EFFECT OF SALINITY, MOISTURE AND FARMYARD MANURE ON YIELD AND NITROGEN UPTAKE OF WHEAT PLANTS GROWN ON A CALCAREOUS SOIL.

Mohamed, M. M.; M.O. El - Mohtasem Bella; R. A. Abou El-Khair and M. H.Sheta.

Soils and Water Dept., Fac. of Agric., Al - Azhar University.

ABSTRACT

A pot experiment was carried out in the green house of Soils and Water Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azhar University, during the winter of season (2009). The current work was carried out to study the effect of irrigation water salinity, farmyard manure levels and moisture content on the yield and nitrogen (content and uptake) of wheat grains of wheat plant grown on a calcareous soil. Wheat plant (*Triticum aestivum*, L.) Sakha93Variety, used as an indicator plant to experiment treatments.

Four salinity levels of irrigation water were prepared (0.43 (Control), 1.56, 3.12 and 6.25 dSm⁻¹) under different moisture contents (100%, 75% and 60%) of field capacity determined by weight and four organic matter levels (0% (control), 1%, 2% and 4%) farmyard manure(FYM). Twenty grains were sown in each pot and the treatments were three replicates including control. After 15 days, the pots were thinned to 10 seed lings. The obtained results showed that yield of both grains and straw, and nitrogen (content and uptake) in grains were significantly decreased with increasing salinity levels. Increasing of farmyard manure application rates up to 2% increased significantly yield of both grains and straw, and nitrogen (content and uptake) of grains. Yield of both grains and straw and nitrogen (content and uptake) of grains were significantly increased with increasing moisture levels regardless effect of salinity and farmyard manure.

Keywords: Calcareous soil – irrigation water salinity -soil moisture - farmyard manure- nitrogen uptake – wheat.

INTRODUCTION

Salinity is one of the major environmental factors reducing plant growth and productivity worldwide in arid and semi – arid regions (Munns, 2002). Salinity is one of the most serious factors limiting crops production, especially the sensitive ones(Zadeh and Naeini, 2007). Currently, high soil salinity affects the agriculture production in a large proportion in the world's territorial areas (Zhang and Hodson, 2001). Salt affected soils can be managed by reclamation, but due to scarcity of good quality water, low soil permeability and high cost amendments this approach is not feasible on large scale (Qureshi *et al.* 1990).

Organic manure and moisture % are the main factors to improve the saline soil. Wheat, the most important cereal crop, can be classified as a semi tolerant crop to salinity. Organic matter is considered as an important source of plant nutrients, beside it improves the chemical and physical properties of soils, particularly sandy and calcareous soils, subsequently the growth and uptake of nutrients. Organic matter improves soil properties by enhancing redistribution of soil pores (Tate, 1987), which improved water

holding capacity aeration improved soil physical properties and nutrient availability (DeLuca, T. H. and D. K. DeLuca, 1987). Also water is one of the limiting factors for agricultural development in developing countries in order to meet the growing demand of the increasing population. In most soils, optimum growth of grown plants occurs when the water retained in soils is kept near the field capacity (to be more easily taken up by plant) or at least did not approach the wilting point (plant suffer from drought), in other words, increasing A.W is a preferable. (Chauhan and Singh, 1993), in field experiment studied that on sandy loam of wheat was irrigated with water having salinity levels of 2-16 dSm⁻¹. The current work was carried out to study the effect of irrigation water salinity, farmyard manure levels and moisture content on the yield and nitrogen (content and uptake) of wheat grains grown on a calcareous soil.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Calcareous soil samples were selected from EL-Nobaria region (CaCO₃ 30%) Cairo Alexandria, Desert Road, and taken from upper surface layer (0 - 30 cm). Soil samples were air dried. And analyzed to determine some physical and chemical characteristics were estimated and given in Table 1. Some samples were air dried, softly crushed and passed through a 2 mm sieve. Some physical and chemical properties of the studied soil were determined according to Klute (1982) and Page et al. (1982) respectively. Organic matter was used as farmyard manure (FYM). The farmyard manure was taken from station of Animal production, Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azhar University. Some chemical characteristics of the organic manure are given in Table 2. an experiment was carried out in green house of Soils and Water Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azhar University (Nasr city, Cairo, Egypt) during season (2009), Wheat plant (Triticum aestivum, L. Variety, Sakha93) used as an indicator to experiment treatments. Plastic pots of 25 cm in side diameter and 30cm depth. Pots were filled with 5.0 kg of calcareous soil sample. The cultivated plants were fertilized according to the general recommendations of Ministry of Agriculture. Twenty grains were sown in each pot and the treatments were three replicates including control. After 15 days, the pots were thinned to 10 seed lings. Completely randomized block design was used

Table 1: Some physical and chemical characteristics of the used soil.

Physical properties										
Particle size distribution (%)			Texture Class	0.M %	CaCO₃ %	Moisture content % at :			% at :	
Coarse	Fine	0.11	011				F.C	W.P	A.W	
Sand	Sand	Silt	Clay	Sandy Loam	1.43	30	23.21	9.27	13.94	
9.56	57.96	24.98	7.5	Louin			20.21	5.21		
Chemical Properties										
EC dSm ⁻¹	рН		Soluble Cations meq L ⁻¹				So	luble a meq l	4	
2.61	8.11	Ca ²⁺	Mg	²⁺ Na ⁺	K'	Co ₃	HC	O ₃	CL.	SO ₄
		15.21	3.7	6 6.92	1.2	3 0.00) 1.	83	2.50	22.79

Table 2: Chemical properties of farmyard manure used:

На	EC	O.M.	O.C.	C/N	Total	macronut	rient (%)
(1:10)	dSm ⁻¹ (1:10)	(%)	(%)	ratio	N	Р	К
7.62	6.89	42	24.4	17.06	1.43	0.78	1.99

Three salinity levels of irrigation water were prepared (0.43 (Control), 1.56, 3.12 and 6.25 dSm⁻¹ pure NaCL salt) under different moisture contents in a green house. Irrigation was practical to maturity when the soil water depletion reached (100%, 75% and 60%) of field capacity determined by weight and four organic matter levels (0%, 1%, 2% and 4%) farmyard manure(FYM) The plant material was oven dried at 70° C to constant weight ground and kept in paper pages for chemical analysis.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effect of salinity, moisture and farmyard manure on grain and straw yield:

The results presented in Tables 3 and 4 reveale that, grain and straw yield of wheat significantly decreased by increasing salinity levels. This was true with all rates of water salinity, where it reached for grain (13.11, 11.86, 10.26 and 9.16 g pot⁻¹) at salinity levels (Control, 1.56, 3.12 and 6.25 dSm⁻¹), respectively. The corresponding values for straw were (15.91, 14.85, 12.75 and 11.25 g pot¹) at the same levels of salinity. The excessive salt appears to affect the growth and wheat yield by restricting nutrients uptake to extent That a deficiency take place this may be due to a possibility that plants grown under saline condition utilize energy for osmotic adjustment process at the expense of growth and the most important factor which is the high soil water potential hence the water flow from soil to plants very much limited under saline water. These results were in accordance with the findings of Sarhan and Abd El-Salam (1999) they found that, the growth and grain yield of wheat was decreased with the increasing of soil salinity levels .In this respect Mostafa (2001), Hassan and Mostafa (2002) and Kant et al. (2007) reported that increasing salinity levels of irrigation water significantly decreased the dry matter yield of Barley plants.

Concerning to the results effect of farmyard manure on grain and straw yield in Tables 3 and 4 show that, application of Farmyard manure significantly increased yield of both grain and straw of wheat plant up to 2 %., where it reached for grain (9.97, 10.85, 11.96 and 11.62 g pot⁻¹) with farmyard manure levels (0, 1, 2 and 4 %), respectively. The corresponding values for straw were (11.58, 13.90, 15.01 and 14.27 g pot⁻¹) at the same levels of farmyard manure. Regardless the treatment either moisture, water salinity it seem that increasing the rate of farmyard manure content up to rate 2% lead to increase grain and straw yield of wheat plant, but the rate of 4% content relatively decease of grain and straw yield the increasing of grain and straw that caused by increasing the rate of farmyard manure up to 2% may be attributed to one or more of the following reason to reducing soil salinity and /or the increase in the availability of certain plant nutrients due to the decomposition of organic manure. The results consistent with those

obtained by Singh and Agarwal (2001), and Uyanoz *et al.* (2006) they found that, the application of farmyard manure increased the grain yield of wheat plants over the control.

Table 3:Grain yield (g pot⁻¹) of wheat plant as affected by levels of

salinity, farmyard manure and moisture.

	l l	Grain yield (g pot ⁻¹)						
Salinity		Farmyard manure (FYM) %						
(S) dSm ⁻¹	Moisture (M) %	0	1	2	4	Mean		
	100	12.77	13.85	14.45	14.00	13.77		
	75	12.03	12.99	13.62	13.44	13.02		
Control	60	11.54	12.54	13.11	13.01	12.55		
Mean		12.11	13.13	13.73	13.48	13.11		
100		10.99	11.73	13.54	13.01	12.32		
	75	10.45	11.23	12.95	12.77	11.85		
1.56	60	10.02	10.85	12.61	12.11	11.40		
IV	lean	10.49	11.27	13.03	12.63	11.86		
	100	9.42	10.54	11.63	11.33	10.73		
	75	8.89	9.95	11.20	10.75	10.20		
3.12	60	8.43	9.65	10.85	10.44	9.84		
Mean		8.91	10.05	11.23	10.84	10.26		
	100	8.77	9.23	10.12	9.99	9.53		
	75	8.33	8.95	9.85	9.44	9.14		
6.25 60		7.94	8.66	9.54	9.14	8.82		
IV	lean	8.35	8.95	9.84	9.52	9.16		
	100	10.49	11.34	12.44	12.08	11.59		
M × FYM	75	9.93	10.78	11.91	11.60	11.05		
Means	60	9.48	10.43	11.53	11.18	10.65		
FYM Means 9.97			10.85	11.96	11.62	11.10		
LSD at 5%	level							
Salinity (S)			0.042					
Moisture (M)			0.036					
Farmyard manure (FYM)			0.042					
S×M		0.073						
S × FYM		0.085						
M × FYM		0.073						
$S \times M \times FY$	M		0.146					

In this respect, Sheng Mao *et al.*(2006) showed that (FYM) supplies some amount of nutrient such as N and K which tend to balance crop requirement and result in improving grain production. The decreased of grain and straw that caused by increasing the rate of farmyard manure up to 4% may be attributed to one or more of the following reason: (1) the high concentration of acids released during the decomposition of farmyard manure which damage the fine roots.

Table 4:Straw yield (g pot⁻¹) of wheat plant as affected by levels of salinity, farmyard manure and moisture.

	salinity, farm	yaru manu					
			Strav	w yield (g po	ot ⁻¹)		
Salinity (S) dSm ⁻¹	Moisture (M)	Farmyard manure (FYM) %					
dSm ⁻¹	%	0	1	2	4	Mean	
	100	14.01	16.53	17.66	16.93	16.28	
	75	13.85	16.02	17.06	16.53	15.87	
Control	60	13.43	15.85	16.81	16.21	15.58	
N	lean	13.76	16.13	17.18	16.56	15.91	
	100	12.89	15.63	16.77	15.98	15.32	
	75	12.34	15.12	16.16	15.55	14.79	
1.56	60	11.91	14.79	15.87	15.13	14.43	
IV	lean	12.38	15.18	16.27	15.55	14.85	
	100	10.98	13.36	14.63	13.89	13.22	
	75	10.56	12.77	14.12	13.42	12.72	
3.12	60	10.31	12.31	13.67	12.99	12.32	
IV	lean	10.62	12.81	14.14	13.43	12.75	
	100	9.97	11.77	12.89	11.98	11.65	
	75	9.52	11.50	12.47	11.55	11.26	
6.25	60	9.21	11.11	12.03	11.04	10.85	
IV	lean	9.57	11.46	12.46	11.52	11.25	
	100	11.96	14.32	15.49	14.70	14.12	
M × FYM	75	11.57	13.85	14.95	14.26	13.66	
Means	60	11.22	13.52	14.60	13.84	13.29	
FYM	Means	11.58	13.90	15.01	14.27	13.69	
LSD at 5% le	vel						
Salinity (S)			0.041				
Moisture (M)			0.035				
Farmyard manure (FYM)			0.041				
S×M			0.071				
S×FYM			0.082				
M × FYM			0.071				
S×M×FYM	•	0.142					

Consequently the absorption of water and nutrients decreased. (2) The formation and accumulation of some gases, e.g., methane CH₄, ethylene C₂H₄ and carbon dioxide Co₂ as a result of manure decomposition especially under unsuitable aeration conditions. These gases are known to reduce root elongation as reviewed by Van Cleempant and El- Sabaay (1986). C. F. El-Rahman, M. I. (1996). (Effect of soil moisture on the availability of some macro and micro elements in calcareous soils of Egypt). (3) The high content of salinity of (FYM) used in this a study (Ec 6.89 dSm⁻¹).

Data in Tables 3 and 4 clearly show that, increasing moisture rate significantly increased yield of both grain and straw of wheat plant, where it reached for grain (11.59, 11.05 and 10.65 g pot⁻¹) at moisture rates (100, 75 and 60 % of field capacity), respectively. The corresponding values for straw were (14.12, 13.66 and 13.29 g pot⁻¹) at the same levels of moisture levels. This means that the yield of both grain and straw of wheat plant at 100% of field capacity is higher than that of the other two soil moisture depletions at all organic matter (FYM) application rates under water salinity levels. This means that the yield of both grain and straw of wheat plant decreased with

increasing soil moisture depletion. This behavior is attributed to the strong root growth and high nutrients diffusion associated with the high soil moisture content. These results are in harmony with those obtained by many authors (Awad *et al.*, 1982,; El –Desouky, 1999, and Dahdoh *et al.*, 1994). It is well known, in well watered plants, that photosynthesis products are primarily used in metabolism and growth processes. On the contrary, the decrease of yield due to moisture depletion is due to the fact that, as soil moisture decreases, the growth of roots and the amounts of nutrients in the root zone decrease.

- Nitrogen contents and uptake of wheat grains:

Nitrogen Content and uptake of wheat plant grain as affected by levels of water salinity, farmyard manure and moisture %, were presents in Tables 5 and 6. It was noticed that, increasing salinity levels significantly decreased nitrogen content and uptake in grain of wheat plant. This was true with all rates of water salinity, where nitrogen content in grain reached for (2.97, 2.80, 2.68 and 2.48 %) at salinity levels (Control, 1.56, 3.12 and 6.25 dSm⁻¹), respectively. The corresponding values for nitrogen uptake in grain were (399.03, 333.87, 276.23 and 228.17 mg pot⁻¹) at the same levels of salinity. The adverse effect of salinity on nitrogen content could be attributed to the to the presence of high amount of chloride in soil which depressed nitrogen uptake (Saneoka, *et al.* 1999).

As the effect of Farmyard manure (FYM), the data presented in the Tables 5 and 6 revealed that, Increasing farmyard manure levels significantly increased nitrogen content and uptake up to 2% in grain of wheat plant, where nitrogen content in grain reached (2.56, 2.61, 3.03 and 2.73 %) at application of farmyard manure (0, 1%, 2% and 4%), respectively. The corresponding values for nitrogen uptake in grain were (257.97, 294.20, 366.03 and 319.09 mg pot⁻¹) with the same levels of farmyard manure. It is worthy to mention here that a reverse relation was detected between nitrogen and chloride concentration in grain, which was true for all treatments. This could be attributed to the antagonistic effect of chloride on nitrogen uptake, were Jones *et al.* (1991), Hu and Schmidhalter (1998) and Saneoka *et al.* (1999) stated that increasing salt concentration (chloride) in the substrate reduced total nitrogen content in the plant.

Also, data in Tables 5 and 6 showed that, the Increasing moisture levels significantly increased nitrogen content and uptake in grain of wheat plant, where nitrogen content in grain reached for (2.79, 2.73 and 2.67 %) at moisture levels (100, 75, 60 % of field capacity), respectively. The corresponding values for nitrogen uptake in grain were (327.18, 305.93 and 294.85 mg pot⁻¹) at the same levels of moisture.

Table 5: Nitrogen content (%) of wheat grain as affected by levels of

Salinity (S) (M) (M) (S) (M) (M) (M) (M) (M) (M) (M) (M) (M) (M									
(S) (M) dsm ⁻¹ % 0 1 2 4 Mean 100 2.83 2.92 3.33 2.98 3.02 75 2.80 2.87 3.30 2.90 2.97 Control 60 2.78 2.81 3.29 2.85 2.93 Mean 2.80 2.87 3.31 2.91 2.97 100 2.68 2.69 3.20 2.80 2.84 75 2.65 2.66 3.15 2.75 2.80 1.56 60 2.60 2.61 3.11 2.71 2.76 Mean 2.64 2.65 3.15 2.75 2.80 100 2.54 2.64 2.99 2.78 2.74 75 2.50 2.55 2.92 2.70 2.67 3.12 60 2.49 2.51 2.88 2.65 2.63 Mean 2.51 2.57 2.93 2.71 2.68 100 2.35 2.38 2.79 2.75 2.57 75 2.31 2.35 2.74 2.60 2.50 Mean 2.29 2.34 2.74 2.53 2.48 Mean 2.29 2.34 2.74 2.53 2.48 Mean 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) Moisture (M) Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036		1		N Content (%) in grain					
Tool				Farmyard manure (FYM) %					
Tool	(S) ₁								
Control 60 2.78 2.81 3.29 2.85 2.93 Mean 2.80 2.87 3.31 2.91 2.97 100 2.68 2.69 3.20 2.80 2.84 75 2.65 2.66 3.15 2.75 2.80 1.56 60 2.60 2.61 3.11 2.71 2.76 Mean 2.64 2.65 3.15 2.75 2.80 100 2.54 2.64 2.99 2.78 2.74 75 2.50 2.55 2.92 2.70 2.67 3.12 60 2.49 2.51 2.88 2.65 2.63 Mean 2.51 2.57 2.93 2.71 2.68 100 2.35 2.38 2.79 2.75 2.57 75 2.31 2.35 2.74 2.60 2.50 6.25 60 2.20 2.30 2.70 2.25 2.36 <t< th=""><th>dsm⁻'</th><th></th><th>_</th><th>-</th><th></th><th>-</th><th>Mean</th></t<>	dsm ⁻ '		_	-		-	Mean		
Mean 2.80 2.87 3.31 2.91 2.97 100 2.68 2.69 3.20 2.80 2.84 75 2.65 2.66 3.15 2.75 2.80 1.56 60 2.60 2.61 3.11 2.71 2.76 Mean 2.64 2.65 3.15 2.75 2.80 100 2.54 2.64 2.99 2.78 2.74 75 2.50 2.55 2.92 2.70 2.67 3.12 60 2.49 2.51 2.88 2.65 2.63 Mean 2.51 2.57 2.93 2.71 2.68 100 2.35 2.38 2.79 2.75 2.57 75 2.31 2.35 2.74 2.60 2.50 6.25 60 2.20 2.30 2.70 2.25 2.36 M×FYM 75 2.57 2.61 3.03 2.74 2.73			2.83				3.02		
Nean 2.80 2.87 3.31 2.91 2.97		75	2.80	2.87	3.30	2.90	2.97		
100							2.93		
T5	M	lean		2.87			2.97		
1.56		100	2.68	2.69	3.20	2.80	2.84		
Mean 2.64 2.65 3.15 2.75 2.80 100 2.54 2.64 2.99 2.78 2.74 75 2.50 2.55 2.92 2.70 2.67 3.12 60 2.49 2.51 2.88 2.65 2.63 Mean 2.51 2.57 2.93 2.71 2.68 100 2.35 2.38 2.79 2.75 2.57 75 2.31 2.35 2.74 2.60 2.50 6.25 60 2.20 2.30 2.70 2.25 2.36 Mean 2.29 2.34 2.74 2.53 2.48 M × FYM 75 2.57 2.61 3.03 2.74 2.73 Means 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Mois		75	2.65	2.66	3.15	2.75	2.80		
100	1.56	60	2.60	2.61	3.11		2.76		
75	M	lean	2.64	2.65	3.15	2.75	2.80		
3.12 60 2.49 2.51 2.88 2.65 2.63 Mean 2.51 2.57 2.93 2.71 2.68 100 2.35 2.38 2.79 2.75 2.57 75 2.31 2.35 2.74 2.60 2.50 6.25 60 2.20 2.30 2.70 2.25 2.36 Mean 2.29 2.34 2.74 2.53 2.48 100 2.60 2.66 3.08 2.83 2.79 M × FYM 75 2.57 2.61 3.03 2.74 2.73 Means 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036		100	2.54	2.64	2.99	2.78	2.74		
Mean 2.51 2.57 2.93 2.71 2.68 100 2.35 2.38 2.79 2.75 2.57 75 2.31 2.35 2.74 2.60 2.50 6.25 60 2.20 2.30 2.70 2.25 2.36 Mean 2.29 2.34 2.74 2.53 2.48 100 2.60 2.66 3.08 2.83 2.79 Means 60 2.57 2.61 3.03 2.74 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM)		75	2.50	2.55	2.92	2.70	2.67		
100 2.35 2.38 2.79 2.75 2.57 75	3.12	60	2.49	2.51	2.88	2.65	2.63		
75 2.31 2.35 2.74 2.60 2.50 Mean 2.29 2.34 2.74 2.53 2.48 M × FYM Means 75 2.57 2.61 3.03 2.74 2.73 Means 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036	Mean		2.51	2.57	2.93	2.71	2.68		
6.25 60 2.20 2.30 2.70 2.25 2.36 Mean 2.29 2.34 2.74 2.53 2.48 M x FYM 75 2.60 2.66 3.08 2.83 2.79 Means 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036		100	2.35	2.38	2.79	2.75	2.57		
Mean 2.29 2.34 2.74 2.53 2.48 M × FYM Means 75 2.57 2.61 3.03 2.74 2.73 Means 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036		75	2.31	2.35	2.74	2.60	2.50		
M x FYM 75 2.57 2.61 3.08 2.83 2.79 2.79 2.57 2.61 3.03 2.74 2.73 2.67 2.57 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 2.50 3.03 2.73	6.25	60	2.20	2.30	2.70	2.25	2.36		
M x FYM Means 75 2.57 2.61 3.03 2.74 2.73 Means 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036	M	lean	2.29	2.34	2.74	2.53	2.48		
Means 60 2.52 2.56 3.00 2.62 2.67 FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036		100	2.60	2.66	3.08	2.83	2.79		
FYM Means 2.56 2.61 3.03 2.73 2.73 LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036	M × FYM	75	2.57	2.61	3.03	2.74	2.73		
LSD at 5% level Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036	Means	60	2.52	2.56	3.00	2.62	2.67		
Salinity (S) 0.036 Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036	FYM Means 2.56			2.61	3.03	2.73	2.73		
Moisture (M) 0.031 Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036	LSD at 5%	level							
Farmyard manure (FYM) 0.036				0.036					
, ,	` '			0.031					
S v M 0.062	Farmyard manure (FYM)			0.036					
0.002	S×M			0.062					
S × FYM 0.072	S × FYM		0.072						
M × FYM 0.062	M × FYM		0.062						
S × M × FYM 0.125	S×M×F	YM	0.125						

Table 6: Nitrogen uptake (mg pot⁻¹) of wheat grains as affected by levels of salinity, farmyard manure and moisture.

		1	V uptake (in grain			
Salinity	Moisture (M)	Farmyard manure (FYM)%					
(S) dsm ⁻¹	%	0	1	2	4	Mean	
	100	361.39	404.42	481.18	417.20	416.05	
Control	75	336.84	372.81	449.46	389.76	387.22	
	60	320.81	452.37	431.31	370.78	393.82	
N	/lean	339.68	409.87	453.98	392.58	399.03	
	100	294.53	315.53	433.28	364.28	351.91	
1.56	75	276.92	298.71	407.92	351.17	333.68	
	60	260.52	283.18	392.17	328.18	316.01	
N	/lean	277.32	299.14	411.12	347.88	333.87	
	100	239.26	278.25	347.73	314.97	295.05	
3.12	75	222.25	253.72	327.04	290.25	273.32	
	60		242.21	312.48	276.66	260.31	
Mean 223.80		223.80	258.06	329.08	293.96	276.23	
	100	206.09	219.67	282.34	274.72	245.71	
6.25	75	192.42	210.32	269.89	245.44	229.52	
	60	174.68	199.18	257.58	205.65	209.27	
N	/lean	191.06	209.72	269.94	241.94	228.17	
M × FYM	100	275.32	304.47	386.13	342.79	327.18	
Means	75	257.11	283.89	363.58	319.16	305.93	
IVICALIS	60	241.48	294.24	348.39	295.32	294.85	
FYM Means 257.97			294.20	366.03	319.09	309.32	
LSD at 5% level							
Salinity (S)			3.88				
Moisture (M)			3.36				
Farmyard manure (FYM)			3.88				
S × M			6.72				
S × FYM			7.76				
M × FYM		6.72					
$S \times M \times F$	YM	13.45					

REFERENCES

- Awad, F.; Aziz, M.A. and Oker, M.S. (1982). Interaction of phosphorus fertilization and soil moisture depletion on Kindney bean (*phaseolus vulgaris, L.*) I. yield of seeds and their N, P, K and protein contents. Egypt J.Soil Sci., 22(2): 135 -142.
- El-Rahman, M. I. (1996). Effect of soil moisture on the availability of some macro and micro elements in calcareous soils of Egypt. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Ain Shams University, Egypt.
- Chauhan, C.P.S and Singh, S.P. (1993). wheat cultivation under saline irrigation. Wheat Information Service, 1993, 77: 33-38.
- Dahdoh, M.S.A.; El-Desouky, M. and El-Mashhady, H.H. (1994). Effect of phosphorus iron interaction under variable moisture levels on barley grown on calcareous soils. Egypt J. App. Sci., 9(6): 328-344.
- DeLuca, T.H. and D.K. DeLuca,(1987). Composting for feedlot management and soil quality. J. Prod Agric., 10: 236 241.
- El-Dosoky, A.K.R. (1999). Effect of saline water on some soil physical and chemicalsoil properties. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Moshtohor. Zagazig University, Egypt.
- Hassan, M.A.M. And Mostafa, M.M. (2002). Uptake of nutrients and heavy metals by barley plant grown on sandy and calcareous soils as affected by irrigation water salinity and sewage addition. Zagazig J. Agric. Res., 29(6):1929-1950.
- Hu, Y. and Schmidhalter, U. (1998). Spatial distribution and net deposition rates of mineral elements in the elongation wheat (*triticum aestivum* L.) leaf under saline conditions. Plant, 204:212-219.
- Jones, J.B.; Wolf, B. and Mills, H.A. (1991). Plant Analysis Handbook. Micro-Macro publishing, Inc., Georgia USA., 192pp.
- Kant, S.; Kant, P.; Lips, H. and Barak, S. (2007). Partial substitution of NO3 by NH4 fertilization increases ammonium assimilating enzyme activities and reduces the deleterious effect of salinity on the growth of barley. J. Plant physoi., 164:303-311.
- Klute, A. (1982). "Method of Analysis". Part- 1: Physical and Mineralogical Methods (2nd ed.). American Society of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA>
- Page, A.I.; Miller, R.H. and Keeny, D.R.(1982). "Method of soil Analysis" Part- 2: Chemical and Microbiological Properties. (2nd ed.). American Society of Agronomy, Madisons, Wisconsin, USA.
- Manns, R. (2002). Comparative physiology of salt and water stress. Plant Cell Environ., 25: 239-250.
- Mostafa, M.M. (2001). Nutrient uptake and dry matter yield of barley as affected by salinity of irrigation water and addition of organic materials. Zagazig J. Agric. Res., 28(3):533-552.
- Qureshi, R. H.; Rashid, A. and Ahmed, N. (1990). A Procedure for Quick Screening of Wheat Cultivars for Salt Tolerance. In: Elbasam, N., M. Damborth and B. C. Laughman (Eds.)., pp 315-324.
- Saneoka, H.; Shiota, K.; Kurban, H.; Chaudhary, M. I.; Premachandra, G.S. and Fujita, K. (1999). Effect of salinity on growth and solute

- accumulation in two wheat limes differing in salt tolerance. Soil Sci. plant Nutr., 45(4): 873-880.
- Sarhan, S.H. and Abd El-Salam, H.Z.(1999). Effect of soil salinity, nitrogen fertilization and their interaction on wheat plant. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 24(4):2071-2075.
- Sheng Mao, Y.; Feng Min, L.; Tianwen, G.; Jianguo, W.; Bing Ling, S. and Shaoling, J. (2006). Effect of long term fertilization on soil productivity and nitrate accumulation in Gansu Oasis. Agric. Sci, China, 5(1): 57-
- Singh, R. and Agarwal, S. K. (2001). Growth and yield of wheat as influenced by levels of farmyard manure and nitrogen. Ind. J. Agron., 46(3): 462-467.
- Tate, R. L. (1987). Soil Organic Matter: Biological and Ecological Effects. John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Uyanoz, R.; Cetin, U. and Karaarslan, E.(2006). Effect of organic materials on yield and nutrient accumulation of wheat. J. Plant Nutr., 29: 959-
- Zadeh, H.M. and Naeini, M.B. (2007). Effect of salinity stress on the morphology and yield of two cultivars of canola (Brassica napus, L.). J. Agron., 6: 409-414.
- Zahang, H. and Hodson, J. (2001). Engineering salt tolerant brassica plants. Characterization of yield and seed oil quality in transgenic plants with increased vacuolar sodium accumulation. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci, 48: 12832-12836.
- لنباتك تأثير الملوحة والرطوبة وسماد المزرعة على المحصول وامتصاص النتروجين
- القمّح النامية على تربة جيرية. محمود اسامه المعتصم بالله، رمضان عبد المقصود أبو الخير و

قسم الأراضى والمياه - كلية الزراعه- جامعة الأزهر.

أجريت هذه الدراسة في صوبة بلاستيكية بقسم الاراضى والمياه - كلية الزراعة جامعة الأزهر (مدينة نصر - القاهرة - مصر) خلال موسم 2009 وذلك لدراسة تأثير الملوحة والمستويات المختلفة للرطوبة الأرضية والإضافات المختلفة من المادة العضوية على المحصول وتركيز النتروجين والكمية الممتصة منه فى الحبوب على نبات القمح في التربة الجيرية وذلك من خلال تأثيرها على انتاجية محصول القمح بها وكذلك محتوى هذا المحصول من العناصر محل الدراسة . وقد تم إجراء هذا البحث على نبات القمح (سخا 93) وذلك بإستخدام مياه رى ذات تركيزات مختلفة من الملوحة (كنترول ، 56, 1 ، 12, 3 ، 55, 6 ديسيميّنز/ م) وكانت المستويات المختلفة للرطوبة (100 % ، 75 % ، 60 %) من السعة الحقاية وكذلك الإضافات المختلفة من الْمادة العضوية (كنترول ، 1 % ،2 % ، 4 %) قبل الزراعة من سُماد المزرعة . وقد تُم زراعةً 20 حبة من نبات القمح في كل أُصيصُ لَكُل معاملة في ثلاثة مكراراتُ وبعد 15 يوم من الزراعة تم خف هذا العدد الي10 نباتات في الأصيص.

وقد أشارت النتائج المتحصل عليها إلى إنخفاض محصول الحبوب والقش وأيضاً التركيز والكمية الممتصة من النتروجين في الحبوب معنوياً بزيادة مستويات الملوحة ، وأيضاً أدت إضافة السماد العضوى إلى زيادة في محصول الحبوب والقش وأيضاً التركيز والكمية الممتصة من النتروجين في الحِبوب معنوياً عند إضافة 2% من السماد العضوى ، كما أدت زيادة الرطِوبة الى زيادة في محصول الحبوب والقش وأيضاً التركيز والكمية الممتصة من النتروجين في الحبوب بغض النظر عن تأثير الملوحة والمادة العضوية.

قام بتحكيم البحث

كلية الزراعة - جامعة المنصورة كلية الزراعة - جامعة الأزهر

أ.د / خالد حسن الحامدي أ.د / توفيق محمد مسلم