

## Journal of Plant Production

Journal homepage: [www.jpp.mans.edu.eg](http://www.jpp.mans.edu.eg)  
Available online at: [www.jpp.journals.ekb.eg](http://www.jpp.journals.ekb.eg)

### Impact of Foliar Application with Iron, Zinc, Silicon Nano Particles and Yeast on Growth, Yield and Water Use Efficiency of Tomato Plants under Water Stress Conditions

Dawa, K. K.<sup>1\*</sup>; M. M. Zaghloul<sup>1</sup>; H. M. I. Ahmed<sup>2</sup> and KH. M. Hamad



<sup>1</sup>Veget. and Flori. Dept. Fac. Agric., Mans. Univ., Egypt.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Vegetable Crops Seed production and Technology, Horticulture Research institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt.



#### ABSTRACT

Two field experiments were conducted during the two summer seasons of 2015 and 2016 in a private farm at Gemiana village near Belqas City Dakahlia Governorate, Egypt, to study the effect of interaction between deficit irrigation water (60%, 80%, 100% of ETC) and some foliar spray treatments (nano iron, nano zinc, nano silicon and yeast extract) on plant growth parameters, chemical composition of leaves as photosynthetic pigments (Chl. a, Chl. b, total Chl. a+b), leaf mineral percentages (N, P, K) proline, yield and water use efficiency (WUE) of tomato plants (Fayruz hybrid) under drip irrigation system. A strip-plot design with three replicates was used. The vertical plots were allocated to the deficit irrigation, whereas the horizontal-plots were devoted to foliar spray treatments. Results revealed that the interaction among irrigation tomato plants at the level of 80 % Etc and spraying with different nano particles at different concentration or yeast extract significantly increased all aforementioned parameters, meanwhile deficit irrigation water treatments improved leaves proline content and WUE in both growing seasons. The best interaction treatment for increasing plant growth parameters, chemical constituents of leaves as photosynthetic pigments (Chl. a, Chl. b, total Chl. a+b) leaf mineral percentages (N, P, K) early and total yield is irrigation treatment with 80 % Etc and spraying with nano Si at 12 ppm and can be recommended to increase growth and productivity tomato plants of under similar conditions of this study.

**Keywords:** Tomato, Deficit Irrigation, Water Use Efficiency, Nano silicon, Nano iron, Nano zinc, Yeast

#### INTRODUCTION

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) is considered as one of the most important vegetable crops as well as popular vegetative all over the world as well as in Egypt. In addition, tomato represents one of the important vegetable crops for local consumption and export. Tomato is an important source of antioxidants including, lycopene, phenolic, and vitamin C in human diet.

The total cultivated area of tomato in Egypt was about 455,610 fed during 2017 season according to FAO (2018), which produced 7,229,108 tons with an average of 16.016 tons /feddan.

Egypt suffers annually from a water shortage of about 7 billion m<sup>3</sup>. In fact, the United Nations has already warned that Egypt may run out of water by the year 2025 (Texas Water Report, 2014).

In recent years, The strategy is to maximize the efficiency of water use due to the water shortage and rise agriculture productivity from unit area with the minimum levels of irrigation water. Thus, it was essential to use less water resources and achieved the highest productivity by the use of application of some nanoparticles (NPs) foliar applications and yeast to increase plant growth, productivity, quality and stress resistance.

Nanoparticles interact with plants which cause many morphological and physiological changes, depending on the properties of nanoparticles, they have important characteristic such as the little size, greater area-to-weight ratio and different shapes, nano particles may have different properties from their bulk material (Roduner, 2006). Likewise, nano silicon particles (Si-NPs) have different physical and chemical properties from their bulky materials and can work better to mitigate different biotic stresses than bulk materials (Abdel-Haliem *et al.*, 2017). Si-NPs have tremendous potential in agriculture and foliar application with silicon reduce adverse impacts of drought circumstance (Bukhari *et al.*, 2015), as well as it plays a considerable role in alleviate water stress by decreasing the rate of transpiration, enhancing photosynthesis process by improving light receiving efficiency through keeping the leaf rigid and erect (Siddiqui and Al-Whaibi, 2014).

Micronutrient deficiencies in plants may result in decreased yields and plant death, too in extreme cases. Fe and Zn deficiencies among the micronutrients have been the most detrimental to the growth and yield of all crops including tomatoes (Alloway, 2009). Nano Iron is an essential micronutrient for plant growth and development, its deficiency contributes to substantial changes in plant metabolism and causes chlorosis. Consequently, elements

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [dr.kawther@hotmail.com](mailto:dr.kawther@hotmail.com)

DOI: 10.21608/jpp.2020.106331

absorption of nano iron in plants under drought stress can play significant role in drought resistance.

Nano Zinc oxide particles (ZnO NPs) with little size and large surface area are considered to be the perfect candidates for use in plants as a Zn fertilizer (Adhikari et al., 2015). Zinc also plays a key role in plant survival under conditions of environmental stress, where it helps in strengthening or preparing plants to survive drought stress (Cakmak, 2008). It plays an important role in stomata control because of its ability to preserve membrane integrity and retain the potassium content of the cells and also its role in plant water relations (Khan et al., 2004).

yeast extract significantly alleviate water stress by increasing the relative water content, photosynthetic pigments, total carbohydrates, total free amino acids, and enzyme activities in plants (Hammad and Ali, 2014)

Therefore, this study was conducted to investigate the impact of the combination among deficit irrigation water treatments and some foliar application such as nano particles (iron, zinc, silicon) and yeast on plant growth, chemical composition of leaves, yield and WUE of tomato plants grown in clay soil with a system of drip irrigation.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were conducted under clay soil conditions during the two summer seasons of 2015 and 2016 in a private Farm at Gemiana village near Belqas City Dakahlia Governorate, Egypt, to study the effect of the interaction between deficit irrigation water treatments (60%, 80% and 100% from ETc) and some foliar spray treatments nano Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub>, nano ZnO, nano SiO<sub>2</sub> and Yeast extract on growth parameters, leaf pigments, leaf mineral percentages (N, P, K) and yield of tomato. Samples analysis of soil is shown in Table (1)

### 1. The experimental design and treatments:

This experiment included 27 treatments, which were the combinations among deficit irrigation water and eight foliar application treatments, beside control treatment (without foliar) as follows:

#### a. deficit irrigation treatments

60 % of ETc , 80 % of ETc and 100 % of ETc

#### b- Foliar spray treatments

Nano Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> at 1000 ppm , Nano Fe<sub>2</sub>O<sub>3</sub> at 2000 ppm, Nano ZnO at 500 ppm, Nano ZnO at 1000 ppm, Nano SiO<sub>2</sub> at 6 ppm, Nano SiO<sub>2</sub> at 12 ppm, Yeast extract at 5 g/l, Yeast extract at 10 g/l and control (without foliar).

**Table 1. some physical and chemical properties of the experimental soil in 2015 and 2016 seasons:**

| Seasons | Silt % | Clay % | Sand % | Texture soil | F.C mgkg <sup>-1</sup> | Fe mgkg <sup>-1</sup> | Zn mg kg <sup>-1</sup> | PH   | E.C (dSm <sup>-1</sup> ) | O.M % | CaCO <sub>3</sub> g kg <sup>-1</sup> | N mg kg <sup>-1</sup> | P mg kg <sup>-1</sup> | K mg kg <sup>-1</sup> |
|---------|--------|--------|--------|--------------|------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|--------------------------|-------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 2015    | 48.79  | 28.92  | 22.29  | Clay loamy   | 29.2                   | 18.9                  | 16.8                   | 7.88 | 0.97                     | 1.35  | 3.05                                 | 45.8                  | 3.87                  | 173                   |
| 2016    | 49.32  | 27.70  | 22.98  | Clay loamy   | 31.3                   | 18.4                  | 16.8                   | 7.93 | 0.92                     | 1.39  | 2.85                                 | 46.1                  | 3.78                  | 175                   |

F.C: Field Capacity; OM: Organic

A strip-plot design with three replicates was used. The vertical plots were allocated to the deficit irrigation, whereas the horizontal-plots were devoted to foliar spray treatments. The experimental unit area was 12.6 m<sup>2</sup>. It contained one dripper line with 9 m length and 1.4 m in width.

Seeds of tomato were (Fayruz hybrid F<sub>1</sub>) sown on June 1<sup>st</sup> and transplanted on July 8<sup>th</sup> in both seasons. Seedlings were transplanted at 50 cm apart on one side of

the dripper line (drip tubing GR type, 16 mm diameter with 50 cm emitter spacing built in discharge at 4 l/h.

Tomato plants were sprayed with the foliar application treatments six times after 7 days from transplanting and repeated after 10 days intervals.

### 2. Irrigation water treatments:

The irrigation water requirements were calculated according to Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) Penman-Monteith (PM) procedure, FAO 56 (Allen et al. 1998), the results are shown in Table (2).

**Table 2. Irrigation requirements (m<sup>3</sup>/fed) for irrigation treatments (100 %, 80 and 60 % of ETc) for tomato plants grown under clay soil during 2015 and 2016 seasons.**

| Irrigation requirements     | 2015 season |         |         | 2016 season |         |         |
|-----------------------------|-------------|---------|---------|-------------|---------|---------|
|                             | 100 %       | 80 %    | 60 %    | 100 %       | 80 %    | 60 %    |
| Total (m <sup>3</sup> /fed) | 4289.55     | 3431.64 | 2573.73 | 4635.21     | 3708.17 | 2781.13 |

### Recorded Data:

#### 1. Growth Parameters

A random sample of three plants was taken from each plot at 75 days after transplanting, in both seasons of study, for measuring the growth characters of tomato plants expressed as follows: Number of leaves/plant, fresh and dry weights of plant (g/plant).

#### 2. Chemical composition of leaves:

##### 1. Leaf Pigments Determination:

Chlorophyll a and b were determined according to the method described by Lichtenthaler and Wellburn (1983).

##### 2. Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium contents:

Nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium were determined according to the methods described by Bremner and Mulvaney (1982), Olsen and Sommers (1982) and Jackson (1970), respectively.

##### 3. Proline amino acid content:

Proline was determined according to the method described by Bates et al. (1973).

##### 3. Early and total yield:

Early yield: the sum of the first three harvestings (ton/fed).

Total yield (ton/fed).

**4. Water Use Efficiency (WUE)**

Water use efficiency was determined according to equation of Begg and Turner (1976) as follows:

$$\text{Water use efficiency} = \frac{\text{Yield (kg/fed)} / \text{Water quantity (m}^3\text{/fed)}}{\text{kg m}^{-3}}$$

**Statistical analysis:**

All obtained data in the two experiments were subjected to proper statistical analysis of variance technique by means of Costat computer software. according to Snedecor and Cochran (1980) and means separation were done according to LSD at 5 % level.

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Vegetative growth parameters:**

Data in Table (3) indicate the influence of interaction between deficit irrigation water, foliar application of nano particles and yeast extract on plant growth characters of tomato. Data clearly demonstrate that the interaction among deficit irrigation water treatments and foliar application with nano particles and yeast extracts had significant effect on number of leaves, fresh weight/plant and dry weight/plant compared to control in the two seasons. The interaction between irrigation at 80 % Etc level and spraying with nano Si at 12 ppm produced

the maximum values of number of leaves; fresh weights/plant and dry plant weighs in the two seasons.

These results agree with those reported by Wahb-Allah and Al-Omran (2012), Abdelhady *et al.* (2017), Dawa *et al.* (2019) and Ragab *et al.* (2019) who mentioned that the irrigation level of 80% of ETo gave the maximum values of plant height, number of leaves, number of branches per plant, fresh and dry weights as well as leaf area followed by 100% of ETo, while 60% of ETo gave the lowest values of all aforementioned parameters. Similar results were reported by Haghghia and Pessarakli (2013) reported that treated tomato plants with silicon (Si) and nano silicon (N-Si) recorded the best values of fresh and dry weights, root volume than untreated. Also, Lu *et al.* (2016) mentioned that application of nano silica at 5 g/L produced the maximum values of fresh weights and dry weights of tomato plant.

The increment in water supply led to increase vegetative growth parameters may be attributed to that water plays key role for transferring the mineral elements from the soil to plants leave and trans locating the photosynthetic assimilates from the leaves to the other parts in the plant, which lead to increment in the plant growth.

**Table 3. Effect of interaction between deficit irrigation and foliar applications of some Nano particles and yeast on growth parameters of tomato plant after 75 days from transplanting during 2015 and 2016 seasons.**

| Parameters Treatments | No. of leaves/plant |        | Fresh weight g/plant |        | Dry Weight g/plant |        |        |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--------|----------------------|--------|--------------------|--------|--------|
|                       | 2015                | 2016   | 2015                 | 2016   | 2015               | 2016   |        |
| 60% of ETC            | Nano Fe 1000 ppm    | 65.00  | 62.33                | 541.50 | 583.25             | 85.30  | 94.78  |
|                       | Nano Fe 2000 ppm    | 63.17  | 61.34                | 541.50 | 558.25             | 88.60  | 92.35  |
|                       | Nano Zn 500 ppm     | 55.50  | 53.33                | 520.75 | 525.00             | 81.43  | 87.06  |
|                       | Nano Zn 1000 ppm    | 61.67  | 57.66                | 541.50 | 583.25             | 83.51  | 90.80  |
|                       | Nano Si 6 ppm       | 69.84  | 71.84                | 608.25 | 650.00             | 86.33  | 95.83  |
|                       | Nano Si 12 ppm      | 67.17  | 71.50                | 625.00 | 642.00             | 84.80  | 94.13  |
|                       | Yeast 5 g/l         | 56.50  | 58.50                | 458.25 | 488.25             | 76.87  | 81.22  |
|                       | Yeast 10 g/l        | 59.33  | 61.34                | 512.50 | 531.50             | 79.67  | 83.43  |
|                       | Control             | 53.50  | 54.50                | 345.75 | 350.00             | 65.00  | 71.05  |
| 80% of ETC            | Nano Fe 1000 ppm    | 85.33  | 84.67                | 766.50 | 791.50             | 98.40  | 102.22 |
|                       | Nano Fe 2000 ppm    | 86.67  | 87.50                | 778.25 | 790.00             | 99.20  | 104.78 |
|                       | Nano Zn 500 ppm     | 85.50  | 79.84                | 756.50 | 688.25             | 94.77  | 91.29  |
|                       | Nano Zn 1000 ppm    | 84.67  | 82.34                | 625.00 | 600.00             | 97.33  | 92.04  |
|                       | Nano Si 6 ppm       | 114.50 | 116.66               | 833.25 | 845.00             | 119.47 | 121.06 |
|                       | Nano Si 12 ppm      | 117.67 | 118.67               | 851.50 | 861.50             | 122.27 | 125.74 |
|                       | Yeast 5 g/l         | 78.34  | 74.84                | 625.00 | 606.50             | 87.87  | 92.63  |
|                       | Yeast 10 g/l        | 82.66  | 77.17                | 645.00 | 625.00             | 93.70  | 91.01  |
|                       | Control             | 61.67  | 69.17                | 333.25 | 375.00             | 61.80  | 68.60  |
| 100% of ETC           | Nano Fe1000 ppm     | 80.84  | 81.34                | 583.25 | 666.50             | 88.17  | 84.51  |
|                       | Nano Fe 2000 ppm    | 81.84  | 88.34                | 625.00 | 683.25             | 88.10  | 88.89  |
|                       | Nano Zn 500 ppm     | 83.17  | 80.34                | 600.00 | 608.25             | 87.13  | 86.72  |
|                       | Nano Zn 1000 ppm    | 79.67  | 81.50                | 625.00 | 625.00             | 85.00  | 86.55  |
|                       | Nano Si 6 ppm       | 96.67  | 108.50               | 738.25 | 790.00             | 94.77  | 97.42  |
|                       | Nano Si 12 ppm      | 94.67  | 115.00               | 750.00 | 799.00             | 101.30 | 102.45 |
|                       | Yeast 5 g/l         | 55.67  | 66.67                | 500.00 | 541.50             | 75.67  | 83.99  |
|                       | Yeast 10 g/l        | 79.34  | 77.17                | 541.50 | 625.00             | 82.67  | 91.76  |
|                       | Control             | 59.17  | 64.84                | 391.50 | 433.25             | 62.13  | 67.85  |
| LSD at 5%             | 7.73                | 6.79   | 71.59                | 76.22  | 9.68               | 8.22   |        |

The simulative effect of nano silicon under water stress conditions may be due to the effect of silicon in alleviate the negative effects of environmental stress and decrease the loss of nutrients in the soil (Guntzer *et al.*, 2012). Moreover, silicon maintain mineral balance (Shi *et al.*, 2014) and improving the absorption of water by roots

(Liu *et al.*, 2014), restriction in toxic ions uptake and efficient functioning of anti-oxidative mechanisms (Sacala, 2009).

**Chemical Composition of leaves:**

**1. Leaf pigments:**

The impacts of interaction among deficit irrigation

and foliar application treatments on leaf pigments in leaf tissues of tomato are presented in Table (4). It is obvious from the data that the interaction between deficit irrigation water treatments and foliar application with Nano Fe, Zn, Si and yeast extract had significant effect on chlorophyll a, b and total chlorophyll (a+b) in leaf tissues of tomato at 75 days after transplanting in the two seasons. In this connect, the interaction between irrigation at 80 % Etc and spraying with nano Fe at 2000 ppm gave the best concentration of chlorophyll a, b and total chlorophyll (a+b) in leaf tissues of tomato, followed by the interaction between the same level of irrigation and spraying with nano Si at 12 ppm and the interaction between 100 % Etc and spraying with nano Fe at 2000 ppm came in the third rank in the two seasons.

The lowest concentration of all leaf pigments were obtained with the interaction between 60 % Etc and unsprayed plants in the two seasons.

The result are supported by the findings of sibomana *et al.* (2013) Who observed that water stress (40% F.C) reduced chlorophyll content of tomato plants compared to control. Dawa *et al.* (2019) Highlighted that the highest values of chlorophylls contents in leaves of

tomato were recorded with irrigation at 80% of ETc than 60 or 100 % ETc. On the other side, Abdelhady *et al.* (2017) and Ragab *et al.* (2019) reported that the maximum concentrations of chlorophylls in leaves were obtained with the highest levels of irrigation 100% of ETc. Furthermore, Ejraei (2013) and Rahmatizadeh *et al.* (2019) suggested that foliar spray with nano Fe<sub>3</sub>O<sub>4</sub> at 20 mg/L improved chlorophyll a, b and total chlorophyll contents of tomato plants. The stimulation impact of irrigation water at 80% ETc may be due to the fact that applications of an acceptable level of irrigation ensure the availability of mineral nutrients and the uptake of plant roots which enhanced chlorophyll formation.

The improvement of chlorophyll in response to the foliar application of nano iron than unsprayed plants may be attributed to Fe increased leaf surface, plant growth, net photosynthetic speed, and plant chlorophyll content (Huda *et al.*, 2009). Iron nutrients also play a key role in tomato plant physiology and are essential for plant activities such as respiration, meristematic growth, formation of chlorophyll, photosynthesis, production of gossypol, tannin and phenolic compounds (Bhatt *et al.*, 2005).

**Table 4. Effect of interaction between deficit irrigation and foliar applications of Nano particles and yeast on leaf pigments (mg/g FW) of tomato plants after 75 days from transplanting during 2015 and 2016 summer seasons.**

| Parameters<br>Treatments | Chlorophyll a    |       | Chlorophyll b |       | Total chlorophyll (a+b) |       |       |
|--------------------------|------------------|-------|---------------|-------|-------------------------|-------|-------|
|                          | 2015             | 2016  | 2015          | 2016  | 2015                    | 2016  |       |
| 60% of ETc               | Nano Fe 1000 ppm | 0.631 | 0.580         | 0.420 | 0.358                   | 1.051 | 0.938 |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm | 0.653 | 0.607         | 0.430 | 0.383                   | 1.083 | 0.989 |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 0.540 | 0.540         | 0.370 | 0.398                   | 0.910 | 0.938 |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm | 0.544 | 0.560         | 0.368 | 0.420                   | 0.912 | 0.980 |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm    | 0.587 | 0.589         | 0.395 | 0.440                   | 0.982 | 1.029 |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 0.609 | 0.613         | 0.413 | 0.418                   | 1.021 | 1.031 |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l      | 0.591 | 0.558         | 0.385 | 0.443                   | 0.976 | 1.000 |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l     | 0.593 | 0.593         | 0.398 | 0.465                   | 0.991 | 1.058 |
|                          | Control          | 0.511 | 0.520         | 0.345 | 0.348                   | 0.856 | 0.868 |
| 80% of ETc               | Nano Fe 1000 ppm | 0.656 | 0.651         | 0.443 | 0.430                   | 1.098 | 1.081 |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm | 0.676 | 0.693         | 0.460 | 0.453                   | 1.136 | 1.146 |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 0.591 | 0.593         | 0.400 | 0.390                   | 0.991 | 0.983 |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm | 0.604 | 0.624         | 0.415 | 0.405                   | 1.019 | 1.029 |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm    | 0.644 | 0.651         | 0.430 | 0.410                   | 1.074 | 1.061 |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 0.667 | 0.671         | 0.443 | 0.403                   | 1.098 | 1.074 |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l      | 0.611 | 0.598         | 0.405 | 0.413                   | 1.016 | 1.010 |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l     | 0.636 | 0.618         | 0.423 | 0.425                   | 1.058 | 1.043 |
|                          | Control          | 0.560 | 0.573         | 0.383 | 0.413                   | 0.943 | 0.986 |
| 100% of ETc              | Nano Fe 1000 ppm | 0.620 | 0.627         | 0.420 | 0.393                   | 1.040 | 1.019 |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm | 0.656 | 0.658         | 0.443 | 0.400                   | 1.098 | 1.058 |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 0.571 | 0.573         | 0.380 | 0.375                   | 0.951 | 0.948 |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm | 0.589 | 0.587         | 0.398 | 0.395                   | 0.986 | 0.982 |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm    | 0.600 | 0.604         | 0.403 | 0.413                   | 1.003 | 1.017 |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 0.642 | 0.624         | 0.425 | 0.395                   | 1.067 | 1.019 |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l      | 0.596 | 0.589         | 0.395 | 0.408                   | 0.991 | 0.996 |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l     | 0.618 | 0.602         | 0.410 | 0.445                   | 1.028 | 1.047 |
|                          | Control          | 0.527 | 0.536         | 0.360 | 0.358                   | 0.887 | 0.893 |
| LSD at 5%                | 0.043            | 0.051 | 0.031         | 0.029 | 0.083                   | 0.086 |       |

**2. N, P and K percentages and proline:**

Data in Table (5) show the impact of interaction among deficit irrigation water and foliar application treatments on N, P and K percentages leaves as well as proline amino acid in leaves in both seasons. The interaction among deficit irrigation and spraying with nano particles as well as yeast extract reflected significant effect on N, P and K percentages in leaves as well as proline

amino acid in leaves in the two seasons. The highest values of, N, P and K percentages in leaves were obtained with the interaction between 80 % Etc and spraying with nano Fe at 2000 ppm. On the other hand, the combination among deficit irrigation water at 60 % Etc and unsprayed plants recorded the lowest values of N, P and K percentages and highest values of proline amino acid in leaves in the two growing seasons.

The beneficial effects of high irrigation levels on mineral absorption may be due to its enhancing effect on transport of dissolved nutrients by mass flow also, the suitable balance of moisture in plant creates favorable conditions for photosynthesis and metabolites translocation, which accelerate the rate of nutrients absorption.

These results are in harmony with those reported by Abdelhady *et al.* (2017), Elzopy *et al.* (2017), Dawa *et al.* (2019), and Ragab *et al.* (2019) they found that moderate or high levels of irrigation increased N, P and K contents in shoots of tomato plants grown under stress. Also, our result in parallel line with findings by Gao *et al.* (2012) who revealed that the content of proline increased in the leaves of processing tomato under drought stress. In addition to, Ghorbanli *et al.* (2013) who mentioned that proline is an antioxidant against drought stress. Furthermore, Kazemi

(2013) showed that the highest concentrations of N and K in leaf were recorded with cucumber plants when sprayed with iron at 100 ml/l than 50 ml/l or unsprayed plants.

The conversion of proline to glutamic acid and hence to other soluble compounds (proline oxidation) proceeds readily in turgid leaves and it is stimulated by higher concentrations of proline. This suggests that proline oxidation could function as a control mechanism for maintaining low cellular levels of proline in turgid tissues. In water stressed, however proline oxidation is reduced to negligible rates. It seems likely that inhibition of proline oxidation is necessary in maintaining high levels of proline found in stressed levels. Proline accumulates under stressed conditions supplies energy for growth and survival and thereby helps the plant to tolerate stress (Stewart, 1977).

**Table 5. Effect of interaction between deficit irrigation and foliar applications of Nano particles and yeast on N,P, K percentages as well as proline in leaves of tomato plants during 2015 and 2016 summer seasons:**

| Parameters<br>Treatments | N (%)            |      | P (%) |       | K (%) |      | Proline amino acid mg/100 g DW |        |        |
|--------------------------|------------------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|--------------------------------|--------|--------|
|                          | 2015             | 2016 | 2015  | 2016  | 2015  | 2016 | 2015                           | 2016   |        |
| 60% of ETc               | Nano Fe 1000 ppm | 2.93 | 3.02  | 0.305 | 0.326 | 2.30 | 2.59                           | 106.00 | 109.00 |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm | 3.32 | 3.42  | 0.348 | 0.372 | 2.65 | 2.99                           | 105.60 | 106.80 |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 2.72 | 2.80  | 0.288 | 0.308 | 2.12 | 2.39                           | 118.00 | 116.92 |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm | 3.13 | 3.22  | 0.325 | 0.325 | 2.47 | 2.79                           | 115.24 | 115.32 |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm    | 2.65 | 2.73  | 0.277 | 0.292 | 2.04 | 2.30                           | 101.88 | 109.76 |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 3.02 | 3.11  | 0.337 | 0.360 | 2.41 | 2.72                           | 96.44  | 95.36  |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l      | 2.81 | 2.89  | 0.297 | 0.318 | 2.21 | 2.49                           | 112.20 | 118.56 |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l     | 3.23 | 3.32  | 0.288 | 0.308 | 2.51 | 2.84                           | 114.00 | 117.56 |
|                          | Control          | 2.51 | 2.58  | 0.269 | 0.284 | 1.93 | 2.18                           | 145.44 | 138.72 |
| 80% of ETc               | Nano Fe 1000 ppm | 3.34 | 3.44  | 0.344 | 0.368 | 2.77 | 3.13                           | 87.28  | 90.56  |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm | 3.73 | 3.84  | 0.387 | 0.414 | 3.16 | 3.57                           | 80.40  | 73.64  |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 3.14 | 3.23  | 0.324 | 0.346 | 2.59 | 2.92                           | 89.32  | 84.00  |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm | 3.55 | 3.65  | 0.368 | 0.393 | 2.96 | 3.34                           | 86.16  | 80.80  |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm    | 3.05 | 3.14  | 0.313 | 0.335 | 2.50 | 2.83                           | 73.44  | 70.64  |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 3.43 | 3.53  | 0.356 | 0.381 | 2.87 | 3.24                           | 65.12  | 62.84  |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l      | 3.26 | 3.36  | 0.335 | 0.358 | 2.68 | 3.03                           | 89.44  | 89.44  |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l     | 3.62 | 3.73  | 0.375 | 0.401 | 3.07 | 3.48                           | 79.84  | 87.96  |
|                          | Control          | 2.94 | 3.03  | 0.304 | 0.325 | 2.41 | 2.72                           | 112.40 | 115.56 |
| 100% of ETc              | Nano Fe 1000 ppm | 3.07 | 3.16  | 0.335 | 0.358 | 2.45 | 2.77                           | 78.56  | 75.12  |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm | 3.52 | 3.62  | 0.377 | 0.403 | 2.83 | 3.19                           | 66.20  | 70.96  |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 2.86 | 2.94  | 0.303 | 0.325 | 2.25 | 2.54                           | 83.88  | 85.76  |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm | 3.29 | 3.38  | 0.357 | 0.382 | 2.68 | 3.03                           | 75.60  | 72.60  |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm    | 2.75 | 2.83  | 0.303 | 0.324 | 2.17 | 2.45                           | 65.76  | 68.92  |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 3.18 | 3.27  | 0.346 | 0.370 | 2.57 | 2.90                           | 60.24  | 62.52  |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l      | 2.95 | 3.04  | 0.323 | 0.345 | 2.36 | 2.66                           | 73.08  | 78.32  |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l     | 3.41 | 3.51  | 0.368 | 0.393 | 2.75 | 3.10                           | 72.20  | 74.76  |
|                          | Control          | 2.66 | 2.74  | 0.294 | 0.314 | 2.08 | 2.35                           | 96.16  | 88.12  |
| LSD at 5%                | 0.16             | 0.14 | 0.024 | 0.023 | 0.13  | 0.14 | 1.71                           | 2.84   |        |

**3. Early and total yield:**

Results in the Table (6) cleared that early and total yield per feddan were significantly affected by the interaction among deficit irrigation water and foliar application treatments (nano Fe, nano Zn, nano Si and yeast extract) as compared with control in the two growing seasons.

In general, results showed that the most suitable irrigation treatment at 80% ETc with all different foliar applications which achieved significant higher mean values of early and total yield compared to other same treatments 60% and 100% of ETc. The highest mean values of the early and total yield were recorded for the treatment of 80% of ETc irrigation with nano Si at the rate of 12 ppm,

while the lowest ones were connected with control plants (without foliar applications) under all different irrigation treatments.

These results are agreeable with those reported by Abdelhady *et al.* (2

017), Hui *et al.* (2017), Liu *et al.* (2019) and Ragab *et al.* (2019) who observed that increasing water quantity (soil moisture content) or irrigation frequency increased total yield of tomato. Furthermore, Lu *et al.* (2016) on tomato, Tantawy *et al.* (2015) on sweet pepper and Yassen *et al.* (2017) on cucumber who showed that foliar application plants with Si recorded the maximum values of yield and its components compared to control (without foliar).

The improvement in total yield of tomato plant due to irrigation at 80 % ET might be due to the favorable effect of higher amounts of irrigation water on plant growth (Table 3) and increased leaf mineral nutrient (Table 5) and leaf pigments (Table 4) which resulted in increased tomato yield.

Low water supply content decrease root growth and inhibit leaf elongation rate and is associated with increase in ABA concentration in leaves (Smith and Dale, 1988)

and decrease CYT production and export ( Atkin *et al.* 1973) and this in turn affect the growth and yield of tomato plants.

Silicon affects yield by its deposition under the leaf epidermis, so it results a physical mechanism of defense, phenols production causing phytoalexin production, decreases water losses (transpiration) and increases plant photosynthesis capacity (Ahmad *et al.*, 2012).

**Table 6. Effect of interaction between deficit irrigation and foliar applications of Nano particles and yeast on yield of tomato plants after 75 days from transplanting during 2015 and 2016 summer seasons:**

| Parameters<br>Treatments | Early yield (ton/fed) |        | Total yield (ton/fed) |        |        |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------|-----------------------|--------|--------|
|                          | 2015                  | 2016   | 2015                  | 2016   |        |
| 60% of ETc               | Nano Fe 1000 ppm      | 15.782 | 14.715                | 20.879 | 22.808 |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm      | 17.981 | 15.969                | 23.141 | 26.668 |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm       | 12.671 | 13.634                | 16.461 | 20.723 |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm      | 13.513 | 14.670                | 21.843 | 22.299 |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm         | 17.249 | 16.404                | 26.079 | 27.723 |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm        | 19.164 | 17.302                | 26.793 | 29.067 |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l           | 10.745 | 13.946                | 20.233 | 22.035 |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l          | 14.724 | 15.283                | 22.941 | 24.758 |
|                          | Control               | 10.864 | 10.231                | 14.906 | 15.551 |
| 80% of ETc               | Nano Fe 1000 ppm      | 23.089 | 23.107                | 31.747 | 30.270 |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm      | 25.612 | 27.988                | 34.048 | 34.425 |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm       | 18.157 | 20.036                | 24.288 | 26.047 |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm      | 19.331 | 22.122                | 25.055 | 30.086 |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm         | 24.765 | 26.822                | 31.893 | 33.527 |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm        | 26.330 | 30.671                | 34.492 | 37.725 |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l           | 16.039 | 22.460                | 25.912 | 28.075 |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l          | 17.482 | 23.249                | 27.586 | 28.364 |
|                          | Control               | 17.559 | 17.812                | 22.019 | 23.868 |
| 100% of ETc              | Nano Fe 1000 ppm      | 18.936 | 19.133                | 26.491 | 28.700 |
|                          | Nano Fe 2000 ppm      | 20.096 | 20.403                | 28.058 | 31.829 |
|                          | Nano Zn 500 ppm       | 15.884 | 15.847                | 22.730 | 25.196 |
|                          | Nano Zn 1000 ppm      | 17.746 | 16.845                | 23.754 | 27.625 |
|                          | Nano Si 6 ppm         | 20.413 | 20.318                | 27.980 | 30.680 |
|                          | Nano Si 12 ppm        | 23.460 | 23.905                | 29.985 | 30.838 |
|                          | Yeast 5 g/l           | 15.810 | 18.027                | 25.114 | 26.320 |
|                          | Yeast 10 g/l          | 15.995 | 18.677                | 26.764 | 27.828 |
|                          | Control               | 13.329 | 13.560                | 19.381 | 21.696 |
| LSD at 5%                | 2.202                 | 2.465  | 2.332                 | 2.256  |        |

**Water use efficiency**

Presented data in Table (7) illustrate the impact of interaction between deficit irrigation water and spraying with nano particles (Fe, Zn, Si) and yeast extract on water use efficiency. Results revealed that the interaction between irrigation levels and the foliar application treatments recorded a stimulated effect on water use efficiency in the two seasons. In addition, the highest values of WUE were obtained for the treatment of 60% ETc irrigation and 80% ETc in both seasons respectively, with nano Si at 12 ppm while the lowest ones were connected with the treatment without any of applied foliar application substances.

These findings are consistent with those reported by Xiukang and Yingying (2016) found that water stress 50% increased water use efficiency of tomato plant. Also, Romero-Aranda *et al.* (2006) concluded that the application Si increase plant water storage and WUE in tomato plants.

Under water stress conditions, silicon improved plant water status, reduced water loss through transpiration, maintained adequate supply of essential nutrients, and limited uptake of toxic ions and efficient functioning of ant oxidative mechanisms (Sacala, 2009).

**Table 7. Effect of interaction between deficit irrigation and foliar applications of Nano particles and yeast on water use efficiency (kg fruit /m<sup>3</sup> water) during 2015 and 2016 summer season:**

| Parameter<br>Treatments | water use efficiency<br>(kg fruit /m <sup>3</sup> water) |        |        |
|-------------------------|--|--------|--------|
|                         | 2015   | 2016   |        |
| 60% of ETc              | Nano Fe 1000 ppm   | 8.115  | 8.201  |
|                         | Nano Fe 2000 ppm   | 8.994  | 9.589  |
|                         | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 6.398  | 7.452  |
|                         | Nano Zn 1000 ppm   | 8.489  | 8.018  |
|                         | Nano Si 6 ppm  | 10.136 | 9.969  |
|                         | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 10.413 | 10.452 |
|                         | Yeast 5 g/l  | 7.864  | 7.923  |
|                         | Yeast 10 g/l   | 8.916  | 8.903  |
|                         | Control  | 5.793  | 5.592  |
| 80% of ETc              | Nano Fe 1000 ppm   | 9.253  | 8.163  |
|                         | Nano Fe 2000 ppm   | 9.924  | 9.284  |
|                         | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 7.079  | 7.025  |
|                         | Nano Zn 1000 ppm   | 7.303  | 8.114  |
|                         | Nano Si 6 ppm  | 9.296  | 9.042  |
|                         | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 10.053 | 10.174 |
|                         | Yeast 5 g/l  | 7.552  | 7.571  |
|                         | Yeast 10 g/l   | 8.040  | 7.649  |
|                         | Control  | 6.418  | 6.437  |
| 100% of ETc             | Nano Fe 1000 ppm   | 6.176  | 6.192  |
|                         | Nano Fe 2000 ppm   | 6.542  | 6.867  |
|                         | Nano Zn 500 ppm  | 5.300  | 5.436  |
|                         | Nano Zn 1000 ppm   | 5.538  | 5.960  |
|                         | Nano Si 6 ppm  | 6.524  | 6.619  |
|                         | Nano Si 12 ppm   | 6.991  | 6.653  |
|                         | Yeast 5 g/l  | 5.855  | 5.679  |
|                         | Yeast 10 g/l   | 6.240  | 6.004  |
|                         | Control  | 4.519  | 4.681  |
| LSD at 5%               | 0.732  | 0.615  |        |

## CONCLUSION

It could be concluded that the irrigation of tomato plants with 80 % from Etc and spraying with Silicon nanoparticles at 12 ppm save more irrigation water and improved plant growth parameters, chemical constituents of leaves and total yield of tomato plants under similar conditions of this study.

## REFERENCES

- Abdelhady S. A.; N. A. I. Abu El-Azm and E. H. El-Kafafi (2017). Effect of deficit irrigation levels and NPK fertilization rates on tomato growth, yield and fruits quality. Middle East J. Agric. Res., 6 (3): 587-604.
- Abdel-Haliem M.E.F.; H. S. Hegazy, N.S. Hassan and D.M. Naguib (2017). Effect of silica ions and nano silica on rice plants under salinity stress. Ecol Eng., 99:282–289.
- Adhikari, T.; S. Kundu, A. K. Biswas, J.C. Tarafdar, and A. Subba Rao, (2015). Characterization of zinc oxide nano particles and their effect on growth of maize (*Zea mays* L.) plant. J. Plant Nutrition., 38: 1505-1515.
- Ahmad, A.; T. Muhammad, U. I. Ehsan, N. Muhammad, A. Muhammad, R. Hassebur and T. Muhammad. (2012). Effect of Silicon and Boron Foliar Application on Yield and Quality of Rice. Pak. j. life soc. Sci., 10(2): 161-165.
- Allen, R.G., L.S. Perira, D. Raes and M. Smith. (1998). Crop Evapotranspiration. FAO irrigation and drainage, Rome, paper 56.
- Alloway, B. J. (2009). Soil factors associated with zinc deficiency in crops and humans Environmental Geochemistry & Health., 31: 537-548.
- Atkin, R. K.; G.E.Barton and D.K. Robinson (1973). Effect of root growing temperature on growth substances in xylem oxudates of *Zea mays*. J.Exp. Bot., 24: 475-487.
- Bates, L., R. P. Waldren and I. D. Teare (1973). Rapid determination of free proline for water-stress studies. Plant and Soil, 39: 205-207.
- Begg, J. E. and N. C. Turner (1976). Crop water deficits. Advances in Agron., 28, pp.189.
- Bhatt, L.; B.K. Srivastava and M.P Singh (2005). Studies on the effect of foliar application of micronutrients on growth, yield and economics of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* L.). *Progressive Hort.*, 36 (2): 331-334.
- Bremner, J.M. and C.S. Mulvaney (1982). Total nitrogen. In: Page, A.L., R.H. Miller, and D.R. Keeney (Eds.). Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2, Am. Soc. Agron. Madison, W.I. USA. pp. 595- 624.
- Bukhari, M. A.; M. Y Ashraf, R. Ahmad, , E. A. Waraich. and M. Hameed. (2015). Improving drought tolerance potential in wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) through exogenous silicon supply. Pak. J. Bot., 47(5): 1641-1648.
- Cakmak, I. (2008). Enrichment of cereal grains with zinc: agronomic or genetic bio fortification. Plant and Soil, 302: (1-2) 1-17.
- Dawa, K. k. A.; T. M. Al-Gazar and A. M. Abdel-Fatah (2019). Response of tomato plants (vegetative growth and leaf chemical constituents) to water irrigation levels and some foliar application under drip irrigation system. J.plant production, Mansoura, Unvi, 10 (3):265-273.
- Ejraei, A. (2013) Determination optimum concentration of iron in hydroponic medium of Tomato (*Lycopersicom esculentum*). J . Novel Applied Sci. 2(3): 856-860.
- Elzopy, K. A.; M. S. Biradar, H. T. Channal, M. V. Manjunath, Y. B. Palled, B. M. Radder and P. L. Patil (2017). NPK uptake of tomato as influenced by irrigation regimes and fertigation levels under greenhouse condition. Asian J. Advances in Agric. Res., 3(1): 1-10.
- FAO (2018). Statistical Database. Food and agricultural organization of the united nations. Available at <http://www.faostat.fao.org>
- Gao, Y.; C. Li and K. Lou (2012). Effect of spraying glycine betaine on physiological responses of processing tomato under drought stress. Plant Nutrition and Fertilizer Science. 18(2): 426-432.
- Ghorbanli, M.; M. Gafarabad,T. Amirkian and B.A. Mamagha(2013). Investigation of proline, total protein, chlorophyll, ascorbate and dehydro ascorbate changes under drought stress in Akria and Mobil tomato cultivars. Iranian J. Plant Physiology 3 (2): 651-658.59
- Guntzer. F.; K. Catherine and M. Jean-Dominique (2012). Benefits of plant silicon for crops: a review. Agron. Sustain. Dev., 32: 201– 213.
- Haghighia, M. and M. Pessaraki (2013). Influence of silicon and nano-silicon on salinity tolerance of cherry tomatoes (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) at early growth stage. Scientia Horti., 161: 111–117.
- Hammad, S.A.R. and O.A.M. Ali (2014) Physiological and biochemical studies on drought tolerance of wheat plants by application of amino acids and yeast extract. Annals . Agri. Sci. 59:133-145.
- Huda, K.M.K.; M.S.R. Bhuiyan, N. Zeba, S.A. Banu., F.Mahmud and A. Khatun (2009). Effect of FeSO<sub>4</sub> and pH on shoot regeneration from the cotyledonary explants of Tossa Jute. Plant Omics J., 2(5): 190-196.
- Hui, Y.; C. Hongxia, H. Xinmei, G. Lijie, L. Hongzheng and W. Xuanyi (2017). Evaluation of tomato fruit quality response to water and nitrogen management under alternate partial root-zone irrigation. Int. J. Agric. & Biol. Eng., 10 (5): 87-94.
- Jackson, M. L. (1970). Soil Chemical Analysis. Prentice Hall, Englewood Ceiffs, N. J.
- Kazemi M. (2013). Effect of foliar application of iron and zinc on growth and productivity of cucumber. Bull. Env. Pharmacol. Life Sci., 2 (11): 11-14.
- Khan H. R.; G. K. McDonald and Z. Rengel (2004). Zinc fertilization and water stress affects plant water relations, stomatal conductance and osmotic adjustment in chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.). Plant and Soil, 267(1-2): 271-284.
- Lichtenthaler, H. k. and A. R. Wellburn, (1983). Determinations of total carotenoids and chlorophylls a and b of leaf extracts in different solvents. Biochem. Soc. Trans., 11(5): 591-592.
- Liu J; T. Hu, P. Feng, L. Wanga and S. Yang (2019). Tomato yield and water use efficiency change with various soil moisture and potassium levels during different growth stages. PLoS ONE 14(3): e0213643.<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0213643>

- Liu, P.; L. Yin, X. Deng, S. Wang, K. Tanaka and S. Zhang, (2014). Aquaporin-mediated increase in root hydraulic conductance is involved in silicon-induced improved root water uptake under osmotic stress in *Sorghum bicolor* L. J. Experimental Botany., 65: 4747-4756.
- Lu, M. M. D.; D. M. R. De Silva, E. K. Peralta, A. N. Fajardo and M. M. Peralta (2016). Growth and yield of tomato applied with silicon supplements with varying material structures .Philippine e-J. for Applied Research and Development 6: 10-18.
- Olsen, S.R. and L.E. Sommers (1982). Phosphorus. In: Page. A.L., R.H. Miller, and D.R. Keeney (Eds). Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2 Am. Soc. Agron. Madison, W.I. USA, pp. 403-430.
- Ragab M.E.; Y. E. Arafa, O. M. Sawan, Z. F. Fawzy and S. M. El-Sawy (2019). Effect of irrigation systems on vegetative growth, fruit yield, quality and irrigation water use efficiency of tomato plants (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) grown under water stress conditions. Acta Scientific Agric., 3.4: 172-183.
- Rahmatizadeha, R.; S. M. J. Arvin, R. Jameia, H. Mozaffarib and F. R. Nejhad.(2019). Response of tomato plants to interaction effects of magnetic ( $Fe_3O_4$ ) nanoparticles and cadmium stress J. plant interactions. 14(1): 474-481.
- Roduner, E (2006). Size matters: why nanomaterials are different. Chem Soc Rev., 35 (7): 583-592.
- Romero-Aranda, M.R., O. Jurado, and J. Cuartero. (2006). Silicon alleviates the deleterious salt effect on tomato plant growth by improving plant water status. J. Plant Phys. 163:847-855.
- Sacala, E. (2009). Role of silicon in plant resistance to water stress. J. Elementol., 14 (3): 619-630.
- Shi, Y.; Z. Yi, Y. Hejin, W. Jiawen, Sun. Hao and G. Haijun (2014). Silicon improves seed germination and alleviates oxidative stress of bud seedlings in tomato under water deficit stress. Plant. Phys.and Biochemistry. 78: 27-36.
- Sibomana, I.C.; J. N. Aguyo and A. M. Opiyo (2013). Water stress affects growth and yield of container grown tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill) plants. Global Journal of .Bio-science and Biotechnology, 2(4): 461-466.
- Siddiqui, M. H and M. H. Al-Wahaibi (2014). Role of nano-SiO<sub>2</sub> in germination of tomato (*Lycopersicum esculentum* Mill.). Saudi Journal of Biological Sciences, 21(1): 13-17.
- silicon sources and rates. Horti. Brasileira., 32: 220-224.
- Smith, P.G. and J.E. Dale (1988). The effect of root cooling and excision treatments on the growth of primary leaves of *Phaseolus Vulgars*, L. Rapid and reversible increases in abscisic acid content. New Phytal. 110 293-300.
- Snedecor, G. W. and W. G. Cochran (1980). Statistical Methods. 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Ames, Iowa U.S.A: Iowa State Univ. Press, pp. 507.
- Stewart, C.R. (1977). Inhibition of proline oxidation by water stress. Plant physiol. 59:930-932.
- Tantawy, A. S.; Y. A. M. Salama, M. A. El-Nemr and A. M. R. Abdel-Mawgoud (2015). Nano silicon application improves salinity tolerance of sweet pepper Plants. Int. J. Chem. Tech. Res., 8 (10): 11-17.
- Texas Water Report (2014). Going Deeper for the solution, Available at: <http://www.window.state.tx.us/specialrpt/water/96-1746.pdf>.
- Wahb-Allah, M.A. and A. M. Al-Omran (2012). Effect of water quality and deficit irrigation on tomato growth, yield and water use efficiency at different developmental stages. J.Agric.& Env.Sci. Dam.Univ., Egypt.,11 (2) :80-110.
- Xiukang, W and X. Yingying (2016). Evaluation of the effect of irrigation and fertilization by drip fertigation on tomato yield and water use efficiency in greenhouse. International. J. Agronomy
- Yassen, A; E. A. M. Gaballah and S. Zaghloul (2017). Role of silicon dioxide nano fertilizer in mitigating salt stress on growth, yield and chemical composition of cucumber (*Cucumis sativus* L.). nternational J. Agricultural Research., 12(3): 130-135.

## تأثير الرش الورقي بجزيئات نانو الحديد والزنك والسيليكون والخميرة على النمو والمحصول وكفاءة الاستهلاك المائي لنباتات الطماطم تحت ظروف الإجهاد المائي

كوثر كامل ضوه<sup>1</sup> ، محمود محمد زغلول<sup>1</sup>، حمدينومحمد أحمد<sup>2</sup> و خديجة محمد حمد

<sup>1</sup> قسم الخضر والزينة - كلية الزراعة - جامعة المنصورة - مصر

<sup>2</sup> قسم بحوث تكنولوجيا تقاوى الخضر - معهد بحوث البساتين- مركز البحوث الزراعية - مصر

أجريت تجربتان حقليتان خلال موسمى النمو الصيفى 2015 و2016 تحت نظام الري بالتنقيط بمزرعة خاصة بقرية جمانة بالقرب من مدينة بلقاس- محافظة الدقهلية مصر لدراسة تأثير التفاعل بين معاملات نقص الري (100%، 80%، 60% من البخر نتج) والرش ببعض الإضافات الوريقيه (الحديد النانو، الزنك النانو، السيليكون النانو ومستخلص الخميرة) على النمو الخضرى والتركيب الكيماوى للأوراق مثل صبغات البناء الضوئى (كلوروفيل أ، كلوروفيل ب، الكلوروفيل الكلى +أ ب) محتوى الأوراق من العناصر (النيتروجين، الفسفور، البوتاسيوم) وكذلك محتوى البرولين فى الأوراق والمحصول لنبات الطماطم هجين (فيروز) تحت نظام الري بالتنقيط. استخدم تصميم الشرائح المتعامدة فى ثلاث مكررات حيث خصصت الشرائح الرأسية لمستويات ماء الري، فى حين خصصت الشرائح الأفقية لمعدلات الرش الورقي. أظهرت النتائج أن ري نباتات الطماطم عند مستوى 80 % من البخر نتج والرش بجزيئات النانو المختلفة أو مستخلص الخميرة بالتركيزات المختلفة قد سجلت زيادة معنويه. لجميع الصفات المذكورة أعلاه فى هذا الصدد بينما حسنت معاملات نقص الماء محتوى البرولين فى الاوراق وكفاءة الاستهلاك المائى فى كلا موسمى الزراعة. ووجد أن أفضل النتائج المتحصل عليها لزياده النمو الخضرى والتركيب الكيماوى للأوراق مثل صبغات البناء الضوئى (كلوروفيل أ، كلوروفيل ب، الكلوروفيل الكلى +أ ب) ومحتوى الأوراق من العناصر (النيتروجين، الفسفور، البوتاسيوم) ومحصول الطماطم المبكر والكلى عند ري النباتات بمستوى 80% من البخر نتج مع الرش الورقي بالنانو سيليكون بمعدل 12 جزء فى المليون ولهذا يمكن التوصية باستخدام هذه المعاملة لزيادة نمو وانتاجية الطماطم تحت ظروف مماثلة لهذه الدراسه.