INFLUENCE OF SALINITY OF IRRIGATION WATER ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF VALENCIA ORANGE TREES GROWN ON NEW RECLAIMED SOILS.

Gobran, Y.N.; Ahlam A. Al-Sayed and Enshrah A. Tayeh Citrus Dept., Horticulture Res. Institute, A.R.E., Egypt.

ABSTRACT

The effect of four levels of saline irrigation water (394&1130,1447 and 2045 ppm) on growth, some chemical components (leaf chlorophyll a,b and carotene, shoot starch and total carbohydrates), leaf mineral contents, tree fruiting, yield and physical and chemical fruit properties of Valencia orange trees cultivated at new reclaimed areas were studied for three (1999,2000 and 2001) successive seasons. Shoot number, shoot length, number of leaves/shoot of different growth cycles, tree canopy, leaf area, leaf specific weight, leaf chlorophyll a,b and carotene contents, shoot starch and total carbohydrates, leaf (P,K and Ca), fruit set percentage, fruiting percentage, yield as (fruit No./tree, Kg./tree), fruit weight, fruit size and Juice weight percentage, were adversely affected by salinity of irrigation water. On the contrary it increased leaf (N, Na, Cl, Zn, Fe and Mn), June drop, T.S.S, Acidity, T.S.S/Acid ratio and Vitamin C.

INTRODUCTION

Salinity is one of the troublesome stress that can cause a poor harvest in many agriculture crops, particularly in arid regions where saline soils are prevalent due to insufficient irrigation water. Salinity inhibits the plant growth by affecting both water absorption and biochemical processes, such as nitrogen assimilation and protein biosynthesis (Dubey, 1994). Under saline conditions, the plant fail to maintain the required balance of organic constituents leading to suppressed growth and yield. Reductions in citrus growth with salinity of irrigation water had been previously reported by (Bernstein & Hayard 1958 and Haggag 1977). Also, reductions in citrus yield with salinity of irrigation water is expected as it had been described as salt sensitive crop (Mass and Hoffiman, 1977).

Salinity conditions have a direct effect on plant nutrition (Kafkafi, 1987). Recently a close relationship between mineral nutrition and carbohydrate had been described (Fischer & Bremer, 1993 and Haggag et al., 1995). Carbohydrates constitute a reserve pool which may put back into use for vegetative and reproductive growth. The presence of carbohydrate reserves in leaves, stems, trunk, and root of citrus trees is well documented by Wallerstein et al. (1974). and Yelenosky and Guy (1977). Furthermore, Jones et al. (1975), reported that correlations between fruiting and starch levels were always higher than correlations with soluble sugars or total carbohydrate levels.

This study aimed to throw some light on the effect of salinity of irrigation water on growth, some chemical components and yield of Valencia orange trees.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This investigation was carried out during three successive seasons (1999—&2000 and 2001) in four orchards having Valencia orange (Citrus sinensis .(L.) Osback) trees budded on sour orange (Citrus aurantium L.)

root stock. The first orchard located at EL. Nobaria, North EL – Tahreer Province, while the others located at EL – Kattbia and Kilometer point 75 and 92 along Cairo - Alexandria high way. The trees age at these orchards were about 12 – 15 years old planted at 5x 5 m. apart. Salinity of irrigation water used at the four orchards were 394 (control),1130,1447 and 2045 ppm respectively (Table 1).

Table (1): Analysis of irrigation water used (ppm).

Experimental orchard	Tss	Ca	Mg	Na	K	CO3	нсоз	S04	CI
1 (control)	394	56	27	32	8	1	9	120	142
2	1130	104	39	290	8	100	6	348	335
3	1447	140	62	355	9	03/20	12	336	533
4	2045	190	108	426	10		46	768	497

Drip irrigation system was employed at the four orchards. The orchards soil physical and chemical analysis was carried out according to the standard methods outlined by Wilde et Al. (1985) and the data are presented in Table (2).

Table (2): Physical and chemical characteristics of investigated soils.

Call shoulast and shoulast shows station	Part English	Experimen	ital orchard	1
Soil physical and chemical characteristics	1	2	3	4
Particle size distribution		35,50		
Sand%	90.5	89.2	87.9	92.3
Silt%	5.3	4.0	7.2	5.2
Clay%	4.2	6.8	4.9	2.5
Texture grade	sandy	sandy	sandy	sandy
pH(1:2.5 extract)	7.8	8.1	7.9	8.0
E.C.(1;2.5 extract) (mmhos/cm)	1.5	1.8	2.2	2.4
CaCO ₃ %	3.9	5.2	4.8	6.0
O.M %	0.22	0.35	0.29	0.27
Available macronutrients:	1 1		1	Ì
Total N%	0.021	0.017	0.019	0.023
P(Olsen ,ppm)	2.5	3.2	3.5	28
K(ammonium acetate, ppm)	3.0	2.8	2.5	2.6

The narrow range of soil and climate differences at the four locations played the major factor in chosing these orchard. Fifteen trees, uniform in vigor and representing the average size of trees in each orchard were chosen to carry out this study. Valencia orange trees at the chosen orchards received nearly the same management and the fertilizer doses.

1- Vegetative growth

On 1st March of the three seasons, four branches (about 2-2.5 cm) in diameter were labeled on different treated tree directions to determine shoot number, shoot length and number of leaves per shoot of spring, first and second summer and autumn growth cycles. Each year, tree height and diameter were measured in autumn. The canopy volume was then calculated using the Turrell formula (1946).

2- Some leaf parameters

- 2-1. Leaf area using a planimeter and leaf dry weight were measured.
- 2-2. Leaf chlorophyll a,b and carotene contents were determined using the method of Wettstein (1957).

3- Shoot carbohydrate contents

Were determined calorimetrically as gm. Glucose per 100 gm. shoot dry weight according to Smith et.al. (1956).

4- Leaf nutrient contents

For mineral analysis, 20 mature leaves of 6 months old from non fruiting spring shoots were collected in September of the three seasons, then oven dried at 70° C and ground for chemical determinations as follows.

0.2 gm. Of each ground sample was digested using the procedure suggested by Jackson (1958). The digested solution was used for the determinations of N, P, K, Ca, Mg, Na, Cl, Fe Zn and Mn nutrients .

Total nitrogen was estimated according to microkjeldahl method as described by Pregl (1945). Total phosphorus was determined by the method recommended by Chapman and Pratt (1961).

Chloride was extracted from the ached samples with hot water and titrated with a standard silver nitrate solution and then determined as employed by Higinbothan et al. (1967).

Moreover, K, Ca, Mg, Na, Fe, Zn and Mn were determined directly in the diluted digested solution using the atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Perkin Elmer 3300). Anyhow, N, P, K, Ca, Mg, Na and CI elements were calculated as percentages in dry matter, whilst Zn, Fe and Mn were estimated on the basis of ppm.

5- Tree fruiting

Number of developed fruitlets

× 100

5-1. Fruit set % = Persistent number of flowers

5-2. June drop: At early May and end of June, number of fruitlets on the selected branches was counted and the percentage of fruit drop was calculated according to the equation given by Vyvyan (1946).

$$Q = \frac{\log x_1 - \log x_2}{t_1 - t_2} \times 100$$

Where: $x_1 & x_2 = No.$ of fruits/tree at t_1 and t_2 times.

No. of fruits at harvesting time on the tagged branches ×100

5-3.Fruiting%=
Total No. of tagged flowers

6- Yield

At harvest time, yield of each tree was recorded as number of fruits and Kg. per tree. A sample of ten fruits from each tree were taken to study. 7-Physical and chemical fruit properties

7-1. Physical fruit properties

Fruit weight, volume and juice weight percentage were measured.

7-2. Chemical fruit properties

Total soluble solids (%) using hand refractometer, titration of total acidity (%), Vitamin C (mg/100 gm. juice) according to (A.O.A.C.1975) and total soluble solid/acid ratio were determined.

Any way, these treatments were arranged in a complete randomized blocks design and each treatment was replicated three times with five trees per each replicate. All data were statistically analyzed using the procedure outlined by Snedecor and Cochren (1972). Also, data were tested for least significant differences to compare the averages of the determined parameters.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1-Vegetative growth

1-1. Shoot number.

It is quite clear from Table (3) that increasing salinity of irrigation water decreased significantly shoot number produced at different growth cycles compared with the control. These results were true in the three successive seasons.

1-2. Shoot length.

The rate of shoot elongation was adversely affected by salinity of irrigation water as shown in Table (3). Shoot elongation was scarcely affected by differences of salinity concentrations of irrigation water used (1130, 1447 and 2045 ppm), but a pronounced differences from the control (394 ppm) were observed. The differences in shoot length decrease of spring and autumn growth cycles was obvious to reach the significant level.

1-3. No. of leaves / shoot.

It is obvious from Table (3) that shoots on low saline irrigation water had significantly higher number of leaves of spring growth cycle in the three successive seasons. On the other hand, the differences was lacked to be significant from the others (first & second summer and autumn) growth cycles.

1-4. Tree canopy.

It is clear from Table (3) that irrigating mature Valencia orange trees with saline irrigation water caused a slight decrease in tree canopy compared with the control (394 ppm) in the three studying seasons. However, the differences between the control and saline irrigation water treatments (1130, 1447 and 2045 ppm) in this respect were so small to reach the significant level.

These results are in conjunction with those obtained by Minessy et al. (1973), Caro et al. (1979), Gobran (1989) and Haggag (1997), They found that growth of new shoots, tree height, tree diameter and vegetative growth were adversely affected by salinity.

2- Some leaf parameters .

2-1. Leaf area.

It is clear from Table (4) that salinity treatments decreased leaf area below the control (394 ppm). However, the differences reached significant level in case of (2045 ppm) treatment only. These results are true in the three studying seasons.

Table(3) The influence of selfnity of irrigation water on vegetailve growth of valencia orange trees (seasons, 1999, 2000and 2001)

Canopy	volum	m.u.e.	8	72	53		57	ν.	Ži.	ži Š	3.8	36	28 88 7.0 8.8 8.8	28 38 80 80 80	23.00 %	225 007 88 660 660 54	38 38 38 38 36 56 55 55	55 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	25 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5
5		Ē	18 00	17.72	17.53		17.25	17.2 N.S	- Z	17.25 N.S 18.36	18.36 18.07	N.S. N.S. 18.36 18.07	18.36 17.88 17.88 17.86	2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	17. 18. N.	17. 18. 18. N. S.	17.25 N.S 18.07 17.88 17.60 N.S N.S 19.54	18.36 18.03 17.88 17.88 17.80 N.S 19.54 18.06	17.25 N. S 18.07 17.60 N. S N. S 19.54 19.54 19.54 19.55 19.56
ycle	feaves No.	10042	ω 33	63 53	3.0		2.9	2.9 N S	2.9 N S	2.9 N S	2.9 N S 3.3	2.9 N S 3.3 3.2	2.9 3.3 3.2 3.0 2.8 2.8	2.9 2.3 3.3 3.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2	2.9 3.3 3.3 3.2 3.2 3.2 7.8 8.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 8.0 8	2.9 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0	2.9 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3.0 3	2,9 2,0 2,0 2,0 2,0 2,0 2,0 3,0 3,0 4,0 4,0 4,0 4,0 4,0 4,0 4,0 4,0 4,0 4	2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0
Autunn growth cycle		E G B	4.5	3.9	3.6		3.2	3.2	3.2	3.2 0.42	3.2 0.42 4.2 3.7	3.2 0.42 4.2 3.7 3.7	3.2 0.42 3.7 3.4 3.2	3.2 0.42 4.2 3.7 3.2 0.39	3.2 0.42 3.7 3.4 3.2 0.39	3.2 0.42 3.7 3.4 3.2 0.39	3.2 0.42 3.7 3.2 3.2 0.39	3.2 0.42 3.4 3.4 3.2 0.38 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2	3.2 0.42 3.4 3.4 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.0
Autur	thoota No.	_	8.4	7.9	7.5		8.8	1.08	1.08	6.8 1.08 8.3	6.8 1.08 7.8	6.8 1.08 7.8 7.3	6.8 1.06 7.8 7.8 7.3 8.3	6.8 1.06 7.3 8.3 7.3 8.8 1.01	8.3 7.8 7.3 8.3 7.0 1.01	8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2 101 8.2 8.2 101	8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2 8.2	6.8 1.08 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3 7.3	8.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8 7.8
cycle	3	100 de	7.0	6.9	6.7		8.6	8.6 N.S	8.6 N.S	8.8 8.9	8.6 8.8	8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00	8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00 8.00	8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8	8 Z 8 8 9 8 Z 8 9 8 Z 8 9 8 8 9 8 Z 8 9 8 8 8 8				
Scond surnmer growth cycle	_	lengtn }	11.2	10.8	9.01		10.2	10.2 N.S	10.2 N.S	10.2 N.S	10.2 N.S 11.0	10.2 N.S 11.0 10.7	10.2 N.S 11.0 10.7 10.5 8.9	10.2 N.S 10.7 10.7 10.5 N.S	10.2 N.S. 10.7 10.7 10.5 N.S. S.	10.2 N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.	10.2 N.S. 10.7 10.7 11.0 11.0 11.0	10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5	10.2 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.4
Scond aurr	shoot No.		14.8	12.9	12.3		11.8	11.87	11.87	11.87	11.87 14.6 12.5	11.87 14.6 12.5 12.0	11.8 14.8 12.5 12.0	11.8 14.6 12.5 11.4 11.4	118 1.87 12.0 11.4 17.7	11.87 14.6 12.5 11.4 1.77	118 1187 12.5 11.4 11.4 11.4 1.77	11.87 14.8 12.0 11.4 17.7 17.7 12.4 12.4	11.87 14.8 12.0 11.4 11.4 17.7 14.8 12.4 12.0 11.3
ych	2	Ehood E	7.1	8.8	8.8		6.4	6.4 N.S	6.4 N.S n 2300)	6.4 7.300) 6.8	6.4 N.S n.3300) 6.8 6.8	6.8 6.8 6.8	6.8 6.8 6.8 6.3 6.3	6.4 6.8 6.8 6.8 7.0 7.0 8.8 8.8 7.0 8.3	6.4 6.8 6.3 6.1 7 N.S 7 N.S 7 N.S 7 N.S	6.4 6.8 6.8 6.1 N.S N.S 6.7	6.4 (6.8 (6.3 (6.1 (6.1 (6.1 (6.1 (6.1 (6.2 (6.4 (6.4	0.7 (0.8 (0.8 (0.8 (0.8 (0.8 (0.8 (0.8 (0.8	0.00 0.00
growth cy		500	8.5	8.2	0.6		8,0	8.8 N.S	N.S N.S N.S (searon 2300)	N.S. N.S. 40	N.S N.S 9.4	N.S. N.S. 9.4	8.8 9.1 9.1 8.9 8.5	8.8.7 4.0.9.8.8.2 8.8.8.2 8.8.8.3 8	N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.	N.S N.S N.S 99.1 83.5 N.S N.S 188.5	N.S. S.	N. N	N. N
Friet summer growth cyclin		_	15.5	13.8	12.6		7.1.		₩,	$+\downarrow$	++	↓							
ř	officials No.		1.	_	÷	-	-	Ц	Щ	\sqcup	4		<u> </u>			┧┞─┼┦┞		\dashv	
r)Cle	PARVES NO.	Phoo	6.7	9. 9.	9	9 7	7	105	1 05	9.6	3.6 8.6 8.7	8.6 7.3 7.3 8.6	8.6 8.7 8.7 8.4 8.4 8.4	8.6 5.7 5.7 4.6 4.6 1.08	3.0 1.08 1.08 1.08 1.08	8.6 8.7 8.7 8.6 8.6 8.6 8.6	0.01 0.02 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03 0.03	80.1 80.1 80.1 80.1 80.1 80.1 80.1 80.1	80 1 05 2.7 4 4 5 2.7 4 4 5 2.5 4 4 5 4.5 4 4 5 1.4 5 4 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6
Spring growth cycle	phool	len(Itu	12.3	=	10.2	ć	P. D.	1.15	2 -	1.15	1.15	1.15 10.9 10.9	1.15 1.22 10.9 9.8	1.15 10.9 10.1 10.1 1.23	1.15 10.9 10.9 10.1 12.3	1.2.2 10.9 10.1 1.2.3 1.2.3	9.9 10.9 10.9 10.0 12.0 12.0 10.7	1.2.2 10.9 10.9 12.0 12.0 10.7 10.0	1.2 2 10.9 10.9 12.0 12.0 10.7 10.0 9.6
Sprin	Thoots No.		28.5	23.8	20.2		4.7	3.61	3.61	3.61	3.61	27.3 22.5 20.0	27.3 22.5 20.0 16.8	27.3 22.5 20.0 16.8 3.31	27.3 22.5 20.0 16.8 3.31	27.3 22.5 20.0 16.8 3.31	27.3 22.5 20.0 16.8 3.31 27.7 21.9	27.3 22.5 22.5 22.5 22.5 22.5 27.7 27.7 21.8	27.3 22.5 22.5 22.5 22.5 3.31 27.7 21.9 18.8 16.5
Sallolty of	urigation.	water (pom)	394	1130	1447	3000	250	2040	2042	394	394	394 1130 1447	394 1130 1447 2045	394 1130 1447 2045	394 1130 1447 2045	294 1130 1447 2045 394	2045 1130 1447 2045 394 1130	294 1130 1447 2045 394 1130	294 1130 1447 2045 394 1130 1447 2045
_	Capelline libit	*	(control)	2	n	7	-	S Dat 0.05	\$ Dat 0.05	\$ Dat 0.05	\$ Dat 0.05 1(control)	\$ Dat 0.05 1(control)	\$ Dar 0.05 ?(control) 2 3 4	\$ Dat 0.05 ?(:outrol) 2 3 4 5 Dat 0.05	\$ Dat 0.05 {(control) 2 3 4 4	3 Dat 0 05 2 2 3 4 4 4 4 4 1 (control)	(control) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1 (Control) 1 (Control) 2 2 3 4 4 4 5 Dat 0 05	1 (Control) 1 (Control) 1 (Control) 2 2 3 3 1 4 4 4 4 4 5 Dat 0 05

Table(4): Effect of salinity of irrigation water on some leaf parameters and shnot carbohydrates contents of valencia orange trees (seasons, 1999, 2000 and 2001)

				(season 1999)	(666			
Experimental	Salinity of irrigation	Leaf area	Dry weight of 100(cm2)	Leaf chic	Leaf chlorophyll and carotene contents (mg/l)	carotene (I)	Shoof	Shoot chrbohydrates contents
5	water (ppm)	(cm2)	leaves(gi)	chl.a	chl.b	Carotene	Starch %	Total chrbohydrates
1(control)	394	19.2	1.02	3.81	3.64	1.88	13.09	17.79
2	1130	18.2	96.0	3.52	3.50	1.85	10.89	14.70
က	1447	16.4	0.95	3.39	3.40	1.80	8.29	13.05
4	2045	14.3	0.92	3.26	3.27	1.73	5.85	7.90
.S.Dat 0.05		3.50	0.082	0.15	60.0	N.S	1.98	2.67
				(season 2000	(000	TOTAL DISCOUNTRY		
1(control)	394	20.8	66.0	3.60	3.72	1.47	12.36	16.69
2	1130	19.1	96.0	3.46	3,57	1.43	10.63	14.35
3	1447	17.6	0.95	3.29	3,36	1.30	8.18	11.04
4	2045	16.2	0.93	3.18	3.23	1.23	5.97	8.05
S.Dat 0.05	100 T 100 T 100 T	3.65	N.S	0.12	0.11	N.S	1.65	2.23
		100		(season 2001	(1001)			
1(control)	394	20.2	1.00	3.67	3,75	1.69	12.74	17.20
2	1130	19.6	0.97	3,51	3,60	1.62	10.82	14.43
က	1447	18.5	96.0	3.39	3.49	1.58	8.53	11.48
4	2045	16.8	0.94	3.25	3,35	1.45	6.05	8.16
S.Dat 0.05		3.32	N.S	0.14	0.12	N.S	1.85	2.52

2-2, Leaf specific weight.

In all studied seasons, it is interesting to notice that salinity treatments generally decreased the values of leaf specific weight (dry weight of 100 Cm² leaves) in respect to the analogous ones of the control. Significant differences were clear with (2054 ppm) treatment at the first season only. The obtained data are in line with those of Abd-EL-Aziz *et al.* (1985) and Gobran (1989) who reported that, citrus plants treated with high level of salinity showed a reduction in leaf area and dry weight of leaves.

2-3. Leaf chlorophyll a, b and carotene contents.

Results concerning leaf chlorophyll a and b contents had significantly negative effect in the three seasons of study with increasing salinity of irrigation water as shown in Table (4).

Referring to salinity treatments and their relation to leaf carotene content. It is clear from Table (4) that in the three studying seasons, salinity treatment decreased insignificantly leaf carotene content.

The decrease of leaf chlorophyll a , b and carotene contents were greatly suppressed at the orchard irrigated with high levels of salinity (1447 ppm and 2045 ppm) compared with the lowest level of salinity (394 ppm). These results were true at the three studying seasons. Moreover it reflected the important effect of salinity on chlorophylls activity which had been differed positively or negatively according to the level of salinity (Sivtsev et al. 1973). Also, it is considerable that, the difference in chlorophylls activity depends on the salt exerted salinity (Austenfeld, 1976).

These result are in line with those obtained by Sherif (1985) and Gobran (1989). they found that salinity generally decreased chlorophyll a, b and carotene contents of citrus leaves.

2-4. Shoot carbohydrates content.

Table (4) shows that effect of different levels of irrigation water salinity on starch and total carbohydrates contents of Valencia orange shoots caused insignificant decrease in both shoot starch and total carbohydrates contents upon increasing salinity of irrigation water can be easily noticed in the three seasons of study.

The adverse effects of salinity on photosynthetic activity of leaves as previously reported by Gale *et al.*(1967) and Downton (1977) can interpret this reduction of starch and total carbohydrate contents. There is no doubt that selective supply of roots to the aerial part of both ions and specific phytohormones , which were adversely affected by salinity (Zofia and Czajkowska, 1981) may be responsible , partially at least , for the depression of photosynthetic activity .

4- Leaf nutrient contents.

It is quite evident from Table (5) that leaf nitrogen content of saline irrigation treatments increased as compared with those of the control (394 ppm) . Such effect was statistically observed at (1447 and 2045 ppm) treatments . That was true in the three studying seasons .

trees 53.7 36.3 60.2 84.0 50.0 39.5 66.7 80.3 8.9 45.0 31.2 72.3 86.0 10.5 Ę valencia orange 432.5 464.3 498.7 337.0 380.0 395.0 420.0 25.6 359.7 376.2 405.6 455.2 13.5 Ę. 6.70 9.35 11.23 15.30 6.95 9.32 11.50 14.56 7.35 9.50 13.85 1.32 (mdd) Zu ō 0.59 0.73 0.85 0.85 0.48 0.52 0.61 0.78 0.55 0.62 0.82 0.14 0.11 ō Effect of salinity of irrigation water on leaf nutrient contents (seasons,1998,1999and2000)1999, 2000 and 2001 and 2001) Elements concentration 0.21 0.37 0.55 0.65 0.13 0.23 0.37 0.50 0.55 0.12 0.17 0.35 0.52 0.60 0.15 2 0.205 0.223 0.245 0.265 0.016 0.220 0.250 0.270 0.280 0.025 0.210 0.227 0.248 0.267 0.015 Μg 52 5.05 58 4.80 52 4.56 48 4.47 21 0.55 (Season 2001) (Season 1999) (Season 2000 5.27 5.20 4.80 4.60 0.61 5.30 5.00 4.60 4.53 Ca 1.89 1.64 1.61 0.25 1.62 1.58 1.52 1.48 1.54 0.21 0.21 X % 0.330 0.305 0.290 0.275 0.030 0.320 0.310 0.295 0.280 0.028 0.310 0.290 0.282 0.275 0.02 a. 2.12 2.45 2.58 2.58 0.40 2.16 2.52 2.62 2.68 0.42 2.10 2.41 2.65 2.82 0.47 z Salinity of irrigation water (ppm) 394 1130 1447 2045 394 1130 1447 2045 394 1130 2045 Effect Experimental L.S.Dat 0.05 L.S.Dat 0.05 L.S.Dat 0.05 1(control) 1(control) 1(control) orchard Table(5): 20 20 20 4

Respecting leaf phosphorus content at the three successive seasons, data presented in Table (5) showed that plants irrigated with saline irrigation water were lower in their leaf phosphorus content than those of the control .Moreover , the significance was observed only in case of high saline irrigation water (2045 ppm).

Concerning leaf potassium content, it is found that trees irrigated with saline water were mostly poor in leaf potassium content as compared with the control (394 ppm). Moreover, high level of saline irrigation water treatment

(2045 ppm) caused a significant decrease.

As for leaf Ca content, it is quite evident from Table (5) that treating Valencia orange trees with different levels of saline irrigation water decreased obviously leaf Ca content in respect of control treatment. Such effect from the statistical point of view mostly observed in case of high saline water treatment (2045).

Considering leaf Mg content, data in Table (5) declared that in all studying seasons, salinity treatments increased leaf Mg content significantly

over the control in most cases.

Referring to leaf Na content, it is guite evident from Table (5) that salinity treatments raised up remarkably leaf Na content in respect of the analogous ones of the control. Significant differences were observed in all cases. Moreover, high level of salinity surpassed remarkably all other treatments of saline water in increasing leaf Na content.

Regarding leaf CI content, tabulated data, indicated that salinity treatments, increased significantly leaf. Clicontent compared with the control (394 ppm) in all studying seasons. Moreover, high level of saline irrigation

water caused a remarkable increase in leaf CI content (Table 5).

Concerning leaf Zn content, it is clear from Table (5) that control trees had generally leaves with low amount of Zn as compared with those treated with saline irrigation water. Any how, significant differences were observed in all cases during the three seasons of study.

Considering leaf Fe content, it is quite evident from Table (5) that citrus plant irrigated with different saline water treatments were mostly higher significantly in their leaf Fe content in respect of those of the control. This result was true in the three successive seasons.

Concerning leaf Mn content, Table (5) disclose that salinity concentration varied in their effect. Thus, while low level of salmity (1130) ppm) treatment, decreased significantly leaf Mn content in respect of the corresponding ones of the control (394 ppm). The high rate of salinity values took, the other, way around. That was true in all seasons of study. Moreover, leaves of Valencia orange tree treated with high level of salinity (2045 ppm) were more significantly higher in their values than the analogous ones received low level (1130 ppm).

These findings were in accordance with those obtained by Guillen et al. (1979) on some citrus rootstocks who found that nitrogen and iron content was increased while Mn decreased by salinity treatments. Aly et al. (1986) pointed out that salinity reduced phosphorus potassium and Zn in plant tissue. While it caused an increase in Na and CI contents, Patil and

Bhambota (1980) found that increasing the salinity level of irrigation water induced Ca decrease, while it increased Mg in citrus leaves.

5- Tree fruiting.

5-1 .Fruit set percentage .

It is quite evident from Table (6) that in all studying seasons, irrigated Valencia orange trees with saline water decreased significantly fruit set percentage.

5-2. June drop percentage .

Table (6) reveals that, in the three successive seasons, June drop percentage increased significantly with increasing salinity of irrigation water.

5-3. Fruiting percentage.

As for the effect of saline irrigation water on fruiting percentage, it is clear from Table (6) that around the three seasons of study, increased salinity of irrigation water caused a significant decrease in fruiting percentage.

The obtained results go in line with those mentioned by Howie and Lloyd (1991) mentioned that Washington navel orange trees irrigated with high salinity water had reduced flowering intensities and lower rates of fruit set. They suggested that unimpaired growth of fruits on high salinity trees during summer and autumn occurred, despite appreciable leaf abscission. They added that reserve carbohydrate was used for growth during this period. Twigs on high salinity trees had a much reduced starch content at the time of floral differentiation in winter. Twig starch content and extract of floral differentiation varied a similar way when examined as a function of leaf abscission, suggesting that reduced flowering and fruit set in salinized citrus trees is due to low levels of reserve starch, most of which has been used to support fruit growth in the absence of carbohydrate production during summer and autumn.

6- Yield

Concerning fruit number per tree, it is interesting to notice that salinity treatments generally decreased significantly fruit number per tree as compared with the control. Such decrease varied from (10.8-7.5-11.9%), (16.3-15.5-18.1%) and (26.7-30.5-19.6%) for (1130 ppm, 1447 ppm and 2045 ppm) treatments, respectively. (Table6).

As for yield of Valencia orange tree as Kg/tree, it is clear that salinity treatments decreased significantly tree yield as compared with the control. This result was true in the three successive seasons.

7- Physical and chemical fruit properties.

7-1. Physical fruit properties.

Data illustrated in Table (6) show, in general, that the studied parameters i.e. (fruit weight, fruit size and juice weight percentage)were insignificantly decreased with increasing salinity of irrigation water.

Effect of salinity of irrigation water on fruiting parameters, yield and physical and chemical fruit properties of Valencia orange trees (seasons,1999,2000and2001) Table(6):

Experimental control of fulfing parameters fruit poperation of fulfing parameters fruit poperation of fulfing parameters γield per properation of protein prote							(Season 1999)	1999)						
Journal Pount Fruit Set Fruit Acroption Fruit Acroption <th></th> <th></th> <th>fruiti</th> <th>ng parame</th> <th>sters</th> <th>yie</th> <th>ple</th> <th>physica</th> <th>al fruit pro</th> <th>perties</th> <th>3</th> <th>hemical f</th> <th>ruit prop</th> <th>erties</th>			fruiti	ng parame	sters	yie	ple	physica	al fruit pro	perties	3	hemical f	ruit prop	erties
water (ppm) set drop water (ppm) ber weight Size weight Size weight Size weight Size weight Acidity 394 28.5 75.6 1.42 435 76.1 175.4 196.2 42.5 8.5 0.92 9.24 130 24.6 86.5 1.23 388 66.7 165.0 189.3 386 10.0 10.2 9.8 96.9 1447 21.4 88.9 1.09 364 61.5 189.0 10.0 10.2 9.8 96.9 98.9 2045 18.8 93.2 0.95 319 52.6 185.0 184.8 35.3 10.4 1.03 10.08 98.9 10.0 10.2 98.9 10.08 98.9 10.08 10.08 98.9 10.08 10.08 10.08 10.08 10.08 10.08 10.08 10.08 10.09 10.08 10.08 10.08 10.08 10.08	Experimental		Fruit	June	E. C. Iting	Fruits	Kg.	Fruit	Fruit	Juice	7 0		T.S.S/	Vitamin c
130 246 865 1.42 435 76.1 175.4 196.2 42.5 85 0.92 9.24 130 246 86.5 1.23 388 66.7 172.2 192.8 40.2 9.5 0.98 9.69 1447 22.4 88.9 1.09 354 1.15 169.0 184.8 35.3 10.4 1.03 10.08 1447 22.5 6.4 0.13 32 82.1 172.0 192.6 39.9 10.0 1.01 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 39.9 10.0 1.01 9.90 1447 22.5 82.5 1.32 34.5 54.5 172.1 192.6 38.9 10.1 10.09 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 32.1 54.5 170.3 10.3 10.00 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 32.1 54.5 170.3 10.3 10.00 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 32.1 54.5 170.3 10.3 10.00 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 32.1 54.5 170.3 10.3 10.00 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 32.1 54.5 170.3 10.3 10.00 2045 92.5 0.90 276 45.5 165.2 185.0 34.3 10.8 10.5 10.29 2045 20.8	orchard	(coop)	set	drop	8	No. Per	per	weight	Size	weight))))		Acidity	mg/100 m
394 28.5 76.6 1.42 435 76.1 175.4 196.2 42.6 8.5 0.92 9.24 1130 24.6 86.5 1.23 388 66.7 172.2 192.8 40.2 9.5 0.98 9.69 1447 21.4 88.9 1.09 364 61.5 169.0 189.3 38.6 10.0 1.02 9.8 9.69 9.69 2045 18.8 93.2 0.95 319 52.6 185.0 184.8 35.3 10.4 1.03 10.08 394 27.8 7.3 0.12 28 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 1.05 10.00 130 20.9 96.3 0.92 278 46.7 168.2 188.4 35.0 11.0 1.05 10.00 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.0 10.09 2045		(mdd) loses	%	%	0	tree	tree	(8.)	(C.C)	%	0/	9/	(1:x)	Juice
1130 24.6 86.5 1.23 388 66.7 172.2 192.8 40.2 9.5 0.98 9.69 1447 21.4 88.9 1.09 364 61.5 169.0 189.3 38.6 10.0 1.02 9.8 2045 18.8 93.2 0.95 319 52.6 165.0 184.8 35.3 10.4 1.03 10.08 394 22.5 96.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 1130 24.7 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 2045 20.9 95.3 0.92 278 46.7 168.2 188.4 35.0 11.0 1.09 10.09 394 26.4 69.9 1.32 392 69.8 178.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 1.01 9.70 395 20.5 3.8 73 0.12 28 4.2 N.S N.S N.S 0.46 N.S N.S	1(control)	394	28.5	75.6	1.42	435	76.1	175.4	196.2	42.5	8.5	0.92	9.24	35.5
1447 21.4 88.9 1.09 364 61.5 169.0 189.3 38.6 10.0 1.02 9.8 2045 18.8 93.2 0.95 319 52.6 165.0 184.8 35.3 10.4 1.03 10.08 394 27.8 37.4 1.19 370 65.9 178.2 199.6 39.9 10.0 1.01 9.90 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.09 2045 20.9 96.3 0.92 278 46.7 168.2 188.4 35.0 11.0 1.09 10.09 1394 26.4 69.9 1.32 39.2 69.8 178.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 10.1 9.70 1447 22.5 32.8 58.1 178.0 199.4 40.8 9.0 0.96 9.38 1447 22.5 32.5 39.2 69.8 178.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 10.1 9.70 1447 22.5 32.5 32.5 69.8 178.0 199.4 40.8 9.0 0.96 9.38 1447 22.5 32.5 32.5 69.8 172.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 10.1 9.70 1447 22.5 32.5 32.5 69.8 172.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 10.1 9.70 23.8 22.5 0.90 276 45.5 165.0 34.3 10.3 10.20 23.8 23.8 25.5 0.90 276 45.5 185.0 34.3 10.8 10.5 10.29 23.8 23.8 25.5 0.90 276 45.5 185.0 34.3 10.8 10.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 22.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 23.5 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 23.8 24.5 24.5 24.5 24.5 24.8 24.8 24.8 24.8 24.8 24.8 24.8 24.8 24.8 24.8	2	1130	24.6	86.5	1.23	388	66.7	172.2	192.8	40.2	9.5	0.98	9.69	40.3
1947 2245 18.8 93.2 0.95 319 52.6 165.0 184.8 35.3 10.4 1.03 10.08 2.9	က	1447	21.4	88.9	1.09	364	61.5	169.0	189.3	38.6	10.0	1.02	9.8	41.1
394 27.8 72.8 1.36 400 72.8 182.1 203.6 43.2 9.5 N.S 0.65 N.S <	4	2045	18.8	93.2	0.95	319	52.6	165.0	184.8	35.3	10.4	1.03	10.08	42.4
Season 2000 Season 2001	L.S.Dat 0 05		2.9	6.4	0.13	32	8.2	S.S.	S.S.	N.S.	0.55	SZ	SZ	S.N.
394 27.8 72.8 136 400 72.8 182.1 203.8 43.2 92.2 0.95 9.68 1130 24.7 83.4 1.19 370 65.9 178.2 199.6 39.9 10.0 1.01 9.90 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 10.0 10.0 2045 20.9 96.3 0.92 278 46.7 168.2 188.4 35.0 11.0 1.09 10.09 394 26.4 69.9 1.32 392 69.8 178.0 199.4 40.8 9.0 0.96 9.38 1130 23.8 78.3 1.16 345 59.3 172.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 1.01 9.70 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 321 54.6 172.1 190.7 36.7 10.3 10.09 2045 19.5 92.5						(Sea:	son 2000)							
1130 24.7 83.4 1.19 370 65.9 178.2 199.6 39.9 10.0 1.01 9.90 1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 1.05 10.00 10.00 20.45 20.9 95.3 0.92 278 46.7 168.2 188.4 35.0 11.0 1.09 10.09 10.09 10.09 25.4 69.9 1.32 28 4.2 N.S	1(control)	394	27.8	72.8	1.36	400	72.8	182.1	203.8	43.2	9.2	0.95	9.68	36.7
1447 22.5 90.4 1.05 338 58.1 172.0 192.6 37.3 10.5 1.05 10.00 10.00 20.45 20.9 95.3 0.92 278 46.7 168.2 188.4 35.0 11.0 1.09 10.09 10.09 25.8 20.9 95.3 0.12 28 42 N.S	2	1130	24.7	83.4	1.19	370	62.9	178.2	199,6	39.9	10.0	1.01	9.90	39.8
2045 20.9 95.3 0.92 278 46.7 168.2 188.4 35.0 11.0 1.09 10.09 10.09 2 2.5 7.3 0.12 28 4.2 N.S N.S N.S 0.46 N.S N.S N.S 10.09 10.09 29.4 2.5 7.3 0.12 28.8 1.32 29.8 1.72.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 1.01 9.70 1447 20.45 19.5 92.5 0.90 276 45.5 185.0 N.S N.S 0.63 N.S	က	1447	22.5	90,4	1.05	338	58.1	172.0	192.6	37.3	10.5	1.05	10.00	40.9
2.5 7.3 0.12 28 4.2 N.S N.S N.S 0.46 N.S N.S	4	2045	20.9	95.3	0.92	278	46.7	168.2	188.4	35.0	11.0	1.09	10.09	41.8
(Season 2001) 394 26.4 69.9 1.32 39.2 69.8 178.0 199.4 40.8 9.0 0.96 9.38 1130 23.8 78.3 1.16 345 59.3 172.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 1.01 9.70 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 34.5 16.0 36.7 10.3 10.00 2045 19.5 92.5 0.90 276 45.5 185.0 34.3 10.8 10.8 10.29 2.3 5.6 0.11 29 7.4 N.S N.S N.S N.S N.S N.S	L.S.Dat 0.05		2.5	7.3	0.12	28	4.2	SZ	S.N	SZ	0.46	N.S	N.S	υż
394 26.4 69.9 1.32 392 69.8 178.0 199.4 40.8 9.0 0.96 9.38 1130 23.8 78.3 1.16 345 59.3 172.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 1.01 9.70 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 321 54.6 170.3 190.7 36.7 10.3 1.03 10.00 2045 19.5 92.5 0.90 276 45.5 165.2 185.0 34.3 10.8 1.05 10.29 2.3 5.6 0.11 29 7.4 N.S N.S N.S N.S N.S N.S N.S N.S						(Sea:	son 2001)							
1130 23.8 78.3 1.16 345 59.3 172.1 192.6 38.9 9.8 1.01 9.70 1447 22.2 88.2 1.02 321 54.6 170.3 190.7 36.7 10.3 1.03 10.00 2045 19.5 92.5 0.90 276 45.5 165.2 185.0 34.3 10.8 1.05 10.29 2.3 5.6 0.11 29 7.4 N.S N.S N.S N.S N.S N.S	1(control)	394	26.4	6.69	1.32	392	8.69	178.0	199.4	40.8	9.0	96.0	9.38	36.5
2045 19.5 88.2 1.02 321 54.6 170.3 190.7 36.7 10.3 1.03 10.00 2045 19.5 92.5 0.90 276 45.5 165.2 185.0 34.3 10.8 1.05 10.29 2.3 5.6 0.11 2.9 7.4 N.S	2	1130	23.8	78.3	1,16	345	59.3	172.1	192.6	38.9	9.8	1.0.1	9.70	39.5
2045 19.5 92.5 0.90 276 45.5 165.2 185.0 34.3 10.8 1.05 10.29 2.3 5.6 0.11 2.9 7.4 N.S N.S N.S 0.63 N.S N.S N.S	3	1447	22.2	88.2	1.02	321	54.6	170.3	190.7	36.7	10.3	1.03	10.00	41.2
2.3 5.6 0.11 29 7.4 N.S N.S 0.63 N.S N.S	4	2045	19.5	92.5	0.90	276	45.5	165.2	185.0	34.3	10.8	1.05	10.29	41.9
	L.S.Dat 0.05		2.3	5.6	0.11	29	7.4	ις. Z	o,z	o Z	0.63	S	S)	ν: 2

7-2. Chemical fruit properties.

Table (6) show in the three seasons of study that salinity treatments increased significantly T.S.S% as compared with the control, while the other studied parameters i.e., (Acidity % & T.S.S/Acid ratio and Vitamin C) increased insignificantly with increasing salinity of irrigation water.

These results are in agreement with that found by Haggag (1997) who indicated that yield reduction associated with increasing salinity of irrigation water was mainly due to the reduction in the number of fruit/tree more than to the reduction in average of individual fruits weight.

These findings also are in agreement with those obtained by Howie and Lloyd (1991) They pointed out that measurements of Brix: acid ratio showed that fruits of high salinity trees reached maturity standards 25 days after fruits on low salinity trees.

These results showed to what extent using saline water depressed growth and yield of Valencia orange tree which considered an important factor help the growers to choose the fruit tree cultivated at areas depending on saline water only available.

REFERENCES

- Abd- El-Aziz, A. Z. E.; E.Y. Youssef; M. A. Khamis; M. Sharaf and M. El-Ashram (1985). Effect of salinity, sodium adsorption ratio and chloride levels on vegetative growth and leaf minerals composition of some citrus stocks seedlings. 1. Effect on vegetative growth. Moshtohor, Annals of Agriculture science., 23 (2): 1047-1063.
- Aly, M.M.; M.M. E-I-Hamady and M.I. Salama (1986). Plant nutrients of some citrus rootstocks as affected by salinity. Proc. 1st Hort. Sci. Conf. Tanta Univ., (2): 804-829.
- A.O.A.C. (1957). Association of Official Agricultural Chemists . Official Methods of Analysis . 12th Ed . Washington D.C.
- Austenfeld, F. A. (1976). The effect of various alkaline salts on glycolate oxides of Salicornia europaea and Pisum sativum in vitro. Physiol. Plant, 36: 82.
- Bernstein, L. and H.E. Hayward (1958). Physiology of salt tolerance. Ann.Rev. Plant Physiol. 9: 25.
- Caro, M.; F. G. Fernandiz; A. Cerda and M. G.Guillan (1979). The effect of sodium chloride in irrigation water on the development of citrus rootstocks. Revista de Agroguimica Tecnología de Alimentas Biología Applica del Segura Murcia, Spain (Hort Abst., 49:1530).
- Chapman, H. D. and P. F. Pratt (1961). Methods of analysis for soil, plant and water. Div . Agric . Sci . ,Univ . Calif.
- Downton , W. J. S. (1977). Photosynthesis in salt stressed Grapevines Aust .J. Plant Physiol., 4: 183 .
- Dubey, R. (1994). Protein synthesis by plant under stressful conditions. In: Handbook of Plant and Crop Stress, P. Mohammed (Ed.) marcel Dekker, New York, pp:277 – 299.
- Fischer, E. S. and E. Bremer (1993). Influence of magnesium deficiency on rates of leaf expansion, starch and sucrose accumulation and net assimilation in Phoseolus vulgaris. Physiol. Plant, 89271.

- Gale, J.; H. C. Kohl and R. M. Haggan (1967). Changes in water balance and photosynthesis of onion, been and cotton plants under saline conditions. Physiol. Plant, 20: 408.
- Gobran, Y. N. (1989). Selection of some citrus rootstocks tolerant to salinity . Ph.D. Thesis . Fac. Agric. . Moshtohor Zagazig university.
- Guillen, M. G.; M. Caro; F. G. Fernandaz and A. Cerda (1979). Foliar composition of citrus seedlings irrigated with saline waters. Soil Science and Plant Analysis. 9 (7) 595-606. (Hort. Abst. 49:796.).
- Haggag, L. F.; M. A. Maksoud and F. M. Z. El-Barkouky (1995). Alternate bearing of Balady mandarin as influenced by nutritional status of tree. Annals. Agric. Sci. Ain Shams Univ. Cairo, 40 (2): 759.
- Haggag, L. F. (1997). Response of Washington navel orange trees to satinity of irrigation water. Egypt. J. Hort. 24,No.1,pp.6774.
- Higinbotham, N., Bud Etherton and R. J. Foster (1967). Mineral ion contents and cell transmembrane electropotentials of pea and oat seeding tissue. Plant Physiol., 42:37-46.
- Howie, H.; J. Lloyd (1991). Response of orchard Washington navel orange to saline irrigation water.2- Flowering, fruit set and fruit growth. Australian Journal- of-Agricultural –Research., 40 (2): 371-380.
- Jaskson, M. L. (1958).Soil Chemical Analysis. New Jersey, Prestice-Hall., Inc. Inglewood, Cliffis , N.J., U.S.A.
- Jones, W. W.; T. W. Embleton and Jr. C. W.Coggins (1975). Starch content of roots of Kinnow mandarin trees bearing fruit in alternate years. Hort . Sci., 10: 514.
- Kofkafi, U. (1987). Plant nutrition under saline conditions. Fertilizers and Agriculture, 95: 3.
- Mass, E. V. and G. J. Hoffman (1977). Crop salt tolerance. Current assessment. Proc. Am. Soc. Civ. Eng., Irrig. Drain, Div. 103,115.
- Minessy, F. A.; E. M. El-Azab and M. A. Barakat (1973). Effect of salinity and depth of water table on the minerals content of Washington navel orange and Balady mandarin. Abstracts. International citrus congres. Mucia Velencia S pain.
- Patil, V. K. and J. R. Bhambota (1979). Effect of soil salinity on growth of citrus rootstocks. Research Bulletin, Marathwada Agricultural University 2 (7): 94-96. Soil and fertilizers, 43:2775.
- Pregl, F. (1945). Quantitative Organic Micro analysis, 4th ed. J & A. Church II. Lted., London.
- Sherif, S. E. (1985). Growth of citrus rootstock seedlings as affected by irrigation with saline water. Ph. D. Thesis, Faculty of Agric Cairo Univ
- Sivtsev, M. V.; Ponamareva, S. V. and Kuzmetsova, E. A. (1973). Effect of salinization and herbicide on chlorophylls activity in tomato leaves. Fiziol. Rast., 20: 62.
- Smith, F., M.A. Gilles; J.K. Hamilton and Godess, P.A. (1956). Colorimetric method for determination of sugar related substance. Annal. Chem., 28:350-356.
- Snedecor, G. W. and W. G. Cochron (1972). Statistical Methods. 6th ed., Iowa State Univ., Press, U.S.A.

- Turrell, F. M. (1946). Tables of surfaces and volumes of spheres and of probate and oblate sheroids and spheroidal coefficients. Univ. Calif. Press, Berkeley.
- Vyvyan, M. C. (1946). Experiments with growth substance, Sprays for reduction of preharvest drop of fruit. J. Pomol., 22:11-37.
- Wallerstein, L.; Goren, R. and S. P.Monselise (1974). The effect of girding on starch accumulation in sour orange seedlings. Can. J. Bot., 52:935.
- Wettstein, D. (1957). Chlorophyll. Letal under Submikroskopische For mmech Sell-der- Plastiden . Exptl . cell . Res., 12: 427.
- Wilde, S. A.; R. B. Corey; J. G Lyer and G. K. Volgete (1985). Soil and Plant Analysis for tree culture,pp.93-105. Oxford IBH, Publishing, New Delhi, India.
- Yelenosky, C. and C. U.Guy (1977). Carbohydrate accumulation in leaves and stems of Valencia orange at progressively color temperatures. Bot. Gaz., 138: 13.
- Zofia, S. and E. Czjkowska (1981). Function of roots in NaCl stressed been plants. Plant and Soil, 63:107.

تأثير ملوحة مياه الري على نمو ومحصول أشجار البرتقال الفالنشيا المزروعة في الأراضي المستصلحة حديثا

يوسف نصيف جبران ، احلام عبد المنعم السيد، انشراح عبد العال طابع معهد بحوث البسانين ، مركز البحوث الزراعية ، مصر

أجرى هذا البحث لمدة ثلاثة أعوام (١٩٩٩ و ٢٠٠٠ و ٢٠٠١) . واختير له أربع مزارع مزروعة بالبرتقال الغالشيا تقع في النوبارية و الخطاطبة و الكيلو ٧٥،٩٢ طريق القساهرة الإسكندرية الصحــراوي. وكان تركيز ملوحة مياة الري في هزة المزارع(٣٩٤،١١٣٠،١٤٤٧،٢٠٥٤ جزء فـــي المليــون). حســب تحليل مياة الري.

وقد أوضعت الدراسة أن استخدام ماء الري المالح في ري أشجار البرتقال الفائشيا سبب نقصص في عدد الأفرع وطول الأفرع و عدد الأوراق على الفرع في كل دورات النمو و حجم الشجرة و المسلحة الو رقية والوزن النوعي للأوراق ، ومحتوى الأوراق من كلوروفيل ا ، ب والكاروتين ، و محتوى الأفسرع من النشا والكربوهيدرات الكلية و محتوى الأوراق من عناصر (الفسفور و البوياسيوم و الكالسيوم) و النسبة المئوية للعصير.

وعلى العكس من ذلك نتج عن استعمال الماء المالح في ري أشـــجار البرتقـــال الفالنشـــيا زيـــادة محتوى الأوراق من عناصر (النيتروجين و الصوديوم و الكلورين و الزنك و الحديد و المنجنيز) و تســـاقط يونيو و نمية المواد الصلية الذائبة و الحموضة ونمية المواد الصلية الذائبة إلى الحموضة ، وكذلك فيتـــامين