### NITROGEN CONTENT AND YIELD OF WHEAT PLANT GROWN ON SANDY SOIL UNDER THE EFFECT OF ORGANIC AND BIO FERTILIZERS ADDITION

Abu-Saty, E.A.M., E.A.M. Awad, A.H. Ibrahim

and M.M.El-Sawy

Soil Sci. Dept., Fac. of Agric., Zagazig University, Egypt

Accepted 30 /1 /2010

ABSTRACT: In Egypt, there is a great gap between consumption and production of wheat. Many efforts have been made to cross this gap within adequate and balanced nutrition in newly reclaimed soils.

Organic fertilizers: farmyard manure "FYM", chicken manure "ChM" and plant residues "PR" were applied. Organic fertilizers were applied at the levels of 30 and 60 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup>. Bio-fertilizers: Azotien, Phosphatine and Effective Microorganisms (EM) were applied. Mineral fertilizers: the recommended dose of phosphorus and potassium was added hence, the phosphorus was added as ordinary super phosphate (6.5 % P) at the rate of 15 kg P fed<sup>-1</sup>, while potassium was added as potassium sulphate (41 % K) at the rate of 30 kg K fed<sup>-1</sup> in tow equal doses. Nitrogen was added as ammonium sulphate ("AS" 20.6 % N) at the rate of 60, 90 and 120 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> respectively, in three equal doses.

A field experiment was conducted at Abou-Hammad town, Sharkia governorate, Egypt using wheat (*Triticum aestivum* c.v., Sakha 94) during the winter season of 2006 – 2007. This investigation aims to study the effect of organic and bio fertilization on plant growth, N uptake, grain yield and its quality. All treatments of mineral, organic and bio fertilizers in the current study were arranged in a split – plots design with three replicates.

Plant samples were collected at three different growth stages, i.e., 60, 90 and 150 days from sowing, corresponding to shooting stage, flowering stage, and harvest stage respectively. Plant samples were dried at 70 °C till constant weight and wet digested using a mixture of HClO<sub>4</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> for determining N uptake. Plant growth, grains yield, N uptake and its quality were measured.

The obtained results can be summarized as following:

- 1. The addition of organic fertilizers significantly increased the dry matter content and grains yield; while the straw yield was decreased. The differences between the different sources of organic fertilizers were significant.
- 2. The addition of organic fertilizers significantly increased N uptake.
- 3. The addition of bio-fertilizers significantly increased the dry matter content and both of grains and straw yields. The differences between the different sources of bio fertilizers were significant.
- 4. The addition of bio fertilizers significantly increased N uptake at all stages; while the differences between the different sources of bio fertilizers were significant.
- 5. Interaction effect between organic and bio fertilization showed positive effect on dry matter content and yield of wheat.
- 6. Regarding to the interaction effect between the organic and biofertilizers on N uptake, the data showed that the interaction was significant.

Key words: Bio-fertilizers, mineral fertilizers, organic manures, nutrients uptake, interaction effect

#### INTRODUCTION

The productivity of newly reclaimed sandy soils of Egypt is far less from their capacity to produce most of cultivars due to many factors, among them, poor soil fertility, low content of organic matter, low water holding capacity, high infiltration rate and low fertilizers use efficiency which in turn create many nutritional problems.

Low sandy soils fertility and productivity need to increase the use of mineral fertilizers. However, the mineral fertilizers have many problems such as speed

losses, conversion into insoluble forms. Also manufacture of mineral fertilizer requires too high cost of energy; hence the organic fertilizers are known to have favorable effect on improving chemical and physical properties of the soil, as well as on nitrogen status, which in turn influence the potentiality of soil fertility.

Recently, great efforts are made on a large scale in the world to get informations about the biological activities in soil including the free living bacteria species which are able to fix atmospheric nitrogen as well as phosphate dissolving bacteria.etc.

The present work was conducted to investigate the possibility of using organic or biofertilizers in sandy soil as an alternative complementary or treatment in combination with fertilization mineral and investigating their effects on plant growth, grains yield, N uptake and quality of wheat grain.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted at Abou-Hammad town, Sharkia governorate, Egypt using wheat (*Triticum aestivum* c.v., Sakha 94) during the winter season of 2006 – 2007. This investigation aims to study the effect of organic and bio fertilization on growth and N uptake as well as yield and quality of wheat grain.

Physical and chemical properties of the investigated soil are shown in Table 1.

#### Mineral Fertilizers

The recommended doses of phosphorus and potassium were added, phosphorus used for all treatments was added as ordinary super phosphate (6.5 % P) at the rate of 15 kg P fed<sup>-1</sup> before sowing. Potassium used for all treatments was added as potassium sulphate (41 % K) at the rate of 30

kg K fed<sup>-1</sup> in two equal doses, before sowing and before booting stage. Nitrogen used for all treatments was added as ammonium sulphate (AS); 20.6 % N at the rate of 60, 90 and 120 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup>, respectively in three equal doses.

#### **Organic Fertilizers**

Farmyard manure "FYM" (1.16 % N), chicken manure "ChM" (3.48 % N) and plant residues "PR" (1.39 % N) were applied as N sources. The main chemical properties of these organic fertilizers are shown in Table 2.

#### **Bio-fertilizers**

Azotien a commercial fertilizer contain non symbiotic N2-fixing bacteria (Azotobacter, Achromobacter, 10<sup>6</sup> cell g<sup>-1</sup>beat); it has an effective role of increasing the nitrogen availability in the soil, and saving nitrogen fertilizers for plants. Phosphatine a commercial fertilizer contain free living bacteria (Bacillus megatherium 10<sup>6</sup> cell g<sup>-1</sup>beat) which dissolves the unavailable forms of phosphorus such as (Ca  $_{3}(PO_{4})_{2}$ ) to available forms such as "P-dissolving (Ca  $(H_2PO_4)_2$ bacteria" (PDB). A commercial

Table 1a. Some physical properties of the investigated soil

| CEC       | O.M  | CaCO <sub>3</sub> | S.P   | F.C  | -                |             |             | al analysis |                |  |  |
|-----------|------|-------------------|-------|------|------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------------|--|--|
| (me/190g) | (%)  | (%)               | (%)   | (%)  | Fine Sand<br>(%) | Coarse sand | Silt<br>(%) | Clay<br>(%) | Textural Class |  |  |
| 17.49     | 1.60 | 6.20              | 18.20 | 8.90 | 70.38            | 20.62       | 5.90        | 3.10        | Sand           |  |  |

Table 1b. Some chemical properties of the investigated soil

|  | ······ | . <u>-</u> |                 | Soluble ions (meL <sup>-1</sup> )* |                  |                 |      |                        |      |      |  |
|--|--------|------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|------|------------------------|------|------|--|
| T7 </th <th>**</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th colspan="4">Cations</th> <th colspan="4">Anions Cl CO3 HCO3 SO4</th> | **     |            |                 | Cations                            |                  |                 |      | Anions Cl CO3 HCO3 SO4 |      |      |  |
| EC   | рн     | SAK        | Na <sup>+</sup> | K <sup>+</sup>                     | Ca <sup>1+</sup> | Mg <sup>↔</sup> | Cl   | CO3 <sup>-</sup>       | HCO3 | SO4  |  |
| 0.71   | 7.41   | 3.86       | 4.17            | 0.54                               | 1.33             | 1.03            | 1.41 | nil                    | 4.80 | 0.86 |  |

<sup>\*</sup>Water extract of 1: 2.5 soil : water;

Table 1c. Some nutrients content of the investigated soil

| · <b>-</b> : |   |              | Total micro nutrients<br>(mg kg soil <sup>-1</sup> ) |              |   |          |        |       |       |
|--------------|---|--------------|--|--------------|---|----------|--------|-------|-------|
| Nitrogen     |   | Ph           | osphorus   | Potassium    |   | Fe       | Mn     | Zn    | Cu    |
| Total<br>(%) | Available*<br>(mg kg soil <sup>-1</sup> ) | Total<br>(%) | Available* (mg kg soil <sup>-1</sup> )               | Total<br>(%) | Available*<br>(mg kg soil <sup>-1</sup> ) | <u> </u> |        |       |       |
| 0.14         | 93.30                                     | 0.04         | 13.80  | 0.13 298.35  |   | 671.05   | 180.10 | 55.26 | 59.20 |

<sup>\*</sup> Extract for nutrients as follow: N (2 M KCl extract; mineral N); P: 0.5 M NaHCO3 extractant at pH 8.5; K: 1 M NH4OAc at adjusted pH 7.

<sup>\*\*</sup>suspension of 1: 2.5 soil : water.

Table 2. Some chemical characteristics of the used organic fertilizers used

| Characters          | *************************************** |      | <del></del>  |            |              | Mac                                     | Total Micro nutrients                   |   |      |     |        |        |
|---------------------|---|------|--------------|------------|--------------|---|---|---|------|-----|--------|--------|
|                     | EC*                                     | рН** | C:N<br>ratio | O.M<br>(%) |              |   |   |   | (%)  | ( m | g kg-1 | soil ) |
|                     |   |      |              | ` '        | 1            | Nitrogen                                | Phosphorus                              | Potassium                               |      |     | _      |        |
| Organic fertilizers | <b>.</b>                                |      |              |            | Total<br>(%) | Available<br>(mg kg <sup>-1</sup> soil) | Available<br>(mg kg <sup>-1</sup> soil) | Available<br>(mg kg <sup>-1</sup> soil) | · Fe | Mn  | Zn     | Cu     |
| Farmyard<br>manure  | 3.00                                    | 7,25 | 12 : I       | 24.82      | 1.16         | 279.9                                   | 95.0                                    | 4065                                    | 2.31 | 551 | 187    | 117    |
| Chicken<br>manure   | 4.21                                    | 7.84 | 9:1          | 56.03      | 3.48         | 4804.7                                  | 250.0                                   | 9016                                    | 0.22 | 391 | 316    | 123    |
| Plant<br>residues   | 3.22                                    | 8.72 | 15:1         | 35.34      | 1.39         | 350.0                                   | 132.0                                   | 10295                                   | 1.32 | 426 | 144    | 110    |

<sup>\*</sup> Water extract of 1: 10 organic fertilizers: water ; \*\* suspension of 1: 10 organic fertilizers: water.

suspension named EM (Effective Microorganisms) containing photosynthic bacteria, lactic acid bacteria, yeast and fungi.

#### **Experimental Design**

The design of the experiment was a randomized complete block "factorial", involving 3 factors as follows:

FactorA: organic-mineral-N using farmyard manure (FYM); chicken manure (ChM), and plant residues (PR).

Factor bio-fertilization B: using: non-symbiotic N2-fixing bacteria "Azotobacter, Achromobacter, 10<sup>6</sup> cell g<sup>-1</sup>beat" (in form a commercial biofertilizer Azotien) dissolving bacteria (PDB)" Bacillus megatherium 10<sup>6</sup> cell g beat" (in form of a commercial biofertilizer Phosphatine), and a microorganisms mixture of including photosynthic bacteria, lactic acid bacteria, yeast and fungi(in form of a commercial biofertilizer EM), a mixture of PDB + N2-fixing bacteria; and a no-biofertilization treatment.

Factor C: N-type rates: using 3 rates of all mineral N, 1/3 organic N + 2/3 mineral N, 1/2 organic N + 1/2 mineral N.

Thus, total number of treatments is 45 (3 organic-

mineral-N ×5 biofertilization × 3 N-type rates)

Organic N fertilizers combined with mineral N fertilizer were applied in the following rates:

- (1) 120 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (AS).
- (2) 30 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (FYM) + 90 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (AS).
- (3) 60 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (FYM) + 60 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (AS).
- (4)  $30 \text{ kg N fed}^{-1} \text{ (ChM)} + 90 \text{ kg N} \text{ fed}^{-1} \text{ (AS)}.$
- (5) 60 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (ChM) + 60 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (AS).
- (6) 30 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (PR) + 90 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup> (AS).
- (7)  $60 \text{ kg N fed}^{-1} (PR) + 60 \text{ kg N}$   $\text{fed}^{-1} (AS)$ .

Bio-fertilization was achieved through the addition of bio fertilizers as follows

- (1) No addition, control.
- (2) Azotien: 10 g plot<sup>-1</sup>(10.5 m<sup>2</sup>); mixed thoroughly with the soil before sowing.
- (3) Phosphatine: 10 g plot<sup>-1</sup>(10.5 m<sup>2</sup>); mixed thoroughly with the soil before sowing.
- (4) Azotien + Phosphatine: (5g Azotien + 5g Phosphatine) plot<sup>-1</sup>; mixed thoroughly with the soil before sowing.
- (5) Effective Microorganisms (EM): 3 L fed<sup>-1</sup> with irrigation water three times, once every month starting from sowing.

The bio-fertilizer treatments were applied under the above combined treatments of organic and mineral N fertilizers.

All treatments of organic, mineral and bio fertilizers in the current study were arranged in a split – plots design with three replicates.

Plant samples were collected at three different growth stages i.e. 60, 90 and 150 days from sowing, corresponding to shooting, flowering, and harvest stage, respectively. Plant samples were dried at 70 °C till constant weight and wet digested using a mixture of HClO<sub>4</sub> and H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> (Piper, 1950) for determining total-N. Plant growth, N uptake, grain yield and yield quality were measured.

### Methods of Analysis Soil analysis

The following soil analyses were conducted:

Particle size distribution, by the pipette methods (Piper, 1950).

Calcium carbonate (CaCO<sub>3</sub>) content, gasometrically using Collin's Calcimeter (Piper, 1950).

Soil reaction (pH), using a glass electrode pH meter in (1:2.5) soil: water suspension (Jackson, 1973).

Electrical conductivity (EC) and soluble ions in (1:2.5) soil: water extracts as described by Jackson (1973).

Organic matter, the methods described by Black (1982).

Cation exchange capacity (CEC), according to Jackson (1973).

Available nitrogen was determined by steam - distillation procedure using MgO - Devarda alloy according to Bremner and Keency methods as described by Black (1982).

Available phosphorus in soil solution extracted by 0.5 NaHCO<sub>3</sub> of pH adjusted at 8.5 (Olsen *et al.*1954); determined colourimetrically using the ascorbic acid methods (Watanabe and Olsen, 1965).

Available potassium, using 1 N ammonium acetate at pH 7.0 and determined flamephotometrically according to Jackson (1973).

Total nitrogen content was measured using the micro - Kjeldahl method according to Jackson (1973).

Total micro nutrients (Fe, Mn, Zn and Cu) in conc. H<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub> acid using an atomic absorption spectrophotometer as described by Black (1982).

#### Fertilizers analysis

pH was measured using a glass electrode pH meter in (1: 10) organic fertilizer: water suspension according to Jackson (1973).

EC was measured in (1:10) organic fertilizer: water extracts as described by Jackson (1973).

Organic matter and total (N, P, K, Fe, Mn, Zn and Cu) and available (N, P and K) were determined as well as soil analysis.

Total bacterial count was determined using soil extract a jar medium according to Allen (1953).

#### Plant analysis

Total nitrogen content was determined using the micro - Kjeldahl method according to Jackson (1973).

Protein percent "yield quality" was calculated by N x 5.7 for wheat grains (Bishni and Hughes, 1979).

#### Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis of obtained results was carried out according to MSTAT-C (1988) program for ANOVA and L.S.D analysis.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

# Effect of Organic and Bio fertilizers on Plant Growth

#### Effect of organic fertilizers

Data in Tables 3 and 4 reveal that. generally the farmvard manure addition gave the highest dry matter weight of wheat plant (0.721 kg plot<sup>-1</sup>) at the shooting stage. The highest value (3.400 kg plot ) of wheat dry weight at the flowering stage was observed under the addition of plant residues. In this respect, Saks et al. (1992) found that the dry matter weight of wheat showed pronounced increase by addition of FYM especially in combination with 60kg N/fed. Basyouny (2001) found that application of organic manures (FYM chicken or manure) had marked effect on the shoot dry weigh of wheat at tillering stage.

Statistical analysis of the obtained data shows that the addition of organic fertilizers significantly increased the dry matter weight. The differences between the different sources of organic fertilizers were significant.

#### Effect of bio-fertilizers

Data show that the highest values of dry matter weight at shooting and flowering stages

Table 3. Dry matter weight of wheat plant (kg plot<sup>-1</sup>) at the shooting stage as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| )rg. minl | V A             |          |           | Bio-ferti | lizer (C) |   |       |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|---|-------|
| (A)       | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)  | Bio 0    | Bio I     | Bio II    | Bio III   | Bio IV  | Mean  |
| (ENA)     | 120 AS          | 0.649    | 0.977     | 0.889     | 0.937     | 0.708   | 0.832 |
| (FYM)     | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 0.715    | 1.158     | 0.865     | 0.972     | 0.832   | 0.908 |
|           | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 0.798    | 0.991     | 0.899     | 0.972     | 0.884   | 0.909 |
|           | Mean            | 0.721    | 1.042     | 0.884     | 0.960     | 0.808   | 0.883 |
| (ChM)     | 120 AS          | 0.649    | 0.977     | 0.889     | 0.937     | 0.708   | 0.832 |
| (ChM)     | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 0.737    | 1.078     | 1.013     | 0.854     | 0.744   | 0.885 |
|           | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 0.742    | 1.164     | 0.884     | 0.890     | 0.879   | 0.912 |
|           | Mean            | 0.709    | 1.073     | 0.929     | 0.894     | 0.777   | 0.876 |
| (PR)      | 120 AS          | 0.649    | 0.977     | 0.889     | 0.937     | 0.708   | 0.832 |
| (1 11)    | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 0.681    | 1.166     | 1.000     | 0.872     | 7 0.708<br>2 0.832<br>2 0.884<br>0 0.808<br>7 0.708<br>4 0.744<br>0 0.879<br>0.777<br>0.708<br>2 0.736<br>0.745<br>0.730<br>0.772<br>0.708<br>0.771 | 0.891 |
|           | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 0.716    | 0.959     | 0.804     | 0.834     | 0.745   | 0.812 |
|           | Mean            | 0.682    | 1.034     | 0.898     | 0.881     | 0.730   | 0.845 |
| Gı        | rand mean       | 0.704    | 1.050     | 0.903     | 0.912     | 0.772   | 0.868 |
|           | Means of        | N-type r | ates ( AS | -N/org.)  |           |   |       |
|           | 120 AS          | 0.649    | 0.977     | 0.889     | 0.937     | 0.708   | 0.832 |
|           | 90 AS / 30 org. | 0.711    | 1.134     | 0.959     | 0.899     | 0.771   | 0.895 |
|           | 60 AS / 60 org. | 0.725    | 1.038     | 0.862     | 0.899     | 0.836   | 0.877 |
| T OD 1    | 0               | В        | R         | во        | BR        | OR  | BOR   |
| LSD at    | 0.05            | 0.028    | 0.022     | 0.048     | 0.048     | 0.038   | 0.084 |

A.S = Ammonium sulfate

Ch.M = Chicken manure

Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

Diell Thospila

Bio IV= EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +30 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1(as A.S) + 60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

FYM = Farmyard manure,

Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine

PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien

Table 4. Dry matter weight of wheat plant (kg plot<sup>-1</sup>) at the flowering stage as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| Org. minN   | • •             | Bio-fertilizer (C) |           |          |         |        |       |  |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------|----------|---------|--------|-------|--|
| (A)         | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)  | Bio 0              | Bio I     | Віо П    | Bio III | Bio IV | Mean  |  |
| (ITS/IN II) | 120 AS          | 3.412              | 4.917     | 4.502    | 3.649   | 3.470  | 3.990 |  |
| (FYM)       | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 3.150              | 4.825     | 3.617    | 3.998   | 3.594  | 3.837 |  |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 3.401              | 4.050     | 3.765    | 3.793   | 3.574  | 3.717 |  |
|             | Mean            | 0.721              | 3.321     | 4.597    | 3.961   | 3.813  | 3.546 |  |
| (CEAN)      | 120 AS          | 3.412              | 4.917     | 4.502    | 3.649   | 3.470  | 3.990 |  |
| (ChM)       | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 3.546              | 4.660     | 5.114    | 4.638   | 3.661  | 4.324 |  |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 2.882              | 4.661     | 5.617    | 4.258   | 4.077  | 4.299 |  |
|             | Mean            | 0.709              | 3.280     | 4.746    | 5.078   | 4.182  | 3.736 |  |
| /ma)        | 120 AS          | 3.412              | 4.917     | 4.502    | 3.649   | 3.470  | 3.990 |  |
| (PR)        | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 3.352              | 4.415     | 4.014    | 4.943   | 3.907  | 4.126 |  |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 3.436              | 4.929     | 4.028    | 4.113   | 3.795  | 4.060 |  |
|             | Mean            | 0.682              | 3.400     | 4.754    | 4.181   | 4.235  | 3.724 |  |
| Gra         | and mean        | 0.704              | 3.334     | 4.699    | 4.407   | 4.077  | 3.669 |  |
|             | Means of        | N-type             | rates (AS | -N/org.) |         |        |       |  |
|             | 120 AS          | 3.412              | 4.917     | 4.502    | 3.649   | 3.470  | 3.990 |  |
|             | 90 AS / 30 org. | 3.349              | 4.633     | 4.249    | 4.526   | 3.720  | 4.096 |  |
|             | 60 AS / 60 org. | 3.240              | 4.547     | 4.470    | 4.055   | 3.815  | 4.025 |  |
| T. C.D      | 0               | В                  | R         | во       | BR      | OR     | BOR   |  |
| LSD at 0    | 0.111           | 0.143              | N.S       | 0.247    | 0.247   | 0.192  | 0.428 |  |

A.S = Ammonium sulfate Ch.M = Chicken manure Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

Bio IV= EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +30 kg N fed-1 (Org.) 60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

FYM = Farmyard manure,

PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine (0.977 and 4.917 kg plot<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) were observed under the addition of Azotien. In this respect, Indu-Bala et al. (1988) found that wheat inoculation with Azospirillum braslense and Azospirillum lipoferum increased dry matter content by 2.9-8.4% and 0.0-10.0%, respectively.

(El- Maddah et al. 2005) found that seed inoculation with Azotobacter chroococcum increased plant growth.

Statistical analysis of the obtained data shows that the addition of bio-fertilizers increased significantly the dry matter weight.

The differences between the different sources of bio-fertilizers were significant.

### Interaction effect between organic and bio fertilization

Concerning the interaction effect between organic and bio fertilization, presented data in Table 3 show that the addition of Azotien combined with chicken manure gave the highest value (1.073 kg plot-1) of dry matter shooting content at Regarding to the flowering stage, the addition of Phosphatine combined with chicken manure gave the highest value (5.078 kg plot<sup>-1</sup>, Table 4) of dry matter content.

Concerning the interaction effect between the organic and bio

fertilizers under study, statistical analysis in Tables 3 and 4 show that the interaction effect between the organic and bio fertilizers under study positive. In this respect, Desoki (2000) found that enriched by using compostused some microbial activators such Azotobacter chroococcum Bacillus active  $N_2$ fixer), active megatherium (an dissolver) and Trichoderma viride (a cellulose decomposer) with organic amendments some increased plant growth than those obtained by using town refuse compost as organic manure.

# Effect of Organic and Bio fertilizers on Yield of Wheat

#### Effect of organic fertilizers

Data in Tables 5 and 6 reveal that, at the harvest stage, the highest values of grains and straw yields of wheat (5.591 and 5.725 kg plot<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) were recorded under the addition of chicken manure and plant residues. respectively. In this respect, Abou-Bakr and Omar (1996) revealed that the addition of organic manure i.e. plant residues, farm wastes, mature compost or green manure to newly reclaimed sandy soil increased both yield and yield components of wheat; where increases were more pronounced

Table 5. Dry matter weight of wheat grains (kg plot<sup>-1</sup>) at the harvest stage as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| Org. minN  | N-type rates    |        |           | Bio-fert | ilizer (C) |        |               |
|------------|-----------------|--------|-----------|----------|------------|--------|---------------|
| (A)        | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)  | Bio 0  | Bio I     | Віо П    | Bio III    | Bio IV | Mean          |
| (PADA)     | 120 AS          | 5.154  | 5.556     | 5.570    | 5.418      | 5.362  | 5.412         |
| (FYM)      | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 3.637  | 6.896     | 5.766    | 6.143      | 5.556  | 5.600         |
|            | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 5.415  | 6.507     | 6.181    | 6.349      | 5.418  | 5.974         |
| M          | Геал            | 4.735  | 6.320     | 5.839    | 5.970      | 5.445  | 5.662         |
| (ChM)      | 120 AS          | 5.154  | 5.556     | 5.570    | 5.418      | 5.362  | 5.412         |
| (          | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 6.279  | 7.515     | 7.179    | 8.657      | 6.463  | 7.219         |
|            | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 5.339  | 6.925     | 6.452    | 7.905      | 5.481  | 6.421         |
| M          | lean            | 5.591  | 6.666     | 6.401    | 7.327      | 5.769  | 6.350         |
| (PR)       | 120 AS          | 5.154  | 5.556     | 5.570    | 5.418      | 5.362  | 5.412         |
| (* 1.)     | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 5.305  | 8.155     | 8.132    | 7.191      | 6.699  | 7.097         |
|            | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 5.757  | 7.143     | 6.232    | 6.802      | 5.919  | <b>6.37</b> 1 |
| M          | lean            | 5.405  | 6.952     | 6.645    | 6.470      | 5.993  | 6.299         |
| Gran       | d mean          | 5.224  | 6.646     | 6.295    | 6.589      | 5,746  | 6.104         |
|            | Means of        | N-type | rates (AS | -N/org.) |            |        |               |
|            | 120 AS          | 5.154  | 5.556     | 5.570    | 5.418      | 5.362  | 5.412         |
|            | 90 AS/30 org.   | 5.074  | 7.522     | 7.026    | 7.330      | 6.240  | 6.638         |
|            | 60 AS / 60 org. | 5.504  | 6.858     | 6.288    | 7.019      | 5.636  | 6.261         |
| LSD at 0.0 | 5 0             | В      | R         | ВО       | BR         | OR     | BOR           |
|            | 0.036           | 0.047  | 0.036     | 0.081    | 0.081      | 0.063  | 0.140         |

A.S = Ammonium sulfate Ch.M = Chicken manure

Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

Bio IV= EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +30 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1 (as A.S) + 60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

FYM = Farmyard manure,

Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine

PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien

Table 6. Dry matter weight of wheat straw (kg plot<sup>1</sup>) at the harvest stage as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| Org. minN     | N-type rates                     |                |                   | Bio-fer         | ilizer (C       | )              |                  |
|---------------|----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|
| (ChM)  M (PR) | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)                   | Bio 0          | Bio I             | Bio II          | Bio III         | Bio IV         | Mean             |
| arsa.o        | 120 AS                           | 6.177          | 6.836             | 6.398           | 6.468           | 6.292          | 6.434            |
| (FYNI)        | 90 AS/ 30 Org.                   | 5.299          | 7.382             | 5.598           | 5.878           | 5.560          | 5.944            |
|               | 60 AS/ 60 Org.                   | 5.051          | 6.236             | 5.885           | 6.304           | 5.719          | 5.839            |
| M             | lean                             | 5.509          | 6.818             | 5.961           | 6.217           | 5.857          | 6.049            |
| (ChM)         | 120 AS                           | 6.177          | 6.836             | 6.398           | 6.468           | 6.292          | 6.434            |
| (CIIVI)       | 90 AS/ 30 Org.<br>60 AS/ 60 Org. | 4.783<br>5.360 | 7.565<br>6.874    | 7.534<br>6.137  | 8.075<br>7.492  | 5.681<br>5.415 | 6.728<br>6.256   |
| M             | lean                             | 5.440          | 7.092             | 6.690           | 7.345           | 5.796          | 6.473            |
| (BD)          | 120 AS                           | 6.177          | 6.836             | 6.398           | 6.468           | 6.292          | 6.434            |
| (PR)          | 90 AS/ 30 Org.                   | 5.358          | 6.993             | 6.585           | 6.907           | 6.108          | 6.390            |
|               | 60 AS / 60 Org.                  | 5.639          | 7.130             | 6.078           | 6.579           | 5.846          | 6.254            |
| M             | lean                             | 5.725          | 6.986             | 6.354           | 6.651           | 6.082          | 6.335            |
| Gran          | d mean                           | 5.558          | 6.891             | 6.334           | 7.38            | 5.908          | 6.286            |
|               | Means of                         | N-type         | rates (AS         | -N/org.)        |                 |                |                  |
|               | 120 AS                           | 6.177          | 6.614             | 6.398           | 6.468           | 6.292          | 6.390            |
|               | 90 AS / 30 org.                  | 5.147          | 7.313             | 6.573           | 6.954           | 5.773          | 6.352            |
|               | 60 AS / 60 org.                  | 5.350          | 6.747             | 6.030           | 6.791           | 5.660          | 6.116            |
| LSD at 0.0    | O O 0.202                        | <b>B</b> 0.261 | <b>R</b><br>0.202 | <b>BO</b> 0.452 | <b>BR</b> 0.452 | OR<br>N.S      | <b>BOR</b> 0.783 |

A.S = Ammonium sulfate

Ch.M = Chicken manure

Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

FYM =Farmyard manure,

PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien

Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine

Bio IV= EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) + 30 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1(as A.S) + 60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

with increasing the rate applying of these soil conditioners. E1-Beshbeshy (2000) reported that responded wheat plants significantly to compost application, when it was applied alone or in combination with mineral fertilizers, compared with mineral fertilizers alone.

Statistical analysis of the obtained data showed that the addition of organic fertilizers significantly increased the grains yield; while the straw yield was decreased. The differences between the different sources of organic fertilizers were highly significant.

#### Effect of bio-fertilizers

At harvest stage, the highest values of grains and straw yield of wheat (5.570 and 6.836 kg plot<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) were obtained by the addition of Phosphatine and respectively. Azotien. this In respect, Fares (1997) noticed that inoculation of wheat seeds by Azotobacter showed a significant increase in grains and straw yields of wheat. Abdel-Hamid (1995) found that significant increases in the yield of different corps were possible when seeds inoculated with P-dissolvers in the presence of rock-phosphate.

Statistical analysis of obtained

data, Tables 5 and 6 showed that, the addition of bio-fertilizers significantly increased the grains and straw yields. The differences between the different sources of bio-fertilizers were significant.

### Interaction effect between organic and bio fertilization

At the harvest stage, the (Azotien addition of Phosphatine) gave the highest values  $(7.327 \text{ and } 7.345 \text{ kg plot}^{-1},$ Table 5 and 6 respectively) of grains and straw yield respectively were observed when combined with chicken manure. In this respect, Khamis and Metwally (1998) found that grains yield of increased by wheat the incorporation of organic material inoculated with microbial decomposers and Azotobacter in the soil compared to mineral fertilizer.

The statistical analysis shows that, the interaction effect between organic and biofertilizers under study was positive.

# Effect of Organic and Bio fertilizers on N Uptake by Wheat Plant

#### Effect of organic fertilizers

Data in Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 reveal that, generally the chicken manure addition gave the highest

Table 7. N-uptake by wheat plant (g plot<sup>-1</sup>) at shooting stage as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| Org. minN   | N-type rates    |          | I        | 3io-fert | ilizer (C | ()     | <del>-</del> |
|-------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|--------|--------------|
| (A)         | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)  | Bio 0    | Bio I    | Bio II   | Bio III   | Bio IV | Mean         |
| (FYM)       | 120 AS          | 26.11    | 40.04    | 32.34    | 34.83     | 26.18  | 31.90        |
| (1111)      | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 28.26    | 47,53    | 33.43    | 37.15     | 28.94  | 35.06        |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 27.13    | 38.37    | 33.43    | 35.30     | 31.65  | 33.18        |
| M           | ean             | 27.17    | 41.98    | 33.06    | 35.76     | 28.93  | 33.38        |
| (ChM)       | 120 AS          | 26.11    | 40.04    | 32.34    | 34.83     | 26.18  | 31.90        |
| (CILVI)     | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 30.63    | 45.88    | 37.64    | 33.05     | 30.85  | 35.61        |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 26.98    | 46.62    | 32.19    | 34.06     | 30.82  | 34.13        |
| M           | ean             | 27.91    | 44.18    | 34.05    | 33.98     | 29,28  | 33.88        |
| (PR)        | 120 AS          | 26.11    | 40.04    | 32.34    | 34.83     | 26.18  | 31.90        |
| (* **)      | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 24.28    | 43.31    | 33.26    | 31.30     | 25.65  | 31.56        |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 22,74    | 33.65    | 25.57    | 27.13     | 25.16  | 26.85        |
| M           | ean             | 24.38    | 39.00    | 30.39    | 31.09     | 25.67  | 30.10        |
| Gran        | d mean          | 26.48    | 41.72    | 32.50    | 33.61     | 27.96  | 32.45        |
|             | Means of        | N-type i | ates (AS | -N/org.) |           |        |              |
|             | 120 AS          | 26.11    | 40.04    | 32.34    | 34.83     | 26.18  | 31.90        |
| i .         | 90 AS / 30 org. | 27.72    | 45.57    | 34.77    | 33.83     | 28.48  | 34.08        |
|             | 60 AS / 60 org. | 25.62    | 39.55    | 30.39    | 32.17     | 29.21  | 31.39        |
| LSD at 0.0: | , 0             | В        | R        | во       | BR        | OR     | BOR          |
|             | 0.356           | 0.459    | 0.356    | 0.795    | 0.795     | 0.616  | 2.638        |

FYM =Farmyard manure,

Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine

PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien

#### Notes:

A.S = Ammonium sulfate

Ch.M = Chicken manure Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

Bio IV= EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) + 30 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1(as A.S) + 60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

Table 8. N-uptake by wheat plant (g plot-1) at flowering stage as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| Org. minN   | N-type rates              |                | J              | 3io-ferti      | lizer (C)      |                |                |
|-------------|---------------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| (A)         | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)            | Bio 0          | Bio I          | Bio II         | Bio III        | Bio IV         | Mean           |
| (FYM)       | 120 AS                    | 66.07          | 123.5          | 93.16          | 88.95          | 82.93          | 90.92          |
| (A. X 14.X) | 90 AS / 30 Org.           | 58.79          | 86.73          | 64.04          | 86.37          | 61.70          | 71.52          |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org.           | 62.74          | 87.9           | 71.72          | 72.42          | 64.16          | 71.79          |
| M           | ean                       | 62.53          | 99.37          | 76.30          | 82.58          | 69.59          | 78.08          |
| (ChM)       | 120 AS<br>90 AS / 30 Org. | 66.07<br>64.86 | 123.5<br>89.12 | 93.16<br>102.7 | 88.95<br>86.21 | 82.93<br>73.49 | 90.92<br>83.27 |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org.           | 53.58          | 100.1          | 104.7          | 95.51          | 81.95          | 87.16          |
| M           | lean                      | 61.5           | 104.2          | 100.2          | 90.22          | 79.46          | 87.19          |
| (PR)        | 120 AS<br>90 AS / 30 Org. | 66.07<br>60.24 | 123.5<br>76.49 | 93.16<br>75.29 | 88.95<br>81.24 | 82.93<br>70.78 | 90.92<br>72.81 |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org.           | 45.74          | 103.7          | 70.11          | 71.76          | 67.56          | 71,78          |
| М           | (ean                      | 57.35          | 101.2          | 79.52          | 80.65          | 73.76          | 78.50          |
| Gran        | d mean                    | 60.46          | 101.6          | 85.33          | 84.48          | 74.27          | 81,23          |
| 4           | Means of                  | N-type i       | ates (AS-      | N/org.)        |                |                |                |
|             | 120 AS                    | 66.07          | 123.5          | 93.16          | 88.95          | 82.93          | 90.92          |
|             | 90 AS / 30 org.           | 61.30          | 84.11          | 80.67          | 84.61          | 68.66          | 75.87          |
|             | 60 AS / 60 org.           | 54.02          | 97.23          | 82.18          | 79.89          | 71.21          | 76.91          |
| <b>.</b>    | o                         | В              | R              | во             | BR             | OR             | BOR            |
| LSD at 0.05 | 0.377                     | 0.487          | 0.377          | 0.843          | 0.843          | 0.653          | 1.461          |

A,S = Ammonium sulfate

Ch.M = Chicken manure

Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

Bio IV= EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +30 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

FYM = Farmyard manure,

Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine

PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien

Table 9. N-uptake in wheat grains (g plot<sup>-1</sup>) at harvest stage as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| Org. minN   |                 |          |          | Bio-fert | ilizer (C) |        |       |
|-------------|-----------------|----------|----------|----------|------------|--------|-------|
| (A)         | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)  | Bio 0    | Bio I    | Bio II   | Bio III    | Bio IV | Mean  |
| (FYM)       | 120 AS          | 106.20   | 129.8    | 130.6    | 119.3      | 110.0  | 119,2 |
| (FIM)       | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 71.27    | 123.4    | 98.97    | 104.7      | 80.52  | 95.78 |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 63.93    | 119.8    | 96.45    | 105.7      | 95.77  | 96.33 |
| 1           | Mean            | 80.47    | 124.3    | 108.7    | 109.9      | 95.43  | 103.8 |
|             | 120 AS          | 106.2    | 129.8    | 130.6    | 119.3      | 110.0  | 119.2 |
| (ChM)       | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 91.89    | 151.9    | 110.5    | 160.0      | 96.29  | 122.1 |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 80.04    | 122.4    | 97.11    | 123.4      | 90.67  | 102.7 |
| ľ           | Mean            | 92.71    | 134.7    | 112.7    | 134.2      | 98.99  | 114.7 |
| (DD)        | 120 AS          | 106.2    | 129.8    | 130.6    | 119.3      | 110.0  | 119.2 |
| (PR)        | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 93.17    | 158.1    | 133.8    | 132.3      | 94.54  | 122.4 |
|             | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 64.60    | 115.8    | 111.0    | 111.1      | 97.89  | 100.1 |
| ľ           | Mean            | 87.99    | 134.6    | 125.2    | 120.9      | 100.8  | 113.9 |
| Gra         | nd mean         | 87.05    | 131.2    | 115.5    | 121.7      | 98.4   | 110.8 |
|             | Means o         | f N-type | rates (A | S-N/org. | )          |        |       |
|             | 120 AS          | 106.2    | 129.8    | 130.6    | 119.3      | 110.0  | 119.2 |
|             | 90 AS / 30 org. | 85.44    | 144.5    | 114.4    | 132.3      | 90.44  | 113.4 |
|             | 60 AS / 60 org. | 69.53    | 119.3    | 101.5    | 113.4      | 94.78  | 99.7  |
| T CD -4 6 4 | 0               | В        | R        | во       | BR         | OR     | BOR   |
| LSD at 0.0  | 0.454           | 0.456    | 0.454    | 1.014    | 1.014      | 0.786  | 1.757 |

A.S = Ammonium sulfate

Ch.M = Chicken manure

Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

FYM = Farmyard manure, PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien

Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine

Bio IV=EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +30 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1(as A.S) + 60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

Table 10. N-uptake in wheat straw (g plot<sup>-1</sup>) at harvest stage as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| Org. minN | • •                       |                   |                | Bio-ferti       | lizer (C)       |                |                |
|-----------|---------------------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|
| (A)       | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)            | Bio 0             | Bio I          | Bio II          | Bio III         | Bio IV         | Mean           |
| (ENZAM)   | 120 AS                    | 39.79             | 72.96          | 52.95           | 54.03           | 42.94          | 52.53          |
| (FYM)     | 90 AS / 30 Org.           | 31.77             | 57.16          | 36.93           | 38,75           | 34.80          | 39.88          |
|           | 60 AS / 60 Org.           | 33.71             | 41.32          | 39.86           | 48.43           | 38.60          | 40.38          |
| I         | Mean                      | 35.09             | 57.15          | 43.25           | 47.07           | 38.78          | 44.27          |
| (ChM)     | 120 AS<br>90 AS / 30 Org. | 39.79<br>27.39    | 72.96<br>56.28 | 52.95<br>43.92  | 54.03<br>64.02  | 42.94<br>33.42 | 52.53<br>45.01 |
| 1         | 60 AS / 60 Org.<br>Mean   | 31.75<br>32.98    | 41.99<br>57.08 | 41.15<br>46.01  | 48.14<br>55.40  | 40.17<br>38.84 | 40.64<br>46.06 |
| (PR)      | 120 AS<br>90 AS / 30 Org. | 39.79<br>58.91    | 72.96<br>79.40 | 52.95<br>61.24  | 54.03<br>63.85  | 42.94<br>60.74 | 52.53<br>64.83 |
| 1         | 60 AS / 60 Org.<br>Vlean  | 47.34<br>48.68    | 76.07<br>76.14 | 54.37<br>56.19  | 61.21<br>59.70  | 47.54<br>50.41 | 57.30<br>58.22 |
| Gra       | nd mean                   | 38.92             | 63.45          | 48.48           | 54.05           | 42.67          | 49.52          |
|           | Means o                   | f N-type          | rates (A       | S-N/org.)       |                 |                |                |
|           | 120 AS                    | 39.79             | 72.96          | 52.95           | 54.03           | 42.94          | 52.53          |
|           | 90 AS / 30 rg.            | 39.36             | 64.28          | 47.37           | 55.54           | 42.99          | 49.91          |
|           | 60 AS / 60org.            | 37.60             | 53.13          | 45.12           | 52.59           | 42.10          | 46.12          |
| LSD at 0. | 05 O O 0.258              | <b>B</b><br>0.862 | R<br>0.258     | <b>BO</b> 1,181 | <b>BR</b> 1.181 | OR<br>0.915    | BOR<br>2.046   |

A.S = Ammonium sulfate

Ch.M = Chicken manure

Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

Bio IV= EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) + 30 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

FYM = Farmyard manure,

Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine

PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien

N uptake (27.91 g plot<sup>-1</sup>) at the shooting stage. However the highest of N uptake value at the flowering stage (62.53 g plot<sup>-1</sup>) was accrued under the addition of farmyard manure. Moharram (1997) and Abdel-Wahab (1999) reported that addition of organic materials with 50 kg N/fed gave the highest values of N uptake by wheat plants grown on sandy soils.

However, at the harvest stage the highest values of N uptake in grains and straw (92.71 and 48.68 plot<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) recorded due to the addition of chicken manure and plant residues respectively. These results agree with these obtained by Amer et al.(1997) who found that the addition of organic manure to wheat plants grown on sandy soil at a rate of 2.0% markedly increased N uptake by wheat plants. Sarkar and Singh (1997) found that organic fertilizer alone or in combination with chemical fertilizers increased the total N content.

Statistical analysis of obtained data show that the addition of organic fertilizers significantly increased N uptake. The differences between the different sources of organic fertilizers were highly significant.

#### Effect of bio-fertilizers

Regarding the effect of biofertilizers addition on N uptake, data show that the highest values of N uptake at shooting and flowering stages (40.04 and 123.5 g plot<sup>1</sup>, Tables 7 and 8, respectively) were observed under the individual addition of Azotien. In this respect, Mutry and Ladha (1988) and Patel et al. (1996) and Rashid et al. (1996) stated that inoculation of wheat plants with Azospirillum, Azotobacter strains increased N uptake in plants.

However, at the harvest stage, the addition of Phosphatine and Azotien gave the highest values of N uptake in both grains and straw (130.6 and 72.96 g plot-1, Tables 9 and 10, respectively). In this respect. Amare and Dahdoh (1997) stated that inoculation of wheat grains with а mixture Azotobacter sp. plus Azospirillum sp. increased the uptake of N in the straw. Gopal et al. (2000) concluded that inoculation with Azotobacter increased N uptake of wheat plants over no plants inoculation.

Statistical analysis of the obtained data showed that the addition of bio-fertilizers increased significantly N uptake at all growth stages; while the differences between the different

sources of bio-fertilizers were significant.

### Interaction effect between organic and bio fertilization

Concerning the interaction effect between organic and bio fertilization, presented data in Tables 7 and 8 show that the addition of Azotien, combined with chicken manure gave the highest values (44.18 and 104.2 g plot<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) of N uptake of wheat plants at shooting and flowering stage, respectively. At the harvest stage, the addition of Azotien combined with chicken manure gave the highest value (134.7 g plot<sup>-1</sup>, Table 9) of N uptake of grains. Concerning of N uptake of straw, data in Table 10 show that the addition of Azotien gave the highest value of N uptake (76.14g plot<sup>-1</sup>) when combined with plant residues. In this respect, Abdalla et al. (2003) reported that the greatest N uptake was obtained by the addition of microbine (a mixture of N-fixing + P-dissolving bacteria) combined with organic manure.

Regarding to the interaction effect between the organic and biofertilizers, the statistical analysis in Tables 7, 8, 9 and 10 show that the interaction effect between the organic and biofertilizers under study was

highly significant.

### Effect of Organic and Bio fertilizers on Yield Quality

#### Effect of organic fertilizers

Data in Table 11 reveal that, the highest value of wheat grains protein percent (9.89 %) was recorded under the addition of farmyard manure.

#### Effect of bio fertilizers

Regarding to the effect of bio fertilizers addition on protein percent, data show that the highest value (13.37 %, Table 11) was recorded under the addition of Phosphatine. In this respect, Omar et al. (1996) suggested that inoculation with B. polymyxa and A. brasilense beside nitrogen fertilization have a positive effect on both yield and grains protein content of wheat.

### Interaction effect between organic and bio fertilization

Concerning the interaction effect between organic and bio fertilization, presented data in Table 11 show that the highest value of protein percent (11.64 %) was observed under the addition of Azotien when combined with chicken manure.

Table 11. Protein content (%) of wheat grains as affected by organic and bio fertilization

| Org. minN<br>(A)                  | N-type rates    | Bio-fertilizer (C) |       |        |         |        |       |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-------|--------|---------|--------|-------|
|                                   | (AS-N/OrgN)(B)  | Bio 0              | Bio I | Bio II | Bio III | Bio IV | Mean  |
| (FYM)                             | 120 AS          | 11.75              | 13.31 | 13.37  | 12.55   | 11.69  | 12.53 |
|                                   | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 11.20              | 10.20 | 9.783  | 9.715   | 8.261  | 9.832 |
|                                   | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 6.730              | 10.50 | 8.896  | 9.489   | 10.08  | 9.137 |
| Mean                              |                 | 9.890              | 11.34 | 10,68  | 10.58   | 10.01  | 10.50 |
| (ChM)                             | 120 AS          | 11.75              | 13.31 | 13.37  | 12.55   | 11.69  | 12.53 |
|                                   | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 8.342              | 11.52 | 8.775  | 10.54   | 8.493  | 9.533 |
|                                   | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 8.545              | 10.08 | 8.578  | 8.899   | 9.432  | 9.107 |
| Mean                              |                 | 9.544              | 11.64 | 10.24  | 10.66   | 9.873  | 10.39 |
| (PR)                              | 120 AS          | 11.75              | 13.31 | 13.37  | 12.55   | 11.69  | 12.53 |
|                                   | 90 AS / 30 Org. | 10.01              | 11.05 | 9.379  | 10.49   | 8.044  | 9.795 |
|                                   | 60 AS / 60 Org. | 6.396              | 9.244 | 10.16  | 9.312   | 9.435  | 8.909 |
| Mean                              |                 | 9.384              | 11.20 | 10.97  | 10.78   | 9.725  | 10.41 |
| Grand mean                        |                 | 9.606              | 11.39 | 10.63  | 10.67   | 9,869  | 10.43 |
| Means of N-type rates (AS-N/org.) |                 |                    |       |        |         |        |       |
| 120 AS                            |                 | 11.75              | 13.31 | 13.37  | 12.55   | 11.69  | 12.53 |
|                                   | 90 AS / 30 org. | 9.851              | 10.92 | 9.312  | 10.25   | 8.266  | 9.720 |
|                                   | 60 AS / 60 org. | 7.224              | 9.941 | 9.211  | 9.233   | 9.649  | 9.051 |

A.S = Ammonium sulfate

Ch.M = Chicken manure

Bio = No addition

BioII = Phosphatine

Bio IV= EM

120 AS = 120 kg N fed-1 (as A.S)

90 AS / 30 org. = 90 kg N fed-1(as A.S) + 30 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

60 AS / 60 org. = 60 kg N fed-1(as A.S) +60 kg N fed-1 (Org.)

FYM = Farmyard manure,

PR = Plant residues

Bio I = Azotien

Bio III = Azotien + Phosphatine

In this respect, El-Sersawy et al. (1997) studied the effect of using composted garbage; alone or with either sludge or sheep dung; combined with biofertilizers on wheat plants grown under sand sandy soil conditions. They reported that under all treatments, the N uptake and protein content of straw and grains were enhanced.

#### REFERENCES

- Abdalla, A.M., S.E. El-Kalla, A.E. Sharief, A.A. Leilah and S.A.K. El-Awami. 2003. Utilization of some agricultural practices to improve some wheat cultivars productivity. J. Agri. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 28 (10): 7547-7555.
- Abdel-Hamid, E.A.Ahlam.1995.
  Studies on the role of microorganisms in utilizing phosphate in desert soils. M. Sc. Thesis, Fac, Agric., Ain Shams Univ.
- Abdel-Wahab, A. F. M. 1999. Iron-Zinc-organic wastes interactions and their effects on biological nitrogen fixation in newly reclaimed soils. Ph. D. Thesis, Fac. of Agric., Ain Shams Univ., Egypt.
- Abou-Bakr, M. A. and A. M. Omar. 1996. Contribution of municipal waste as organic

- fertilizer to sunflower production. Egypt. J. Soil Sci., 36:69-82.
- Allen, O.N. 1953. Experiments in soil bacteriology. 1<sup>st</sup>. Ed. Burges Publ. Co., U.S.A.
- Amare, Mervat, A. and M.S.A. Dahdoh. 1997. Effect of inoculation with plant growth promoting rhizobeteria (PGPR) on yield and uptake of nutrients by wheat grown on sandy soils. Egypt J. Soil Sci., 37: 467-484.
- Amer, A.A., M.A. Badawi and A.A. El-Banna. 1997. Effect of organic manuring on wheat plants grown in sandy soil. Annals of Agric. Sci., Cairo, 42 (1): 107-116.
- Basyouny, El. A. 2001. Plant response to fertilization in relation to micronutrietns status in plant and soil. Ph.D. thesis, Faco. Of Agric. Ain Shams Univ., Egypt.
- Bishni, U.R. and I.L. Hughes. 1979. Agronomic performance and protein content of fall-planted tritica, wheat, and rye. Agron. J. 71: 359-360.
- Black, C.A. 1982. Methods of Soil Analysis. Amer. Soc. of Agro., Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A.
- Desoki, A.H. 2000. Utilization of some agricultural wastes for the

- production of rhizobial inoculants and soil amendments. M.Sc. Thesis, Dept. of Agric.Sci., Institute of Environmental Studies & Research, Ain Shams Univ., Egypt.
- El-Beshbeshy, T.R.A. 2000. Partial substitution of chemical fertilization by composted plants residues in the nutrient of wheat grown on sandy soil. Minia Journal of Agricultural Research and Development. Vol. 20: 3, 423-437.
- El-Maddah, E.L., M.D. El-Sodany and E.A. Koreish, 2005, Effect of Azotobacter chroococcum and phosphate solubilizing bacteria on wheat growth. productivity and nutrient availability. J. Agric. Sci.. Mansoura Univ., 30(5): 2895-2908.
- Fares, C.N. 1997. Growth and yield of wheat plants as affected by biofertilization with associative, symbiotic N<sub>2</sub>-fixers and endomycorhizae in the presence of different P-fertilizers. Annals Agri. Sci., Ain Shams Univ., 42 (1): 371-740.
- Gopal, S., L.L. Somani, K.L. Totwat, and G. Singh. 2000. Effect of integrated nitrogen

- management on yield attributing characters and yield of wheat. Research. on crops, 1:123-127. Department of Agricultural Chemistry and Soil Scince, Rajastan College of Agriculture, India.
- Indu-Bala, Bs.K. 1988.
  Interactions between
  Azospirillum species and wheat
  (*Triticum aestivum* L.) varieties
  Indian Journal of Agricultural
  Sci. 58:227-229
- Jackson, M.L. 1973. Soil chemical analysis. Prentice Hall, Ic., Englewood Califfs, New Jersy.
- Khamis, M.A. and M. Metwally 1998. Utilization of organic materials inoculated with microbial decomposers as nitrogen source for wheat in presence of Azotobacter in sandy soil. Egypt. J.Soil Sci, 38:81-99.
- Moharram, T. M. M. 1997. Effect of soil amendments with composted filter mod and inoculation with *Azotobacter sp.* on the yield of wheat plants in newly reclaimed soil. Annals Agric. Sci., Cairo, 44:13-26.
- MSTAT-C, V.2.10. 1988. A microcomputer program for the design, Management and Analysis of Agronomic Res.

- Mutry, M.G. and J. K. Ladha. 1988. Influnce of *Azospirillum* inoculation on the mineral uptake and growth of rice under hydroponic conditions. Plat & Soil, 108: 281 291.
- Olsen, S.R., F.S.Cole. and L.A. Dean. 1954. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbonate. U.S. Dept. Agri. Cir., 939-1-9.
- Omar, M.N.A., N.M. Mahrous and A.M. Hamouda 1996. Evaluation the efficiency of inoculating some *diazotrophs* on yield and protein content of 3 wheat cultivars under graded levels of nitrogen fertilization. Annals of Agric.Sci., Cairo, 41 (2): 579-590.
- Patel, J.G., D. D. Malavia, B. B. Kneria and V. D. Khanpara. 1996. Effect of N, P and biofertilizer on yield quality and nutrients uptake in wheat. Gujarate. Agric. Univ. Res. J. India.22:118-120.
- Piper, C.S. 1950. Soil and plant analysis. Inter-science Publishers. Inc. New York.

- Rashid, A., M.R. Sajjad, M.A. Gill, M.S. Cheema, M.S. Sindhu and M.M.Nayyer. 1996. Response of wheat to an associative diazotroph inculum under different levels of nitrogen fertilizer. Abstract: Oct. 16-21, Faisalbad Pakistan.
- Sakr, A. A., S. A. Rizk and A.S. El Sebaay. 1992. Effect of organic manures on plant growth and NPK uptake by wheat and maize plants. Egypt. J. of Soil Sci., 32: 249 263.
- Sarkar, S. and S.R. Singh. 1997. Integrated nutrient management in relation to soil fertility and yield sustainability under dry land farming. Indian J. Agric. Sci., 67(9): 431-433.
- Watanabe F.S. and S.R. Olsen. 1965. Test of an ascorbic acid method for determining phosphorus in water and NaHCO3 extracts from soil. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Proc., 29: 677-678.

# محتوى النيتروجين والمحصول لنبات القمح النامى فى أرض رملية تحت تأثير إضافة الأسمدة العضوية والحيوية

عماد السيد محمد أبوساطى-السيد عوض محمد عوض أحمد حسين إبراهيم- مصطفى محمد مصطفى الصاوى قسم علوم الأراضى - كلية الزراعة - جامعة الزقازيق

أجريت تجربة حقلية في مدينة أبو حمساد / محافظة الشسرقية باسستخدام القمسح (سخا ؟ ٩) وذلك خلال الموسم الزراعي ٢٠٠٢ / ٢٠٠٧ ، بهدف دراسسة تسأثير التسسميد العضوي والحيوي على محتوى المادة الجافة، وامتصساص النيتسروجين وكذلك إنتاجيسة المحصول. أخذت العينات النباتية عند ثلاث مراحل نمو مختلفة من الزراعة هسى مرحلسة الإستطالة، مرحلة التزهير، ومرحلة الحصاد (٢٠، ٩٠، ٥٠ يوماً مسن الزراعة علسى التوالى). وقد تم تقدير محتوى المادة الجافسة وامتصساص النيتسروجين وكذلك إنتاجيسة المحصول وجودتة.

### النَّتَائج المتحصل عليها يُمكنُ أَنْ تُلخُّصَ كالتالي:

- ١. أوضح التحليلَ الإحصائيَ للبياتاتِ المتحصل عليها أنّ إضافةَ الأسمدة العضويةِ أدت إلى زيادة محتوى المادة الجافة ومحصول الحبوب زيادة معنوية؛ بينما نقص محصول القش. وكانت الإختلافات بين المصادر المختلفة للأسمدة العضوية معنوية .
- ٢. أوضح التحليل الإحصائي للبياتات المتحصل عليها أن إضافة الأسمدة العضوية أدت الى زيادة امتصاص النيتروجين زيادة معنوية.
- ٣. أظهرت النتائج أنّ إضافة الأسمدة الحيوية أدت إلى زيادة محتوى المادة الجافة وكسلا من محصول الحيوب والقش زيادة معنوية. وكانت الإختلافات بين المصادر المختلفة للأسمدة الحيوية معنوية.
- ٤. أوضح التحليلَ الإحصائيَ للبياتات المتحصل عليها أنّ إضافةً الأسمدة الحيوية أدت إلى زيادة امتصاص النيتروجين زيادة معنوية في كل مراحل النمو، وكانت الإختلافات بين المصادر المختلفة للأسمدة الحيوية معنوية .
- ه. أوضحت النتائج أن التداخل بين الأسمدة العضوية والحيوية تحت الدراسة على محتوى المادة الجافة ومحصول الحبوب والقش كان إيجابياً.
- آظهر التحليلَ الإحصائيَ أنّ التداحل بين الأسمدة العضوية والحيوية علي امتصاص النيتروجين كان معنوياً.