RESPONSE OF SWEET PEPPER PLANTS (VEGETATIVE GROWTH AND LEAF CHEMICAL CONSTITUENTS) TO ORGANIC, BIOFERTILIZERS AND SOME FOLIAR APPLICATION TREATMENTS.

Dawa, K. K. ; H. M. E. Abd El - Nabi and W. M. E. Swelam Veget. and Flori. Dept. Fac. Agric., Mans. Univ., Egypt.

ABSTRACT

This investigation was conducted in the two successive summer seasons of 2010 and 2011 on sweet pepper plants "Madir" hybride at a private farm at Sahragt El-Soghra near Mansoura, Dakahlia Governorate, Egypt to study the effect of two sources of organic fertilizers (chicken manure and compost), biofertilizers (a mixture of *Azotobacter chroococcum* and *Bacillus circulans* bacteria and Mycorrhiza fungi), some foliar application treatments (seaweed extract, yeast extract and humic acid) and their interaction on vegetative characteristics and chemical constituents of leaves. Results indicated that the highest values of vegetative parameters, i.e., plant height, number of leaves, number of branches, leaf area, fresh and dry weights as well as chemical constituents of leaves, i.e., chlorophylls (Chl. a, Chl. b and total Chl. a+b), N, P and K percentages were recorded when plants supplied with chicken manure at 2.43 ton/fed. as compared with compost in the two seasons. Plants in the presence of biofertilizers recorded better growth performance and higher values of chemical composition in leaves than untreated plants in the two seasons.

Comparing the effect of foliar applications, seaweed extract at 2.5 ml/L or yeast extract at 5 g/L recorded the highest significant values of most formentioned parameters compared with the control in both seasons. in addition, spraying humic acid at 1.5 ml/L came in the second order and significantly increased number of branches, fresh and dry weights in both seasons and leaf area in the second season as compared with the check treatment.

The best results of both vegetative parameters and chemical constituents were recorded when plants fertilized with chicken manure at 2.43 ton/fed. and sprayed with either seaweed extract at 2.5 ml/L or yeast extract at 5 g/L in the presence of biofertilizers in both seasons. Therefore, this treatment could be recommended for improving sweet pepper performance under similar conditions of this study.

Keywords: Sweet pepper, chicken manure, compost, biofertilizers, foliar application, seaweed extract, yeast extract, humic acid, vegetative growth, chemical composition.

INTRODUCTION

Capsicum (*Capsicum annuum* L.) commonly known as sweet pepper belongs to family Solanaceae and it is a high value crop and its fruits are highly nutritious, rich in vitamins particularly pro-vitamin A, vitamin B, vitamin C and minerals such as Ca, P, K and Fe. The fruits are non-pungent and have widely used in immature or green stage as vegetable for stuffing or for salads. With the increase in population, the demand for the crop has been increasing day by day and the traditional varieties due to their inherent low yield potential would not be fulfilling the demand.

At the present time, a great attention has been given to organic and bio-fertilization as a management tool for increasing the quality of vegetable ;

Dawa, K. K. et al.

crops. Egyptian soils are low in organic matter about 2% (Balba, 1976). Organic manure such as chicken manure and compost contribute to plant growth through its effect on physical, chemical and biological properties of the soil. In addition, organic fertilizers provide soil with essential nutrients such as N, P, S and some micro nutrients after its mineralization under soil conditions (Meshref *et al.*, 1995 and El-Nagar, 1996). Regarding the effect of chicken manure on sweet pepper growth, Alabi (2006) and Odebode and Fajinmi (2009) indicated that plant height, number of leaves, number of branches, leaf area, fresh and dry weights significantly enhanced in response to application of chicken manure fertilization. Also, Abd El-Aty (1997) and Alabi (2006) reported that chlorophylls as well as N, P and K% increased in sweet pepper leaves when plants supplied with chicken manure.

In addition, there is a great debate among scientists about the role played by microorganisms in promoting plant growth, while some other investigators directed their contribution to N-fixing, P or K solubilization and cellulose decomposition. Others went to production of plant growth modifying substances by such biofertilizers. Many investigators reported that Biofertilizer affected plant growth and chemical composition of leaves (Supanjani *et al.*, 2006; Kaya *et al.*, 2009 and Khan *et al.*, 2012) of pepper plants.

Engaging in vegetable production the chemicals of regulatory effect on plant growth and development (biostimulators) are one of means for obtaining the increase in plant performance. However, plant biostimulation has recently become an increasingly more common treatment in modern agricultural production, among such substances are seaweed extract, yeast extract and humic acid. The application of seaweed extract for different crops was a great importance due to containing high levels of organic matter, macro and micro elements, vitamins and fatty acids and also rich in growth regulators such as auxins, cytokinins and gibberellins (Crouch and Van Staden, 1994).However, application of seaweed extract increased vegetative growth (El-Aidy *et al.*, 2002 on sweet pepper and Nour *et al.*, 2010 on tomato), El-Aidy *et al.* (2002) on sweet pepper observed increases in leaves chemical compositions.

The positive effects of dry yeast application may be due to that it is considered as a natural source of cytokinins that stimulates cell division and enlargement as well as the synthesis of protein, nucleic acid and chlorophyll (Fathy and Farid, 1996). It also contains sugar, proteins, amino acids and vitamins (Shady, 1978). Many investigators reported that spraying yeast extract significantly enhanced vegetative growth performance (EI-Tohamy *et al.*, 2008 on eggplant; Ghoname *et al.*, 2010 on sweet pepper) and chemical composition of leaves (Shokr and Abd EI-Hamid, 2009 on pea plants).

Humic acid as a foliar treatment enhanced plant growth (Ertan, 2007 on tomato and Azarpour *et al.*, 2012 on eggplant) and increases chemical composition of leaves (Hanafy *et al.*, 2010 on snap bean and Unlu *et al.*, 2011 on cucumber) through increasing nutrient uptake such as N, Ca, P, K, Mg, Fe, Zn and Cu, serving as a source of mineral plant nutrient and regulator of their release which decrease pollution and costs (Atiyeh *et al.*, 2002; Neri *et al.*, 2002 and El- Desouki, 2004). Also, enhancement of photosynthesis, chlorophyll density and plant root respiration has resulted in greater plant growth with humate application (Chen and Aviad 1990).

Therefore, this work aimed to evaluate the effect of organic manure, biofertilizers and foliar applications on sweet pepper performance (vegetative growth and chemical constituents of leaves).

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were conducted in the two successive summer seasons of 2010 and 2011 on sweet pepper plants "Madir" hybride at a private farm at Sahragt El-Soghra near Mansoura, Dakahlia Governorate, Egypt to study the effect of two sources of organic fertilizers, biofertilizers, some foliar application treatments and their interaction on vegetative characteristics and chemical constituents of leaves.

The physical and chemical properties of the experimental soil are reviewed in Table 1. The experimental layout was split split plot system in a randomized complete block design with three replicates. Organic manure sources were presented in the main plots, which were subdivided to two sub plots presented biofertilizers treatments. The biostimulators were randomly assigned in the sub sub plots. The experimental unit area was 11.25 m^2 and it contained three ridges, 5 m long and 0.75 m wide. Forty five days old seedlings were transplanted into the open field at the beginning of June in the two seasons. The seedlings were transplanted on one side of ridge at 50 cm apart. The experiment included 16 treatments.

 Table 1: Physical and chemical properties of experimental soil in 2010 and 2011 seasons:

Seasons	0.M (%)	Clay (%)	Silt (%)	Sand (%)	Texture class	E.C (dSm- ¹)	pН	AV N	ailable P	(%) K
1 st	1.45	40.5	33.65	25.95	Clay loam	1.12	8.11	0.2	11.72	5.33
2 nd	1.45	40.3	33.45	26.25	Clay loam	1.130	8.10	0.2	11.70	5.33

In this investigation, plants were supplied with chicken manure at 2.43 ton/fed. which compared with rice straw compost application at 3.1 and 3.4 ton/fed. in the first and second seasons respectively (containing the same units of nitrogen in chicken manure). The chemical analysis of chicken manure and compost is presented in Table 2. Biofertilizers treatment involved a mixture of beneficial microorganisms including *Azotobacter chroococcum* bacteria which fixes nitrogen by a free manner; *Bacillus circulans* bacteria which make potassium more available and Mycorrhiza fungi which increases phosphorus and many nutrients absorption. All inoculans were provided by Biofertilizer Unit, Fac. Agric., Ain Shams University. Biofertilizer solution was added to the wet soil twice to the root absorption zone of each plant at the recommended rate (5 ml/plant), the first one was after a week from transplanting. The second one was added three weeks later.

Four foliar applications including the check treatment (tap water spray only), seaweed extract (commercial name of Goemar BM 86). It contains total nitrogen 5.2%, Magnesium 6.2%, Boron 2.67%, Sulfur 12.3%

Dawa, K. K. et al.

and molybdenum 0.25% and sprayed at 2.5 ml/L. Also, yeast extract was applied at 5 g/L. preparation of yeast solution was done according to El-Ghamriny *et al.* (1999). Humic acid (commercial name of Canada Humex) was sprayed at 1.5 ml/L. Plants were sprayed three times with the different assigned treatments starting after 30 days from transplanting and repeated after 15 days from the last one.

Sagara		Mac	011 (1/)				
36450115	Organic manute	N	Р	ĸ]		
4 St	Chicken manure	2.01	0.42	1.17	55.12		
	Compost	1.57	0.41	0.62	36.24		
2110	Chicken manure	2.14	0.49	1.20	56.32		
2	Compost	1.52	0.37	0.60	35.11		

Table 2: C	hemical analysis:	of chicken	manure a	and compost	during the
t	wo seasons:				

During the growing seasons, all agricultural practices were performed according to the Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation recommendations.

Data recorded

Growth parameters:

One sample of nine plants were taken from each plot after 70 days from transplanting in both seasons of the investigation for measuring growth characters of sweet pepper plants, i.e., plant height, number of leaves/plant, number of branches/plant, leaf area /plant according to Koller (1972), fresh and dry weights (leaves and branches).

Chemical constituents of leaves:

Chlorophyll a, b and total chlorophyll were colorimetrically determined in the leaves of sweet pepper plants at 70 days after transplanting during both seasons according to the methods described by Wettstein (1957) and calculated as mg/g fresh weight. In addition, nitrogen was determined in the dry matter of sweet pepper leaves according to piper (1947). Phosphorus was determined colorimtrically according to the method of Sandell (1950) and calculated as mg/g dry weight. Potassium was determined by the method described by Horneck and Hanson (1998).

Statistical analysis:

The obtained data were subjected to statistical analysis of variance according to Snedecor and Cochran (1967). The treatment means were compared using the LSD test as described by Gomez and Gomez (1984).

RESULTS AND DISSCUSSION

Growth parameters

Effect of organic manure sources:

Data presented in Table 3 showed growth performance of sweet pepper plants as influenced by different organic manure sources (chicken manure and compost) in the two growing seasons. Results showed that growth attributes like plant height, number of leaves and branches, fresh and dry weights and leaf area differed due to different sources of organic manure. The applications of chicken manure at 2.43 ton/fed. gave the highest significant values of all formentioned parameters compared to compost.

Table	3:	Effect	of	organic	manure	sources,	biofertilizers	and	foliar
		applica	tior	ns on veg	jetative g	rowth par	ameters of sw	/eet p	epper
		plants	duri	ing 2010	and 2011	seasons.			

hei	ght	No.	. of ves	No. bran	. of ches	⊢re weigh	esn t/plant	weigh	ry t/plant	Le area/	af plant
<u>(c</u>	<u>m)</u>					(g	m)	<u>(g</u>	<u>m)</u>	<u>(n</u>	<u>1^)</u>
2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
es:				_	_						
67.59	66.87	239.5	231.0	9.9	9.9	850.19	840.13	171.28	167.80	2.27	2.07
50.67	59.21	200.9	193.2	7.0	7.0	698.64	683.41	134.63	131.60	2.12	1.91
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
+AM	F):										
56.25	65.37	235.1	226.4	9.3	9.3	825.56	810.37	166.07	162.17	2.50	2.32
62.01	60.70	205.3	197.7	7.5	7.5	723.27	713.17	139.83	137.23	1.89	1.66
*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	•	*
6.05	65.38	234.1	224.6	9.3	9.3	819.66	808.57	163.65	160.35	2.37	2.23
54.88	63.59	224.3	217.2	8.5	8.5	795.85	786.16	156.30	154.12	2.27	2.02
53.60	61. 9 9	216.1	208.0	8.2	8.2	761.80	742.96	151.90	147.88	2.16	1.89
52.00	60.83	206.3	198.5	76	7.6	720.35	709.38	139.98	136.46	1.98	1.82
2.57	2.41	14.7	13.2	0.5	0.5	31.70	31.38	9.56	7.45	0.07	0.18
	hei (c 2010 es: 57.59 50.67 * +AM 56.25 52.01 * 56.05 54.88 53.60 52.00 2.57	height (cm) 2010 2011 es: 7.5966.87 50.67 59.21 * * +AMF): 56.2565.37 52.0160.70 * * 56.0565.38 54.8863.59 53.6061.99 52.0060.83 2.57 2.41	height (cm) lea 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 es: 2010 2011 37.59 66.87239.5 5 30.67 59.21 200.9 * * * * * * * * * * * 50.67 59.21 200.9 * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * <td>height (cm) leaves 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 50.67 59.21 200.9 193.2 * * * * * 4 * * * * 56.2565.37 235.1 226.4 3 50.0565.38 234.1 224.6 5 56.0565.38 234.1 224.6 5 53.6061.99 216.1 208.0 3 52.0060.83 206.3 198.5 3 52.0060.83 206.3 198.5 3 2</td> <td>height (cm) leaves bran 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 5231.0 9.9 30.67 59.21 200.9 193.2 7.0 * <t< td=""><td>height (cm) leaves branches 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010</td><td>height (cm) leaves leaves branches branches weigh (g 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010</td><td>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td><td>height (cm) leaves branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm)<!--</td--><td>height (cm) leaves branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2011 2010 2011 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011</td></td></t<><td>height (cm) leaves leaves branches branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) area/ (gm) 2010 2011 2010 2.27 30.6759.21200.9193.2 7.0 7.0 698.64 683.41 134.63131.60 2.12 2.50 32.01 67.70205.3197.7 7.5 7.5 723.27 713.17 139.83 137.23 1.89</td></td>	height (cm) leaves 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 50.67 59.21 200.9 193.2 * * * * * 4 * * * * 56.2565.37 235.1 226.4 3 50.0565.38 234.1 224.6 5 56.0565.38 234.1 224.6 5 53.6061.99 216.1 208.0 3 52.0060.83 206.3 198.5 3 52.0060.83 206.3 198.5 3 2	height (cm) leaves bran 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 5231.0 9.9 30.67 59.21 200.9 193.2 7.0 * <t< td=""><td>height (cm) leaves branches 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010</td><td>height (cm) leaves leaves branches branches weigh (g 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010</td><td>$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$</td><td>height (cm) leaves branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm)<!--</td--><td>height (cm) leaves branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2011 2010 2011 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011</td></td></t<> <td>height (cm) leaves leaves branches branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) area/ (gm) 2010 2011 2010 2.27 30.6759.21200.9193.2 7.0 7.0 698.64 683.41 134.63131.60 2.12 2.50 32.01 67.70205.3197.7 7.5 7.5 723.27 713.17 139.83 137.23 1.89</td>	height (cm) leaves branches 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010	height (cm) leaves leaves branches branches weigh (g 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2010 2011 2010	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	height (cm) leaves branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) </td <td>height (cm) leaves branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2011 2010 2011 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011</td>	height (cm) leaves branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2011 2010 2011 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2010 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011 2011	height (cm) leaves leaves branches branches weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) weight/plant (gm) area/ (gm) 2010 2011 2010 2.27 30.6759.21200.9193.2 7.0 7.0 698.64 683.41 134.63131.60 2.12 2.50 32.01 67.70205.3197.7 7.5 7.5 723.27 713.17 139.83 137.23 1.89

Az: Azotobacter chroococcum, Bac: Bacillus circulans and AMF: Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi.

The variation in results between the two sources of organic manure may be due to the differences in the management of soil fertility under organic practices that affect soil dynamics and plant metabolism, which result in differences in plant composition and nutrient quality (Worthington, 2001). The increment in plant growth due to chicken manure application might be attributed to the favorable effect on soil texture, water holding capacity and it creates good aeration in soils. In addition to the slow release of the nutrients resulted from it by the biodegrading soil microorganisms creates better conditions of nutrient uptake to root growth and proliferation there by, creating more absorptive surface for nutrient uptake and reflect better to photosynthetic activity which in turn resulted in higher vegetative growth. Also, Shashidhara (2000) and Bidari (2000) reported that improved nutrient uptake especially nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium in the organics (Table 2) applied treatments may be responsible for the improved vegetative growth. These results are in conformity with the findings of Alabi (2006) and Odebode and Fajinmi (2009) who reported that different growth parameters of sweet pepper plants were increased in response to the addition of chicken manure. Effect of biofertilizers:

With respect to the effect of biofertilizers on sweet pepper growth performance, data reviewed in Table 3 clarified that plants in the presence of biofertilizers (*Azotobacter chroococcum*, *Basillus circulans* and Mycorrhiza fungi) achieved the best records of plant height, number of leaves and *branches*, fresh and dry weights and leaf area in the two successive seasons' as compared with those in the absence of biofertilizers.

1

Dawa,
7
X
et
al.

			Plant	height	No	. of	No	. of	Fresh we	ight/plant	Dry weig	ght/plant	Leaf area/plan		
	Treat	tments	(C	(cm)		leaves		ches	(g	m)	(gm)		(m²)		
			2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	
	.+Ba IF)	Seaweed extract	71.50	71.10	275.6	267.3	12.0	12.0	952.43	938.20	196.40	192.20	3.06	3.20	
er	AZ AV	Yeast	70.83	70.20	245.0	232.3	10.3	10.3	914.33	906.00	179.33	176.16	2.91	2.66	
G G	tti	Humic acid	68.83	67.90	240.0	230.6	10.3	10.3	870.66	857.76	176.00	172.93	2.68	2.33	
Ë	N	Control	68.16	67.86	239.0	229.3	10.0	10.0	832.76	821.76	168.43	163.63	2.32	2.10	
Chicken	Seaweed extract	67.93	67.13	231.0	223.0	9.6	9.6	819.46	811.33	165.20	162.76	1.88	1.83		
	tho	Yeast extract	65.50	64.53	230.6	226.6	9.3	9.3	812.00	803.43	164.03	159.66	1.80	1.58	
	ž	Humic acid	64.16	62.36	228.6	223.6	9.0	9.0	804.00	799.66	161.36	159.20	1.75	1.45	
		Control	63.83	63.86	226.3	215.0	8.6	8.6	795.86	782.9	159.50	155.86	1.74	1.43	
	.+Ba IF)	Seaweed extract	63.70	63.36	224.6	221.6	8.6	8.6	793.33	783.2	158.16	154.70	2.39	2.08	
	A Az	Yeast extract	62.93	61.90	222.6	217.3	8.3	8.3	779.66	770.33	157.90	153.46	2.28	2.06	
7	, ¥	Humic acid	62.16	60.70	219.0	210.0	7.6	7.6	733.90	688.20	148.50	143.83	2.09	1.99	
<u>S</u> i	3	Control	61.93	59.96	215.0	212.0	7.3	7.3	727.43	717.53	143.90	140.46	2.25	2.16	
	out	Seaweed extract	61.06	59.93	205.3	195.6	7.0	7.0	713.43	701.56	134.83	131.73	2.14	1.79	
	the	Yeast extract	60.26	59.20	199.0	192.6	6.3	6.3	677.43	664.90	123.93	127.20	2.11	1.78	
	ž	Humic acid	59.26	57.00	177.0	167.6	6.0	6.0	638.63	626.23	121.73	115.56	2.10	1.80	
		Control	45.06	51.63	145.0	138.0	4.6	4.6	525.33	515.33	88.10	85.9	1.62	1.61	
	Len	-4 E0/	E 4 4	4 00	20.4	20 E	4 4	4 4	00.44	00 77	40.40	44.04	0.45	0.07	

.

t

 LSD at 5%
 5.14
 4.82
 29.4
 26.5
 1.1
 1.1
 63.41
 62.77
 19.13
 14.91
 0.15
 0.37

 Az: Azotobacter chroococcum, Bac: Bacillus circulans and AMF: Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi.

۰ ÷ ,

J. Plant Production, Mansoura Univ., Vol. 3 (9), September, 2012

The significant effect of biofertilizers may be due to the effect of different strain groups such as nitrogen fixers (*Azotobacter chroococcum*), phosphate solubilizing microorganisms (Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi) and potassium solubilizing bacteria (*Bacillus circulans*) which help in availability of minerals and their forms in the composted materials and increased levels of extractable N, P, K, Fe, Zn and Mn (El-Karamany *et al.*, 2000). Also, Rajaee *et al.* (2007) reported that free-living microorganisms enhance root development, increase water and mineral uptake and produce plant hormones that might be responsible for growth of pepper plants. These results are in agreement with those of Supanjani *et al.* (2006); Kaya *et al.* (2009) and Khan *et al.* (2012) on pepper plants.

Effect of foliar application treatments:

Comparing the effect of foliar application treatments (seaweed extract, yeast extract and humic acid), it was found that all growth parameters including plant height, number of leaves and branches, fresh and dry weights and leaf area were increased in the two growing seasons compared to the check treatment (sprayed with tap water) (Table 3). Data clearly showed that the highest significant values of the formentioned parameters were recorded by spraying plants with seaweed extract (2.5 ml/L) followed by spraying yeast extract (5g/L) (without significant differences between the two treatments except for number of branches and leaf area). Foliar application with humic acid came in the third order, while the control treatment (sprayed with tap water) recorded the lowest values of the mentioned vegetative parameters in both seasons.

Regarding the growth enhancing potential of seaweed extract might be attributed to the presence of macro and micronutrients, i.e., N, Mg, B, S and Mo as mentioned previously. Also, the presence of some growth promoting substances present in the seaweed extracts (Blunden, 1991). Exogenous application of seaweed extract has already shown to enhance plant growth by El-Aidy *et al.* (2002) on sweet pepper and Nour *et al.* (2010) on tomato.

Also, the beneficial effect of yeast extract might be due to that it is considered as a natural source of cytokinins which stimulate cell division and enlargement as well as the synthesis of protein, nucleic acid and chlorophyll (Fathy and Farid, 1996). In addition, yeast is a natural source of many growth substances and it contains protective agent, i.e., sugars, proteins, amino acids, several vitamins as well as most of nutritional elements (Na, Ca, Fe, Mg, K, P, S, Zn and Si) and organic compounds (Nagodawithana, 1991). Effect of interaction among organic manure sources, biofertilizers and foliar application treatments:

Regarding the effect of interaction among organic manure sources, biofertilizers and foliar application treatments, it is evident from such data presented in Table 4 that there was significant response on all measured parameters as affected by the triple interaction in both seasons. Generally, it is clear that application of chicken manure in the presence of biofertilizers and all foliar treatments recorded the highest figures of all measured parameters as compared to compost treatments. The best records were

3

obtained when plants fertilized with chicken manure and spraying with seaweed extract (2.5 ml/L) in the presence of biofertilizers in both seasons. The lowest values of all measured parameters were recorded by adding compost in the absence of biofertilizers or foliar application in both seasons.

Chemical constituents of leaves

Effect of organic manure sources:

The obtained results in Table 5 showed that chlorophylls (a, b, and a+b) as well as N, P and K in leaves differed due to different sources of organic manure. The applications of chicken manure at 2.43 ton/fed, gave the highest significant values of chlorophylls in both growing seasons as well as N, P and K percentages in leaves as compared with compost in the two successive seasons.

Table	5:	Effect	of	organic	manure	sources,	biofertilizers	and	foliar
		applic	atic	ons on ch	emical c	onstituent	s of sweet per	oper le	eaves
		during	į 20	10 and 20	011 sease	ons.			

	Ch	l. a	Ch	l. b	Total	(a+b)		941	D	961	K	<u>هر</u> ۲		
Treatments	(mg/1)	00 <u>gm</u>)	(mg/1)	00gm)	(mg/1)	00gm)		/0]	- F (<i>/</i> 0)		/01		
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011		
Organic manui	'e sou	rces:												
Chicken	Chicken 1.15 1.14 0.84 0.84 1.99 1.97 3.29 3.17 0.82 0.82 1.79 1.70													
manure	1.15	1.14	0.04	0.04	1.99	1.97	5.29	3.17	0.62	0.02	1.79	1.70		
Compost	1.03	1.02	0.75	0.75	1.78	1.77	1.85	1.77	0.51	0.51	1.56	1.46		
F. test	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
Biofertilizer: (A	z.+Ba	c.+AM	F):											
With	1.14	1.13	0.82	0.82	1.96	1.94	3.05	2.94	0.75	0.75	1.74	1.64		
Without	1.05	1.04	0.77	0.77	1.82	1.80	2.10	2.00	0.58	0.58	1.61	1.51		
F. test	*	*	<u>,</u> *	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*		
Foliar applicati	ons		· ·											
Seaweed	1 1 4	1 12	0 02	0.01	1.00	1.04	2.00	2 94	0 72	0 72	1 72	1 64		
extract	1.14	1.13	0.02	0.01	1.90	1.94	2.90	Z.04	0.72	0.72	1.73	1.04		
Yeast extract	1.13	1.12	0.81	0.81	1.94	1.92	2.82	2.71	0.67	0.69	1.68	1.59		
Humic acid	1.09	1.08	0.79	0.78	1.78	1.86	2.43	2.33	0.65	0.65	1.65	1.55		
Control	1.02	1.01	0.76	0.76	1.78	1.77	2.09	1.99	0.61	0.61	1.63	1.53		
LSD at 5%	0.04	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.39	0.38	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.03		
Az: Azotobacter	chroo	coccun	n, Bac:	Bacill	us circ	ulans	and A	MF: A	Arbus	cular	Мусо	rrhiza		

1 Fungi.

The variation in results between the two sources of organic manure may be due to the differences in the chemical composition of the two sources, i.e., organic matter and elements ratio as shown in Table 2 which reflected positively on the mentioned parameters. The obtained results are in the same line with Alabi and Odubena (2001) who reported that poultry manure contains large contents of all mineral nutrients needed by cowpea plants. Also, Dibb et al. (1990) reported that application of N and P in crop fertilization is leading to increase absorption of both elements, hence increasing top growth, particularly as a result of N absorption. Nitrogenous compounds make up a significant part of the total weight of plants. Similarly increase in nitrogen supply leads to utilization of carbohydrates to form

J. Plant Production, Mansoura Univ., Vol. 3 (9), September, 2012

protoplasm and more cells to enhance growth. These confirm the ability of poultry manure to supply the required N contents needed by pepper plants to enhance their growth and general performance. This is in an agreement with similar observations made by Abd El-Aty (1997) and Alabi (2006) on sweet pepper, who reported that chlorophylls, N, P and K content in plant leaves significantly enhanced in response to fertilization with chicken manure.

Effect of biofertilizers:

Data presented in Table 5 illustrated the effect of inoculation of sweet pepper plants with biofertilizers on chlorophylls, N, P and K percentages in sweet pepper leaves. It was noticed that the highest significant values of the mentioned parameters were obtained by inoculation with biofertilizer in both seasons compared to the uninoculated plants.

The significant effect of biofertilizers may be due to the fact that biofertilizers have a positive effect on chemical composition in leaves by providing doses of nutrient to the plants and in some cases to provide plants with some promoting growth regulators. In addition, biofertilizer increase microorganisms living in the soil and these microorganisms working on the organic matter in the soil to convert organic N to mineral N (Lampkin, 1990).

Biofertilizers play a fundamental role in converting P and K fixed form to be ready soluble for plant nutrition and making the uptake of nutrients by plants more easy. These results are in conformity with the findings of Supangani *et al.* (2006); kaya *et al.* (2009) and Khan *et al.* (2012), who showed that application of biofertilizers (N-fixing bacteria, P-dissolving microorganisms and K-solubilizing bacteria) increased chemical constituents of sweet pepper leaves.

Effect of foliar application treatments:

The obtained results in Table 5 showed that spraying pepper plants with seaweed extract, yeast extract and humic acid significantly increased chlorophylls, N, P and K content in leaves in the two growing seasons as compared to the control treatment (sprayed with tap water). Data clearly showed that the highest significant values of the formentioned parameters were recorded by spraying plants with seaweed extract (2.5 ml/L) followed by spraying yeast extract (5g/L). No significant differences were detected between both seaweed extract and yeast treatments on all studied characters except for K content in leaves.

With respect to the enhancement of seaweed extract on chlorophylls, seaweed extracts have been found to contain significant amounts of cytokinins, auxins and betaines, which enhance chlorophyll concentration in the leaves (Schwab and Raab, 2004). Also, this increase in chlorophyll content may be due to a decrease in chlorophyll degradation (Whapham *et al.*, 1993). Our findings coincide with some earlier findings of El-Aidy *et al.* (2002), who observed that application of seaweed extract increased chlorophyll content in sweet pepper leaves.

Regarding the enhancement of seaweed extract to N, P and K, seaweed extracts have been found to improve root system which could be influenced by endogenous auxins as well as other compounds in the extracts (Crouch *et al.*, 1992). Seaweed extracts improve nutrient uptake by roots

18-

(Crouch *et al.*, 1990), resulting in root systems with improved water and nutrient efficiency, thereby causing enhancement in general plant growth and vigor. Similar results were obtained by Hamed (1997) and El-Aidy *et al.* (2002). They indicated that foliar application of seaweed extract increased N, P and K contents in sweet pepper leaves.

Effect of interaction among organic manure sources, biofertilizers and foliar application treatments:

With respect of the effect of interaction among organic manure sources, biofertilizers and foliar application treatments on chemical constituents of sweet pepper leaves, it is evident from such data presented in Table 6 that the combination between the three factors had a significant marked effect on leaf content of chlorophylls (a, b and a+ b) as well as N, P and K content in sweet pepper plants in both seasons. It was clearly noticed that the best records in the mentioned characters were obtained by plants fertilized with chicken manure, inoculated with biofertilizers and sprayed with seaweed extract (2.5 ml/L) followed by yeast treatment (without significant differences between the two seasons). The lowest values of all measured parameters were recorded by adding compost without biofertilizers and foliar application in both seasons.

Treatments Chl. a (mg/100gm)(mg/100gm)(mg/100gm) (mg/100gm)(mg/100gm) (mg/100gm)(mg/100gm) N (%) P (%) K (%) and the stress box of the st			during 20	<u>10 an</u>	<u>d 201</u>	<u>1 sea</u>	so <u>ns</u> .								
Treatments (mg/100gm)(mg/100gm)(mg/100gm) N (n) P (n) K (n) 2010 2011 2010				Ch	l.a	Ch	l. b	Total	(a+b)	M	%)		9/ \	ĸ	9/.)
2010 2011 2010 2010 <th< td=""><td></td><td>Trea</td><td>tments</td><td>(mg/1</td><td>00gm)</td><td>(mg/1</td><td>00gm)</td><td>(mg/1</td><td>00gm)</td><td>IN Q</td><td>/01</td><td></td><td>70)</td><td>- ^ </td><td>793</td></th<>		Trea	tments	(mg/1	00gm)	(mg/1	00gm)	(mg/1	00gm)	IN Q	/01		70)	- ^	793
No. Seaweed extract 1.25 1.24 0.87 0.86 2.12 2.10 4.20 4.03 0.97 0.98 1.97 1.85 Yes Yeast extract 1.19 1.18 0.86 0.86 2.04 2.03 4.03 0.97 0.98 1.97 1.85 Yeast extract 1.19 1.18 0.86 0.86 2.04 2.03 4.03 0.96 0.95 1.85 1.75 Yeast extract 1.19 1.18 0.86 0.86 2.00 1.99 3.27 3.17 0.91 0.92 1.83 1.77 Control 1.14 1.13 0.84 0.84 1.99 1.97 3.15 3.03 0.90 0.89 1.77 1.66 Yeast extract 1.13 1.2 0.83 0.83 1.96 3.14 3.02 0.79 0.78 1.90 2.89 2.80 0.75 0.74 1.72 1.63 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09<				2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
No Yeast extract 1.19 1.18 0.86 0.86 2.04 2.03 4.03 3.88 0.96 0.95 1.85 1.75 Humic acid 1.15 1.14 0.85 0.85 2.00 1.99 3.27 3.17 0.91 0.92 1.83 1.75 Seaweed 1.14 1.13 0.85 0.84 1.99 1.97 3.15 3.03 0.90 0.89 1.81 1.77 Seaweed 1.14 1.13 0.84 0.84 1.98 1.96 3.14 3.02 0.79 0.78 1.77 1.66 Yeast extract 1.13 1.2 0.83 0.83 1.96 3.14 3.02 0.79 0.78 1.77 1.66 Yeast extract 1.11 0.82 0.81 1.94 1.92 2.89 2.77 0.66 0.65 1.70 1.67 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.90 1.88 2.59		Seaweed +		1.25	1.24	0.87	0.86	2.12	2.10	4.20	4.03	0.97	0.98	1.97	1.87
E Humic acid 1.15 1.14 0.85 0.85 2.00 1.99 3.27 3.17 0.91 0.92 1.83 1.73 S Control 1.14 1.13 0.85 0.84 1.99 1.97 3.15 3.03 0.90 0.89 1.81 1.72 Seaweed 1.14 1.13 0.84 0.84 1.98 1.96 3.14 3.02 0.79 0.78 1.77 1.69 Yeast extract 1.13 1.2 0.83 0.83 1.96 1.94 2.89 2.80 0.75 0.74 1.72 1.69 Yeast extract 1.11 0.82 0.81 1.94 1.92 2.89 2.77 0.66 0.65 1.70 1.61 Control 1.12 1.11 0.82 0.81 1.92 2.89 2.80 0.75 0.74 1.72 1.63 Yeast extract 1.01 0.99 0.79 0.78 1.90 1.88 2.59	e l	E R A Yeast extract		1.19	1.18	0.86	0.86	2.04	2.03	4.03	3.88	0.96	0.95	1.85	1.75
Seaweed 1.14 1.13 0.85 0.84 1.99 1.97 3.15 3.03 0.90 0.89 1.81 1.72 Seaweed 1.14 1.13 0.84 0.84 1.98 1.96 3.14 3.02 0.79 0.78 1.77 1.69 Seaweed 1.14 1.13 0.84 0.84 1.98 1.96 3.14 3.02 0.79 0.78 1.77 1.69 Yeast extract 1.13 1.2 0.83 0.83 1.96 1.94 2.89 2.80 0.75 0.74 1.72 1.66 Humic acid 1.12 1.11 0.82 0.81 1.94 1.92 2.89 2.77 0.66 0.65 1.70 1.66 Control 1.12 1.11 0.80 0.80 1.92 1.90 2.76 2.66 0.64 0.65 1.70 1.66 Yeast extract 1.00 0.79 0.78 1.89 1.87 2.54 2.45	E E Humic acid			1.15	1.14	0.85	0.85	2.00	1.99	3.27	3.17	0.91	0.92	1.83	1.73
Seaweed extract 1.14 1.13 0.84 0.84 1.98 1.96 3.14 3.02 0.79 0.78 1.77 1.69 Yeast extract 1.13 1.2 0.83 0.83 1.96 3.14 3.02 0.79 0.78 1.77 1.69 Yeast extract 1.13 1.2 0.83 0.83 1.96 1.94 2.89 2.80 0.75 0.74 1.72 1.69 Humic acid 1.12 1.11 0.82 0.81 1.94 1.92 2.89 2.77 0.66 0.65 1.70 1.60 Control 1.12 1.11 0.80 0.80 1.92 1.90 2.76 2.66 0.64 0.65 1.70 1.66 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.89 1.87 2.54 2.45 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.55 Yeast extract 1.09 0.78 0.77 1.87 1.86 2.28 2.22 <td>Ê</td> <td>3</td> <td>Control</td> <td>1.14</td> <td>1.13</td> <td>0.85</td> <td>0.84</td> <td>1.99</td> <td>1.97</td> <td>3.15</td> <td>3.03</td> <td>0.90</td> <td>0.89</td> <td>1.81</td> <td>1.72</td>	Ê	3	Control	1.14	1.13	0.85	0.84	1.99	1.97	3.15	3.03	0.90	0.89	1.81	1.72
5 Yeast extract 1.13 1.2 0.83 0.83 1.96 1.94 2.89 2.80 0.75 0.74 1.72 1.62 Humic acid 1.12 1.11 0.82 0.81 1.94 1.92 2.89 2.77 0.66 0.65 1.70 1.61 Control 1.12 1.11 0.80 0.80 1.92 1.90 2.76 2.66 0.64 0.65 1.70 1.61 Control 1.12 1.11 0.80 0.80 1.92 1.90 2.76 2.66 0.64 0.65 1.70 1.60 Control 1.12 1.11 0.80 0.80 1.92 1.90 2.76 2.66 0.64 0.65 1.70 1.60 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.89 1.87 2.54 2.45 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.55 Humic acid 1.10 1.09 0.78 0.77 1.87 1.86 2.33 2.25 0.57 0.57 1.61 1.43 Seaweed	icken	out	Seaweed extract	1.14	1.13	0.84	0.84	1.98	1.96	3.14	3.02	0.79	0.78	1.77	1.69
No. Humic acid 1.12 1.11 0.82 0.81 1.94 1.92 2.89 2.77 0.66 0.65 1.70 1.61 Control 1.12 1.11 0.80 0.80 1.92 1.90 2.76 2.66 0.64 0.65 1.70 1.61 Control 1.12 1.11 0.80 0.80 1.92 1.90 2.76 2.66 0.64 0.65 1.70 1.60 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.80 1.87 2.54 2.45 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.78 0.78 1.88 1.86 2.33 2.25 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Humic acid 1.09 1.08 0.78 0.77 1.87 1.86 2.33 2.25 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Control 1.09 1.08 0.77 0.77 1.87 1	រ	F Peast extract		1.13	1.2	0.83	0.83	1.96	1.94	2.89	2.80	0.75	0.74	1.72	1.62
Control 1.12 1.11 0.80 0.80 1.92 1.90 2.76 2.66 0.64 0.65 1.70 1.60 Seaweed 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.90 1.88 2.59 2.48 0.62 0.61 1.69 1.59 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.89 1.87 2.54 2.45 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.89 1.87 2.54 2.45 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Humic acid 1.00 0.79 0.78 0.78 1.88 1.86 2.33 2.25 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Control 1.09 1.08 0.77 1.87 1.86 2.28 2.22 0.54 0.54 1.44 Seaweed 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.86 1.84 1.91 1.84 0.5	- \$		Humic acid	1.12	1.11	0.82	0.81	1.94	1.92	2.89	2.77	0.66	0.65	1.70	1.61
Seaweed 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.90 1.88 2.59 2.48 0.62 0.61 1.69 1.59 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.89 1.87 2.54 2.45 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Yeast extract 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.89 1.87 2.54 2.45 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Humic acid 1.10 1.09 0.78 0.78 1.88 1.86 2.33 2.25 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Control 1.09 1.08 0.77 1.87 1.86 2.28 2.22 0.54 0.54 1.54 1.42 Seaweed extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.86 1.84 1.91 1.84 0.51 0.51 1.41 Yeast extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.85 1.83 1.80 1.70			Control	1.12	1.11	0.80	0.80	1.92	1.90	2.76	2.66	0.64	0.65	1.70	1.60
Version Version 1.10 1.09 0.79 0.78 1.89 1.87 2.54 2.45 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Version Humic acid 1.10 1.09 0.78 0.78 1.88 1.86 2.33 2.25 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Version Control 1.09 0.78 0.77 1.87 1.86 2.33 2.25 0.57 0.57 1.66 1.57 Ope Seaweed 1.09 0.78 0.77 1.87 1.86 2.28 2.22 0.54 0.54 1.54 1.43 Seaweed 1.08 1.07 0.78 0.77 1.85 1.83 1.80 1.70 0.49 0.49 1.50 1.44 Yeast extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.85 1.83 1.80 1.70 0.49 0.49 1.50 1.44 Yeast extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77		.+8a 1F)	Seaweed extract	1.10	1.09	0.79	0.78	1.90	1.88	2.59	2.48	0.6 <u>2</u>	0.61	1.69	1.59
Image: Second		AN AZ	Yeast extract	1.10	1.09	0.79	0.78	1.89	1.87	2.54	2.45	0.57	0.57	1.66	1.57
A Seaweed 1.09 1.08 0.78 0.77 1.87 1.86 2.28 2.22 0.54 0.54 1.54 1.43 B Seaweed 1.08 1.07 0.78 0.77 1.86 1.84 1.91 1.84 0.51 0.51 1.51 1.41 Seaweed extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.86 1.84 1.91 1.84 0.51 0.51 1.51 1.41 Yeast extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.85 1.83 1.80 1.70 0.49 0.49 1.49 1.31 1.41 Yeast extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.85 1.83 1.80 1.70 0.49 0.49 1.40 Humic acid 0.97 0.96 0.70 0.70 1.68 1.66 1.23 1.14 0.46 0.46 1.49 1.33 Control 0.74 0.73 0.62 0.61<	ۍ ا	+ <u>+</u>	Humic acid	1.10	1.09	0.78	0.78	1.88	1.86	2.33	2.25	0.57	0.57	1.60	1.50
Seaweed extract 1.08 1.07 0.78 0.77 1.86 1.84 1.91 1.84 0.51 0.51 1.51 1.41 Seaweed extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.86 1.84 1.91 1.84 0.51 0.51 1.51 1.41 Yeast extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.85 1.83 1.80 1.70 0.49 0.49 1.40 1.41 Humic acid 0.97 0.96 0.70 0.77 1.85 1.83 1.80 1.70 0.49 0.49 1.40 Control 0.97 0.96 0.70 0.70 1.68 1.66 1.23 1.14 0.46 0.46 1.49 1.30 1.30 1.34 0.16 0.06 0.36 0.35 1.46 1.30 Control 0.74 0.73 0.62 0.61 1.36 1.34 0.16 0.06 0.36 0.35 1.46 1.30	8	3	Control	1.09	1.08	0.78	0.77	1.87	1.86	2.28	2.22	0.54	0.54	1.54	1.43
E Yeast extract 1.08 1.07 0.77 0.77 1.85 1.83 1.80 1.70 0.49 0.49 1.40 S Humic acid 0.97 0.96 0.70 0.70 1.68 1.66 1.23 1.14 0.46 0.46 1.49 1.36 - Control 0.74 0.73 0.62 0.61 1.36 1.34 0.16 0.06 0.36 0.35 1.46 1.36 - Control 0.74 0.73 0.62 0.61 1.36 1.34 0.16 0.06 0.36 0.35 1.46 1.36 - SD at 5% 0.09 0.09 0.05 0.05 0.13 0.13 0.70 0.15 0.13 0.70 1.50 16 0.08 0.07	Con Con	out	Seaweed extract	1.08	1.07	0.78	0.77	1.86	1.84	1.91	1.84	0.51	0.51	1.51	1.41
Humic acid 0.97 0.96 0.70 0.70 1.68 1.66 1.23 1.14 0.46 0.46 1.49 1.36 - Control 0.74 0.73 0.62 0.61 1.36 1.34 0.16 0.06 0.36 0.35 1.46 1.36 - SD at 5% 0.09 0.09 0.05 0.05 0.13 0.13 0.70 150 16 0.08 0.07	l j ž		Yeast extract	1.08	1.07	0.77	0.77	1.85	1.83	1.80	1.70	0.49	0.49	1.50	1.40
Control 0.74 0.73 0.62 0.61 1.36 1.34 0.16 0.06 0.36 0.35 1.46 1.36 1.36 1.37 0.15 0.06 0.36 0.35 1.46 1.36 1.36 1.37 0.13 0.72 0.72 0.15 0.16 0.08 0.07		N N	Humic acid	0.97	0.96	0.70	0.70	1.68	1.66	1.23	1.14	0.46	0.46	1.49	1.39
LSD at 5% 0.09 0.09 0.05 0.05 0.13 0.13 0.79 0.77 0.15 0.16 0.08 0.07			Control	0.74	0.73	0.62	0.61	1.36	1.34	0.16	0.06	0.36	0.35	1.46	1.36
	[LSD	at 5%	0.09	0.09	0.05	0.05	0.13	0.13	0.79	0.77	0.15	0.16	0.08	0.07

 Table 6: Effect of interaction among organic manure sources, biofertilizers and foliar applications on chemical constituents of sweet pepper leaves during 2010 and 2011 seasons

Az: Azotobacter chroococcum, Bac: Bacillus circulans and AMF: Arbuscular Mycorrhizal Fungi.

REFERENCES

- Abd El-Aty, S.A. (1997). Influence of some organic fertilizers on growth and yield of pepper plants (*Capsicum annuum* L.) cultivated under plastic houses. M. Sc. Thesis Fac. Agric. Ain Shams Univ., Cairo, Egypt.
- Alabi, D.A. and Y. Odubena (2001). A preliminary study of the effects of two organic wastes and NPK (15:15:15) on the growth and yield of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.). Nigeria. J. Hort. Sci., 5:19-27.
- Alabi, D.A. (2006). Effects of fertilizer phosphorus and poultry droppings treatments on growth and nutrient components of pepper (*Capsicum annum* L.). Afric. J. Biotech., 5(8): 671-677.
- Atiyeh, R.M.; C.A. Edwards; J.D. Metzger; S. Lee and N.Q. Arancon (2002). The influence of humic acids derived from earthworm-processed organic wastes on plant growth. Bioresource Technol., 84: 7-14
- Azarpour, E.; M.K. Motamed; M. Moraditochaee and H.R. Bozorgi (2012). Effect of bio, mineral nitrogen fertilizer management under humic acid foliar spraying on fruit and several trails of eggplant (Solanum melongena L.). Afric. J. Agric. Res., 7(7): 1104-1109.
- Balba, A.M. (1976). "Soil Fertility and Fertilization". Dar El-Motboat El-Gadida, Alex. Egypt (In Arabic).
- Bidari, B.I. (2000). Studies on yield and quality of Byadgi chilli (Capsicum annuum L.) in relation to soil properties in transitional zone and part of dry zone of north Karnataka. Ph.D. Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad.
- Blunden, G. (1991). "Agricultural Uses of Seaweeds and Seaweed Extract". In: Guiry MD, Blunden G (eds) Seaweed resources in Europe. Uses and potential. Wiley, Chichester, Pp: 65-81.
- Chen, Y. and T. Aviad (1990). Effects of humic substances on plant growth. In Chen, Y. and T. Aviad (eds.). Humic substances in soil and crop science. Amer. Soc. Agron. Soil Sci. Soc. Amer., Madison, Wisconsin, USA., Pp: 161-186.
- Crouch, I.J. and J. Van Staden (1994). Commercial seaweed products as Biostimulants in horticulture. J. of Hort., 1: 19–76.
- Crouch, I.J.; M.T. Smith; J. Van Staden; M.J. Lewis and G.V. Hoad (1992). Identification of auxins in acommercial seaweed concentrates. J. Plant Physiol., 139:590–594.
- Crouch, I.J., R.P. Beckett and J. Van Staden (1990). Effect of seaweed concentrate on the growth and mineral nutrition of nutrient stressed lettuce. J. Appl. Phycol., 2:269–272.
- Dibb, D.W.; P.E. Fixen and L.S. Murphy (1990). Balanced fertilization with particular reference to phosphorus interaction of phosphorus with other inputs and management practices. Fert. Res., 26(1-3):29-52.
- El-Aidy, F.; A.I. El-Zawily; B.I. El-Sawy and E.M. Hamed (2002). Effect of seaweed extracts on sweet pepper plants grown under protected cultivation. 2nd Inter. Conf. Hort. Sci., 10-12 Sept. Kafr El-Sheikh, Tanta Univ., Egypt.

1

El-Desuky, M. (2004). Response of onion plants to humic acid and mineralfertilizers application. Annals Agric. Sci., Moshtohor, 42(4): 1955-1964.

- El-Ghamriny, E.A., H.M.E. Arisha and K.A. Nour (1999). Studies in tomato flowering, fruit set, yield and quality in summer seasons. 1- Spraying with thiamine, ascorbic acid and yeast. Zagazig J. Agric. Res., 26 (5): 1345-1367.
- El-Karamany, M.F.; M.K.A. Ahmed; A.A. Bahr and M.O. Kabesh (2000). Utilization of biofertilizers in field crop production. Egypt J. Appl. Sci., 15: 137-145.
- El-Nagar, E.M. (1996). Effect of applying some organic residues to sandy calcareous soils on growth and composition of some plants. M. Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric. Mansoura Univ., Egypt.
- El-Tohamy, W.A.; H.M. El-Abagy and N.H.M. El-Greadly (2008). Studies on the Effect of putrescine, yeast and vitamin C on growth, yield and Physiological responses of eggplant (Salanum melongena L.)Under Sandy Soil Conditions. Australian J. of Basic and Appl. Sci., 2(2): 296-300.
- Ertan, Y. (2007). Foliar and soil fertilization of humic acid affect productivity and quality of tomato Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica Section B Plant Soil Sci. 57(2): 182-186.
- Fathy, S.L. and S. Farid (1996). Effect of some chemical treatments, yeast preparation and royal Jelly on some vegetable crops growing in late summer season to induce their ability towards better thermal tolerance. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 25(4): 2215-2249.
- Ghoname, A.A.; M.A. El-Nemr; A.M.R. Abdel-Mawgoud and W.A. El-Tohamy (2010). Enhancement of sweet pepper crop growth and production by application of biological, organic and nutritional solutions. Res. J. of Agric. and Biol. Sci., 6(3): 349-355.
- Gomez, K.A. and A.A. Gomez (1984). Statistical Procedures for the Agricultural Researches. John Wiley and Son, Inc. New York.
- Hamed, E.M. (1997). Studies on seaweed extracts and shoot pruning on sweet pepper under plastic green house. M. SC. Thesis, Fac. Agric. Tanta Univ., Egypt.
- Hanafy, A.A.H.; M.R. Nesiem; A.M. Hewedy and H.E. Sallam (2010). Effect of some simulative compounds on growth, yield and chemical composition of snap bean plants grown under calcareous soil conditions. J. Amer. Sci., 6(10): 552-569.
- Horneck, D.A. and D. Hanson (1998). Determination of potassium and sodium by Flame Emission Spectrophotometry. In Handbook of Reference Methods for Plant Analysis, pp. 153-155.
- Kaya, C.; M. Ashraf; O. Sonmez; S. Aydemir; A.L. Tuna and M.A. Culla (2009). The influence of arbuscular mycorrhizal colonization on key growth parameters and fruit yield of pepper plants grown at high salinity. Scienta Horticulturae, 121: 1-6.
- Khan, Z.; S.A. Tiyagi; I. Mohmood and R. Rizvi (2012). Effect of N fertilization, organic matter and biofertilizers on growth and yield of chilli in relation to management of plant-parasitic nematodes. Turk. J. Bot. 36: 73-81.
- Koller, H.R. (1972). Leaf area-Leaf weight relationship in soybean canopy. Crop Sci., 12:180-183.

J. Plant Production, Mansoura Univ., Vol. 3 (9), September, 2012

- Lampkin, N. (1990). "Organic Farming" Farming Press Books and Video-Wharfedule Road, Ipswich (P), 4 LG, United, kingdom, pp. 681.
- Meshref, H.; A. Houka; A. Selim; M.N.A. El-Sawah and H. El-Hamaky (1995). Some microbial aspects of Damietta city refuce compost. J. Environ. Sci., 10(2): 1-12.
- Nagodawithana, W.T. (1991). Yeast technology. Univ. Foods Corporation Milwaukee, Wisconsin. Published by Van Nostrand Reinhold New York. Pp: 273.
- Neri, D.; E.M. Lodolini; P. Savini; P. Sabbatini; G. Bonanomi and F. Zucconi (2002). Foliar application of humic acids on strawberry (cv. Onda). Proc. 1S on Foliar Nutrient. Eds. M. Tagliavini *et al.*, Acta Hort., 594: 297-302.
- Nour, K.A.M.; N.T.S. Mansour and Abd W.M. El-Hakim (2010). Influence of foliar spray with seaweed extract on growth, setting and yield of tomato during summer season. J. Plant Production, Mansoura Univ., 1(7): 961-976.
- Odebode, A.A. and C.A. Fajinmi (2009). Effect of poultry manure on pepper veinal mottle virus (PVMV), yield and agronomic parameters of pepper (*Capsicum annuum* L.) in Nigeria. EAJS., I (1):104-111.
- Piper, C.S, (1947). "Soil and Plant Analysis". The Univ. of Adelaiada, Pp: 293-296.
- Rajaee, S.; A.H. Alikham and F. Raiesi (2007). Effect of plant growth promoting potentials of *Azotobacter chroococcum* native strains on growth, yield and uptake of nutrients in chilli. J. Sci. Tech. Agric. and Natural Resources, 11:297.
- Sandell, R. (1950). Colorimetric determination of traces of metal 2nd Ed. Interscience pub., Inc. New York.
- Schwab, W. and T. Raab (2004). Developmental changes during strawberry fruit ripening and physico-chemical changes during postharvest storage. In: Dris, R., Jain,S.M. (Eds.), Production Practices and Quality Assessment of Food Crops, 'Qualityhandling and Evaluation', vol. 3. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands, pp: 341–369.
- Shady, M.A. (1978). "The Yeasts". Adv. Cour. Four postcard. St. In Microbial. pp; 146-247. Agric. Bot. Dept. Fac. Agric., Mansoura Univ.
- Shashidhara, G.B. (2000). Integrated nutrient management for chilli (*Capsicum annuum* L.) in alfisols of Northern transition zone of Karnataka. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. Agric. Sci., Dharwad.
- Shokr, M. M. B. and M. T. Abd El-Hamid (2009). Using some antioxidant substances for enhancing therotolerance and improving productivity of pea (*Pisum sativum* L.) plants under local environment of early summer season. Agric. Res. J. Suez Canal Univ., 9(1):69-76.
- Snedecor, G.W. and W. G. Cochran (1967). "Statistical Methods". 7th ed. Lowa State Univ. Press, Ames, Lowa, U.S.A., Pp: 507.
- Supanjani, H.S; S.J. Jung and K.D. Lee (2006). Rock phosphate potassium and rock solubilizing bacteria as alternative sustainable fertilizers. Agro. Sustain, Develop., 26: 233-240.
- Unlu, H.O.; H. Unlu; Y. Karakurt and H. Padem (2011). Changes in fruit yield

and quality in response to foliar and soil humic acid application in cucumber. Sci. Res. and Essay, 6(13): 2800-2803.

Wettestein, D. (1957). "Chlorophyil". Lethale und der Submikroskopische Formwechsel der plastiden. Exptl. Cell Reso., 12: 427-506.

Whapham, C.A.; G. Blunden; T. Jenkins and S.D. Hankins (1993). Significance of betaines in the increased chlorophyll content of plants treated with seaweed extract. J. Appl. Phycol., 5: 231–234.

Worthington, V. (2001). Nutritional quality of organic versus conventional fruits, vegetables and grains. J. Alternative and Complementary Medicine, 7: 161-173.

استجابه نباتات الفلفل الحلو (النمو الخضري والمحتوى الكيماوي للأوراق) للتسميد العضوي والحيوي وبعض معاملات الرش الورقي كوثر كامل ضوه ، حسام محمد السعيد عبد النبي و ولاء محمد السعيد سويلم قسم الخضر والزينة- كلية الزراعة- جامعة المنصورة – مصر

أجريت هذه الدراسة خلال موسمي صيف ٢٠١٠-٢٠١١ بمزرعة خاصة بقرية صهرجت الصغرى قرب مدينة المنصورة- محافظة الدقهلية بهدف دراسة تأثير مصدرين من التسميد العضوي (سماد الدواجن والكمبوست) والتسميد الحيوي (مخلوط من بكتريا الأزوتوباكتر والبكتريا المذيبة للبوتاسيوم وفطر الميكروهيزا) وبعض معاملات الرش الورقي (مستخلص الطحالب، مستخلص الخميرة، الهيوميك أسيد) والتفاعل بينهم على النمو الخضري والمحتوى الكيماوي لأوراق نباتات الغلغل الحلو هجين مادير.

ويمكن تلخيص أهم التنائج المتحصل عليها كالتالي:-

- ١. أعطت معاملة تسميد النباتات بسماد الدواجن بمعدل ٢,٤٣ طن/فدان أعلى القيم لصفات النمو الخضري والممثلة في ارتفاع النبات، عدد الأوراق، عدد الأفرع، المساحة الورقية، الوزن الطازج والجاف وكذلك المحتوى الكيماوي للأوراق مثل كلوروفيل أ، كلوروفيل ب، الكلوروفيل الكلي أ+ ب، النسبة المنوية للنيتروجين والغوسغور والبوتاسيوم عند المقارنة بمعاملة الكمبوست في موسمي الزراعة.
- ٢. أدى تلقيح النباتات بالسماد الحيوي الى زيادة معنوية في كل قياسات النمو الخضري وكذلك المحتوى الكيماوي للأوراق مقارنة بالنباتات غير المعاملة بالسماد الحيوي.
- ٢. أدت معاملة النباتات بمستخلص الطحالب بتركيز ٢,٩ مل/لتر أو مستخلص الخميرة بمعدل ٥ جم/لتر الى زيادة معنوية في معظم الصفات المدروسة عند المقارنة بمعاملة الكنترول في موسمي الزراعة. بينما جاءت معاملة الرش بالهيوميك أسيد في المرتبة الثانية حيث أدت الى زيادة معنوية في صفات عدد الأفرع والوزن الطازج والجاف في موسمي الزراعة وكذلك المساحة الورقية في الموسم الثانية عند المقارنة بمعاملة الكنترول.
- ٤. كانت أفضل النتائج بالنسبة لصفات النمو الخضري وكذلك المحتوى الكيماوي ناتجة عن تسميد النباتات بسماد الدواجن بمعدل ٢,٤٣ طن/فدان والرش بمستخلص الطحالب بتركيز ٢,٥ مل/لتر أو مستخلص الخميرة بتركيز ٥ جم/لتر في وجود السماد الحيوي حيث يمكن أن نوصي بها لتحسين أداء نباتات الفلفل تحت ظروف مشابهة لظروف التجربة.
 - قام بتحكيم البحث
 - أ.د / السيد طرطوره
 كلية الزراعة جامعة المنصورة
 أ.د / سمير كامل الصيفى
 كلية الزراعة جامعة قذاة السويس