EFFECT OF COBALT APPLICATIONS ON YIELD AND YIELD COMPONENTS OF WHEAT GROWN UNDER TWO INTERVALS OF IRRIGATION

Zeinab M. Khalil, Manal F. Tantawy and M. A. H. Mohamad

Soils, Water and Environment Res. Inst., Agric. Res. Center, Giza, Egypt.

(Received: Nov. 22, 2014)

ABSTRACT: A field experiment was carried out on a clayey soil at El-Gemeiza Agricultural Research Station, El-Gharbia Governorate, Middle Nile Delta region, Egypt during two successive growing winter seasons of 2012 / 2013 and 2013 / 2014 to study the effect of different rates and doses of cobalt and its temporal foliar application on growth, yield and some chemical compositions of wheat plant (Triticum aestivum L.) variety Gemeiza 11 under two intervals of irrigation; 25 and 40 days. Cobalt was added as Co- acetate { $(CH_3COO)_2 Co$ } at four rates namely 81, 162, 324 and 648 mg Co / L in addition to control treatment with Co-free water on two techniques; the first was three equal doses at seedling, tillering and heading stages and the second was one dose only at tillering stage. The volume of the spray solution for each application was 400 I / fed. The experiment was carried out in a split split plot design with three replicates. The obtained results showed that:-

Plant height (cm), spike length (cm), number of spikes / m², weight of 1000 grains (g), grains and straw yields as (kg/plot and kg/fed.) as well as biological yield (kg/fed.) were significantly increased with the increase of added Co rate. Foliar application of Co on three equal doses efficiently enhanced these parameters more than those sprayed on one dose. Also, the values of the previous parameters were markedly higher when wheat plants irrigated every 25 days than those irrigated every 40 days. The best results were accompanied with the foliar application of Co at a rate of 648 mg Co / L, applied on three equal doses, under 25-day irrigation interval treatment.

Interaction effects among all the applied treatments were insignificant on the studied parameters of plant growth, grains and straw yields and yield quality. Also, most of the dual interactions exerted significant effect on growth characters. However, the interaction between the techniques of Co application rates and doses was significant effect on grain and straw yields.

Nitrogen, P and K concentration (%) and uptake (kg / fed.) by grains and straw as well as crude protein (%) were increased by elevating Co rates especially in the first technique of Co application and at 25-day irrigation interval. Nitrogen and P concentration (%) and uptake (kg / fed.) by grains were higher than those by straw, while K appeared reverse this trend.

Except Fe, both concentrations (mg kg⁻¹) and uptake (g / fed.) of Mn, Zn, Cu and Co by grains and straw were increased with the increase of added Co rates, especially in the first technique of Co application and at irrigation every 25 days. The obtained data exhibited existence of an antagonistic relationship between the added Co and Fe. These microelements could be arranged, according to their contents of both grains and straw, in the following orders: Fe > Zn >Mn > Cu > Co. Except Zn, the content of the microelements, under study, in grains were higher than those found in straw.

Key words: Clayey soil, Irrigation intervals, Cobalt, Foliar application, Rates and doses and Wheat productivity and quality.

INTRODUCTION

The scarcity of water makes it difficult and expensive to expand the cultivated lands or even protect soils with natural cover. In Egypt, there is growing concern about the very limited water resource. Abu-Zeid (1999) indicated that, the country reached the so-called line in water resources with a per capita water share of almost 1000 m³ / person / year. This is expected to fall to less than 500 m³ by 2030, when the population reaches an estimated 100 million. Because of increasing population, demand for irrigation water will continue to increase. Irrigation uses more than 85 % of the total renewable water in Egypt. So, efficient and effective water management is necessary.

From other wise, wheat plant (Triticum aestivum L.) is considered one of the most important cereal crops in the world. The mass production of wheat in Egypt (8 million ton) is about 50 % lower than the consumption (14.5 million ton / year at 2010). Therefore, more than six million tons must be imported annually. One or more of various manners should be followed. The first is by increasing the cultivated area of wheat in both old and newly reclaimed soils. The second is by growing resistant cultivars (plant certified must-free seed) which is considered the most economical and effective way of controlling diseases. The third is by improving agriculture practices among which are the time, irrigation and amount of chemical fertilization (Elbaalawy, 2010).

Through the role of producing healthy wheat plants, cobalt is considered a beneficial element in spite of the absence of evidence for direct role in plant metabolism. It is essential for the synthesis of vitamin B., which is required for human and animal nutrition (Smith, 1991). The daily cobalt requirement for human nutrition could reach 8 ppm depending on cobalt levels in the local supply of drinking water without health hazard (Gad et al., 2013). WenHua et al. (2004) showed that cobalt application at rates of 0.75 and 1.05 kg Co / ha increased grain yield of wheat by 7.4 - 20.3 % as compared with the no-Co control. respectively. The greatest yield increase was obtained with the treatment of 1.05 kg Co / ha. Also, Cobalt treatment of 0.75 kg Co / ha increased the different extents; protein content and protein yield of the grain. Elbaalawy (2010) found that application of cobalt to alluvial soil at rate of 2 mg L-1 enhanced both air and oven dry weights of

straw and grains yield of wheat plants. Also, Gad and Kandil (2011) indicated that increasing cobalt levels in the wheat plants cultural media up to 15.0 mg Co kg-1 soil stimulated their growth, dry matter content, yield and its quality. Cobalt at application rate of 15.0 mg kg-1 soil gave a significant increase of wheat growth; yield and nutritional status except Fe, Also, they found that iron content was decreased with increasing cobalt doses and suggested the existence of certain antagonistic relationships between the two elements (Co and Fe). In addition, Aziz (2012) indicated that the application of different levels of cobalt (10-50 mg kg-1 soil) led to an increase in biomass accumulation and yield responses to cobalt and such increase was always accompanied by increasing nitrogen. phosphorous and potassium concentrations in both shoots and roots as well as protein content of alfalfa.

This work was carried out to study the effect of different rates and doses of cobalt and its temporal foliar applications on wheat growth, yield and some nutrient contents in grains and straw under two intervals of irrigation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was carried out on clavev alluvial soil at El-Gemeiza Agricultural Research Station, El-Gharbia Governorate, Middle Nile Delta region, Egypt during the two successive growing winter seasons of 2012 / 2013 and 2013 / 2014 to study the effect of foliar application of different rates of Co, numbers of doses and its temporal application, under two intervals of irrigation on wheat plant (Triticum aestivum L.) variety (Gemeiza 11). These characters of wheat plant were appraised according to the previous treatments; growth parameters, grain and straw yields, some nutrient contents and its tolerance for drought stress under the these circumstance of treatments. Representative surface soil samples (0 - 30 cm) were taken from the used soil before performance of the experiment. Soil

samples were air - dried, ground, mixed well, sieved through a 2 mm sieve. The for samples then were analyzed determination of some physical and chemical properties, also, the content of some available macro- and micronutrients and Co according to the methods described by Cottenie et al. (1982); Page et al. (1982) and Klute (1986). The obtained data were recorded in Table (1).

The present experiment includes 60 experimental units (plots). The area of each plot was $10.5m^2$ (3.5 m length × 3 m width; 1/400 fed.). The experiment was carried out in a split split plot design with three replicates. The main plots were assigned to two intervals of irrigation; at 25 and 40 days. The subplots received the different rates of cobalt namely 0, 81, 162, 324 and 648 mg Co / L and the sub subplots were denoted for the number of Co application doses (one or three doses).

Cobalt was added as foliar applications in the form of Co- acetate $\{(CH_3COO)_2 Co\}$ on two different techniques. In the first technique, Co was applied on three equal doses (each was of 27, 54, 108 and 216 mg Co / L) for different growth periods, i.e., seedling stage (with the first irrigation), tillering and heading stages. While in the second technique, Co was applied on one dose at tillering stage, only. The volume of the spray solution for each foliar spraying was 400 I / fed.

All agricultural practices beginning from sowing to harvesting were performed as recommended by Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture. Before sowing, all plots were fertilized with 100 kg /fed. of ordinary super phosphate (15.5 % P2 O6), during the final soil preparation. Wheat grains were planted on 15th and 18th of November 2012 and 2013 and harvested on 4th and 8th of May 2013 and 2014 at the first and second season, respectively.

^o hysical roperties	Pa Coarse	rticles s	size di (%) Fine sand	stribi Sil	ution	Clay	Textur grade	al (B de (Mg	sulk nsity g / m³)	Total (porosity %)	Water field capacity (%)
цā	6.62	2	14.22	28.5	50 5	50.66	Claye	у	1	.33	4	9.81	34.5
ties	ater	S m ⁻¹	So (luble (mea	catio	ons)	Solu (r	ble neq	ani /	ons I)		(6y	
hemical propert	pH 1:2.5 soil : w: susp.	EC (soil paste) dS	Na+	¥	Ca ²⁺	Mg ²⁺	CI-		ло Сор	SO4 ²⁻	(%)	CEC (cmol /	Ca CO ₃ (%)
0	7.81	3.8	21.10	0.7 5	7.01	9.14	20.12	5.2	22	12.66	2.05	34.20	3.22
ole	Macro	onutrien	ts (mg	/ kg)	Microelements (mg / kg)							
ailat men	N		Р		К	Fe	Mn			Zn		Cu	Со
Av: ele	45.0	00	7.21		354	10.42	4.11	1		3.23		2.96	0.26

Table (1):	Some Ph	vsical and	chemical	properties	of the	used soil.
------------	---------	------------	----------	------------	--------	------------

* SO4²⁻ were calculated as the difference between the content of soluble cation (Na⁺, K⁺, Ca²⁺ and Mg²⁺) and soluble anions (Cl⁻ and HCO3⁻).

Just before harvesting, ten plants were taken randomly from each plot. Some growth parameters, i.e., height of whole plant (cm), spike length (cm) and number of spikes / m² were measured. At harvesting time, the plants of each plot were harvested separately. The grains were separated from straw to measure: weight of 1000 grains (g), grains and straw yield as kg / plot and kg /fed. and were recorded. Biological yield (kg /fed.), harvest index (%), relative change of wheat yield (grains and straw) and agronomical efficiency were calculated. Grain and straw samples were air-dried then, oven-dried at 70 °C for 48 hrs., weighed, ground and digested for chemical determination according to the method described by Chapman and Pratt (1961). Nitrogen, P and K content in the digests were determined according to the methods described by Cottenie et al. (1982). Crude protein percentage was estimated in the different parts by multiplying N % values by 5.75 as described by A.O.A.C. (1990). The atomic absorption spectrophotometer was used to determine Fe, Zn, Mn, Cu and Co concentrations in the prior parts according to the methods recommended by A. O. A. C. (1990).

The relative change (RC) of wheat yield (grains and straw) was calculated as follows:-

RC = {(dry matter yield of treated plants) -(dry matter yield of untreated plants) / (dry matter yield of untreated plants)}x 100.

The agronomical efficiency (AE) was calculated according to Sisworo *et al.* (1990) as follows:-

AE = {(dry matter yield of treated plants) -(dry matter yield of untreated plants)}/ added Co (mg L⁻¹).

The data were exposed to statistical analysis according to Gomez and Gomez (1984). The significant differences among means were tested using the least significant differences (L.S.D.) at 5 % level of significant error.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION Growth Parameters.

The presented data in Tables (2 and 3) showed the effect of foliar application cobalt rates and two techniques of application (rates, number of applied doses and its temporal application) under two intervals of irrigation on some growth parameters of wheat plants. These data showed that all plant growth parameters under study; plant height, spike length, number of spikes / m², spike weight and 1000 - grain weight were increased significantly with the increase rates of added Co. At the same interval of the values of all growth irrigation, parameters of plants treated by Co, in three doses, were higher than those treated in one dose. The greatest effect of cobalt on dry matter accumulation of different plant parts was observed with Co rate of 648 mg Co L⁻¹, applied in three doses treatment. This trend was found under the two intervals of irrigation. These increases indicated that the enhanced effect of Co on plant growth may be resulted due to its important role on some biochemical processes and enzymes activity within plant tissues (Marschner, 2003). These data are in harmony with those obtained by Elbaalawy (2010) and Gad and Kandil (2011). Also, data clarified that performed application of Co in doses was preferred among the beneficial effects of Co to be exist at different growth periods. These findings may be supported by the calculated values of relative changes (RC) as a per cent of the found values of the control treatment for all growth parameters under study (Table, 3). The results revealed that all RC values at different application rates of Co were positive with different growth parameters. These percentage of increases were elevated by increasing the added Co rates, especially in three doses. At the same application rate of Co, the percentage of increases values of each growth parameter in the plants treated by Co, in three doses, were higher than those found in the plants treated by Co, in one dose. In the two techniques of Co application, the highest values of RC were found with spike weight followed by spike length, while the lowest values were found with RC of plant height. This trend reflects the differences among these growth parameters to response for Co application.

Table (

Table (2) :	Effect o	f cobali t plants	t foliar a	an valu	ions, at es of tw	t differe vo seas	nt rates ; ons.	and dos	ses unde	er two irr	igatior	intervi	als on sc	ome gro	wth pa	rameters
	-traceto	Plan	t height	(cm)	Spik	te lengt	(m) (Ň	of spike	s / m²	Spi	ke weig	ht (g)	1000-	grain we	ight (g)
	SILIALINA							rrigation	interval	ls (days	~					
Added	Added															
rate (mg/L)	doses No.	25	40	Mean	25	40	Mean	25	40	Mean	25	40	Mean	25	40	Mean
0		101.1	99.1	100.1	18.9	17.8	18.4	615	594	605	2.50	2.05	2.28	31.0	29.0	30.0
81		103.2	102.5	102.9	20.7	18.5	19.6	693	658	676	2.93	2.58	2.76	35.0	33.0	34.0
162	On three doses	105.6	104.1	104.9	24.4	20.3	22.4	749	689	719	3.74	2.80	3.27	37.0	36.0	36.5
324		108.8	106.2	107.5	27.3	24.1	25.7	785	737	761	3.85	3.18	3.52	37.8	36.5	37.2
648		112.5	109.1	110.8	29.5	26.5	28.0	818	756	787	4.50	3.80	4.15	38.5	37.3	37.9
Meá	an	106.2	104.2	105.2	24.2	21.5	22.8	732	687	710	3.50	2.88	3.19	35.8	34.4	35.1
0		101.1	99.1	100.1	18.9	17.8	18.4	615	594	605	2.50	2.05	2.28	31.0	29.0	30.0
81		102.5	101.4	101.9	19.5	18.1	18.8	678	611	645	2.65	2.53	2.59	33.5	31.0	32.3
162	On one dose	103.8	102.5	103.2	22.8	21.5	22.2	685	665	675	2.93	2.73	2.83	35.8	32.5	34.2
324		106.8	104.8	105.8	25.1	23.1	24.1	701	677	689	3.31	2.95	3.13	36.6	35.5	36.1
648		108.3	106.1	107.2	27.1	24.9	26.0	749	701	725	3.82	3.41	3.62	37.5	37.0	37.3
Mea	UE	104.5	102.8	103.6	22.7	21.1	21.9	686	650	668	3.04	2.73	2.88	34.9	33.0	33.9
General	mean	105.4	103.5	104.4	23.4	21.3	22.4	209	668	689	3.27	2.81	3.04	35.4	33.7	34.5
L.S.D. at level 0.05 Tir.x.F Tr.x.F Tr.x.F Rates X.F	tion s Rates Doses xDoses Ra.xDo.	-0-0505	1 			0.3 0.5 0.3 0.5 0.3 0.5 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8			01 8 8 1 9 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 1 0 0 1 0			0.12 0.11 0.09 0.15 0.15 0.15 1.15 1.15 1.15		-000-0	.40 .44 .43 .81 .81 .81 ns ns	

	_									
		1000- grain weight (g)	13.793	24.138	25.862	28.621	6.897	12.069	22.414	27.586
		Spike weight (g)	25.854	36.585	55.122	85.366	23.415	32.195	43.902	66.341
	40	No. of spikes / m ²	10.774	15.993	24.074	27.273	2.862	11.953	13.973	18.013
s)		Spike length (cm)	3.933	14.045	35.393	48.876	1.685	9.551	29.775	39.888
rvais (day:		Plant height (cm)	3.431	5.045	7.164	10.091	2.321	3.431	5.752	7.064
rrigation inte		1000 grain weight (g)	12.903	19.355	21.935	24.194	8.065	15.484	18.065	20.968
		Spike weight (g)	17.20	29.60	54.00	80.00	6.00	17.20	32.40	52.80
	25	No. of spikes / m ²	12.683	21.789	27.642	33.008	10.244	11.382	13.984	21.789
		Spike length (cm)	9.524	29.101	44.444	56.085	3.175	20.635	32.804	43.386
nge (RC, % ses under 1		Plant height (cm)	2.077	4.451	7.616	11.177	1.385	2.671	5.638	7.122
alt	ients	Added doses No.		On three	doses			On one	dose	
Cobi	treatm	Added rate (mg L ⁻¹)	81	162	324	648	81	162	324	648

In this respect, WenHua *et al.* (2004); Hussain *et al.* (2005) and Elbaalawy (2010) obtained similar results.

Concerning to the effect of irrigation intervals on all studied plant growth parameters, data in Table (2) showed that their were significant differences between 25 days and 40 days intervals. The results in Table (2) illustrated that all studied plant growth parameters were higher at 25 days irrigation intervals than that at 40 days. The enhanced findings, under 25-day interval. may be resulted from the higher amounts of available or soluble nutrients and its uptake by plants associated the high content of available water under 25 days of irrigation interval compared with that of the another one. Also, the high content of available water might be resulted in a decrease of salinity and/or drought stress (Marschener, 2003). These results are in accordance with those obtained by Mahgoub and El-Saved (2001); Nassar et al. (2004) and El-Ashry and El-Kholy (2005).

The listed RC (%) values in Table (3) for the spike weights and 1000- grain weights revealed that, with the same application rate of Co, RC values for the plants irrigated every 40 day were higher than those in the plants irrigated every 25 day. These findings could be explained due to higher efficiency of Co applications under 40 days irrigation interval. Also, it means that Co applications raised plants tolerance for drought stress. In this concern, Li et al. (2005) noticed that treatment of potato seedlings with Co alleviated the decline of polyamines content which are bound to cell membrane, under stress, and exert protective effect on leaves from stress damage. Another reason for such results was reported by El-Sheekh et al. (2003) who found that Co application was associated by an increase of photosynthetic electron transport. Finally it could be concluded that, Co fertilization may be used to overcome the deficient of available water, where these fertilizer applications were resulted in increasing water use efficiency.

Grain and Straw Yields.

The presented data in Tables (4 and 5) showed the yields of grain and straw of

wheat plants and their statistical analysis as affected by different treatments of Co (rates and techniques) and intervals of irrigation. The data showed that both grains and straw yields (kg / plot and kg / fed.) were significantly increased with the increase rate of added Co. The obtained increases in wheat yield treated by Co applied in three doses were markedly higher than that in one dose, where splitting the rates of Co into three doses during the different stages allows the enhancement effect of Co on plant growth to be excised for longer periods. A significant interaction effect between the numbers of applied doses and the rates of Co application was detected. This finding may be clarified from the calculated RC (%) values for both grains and straw yield (Table, 5). These values show that all RC values were positively increased with the increase rates of added Co. And the obtained percentage of grain and straw yield increases with the plants treated by 3-doses Co application were higher than those sprayed by 1-dose only. From these results, it could be concluded that Co fertilization rates should be added in splitted portions. The enhanced effect of Co application, on plant growth and yield productivity may be attributed to its effect on some enzymes activity, nutrients uptake and photosynthetic electron transport (El-Sheekh et al., 2003; Gad, 2006; Kandil, 2007 and Elbaalawy, 2010).

The data of grains and straw yield of wheat plants and their statistical analysis presented in Tables (4 and 5) detected the obtained yields of both grains and straw wheat plants irrigated every 25 days were significantly higher than those produced by the plants irrigated every 40 days. These findings were found with all applied Co rates at the two application techniques. On the other hand, the results showed that, RC (%) values of grain and straw yields of wheat plants irrigated every 25 days were higher than those in the plants irrigated every 40 days. This could be explained due to the differences between the increases percentages of both yields of Co rates of the two intervals did not reach the significance where the highest difference was 2.89 for

eniaik Ma			Harvest	index (%)	44.40	44.48	43.90	43.89	44.22	44.12	44.16	43.90	44.11	43.58	43.94	44.03
			Biological	yield (kg/fed.)	5892	6124	6396	6616	6856	6376	6032	6260	6448	6636	6253	6314
on gra			eld	RC (%)	I	3.79	9.52	13.31	16.73	10.84	2.81	7.20	10.01	14.29	8.58	9.71
rvais,		40	raw yi	(kg/ fed.)	3276	3400	3588	3712	3824	3560	3368	3512	3604	3744	3500	3530
			St	(kg / plot)	8.19	8.50	8.97	9.28	9.56	8.90	8.42	8.78	9.01	9.36	8.75	8.83
s).			eld	RC (%)	ı	4.13	7.34	11.01	15.90	9.60	1.83	5.05	8.72	10.55	6.54	8.07
eason	days)		ains yi	(kg/ fed.)	2616	2724	2808	2904	3032	2816	2664	2748	2844	2892	2752	2784
twos	vals (ษั	(kg / plot)	6.54	6.81	7.02	7.26	7.58	7.04	6.66	6.87	7.11	7.23	6.88	6.96
doses u mean of	ition inter		Harvest	index (%)	44.36	44.31	43.99	44.07	44.05	44.11	44.47	44.22	43.75	44.06	44.13	44.12
t rates and Je (RC,%) (Irriga		Biological	yield (kg/fed.)	6032	6364	6684	6916	7056	6610	6180	6432	6684	6836	6432	6521
chang			p	RC (%)	I	5.60	11.56	15.26	17.64	12.52	2.26	6.91	12.04	13.95	8.79	10.66
s, at d elative		25	aw yie	(kg/ fed.)	3356	3544	3744	3868	3948	3692	3432	3588	3760	3824	3592	3642
their r			Str	(kg / plot)	8.39	8.86	9.36	9.67	9.87	9.23	8.58	8.97	9.40	9.56	8.98	9.11
vell as			eld	RC (%)	I	5.38	9.87	13.90	16.14	11.32	2.69	6.28	9.27	12.56	7.70	9.51
ts as v			ains yi	(kg/ fed.)	2676	2820	2940	3048	3108	2918	2748	2844	2924	3012	2840	2879
t cobs			ษั	(kg / plot)	6.69	7.05	7.35	7.62	7.77	7.30	6.87	7.11	7.31	7.53	7.10	7.20
Effect o	balt	nents	Added	doses No.	itrol		Ő	three	doses				On one dose			l mean
able (4):	Cot	treatn	Added	rate (mg L ⁻¹)	Con	81	162	324	648	Mean	81	162	324	648	Mean	Genera

1110170101				
The chudied treatments	Grains	s yield	Stra	w yield
The studied treatments	kg / plot	kg / fed.	kg / plot	kg / fed.
Irrigation	0.100	40.0	0.160	64.0
Rates	0.133	53.2	0.070	28.0
Doses	0.123	49.2	0.090	36.0
Irrigation x Rates	ns	ns	ns	ns
Irrigation x Doses	ns	ns	ns	ns
Rates x Doses	0.16	65.0	0.100	40.0
Irrigation x Rates x Doses	ns	ns	ns	ns

Effect of cobalt applications on yield and yield components of wheat......

Table (5) : L.S.D. at level 0.05 of wheat plants (grains and straw yields) as affected by

different cobalt foliar applications rates and doses under two irrigation

ns = not significant

grains and 2.04 for straw. This might be revealed that treatment of wheat plants with Co enabled the plants to tolerate the wider interval of irrigation. In this regard, Hu and Schmidhalter (2005) demonstrated that decreasing soil water content decreases the availability of K the element of an important role in stomatal closure during abiotic stress; like drought and salinity. Cabanero and Carvajal (2007) reported that K starvation in plants favors stimulation of stomatal conductance and promotion of transpiration as well as synthesis of ethylene that counteracts and delays stomatal closure. Benlloch-Gonalez et al. (2010) found that treatment of K-starved sunflower plants with 5 µ M CoSO4 inhibited stomatal conductance as those of plants with an adequate K and inhibited synthesis of ethylene. Data of RC (%) in Table (4) revealed that, under all treatments of Co, the increasing percentages of straw yield were higher than those of grain yield. So, it may be concluded that straw of wheat plants have higher responses to Co application than grains. Also, RC values of straw under the two intervals of irrigation were higher than those of grains (Table, 4). This means that, straw yield less affected by the availability of soil water content than grains. In this concern, Ghazanavi and Abdolshahi (2012) indicated that drought stress had the highest impact on grain yield out of the studied traits. These results could be related to the limited translocation of photosynthetase and nutrients to the developing grains as affected by limited availability of water. These results agree with these obtained by Aery and Jagetiya (2000); Elbaalawy (2010) and Aziz (2012).

Data shown in Table (6) illustrated the agronomical efficiency (AE) which indicated the effect of each unit of added Co at the two techniques and, under two intervals of irrigation on plant growth, dry matter accumulation and yield productivity. AE values were varied widely according to plant part and added Co concentrations. The obtained values of AE in the first technique of Co application were higher than those in the second technique, under the two intervals of irrigation. The higher increases of AE were found with plants irrigated every 25 days. Also, these results were in harmony with the tabulated value of RC of dry matter. The results are in a good accordance with those of Tantawy (2004); WenHua et al. (2004) and Gad and Kandil (2011).

able (o).	Agrons applica	officat er	tes and o	Ioses und	er two irrig	gation inter	vals.		in arian) ao an	acted by	מווובובווו ה	
Cob	alt					Irriga	ation inter	rvals (da	ys)				
treatm	ients				25						40		
Added		Grains	s yield	Straw	yield	Biological	1000	Grain:	s yield	Straw	' yield	Biological	1000
rate (mg L ⁻¹)	Added doses No.	(g/plot)	(g/fed.)	(g/plot)	(g/fed.)	yield (g/fed.)	yrain weigh (g)	(g/plot)	(g/fed.)	(g/plot)	(g/fed.)	yield (g/fed.)	grain weigh (g)
81		4.44	1777.8	5.80	2321.0	4098.8	0.049	3.33	1333.3	3.83	1530.9	2864.2	0.049
162	Ĉ	4.07	1629.6	5.99	2395.1	4024.7	0.037	2.96	1185.2	4.81	1925.9	3111.1	0.043
324	three	2.87	1148.1	3.95	1580.2	2728.3	0.021	2.22	888.9	3.36	1345.7	2234.6	0.023
648	doses	1.67	666.7	2.28	913.6	1580.3	0.012	1.60	642.0	2.11	845.7	1487.7	0.013
Mean		3.26	1305.6	4.51	1802.5	3108.0	0.030	2.53	1012.4	3.53	1412.1	2424.4	0.032
81		2.22	888.9	2.35	938.3	1827.2	0.031	1.48	592.6	2.84	1135.8	1728.4	0.025
162		2.59	1037.0	3.58	1432.1	2469.1	0.030	2 04	814.8	3.64	1456.8	2270.6	0.022
324	On one	1.91	765.4	3.12	1246.9	2012.3	0.017	1.76	703.7	2.53	1012.3	1716.0	0.020
648		1.30	518.5	1.81	722.2	1240.7	0.010	1.06	425.9	1.81	722.2	1148.1	0.012
Mean		2.01	802.5	2.72	1084.9	, 1887.3	0.022	1.59	634.3	2.71	1081.8	1715.8	0.020
General	mean	2.64	1054.1	3.62	1443.7	2497.7	0.026	2.06	823.4	3.12	1247.0	2070.1	0.026

Macronutrients Content of Grain and Straw.

The presented data in Tables (7 to 9) showed concentrations (%) and uptake (kg / fed.) of N, P and K by grains and straw of wheat plants as affected by Co application rates and doses under two intervals of irrigation. These data showed that the contents of N. P and K were increased with the increase of added Co in the two techniques. In grains and straw, contents of N, P and K with Co application rate as three doses were higher than those of one dose. This finding may be attributed to covering almost the different growth periods, in the first technique. In the two techniques of Co application, N and P concentration and uptake by grains were higher than those found with straw, while K appeared reverse this trend. This trend was found with different application rates of Co, under the two intervals of irrigation. At the same application rate of Co under the two irrigation intervals, the content of N, P and K in the grains takes the order of N > K > P. while in the straw this order was: K > N > P. These results are in agreement with these obtained by Basak (2006); Elbaalawy (2010) and El- Dardiry et al. (2010). The data in Table (7) also, showed that grain and straw contents of protein (%) takes the same trend of N concentration (%), where it's obtained by multiple the content of N (%) by 5.75 (A.O.A.C., 1990). The increase effect of Co applications on N, P and K uptake could be clear by the calculated values of RC (%) for these macronutrients under the two irrigation intervals as listed in Tables (7 to 9). These tables show that all RC values for N, P and K uptake by both grain and straw were increased with the increase of added Co. The values of RC with Co application in 3doses technique were higher than those of sole dose. This trend was found with different application rates of Co under the two irrigation intervals. With the same treatment of Co and irrigation period, RC (%) of N and P uptake by straw were higher than those of grains, while K appeared reverse this trend.

Regarding the effect of irrigation intervals on wheat plant (grain and straw) content of N, P and K (% and kg / fed.) as presented in Tables (7 to 9), it was showed that with the two techniques of Co applications at all application rates, N, P and K concentration and uptake by both grains and straw of wheat plants irrigated every 25 days were higher than those irrigated every 40 days. These findings were resulted from the higher soil content of available water under 25 days treatment compared with that under 40 days one. The increases were varied between grains and straw. These differences may be clear from the calculated values RC (%) for N, P and K uptake by either of grains or straw as recorded in Tables (7 to 9). The RC values of these nutrients uptake by wheat plants with 25 and 40 days intervals of irrigation were positive, but these values were higher with 25-day irrigation treatment compared with the another interval treatment. These findings were in good harmony with those obtained by El-Ashry and El- Kholy (2005); Arif et al. (2006) and El- Dardiry et al. (2010).

Microelements Content of Grain and Straw.

The presented data in Tables (10 to 14) pointed out that except Fe, both concentration (mg kg⁻¹) and uptake (g / fed.) of Zn, Mn, Cu and Co by grains and straw of wheat plants were increased with the increase of added Co under the two intervals of irrigation. In both grains and straw, the found increases of Zn, Mn, Cu and Co content in wheat plants treated by Co as three doses were higher than those treated by Co as one dose. Also, at the same rate of added Co under the two intervals of irrigation, the concentration (mg kg⁻¹) and uptake (g / fed.) of microelements, under study, in the grains were higher than those in the straw, except Zn where it was reverse this trend. These results are in agreement with those obtained by Arif et al. (2006); Basak (2006) and Gad and Kandil (2011). At the same studied treatment, the values of concentration (mg kg-1) and uptake (g/fed.) of microelements, under study, by grains and straw were varied from element to another where these elements may be arranged according to their content of both grains and straw in the following order: Fe > Zn > Mn > Cu > Co.

Khalil, et al.,

Table (7) :	Nitro (grail (mea	ogen (ns an n valt	d straw	tration) as al wo sea	(%) an ffected sons, 2(id uptal by diffe 012/201	ke (kg/l srent co 3 and 20	ed.) and balt foli 013/201	l their r ar app 4).	elative licatio	e chang ns rate	es (RC s and d	%) and oses u	d prote nder tw	in (%) o /o irrig	f whea ation ii	t plants itervals
Cobal	ц.							Irriga	tion inte	Ivals (days)						
treatme	nts					25							4	0			
ŧ			Grain	is yield			Straw	yield			Grain	s yield			Straw	yield	
d rate g L⁻¹) Ω	dded		Nitrogei	c	Drotoin		Nitroger	~	Drotoin		Nitroger		Drotoin	-	Vitrogen		Drotoin
əbbA gm)	ÖN	Conc. (%)	Uptake (kg/fed.)	RC (%)	(%)	Conc. (%) (Uptake (kg/fed.)	RC (%)	(%)	Conc. (%)	Uptake (kg/fed.)	RC (%)	(%)	Conc. (%)	Uptake kg/fed.)	RC (%)	(%)
Contre		1.28	34.25	I	7.36	0.196	6.58	ı	1.13	1.23	32.18	1	7.07	0.190	6.22	١	1.09
81		1.42	40.04	16.91	8.17	0.224	7.94	20.67	1.29	1.35	36.77	14.26	7.76	0.215	7.31	17.52	1.24
162	uO	1.50	44.10	28.76	8.63	0.252	9.43	43.31	1.45	1.40	39.31	22.16	8.05	0.240	8.61	38.42	1.38
324 t	hree	1.56	47.55	38.83	8.97	0.308	11.91	81.00	1.77	1.48	42.98	33.56	8.51	0.272	10.10	62.38	1.56
648 ^d	oses	1.60	49.73	45.20	9.20	0.336	13.27	101.67	1.93	1.57	47.60	47.92	9.03	0.298	11.40	83.28	1.71
Mean		1.47	43.14	32.43	8.46	0.263	9.83	61.66	1.51	1.41	39.77	29.48	8.09	0.243	8.73	50.40	1.39
81		1.32	36.27	5.90	7.59	0.204	7.00	6.38	1.17	1.28	34.10	5.97	7.36	0.198	6.67	7.23	1.14
162	ő	1.37	38.96	13.75	7.88	0.240	8.61	30.85	1.38	1.36	37.37	16.13	7.82	0.225	7.90	27.01	1.29
324	one	1.45	42.40	23.80	8.34	0.280	10.53	60.03	1.61	1,40	39.82	23.74	8.05	0.258	9.30	49.52	1.48
648 (ose	1.53	46.08	34.54	8.80	0.315	10.05	83.13	1.81	1.46	42.22	31.20	8.40	0.280	10.48	68.49	1.61
Mean		1.39	39.59	19.50	7.99	0.247	8.96	45.10	1.42	1.35	37.14	19.26	7.74	0.230	8.12	38.06	1.32
General r	nean	1.43	41.37	1	8.23	0.255	9.40	I	1.47	1.38	38.46	•	7.92	0.237	8.43	•	1.36

	values	of two	seasons, 2	2012/2013	and 2013	(2014).								
Cot	alt					Irrig	jation inte	ervals (d	ays)					
treatm	nents				25						40			
Added			Grains			Straw			Grains			Straw		
rate (mg L ⁻¹)	Added doses	Conc. (%)	Uptake (kg/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (%)	Uptake (kg/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (%)	Uptake (kg/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (%)	Uptake (kg/fed.)	RC (%)	
Con	trol	0.325	8.70	ł	0.235	7.89	t	0.319	8.35	,	0.227	7.44	ı	
81		0.343	9.67	11.15	0.247	8.75	10.90	0.340	9.26	10.90	0.239	8.13	9.27	
162	Č	0.350	10.29	18.28	0.260	9.73	23.32	0.345	9.69	10.05	0.254	9.11	22.45	
324	three	0.360	10.97	26.09	0.264	10.21	29.40	0.352	10.22	22.40	0.258	9.58	28.76	
648	doses	0.366	11.38	30.80	0.266	10.50	33.08	0.356	10.79	29.22	0.260	9.94	33.60	
Mean		0.349	10.20	21.58	0.254	9.42	24.18	0.342	9.72	19.64	0.248	8.84	23.52	
81		0.339	9.32	7.13	0.241	8.27	4.82	0.337	8.98	7.54	0.237	7.98	7.26	
162		0.344	9.78	12.41	0.250	8.97	13.69	0.340	9.34	11.86	0.247	8.67	16.53	
324	On one dose	0.351	10.26	17.93	0.255	9.59	21.55	0.346	9.84	17.84	0.250	9.01	21.10	_
648		0.355	10.69	22.87	0.258	9.87	25.10	0.349	10.09	20.84	0.254	9.51	27.82	
Mean		0.343	9.75	15.09	0.248	8.92	16.29	0.338	9.32	14.52	0.243	8.52	18.18	
General	mean	0.346	9.98	1	0.251	9.17	,	0.340	9.52	ł	0.246	8.68	I	

Khalil,	et al.	,
---------	--------	---

Iteatments 25 Straw 0 Added Conc. Uptake RC Conc.	Irrigation inte	rvals (days)				
Added Grains Straw Straw Straw O rate Added Conc. Uptake RC Conc. Uptace RC Conc.				40		
rate (mg L ⁻¹) Added doses Conc. (%) Uptake (%) RC (%) Conc. (%) Uptake (%) Conc. (%) Uptake (%) Uptake (%) Uptake (%) Uptake (%) Uptake (%) Uptake (%) Uptake (%) Uptake (%)	Straw	Graii	s		Straw	
Control 0.501 13.41 - 1.850 62.09 - 0.485 1 81 0.540 15.23 13.57 1.872 66.34 6.84 0.525 1 162 0. 0.570 16.76 24.98 1.875 70.57 13.66 0.558 1 324 three 0.570 16.76 24.98 1.885 70.57 13.66 0.558 1 324 three 0.594 18.11 35.05 1.894 73.26 17.99 0.596 1 81 0.563 18.11 35.05 1.894 73.26 17.99 0.596 1 81 0.563 18.79 1.802 2.010 79.35 2.7.80 0.596 1 81 0.563 1.879 1.873 2.877 0.549 0.556 1 81 0.563 1.873 2.873 0.563 0.556 1 162 0.593	Uptake RC (kg/fed.) (%)	Conc. Uptak (%) (kg/fec	e RC I.) (%)	Conc. (%)	Uptake (kg/fed.)	RC (%)
81 0.540 15.23 13.57 1.872 66.34 6.84 0.525 1 162 On 0.570 16.76 24.98 1.885 70.57 13.66 0.558 1 324 three 0.594 18.11 35.05 1.894 73.26 17.99 0.590 1 324 three 0.593 18.11 35.05 1.894 73.26 17.99 0.590 1 648 doses 0.610 18.96 41.39 2.010 79.35 27.80 0.596 1 Mean 0.563 16.50 28.75 1.902 70.32 16.57 0.549 1 81 0.563 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.555 1 324 dose 0.560 18.79 1.873 70.30 14.03 0.555 1 324 dose 0.565 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 0.590 1 324 dose 0.555 1.891 72.31 <td< td=""><td>62.09 -</td><td>0.485 12.69</td><td></td><td>1.810</td><td>59.30</td><td>ı</td></td<>	62.09 -	0.485 12.69		1.810	59.30	ı
162 On 0.570 16.76 24.98 1.885 70.57 13.66 0.558 1 324 three 0.594 18.11 35.05 1.894 73.26 17.99 0.580 1 648 doses 0.610 18.96 41.39 2.010 79.35 27.80 0.580 1 Mean 0.563 16.50 28.75 1.902 70.32 16.57 0.549 1 81 0.563 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.549 1 162 0.563 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.549 1 162 0.563 17.05 27.14 1.873 67.20 8.23 0.555 1 324 dose 0.595 17.05 27.14 1.883 70.80 14.03 0.556 1 324 dose 0.595 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 <td< td=""><td>66.34 6.84</td><td>0.525 14.30</td><td>12.69</td><td>1.860</td><td>63.24</td><td>6.64</td></td<>	66.34 6.84	0.525 14.30	12.69	1.860	63.24	6.64
324 three 0.594 18.11 35.05 1.894 73.26 17.99 0.580 1 648 doses 0.610 18.96 41.39 2.010 79.35 27.80 0.596 1 Mean 0.563 16.50 28.75 1.902 70.32 16.57 0.549 1 81 0.563 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.520 1 162 0.563 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.520 1 162 0.563 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.520 1 324 0.660 15.93 18.79 1.873 67.20 8.23 0.556 1 324 0none 0.583 17.05 27.14 1.883 70.80 14.03 0.560 1 324 0see 0.595 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 0.590 1 Mean 0.5554 15.78 2.872 0.546 1 <td< td=""><td>70.57 13.66</td><td>0.558 15.67</td><td>23.48</td><td>1.872</td><td>67.17</td><td>13.27</td></td<>	70.57 13.66	0.558 15.67	23.48	1.872	67.17	13.27
648 doses 0.610 18.96 41.39 2.010 79.35 27.80 0.596 1 Mean 0.563 16.50 28.75 1.902 70.32 16.57 0.596 1 81 0.563 16.50 28.75 1.902 70.32 16.57 0.549 1 81 0.553 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.520 1 162 0.553 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.520 1 324 0.563 17.05 27.14 1.873 67.20 8.23 0.550 1 324 dose 0.595 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 0.590 1 Mean 0.554 15.78 22.04 1.872 67.26 10.40 0.546 1	73.26 17.99	0.580 16.84	32.70	1.883	69.90	17.88
Mean 0.563 16.50 28.75 1.902 70.32 16.57 0.549 1 81 0.530 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.520 1 162 0.550 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.520 1 162 0.560 15.93 18.79 1.873 67.20 8.23 0.555 1 324 0none 0.563 17.05 27.14 1.883 70.80 14.03 0.580 1 324 dose 0.595 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 0.590 1 Mean 0.554 15.78 22.04 1.872 67.26 10.40 0.546 1	79.35 27.80	0.596 18.07	42.40	1.890	72.27	21.87
81 0.530 14.56 8.58 1.861 63.87 2.87 0.520 1 162 0.560 15.93 18.79 1.873 67.20 8.23 0.555 1 324 On one dose 0.583 17.05 27.14 1.883 70.80 14.03 0.550 1 324 On one dose 0.595 17.05 27.14 1.883 70.80 14.03 0.580 1 648 0.595 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 0.590 1 Mean 0.554 15.78 22.04 1.872 67.26 10.40 0.546 1	70.32 16.57	0.549 15.51	27.82	1.863	66.38	14.92
162 0.560 15.93 18.79 1.873 67.20 8.23 0.555 1 324 On one dose 0.583 17.05 27.14 1.883 70.80 14.03 0.580 1 648 0.595 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 0.590 1 Mean 0.554 15.78 22.04 1.872 67.26 10.40 0.546 1	63.87 2.87	0.520 13.85	9.14	1.857	62.54	5.46
324 On one dose 0.583 17.05 27.14 1.883 70.80 14.03 0.580 1 648 0.595 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 0.590 1 Mean 0.554 15.78 22.04 1.872 67.26 10.40 0.546 1	67.20 8.23	0.555 15.25	20.17	1.865	65.50	10.46
648 0.595 17.92 33.63 1.891 72.31 16.46 0.590 1 Mean 0.554 15.78 22.04 1.872 67.26 10.40 0.546 1 General mean 0.550 16.14 0.548 1.872 67.26 10.40 0.546 1	70.80 14.03	0.580 16.50	30.02	1.875	67.58	13.96
Mean 0.554 15.78 22.04 1.872 67.26 10.40 0.546 1 General mean 0.559 16.14 1.872 57.52 0.548 1	72.31 16.46	0.590 17.06	34.44	1.885	70.57	19.01
General mean 0 550 16 14 _ 1 887 27 52 _ 0 548 1	67.26 10.40	0.546 15.07	23.44	1.859	65.10	12.22
	27.52 -	0.548 15.29	1	1.861	65.74	I

Table (10): Iron concentration (mg / kg) and uptake	(g / fed.) and their relative changes (RC, $\%$) of wheat plants (grains and
straw) as affected by different cobalt folia	r applications rates and doses under two irrigation intervals (mean values

	of two	seasons,	2012/201	3 and 2	013/2014)								
Coba	alt					Irrig	ation inte	rvals (days	(\$				
treatme	ents				25						10		
Added			Grains			Straw			Grains			Straw	
(mg L ⁻¹)	Added doses	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)
Contr	lo I	145	388.0	I	58.4	196.0	r	133	347,9	ì	51.0	167.1	1
81		141	397.6	2.47	52.5	186.1	-5.05	131	356.8	2.56	47.4	161.2	-3.53
162	Ő	135	396.9	2.29	41.0	153.5	-21.68	127	356.6	2.50	38.1	136.7	-18.19
324	three	122	371.9	-4.15	35.4	136.9	-30.15	119	345.6	-0.66	33.3	123.6	-26.03
648	doses	119	369.9	-4.66	31.5	124.4	-36.53	108	327.5	-5.86	29.0	110.9	-33.63
Mean		132.4	384.9	4.05	43.8	159.4	-23.35	123.6	346.9	-0.37	39.8	139.9	-20.35
81		137	376.5	-2.96	45.5	156.2	-20.31	128	341.0	-1.98	44.2	148.9	-10.89
162		130	369.7	-4.72	38.0	136.3	-30.46	120	329.8	-5.20	36.7	128.9	-22.86
324 (On one dose	121	353.8	-8.81	32.5	122.2	-37.65	112	318.5	-8.45	30.5	109.9	-34.23
648		109	328.3	-15.39	30.7	117.4	-40.10	100	289.2	-16.87	27.5	103.0	-38.36
Mean		128.4	363.3	-7.97	41.0	145.6	-32.13	118.6	325.3	-8,13	38.0	131.6	-26.59
General r	nean	130.4	374.1	1	42.4	152.5	1	121.1	336.1	1	38.9	135.8	

Khalil, et al.,

able (11) : Man and valu	iganese con straw) as al ies of two se	centratior ffected by easons, 20	n (mg / differei 112/2013	kg) and ug nt cobalt fc 3 and 2013/	otake (g iliar appi 2014).	/ fed.) an lications	nd their rela	ative chang I doses unc	les (RC, ler two ir	%) of wh itervals of	eat plant irrigatio	s (grains n (mean
					Irri	gation int	tervals (da	ys)				
	2			25					4	0		
Added Adde	p	Grains			Straw			Grains			Straw	
rate dose (mg L ⁻¹) No.	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)
Control	20.15	53.92	ı	11.22	37.65	ı	18.85	49.31	t	10.95	35.87	3
81	21.65	61.05	13.22	12.50	44.30	17.66	20.95	57.07	15.74	11.45	38.93	8.53
162 On	25.30	74.38	37.95	14.65	54.85	45.68	23.65	66.41	34.68	12.85	46.11	28.55
324 three	e 28.50	86.87	61.11	15.83	61.23	62.63	26.50	76.96	56.07	14.10	52.34	45.92
648 dose	30.75	95.57	77.24	16.50	65.14	73.01	27.92	84.65	71.67	15.63	59.77	66.63
Mean	25.27	74.36	47.38	14.14	52.63	49.75	23.58	66.88	44.54	13.00	46.61	37.41
81	20.90	57.43	6.51	11.90	40.84	8.47	20.47	54.53	10.59	11.30	38.06	6.11
162	23.10	65.70	21.85	12.85	46.11	22.47	22.05	60.59	22.88	12.52	43.97	22.58
324 On oi dose	ne 25.17	73.60	36.50	14.15	53.20	41.30	24.25	68.97	39.87	13.78	49.66	38.44
648	26.85	80.87	49.98	15.20	58.12	54.37	25.62	74.09	50.25	14.53	54.40	51.66
Mean	23.24	66.30	28.71	13.07	47.19	31.65	22.25	61.50	30.90	12.61	44.39	29.70
General mear	1 24.26	70.33	•	13.61	49.91	1	22.92	64.19	ı	12.81	45.50	ı

Treatments 25 Straw 40 Added Added Added Grains Straw rate doses Conc. Uptake RC Conc. Uptake RC Conc. (mg L ⁻¹) No. (mg / kg) (g/fed.) (%) (mg / kg) (g/fed.) (%) (mg L ⁻¹) No. mg / kg) (g/fed.) (%) (mg / kg) (g/fed.) (%) 7 242 151.3 249.4 38.3 104.3 33.7 45.9 156.1 314.1 162 0n 514 151.1 65.1 151.3 249.4 38.3 104.3 33.7 45.9 156.1 34.1 162 0n 51.1 193.2 249.4 38.3 104.3 33.7 45.9 156.1 34.1 162 0n 51.1 193.2 153.2 249.4 51.7 156.1 34.3 162 0n 51.1 113.1 65.8	<u>n_</u>	5	tict					Irri	gation in	itervals (da	/s)				
Added rate (mg L ⁻¹) Added No. Grains Straw Straw Grains Straw Straw rate (mg L ⁻¹) No. Conc. Uptake RC C		treatm	nents				25					4	0		
Tarke (mg L·1) Rocks No. Concs (mg / kg) Uptake (g/fed.) RC (%) A 34.2 91.5 - 12.9 43.3 - 29.8 78.0 - 11.5 37.7 - 81 38.7 109.2 19.3 42.7 151.3 249.4 38.3 104.3 33.7 45.9 156.1 37.7 - 324 three 56.0 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 150.1 92.4 75.5 276.5 633.4 324 three 56.0 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 134.7 93.1 35.6 633.4 Mean 49.8 134.7 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 356.6 534.6 550.7 565.6 <th></th> <th>Added</th> <th>Added</th> <th></th> <th>Grains</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Straw</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Grains</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Straw</th> <th></th>		Added	Added		Grains			Straw			Grains			Straw	
Image: Control 34.2 91.5 - 12.9 43.3 - 29.8 78.0 - 11.5 37.7 - 81 38.7 109.2 19.3 42.7 151.3 249.4 38.3 104.3 33.7 45.9 156.1 314.1 162 0n 51.4 151.1 65.0 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 150.1 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 324 three 56.0 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 150.1 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 46.8 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 150.1 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 648 49.8 177.3 76.3 59.3 292.4 150.1 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 81 162 71.4 169.0 292.5 52.5 45.2		rate (mg L ⁻¹)	doses No.	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)
S1 38.7 109.2 19.3 42.7 151.3 249.4 38.3 104.3 33.7 45.9 156.1 314.1 162 0n 51.4 151.1 65.1 68.9 258.0 495.8 46.9 131.7 68.8 59.1 212.1 462.6 324 three 56.0 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 150.1 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 648 68.9 214.1 134.0 99.4 392.4 806.2 60.4 183.1 134.7 93.1 356.0 844.3 Mean 49.8 147.3 76.3 59.3 225.2 45.2 129.4 82.4 56.8 207.7 563.6 81 35.6 100.6 10.0 36.4 124.9 188.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 207.7 563.6 81 162 36.5 128.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 37.5		Con	trol	34.2	91.5	I	12.9	43.3	I	29.8	78.0	ı	11.5	37.7	I
162 0n 51.4 151.1 65.1 68.9 258.0 495.8 46.9 131.7 68.8 59.1 212.1 462.6 324 three 56.0 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 150.1 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 324 three 56.0 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 150.1 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 648 49.8 147.3 76.3 59.3 225.2 55.2 45.2 129.4 82.4 56.8 207.7 563.6 Mean 49.8 147.3 76.3 59.3 225.2 55.2 45.2 129.4 82.4 56.8 207.7 563.6 162 00.0 42.8 121.7 33.0 47.1 169.0 290.3 36.3 51.5 180.9 375.8 276.3 235.0 235.0 162 64.4 13.1 <th>25</th> <td>81</td> <td></td> <td>38.7</td> <td>109.2</td> <td>19.3</td> <td>42.7</td> <td>151.3</td> <td>249.4</td> <td>38.3</td> <td>104.3</td> <td>33.7</td> <td>45.9</td> <td>156.1</td> <td>314.1</td>	25	81		38.7	109.2	19.3	42.7	151.3	249.4	38.3	104.3	33.7	45.9	156.1	314.1
324 three 56.0 170.7 86.6 72.7 281.2 549.4 51.7 150.1 92.4 74.5 276.5 633.4 648 68.9 214.1 134.0 99.4 392.4 806.2 60.4 183.1 134.7 93.1 356.0 844.3 Mean 49.8 147.3 76.3 59.3 225.2 552.2 45.2 129.4 82.4 56.8 207.7 563.6 81 36.6 100.6 10.0 36.4 124.9 188.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 37.5 126.3 235.0 81 36.6 10.0 36.4 124.9 188.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 37.5 126.3 235.0 162 36.6 10.6 32.4 169.0 290.3 38.7 106.3 36.15 130.9 324 dose 61.1 149.4 63.3 69.1 250.6 51.6 510.0 324	55	162	Ö	51.4	151.1	65.1	68.9	258.0	495.8	46.9	131.7	68.8	59.1	212.1	462.6
648 doses 68.9 214.1 134.0 99.4 392.4 806.2 60.4 183.1 134.7 93.1 356.0 844.3 Mean 49.8 147.3 76.3 59.3 225.2 55.2 45.2 129.4 82.4 56.8 207.7 563.6 81 36.6 100.6 10.0 36.4 124.9 188.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 37.5 126.3 535.0 81 36.6 100.6 10.0 36.4 124.9 188.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 37.5 126.3 535.0 81 42.8 121.7 33.0 47.1 169.0 290.3 38.7 106.3 36.3 51.5 180.9 379.8 324 dose 51.1 149.4 63.3 69.1 259.8 50.0 70.1 252.6 570.0 324 dose 64.4 194.0 112.0 81.7 312.4 50.6 180.9		324	three	56.0	170.7	86.6	72.7	281.2	549.4	51.7	150.1	92.4	74.5	276.5	633.4
Mean 49.8 147.3 76.3 59.3 225.2 525.2 45.2 129.4 82.4 56.8 207.7 563.6 81 36.6 100.6 10.0 36.4 124.9 188.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 37.5 126.3 235.0 162 36.6 100.6 10.0 36.4 124.9 188.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 37.5 126.3 235.0 162 42.8 121.7 33.0 47.1 169.0 290.3 38.7 106.3 36.3 51.5 180.9 379.8 324 00se 51.1 149.4 63.3 69.1 259.8 500.0 42.5 120.9 55.0 70.1 252.6 570.0 648 194.0 112.0 81.7 312.4 62.1 39.5 109.4 50.3 50.6 181.3 476.1 Mean 45.8 131.4 54.5 203.6 50.1 308.9 719.4 <th></th> <td>648</td> <td>doses</td> <td>68.9</td> <td>214.1</td> <td>134.0</td> <td>99.4</td> <td>392.4</td> <td>806.2</td> <td>60.4</td> <td>183.1</td> <td>134.7</td> <td>93.1</td> <td>356.0</td> <td>844.3</td>		648	doses	68.9	214.1	134.0	99.4	392.4	806.2	60.4	183.1	134.7	93.1	356.0	844.3
81 36.6 100.6 10.0 36.4 124.9 188.5 34.5 91.9 17.8 37.5 126.3 235.0 162 42.8 121.7 33.0 47.1 169.0 290.3 38.7 106.3 36.3 51.5 180.9 379.8 162 0n one 51.1 149.4 63.3 69.1 259.8 500.0 42.5 120.9 55.0 70.1 252.6 570.0 324 dose 64.4 194.0 112.0 81.7 312.4 620.15 51.8 149.8 92.1 82.5 308.9 719.4 Mean 45.8 131.4 54.6 49.6 181.9 400.1 39.5 109.4 50.3 50.6 181.3 476.1 General mean 47.8 139.4 - 54.5 203.6 - 50.7 104.5 - 53.7 194.5 -		Mean		49.8	147.3	76.3	59.3	225.2	525.2	45.2	129.4	82.4	56.8	207.7	563.6
		81		36.6	100.6	10.0	36.4	124.9	188.5	34.5	91.9	17.8	37.5	126.3	235.0
324 On one 51.1 149.4 63.3 69.1 259.8 500.0 42.5 120.9 55.0 70.1 252.6 570.0 648 64.4 194.0 112.0 81.7 312.4 621.5 51.8 149.8 92.1 82.5 308.9 719.4 Mean 45.8 131.4 54.6 49.6 181.9 400.1 39.5 109.4 50.3 50.6 181.3 476.1 General mean 47.8 139.4 - 54.5 203.6 - 42.4 119.4 - 53.7 194.5 -		162		42.8	121.7	33.0	47.1	169.0	290.3	38.7	106.3	36.3	51.5	180.9	379.8
648 64.4 194.0 112.0 81.7 312.4 621.5 51.8 149.8 92.1 82.5 308.9 719.4 Mean 45.8 131.4 54.6 49.6 181.9 400.1 39.5 109.4 50.3 50.6 181.3 476.1 General mean 47.8 139.4 - 54.5 203.6 - 42.4 119.4 - 53.7 194.5 -		324	On one dose	51.1	149.4	63.3	69.1	259.8	500.0	42.5	120.9	55.0	70.1	252.6	570.0
Mean 45.8 131.4 54.6 49.6 181.9 400.1 39.5 109.4 50.3 50.6 181.3 476.1 General mean 47.8 139.4 - 54.5 203.6 - 42.4 119.4 - 53.7 194.5 -		648		64.4	194.0	112.0	81.7	312.4	621.5	51.8	149.8	92.1	82.5	308.9	719.4
General mean 47.8 139.4 - 54.5 203.6 - 42.4 119.4 - 53.7 194.5 -		Mean		45.8	131.4	54.6	49.6	181.9	400.1	39.5	109.4	50.3	50.6	181.3	476.1
		General	mean	47.8	139.4	I	54.5	203.6	1	42.4	119.4		53.7	194.5	,

Cob	alt					Ir	igation in	tervals (da	(sít				
treatr	ients			0	5					4	0		
Added	νανου		Grains			Straw			Grains			Straw	
rate (mg L ⁻¹)	doses No.	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)
Con	trol	3.50	9.37	ı	3.33	11.18	t	3.32	8.69	ı	3.00	9.83	I
81		8.60	24.25	158.8	7.66	27.15	142.8	6.40	17.43	100.6	4.00	13.60	38.4
162	Č	17.66	51.92	454.1	10.12	37.89	238.9	11.33	31.81	266.1	6.33	22.71	131.0
324	three	23.66	72.12	669.7	18.33	70.90	534.2	18.67	54.22	523.9	8.33	30.92	214.5
648	doses	30.33	94.27	906.1	27.66	109.20	876.7	23.11	70.07	706.3	14.67	56.10	470.7
Mean		16.75	50.39	547.2	13.42	51.27	448.2	12.57	36.44	399.2	7.26	26.63	213.7
81		4.88	13.41	43.1	4.37	15.00	34.2	4.00	10.66	22.7	3.67	12.36	25.7
162		15.66	44.54	375.3	7.84	28.13	151.6	8.67	23.83	174.2	5.00	17.56	78.6
324	On one	22.00	64.33	586.6	11.24	42.26	278.0	13.88	39.47	354.2	5.33	19.21	95.4
648		27.00	81.32	767.9	19.11	73.08	553.7	19.14	55.35	536.9	9.33	34.93	255.3
Mean		14.61	42.59	443.2	9.18	33.93	254.4	9.80	27.60	272.0	5.26	18.78	113.8
Genera	mean	15.68	46.49	1	11.30	42.60	I	11.19	32.02	'	6.26	22.71	ı

Cobalt						In	igation int	ervals (day	(S				
treatmen	its				25					40			
Added Ac	dded		Grains			Straw			Grains			Straw	
(mg L ⁻¹)	oses No.	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)	Conc. (mg / kg)	Uptake (g/fed.)	RC (%)
Control		0.94	2.52	·	0.71	2.38	ı	0.78	2.04	I	0.59	1.93	ł
81		5.20	14.66	481.7	3.45	12.23	413.9	4.31	11.74	475.5	2.06	7.00	262.7
162	Ű	7.03	20.67	720.2	4.11	15.39	546.6	5.46	15.33	651.5	3.31	11.88	515.5
324 th	rree	10.65	32.46	1188.1	5.82	22.51	845.8	7.11	20.65	912.3	4.33	16.07	732.6
648 dc	oses	12.33	38.32	1420.6	7.23	28.54	1099.2	9.89	29.99	1370.1	5.11	19.54	912.4
Mean		7.23	21.73	952.7	4.26	16.21	726.4	5.51	15.95	852.4	3.08	11.28	605.8
81		2.88	7.91	213.9	2.33	8.00	236.1	1.78	4.74	132.4	1.05	3.54	83.4
162		5.88	16.72	563.5	3.35	12.02	405.0	3.50	9.62	371.6	2.50	8.78	354.9
324 On	n one ose	7.71	22.54	794.4	4.45	16.73	602.9	5.41	15.39	654.4	3.13	11.28	484.5
648		9.12	27.47	990.1	5.96	22.79	857.6	6.02	17.41	753.4	4.10	15.35	695.3
Mean		5.31	15.43	640.5	3.36	12.39	525.4	3.53	9.84	478.0	2.27	8.18	404.5
General me	ean	6.27	18.58		3.81	14.30	ı	4.52	12.90	I	2 68	9.73	ı

Regarding the data of RC (%) of the determined microelements uptake by grains and straw of wheat plants as recorded in Tables (10 to 14) may be concluded that, except RC values of Fe uptake, all RC values for the other microelements uptake by either of grains and straw were increased with increasing of added Co in the two used application techniques under the two intervals of irrigation. At the same application rate of Co, RC (%) of microelements uptake by grains and straw of wheat plants treated by Co on three doses were higher than those on one dose; under the two irrigation intervals. The calculated RC (%) values were the highest with Co and the lowest with Fe.

The presented data in Tables (10 to 14) also, showed that Fe, Zn. Mn, Cu and Co concentration and uptake as well as the RC values of their uptake by grains and straw of wheat plants irrigated every 25 days were higher than those irrigated every 40 days. These findings were in harmony with the soil content of available water and its effect on nutrients solubility and uptake by plants.

Conclusion

From the previously obtained results it could be suggested that cobalt is considered a beneficial element for wheat. It stimulated the growth of plants, increased grains and straw yields and enhanced the quality of the grains by heightened their nutrients status; macronutrients N, P, and K and microelements Fe, Zn, Mn, Cu and Co. Also, it assisted wheat plant to tolerate drought condition.

REFERENCES

- Abu-Zeid, M. (1999). Egypt's Water Policy for the 21st Century, 7th Nile 2002, Conference, March 15-19, 1999, Cairo, Egypt.
- Aery, N. C. and B. L. Jagetiya (2000). Effect of cobalt treatments on dry matter production of wheat and DTPA extractable cobalt content in soil. Communications. Soil Science and Plant Analysis, 31(9-10): 1275 - 1286.
- A.O.A.C. (1990)." Association of Official Methods of Analysis Chemists, Official

Methods of Analysis ." 5th Ed. Washington , D. C. , USA.

- Arif, M., M. A. Khan, H. Akbar and S. Ali (2006). Prospects of wheat as a dual purpose crop and its impact on weeds. Pak. J. Weed Sci. Res., 12 (1-2): 13-17.
- Aziz, N. A. (2012). Effect of application of different levels of cobalt on yield, nodule formation, NPK content and photosynthetic pigments of alfalfa (*Medicago sativa L.*) plant in a calcareous soil. Bull. Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., 63: 108 - 115.
- Basak, R.K. (2006). "Fertilizers" Kalyani Publishers, Ludhiana-New Delhi, Nodia (U. P.), Hyderabad, Chennai, Calcutta, Cuttack.
- Benlioch-Gonalez, M., J. Romera, S. Cristescu, F. Harren, J. M. Fourinier and M. Benlich (2010). K⁺ starvation inhibit water-stress-induced stomatal closure via ethylene synthesis in sunflower plants. J. Exp. Bot., 61(4):1139-1145.
- Cabanero, F. J. and M. Carvajal (2007). Different cation stresses after specifically osmotic root hydraulic conductance involving aquaporins, ATPase and xylem loading of ions in *Capsicum annnum* L. plants. J. Plant physiology. 164: 1300-1310.
- Chapman, H. O. and P. E. Pratt (1961)." Methods of Analysis for Soil, Plant and Water ". California Univ., Div. Agric. Sci., Davis, California, USA.
- Cottenie, A., M. Verloo, L. Kiekens, G. Velghe and R. Camerlyek (1982). " Chemical Analysis of Plants and Soils ". Laboratory of Analytical and Agro chemistry, State Univ. Ghent, Belgium.
- El-Ashry–Soad, M. and M. A. El Kholy (2005). Response of wheat cultivars to chemical desiccants under water stress conditions. J. Appl. Sci. Res., 1 (2): 253 – 262.
- Elbaalawy, A. M. (2010). Studies on plant nutrition. M.Sc. Thesis Fac. of Agric., Menuofiya Univ., Egypt.
- El-Dardiry, E. I., M. Abd El-Hady and S. M. El-Ashry (2010). Effect of water regime and potassium application on water relations and nutrients uptake of wheat plant. Int. J. Academic. Res., 2 (2): 75 – 82.

- El- Sheekh, M. M., A. H. El Naggar and M. E. H. El - Mazaly (2003). Effect of cobalt on growth, pigment and the photosynthetic electron transport in *Monoraphidium minutum and Nitzhia perminuta*. Brazilian J. of Plant Physiology. 15: 159 - 166.
- Gad, Nadia (2006). Increasing the efficiency of nitrogen fertilization through cobalt application to pea plant. Research J. of Agriculture and Biological Sci., 2 (6): 433 - 442.
- Gad, Nadia and Hala Kandil (2011). Maximizing the tolerance of wheat plants to soil salinity using cobalt. 1- Growth and mineral composition. J. of Applied Sciences Res., 7 (11): 1569-1574.
- Gad, Nadia, A. M. Mohammed and L. K. Bekbayeva (2013). Response of cowpea (*Vigna Anguiculata*) to cobalt nutrition. Middle-East J. Scientific research, 14(2): 177-184.
- Ghazanavi, A. F. and F. A. Abdolshahi (2012). Study on effect of potassium sulphate application on drought tolerance of bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum L.*). Plant ecophysiology 3: 87-93
- Gomez, K. A. and A. A. Gomez (1984)." Statistical Procedures for
- Agricultural ", Research , 2nd (Ed.) John Wily and Sons, New York.
- Hu, Y. and U. Schmidhalter (2005). Drought and salinity; A comparison of their effect on mineral nutrition of plants. J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci., 168: 541-549.
- Hussain, N. M. A. Khan and M. A. Javed (2005). Effect of foliar application of plant micronutrient mixture on growth and yield of wheat (*Triticum aestivum L.*). Pakistan J. of Biological Sci., 8(8): 1096-1099.
- Kandil, Hala (2007). Effect of cobalt fertilizer on growth, yield and nutrients status of faba bean (*Vicia faba L.*) plants. J. Applied Sci. Res. 3 (9): 867-872.

- Klute, A. (1986). "Methods of Soil Analysis". American Society of Agron., Inc. Soil Sci. Soc. of Amer., Inc. Madison Wisconsin, USA, 2nd Edition.
- Li , C. Z., D. Wang and G. X. Wang (2005). The protective effective of potato seedling leaves during osmotic stress. Bot. Bull. Acad. Sin., 46: 119-125.
- Mahgoub, Hayam S. and M. A. El- Sayed (2001). Response of two wheat cultivars to irrigation amount and nitrogen level in sandy soil. Mansoura Univ. J. Agric. Sci. 26(4): 1863 - 1873.
- Marschner, H. (2003). "Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants". Academic Press, Harcount Brace Janovisch Publishers. New York. P: 210 - 228.
- Nassar, K.E.M., M. M. El-Shouny and E. M. K. Behiry (2004). Improving the quantity and quality of wheat in salt affected soils. Zagazig J. Agric. Res. 31(6): 2861 -2883.
- Page, A. L., R. H. Miller and D. R. Keeney (1982)." Methods of Soil Analysis". Amer. Soc. of Agron., Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Sisworo, E.L., D. L. Eskew, W. H. Resjidand-Sisworo, H. Kadarusman, H. Solahuddin and G. Soepardi (1990). Studies on the availability of Azolla N and urea for rice growth using N¹⁵. Plant and Soil, 128:209.
- Smith, R. M. (1991). "Trace Elements in Human and Animal Nutrition ". Micronut. News. Info., pp:119.
- Tantawy, Manal F. (2004). Monitoring of environmental pollution with heavy metals in some delta soils and its phytoremediation. Ph. D. Thesis, Fac. of Agric., Tanta Univ., Egypt.
- WenHua, F., X. XiaoGuang, Y. LiFang and L. SuPing (2004). Effects of cobalt on grain yield and quality of winter wheat. Plant Nutrition and Fertilizer Sci., 10(4): 429 - 432.

تأثير إضافات الكوبلت على محصول و مكونات القمح النامي تحت فترتين من الري

زينب محمود خليل ، منال فتحي طنطاوي ، محمد عبد الفتاح حسن محمد

معهد بحوث الأراضي والمياه والبيئة- مركز البحوث الزراعية- الجيزة- مصر

الملخص العربي

أجريت تجربة حقلية علي أرض طينية بمحطة الجميزة للبحوث الزراعية – محافظة الغربية بمنطقة وسط دلتا النيل – مصر و ذلك خلال موسمي نمو شتوبين متتاليين لعامي ٢٠١٢ / ٢٠١٣ و ٢٠١٣ / ٢٠١٢ م، لدراسة تأثير المستويات المختلفة لإضافة الكوبلت رشأ (صغر , ٨١ , ١٦٢ , ٣٢٤ و ٢٤ ملليجرام كوبلت / لتر) في صورة خلات كوبلت و توقيت إضافته (علي ثلاث دفع متساوية عند أطوار البادرة و التفريع و طرد السنابل أو علي دفعة واحدة عند طور التفريع للنبات) علي النمو و المحصول و التركيب الكيميائي لنباتات القمح صنف جميزة ١١ و ذلك تحت تأثير فترتيين من الري (٢٥ و ٤٠ يوماً). و كان حجم محلول الرش لكل معدل إضافة هو ٢٠٠ لتر / فدان. و أجريت التجربة في تصميم قطع منشاة مرتين بثلاث مكررات.

- و أوضحت النتائج ما يلي:
- وجود زيادة معنوية في كل مقاييس النمو و المتمثلة في : طول النبات (سم) طول السنبلة (سم) عدد السنابل لكل م^٢ – وزن ١٠٠٠ حبة (جم) – محصول الحبوب و القش علي مستوي الوحدة التجريبية أو الفدان و أيضاً المحصول الكلي (كجم / فدان) و ذلك بزيادة المضاف من الكوبلت، وكانت هذه الزيادة أكثر وضوحاً في معاملة إضافة الكوبلت علي ثلاثة دفعات متساوية و عند الري كل ٢٥ يوماً.
- و قد بين التحليل الإحصائي للنتائج عدم وجود معنوية للتأثير المشترك للمعاملات تحت الدراسة و هي متحدة (فترات الري – مستويات إضافة الكوبلت – عدد دفعات الكوبلت و توقيت إضافتها) علي مقاييس النمو و محصولي الحبوب و القش. بينما أوضح أن معظم التفاعلات الثنائية لها تأثير معنوي علي صفات النمو , و أيضاً كان التفاعل بين المستويات المختلفة لإضافة الكوبلت و عدد دفعات إضافته ذو تأثير معنوي على كل من محصولي الحبوب و القش.
- إزداد التركيز (٪) وكذلك الممتص (كجم/فدان) من عناصر النيتروجين و الفوسفور و البوتاسيوم و البروتين (٪) في كل من الحبوب و القش بزيادة المضاف من الكوبلت و كانت هذه الزيادة أكثر وضوحاً مع إضافة الكوبلت علي ثلاث دفعات متساوية و عند الري كل ٢٥ يوماً. كما كان التركيز (٪) و الممتص (كجم / فدان) لكل من عنصري النيتروجين و الفوسفور في الحبوب أكبر من القش بينما أخذ عنصر البوتاسيوم عكس هذا الإتجاه.

- و بالنسبة للعناصر الصغري , فقد وجد زيادة في التركيز (ملليجم/كجم) و أيضاً الممتص (جم / فدان) لكل من عناصر المنجنيز - الزنك - النحاس - الكوبلت في كل من الحبوب و القش بزيادة المضاف من الكوبلت و خصوصاً عند إضافته على ثلاث دفعات متساوية و الري كل ٢٥ يوماً , بينما أخذ عنصر الحديد عكس هذا الإتجاه و هذا يوضح علاقة التضاد بين عنصري الحديد و الكوبلت. و قد أخذت العناصر الصغري التي تحت الدراسة في كل من الحبوب و القش هذا الإتجاه: الحديد > الزنك > المنجنيز > النحاس > الكوبلت. كما إتضح أيضاً أن تركيز هذه العناصر الصغري كان في الحبوب أكبر من القش ما عدا عنصر الزنك الذي أخذ عكس هذا الإتجاه.
- و أخيراً أوضحت نتائج الدراسة التأثير الإيجابي لفترات الري و إضافات الكوبلت على جميع قياسات نمو النباتات. و على ضوء النتائج السابقة يمكن القول بأن ري نباتات القمح كل ٢٥ يوماً مع إضافة الكوبلت رشاً بمعدل إضافة ٦٤٨ ملليجرام كوبلت / لتر علي ثلاث دفعات متساوية (عند أطوار البادرة و التفريع و طرد السنابل) أدي إلي زيادة محصول القمح و تحسين قياسات الجودة و محتواه من العناصر الغذائية.