Effect of pulsed electromagnetic field on yield of grain, yield of protein and oil of soybean

Marija Bajagić¹*, Vojin Đukić², Zlatica Miladinov Mamlić², Jovana Sekulić³, Vojin Cvijanović⁴, Nenad Đurić⁵, Gorica Cvijanović¹

¹University of Bijeljina, Faculty of Agriculture – Bijeljina, Republic Srpska, Bosnia and Herzegovina ²Institute of Field and Vegetable Crops Novi Sad, Novi Sad, Serbia ³University of Kragujevac, Institute of Information Technologies Kragujevac, Kragujevac, Serbia ⁴Institute for Science Application in Agriculture, Belgrade, Serbia ⁵Institute for Vegetable Crops Smederevska Palanka, Smederevska Palanka, Serbia *Corresponding author: bajagicmarija@yahoo.com

Citation: Bajagić M., Đukić V., Miladinov Mamlić Z., Sekulić J., Cvijanović V., Đurić N., Cvijanović G. (2023): Effect of pulsed electromagnetic field on yield of grain, yield of protein and oil of soybean. Plant Soil Environ., 69.

Abstract: One of the latest environmentally friendly methods in soybean production technology is the pulsed electromagnetic field of low frequencies (PEMP). The paper presents the results of the influence of electromagnetic stimulation of soybean seeds on grain yield, protein and oil yield, depending on different agroclimatic conditions, exposure time and frequency. In the 2012–2017 research period, the soybean cv. Valjevka was used in the Institute of Field and Vegetable Agriculture experimental field, Novi Sad, Serbia. Immediately before sowing, the seeds were subjected to PEMP treatment, with a pulse generator and a tape applicator, in the following variants: electromagnetic field frequencies of 16, 24 and 30 Hz, and exposure time of 0, 30 and 60 min. The most successful variant of seed stimulation for all three examined parameters was at 16 Hz and 30 min, where the research results show that this measure can increase the examined parameters by more than 10%. The average yield of grain for all years of research with seed stimulation was 4.85% (3 338 kg/ha) compared to the control (3 203 kg/ha). The average grain protein yield in the treatments with PEMP was 1 315 kg/ha, which was 4.26% higher compared to the control 676 kg/ha. Also, the analysis of the mutual dependence of the indicators is in a positive correlation, which is essential for plant breeding and the development of new technologies, which have economic justification, are safe for use and have a positive impact on adverse effects such as drought.

Keywords: *Glycine max* (L.) Merr.; nutrition; agroecolocical condition

Soybean (*Glycine max* (L.) Merr.) became an "absolute hit" on the world market, thanks to its economic importance. Oil and various products with a high percentage of protein are obtained by processing soybeans, which are used in the nutrition of domestic animals and human nutrition as raw materials in various industries. Namely, its importance is reflected in the composition of the grain, i.e. 45% protein, 20–22% oil, 20–26% carbohydrates, 5% minerals (phosphorus, potassium, calcium, sulphur, magnesium, etc.) and many vitamins (mainly A and B) (Yalçin 2018). Zhang et al. (2013) state that soy proteins contain high-quality amino acids, which, in terms of quality and importance, can be a substitute for meat proteins in the diet, especially for vegetarians. Soybean oils are multi-beneficial for diets lacking in omega-3 and omega-6 fatty acids. Soybean oil is characterised by a good ratio of fatty acids, namely: unsaturated linoleic, oleic and linolenic acids, and as representatives of saturated fatty acids: palmitic and stearic acids (Wang et al. 2019). Soybean as a plant crop was among the first to be

[©] The authors. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International (CC BY-NC 4.0).

used in genetic engineering (Maffei 2014), in plant breeding (Lewandowska et al. 2019), as well as the impact of various technologies considering its positive impact on the physical, chemical and biological properties of the soil (Đukić et al. 2017).

Planet Earth has a magnetic field that represents a natural component for all living organisms that influence biological processes (Joshi-Paneri et al. 2023). The intensity of the Earth's natural magnetic field is in the range of 30 to 70 mT (Maffei 2014). This phenomenon has interested many researchers in biology, medicine and agriculture, where many experiments related to the effects of electric and magnetic fields have been performed (Joshi-Paneri et al. 2023). Pietruszewski et al. (2007) explain that there are three main lines of experiments related to investigating the effects of electromagnetic fields (EMP) on plants: investigating the effects of extremely strong frequencies (Sarraf et al. 2021), examining the field in the absence of the Earth's magnetic field (Negishi et al. 1999), and the third and most represented research is related to the influence of EMP of low frequencies (Lewandowska et al. 2019, Sarraf et al. 2021). Many studies like Radhakrishnan (2019) and Abdel Latef et al. (2020) prove the effectiveness and changes caused by the action of EMP, such as increases in the electro potential of membranes, stimulation of protein and enzyme activity, a faster process of photosynthesis and a higher content of pigments, increased cell divisions, which affect the better accumulation of water and nutrients. The largest number of studies refer to treatments of seeds and plants in the initial stages of development, where the effects of seed germination morphological and productive properties of plants are examined (Himoud et al. 2022, Tirono and Hananto 2023). According to Bajagić et al. (2021), obtained results do not depend only on plant species (moisture content, growth rate, storage period) but also on climatic conditions (temperature, air and soil humidity) and on exposure time, intensity and nature of the field. Considering that these are physical actions on biological systems, these methods can be included in the domain of biophysical actions, better known as e-treatments or biostimulators for plants, whose mechanisms of action on plants are still unclear.

Climatic changes, which are increasingly unpredictable due to high temperatures and the occurrence of drought, adversely affect the achievement of high yields and stable production. In this direction, various researches on the use of EMP have shown positive changes in plants during unfavourable external conditions, such as drought (Bajagić et al. 2021), protection of plants from weeds (Stanković et al. 2016), diseases and pests (Abdollahi et al. 2012).

New world trends aimed at protecting the environment and producing health-safe food open up the possibility of finding new production technologies, which should be efficient and economical at the same time. Himoud et al. (2022), Tirono and Hananto (2023), and many other authors report on the beneficial effects of the pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMP) and that its use is introduced as one of the environmentally acceptable techniques that meet the requirements of organic agriculture. Many authors, such as Nair et al. (2018), and Radhakrishnan (2019), state that research is carried out both at the cell level and on whole organisms, where the mechanism of action of PEMP affects various biochemical processes of cells in plants, such as membrane electropotential, protein and enzyme activities, positive changes in the photosynthesis process and content pigments. Radhakrishnan (2019) states that the treatments affect increased cell division, and Nyakane et al. (2019) that it can affect the movement of charged particles through the cell membrane, which implies a faster absorption of water and nutrients, and plants grow faster and become more resistant to climatic conditions.

For EMP research to be more precise and successful, according to Maffei (2014), it would be desirable to collect data on the present static magnetic fields of the Earth, which are missing in the literature, as well as experimental research carried out in an open field under different climatic influences (Đukić et al. 2017, Bajagić et al. 2021).

Therefore, this research aims to examine the effect of stimulation of soybean seeds before sowing with different variants of pulsed electromagnetic fields of low frequency on grain yield, protein yield and oil yield in different agroecological conditions.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

Weather conditions. Data on temperature and precipitation, shown in Table 1, were collected at the meteorological station Rimski Šančevi, near Novi Sad. The sum of precipitation in the growing season for the multi-year average (1964–2017) was 375.3 mm. Compared to the multi-year average, the sum of precipitation was higher in 2013 (448.2 mm), 2014 (595.6 mm), 2015 (389.0 mm) and in 2016 (450.5 mm).

Table 1. The sum of precipitation (mm) and average mean temperature (°C) for the research period 2012–2017 and the multi-year period 1964–2017

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	1964-2017
The sum of precipitation							
April	82.8	35.8	51.2	15.0	74.5	57.0	47.6
May	52.2	118.1	202.1	192.0	85.0	82.9	67.7
June	27.5	125.7	38.2	28.0	143.18	65.7	87.2
July	47.7	34.1	141.1	2.0	68.4	12.0	66.4
August	3.5	26.7	78.7	99.0	45.8	17.4	58.2
September	13.1	107.8	84.3	53.0	33.7	81.5	48.2
Sum	226.8	448.2	595.6	389.0	450.5	316.5	375.3
Average mean temperature							
April	13.0	13.4	13.2	11.8	14.2	11.4	11.7
May	17.5	17.4	16.3	17.8	16.9	17.6	17.0
June	23.0	20.2	20.5	20.5	21.7	23.2	20.1
July	25.2	22.3	21.9	24.5	22.8	24.3	21.8
August	24.6	22.9	20.9	24.4	21.1	24.8	21.3
September	19.8	15.7	17.2	19.9	18.5	16.9	16.9
Average	20.5	18.6	18.3	19.8	19.2	19.7	18.1

In 2012 (226.8 mm) and 2017 (316.5 mm), the amount of precipitation was less. Also, it is important to point out that in addition to the amount of precipitation, the distribution of precipitation is extremely important, given that soybeans are demanding in terms of the amount of water in the phases of filling the grains (July–August). Therefore, the lack of precipitation is clearly visible in 2012 (August – 3.5 mm), 2015 (July – 2 mm), as well as in 2017 (July – 12.0 mm and August 17.4 mm). The average air temperature of the multi-year period was 18.0 °C, which is lower compared to all the examined years (2012 – 20.5 °C, 2013 – 18.6 °C; 2014 – 18.3 °C; 2015 – 19.8 °C, 2016 – 19.2 °C, 2017 – 19.7 °C).

Design of experimental research. The multi-year research was carried out on the experimental field in Rimski Šančevi (45°20'N, 19°51'E), near Novi Sad, region of Vojvodina – Serbia. The research period includes the vegetative season of 6 years (2012–2017). Each year, the area of the experimental plot was 10 m² (row spacing 50 cm × 5 cm). The experiment was set up according to randomised block design with four replications on the humus soil type of carbonate chernozem, class A-AC-C (humous – accumulative soils, arable + sub-arable (A), transitional (AC) and parent rock (C). The plant material used for this research is the soybean cv. Valjevka was selected by the Institute of Field and Vegetables in Novi Sad

(0 ripening groups, length of the vegetation period up to 120 days, genetic potential for yield above 4 500 kg/ha). Standard agricultural practice was used, where all agrotechnical measures were carried out in optimal conditions. No significant attacks of diseases and insects were recorded. Seed stimulation with a pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMP) was treated in laboratory conditions using an apparatus with a specific spectral content. Five hundred grains were prepared for each subplot stimulated by a pulsating electromagnetic field. The device consists of a pulse generator and a strip applicator, through which the pulsating alternating movement of electric and magnetic fields takes place (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Apparatus of specific spectral content during seed stimulation immediately before sowing

The pulse generator consists of a power supply that transforms the input network from 235 VAC to direct current, and then through a driver, controlled by a microcontroller for generating waveforms and frequencies, feeds the inductive circuit at the output that treats the desired mass. The device has controls for setting the frequency in the range from 1 Hz to 100 Hz with a potentiometer for the possibility of setting \pm 1 Hz. The following command is to select the time duration in minutes from 1 min to 60 min. The seeds were exposed to low frequencies of PEMF (16, 24 and 30 Hz) for 0, 30 and 60 min immediately before sowing. Sowing was done immediately after the seeds were exposed to PEMF. In the stage of technological maturity, harvesting was carried out, and measurement of the weight of soybeans, grain moisture, and the yield per hectare with 14% moisture was calculated with the help of a Wintersteiger elite combine harvester, intended for trial plots with a small working area.

The yield of obtained soybean seeds is expressed in kg/ha at 14% moisture. In the laboratory of the Soybean Department, Institute of Agriculture and Vegetables, Serbia, the protein and oil content of the same seed was measured by the nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy (NMR) method, according to Granlund and Zimmerman (1975). Protein yield was calculated as the product of grain yield and seed protein content. At the same time, oil yield was calculated as the product of grain yield and seed oil content.

Statistical analysis. The research results were processed with descriptive statistics and analysis of the variance of the three-factorial experiment in the DSAASTAT program (Perugia, Italy). A three-way ANOVA was used to test for the effects of year, exposure time, and frequency strength. The correlations between the traits tested were also determined. The significance of the differences was tested with the least significant difference (*LSD*) test at the *P* < 0.01 and *P* < 0.05 significance levels. The results are presented in tabular form.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The years of research (2012–2017), i.e. meteorological conditions in the vegetative period of soybean production, are of exceptional importance, given that soybean production takes place in an open field, without an additional irrigation system. Cvijanović et al. (2020) suggest that earlier sowing and seed stimulation, which affects faster germination and plant growth, are important measures of adaptation to climate change. According to Bajagić et al. (2021), lack of precipitation, high temperatures and occurrence of dry periods in the reproductive stages reduce the number of grains per plant, negatively affecting the total yield.

The effect of PEMF on soybean seed yield depends on years (Y), exposure time (T) and frequency (F), the interaction of exposure time and frequency $(B \times C)$ and the interaction of all three factors $(Y \times T \times F)$ (Table 2). According to all examined factors, the total yield of soybeans is 3 269 kg/ha. The highest yield was determined in 2014 (4 945 kg/ha), given that in that year, there was enough rainfall, which had a regular schedule, as well as high temperatures that were suitable for normal soybean development. In the arid year 2015, the lowest yield was determined, only 2 004 kg/ha, 40.53% less than in 2014. Đukić et al. (2011) state that high temperatures lead to drying of the surface part of the soil, which negatively affects the germination of plants - the exposure time with PEMP lasting 60 min had the greatest effect on the increase in yield (3 268 kg/ha), with a statistical significance of P < 0.01 compared to the control variant. Seed stimulation had a statistically significant effect on the increase in yield, and the highest yield was achieved at a frequency of 24 Hz (3 327 kg/ha). The established results are in correlation with the studies of the treatment of soybean seeds with PEMP (frequency 16 Hz and 30 min), which positively influenced the germination of soybean seeds by 8%, which further influenced the increase in yield by 21% (Đukić et al. 2017). Similar results of increasing germination in three different soybean cultivars were recorded by Yalçin (2018). Various seed treatment studies suggest an increase in yield, depending on the intensity of the frequency and time of exposure (Maffei 2014, Sarraf et al. 2021). On average, for all years of research, the best combination for increasing yields by 11.30% is at 16 Hz and 30 min compared to the control. Similar results were obtained by Badiger and Hunje (2020) by examining the impact of pulsed electromagnetic field treatments on soybean seeds with strengths of 1, 10, 50 and 100 Hz for 5 h a day for 15 days. The highest yield of soybeans was at 50 Hz (21.70 q/ha) compared to the control (without stimulation, 20.23 q/ha), as well as the content of protein in the grain (37.85%) and seed oil (18.24%), in comparison to the control (37.17%, 17.62%). Radhakrishnan and Kumari (2012) state that seed stimulation with PEMP is important

Table 2. The impact of pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMF) on soybean yield (kg/ha) in the period from 2012 to 2017

Year (Y)	Time (min)	Frequency (Hz) (F)					Average		Average Y		
Ieal (1)	(T))	16	16		24			Y × T		werage 1	
	0		2 325		2 325		2 325		2 325			
2012	30	1	2 769		2 405		2 284		2 486		0.451	
2012	60	1	2 363		2 652		2 613		2 543		2 451	
	average	$Y \times F$	$2\ 485$		$2\ 461$		2 407					
	0		3 4 3 0		3 4 3 0		3 4 3 0		3 4 3 0			
2012	30)	3 812		3 624		3 300		3 578		0.540	
2013	60)	3 525		3 806		3 768		3 699		3 569	
	average	$Y \times C$	2 589		3 620		3 499					
	0		4 984		4 984		4 984		4 984			
2014	30)	5 302		5 003		4 327		4 877		1.0.15	
2014	60)	4718		$5\ 144$		5 061		4 974		4 945	
	average	A × C	5 001		$5\ 044$		4 791					
	0		1 961		1 961		1 961		1 961			
2015	30	1	$2\ 174$		$2\ 047$		1 701		1 974		0.004	
	60)	1 897		2 166		2 170		2 078		2 004	
	average	$A \times C$	2 011		2 058		1 944					
	0		4 286		4 286		4 286		4 286			
2017	30)	4 736		4 340		4 069		4 381		4.955	
2016	60	1	$4\ 174$		4 681		4 351		4 402		4 357	
	average	$A \times C$	4 399		4 4 3 6		4 236					
	0		2 2 2 8		2 2 2 8		2 2 2 8		2 228			
2017	30	1	2 595		2 292		2 046		2 311		0.005	
2017	60)	2 1 2 0		2 509		2 359		2 329		2 325	
	average	$Y \times F$	2 314		2 343		2 211					
	0		3 203		3 203		3 203				3 203	
. т. т.	30	1	3 565		3 285		2 955		T		3 268	
Average T × F	60)	3 133		3 493		3 387	â	average T		3 338	
	averag	ge F	3 300		3 327		3 181					
Average 2012-	-2017										3 269	
	Y**	T**		F**		YT ^{ns}		AF ^{ns}		TF	YTF*	
F-test	0.00	0.00		0.00		0.15		0.06		0.00	0.00	
LSD _{0.05}	78.73	55.51		32.07		135.98		78.54		58.87	136.04	
	00.45	74.44		42.42		182.33		103.90		77.87	179.9	

LSD – least significant difference; **P < 0.01; ns – not significant

in improving soybean yield and productivity through faster mineral accumulation and enzyme activity, faster water uptake, germination and emergence, ultimately leading to increased yield.

The total average value of protein yield (1 288.02 kg/ha) was statistically very significant (P < 0.01) for all levels of the examined factors (Table 3),

except for the year-frequency interaction, which was at the level of 5% and year-time exposure interactions where there was no statistical significance. The highest protein yield was determined in 2014 at 1 956 kg/ha, while the lowest yield was recorded in 2015 (792 kg/ha), correlated with the level of soybean yield. Large variations in protein yield per year are due to the

Table 3. Impact of pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMF) on protein yield in soybean seeds (kg/ha) in the period from 2012 to 2017

Year (Y)	Time (min)	Frequency (Hz) (F)					Average		Awana za V		
iear (i)	(T)	16		24		30		$Y \times T$	Average	Average Y	
	0		908		908		908		908			
0010	30)	$1\ 074$		937		895		969		0(0	
2012	60)	967		1 012		1 022		1 001		962	
2013 2014	average	$Y \times F$	983		960		942					
	0		1 342		1 342		1 342		1 342			
010	30)	$1\ 482$		1 423		1 300		1 402		1 200	
2013	60)	1 387		1 486		$1\ 476$		1 450		1 398	
	average	$Y \times F$	$1\ 404$		$1\ 417$		1 373					
2014	0		1 964		1 964		1 964		1 964			
014	30)	2 076		1 990		1 727		1 931		1.056	
.014	60)	1 881		2 048		1 992		1 973		1 956	
	average	$Y \times F$	1 973		2 000		1 894					
	0		773		773		773		773			
2015	30)	856		810		673		779		500	
	60)	755		856		857		823		792	
	average	$Y \times F$	794		813		768					
	0		1 699		1 699		1 699		1 699			
01.0	30)	1 883		1 733		1 631		1 749		1 50 6	
016	60)	1 673		1 867		1 738		1 759		1 736	
	average	$Y \times F$	1 752		1 766		1 689					
	0		865		865		865		865			
015	30)	1 002		894		797		897		016	
017	60)	826		961		871		886		916	
	average	$Y \times F$	908		932		908					
	0		1 259		1 259		1 259				1 260	
	30)	1 395		1 298		1 170				1 288	
Average T × I	60)	1 248		1 372 1 326 average		average 1		1 315			
	avera	ge F	1 301		1 310		1 252					
verage 2012	-2017										1 288	
	Y**	T**		F**		YT ^{ns}		AF ^{ns}		TF**	YTF*	
⁷ -test	0.00	0.00		0.00		0.20		0.06		0.00	0.0	
LSD _{0.05}	31.36	22.42		13.87		54.92		33.99		24.03	58.87	
LSD _{0.01}	40.01	30.06		18.35		73.64		44.96		31.79	77.87	

LSD – least significant difference; **P < 0.01; ns – not significant

lack of moisture in a period that is very important for grain yield formation per plant and the occurrence of drought due to high temperatures. Different variants of the exposure time affected the protein yield variability at the statistical significance P < 0.01, where the highest yield of protein was observed at a duration of 60 min (1 315 kg/ha). The highest protein yield was recorded

at 24 Hz (1 310 kg/ha). The highest protein average was achieved in 16 Hz and 60 min, by 10.87% compared to the control. Similar results were obtained by Đukić et al. (2020) in the study of seed treatment with an electromagnetic field of soybean seeds; on average for four years, the highest protein yield in the amount of 14.15% was in the treatment with 16 Hz \times 30 min.

Table 4. Impact of pulsed electromagnetic field (PEMF) on oil yield in soybean seeds (kg/ha) in the period from 2012 to 2017

Year (Y)	Time (m	nin)		Frequ	uency (H	z) (F)			Average	1	verage Y
	(T)		16		24		30		$Y \times T$	I	
	0		195		495		495		495		
0010	30		589		519		482		530		523
2013 2014 2015 2016	60		501		562		563		544		525
	average Y	X × F	529		527		514				
$\begin{array}{c ccccc} 0 & 195 \\ 30 & 589 \\ 60 & 501 \\ average Y \times F & 529 \\ \hline 0 & 731 \\ average Y \times F & 529 \\ \hline 0 & 731 \\ average Y \times F & 529 \\ \hline 0 & 731 \\ average Y \times F & 529 \\ \hline 0 & 731 \\ average Y \times F & 762 \\ \hline 0 & 1 049 \\ average Y \times F & 762 \\ \hline 0 & 1 049 \\ average Y \times F & 1 051 \\ \hline 0 & 405 \\ average Y \times F & 1 051 \\ \hline 0 & 405 \\ average Y \times F & 1 051 \\ \hline 0 & 405 \\ average Y \times F & 1 051 \\ \hline 0 & 405 \\ average Y \times F & 1 051 \\ \hline 0 & 300 & 444 \\ average Y \times F & 411 \\ \hline 0 & 876 \\ a00 & 957 \\ \hline 600 & 837 \\ average Y \times F & 890 \\ \hline 0 & 491 \\ \hline 300 & 576 \\ \hline \end{array}$		731		731		731					
012	30		809		780		697		762		761
2013	60		746		810		809		788		761
	average Y	(×F	762		774		745				
	0		1 049		1 049		1 049		1 049		
014	30		1 112		$1\ 064$		917		1 0 3 1		1.045
.014	60		991		1 092		1 065		1 049		1 045
2015	average Y	/×F	1 051		1 068		1 016				
2015	0		405		405		405		405		
	30		444		427		372		414		415
	60		384		448		448		427		415
	average Y	/×F	411		426		409				
	0		876		876		876		876		
016	30		957		865		817		880		000
2016	60		837		952		876		889		882
2016	average Y	(×F	890		897		856				
	0		491		491		491		491		
017	30		576		514		452		514		500
2017	60		467		562		527		519		508
	average Y	X × F	511		523		591				
	0		674		674		674				674
	30		748		695		623		Т		688
Average T x I	60		654		739		715	а	werage T		703
	average	e F	693		703		672				
Average 2012	-2017										689
	Y**	T**		F**		YT ^{ns}		AF ^{ns}		TF**	YTF*
² -test	0.00	0.00		0.00		0.07		0.09		0.00	0.00
LSD _{0.05}	17.16	11.17		7.18		27.35		17.59		12.44	30.40
LSD _{0.01}	21.89	14.97		9.50		36.67		23.26		16.45	40.2

LSD – least significant difference; **P < 0.01; ns – not significant

In Table 4, the average value of oil yield (689 kg/ha) was statistically very significantly different (P < 0.01) for all examined factors, except for the interaction A × B and A × C, where there was no statistical significance. The highest oil yield was determined in 2014 at 1 045 kg/ha, while the lowest yield was recorded in 2015 (415 kg/ha). Observing the influence

of exposure time, it can be concluded that, on average, for all levels, oil yield increases by 1.93% at 30 min of exposure and 4.01% at 60 min of seed exposure compared to the control. Regarding the influence of frequency, the highest oil average was at 24 Hz (703 kg/ha). The highest oil yield of the examined combinations of seed stimulation is with 16 Hz and Yield of protein

Yield of oil

	Yield of grain	Yield of protein	Yield of oil
Yield of grain	1		

1

0.992**

1

0.999**

0.995**

Tab	le 5.	Correl	lation	between	the	tested	traits	
-----	-------	--------	--------	---------	-----	--------	--------	--

30 min (748 kg/ha). In pulsed electromagnetic field treatments on soybean seeds from 0 to 100 Hz, the greatest increase in seed oil content was at 50 Hz exposure (18.04%), as well as in seed protein content (37.65%) (Badiger et al. 2016).

It is known that protein and oil content are negatively correlated (Sobko et al. 2019). A strong negative correlation between protein and oil content has hindered efforts to improve soybean seed quality (Wang et al. 2019), given that soybean is an important source of both protein and oil for human consumption. The same authors state that soybean breeding should be focused on finding cultivars with increased protein and oil content. Unlike many studies, seed treatment with PEMP positively affected the correlation relationship. Table 5 shows the correlation dependences of the investigated traits, which are highly statistically significant. There is a positive correlation between grain yield and protein content (0.999**), between grain yield and oil yield (0.995**) and protein and oil yield (0.992**). These results imply that in addition to the influence of the genetic material of the cultivar, agrotechnics and climatic conditions, seed stimulation with PEMP simultaneously increases the amount of protein and oil, which is of great importance for the further technology of soybean production.

The following conclusions are drawn based on the obtained results: soybean yield, protein, and oil yield decrease in years with unfavourable climatic conditions and a characteristic water deficit in arid and semi-arid years. Seed stimulation with PEMP positively affects the increase of the examined parameters. The best combination of seed stimulation is with 16 Hz for 30 min in different agroclimatic conditions. Also, the effect of low frequencies of pulsating electromagnetic waves positively affects the yield of protein and oil, and there is no negative correlation. The introduction of new technologies, such as seed biophysical methods such as seed stimulation with PEMP, can influence the creation of high and stable yields, additionally under unfavourable agrometeorological conditions. The general importance of applying these treatments is considered an ecological, cheap and safe technique.

REFERENCES

- Abdel Latef A.A.H., Dawood M.F.A., Hassanpour H., Rezayian M., Younes N.A. (2020): Impact of the static magnetic field on growth, pigments, osmolytes, nitric oxide, hydrogen sulfide, phenylalanine ammonia-lyase activity, antioxidant defense system, and yield in lettuce. Biology (Basel), 9: 172.
- Abdollahi F., Niknam V., Ghanati F., Masroor F., Noorbakhsh S.N. (2012): Biological effects of weak electromagnetic field on healthy and infected lime (*Citrus aurantifolia*) trees with phytoplasma. The Scientific World Journal, 2012: 716929.
- Badiger B., Hunje R., Motagi B.N. (2016): Impact of pulsed electromagnetic field treatment on seed yield and quality of soybean.
 In: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Drylands, 12th-16th December 2016, Bayero University, Kano, Nigeria, 117.
- Badiger B., Hunje R. (2020): Influence of pulsed electromagnetic seed treatment on seed yield in soybean (*Glycine max* L. Merrill). International Journal of Current Microbiology and Applied Sciences, 9: 966–972.
- Bajagić M., Đukić V., Cvijanović V., Nedeljković M., Dozet G., Stepić V., Cvijanović G. (2021): Effect of low-frequency electromagnetic field treatment of seeds on soybean productivity. Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 66: 321–334.
- Cvijanović M., Đukić V. (2020): Application of biophysical in sustanable soybean production. In: Cvijanovic D., Jonel S., Andrei J. (eds.): Sustainable Agriculture and Rural Development in Terms of the Republic of Serbia Strategic Goals Realization within the Danube Region – Preservation of Rural Values. Belgrade, Institute of Agricultural Economics and Information, 339–356.
- Đukić V., Balešević-Tubić S., Đorđević V., Tatić M., Dozet G., Jaćimović G., Petrović K. (2011): Yield and seed quality of soybean depending on the conditions of the year. Ratarstvo i Povrtarstvo/Field and Vegetable Crops Research, 48: 137–142.
- Đukić V., Miladinov Z., Dozet G., Cvijanović G., Miladinović J., Ranđelović P., Kandelinskaja O. (2020): The impact of a pulsed electromagnetic field on the seed protein content of soybean. Journal of Agricultural Sciences, Belgrade, 65: 311–320.
- Đukić V., Miladinov Z., Dozet G., Cvijanović M., Tatić M., Miladinović J., Balešević-Tubić S. (2017): Pulsed electromagnetic field – a cultivation practice used to increase soybean seed germination and yield. Žemdirbyste Agriculture, 104: 345–352.
- Himoud M.S., Lazim S.K., Al-Bahadliy A.H. (2022): Effect of tillage depths and static magnetic seed treatment on growth parameters and yield of maize (*Zea mays* L.). Indian Journal of Ecology, 49: 18–23.
- Joshi-Paneri J., Sharma S., Guruprasad K.N., Kataria S. (2023): Enhancing the yield potential of soybean after magneto-priming:

detailed study on its relation to underlying physiological processes. Seeds, 2: 60-84.

- Lewandowska S., Michalak I., Niemczyk K., Detyna J., Bujak H., Arik P. (2019): Influence of the static magnetic field and algal extract on the germination of soybean seeds. Open Chemistry, 17: 516–525.
- Maffei M.E. (2014): Magnetic field effects on plant growth, development, and evolution. Frontiers in Plant Science, 5: 445.
- Nair R.M., Leelapriya T., Dhilip K.S., Boddepalli V.N., Ledesma D.R. (2018): Beneficial effects of extremely low frequency (ELF) sinusoidal magnetic field (SMF) exposure on mineral and protein content of mungbean seeds and sprouts. Indian Journal of Agricultural Research, 52: 126–132.
- Negishi Y., Hashimoto A., Tsushima M., Dobrota C., Yamashita M., Nakamura T. (1999): Growth of pea epicotyl in low magnetic field – implication for space research. Advances in Space Research, 23: 2029–2032.
- Nyakane N.E., Markus E.D., Sedibe M.M. (2019): The effects of magnetic fields on plants growth: a comprehensive review. ETP International Journal of Food Engineering, 5: 79–87.
- Pietruszewski S., Muszyński S., Dziwulska A. (2007): Electromagnetic fields and electromagnetic radiation as non-invasive external stimulants for seeds (selected methods and responses). International Agrophysics, 21: 95–100.
- Radhakrishnan R. (2019): Magnetic field regulates plant functions, growth and enhances tolerance against environmental stresses. Physiology and Molecular Biology of Plants, 25: 1107–1119.

- Radhakrishnan R., Kumari R.B. (2012): Pulsed magnetic field: a contemporary approach offers to enhance plant growth and yield of soybean. Plant Physiology and Biochemistry, 51: 139–144.
- Sarraf M., Kataria S., Taimourya H., Santos Lucielen O., Menegatti D.R., Jain M., Ihtisham M., Liu S. (2021): Magnetic field (MF) applications in plants: an overview. Plants, 9: 1139.
- Sobko O., Hartung J., Zikeli S., Claupein W., Gruber S. (2019): Effect of sowing density on grain yield, protein and oil content and plant morphology of soybean (*Glycine max* L. Merrill). Plant, Soil and Environment, 65: 594–601.
- Stankovic M., Cvijanovic M., Dukic V. (2016): Ecological importance of electrical devices innovative in the process of anti *Ambrosia artemisiifolia* L. Economics of Agriculture, 3: 861–870.
- Tirono M., Hananto F.S. (2023): Effective treatment time using a magnetic field to increase soybean (*Glycine max*) productivity. Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA, 9: 5071–5077.
- Wang J., Zhou P., Shi X., Yang N., Yan L., Zhao Q., Yang C., Guan Y. (2019): Primary metabolite contents are correlated with seed protein and oil traits in near-isogenic lines of soybean. The Crop Journal, 7: 651–659.
- Yalçin S. (2018): The effect of magnetic field on three different varieties of soybean seed. Doğu Fen Bilimleri Dergisi, 1: 1–8.
- Zhang Y., Zhao W., Yang R., Abdalbasit Ahmed M., Hua X., Zhang W., Zhang Y. (2013): Preparation and functional properties of protein from heat-denatured soybean meal assisted by steam flash-explosion with dilute acidsoaking. Journal of Food Engineering, 119: 56–64.

Received: August 18, 2023 Accepted: November 11, 2013 Published online: December 4, 2023