EFFECT OF WATER REGIME, NITROGEN LEVEL AND ZINC APPLICATION ON MAIZE YIELD AND ITS WATER RELATIONS Ghazv. M.A.

Soil, Water and Environment Research Institute, ARC, Egypt.

# **ABSTRACT**

A field experiments was carried out at Sakha Agric. Res. Sta. Farm during two successive summer seasons (2002 and 2003) to study the effects of water regime, nitrogen fertilizer levels and zinc application on maize yield and its water relations as well as some soil chemical properties. Split-split plot design with four replicates was used, where 4 water regime treatments (40%, 55%, 70% and 85% depletion of available soil moisture) were occupied the main plots. Nitrogen fertilizer with three levels (90, 110 and 130 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup>.) were placed in the sub-plots and three zinc treatments (150 ppm zinc-EDTA chelate as a foliar spray application, 10 kg fed<sup>-1</sup> Zn- sulfate as soil application and without zinc applied) were allocated to sub-sub-plots.

#### The main results could be summarized as follows:

- There was a significant effect of water regime on maize yield and its components. Irrigation at 55% depletion of available soil moisture (I<sub>2</sub>) produced the highest maize yield and its components. While the irrigation at 85% depletion of available soil moisture (I<sub>4</sub>) gave the lowest maize yield.
- Increasing nitrogen fertilization level up to 130 kg fed<sup>-1</sup> highly significantly increased maize yield and its components.
- The foliar application of zinc produced the higher maize yield than the soil applied zinc.
- The highest amount of irrigation water applied and water consumptive use (WCU) were obtained with irrigation at 40% depletion of available soil moisture. While the irrigation at 85% depletion of available soil moisture gave the highest values of crop water use efficiency (CWUE).
- Soil salinity (ECe), soluble ions and SAR were decreased with increasing the amount of irrigation water applied. On the other hand, decreasing the amount of irrigation water applied (I<sub>4</sub> Treat.) led to salts accumulation in the soil profile during both seasons.

Generally, it could be concluded that increasing nitrogen fertilization level up to 130 kg fed<sup>-1</sup> and irrigation at 55% depletion of available soil moisture with 150 ppm foliar spray of zinc gave the highest maize yield and its components.

**Keywords:** Maize yield, water regime, nitrogen level and zinc application, water relation.

# INTRODUCTION

Maize (zea mays, L.)is one of the most important cereal crops in Egypt for human consumption and animal feeding. Productivity of maize plant is affected by many factors. Duration and irrigation timing, water stress and

fertilization together with yield potentiality could be considered as the main factors.

Water is often the primary limiting factor for maize production. The greatest decrease in grain yield was caused by water deficits during the flowering stage including tasseling, silking and pollination (El-Kassaby et al., 1985). Therefore, it is necessary to determine the optimum water requirements and the best irrigation management for obtaining the maximum yield. Ragab et al. (1986); El-Refai et al. (1988); Sadik et al. (1995); Ghazy (2002) and Ragab et al. (2002) studied the effect of water regime on maize grain yield and its components. They reported that increasing the amount of irrigation water led to increase water consumptive use and significantly increased the maize grain yield and its components. In these connections, they reported that the irrigation at 50 to 55 % depletion of available soil moisture was the suitable irrigation regime for maize. While the maize grain yield was found to be decreased with increasing water stress (Ainer, 1976; Metwally, 1977; Sadik et al., 1995 and Ghazy 2002). On the other hand, high soil moisture content limited root development as a result of insufficient oxygen and lack of nitrate formation (Miller, 1955).

As the level of nitrogen increases, more protein is produced and allows the plant to grow larger surface available for photosynthesis (Russell, 1973). Maize plant is one of the most responding plants to nitrogen and this may be reflected on increasing the plant height, grain yield and protein content (Kandil *et al.*, 1984 and El-Kassaby *et al.*, 1985). Much researches had been carried out to evaluate the optimum level of nitrogen fertilizer required for the maximum yield of maize (Younes *et al.*, 1995; El-Far, 1996; Badawi and El-Moursy, 1997; El-Hamdi *et al.*, 1998; El-Moursy *et al.*, 1998 and Ragab, 1998) they found that increasing nitrogen fertilizer rates from 60 to 220 Kg N/fed. significantly increased maize grain yield and other growth parameters.

Zinc deficiency is one of the main factors affecting strongly the crop production. The susceptibility of crop plants to zinc deficiency varies considerably depending on species and even cultivars. Several forms of zinc fertilizer are available, and their efficiency depend greatly upon placement, soil type and other factors (Soltanpour *et al.*, 1970). El-Khateeb and Selim (1993) found that the application of zinc increased the content of chlorophyll and plant growth of many plants. Srinivasan (1992); Abd El-Salam *et al.* (1994) and Ragab (1998) revealed that the grain yield of maize and its components was increased with zinc fertilizer, especially by foliar application.

The objective of this experiment was to study the effect of water regime, nitrogen fertilizer levels and zinc application on maize yield and its water relations and some soil chemical properties.

# MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiments was carried out at Sakha Agric. Res. St. Farm during the two successive summer seasons of 2002 and 2003 to investigate

the effect of water regime, nitrogen fertilizer levels and zinc application on maize yield and its water relations as well as some soil chemical properties.

A split- split-plot design with four replicates was used, the plot area was 42 m<sup>2</sup> (6 × 7m). Maize (triple hybrid 320 V.) was planted at the same site on 21 and 28 May in the first and second growing seasons, respectively.

Experimental treatments were conducted as follows:

- Water regime was located in the main plots.
  - : irrigation at 40% depletion of available soil moisture.
- $I_1$ : irrigation at 55% depletion of available soil moisture. 12
- : irrigation at 70% depletion of available soil moisture. l<sub>3</sub>
- : irrigation at 85% depletion of available soil moisture. 14
- Nitrogen fertilizer levels were laid in sub plots.
- : Addition of 90 kg N fed-1 N₁

 $N_2$ 

- : Addition of 110 kg N fed<sup>-1</sup>.
- : Addition of 130 kg N fed-1.  $N_3$
- Zinc applications occupied the sub-sub-plots:
- :150 ppm of Zn-EDTA chelate was added as a foliar spray application.
- : 10 kg/fed Zn sulfate was added to the soil.
- : Without zinc applied (control). W

Nitrogen fertilizer, in the form of ammonium nitrate (33.5 %N), was applied in two equal doses with the second and third irrigation. Zinc sulfate and zinc chelate were applied two times, i.e. 30 days after planting and 15 days later.

The soil of the experimental field was clayey in texture, non-saline non-alkaline soil. Some physical and chemical properties of the experimental field before planting were determined according to Black (1965), Garcia (1978) and Lindsay and Norvell (1978) as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Mean values of some physical and chemical properties of the

experimental field. Bulk density gm/cm 3.0.1 Particle size Soil moisture characters, Total carbon ate, % Soil O.M. EC 1:2.5 dSm<sup>-1</sup> SAR distribution, % % Sand Silt Clay W.P. A.S.W 2.10 1.48 8.10 3.4 7.60 1.30 42.8 21.0 21.8 23.2 | 33.0 | 43.8 Available macro and micro nutrients (ppm) Cu Zn Fe Mn 6.8 256 0.78 16.3 13.4

F.C.: Field capacity

W.P. wilting point A.S.W.: available soil water

#### Parameters studied:

- 1- Maize yield and its components: grain yield, 100-grain weight, straw yield and ear weight were determined at harvest time.
- 2- Water relations:
- 2.1- Amount of irrigation water applied (m<sup>3</sup> fed<sup>-1</sup>.) was measured by cutthroat flume (20 × 90 cm) according to Mahrous (1971).
- 2.2. Water consumptive use (WCU) was determined for different soil depth (0-60 cm) in each plot as m<sup>3</sup> according to Israelsen and Hansen (1962).
- 2.2- Crop water use efficiency (CWUE) was calculated in kg/m³ as follows:

**CWUE =** 
$$\frac{\text{yield (kg/fed.)}}{\text{water consumptive use (m}^3/\text{fed.)}}$$

3- Soil chemical properties were determined in soil paste extract before and after harvesting according to Black (1965). Statistical analysis was done according to Cochran and Cox (1960).

# RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

# Effect of different treatments on

# 1- Maize yield and its components:

Data in Table 2 indicated that the maize grain yield and its components were highly significantly affected by water regime during both seasons. Also, the data indicate that, the irrigation at 55% depletion of available soil moisture (l<sub>2</sub>) produced the highest grain yield, 100-grain weight, straw yield and ear weight of maize (3525.6 kg/fed., 44.07 gm, 9.38 ton/fed. and 320.82 gm, respectively) in the first season and (3454.2 kg/fed., 42.86 gm, 9.67 ton/fed. and 336.85 gm, respectively) in the second season. These results may be due to good moisture and aeration condition in the root zone as well as high efficiency of nitrogen fertilization. These results could be confirmed by the data were obtained by Ragab et al. (1986); El-Refai et al. (1988); Sadik et al. (1995); Ghazy (2002) and Ragab, et al. (2002). On the other hand, the irrigation at 85% depletion of available scil moisture (I<sub>4</sub>) gave the lowest values of maize grain yield and its components in both seasons. These results may be attributed to the low moisture content of soil and the low efficiency of nitrogen fertilization especially, during the flowering period (El-Kassaby et al., 1985).

With regard to nitrogen fertilization, the data in Table 2 show that increasing nitrogen level from 90 to 130 kg N/fed. highly significantly increased grain and straw yields, 100-grain weight and ear weight of maize in both seasons. This increase may reflect the high response of maize plants to nitrogenous fertilizer and consequently improvement of plant growth parameters. This trend may be supported by findings of Sadik *et al.* (1995); Youns *et al.* (1995); El-Far (1996); Badawi and El-Moursy (1997); El-Hamdi *et al.* (1998); EL-Moursy *et al.* (1998) and Ragab (1998).

Also, the data in Table 2 reveal that the grain and straw yield, 100-grain weight and ear weight of maize in both seasons were high significantly increased with zinc application. The foliar addition of 150 ppm Zn-EDTA chelate was the best treatment, since it recorded the highest values of maize yield and yield components in the two growing seasons. This increase may be due to the improvement of the biochemical and physical conditions for maize plants through achieving the nutritional balance of those micronutrients with the applied nitrogen. These results may be enhanced by those obtained by Srinivasan (1992); El-Khateeb and Selim (1993); Abd El-Salam et al. (1994) and Ragab (1998).

The dada in Table 2 indicate again that the interaction between water regime and nitrogen fertilization levels ( $I \times N$ ) or zinc application ( $I \times Z$ ) had highly significant effects on maize yield and its components, except grain

vield with ( I × N) in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season. On the other hand, the interaction between nitrogen fertilizer and zinc application (N × Z) had highly significant effects on maize yield and its components in both seasons, except grain yield and ear weight in the 1<sup>st</sup> season and straw yield in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season.

The interaction between  $1 \times N \times Z$  had highly significant effect on 100-grain weight and straw yield in the 1<sup>st</sup> season and 100-grain weight and ear weight in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season.

Table 2: Yield and yield components of maize crop as affected by

different treatments (1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> seasons)											
	on, 2002		2 <sup>nd</sup> season 2003								
Treatments	Grain yield kg/fed.	100- grain weight (gm)	Straw yield ton/fed.	Ear weight (gm)	Grain yield kg/fed.	100- grain weight (gm)	Straw yield ton/fed.	Ear weight (gm)			
	Irrigat	ion (depl	etion of	available	water,%	)					
I <sub>1</sub> (40%)	3445.8	43.050	9.165	<b>3</b> 13.558	3391.57	41.936	9.497	329.236			
I <sub>2</sub> (55%)	3525.6	44.067	9.376	320.822	3454.15	42.864	9.699	336.849			
I <sub>3</sub> (70%)	3218.9	40.210	8.562		3127.42	39.166	8.855	307.539			
I <sub>4</sub> (85%)	2981.4	36.814	7.835	267.923	2842.37	35.843	8.112	281.321			
Fitest	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**			
L.S.D. 0.05	49.945	0.317	0.073	13.803	70.15	0.323	0.145	2.745			
0.01	71.763	0.456	0.105	19.832	100.79	0.464	0.208	3.944			
		Nit	rogen (k	g fed 1)							
N <sub>1</sub> (90)	3261.9	40.395	8.604		3169.35	39.261	8.892	309.123			
N <sub>2</sub> (110	3270.2	40.899	8.698	297.610	3184.53	39.813	9.011	312.482			
N <sub>3</sub> (130)	3346.7	41.811	8.901	310.712	3257.75	40.783	9.220	319.603			
F test	**	**	**	*	*	**	**	**			
L.S.D. 0.05	35.985	0.191	0.044	10.972	68.93	0.176	0.083	1.640			
0.01	48.765	0.259	0.60	-	-	0.239	0.112	2.223			
			Zinc (Z	n)							
C (foliar spray)	3435.0	42.842	9.120	312.011	3351.90	41.693	9.462	3 <b>2</b> 7.613			
M (Soil application)	3336.3	41.454	8.818	301.733	3221.86	40.364	9.140	316.821			
W(without)	3107.5	38.809	8.265	288.982	3037.86	37.801	8.520	296.775			
F test	**	**	**	**	**	**	**	**			
L.S.D. 0.05	39.05	0.190	0.042	35.495	46.74	0.208	0.075	1.545			
0.01	51.898	0.252	0.055	47.173	62.12	0.277	0.998	2.053			
I × N	**	**	**	*	ns	**	*	**			
I × Z	**	**	**	*	*	**	**	**			
N × Z	ns	**	**	ns	*	**	ns	**			
I×N×Z	ns	**	**	ns	ns_	**	ns	**			

# Water relations:

# 1.1- amount of irrigation water applied:

The data in Table 3 reveal that the highest amount of irrigation water applied was obtained by I<sub>1</sub> treatment in the first and second seasons (3145 and 3105 m<sup>3</sup>/fed., respectively). On the other hand, the lowest values (2255 and 2225 m3/fed.) were recorded by I4 treatment in the first and second seasons, respectively. These results may be due to that the irrigation at I1 treatment received high amount and number of irrigation more than any other treatments. this trend could be confirmed by those recorded by Ghazy (2002) and Ragab et al. (2002).

# 1.2- Water consumptive use (WCU):

Data in Table 3 indicated that,  $I_1$  treatment consumed water more than the other treatments, since it recorded the highest mean values of water consumptive use (2820 and 2800 m³/fed.) in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons, respectively. While the lowest values of WCU (1885 and 1905 m³/fed.) in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons, respectively were obtained by  $I_4$  treatment. This trend may be explained on the basis that increasing the amount of irrigation water, is accompanied by increasing the water consumptive use. These results in general could be supported by those reported by Ragab *et al.* (1986); El-Refai *et al.* (1988); Sadik *et al.* (1995); Ghazy (2002) and Ragab *et al.* (2002). **1.3- Crop water use efficiency (CWUE):** 

The irrigation at 85% depletion of available soil moisture (I<sub>4</sub> treatment) gave the highest values of CWUE (1.58 and 1.49 kg/m<sup>3</sup>) in the first and second seasons, respectively as shown in Table 3. While I<sub>1</sub> treatment gave the lowest values of CWUE in both seasons. These results may be due to that I<sub>1</sub> treatment consumed more amount of irrigation water than the other treatments. The obtained results are similar observation was found by Sadik *et al.* (1995); Ghazy (2002) and Ragab *et al.* (2002).

Table 3: Effect of irrigation water regime on amount of irrigation water applied, water consumptive use and crop water use efficiency in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons.

		CII	101011	Cy 11	<u> </u>	uiii	u =-	304	3011	J.					
Season	Amount of irrigation water applied (m³/fed.				Water consumptive use (m³/fed.)					Crop water use efficiency (kg/m³)					
Season	n applied (in ned.				(iii /ieu.)					(Kg/III )					
	11	l <sub>2</sub>	l <sub>3</sub>	14	Mean	l <sub>1</sub>	l <sub>2</sub>	l <sub>3</sub>	14	Mean	l <sub>1</sub>	l <sub>2</sub>	l <sub>3</sub>	14	Mean
sea	3145	2885	2465	2255	2687.5	2820	2520	2175	1885	2350	1.22	1.40	1.48	1.58	1.42
sea	3105	2855	2495	2225	2670.0	2800	2550	2195	1905	2362.5	1.21	1.35	1.42	1.49	1.37
Mean	3125	2870	2480	2240	2678.75	2810	2535	2185	1895	2356.25	1.22	1.38	1.46	1.54	1.40

### 2- Soil chemical properties:

The rate of change of soil chemical properties after termination of the experiment in first and second seasons is presented in Table 4. The data reveal that increasing the amount of irrigation water applied led to a reduction in soil salinity (ECe), soluble ions (cations and anions) and sodium adsorption ratio (SARe) of the soil. It can be observed that the best treatment was  $\rm I_1$  treatment, since it recorded the highest reduction in ECe in the soil after the  $\rm 1^{st}$  and  $\rm 2^{nd}$  seasons (-1.68 and -1.85 dSm<sup>-1</sup>, respectively) followed by  $\rm I_2$  treatment. On the other hand, decreasing the amount of irrigation water applied ( $\rm I_4$ ) led to accumulation of salts and has increased ECe in both seasons (0.80 and 1.15 dSm<sup>-1</sup>, respectively).

Soluble ions were also affected by different irrigation treatments in both seasons. The data show that most of soluble ions were removed from the soil layers especially,  $\mathrm{Na}^+$ ,  $\mathrm{Cl}^-$  and  $\mathrm{SO_4}^-$  ions. The irrigation at 40% depletion of available soil moisture (I<sub>1</sub>) resulted in the highest reduction of soluble ions, followed by I<sub>2</sub>. While the treatment I<sub>4</sub> (i.e., irrigation at 85% depletion of available soil moisture) led to increase the soluble salts of soil profile.

Table 4: Mean values of the changes occurred in some soil chemical

properties after the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons.

	, pro	perties	anter	ine i	and Z	şeas	<u>ons.</u>				
lrr.	EC dSm	Cations meq/L					SAR				
Treat.	<sup>1</sup> at 25C	Na*	K <sup>+</sup>	Ca <sup>++</sup>	Mg**	Co <sub>3</sub> *	HCO.	CI.	SO₄ <sup>‡</sup>		
Before experiments											
	3.4	20.8	0.4	7.8	7.3	0.0	5.8	17.1	13.4	7.60	
the change after 1 <sup>st</sup> season											
l <sub>1</sub>	-1.68	-8.10	-0.08	-4.2	-1.9	0.0	0.25	-7.20	-6.0	-0.7	
l <sub>2</sub>	-1.45	-2.3	-0.01	-2.6	-0.8	0.0	0.10	-3.10	-2.5	-0.20	
l <sub>3</sub>	0.35	1.2	0.04	1.10	0.30	0.0	0.0	1.05	0.85	0.35	
14	0.80	2.3	0.11	0.8	1.10	0.0	-0.20	2.4	1.10	0.60	
	The change after 2 <sup>nd</sup> season										
l,	-1.85	-9.5	-0.10	-4.8	-2.0	0.0	0.35	-7.9	-6.6	-0.92	
l <sub>2</sub>	-1.30	-2.7	-0.02	-2.9	-0.9	0.0	0.10	-3.4	-2.7	-0.22	
l <sub>3</sub>	0.48	1.9	0.05	1.20	0.40	0.0	0.05	1.10	0.90	0.41	
14	1.15	2.8	0.12	0.8	1.30	0.0	-0.25	2.7	1.15	0.84	

Also, the data in Table 4 indicat that, the higher amount of irrigation water applied, the lower the values of SAR. The reduction of SAR value of soil in the  $1^{st}$  and  $2^{nd}$  seasons (-0.78 and -0.92, respectively) was obtained by  $I_1$  treatment followed by  $I_2$  treatment. On the other hand,  $I_4$  treatment led to increase SAR values in the  $1^{st}$  and  $2^{nd}$  seasons (0.6 and 0.84, respectively). These results may be due to the effect of higher amount of irrigation water applied enhanced the leaching of sodium salts from the soil profile. Similar trend was found by Ghazy (2002).

Generally, it could be concluded that, increasing nitrogen fertilization levels up to 130 kg N/fed. and irrigation at 55% depletion of available soil moisture with foliar application of 150 ppm zinc is the optimum interaction, since it led to the highest values of yield and yield components of maize (*Triple hybrid 320 V.*)

### REFERENCES

Abd El-salam, A.A.; A.H. Ibrahim and I.A. El-Garhi (1994). Comparative study of application techniques of Mn, Zn, and Cu as soil application or foliar spray or seedsoaking to maize on a sand soil. Annals of agric., Sci., Moshtohor. 32(1): 665-673.

Ainer, N.G. (1976). Effect of irrigation and fertilizer treatments on growth and yield of corn, M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric. Tanta Univ.

- Badawi, M.A. and S.A. El-Moursy (1997). Nitrogen and phosphorus requirements for maize grown in a newly reclaimed sandy soil. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 22(3):659-671.
- ·Black, C.A. (1965). Methods of Soil Analysis. Amer Soc. Agron. Inc. Madison. Wisconsin, U.S.A.
- Cochran, W.G. and G.M. Cox (1960). "Experimental Designs" 2<sup>nd</sup> Ed. Hohn Welly, New York, pp. 293-316.
- El-Far, H.A. (1996). Effect of some cultural practices on growth and yield of maize M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Of Agric. Mansoura Univ.
- El-Hamdi, K.H.; R.E. Knany; M.A. El-Saei and A.H. El-Hamdi (1998). Impact of irrigation amounts and fertilization levels on corn yield and nutrient uptake. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 23(10) 4659-4668.
- El-Kassaby, A.T; M.W. El-Agrodi and E.M. El-Hadidi (1985). Effect of soil moisture levels and N & P fertilization on corn (zea maize L.). J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ. 10(2):336-344.
- El-Khateeb, M.A. and S.M. Selim (1993). The influence of gibberellic acid and zinc on gorwth and alkaliodal content of catharanthus Roseus G.Don. Fayoum J. Agric., Res. & Dev. 7 (1): 160-171.
- El-Moursy, S.A.; A.A. Kandil,; A.N. Attia and M.M. Abd El-Naby (1998). Evaluation of some foliar and soil fertilizers on growth and yield of corn. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 23 (2):711-721.
- El-Refai, M.A.; A.Y. Badawy; H.W. Tawadros; M. Hassanien; A. El-Sabagh (1988). Effect of water regime and nitrogen fertilizer on maize productivity and its consumptive use. Field Irrigation and Agroclimatology Conf. 20-23 June, 1988 Giza; Egypt.
- Garcia, I. (1978). Soil water engineering laboratory manual. Department of agricultural and chemical engineering. Colorado state Univ. Fort. Colins colorado, U.S.A.
- Ghazy, M.A. (2002). Effect of water quality and irrigation practices on some soil properties and productivity. J. Agric., Sci., Mansoura Univ., 27(10):7101-7115.
- Israelsen, O.W. and V.E. Hansen (1962). Irrigation Principles and Practices 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed. John Willey and Sons. Inc., New York.
- Kandil, A.A.; M.S. Sultan and A. N. Attia (1984). Differential response of corn (zea maize, L.) to nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium fertilization, J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 9(2): 153-163.
- Lindsay, W. L. and W.A. Norvell (1978). Development of DTPA soil Test for Zn, Fe, Mn, and Cu. Soil Soc. Am. Proc. 42:421-428
- Mahrous, F.N. (1971). Effect of irrigation frequency, irrigation requirements and time of the first post planting irrigation on cotton yield and quality. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric. Alex. Univ.
- Metwally, M.A. (1977). Effect of soil moisture and growth regulators on yield components and some technological properties in corn (zea maize, L.). Ph.D. Thesis, Al-Azhar Univ.
- Miller, C.E. (1955). Soil Fertility "John Willey and Sons, Inc., New York.
- Ragab, M.A.; N.A. Nour El-Din and E.I. Abou Gabal (1986). Deficit of soil water on maize plants. Proceeding of the second conf. of Agron., Egypt, 1:293-308.

- Ragab, M.M.(1998). Effect of irrigation phosphours and microelements on growth and yield of corn under calareous soil conditions Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric. Mansoura University.
- Ragab, M.M.; S.M. El-Barbary; M.I. El-Shahawy and R.A. Saber (2002). Impact of different sources and methods of irrigation on productivity of maize and cotton at North Delta. National symposium on problems of land degradation in Egypt and Africa causes, environment hazard and conservation methods, 23-24 March 2002. Cairo Univ., Institute of African Research pp: 176-190.

Russell, E.W. (1973). Soil Conditions and Plant growth. 10<sup>th</sup> edition, Longman, London and New York p.31.

- Sadik, M.K.; F.I.Gab-Alla; , S.A. Khedr; H.M. Eid and Marsafawy, Samia M. (1995). Effect of water stress and nitrogen fertilization levels on maize yield and water relations. Proceeding of the second conf. Of on-farm irrigation and agroclimatology, Jan. 2-4, 1995, Dokki, Egypt. pp: 509-526.
- Soltanpour, J.O.; J.G. Reussi; J.G. Walker; R.D. Heil; W.L. Lindsay; J.C. Hansen and A.Y. Relyea (1970). Zinc experiments on potatoes in the San Luis Valley of Colorado. Amer. Potats J. 47:435-443.
- Srinivasan, K. (1992). Effect of amendement and zinc levels on the growth and yield of maize (zea mays, L.). Indian J. of Agron., 37(2):246-249.
- Younes, M.A.; F.A. Salama and R.I. Faisal (1995). Effect of planting dates and nitrogen levels on growth and yield of maize. J. Agric. Sci., Mansoura Univ., 20 (1):9-14.

تأثير ترشيد مياه الرى و مستوى التسميد الأزوتى و أضافة الزنك على المحصول و العلاقات المائية للذرة الشاميه

محمد عبد العزيز غازى

معهد بحوث الأراضي و المياد و البيئة - مركز البحوث الزراعية - مصر

أقيمت تجربه حقليه بمزرعة محطة البحوث الزراعية بسخا خلال موسمين متتابعين (صيف ٢٠٠٢ ، ٢٠٠٣م) لدراسة تأثير إضافة مستويات مختلفة من التسميد الأزوتى و ترشيد مياه الرى مع إضافة الزنك على المحصول و العلاقات المائية للذرة الشاميه و أيضا بعض الخوواص الكيميائية للتربة.

تم تنفيذ التجربه بالتصميم الاحصائي للقطع المنشقة مرتين في اربع مكررات. المعاملات الرئيسية هي أربعة مستويات استنفاد الرطوبه الارضية (٤٠%، ٥٥%، ٧٠%، ٥٨% من الرطوبه الأرضية الميسرة)، بينما تم توزيع ثلاثة معدلات من النستروجين (٩٠، ١١٠، ١٣٠ كجم ازوت/فدان) في القطع المنشقة الأولى، أما في القطع المنشقة الثانية فقد تم إضافة ثلاث معاملات من الزنك (١٥٠ جزء/مليون رشا - ١٠ كجم /فدان سلفات زنك أرضى - بدون زنك). يمكن تلخيص أهم النتائج كما يلي: