

Available online at www.garmian.edu.krd

# **Passer Journal**



Passer 6 (Issue 1) (2024) 22-26

http://passer.garmian.edu.krd/

# Desorption of Adsorbed Ammonium in Some Gypsiferous Soils, Tikrit Governorate, Iraq

# Muhammed Obaid Muhammed<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Basim Shakir Al-Obaidi<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Soil and Water Science, College of Agriculture, Tikrit University, Iraq. <sup>2</sup>Department of Chemistry, College of Education, University of Garmian, Kalar, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.

Received 05 October 2023; revised 26 November 2023; accepted 28 November 2023; available online 11 December 2023

DOI: 10.24271/PSR.2023.419402.1400

## ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the ability of Gypsiferous soil to desorb the adsorbed ammonium in Gypsiferous soils. Desorption of ammonium by Gypsiferous soils is a significant process to identify the rout of ammonium nitrogen in soil systems. Two samples of Gypsiferous soils were collected from Tikrit University and Al-Alam city fields. The samples were contained different gypsum concentrations: low 65 g kg<sup>-1</sup> and high 235 g kg<sup>-1</sup>. Soil columns were utilized by using the method of (Head Constant) and various concentrations of ammonium (5, 10, 20, 40, 80, 100, 120 and 150) mg<sub>(NH4)</sub> L<sup>-1</sup> was added. Then, samples were collected at different times (1, 2, 4, 8, 24, and 48) hr; then, 0.01 M of KCl were added to each of the soil columns in order to desorb the adsorbed ammonium in the first stage. Best fitting of different kinetic models have been used to evaluate the desorption process (Zero order, First order, Diffusion, Power function, and Elovich models). The ammonium desorption in Gypsiferous soils was found to conform to the Power function equation more than the other used equations. The results showed that the process of ammonium desorption was affected by the content of calcium carbonate in soil.

https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Keywords: Desorption, Ammonium, Gypsiferous soil, Power function equation.

## 1. Introduction

Soil is considered a non-renewable source for agriculture, and it is essential for providing the basis for food production. Gypsiferous soil is a type of soil that is characterized by a low to high concentration of di-hydrated calcium sulphate, which may range between 5 to more than  $95\%^{[1]}$ . This type of soil is found in arid and semi-arid areas, and is poor in organic matter content<sup>[2]</sup>. These soils are vulnerable to degradation, especially in overuse cases; however, they can be productive with appropriate practices of management<sup>[3,4]</sup>. High contents of gypsum in soil may lead to a decrease in the amount of available water and ultimately affect soil structure<sup>[5,6]</sup>.

Ammonium is considered as the major form of nitrogen fertilizer that is applied in agricultural processes. For plant growth, ammonium in soil is not only a major source of nitrogen, but also as it is significant in the processes of nitrogen transformation<sup>[7-9]</sup>. Among various sources of available Nitrogen, most studies have focused on ammonium, because it is present in cropland and natural soils at higher levels<sup>[10]</sup>. Ammonium has harmful effects on plant growth in excessive quantities<sup>[11]</sup>.

\* Corresponding author

E-mail address: mohamad.a.moh@st.tu.edu.iq (Instructor).

However, ammonium may present in small quantities in soil solutions, as it is more prone to transformation than nitrate<sup>[12]</sup>. Mostly, the plants benefit from nitrate and ammonium in the soil to increase their contents of nitrogen<sup>[13]</sup>. Ammonium is usually adsorbed by clay minerals and organic matter, while it escapes with irrigation water<sup>[14]</sup>. Therefore, ammonium transport is strongly dependent on oxidation conditions<sup>[15]</sup>. The desorption of ammonium in the soil is influenced by several factors, including soil structure, texture, temperature, moisture content, calcium carbonate, gypsum content and some other elements<sup>[16]</sup>. Therefore, the process of ammonium desorption in different types of soils may present great variability. No studies examined the desorption of adsorbed ammonium in gypsum soils were found by the authors. This experiment aims to study the kinetics of ammonium desorption by examining the best kinetic equation that describes the ammonium's desorption.

#### 2. Materials and Methods

# 2.1 Sample collections and analysis

Sampling stations have been selected based on the contents of gypsum in soil, which include low content of gypsum (L1) 65 g kg<sup>-1</sup> and high content of gypsum (L2) 235 g kg<sup>-1[17,18].</sup> The samples were collected from two fields in the University of Tikrit and Al-Alam City, and the samples were taken for a depth of 0-

Peer-reviewed under the responsibility of the University of Garmian.

30 cm. The samples were submitted to chemical and physical analyses; the characteristics of the soil samples are shown in Table 1.

| Soil                                 | Unit                  | Samples    |            |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|------------|------------|--|--|
| Characteristics                      | Unit                  | Location 1 | Location 2 |  |  |
| pН                                   |                       | 7.5        | 7.69       |  |  |
| EC                                   | dS m <sup>-1</sup>    | 2.52       | 2.31       |  |  |
| CaSO <sub>4</sub> .2H <sub>2</sub> O |                       | 65         | 235        |  |  |
| CaCO <sub>3</sub>                    | g kg <sup>-1</sup>    | 230        | 110        |  |  |
| O.M                                  |                       | 9          | 8          |  |  |
| CEC                                  | Cmol kg <sup>-1</sup> | 13.39      | 10.9       |  |  |
| Sand                                 |                       | 669        | 745        |  |  |
| Silt                                 | ~ 1· ~-1              | 77         | 52         |  |  |
| Clay                                 | g kg <sup>-1</sup>    | 255        | 211        |  |  |
| Texture                              |                       | S.C.L      | S.C.L      |  |  |
| Ν                                    |                       | 18.5       | 12.7       |  |  |
| Р                                    | mg kg <sup>-1</sup>   | 5.5        | 1.5        |  |  |
| K <sup>+</sup>                       |                       | 112.8      | 64.89      |  |  |
| Na <sup>+</sup>                      |                       | 1.30       | 2.32       |  |  |
| $K^+$                                |                       | 0.88       | 0.59       |  |  |
| Ca <sup>2+</sup>                     |                       | 5.61       | 13.41      |  |  |
| $Mg^{2+}$                            |                       | 6.43       | 3.23       |  |  |
| Cl <sup>-</sup>                      | mmol L <sup>-1</sup>  | 2.84       | 1.73       |  |  |
| CO <sub>3</sub>                      |                       | Nil        | Nil        |  |  |
| HCO <sub>3</sub>                     |                       | 1.33       | 2.31       |  |  |
| $SO_4^=$                             |                       | 9.87       | 15.43      |  |  |

Table 1: Physicochemical characteristics of the experimental soils.

## 2.2 Ammonium adsorption and desorption

Soil columns with (0.25) m length and a (0.065) m in diameter were utilized by using the method of (Head Constant); then, various concentrations of ammonium (5, 10, 20, 40, 80, 100, 120 and 150)  $mg_{(NH4)}L^{-1}$  was added. Also, times of the first drop for each column were recorded immediately; then, samples were collected after the following periods (1, 2, 4, 8, 24, and 48) hr. In

order to desorb the adsorbed ammonium in the first stage, 0.01 M of KCl was added to each soil column.

The equations are applied in this research are: zero order, first order, diffusion, power function, and Elovich. The mathematical formulas of these equations are the numbered equations from 1 to 5, respectively, as shown in the following<sup>[19]</sup>:

| Zero order equation:                                  |
|---|
| $qt = q0 - kt \dots 1$                                |
| First-order equation:                                 |
| $ln ln qt = ln ln q0 - kt \dots 2$                    |
| Parabolic diffusion equation:                         |
| $qt = q0 - k\sqrt{t} \dots 3$                         |
| Power function equation:                              |
| $\ln \ln qt = \ln \ln q0 - k \ln \ln t \dots 4$       |
| Elovich equation:                                     |
| $qt = q0 - k \ln \ln t \dots 5$                       |
| Where:  |
| qt is the measured concentration at the time (t)      |
| q0 represents the concentration at the time of (zero) |

K is constant.

The amounts of adsorbed and desorbed  $NH_4$  were calculated based on the following equation:

### 3. Results and discussion

#### 3.1 Desorption of adsorbed ammonium

Tables 2 and 3 show an increase in the amount of desorbed ammonium with an increase in the initial concentration of the added ammonium and with an increase in the period in both samples. Regarding low gypsum content soil, the maximum desorbed was  $3.92 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  for the concentration of 150 mg L<sup>-1</sup> for a period of 48 hours. As for the lowest desorbed, it reached 0.84 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> for the concentration of 5 mg L<sup>-1</sup> over a period of 1 hour.

**Table 2:** Amounts of desorbed ammonium in soil with a low gypsum content.

| Added amount of (NH <sub>4</sub> ) mg L <sup>-1</sup> |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |
|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| 150   | 120  | 100  | 80   | 40   | 20   | 10   | 5    |      |  |
| Desorbed amount of (NH <sub>4</sub> )                 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |
| 2.24  | 1.96 | 1.68 | 1.68 | 1.4  | 1.26 | 1.12 | 0.84 | 1    |  |
| 2.66  | 2.1  | 1.96 | 1.4  | 1.68 | 1.4  | 1.4  | 1.12 | 2    |  |
| 2.8   | 1.68 | 2.1  | 1.82 | 1.96 | 1.54 | 1.4  | 1.4  | 4    |  |
| 3.08  | 2.38 | 2.38 | 2.1  | 2.24 | 1.68 | 1.68 | 1.4  | 8    |  |
| 3.5   | 2.8  | 2.66 | 2.1  | 2.38 | 1.4  | 1.96 | 1.82 | 24   |  |
| 3.92  | 3.5  | 3.08 | 2.8  | 2.66 | 2.8  | 2.24 | 2.1  | 48   |  |
| 3.03  | 2.4  | 2.31 | 1.98 | 2.05 | 1.68 | 1.64 | 1.45 | Mean |  |

For the low gypsum content soil, the maximum desorbed of ammonium was  $3.92 \text{ mg kg}^{-1}$  for the concentration of  $150 \text{ mg L}^{-1}$  over a period of 48 hours. Otherwise, the lowest ammonium

desorbed, reached 0.56 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> for the concentration of 5 mg kg<sup>-1</sup> for a period of 1 hour. Overall, the desorbed ammonium in soil with low gypsum was higher than that of high gypsum content.



| Added amount of (NH <sub>4</sub> ) mg L <sup>-1</sup> |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |
|---|---|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|--|
| 150   | 150         120         100         80         40         20         10         5 |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |
| Desorbed amount of (NH4)                              |   |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |  |
| 1.4   | 1.26  | 1.26 | 1.12 | 1.12 | 0.84 | 0.7  | 0.56 | 1    |  |
| 1.68  | 1.68  | 1.4  | 1.26 | 1.4  | 1.12 | 0.98 | 0.7  | 2    |  |
| 1.96  | 1.96  | 1.4  | 1.54 | 1.96 | 1.4  | 1.26 | 1.12 | 4    |  |
| 2.8   | 2.66  | 1.82 | 1.96 | 2.38 | 1.82 | 1.4  | 1.4  | 8    |  |
| 3.36  | 3.08  | 2.52 | 2.52 | 2.66 | 2.1  | 2.1  | 1.68 | 24   |  |
| 3.92  | 3.36  | 3.22 | 2.94 | 2.8  | 2.8  | 2.52 | 1.82 | 48   |  |
| 2.52  | 2.34  | 1.94 | 1.89 | 2.05 | 1.68 | 1.49 | 1.21 | Mean |  |

Table 3: Amounts of desorbed ammonium in soil with a high gypsum content.

It is believed that the amounts of adsorbed and desorbed ammonium are proportional to the amounts of  $(CaCO_3)$  in the soil<sup>[21,22]</sup>. Also, most of the displaced ammonium is ammonium adsorbed on non-specialized sites<sup>[23]</sup>. Therefore, the desorbed ammonium in the soil of the study area was affected by the presence of calcium carbonate, which means that the adsorbed ammonium was subjected to precipitation processes on the solid phase that affected its released quantities.

# 3.2 The Kinetic approach of NH<sub>4</sub> desorption

The standard coefficient of determination  $(R^2)$  and standard error (SE) values were used to determine the best equations for

describing ammonium desorption in the studied soil samples. The tables 4 and 5 represent summarize of the results of the statistical analysis using the five equations for the soils with low and high gypsum-content.

The results indicate that the values of  $R^2$  for the power function equation are 0.95, 0.97, 0.55, 0.94, 0.78, 0.98, 0.73, and 0.98, respectively. While the value of the standard error (SE) are 4.03, 2.93, 2.3, 2.59, 2.23, 2. 28, 2.24, and 1.95 for the added amounts 5, 10, 20, 40, 80, 100, 120, and 150 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively.

| Table 4: R2 and SE values | of Ammonium desor  | rption in low gypsur | n content soil. |
|---------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|-----------------|
|                           | or r minimum acour | .puon miton Sypour   | n content bom.  |

| L1                 | Equations      |       |                       |       |                       |        |                       |        |                       |        |
|--------------------|----------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|
| Conc.              | Zero or        | der   | First o               | order | Diffu                 | ision  | Power fur             | oction | Elovich               |        |
| mg L <sup>-1</sup> | $\mathbb{R}^2$ | SE    | <b>R</b> <sup>2</sup> | SE    | <b>R</b> <sup>2</sup> | SE     | <b>R</b> <sup>2</sup> | SE     | <b>R</b> <sup>2</sup> | SE     |
| 5                  | 0.832          | 0.170 | 0.717                 | 1.479 | 0.929                 | 3.588  | 0.95                  | 4.03   | 0.973                 | 6.146  |
| 10                 | 0.867          | 0.137 | 0.792                 | 1.299 | 0.955                 | 3.276  | 0.97                  | 2.93   | 0.973                 | 5.531  |
| 20                 | 0.756          | 0.255 | 0.723                 | 1.366 | 0.66                  | 3.714  | 0.55                  | 2.30   | 0.534                 | 5.574  |
| 40                 | 0.728          | 0.221 | 0.649                 | 1.519 | 0.861                 | 3.53   | 0.94                  | 2.59   | 0.972                 | 6.275  |
| 80                 | 0.847          | 0.171 | 0.779                 | 1.478 | 0.856                 | 3.602  | 0.78                  | 2.23   | 0.788                 | 5.772  |
| 100                | 0.875          | 0.715 | 0.809                 | 1.701 | 0.96                  | 4.038  | 0.98                  | 2.28   | 0.983                 | 6.835  |
| 120                | 0.91           | 0.180 | 0.841                 | 1.759 | 0.893                 | 5.042  | 0.73                  | 2.24   | 0.762                 | 7.769  |
| 150                | 0.856          | 0.209 | 0.790                 | 2.172 | 0.95                  | 4.8    | 0.98                  | 1.95   | 0.986                 | 8.179  |
| Average            | 0.834          | 0.257 | 0.763                 | 1.597 | 0.883                 | 3.9489 | 0.86                  | 2.57   | 0.8719                | 6.5105 |

The results indicate that the values of  $R^2$  for the power function equation are 0.92, 0.98, 0.97, 0.9, 0.99, 0.94, 0.95, and 0.97, respectively. While the value of the standard error (SE) are 6.18, 6.1, 5.46, 4.27, 4.64, 4.27, 4.35, and 4.6 for the added levels (5, 10, 20, 40, 80, 100, 120 and 150 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively.

Statistical analysis for best fitting of models indicates that all models can describes the ammonium desorption at different

degrees depending on R2 and SE. The success of different models can be arranged as the following:

Power function> Elovich > Diffusion > Zero order > First order

According to the  $(R^2)$  and (SE) values, the results also indicate that the best model that describe ammonium desorption in soil with low and high gypsum content is the (Power function equation).

| Table 5: R2 and SE values of Ammonium | desorption in high gypsum-content soil. |
|---------------------------------------|---|
|---------------------------------------|---|

| L2                 | Equation              |       |                       |       |                       |       |                |      |                       |       |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|-----------------------|-------|----------------|------|-----------------------|-------|
| Conc.              | Zero                  | order | First order           |       | Diffusion             |       | Power function |      | Elovich               |       |
| mg L <sup>-1</sup> | <b>R</b> <sup>2</sup> | SE    | <b>R</b> <sup>2</sup> | SE    | <b>R</b> <sup>2</sup> | SE    | $\mathbf{R}^2$ | SE   | <b>R</b> <sup>2</sup> | SE    |
| 5                  | 0.703                 | 0.255 | 0.586                 | 1.247 | 0.853                 | 3.882 | 0.92           | 6.18 | 0.971                 | 6.925 |
| 10                 | 0.898                 | 0.200 | 0.772                 | 1.336 | 0.978                 | 5.545 | 0.98           | 6.10 | 0.978                 | 9.269 |
| 20                 | 0.882                 | 0.223 | 0.752                 | 1.409 | 0.957                 | 5.675 | 0.97           | 5.46 | 0.970                 | 9.560 |
| 40                 | 0.637                 | 0.375 | 0.551                 | 1.597 | 0.8                   | 5.012 | 0.90           | 4.27 | 0.949                 | 9.132 |
| 80                 | 0.880                 | 0.228 | 0.794                 | 1.500 | 0.973                 | 5.805 | 0.99           | 4.64 | 0.983                 | 9.759 |

Passer

| 100     | 0.968 | 0.125 | 0.918 | 1.526 | 0.991 | 6.285 | 0.94 | 4.27 | 0.904 | 10.03  |
|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|------|-------|--------|
| 120     | 0.842 | 0.383 | 0.646 | 1.789 | 0.883 | 6.366 | 0.95 | 4.35 | 0.981 | 11.219 |
| 150     | 0.836 | 0.369 | 0.742 | 1.950 | 0.944 | 7.927 | 0.97 | 4.60 | 0.98  | 13.505 |
| Average | 0.831 | 0.270 | 0.720 | 1.544 | 0.922 | 5.812 | 0.95 | 4.98 | 0.964 | 9.925  |

#### 3.3 Desorption velocity coefficient

Table 6 shows that the values of the ammonium desorption velocity coefficient of the Power function equation in the low gypsum soil content ranged between 0.892 and 0.798 mg kg day<sup>-1</sup> for the treatments 150 and 5 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively.

 Table 6: Ammonium desorption rate coefficient values in the studied soils based on the Power function equation (mg kg hr-1) and soil hysterias values.

| Treatments<br>mg L <sup>-1</sup> | Low<br>gypsum<br>soil | Soil<br>hysterias<br>values | High<br>gypsum<br>Soils | Soil<br>hysterias<br>values |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 5                                | 0.798                 | 2.2                         | 0.775                   | 1.27                        |
| 10                               | 0.881                 | 8.47                        | 0.839                   | 15.83                       |
| 20                               | 0.869                 | 32.92                       | 0.909                   | 50.17                       |
| 40                               | 0.854                 | 80.78                       | 0.918                   | 117.17                      |
| 80                               | 0.890                 | 181.54                      | 0.885                   | 264.03                      |
| 100                              | 0.863                 | 266.44                      | 0.889                   | 328.69                      |
| 120                              | 0.883                 | 277.98                      | 0.894                   | 390.51                      |
| 150                              | 0.892                 | 350                         | 0.877                   | 500.51                      |
| Ave.                             | 0.867                 | 150.04                      | 0.873                   | 208.52                      |

However, the values of the desorption velocity coefficient of the Power function equation in the high gypsum soil content range between 0.877 and 0.775 mg kg day<sup>-1</sup> for the treatments 150 and 5 mg L<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. Also, the soil hysterias values of high gypsum soils were higher than low gypsum soils as the phenomenon of soil hysteria is the discrepancy between the adsorbed and the desorbed amount of ammonium.

Since the Power function equation is exponential; so, the process of desorption begins quickly on the adsorption surfaces then most of the ammonium desorbed in high concentrations is associated with the specific and nonspecific adsorption surfaces. Regarding the desorption of ammonium at low concentrations, it may occur on nonspecific adsorption surfaces<sup>[24,25]</sup>. The ammonium adsorption process in the soil of the study area was influenced by the presence of calcium carbonate, which means that the adsorbed ammonium was subjected to precipitation processes on the solid phase that affected its desorbed quantities.

# Conclusion

This study aims to investigate the kinetics of ammonium desorption by examining the best kinetic equation that describes the ammonium's desorption. Also, best fitting of different kinetic models was used to evaluate the desorption process (Zero order, First order, Diffusion, Power function, and Elovich models). The Power function equation has successfully described the ammonium desorption kinetics in different types of Gypsiferous soil, including low content 65 g kg<sup>-1</sup> and high content 235 g kg<sup>-1</sup>. This study concluded that the ammonium desorption process is not affected by the content of gypsum, while it has been affected by the presence of calcium carbonate, which means that the

adsorbed ammonium was subjected to precipitation processes on the solid phase, which affect its released quantities.

## **Conflict of interests**

None

## **Author Contribution**

Muhammed Obaid Muhammed: Conceive the idea, data collection and write-up of the paper. Basim Shakir Al-Obaidi: Revise the manuscript, discuss the results and data analysis as well as supervised the work.

### Funding

No funding was received for this work.

### References

- Casby-Horton S, Herrero J and Rolong N A 2015 Gypsum Soils-their morphology, classification, function, and landscapes vol 130, ed D L Sparks
- Marques M J, Álvarez A M, Carral P, Esparza I, Sastre B and Bienes R 2020 Estimating soil organic carbon in agricultural gypsiferous soils by diffuse reflectance spectroscopy *Water* (*Switzerland*) 12 https://doi.org/10.3390/w12010261
- Sarhat, A.R. and Al-Obaidi B S 2023 Contamination of Some Heavy Metals in Soil at Diyala/Sirwan River Banks *Euphrates J. Agric. Sci.* 2 64–73
- Ladoni M, Bahrami H A, Alavipanah S K and Norouzi A A 2010 Estimating soil organic carbon from soil reflectance: A review *Precis. Agric.* 11 82–99
- Etesami H, Halajian L and Jamei M 2012 A qualitative land suitability assessment in gypsiferous soils of kerman province, Iran Aust. J. Basic Appl. Sci. 6 60–4
- Al-Obaidi B S, Sarhat A R and Mohammed A H 2023 Representative and Map Analysis for Irrigation Water Quality Status and Heavy Metal Indices in Qurato River by using GIS *Passer J. Basic Appl. Sci.* 5 161–70
- 7. Chen J-F 1997 Adsorption and diffusion of ammonium in soils *Nitrogen in Soils of China* (Springer) pp 87–111
- Sarhat A R 2015 Assessment of some indicators of soil fertility in a number of agricultural lands under wheat production system in Kalar *Journal of Garmian University* (University of Garmian) pp 183–93
- Sarhat A 2017 Assessment of groundwater quality and its suitability for agricultural uses in Kifri J. Garmian Univ. 4 290–300
- 10. Hachiya T and Sakakibara H 2017 Interactions between nitrate and ammonium in their uptake, allocation, assimilation, and signaling in plants J. *Exp. Bot.* 68 2501–12
- Patterson K, Cakmak T, Cooper A, Lager I, Rasmusson A G and Escobar M A 2010 Distinct signalling pathways and transcriptome response signatures differentiate ammonium- and nitrate-supplied plants *Plant, Cell Environ.* 33 1486–501
- Jadczyszyn T, Pietruch C L W 2010 Soil monitoring in Poland for the content of mineral nitrogen in the years 2007–2009 *Fertizers Fertil.* 38 84–110
- 13. Hachiya T, Watanabe C K, Fujimoto M, Ishikawa T, Takahara K, Kawai-Yamada M, Uchimiya H, Uesono Y, Terashima I and Noguchi K 2012 Nitrate addition alleviates ammonium toxicity without lessening ammonium accumulation, organic acid depletion and inorganic cation depletion in arabidopsis thaliana shoots *Plant Cell Physiol.* 53 577–91
- Subbarao G V. and Searchinger T D 2021 A "more ammonium solution" to mitigate nitrogen pollution and boost crop yields *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S.* A. 118

- **15.** Yupiter R, Arnon S, Yeshno E, Visoly-Fisher I and Dahan O 2023 Real-time detection of ammonium in soil pore water *npj Clean Water* **6**
- 16. Duan L, Wang W K and Sun Y 2013 Ammonium nitrogen adsorptiondesorption characteristics and its hysteresis of typical soils from ganzhong Basin, China Asian J. Chem. 25 3850–4
- 17. Aziz F. Barzanji 1973 *Gypsiferous Soils of Iraq* (State University of Ghent, Belgium)
- Page, A.L., Miller, R.H. and Kenney D R 1982 Methods of Soil Analysis-Part 2 ed agronomy Series ASA
- 19. LÜ X N, XU J M, MA W Z and LU Y F 2007 Comparison of Seven Kinetic Equations for K Release and Application of Kinetic Parameters1 1 Project supported by the National Key Basic Research Support Foundation of China (No. G1999011809) and the Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province, China *Pedosphere* 17 124–9
- **20.** Saadallah A M 1996 *The relationship between salinity and the kinetics of potassium release in Iraqi soil* (Baghdad University)
- Ranjbar F and Jalali M 2013 Measuring and modeling ammonium adsorption by calcareous soils *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 185 3191–9
- 22. Dontsova K M, Norton L D and Johnston C T 2005 Calcium and Magnesium Effects on Ammonia Adsorption by Soil Clays Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 69 1225– 32
- 23. Yu X F, Zhang Y X, Zou Y C, Zhao H M, Lu X G and Wang G P 2011 Adsorption and desorption of ammonium in wetland soils subject to freezethaw cycles *Pedosphere* 21 251–8
- 24. Arora S and Chahal D S 2010 Effect of soil properties on boron adsorption and release in arid and semi-arid benchmark soils *Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal.* 41 2532–44
- **25.** Al-Doury H A D and Al-Obaidi B S 2022 Boron adsorption kinetics in some Gypsiferous soils *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science* vol 1120 (IOP Conf. Ser.: Earth Environ. Sci.)