/00103624.2022.2028807.

- Correia, M.A.R., Flores, R.A., R. de M. Prado, W. Natale, D.E. Rozane and D.W. do Vale, 2018. Using limestone to improve soil fertility and growth of mango (*Mangifera Indica* L.). *Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal.*, doi: 10.1080/00103624.2018.1448407.
- FAO, 2017. Voluntary Guidelines for Sustainable Soil Management, Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
- Ganeshamurthy, A.N., Rupa, T.R. and Shivananda, T.N. 2018. Enhancing Mango productivity through sustainable resource management, *J. Hort. Sci.*, 13(1):1-31.
- Govindarajan, S.V. and Koppar, A.L. 1975. Improved method for determination of gravels in red clay soils. J. Indian Soc. Soil Sci., 23: 138-140.
- He, Y., Yao, Y., Chen, Y. and Ongaro, L. 2011. *Regional land suitability* assessment for tree crops using remote sensing and GIS. Computer distributed control and intelligent environmental monitoring (CDCIEM) IEEE, Changsha, pp 354-363.
- Jackson, M.L. 1973. Soil chemical analysis, Oxford IBH Publishing Co., Bombay.
- Klingebiel, A.A. and Montgomery, P.R. 1966. Land capability classification. Agric. Handbook 210, SCS, USDA, Washington D.C.
- Kumar, D., Pandey, V. and Nath, V. 2008. Effect of drip irrigation regimes on growth, yield and quality of mango hybrid Arka Anmol. *Indian J. Hort.*, 65(4): 409-412.
- Kumar, K., Adak, T. and Singh, V.K. 2015. Status and distribution of micronutrients in mango orchards under subtropical region of Uttar Pradesh. *India. J. Agric. Phys.*, 15(2): 127-139.
- Mandal, D., Chandrakala, M., Alam, N.M., Trisha Roy and Uday Mandal, 2021. Assessment of soil quality and productivity in different phases of soil erosion with the focus on land degradation neutrality in tropical humid region of India". *Catena*, 204, doi.org/10.1016/j. catena.2021.105440.
- Naidu, L.G.K., Ramamurthy, V., Challa, O., Hegde, R. and Krishnan, P. 2006. Manual soil site criteria for major crops NBSS Publication No. 129, NBSS&LUP, Nagpur, 118p.
- Naidu, L.G.K., Srinivas, S., Subbi Reddy, G., Ramesh Kumar, S.C. and Reddy, R.S. 2009. Identification and delineation of suitable areas for mango, banana, citrus and cashew crops in Andhra Pradesh. *Agropedology*, 19(1): 30-40.
- Nalina, C.N., Anil Kumar, K.S. Chandrakala, M., Sheela Rani, S., Sujata, K., Shilpa Shree, K.G., Rajendra Hegde and Singh S.K. 2016. Soil nutrient status mapping of Nagenahalli micro-watershed under eastern dry zone of Karnataka by remote sensing, detailed soil survey and GIS techniques. *Indian J. Agric. Res.*, 50(5): 389-397. doi:10.18 805/ijare.v0iOF.3762.
- NBSS&LUP. 1994. Proceedings National meet on soil site suitability criteria for different crops, NBSS&LUP, Nagpur, 30p.
- Piper, C.S. 1966. Soil and Plant Analysis. Hans Publisher, Bombay.

- Rajasekharan, P., Nair, K.M., Rajasree, G., Sureshkumar, P., Narayanakutty, M.C. 2013. Soil fertility assessment and information management for enhancing crop productivity in Kerala, Kerala state planning board, Government of Kerala, Thiruvananthapuram.
- Rao, N. and Swaminathan, M.S. 2017. A farmers-led approach to achieving a malnutrition-free India. Agric. Res., 6(1): 1-7.
- Rathi, S.G., Nagaraju, M.S.S., Srivastava, R., Prasad, J., Tiwary, P. and Nasre, R.A. 2021. Soil mapping and land evaluation of Khandala village in Nagpur district using high resolution satellite data and GIS. *Indian J. Soil Cons.*, 49(3): 181-189.
- Salunkhe, S.S., Ayare, B.L., Bhange, H.N., Thokal, R.T., Dhekale, J.S. and Nandgude, S.B. 2021. Study of physical properties of soils from Mango orchards of Ratnagiri district of Konkan region. *J. Pharm. Innov. SP*-10(4): 290-294.
- Schollenberger, G.J. and Dreibelbis, F.R. 1930. Analytical methods in base exchange investigations in soils. *Soil Sci.*, 30: 161-163.
- Shankar, K. 2021. Amazing facts in mango, agriculture and food enewsletter; 3(1).
- Siqueira, C.L., Moacir Brito Oliveira, Karen Marcele de Jesus Silva, Marcos Koiti Kondo, Renato Mendes de Oliveira and Silvânio Rodrigues dos Santos. 2019. Palmer' mango yield as affected by soil class and pedon physicochemical characteristics. J. Agric. Sci., 11(4): 252-261, doi:10.5539/jas.v11n4p252.
- Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. In: *handbook No. 436*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., 1-0871. Washington, DC: USDA, natural resources conservation service, agriculture.
- Soil Survey Staff. 2003. Soil survey manual. Agriculture Handbook No. 18, USDA, Washington, DC, https://nrcspad.sc.egov.usda.gov/ DistributionCenter/.
- Soil Survey Staff. 2014. Keys to soil Taxonomy. 12<sup>th</sup> ed. Washington, D.C: USDA/NRCS.
- Soil Survey Staff. 2017. Soil survey manual. Agriculture Handbook No. 18, USDA, Washington, DC. https://nrcspad.sc.egov.usda.gov/ DistributionCenter/. Accessed 5 08 2019.
- Sultana, A., Chowdhury, M.F. and Pervez, A.K.M.K. 2018. Present status of mango cultivation in Bangladesh: Case of Shibganj Upazila of Chaipainawabganj district. J. Agric. Rural Res., 2(3): 47-55.
- Taha, A.M. 2020. Response of mango (keitt var.) productivity to deficit irrigation in sandy soil. J. Soils and Crops, 30(1): 14-25.
- Vishnoi, L., Bisht, H., Ram, S. and Nain, A.S. 2020. Soil fertility assessment for ensuring food security in lower Himalayan range using GIS techniques. *Indian J. Soil Cons.*, 48(1): 41-46.
- Walkley, A.J. and Black, C.A. 1934. An estimation of Deglgare methods for determining soil organic matter and a proposed modification of the chromic acid titration methods. *Soil Sci.*, 37: 29-38.