## Assiut J. Agric. Sci (2012) 43:(6)(82-98) PRODUCTION EFFICIENCY oF SOME NITROGEN FERTILIZATION and THEIR EFFECT on THE DAMAGE CAUSED BY WILD BIRDS on SUNFLOWER CROP

## Youssef, M. A.<sup>1</sup>; Omar, M. M. A<sup>2</sup> and El-bardisy, H. A.E.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Soil and Water Sci. Dept., Fac. Of Agric., Al-Azhar Univ., Assiut Branch. <sup>2</sup>Agric. Zoology and Nematology Dept. Fac. Of Agric., Al-Azhar Univ. Assiut Branch. <sup>3</sup>Agric. Economic Dept,

Fac. Of Agric., Al-Azhar Univ., Assiut Branch.

## ABSTRACT:

A field experiment was carried out at The Experimental Farm, Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azhar Univ. Assiut, Egypt in order to study the effect of different nitrogen fertilization (bio, organic and chemical) with different combination on sunflower yield and its oil content as well as the damage caused by wild birds. The fertilization treatments were carried out as follow. The first treatment without any fertilization as control. The second was treated with ammonium nitrate as a chemical fertilizer (CN) with rate of 50 Kg/fed

the third treatment was the effective microorganisms (EM) with rate 6 L/fed. as a bio-fertilizer. The fourth treatment was treated with humic acid (HA) with a rate of 4 L/fed + EM (EMH). The fifth area was treated with a rate of 20 m<sup>3</sup> fed from the sheep manure (SM) as organic fertilizer. The sixth treatment was a mixed from SM + EM. The last treatment was mixture from SM + EMH. Each treatment was three plots every one was  $(2 \times 4.5m)$  and laid out in a randomized block design with three replicates.

Received on:5/12/2012 Accepted for publication on: 15/1/2013 Referees:Prof. Khlifa.H. Abdel-Gawad Prof.Mahmoud.M.Aldisoky

highest values of seed weight/plant and seed or oil vield/fed (131.42g, 1987.12 kg and 641.67 kg, respectively) were recorded in soil treated by sheep manure. The wild birds attacked the sunflower plants in doughy and mature stages till the harvesting time causing a severe damage in plant heads. Wild birds caused a reduction in sunflower vield by 6.50, 6.67 and 7.33% in the control, (SM) and CN EMH or treatments, respectively. The highest losses in sunflower yield were recorded in the soil treated by SM+EMH (11.97%). The study recommends the introduction of treatment fertilizer (SM+r<sub>2</sub>M) where meets the requirements of production efficiency to produce higher and lower costs, and dissemination of such recommendation on farmers sunflower at the level of the Republic.

Key words: Chemical, organic, bio-fertilizer, without fertilizer, ioss, birds, technical (productivity) efficiency, Data Envelopes Analysis model (DEA), leaner program, optimal treatments and sunflower.

#### **INTRODUCTION:**

Sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*, L.) is one of the most important edible oil crops all over the world. Its seeds contains 24-49 % oil and its cake contains 25-35 % protein, which is mostly feeded to livestock because of its high biological value. Furthermore, sunflower seeds are eaten as salted whole seeds as roasted nut meats. (Saleh *et al.*, 2004 and Aowad and Mohamed, 2009).

Organic materials, particularly solid manure, useful amounts of organic matter to soils, act as soil conditioners and structural improvers. Also, they increased the water holding capacity, drought resistance and soil structural stability as well as enhanced soils biological activity (Meenakumari and Shekhar 2012). Bio-fertilizers drew the attention as an alternative way to nitrogen fertilizer application. They have many merits in supplying part of the plant nitrogen requirement that could be reaching to 25 %. They also help in increasing nutrients availability, reduce environmental pollution as a result of mineral fertilizers over use, control the vegetative

growth and improve the yield potential (Ragab, 1999 and Muhammad *et al.*, 2012).

The bird damage to crops, particularly cereal grains, is a serious problem allover the world. In African countries, bird damage to cereal crops represents economic losses reached to 5 - 10 % of the production (Bruggers and Rulle 1981). In Egypt, some bird species are considered the most important agricultural pest especially in the field crops. Such as house sparrow, Passer domesticus niloticus (L.), hooded crow Corvus corone sardonius (L.) and palm dove, Streptopelia senegalensis egyptica (L.) and other bird species (Bonnah, 2007 and Omar, 2010).

The current study aims to assess the influence of adding different nitrogen fertilizer types on sunflower productivity as well as the damage caused by wild birds. Also, estimated the total economic losses due to them practices.

#### **Materials and Methods**

An experimental field was conducted at the experimental

farm, faculty of agriculture, Al-Azhar University, Assiut, Egypt. Some soil properties were determined according to Page *et al.*, (1982) and they are shown Table (1).

Sunflower seeds (Giza 102 cultivar) were sown on July 5<sup>th</sup> 2011. A seasonal total of 200 kg/fd calcium super phosphate (15.5%  $P_2O_5$ ) and 50 kg/fd potassium sulphate (48% K<sub>2</sub>O) were applied as recommended fertilizer doses. The other recommended cultural practices for growing sunflower plants were followed.

The experiment design was a randomized complete block with three replicates and included seven nitrogen fertilizer treatments:

1) Control (without N fertilization) (C).

2) Treatment was chemical nitrogen fertilizer (ammonium nitrate, 33.5% N) at a rate of 200 kg / fed was added by three doses and 200 kg / fed calcium super phosphate (15.5% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) and 50 kg / fed. potassium sulfate (48% K<sub>2</sub>O) was applied as

\_\_\_\_

recommended fertilizer doses during soil preparation (CN).

3) Effective microorganisms at a rate of 6 L / fed was mixed with irrigation water (EM).

4) Humic acid (HA) (20 % concentration) at a rate of 4 L / fed. + EM (EMH).

5) Sheep manure at a rate of 20  $m^2$  / fed was added during soil predation (SM).

6) SM + EM.

7) SM + EMH. A representative soil sample was collected from each plot (2 x 4.5 m.) to 30 cm depth before cultivation and after harvesting.

The soil sample was air dried and sieved to determine some soil properties according to Jackson (1973). Also, Sheep manure was chemically analyzed (as shown in table 2) according

to Page et al., (1982). At harvest stage, heads were picked from 3 randomly selected plants in each experimental unit and air-dried for 3 days them, seeds were manually extracted. The seeds were subjected to estimate seed weight and seed index. Seed yield (ton fed.) was calculated by using all heads of plants remained in all experimental unit. Oil percentage of seed was determined in the air dried seeds according to the method described by A. O. A. C. (1995) Using soxhelt apparatus and petroleum ether (60-80  $^{\circ}$ C) as solvent. Protein % of seeds was calculated by multiplying N % × 6.25 according to (A. O. A. C., 2000).

Monitoring of bird losses in the field was based on the frequency encounter of loss head sunflower plants until the harvest time. Samples were token at two dates, after doughy and mature stages. Direct count method was used in order to determine the bird loss. Samples of thirty plants were chosen randomly from each plot and loss seeds were recorded. The attacked plants estimated were as a percentage of the total examined plants. The obtained data were subjected to the analysis of variance LSD at 0.05 was used to differentiate the means according Steele and to Torrie (1984).

Table (1): Some son properties	of the studied field.
Parameter	Value
Sand (%)	26.00
Silt (%)	37.40
Clay (%)	36.60
Texture grade	Clay Loam (C L)
PH (1:2.5) Susp.	8.08
EC (dSm <sup>-1</sup> ) (1:2.5)	0.298
Cations (c	mol /kg soil)
Ca <sup>++</sup>	0.84
Mg <sup>++</sup>	0.43
Nat	0.59
Κ <sup>+</sup>	0.28
Anions (ci	mel /kg soil)
CO <sup>-3</sup>	0.00
HCO <sup>-3</sup>	0.56
Cr	0.89
SO <sup>±4</sup>	0.66
Total-N (%)	0.14
O.M (%)	1.56
CaCO <sub>3</sub> %	1.05

## Table (1): Some soil properties of the studied field.

-- ---

Table (2): Chemical analysis of sheep manures

Characteristics	Sheep manure
Total-N %	2.25
Total-P %	1.29
Total-K %	3.56
Organic matter	38.42
PH (1:5) Susp.	8.48
EC dSm <sup>-1</sup> (1:5)	4.164
C/N	9.92

Data Envelopes Analysis modelIt requires measurement mode(DEA):function appropriate for this

purpose and their determinates according to Farrell (1957).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The effect of organic materials and bio-fertilizer on plant behavior is not only a matter of nutrients supply, but also it influences the physical chemical and biological characteristics of soil which in turn influence the plant growth.

# 1- Nitrogen fertilizer and some soil properties:

Soil reaction (pH) shows a little change as a result of addition different nitrogen fertilizer sources Table (3) this might be due to the soil buffering capacity that resists the change of its soil reaction. The values of soil pH show alkaline reaction and they range between 8.22 and 8.40. Soil salinity values differ nitregen among fertilizer treatments and could be arranged in descending order of CN > SM> SM + EMH < C > EMH > SM

+ EM > EM (table 3). The highest value of soil salinity (408 usm) is observed in the soil fertilized by ammonium nitrate which in fact is a real salt. The lowest value of soil salinity (269 usm) is recorded in the soil treated by bio-fertilizer. Soil organic carbon realize obvious change by using different nitrogen fertilizers and could be arranged in descending order of SM + EM > CN > C > EM >EMH > SM > SM + EMH Table (3).

Plus bio-fertilizer compared to the soil treated by sheep manure bio-fertilizer or only, respectively. This might be due to - the existing of organic materials that increase the biological activity and provide the energy and nutrients needs organic materials for decomposition (Abu-zahra and Tahboub, 2008).

Table (3); Synergetic effect of organic fertilizer and EM on pH,

Treatments	pH	EC (uSm <sup>-1</sup> )	OC (%)
Control	8.40	296	1.05
CN	8.32	408	1.06
EM	8.27	269	0.77
EMH	8.24	289	0.69
SM	8.22	323	0.64
SM+EM	8.22	282	1.17
SM+EMH	8.26	323	0.41

EC and OC after harvest of sunflower plant.

The soil organic carbon increases by 83 & 52% when the soil treated by sheep manure.

#### 2- Seed yield and its quality:

6.5

. . .

44

211

:. (<sup>1</sup>)

1.1.2.9

Data in Table (4) indicate the seed yield its components and seed quality are significantly increased as a result of addition different nitrogen fertilizer sources. Seed weight/head or seed yield (kg/fed)are increase by 15.16, 25.56 and 36.10% when soil treated by sheep manure compared to sheep manure plus bio-fertilizer (SM +EM). chemical fertilizer (CN) and sheep manure plus bio-fertilizer plus humic acid (SM + EMH), respectively. Seed weight/head or seed yield (kg/fed) could be arranged in descending order of SM > SM + EM > CN > SM + 6 plot treated by sheep manure + EMH > EMH > EM > C. These effective increase in seed weight/head and humic acid. This may be due to seed yield might be due to that adding SM + EMH act as a store mixing organic fertilizer with house of several macro and

effective microorganisms enhance the metabolic process such as net assimilation rate that increase growth characters and yield components. (Esmaeilian et al., 2012). Seed index (weight of 1000 seeds) significantly increases by using different nitrogen fertilizers. The seed index could be arranged in descending order of SM + EMH > SM + EM > CN > EMH > EM > SM > Control. It is worth to mention that the combination between nitrogen fertilizer given higher value of seed index than individual nitrogen fertilizer. The highest value is recorded in the microorganisms ÷

micronutrients effectively which mineralization (Han et al., 2007). \_ are released during the process of

Treatments	Weight seed\ head (g)	Seed index 1000- seed weight (g)	Seed yield (Kg/fed)	Oil yield (Kg/fed)	Seed protein (%)
Control	68.11	68.42	1029.82	285.35	23.61
CN	104.67	73.18	1582.56	529.40	30.05
EM	83.00	72.57	1254.96	376.33	25.95
ЕМН	90.11	72.94	1362.46	391.17	24.83
SM	131.42	71.93	1987.12	641.67	29.31
SM+EM	114.12	81.21	1725.54	535.21	32.76
SM+EMH	96.56	82.40	1459.94	544.46	33.88
LSD 0.5	14.95	5.56	226.06	89.39	NS

Table (4): Synergetic effect of nitrogen fertilizers and EM on sunflower yield and its quality.

Generally, all fertilizer treatments significantly increase seed oil percentage and oil yield. The maximum values of seed oil content and oil yield (37.27 % & 641.67 kg/fed, respectively) are detected on the plants grown in the soil treated by sheep manure with other compared the fertilization treatments. Seed oil content increases by 11.62, 15.42 & 20.23%. Oil yield increases by 17.85, 19.89 & 21.21% when soil tested with sheep manure compared with SM + EMH, SM + EM and CN, respectively. Seed

oil content or oil yield could be arranged in descending order of SM > SM + EMH > SM + EM > CN > EMH > EM > Control.

~

Protein content in seeds is significantly affected by application of different nitrogen fertilizers. The highest protein content (33.88 %) was recorded on the plants grown in soil treated by SM + EMH fertilizers. Protein content in seed increases by 3.42, 12.75 & 15.59% when soil treated by SM + HEM compared with SM + EM, CN and SM, respectively. This may

be due to the increase in the other major elements, brought about by the good supply and positive effect of nitrogen uptake that encourage the uptake of the available macro nutrients (Nanjundappa et al., 2001). The protein content in seed could be arranged in descending order of SM + EMH > SM + EM > CN >SM > EM > EMH > C. The obtained results are in accordance with those reported by (Akbari et al., 2011 and Esmaeilian et al., 2012).

## 3- Yield loss caused by wild birds:

Data presented in Table (5) show the light of losses due to birds at two ripening stages for sunflower crop (doughy and mature stage) the under conditions of nitrogen fertilizer field treatments. The observations showed that, house sparrow, Passer domesticus niloticus (L.) hooded crow, Corvus corone cornix (L.) and dove. palm Streptopelia senegalensis egyptica (L.) starts to attack sunflower plants from seed formation till the harvest time.

**Dough ripe stage:** 

Data of this stage of grain ripening through growing season, are presented in the same table it was found that, the lowest damage was occurred in descending order of (SM+EM, SM Control and fertilizer treatment). The average of total damage were (4.00, 4.33 & with 4.67%). insignificant difference between them. The fertilizer treatments (CN, EM and EMH) ranked the second order (6.00, 6.00 & 6.67%), with insignificant difference between them. But the highest damage recorded in SM+EMH was fertilizer treatment (13:33%). with highly significant differences between this fertilizer treatment and other treatments.

#### Mature ripe stage:

Data presented in the same table demonstrates the percentage of damage caused by birds, during the mature stage. The lowest calculated damage percentages were revealed with EMH, SM, CN and Control (8.00, 8.67, 8.67 & 8.67%),respectively, with insignificant difference between them. The fertilizer treatment (SM+EMH) ranked his second order (10.00%).with insignificant

,....

difference between the control, CN and SM fertilizer treatments. But. there significant ÌS. difference between EMH fertilizer treatment and other treatments. The highest damage recorded was in SM+EM fertilizer treatment (14.00%),with highly significant differences between this fertilizer treatment and other treatments.

In general, the statistical analysis of data, representing the interaction, revealed that there are significant differences between the doughy and mature stages in yield losses caused by birds; the yield losses being 6.43 & 10.05 %, respectively.

Regarding, impact of nitrogen fertilization on damage caused by birds in sunflower crop. The results revealed that, the lowest damage was recorded in control, SM, CN and EMH fertilizer treatments (6.50, 6.67, 7.33 & 7.33%), respectively. with insignificant difference between them. But, the fertilizer treatments (SM+EM and EM) ranked the second order (9.00 &9.17%). with insignificant difference between them. The highest damage was recorded in (SM+EMH) fertilizer treatment. The mean of total damage was (11.67%), with highly significant differences between this fertilizer treatment and other treatments.

		Growth stag	ges	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Tr	eatments	Doughy stage	Prey-	Mean
			harvest	
(	Control	4.33 fg	8.67 bc	6.50 C
	CN	6.00 ef	8.67 bc	7.33 C
	EM	6.00 ef	12.33 a	9.17 <b>B</b>
	ЕМН	6.67de	8.00 cd	7.33 C
	SM	4.67 fg	8.67 bc	6.67 C
S	M+EM	4.00 g	14.00 a	9.00 B
SN	A+EMH	13.33 a	10.00 b	11.67A
	Mean	6.43 B	10.05 A	8.24 C
LSD	Growth stage		NS	
0.05	Fertilizers	1.21		
	Interaction	1.71		

 Table (5): Different nitrogen fertilizers and sunflower yield losses

 by wild birds.

## Relationship between loss birds and rate of oil and Protein in seeds on sunflower crop:

Data in Table (6) show the relationship between the damage caused by birds and rate of oil and Protein in seeds on sunflower crop. The results revealed that there correlation between the damage caused by birds and the rate of oil and protein in seeds on sunflower plants. This indicated that the increase and decrease of damage caused by birds is related to the rate of oil and protein in sunflower seeds. It has been observed that the lowest yield losses are 6.50 % with rate of oil and protein (27.61 & 23.61%) in soil untreated by any fertilizer (control). While the highest yield of losses are 11.67 % with rate of oil and protein (37.27 & 33.88%) in soil treated by (SM+HEM). Wild bird species cause serious damage to sunflower yield and could be arranged in descending

, **.** 2

92

1. 1

order of SM + EMH > EMH > seeds (that have high oil and EM > SM + EM > CN = EMH > protein content) more than that

SM > Control on sunflower plants. This is may be due to that the birds prefer to feed on mature on doughy stage which provide them by enough energy needed (Abd EL-Gawad *et al.*, 2010).

Table (6): Relationship between loss birds and rate of oil and Protein in seeds on sunflower crop.

Treatments	Seeds oil (%)	Protein in seeds (%)	% of damage birds
Control	27.61	23.61	6.50
CN	33.39	30.05	7.33
ЕМ	29.99	25.95	9.17
ЕМН	28.71	24.83	7.33
SM	32.29	29.31	6.67
SM+EM	31.00	32.76	9.00
SM+EMH	37.27	33.88	11.67

4- Economic Analysis of the technical efficiency of the fertilizer treatments and economic losses:

Data in Table (6) show the efficiency ratios of different fertilizer treatments by using analysis Envelopment models. The data indicate that treated the soil by CN, EM and SM+EM achieves technical efficiency ratio of 100%. The estimated rate of efficiency one true each is considered as showed and check chemical fertilizer treatment (CN). Production rise and less cost (its one of the conditions of economic efficiency), and check treatment fertilizer (SM) the highest production and costs higher, while check fertilizer treatment (SM+EM) had given production is higher than derived from treatment (CN). Most of the profit and the cost of inferior treatment (SM), as the two treatments (Control and EM) technically, with input an estimated technical efficiency for each including about (65 and 79%), respectively. On the other hand the treatments (SM and

SM+EM) more workers in terms of economic loss by wild birds, especially in the process of maturation, which highlights the importance of focusing on transactions (SM and SM+EM) and a private treatment (SM+EM) and the need to recommend the level of the Republic and try to overcome or reduce the attacking birds, especially in the process of maturity.

Table (7): Indicators of economic efficiency of treatmentsfertilizer on sunflower crop.

	Total	Devenue	Th	e loss	*Technical
Treatments	costs	(LE)	Seed	Money	efficiency
	( LE)		(g)	( LE)	(%)
Control	0	3089.46	309.33	927.99	0.65
CN	1096	4747.68	310.00	930.00	1.00
EM	200	3764.88	281.00	843.00	0.79
EMH	240	4087.38	248.33	744.99	0.86
SM	315	5961.36	376.66	1129.98	1.00
SM+EM	515	5176.62	311.00	933.00	1.00
SM+EMH	355	4379.82	211.66	634.98	0.96

Calculated data in tables (4) and (5) Table using model Data Envelopes Analysis model (DEA).

#### **CONCLUSION:**

Finally, under the current experimental conciliation. it could be concluded that the work within hand granted an evidence to the effective role of adding organic fertilizers in combination with bio-fertilizers on vegetation growth, seed yield and its quality of sunflower plants. That is true, since these treatments are overcoming the problem of the little amount of organic matter

content that play an important role in enhancement the physical and chemical soil properties.

#### REFERENCES

Abd El-Gawad, K. H.;
Metwally, A. M.; Mhmoud,
N.A. and Omar, M.M.A.
(2010) Effect of broad bean sowing distances on damage caused by house sparrow,
Passer domesticus niloticus
(L.). Assiut J. of Agric. Sci,
41 (Special Issue) the 4<sup>th</sup>

state of young	bio,organic and mineral
scientists Fac.Of Agric.	fertilization on productivity
Ássiut Univ. April, 27: 216-	of sunflower seed and oil
221. – <sup>193</sup>	yields. J. Agric. Res.
eacting as a second Abu-Zahra, T. R. and Tahboub,	Kafrelsheikh Univ., 35 (4):
A.B.(2008) Effect of Organic	1013-1028.
Matter Sources on Chemical B	onnah, A. A. M. M. (2007) the
ment is and all Properties of the Soil and	damage by and control of
Yield of Strawberry under	hooded crow on some
Organic Farming Conditions,	plantation in Sohag
World Applied Sciences	governorate. Ph.D. Thesis,
Journal 5 (3): 383-388.	faculty of Agriculture, Assiut
Akbari,P.;Ghalavand,A.;	University, Egypt. 140.
Modarres Sanavy, A. M. Bi	uggers,R.L.and Rulle, P.
and Agha Alikhani,M.	(1981) Economic impact of
(2011) the effect of	pest birds on repining cereal
biofertilizers, nitrogen	in Senegal. Prot. Ecol. 3: 7-
	1.5
fertilizer and farmyard	16.
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es	16. maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower	16. maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of	<ul> <li>16.</li> <li>maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology	<ul> <li>16.</li> <li>maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184.	<ul> <li>16.</li> <li>maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association	<ul> <li>16.</li> <li>maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural	<ul> <li>16.</li> <li>maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of	<ul> <li>naeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> <li>International J. of Applied</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15 <sup>th</sup> ed.,	<ul> <li>naeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> <li>International J. of Applied</li> <li>Science and Technology Vol.</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15 <sup>th</sup> ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A.	<ul> <li>naeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> <li>International J. of Applied</li> <li>Science and Technology Vol.</li> <li>2 (3): 214-220.</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15 <sup>th</sup> ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A. A. O. A. C. (2000) Association of Failed	<ul> <li>naeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> <li>International J. of Applied</li> <li>Science and Technology Vol.</li> <li>2 (3): 214-220.</li> <li>rrell, M. J. (1957) "The</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15 <sup>th</sup> ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A. A. O. A. C.(2000) Association of Fat	<ul> <li>naeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> <li>International J. of Applied</li> <li>Science and Technology Vol.</li> <li>2 (3): 214-220.</li> <li>rrell, M. J. (1957) "The</li> <li>measurement of productive</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15 <sup>th</sup> ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A. A. O. A. C. (2000) Association of Fat official agricultural chemists, official and tentative	<ul> <li>naeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> <li>International J. of Applied</li> <li>Science and Technology Vol.</li> <li>2 (3): 214-220.</li> <li>rrell, M. J. (1957) "The</li> <li>measurement of productive</li> <li>efficiency" J. of the royal</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15 <sup>th</sup> ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A. A. O. A. C.(2000) Association of Fai official agricultural chemists, official and tentative methods of analysis, 11 <sup>th</sup> ed.	<ul> <li>16.</li> <li>maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> <li>International J. of Applied</li> <li>Science and Technology Vol.</li> <li>2 (3): 214-220.</li> <li>rrell, M. J. (1957) "The</li> <li>measurement of productive</li> <li>efficiency" J. of the royal</li> <li>statistical society serried A</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15 <sup>th</sup> ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A. A. O. A. C.(2000) Association of Far official agricultural chemists, official and tentative methods of analysis, 11 <sup>th</sup> ed. Washington, D.C., U.S.A.	<ul> <li>16.</li> <li>maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso n of Sole and Combined Nutrient Application on Yield and Biochemical Composition of Sunflower under Water Stress. International J. of Applied Science and Technology Vol. 2 (3): 214-220.</li> <li>rrell, M. J. (1957) "The measurement of productive efficiency" J. of the royal statistical society serried A 120: 253-281.</li> </ul>
fertilizer and farmyard manure on grain yield and Es seed quality of sunflower ( <i>Helianthus annus</i> L.). J. of Agricultural Technology Vol. 7(1): 173-184. A. O. A. C. (1995) Association of official agricultural chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15 <sup>th</sup> ed., Washington, D.C., U.S.A. A. O. A. C. (2000) Association of Fat official agricultural chemists, official and tentative methods of analysis, 11 <sup>th</sup> ed. Washington, D.C., U.S.A. Aowad, M. M. and Mohamed, Jac	<ul> <li>16.</li> <li>maeilian, Y.; Ali R. S. and</li> <li>EbrahimA.(2012)Compariso</li> <li>n of Sole and Combined</li> <li>Nutrient Application on</li> <li>Yield and Biochemical</li> <li>Composition of Sunflower</li> <li>under Water Stress.</li> <li>International J. of Applied</li> <li>Science and Technology Vol.</li> <li>2 (3): 214-220.</li> <li>rrell, M. J. (1957) "The</li> <li>measurement of productive</li> <li>efficiency" J. of the royal</li> <li>statistical society serried A</li> <li>120: 253-281.</li> <li>kson, M. L. (1973)Soil</li> </ul>

- Hall, Inc. Englewood Cliffs, N. J. New Delhi, India.
- Han, X-M.; Wang, R-q.; Liu, J.; Wang, M-C.; Zhou, J. and Guo, W-h. (2007) Effects of vegetation type on soil microbial community structure and catabolic diversity assessed by polyphasic methods in North China. J. of Environmental Sci., 19: 1228–12 34.
- Meenakumari, T. and Shekhar, M. (2012) Biotechnological Solid Waste Management by Vermicomposting. World Research J. of Agric., Biotechnology, ISSN: 2278-9847 & E-ISSN: 2278-9855, Vol. 1 (1): 1-3.
- Muhammad, Y.; Kaleem A.; Amjed A. and Syed, W. H. S.(2012) Role of biofertilizers in flax for ecofriendly agriculture. Sci., Int. (Lahore), 24(1): 95-99.
- Nanjundappa, G.; Shivaraj, B.; Janarjuna, S. and Sridhara, S. (2001) Effect of organic and inorganic sources of nutrients applied alone or in combination on

growth and yield of sunflower (*Helianthus* annuus L.). Helia, 24 (34): 115-120.

- Omar, M. M. A. (2010) Studies on some wild birds in Assiut with special reference to harmful birds and its control. Ph.D. Thesis., Faculty of Agric., Al-Azhar Univ., Egypt.
- Page, A. L.; R. H. Miller and Keeney, D. R. (1982)
  Methods of soil analysis. Part
  2: Chemical and microbiological properties.
  2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Amer. Soc. Agron. Inc. Soil Sci. Soc. Of Am., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Saleh, S. A.; Abd-El-Gwad, N.
  M. and Omran, A. A. M.
  (2004) Response of some sunflower cultivars to some Bio-Nitrogen Fertilization under hill spaces. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 29 (12): 6775-6786.
- Steel, R. G. D. and Torrie, J. H.
  (1984) Principles and practices of statistics, 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed.,
  pp: 107-9. McGraw Hill Co. Inc. New York.
- 96

Assiut J. Agric. Sci (2012) 43:(6)(82-98) الكفاءة الإنتاجية لبعض الأسمدة النيتروجينية وتأثيرها على الخسارة المسيبة بواسطة الطيور البرية فى محصول دوار الشمس محمد أحمد يوسف<sup>1</sup>، محمود مبارك عبدالعال عمر<sup>2</sup>، حرب أحمد السيد البرديسي<sup>3</sup> أقسم علوم الأراضي والمياه – كلية الزراعة – جامعة الأزهر فرع أسيوط.<sup>2</sup> قسم الحيوان الزراعي والنيماتودا - كلية الزراعة – جامعة الأزهر فرع أسيوط. <sup>2</sup> قسم الحيوان الزراعي والنيماتودا - كلية الزراعة – جامعة الأزهر فرع أسيوط.

الملخص العربي:

أجريت هذه الدراسة في المزرعة التجريبية لكلية الزراعة - جامعة الأز هر - أسيوط – مصر، لدراسة تأثير بعض معاملات التسميد كمصدر للنيتر وجنن { دون تسميد (Control)، تسميد كيميائي (CN)، تسميد حيوي (EM)، حمض الهيوميك+ سماد ديوى (EMH)، سماد أغذام (SM)، سماد أغذام + سماد حيوى (SM+EM) و سماد الأغنام+(EiviH} اعلى محصول دوار الشمس وعلاقتها بالخسارة الناتجة عن مهاجمة الطيور البرية لمحصول دوار الشمس. وقد أظهرت النتائج أن التربة التي أضيف إليها سماد الأغنام + حامض "عيوميك + المركب الحيوي قد زادت صفات النبات زيادة معنوية ( دليل الحصاد ، محتوى الزيت والبروتين بالبذور ) وكانت أعلى قيمة لوزن البذور لكل نبات ومحصول الحيوب والزنيت للفدان 131.42 · 1987.12 · 641.67 كجم على الترتييز وقد هاجمت الطيور البرية نباتات دوار الشمس في المورد العريني ومرحلة النضج التام حتى الحصياد مسببة ضرر جسيم لرؤوس النباتات. وقد سبيت الطيور البرية نقص في محصول دوار الشمس بحوالي 6.5 ، 6.67 ، 7.33 في معاملة الكنترول ، وسماد الأضام ومعاملة التسميد الكيماوي = معاملة حامض الميز مذك + السماد الحيوي على الترتيب. وكانت أعلى خسارة في محصول دوار الشمس في معاطة سماد الأغذام + حامض الهيوميك + السماد الحيوي و هي ( 11.97%). عند تقدير الكفاءة الإنتاجية للمعاملات السمادية وعلاقتها بالخسارة للمسببة بواسطة الطيور البرية ، وجد أن هناك ثلاث معاملات حققت نسبة كفاءة 100% من بين المعاملات وهي المعاملات [ بدون تسميد (كنترول ) ، سماد الأغنام (SM) ، سماد أغنام + سماد حيوى(SM+EM)] وعند حساب التكاليف الاقتصادية وجد أن المعاملات السمادية ( بدون تسميد (كنترول ) ، التسميد الكيمياني (CN)] أعطت أقل إنتاج

بأقل تكاليف (احد شروط الكفاءة الاقتصادية)، وتحقق المعاملة السمادية سماد أغنام (SM) أعلى إنتاج بتكاليف أعلى، بينما تحقق المعاملة السمادية [سماد أغنام + سماد حيوى(SM+EM) [ إنتاج أعلى من المتحقق من معاملة التسميد الكيميائي (CN) معظم للربح وتكاليف أدنى من المعاملة سماد أغنام (SM) ، كما أن المعاملتين ( الكنتر ول و التسميد الحيوي(EM) غير كفؤتين تقنياً حيث تقدر الكفاءة التقنية لكل منها بنحو ( 65% و 79% ) على التوالي، وعلى الجانب الأخر تعتبر المعاملات سماد أغذام (SM) و السماد الحيوى (SM+EM) أكثر المعاملات من حيث الخسارة الاقتصادية في محصول دوار الشمس من جانب الطيور البرية ، وخاصبة في طور النضج ، الأمر الذي يبرز أهمية العناية بالمعالمتين وخاصبة معاملة السماد الحيوى (SM+EM) وضرورة التوصية بها على مستوى الجمهورية ومحاولة التغلب على أو الحد من مهاجمة الطيور لها وخاصبة في طور النضج الكامل لمحصول دوار الشمس وتوصى الدراسة بالأخذ بالمعاملة السمادية (SM+EM) المحتوية على سماد الأغذام بجانب الـ EM ،حيث تحقق متطلبات الكفاءة الإنتاجية بإنتاج أعلى وتكاليف أقل، وتعميم تلك التوصية على مزارعي دوار الشمس على مستوى الجمهورية ، كما توصبي بضرورة التجميع الزراعي . لمحصول دوار الشمس للتغلب على مهاجمة الطيور البرية للمحصول والعناية به وخاصبة في طور النضج كما توصبي الدراسة بسرعة حصاد محصول دوار الشمس فور نضجه حتى لايتعرض لمهاجمة الطيور البرية يصورة أكبر وبقل المحصول وبالتالي تقل إنتاجية الفدان