Journal of Plant Production

Journal homepage & Available online at: www.jpp.journals.ekb.eg

Effect of Soil Addition of Biochar, and Foliar Application of Trehalose and Seaweed on Potato Productivity Under Different Rates of Irrigation

Samar M. A. Doklega¹; Hemat A. EL-Bauome¹; Hala A. EL-Sayed¹; H. M. B. EL-Metwally ² and O. M. H. Abd El-Rahman^{1*}



¹ Veg. and Flori. Dept., Fac. of Agric., Mans. Univ., Egypt
 ²Veg. Res. Dept., Hort. Res. Inst., Agric. Res. Center, Giza, Egypt

ABSTRACT



To address water scarcity in arid and semi-arid regions like Egypt and enhance food security, a research trial was conducted to assess the impact of different irrigation rates, soil addition of biochar, and foliar applications of trehalose and seaweed on the enzyme activity, yield and quality of potato. Three irrigation levels: 100% (I_1), 80% (I_2) and 60% (I_3) of the irrigation requirements, with biochar applied at 0.0, 5.0, and 7.0 m³ fed⁻¹, as well as spraying trehalose and seaweed at a concentration of 1.0 g/L, in addition to the control treatment, were investigated. The I_3 treatment led to the highest levels of PPO,CAT and MDA, while the I_1 treatment resulted in the lowest values. Increasing biochar rates reduced enzyme activity, and foliar applications of trehalose and seaweed further decreased these enzyme levels compared to the control. Even under reduced irrigation conditions, trehalose and seaweed application combined with biochar improved plant growth parameters such as plant height, and fresh and dry weights compared to traditional irrigation (I_1 treatment) in the absence of both biochar and foliar applications. The highest tuber yield and quality traits, including total carbohydrates, total sugars, protein percentage and vitamin C content, were achieved under the combined treatment of I_1 x biochar (7.0 m³ fed⁻¹) x trehalose. Notably, the I_2 treatment combined with biochar and either trehalose or seaweed outperformed the I_1 treatment without additional treatments. This study suggests that integrating biochar with foliar treatments of trehalose and seaweed can significantly enhance potato production under water-limited conditions.

Keywords: PPO, CAT, MDA, Cara, biochar, trehalose, seaweed

INTRODUCTION

Potato (Solanum tuberosum) is one of the most important staple crops globally, providing a significant source of nutrition and livelihood for millions of people. Its versatility, high nutritional value, and ability to grow in diverse climates have contributed to its widespread cultivation. However, potato plants are highly susceptible to water deficit, which is a major limiting factor affecting their growth, development and yield. With climate change intensifying water scarcity, it is vital to develop strategies that enhance plant resilience to drought conditions. Water deficit, caused by factors such as drought or inadequate irrigation, adversely affects potato plants at various stages of their life cycle. It leads to reduced photosynthetic activity, stomatal closure, oxidative stress, impaired nutrient uptake, and ultimately results in decreased tuber yield and compromised quality. Recent research has identified biochar as a promising soil amendment, capable of improving water retention and soil fertility. Additionally, seaweed and trehalose have been recognized for their roles in enhancing plant stress tolerance through osmoprotection and nutrient enrichment. Biochar is a carbon-rich material derived from the pyrolysis of organic matter. It has been shown to improve soil water-holding capacity, nutrient availability, and microbial activity, thereby enhancing plant water use efficiency and drought tolerance (Elsherpiny 2023). Seaweed extracts are increasingly recognized for their potential to enhance plant growth and stress tolerance. Rich in bioactive compounds such as polysaccharides, vitamins, minerals, and phytohormones,

seaweed extracts provide a natural source of nutrients and growth-promoting substances (Garai et al. 2021). When applied to plants, these extracts improve nutrient uptake and enhance physiological processes such as photosynthesis and root development. Seaweed extracts are also known to boost plant resilience to environmental stresses, including drought, by improving water retention and activating defense mechanisms. The presence of alginates and other polysaccharides in seaweed contributes to better soil structure and moisture retention, further supporting plant health. By enhancing both nutrient availability and stress resistance, seaweed extracts offer a sustainable solution for improving crop productivity and quality, making them an attractive option for modern agricultural practices (Zhang et al. 2023). Trehalose is a naturally occurring disaccharide sugar that plays a critical role in enhancing plant stress tolerance. It functions as an osmoprotectant, helping plants to stabilize proteins and cellular membranes under adverse environmental conditions, such as drought and extreme temperatures. By accumulating in plant tissues, trehalose helps maintain cell structure and function, allowing plants to continue vital processes like photosynthesis even under stress (Shafiq et al. 2015). Additionally, trehalose has been shown to regulate stress-responsive genes, further boosting a plant's ability to cope with environmental challenges. Its ability to protect against oxidative damage and improve water retention makes trehalose a valuable tool in promoting plant health and productivity. As a result, its application in agriculture is being explored as a strategy to enhance crop resilience to drought

and other stress factors, thereby contributing to sustainable agricultural practices (Al-Rubaie *et al.* 2023).

The primary objective of this study is to explore the potential impact of biochar application combined with foliar sprays of seaweed or trehalose on enhancing drought stress tolerance in potato plants. The research will evaluate the effects of these treatments on enzyme activity, plant performance, tuber yield and quality characteristics. By clarifying the role of biochar, seaweed and trehalose sprays in alleviating the adverse effects of water deficit, this study aims to offer valuable insights for developing sustainable strategies to improve drought resilience in potato cultivation.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Experimental site: A field trial A field trial was conducted during two successive seasons of 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 at a privately-owned farm situated in Koffor Elarab village, Talkha district, Dakahlia governorate, Egypt.

Soil sampling: Prior to conducting the experiment, an initial soil sample was collected from a depth of 0-30 cm then it was analyzed following the methods described by Sparks *et al.* (2020) and Dane and Topp (2020), as their characteristics are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Characteristics of initial soil

Characteristics			Values		
Physical properties	Clay	49.00			
Particle size distribution (%)	Sand	22.55			
Hydro physical	Textural Saturation	70.0			
properties	WHC,	WHC,%			
	pH (soil suspensi	8.100			
	EC dSm ⁻¹ (soil pa	2.870			
Chemical	Organic mat	1.39			
properties		N, mgKg ⁻¹	48.5		
	Available nutrients	P, mgKg ⁻¹	8.94		
		K, mgKg ⁻¹	210.3		

Studied substances: Biochar characterization process followed the methodology outlined by Yang et al. (2019). Plant residues consisting of rice, barely, wheat and maize straw were obtained from private farms and transported to agricultural research center (ARC), Egypt, as the pyrolysis of the plant residues was conducted in the absence of oxygen, at temperatures ranging from 400 to 500 °C, for a duration of two hours. The resulting biochar had a nitrogen content (N) of 1.43%, an organic carbon content (OC) of 44.80%, a pH value of 8.9, an electrical conductivity (EC) value of 4.9 dSm⁻ ¹, and a cation exchange capacity (CEC) value of 66.0 cmol kg⁻¹. The seaweed used in the study was procured from Eco Agro Company, Egypt. The seaweed product had a composition of 20% algae extract, 1.5% alginic acid, and 0.5% mannitol. While trehalose was purchased from Technogene Company located in Dokki, Giza, Egypt,

Potato tubers: Potato tubers (Cv Cara) were sourced from ARC (Agricultural Research Center), and these tubers were subsequently divided into pieces, each weighing approximately 40.0 grams on average.

Experimental setup: This experiment was conducted using a split-split plot design to assess the impact of different irrigation rates , soil biochar additions, and foliar applications on the performance of potato plants. The irrigation rates included three levels: I₁ (100%), I₂ (80%), and I₃ (60%) of the crop's irrigation

requirements. Biochar was applied to the soil at three rates: 0.0, 5.0, and 7.0 m³ per feddan. Additionally, foliar treatments consisted of trehalose (1.0 g L^{-1}) , seaweed extract (1.0 g L^{-1}) and a control treatment (without spraying). In the experimental layout, the irrigation rates were designated as the main plots, while biochar treatments were assigned as the sub-main plots. The foliar treatments were allocated in the sub-sub plots. The total number of treatments was 27 with three replicates (3 irrigation rates treatments x 3 biochar treatments x 3 foliar application x 3 replicates = 81). The experimental unit area was 10.4 m2 (2.8 m \times 3.7 m) for each sub-sub plot, which contained 3 ridges (0.85 m width \times 3.7 m length), where each one ridge represented one replicate. The planting space was 25 cm. Before the planting process, all plots received the application of calcium superphosphate fertilizer (15% P2O5) rate of 100 kg P2O5 fed-1. Additionally, farmyard manure was applied at a rate of 20 m3 fed-1, and biochar was added at the designated rates. The planting was carried out on the 24th of December in both seasons, using tuber pieces in moist soil conditions. Urea (46.5%N) at a rate 150 kg N fed-1 as well as potassium sulfate (48 % K2O) rate of 50.0 kg fed-1 were added at the recommended times. The foliar applications of trehalose alone and seaweed alone were carried out three times, starting one month after planting and with intervals of 15 days between each application. The volume of foliar spray used for each solution was 800 L fed-1. The tubers were harvested after a period of 135 days from the time of planting.

Measurements:

a.Enzymatic performance at 75 days from planting

To determine enzymatic performance, a sample of five plants was randomly selected for analysis.

- Polyphenol oxidase (PPO, mmol catechol /min/mg) and catalase (CAT, μmol H₂O₂min⁻¹.mg⁻¹protein⁻¹) were measured by using spectrophotometric method as described by Alici and Arabaci (2016).
- Malondialdehyde (MDA, µmol.g⁻¹) was spectrophotometrically determined according to Mendes *et al.* (2009).
- b. Growth parameters, photosynthetic pigments and leaves chemical content at 75 days from planting

Some growth parameters were measured after 75 days from planting *i.e.*, plant height (cm), fresh and dry weights of foliage (g plant⁻¹). NPK content in the dry weight of potato leaves was analyzed using standard methods as outlined by Mertens (2005). The wet digestion process for NPK analysis involved a mixture of perchloric and sulfuric acids in a 1:1 ratio, following the procedure described by Peterburgski, (1968). Nitrogen content was determined using the Kjeldahl method, phosphorus was measured with a spectrophotometer, and potassium was assessed using a flame photometer. While Chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b, and carotene (mg g^{-1}) were determined in fresh samples of leaves at the same period using acetone *via* spectrophotometer, following the method described by Sumanta *et al.* (2014).

c. Yield and quality traits at harvest

For the assessment of yield and quality parameters, a random sample consisting of five plants was selected. Tuber yield and their characteristics *i.e.*, average weight of one tuber (g), No. of tuber plant⁻¹ and total tuber yield (Kg plot⁻¹and metric ton ha⁻¹). Tubers quality parameters such as total carbohydrates (%), total sugars(%), dry matter (DM,%), total dissolved solids (TDS) and vitamin C (VC, mg 100g⁻¹) were determined according to AOAC, (2000). As TDS was estimated by a hand refractometer and VC was determined on

fresh weight basis using titrimetric estimation with 2,6 dichloro phenol dye solution.

Statistical analysis: The data analysis was conducted using the statistical technique outlined in the methodology presented by Gomez and Gomez (1984). The software used for analysis was CoStat version 6.303, copyrighted between 1998 and 2004. Treatment means were compared using the least significant difference (LSD) test at a significance level of 0.05. To compare the means of various treatments, the Duncan Multiple Range Test was utilized, as described by Duncan (1955).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Enzymatic antioxidants and indicator of oxidation: Table 2 shows the individual and interaction effect of irrigation rates and biochar rates as well as foliar application of either trehalose or seaweed on polyphenol oxidase (PPO) and catalase (CAT) as enzymatic anti-oxidants as well as malondialdehyde (MDA) at a period of 75 days from planting. Under the I₃ treatment [60% of the irrigation requirements], the highest values of PPO, CAT and MDA were observed, while the lowest values were found under

the I₁ treatment [100% of the irrigation requirements]. On the other hand, as the rate of biochar increased, the values of these traits decreased, where the highest values of PPO, CAT and MDA were achieved with plants grown on untreated soil with biochar followed by that grown on soil treated with biochar at a rate of 5 and 7 m³ fed⁻¹, respectively. Furthermore, the addition of both trehalose and seaweed resulted in lower PPO, CAT and MDA levels compared to the control treatment, where the trehalose came in the last order. In this regard, it can be noticed that the combined treatment of I₁ x biochar (7.0 m³ fed⁻¹) x trehalose recorded the lowest values of PPO, CAT and MDA, whilst the combined treatment (I₃ treatment without soil and foliar applications) caused the highest values of PPO, CAT and MDA. The same trend was achieved for both seasons.

Growth performance and chemical constituents: Table 3 presents the effects of biochar, trehalose and seaweed on the vegetative growth parameters of potato plants under different irrigation rates. The parameters measured include plant height, fresh weight and dry weight at 75 days from planting during the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 growing seasons.

Table 2. Effect of biochar, trehalose and seaweed on enzymatic antioxidants and malondialdehyde (MDA) in leaves of potato plants grown under different irrigation rates at period of 75 days from planting during seasons of 2021/2022 and 2022/2023

2021, 2022 unu 2022, 2023		P	PPO*		CAT *		
Treat	tments	(mmol cate	chol /min/mg)	(umol H2O2 min	⁻¹ .mg ⁻¹ protein ⁻¹)	(umol.g ⁻¹)	
		1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
			Irrigation ra	ites			
I1:100	0% of the irrigation requirements	0.342c	0.359c	8.02c	8.30c	5.15c	5.36c
I2:80%	% of the irrigation requirements	0.462b	0.485b	12.30b	12.69b	7.71b	8.04b
I3:60%	% of the irrigation requirements	0.487a	0.512a	12.75a	13.15a	8.26a	8.59a
LSD	at 5%	0.002	0.003	0.19	0.08	0.09	0.06
			Soil addition	ons			
S ₁ :Co	ontrol (without)	0.456a	0.479a	11.47a	11.83a	7.52a	7.84a
S ₂ :Bio	ochar 5 m ³ fed ⁻¹	0.425b	0.447b	10.97b	11.31b	7.01b	7.30b
S3:Bio	ochar 7 m ³ fed ⁻¹	0.411c	0.431c	10.64c	10.99c	6.58c	6.86c
LSD a	at 5%	0.003	0.003	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.05
			Foliar applica	tions			
F1:Co	ontrol (without spraying)	0.436a	0.458a	11.09a	11.45a	7.12a	7.42a
F ₂ :Se	eaweed (1.0 g L^{-1})	0.430b	0.452b	11.03a	11.37b	7.04b	7.33b
F3:Tre	ehalose (1.0 g L^{-1})	0.423c	0.443c	10.85b	11.21b	6.90c	7.17c
LSD a	at 5%	0.003	0.003	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.05
			Interaction	n			
	F ₁	0.364	0.381	8.36	8.66	5.53	5.76
	$S_1 F_2$	0.360	0.380	8.30	8.58	5.50	5.70
	F3	0.355	0.373	8.26	8.52	5.44	5.65
	F ₁	0.345	0.362	8.20	8.49	5.34	5.56
I_1	S ₂ F ₂	0.341	0.356	8.15	8.42	5.29	5.51
	F ₃	0.339	0.356	8.10	8.39	5.24	5.45
	F ₁	0.335	0.352	7.67	7.93	4.73	4.94
	S ₃ F ₂	0.322	0.339	7.59	7.83	4.68	4.88
	F ₃	0.320	0.336	7.57	7.84	4.63	4.81
	F ₁	0.500	0.527	13.05	13.43	8.46	8.87
	S ₁ F ₂	0.498	0.523	13.01	13.38	8.44	8.79
	F ₃	0.495	0.517	13.00	13.41	8.40	8.75
	Fi	0.458	0.482	12.07	12.43	7.73	8.07
Ŀ	S ₂ F ₂	0.450	0.473	12.06	12.47	7.63	7.96
	F3	0.444	0.466	12.02	12.44	7.49	7.81
	F1	0.443	0.464	11.98	12.36	7.22	7.51
	$S_3 = F_2$	0.438	0.460	11.96	12.33	7.16	749
	F2	0.435	0.457	11.56	11.98	6.84	7.42
	F1	0.516	0.542	13.08	13.51	8.80	9.17
	S ₁ E ₂	0.510	0.535	13.06	13.48	8 58	8.93
	En E	0.505	0.535	13.00	13.46	8 56	8.91
	E1	0.303	0.529	12.07	13.30	8.28	8 50
Ŀ	So Fo	0.491	0.518	12.95	12.56	8.07	8 38
13	52 1 ⁻² Fa	0.402	0.508	12.05	12.75	8.07	8 35
	1'3 E.	0.475	0.301	12.33	12.07	8.04	8 35
		0.475	0.497	12.47	12.09	0.02 7.00	0. <i>33</i> 8 70
	55 F2 E-	0.407	0.409	12.40	12.00	7.99 8.01	0.27 8 37
ICD	r 3	0.402	0.407	0.21	0.22	0.01	0.32
1.017	at 5%	しいワラ	0.010	0.21	0.2.5	0.12	0.13

Means within a row followed by a different letter (s) are statistically different at a 0.05 level

*CAT: Catalase

*PPO: Polyphenol oxidase

*MDA: Malondialdehyde

Table 3. Effect of biochar,	, trehalose and seav	weed on vegetativ	e growth para	meters of potato	plants grown under
different irrigation	a rates at period of 7	75 davs from plan	ting during seas	ons of 2021/2022 :	and 2022/2023

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		0	^	Plant height		Fresh	weight	Dry weight	
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Treatme	ents		(c	m)		(g pla	ant ⁻¹)	• /
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$				1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2^{nd}
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				Irri	igation rates				
$ \begin{array}{c} 1280\% of the irrigation requirements \\ 1260\% of the irrigation requirements \\ 1270\% of the irrigation requirements \\ 1280\% of the irrigation requirement \\ 1280\% of the irrigation requirements \\ 1280\% of the irrigation requirements \\ 1280\% of the irrigation requirement \\ 1280\% of the irrigati$	I1:100%	of the irrigation requireme	ents	55.42a	57.85a	318.94a	324.90a	34.65a	36.06a
$ \begin{array}{c} 1sc00\% of the irrigation requirements \\ Soil additions \\ Soil additions \\ Sil: Control (without) \\ Sc 32c \\ Sc 3$	I2:80% o	f the irrigation requirement	nts	52.52b	54.62b	295.78b	299.08b	33.28b	34.66b
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	I3:60% o	f the irrigation requirement	nts	50.32c	52.22c	276.91c	281.63c	31.69c	32.96c
$\begin{split} S:Control (without) & 50.32c & 52.26c & 277.06c & 281.62c & 31.57c & 32.88c \\ S:Biochar 5 m2 fed1 & 53.34b & 55.47b & 301.36b & 307.22b & 33.73b & 35.08b \\ S:Biochar 7 m2 fed1 & 54.60a & 56.96a & 313.21a & 318.79a & 34.31a & 35.72a \\ ISD at 56 & 0.29 & 1.26 & 2.05 & 0.18 & 0.21 \\ \hline F:Control (without spraying) & 52.38b & 54.43c & 294.31b & 300.36b & 32.97b & 34.33b \\ F:Seaweed (1.0 g L-1) & 53.20a & 55.48a & 300.36b & 32.97b & 34.33b \\ F:Seaweed (1.0 g L-1) & 53.20a & 55.48a & 301.46a & 304.30a & 33.54a & 34.49b \\ F:Trehalose (1.0 g L-1) & 53.20a & 55.48a & 301.46a & 304.30a & 33.54a & 34.93a \\ ISD at 56 & 0.29 & 4.49 & 2.31 & 0.27 & 0.25 \\ \hline The treaction & The tre$	LSD at 5%			0.33	0.43	0.26	1.04	0.26	0.18
$\begin{split} \text{Si:Control (without)} & 50.32c & 52.26c & 277.06c & 281.62c & 31.57c & 32.88c \\ \text{S:Biochar 7 m² fed^{-1}} & 53.34b & 55.47b & 301.36b & 307.22b & 33.73b & 35.08b \\ \text{S:Biochar 7 m² fed^{-1}} & 53.34b & 55.47b & 301.36b & 307.22b & 33.73b & 35.08b \\ \text{S:Biochar 7 m² fed^{-1}} & 52.86b & 56.96a & 313.21a & 318.79a & 34.31a & 35.72a \\ \text{LSD}_{a \leq 9a} & 0.29 & 0.29 & 1.26 & 2.05 & 0.18 & 0.21 \\ \hline \text{Fi:Control (without spraying)} & 52.38b & 54.43c & 294.31b & 300.36b & 32.97b & 34.33b \\ \text{F:Crethalose (1.0 g L^{-1})} & 53.20a & 55.48a & 301.46a & 304.30a & 33.54a & 34.93a \\ \text{LSD}_{a \leq 9a} & 0.39 & 0.39 & 2.40 & 2.31 & 0.27 & 0.25 \\ \hline \text{F:Trehalose (1.0 g L^{-1})} & 52.253 & 54.75 & 295.60 & 299.46 & 33.23 & 34.48 \\ \text{F: 3 } & \text{F2 } 52.53 & 54.75 & 295.60 & 299.46 & 33.23 & 34.58 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 52.93 & 54.81 & 299.47 & 303.85 & 33.61 & 35.14 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 52.66 & 58.04 & 317.91 & 324.11 & 34.76 & 36.12 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 55.46 & 58.04 & 317.91 & 324.11 & 34.76 & 36.12 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 55.46 & 58.04 & 317.91 & 324.11 & 34.76 & 36.612 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 55.46 & 51.69 & 270.01 & 327.48 & 35.33 & 36.73 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 57.74 & 60.31 & 336.89 & 343.87 & 35.52 & 37.05 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 51.69 & 270.19 & 274.49 & 30.74 & 32.03 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 51.69 & 270.01 & 275.44 & 31.16 & 32.40 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 50.68 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 50.68 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 50.68 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 50.68 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 50.68 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 50.68 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 53.40 & 50.60 & 274.01 & 269.06 & 30.07 & 31.24 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 51.41 & 50.76 & 275.08 & 30.58 & 31.89 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 51.41 & 50.75 & 280.17 & 286.51 & 321.6 & 33.41 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 51.41 & 50.51 & 52.10 & 274.60 & 284.62 & 31.91 & 33.21 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 51.28 & 53.19 & 286.11 & 290.87 & 32.63 & 3387 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 51.28 & 53.19 & 286.11 & 290.87 & 32.63 & 3387 \\ \hline \text{F: 5 } 51.28 & 53.19 & 286.1$				Sc	oil additions				
$\begin{split} \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	S1:Contr	ol (without)		50.32c	52.26c	277.06c	281.62c	31.57c	32.88c
$\begin{split} \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	S2:Bioch	$ar 5 m^3 fed^{-1}$		53.34b	55.47b	301.36b	307.22b	33.73b	35.08b
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	S3:Bioch	ar 7 m ³ fed ⁻¹		54.60a	56.96a	313.21a	318.79a	34.31a	35.72a
$F_{12} Control (without spraying) = 52.38b 54.43c 294.31b 300.36b 32.97b 34.33b F_{22} Seawced (1.0 g L-1) = 52.76ab 54.89b 296.59b 302.27b 33.16b 34.46b F_{3} Trehalose (1.0 g L-1) = 53.20a 55.48a 301.46a 304.30a 33.54a 34.93a LSD a.5\% = 0.39 0.39 2.40 2.31 0.27 0.25LSD a.5\% = 0.39 0.39 2.40 2.31 0.27 0.25LSD a.5\% = 0.39 0.39 2.40 4.231 0.27 0.25LSD a.5\% = 0.394 6.8 298.90 33.10 34.41F_{2} 52.65 54.26 294.68 298.90 33.10 34.41F_{3} 52.95 54.81 299.47 303.85 33.61 35.14F_{1} 55.46 58.04 317.91 324.11 34.76 36.12F_{2} 56.27 58.42 320.12 326.96 34.91 36.17F_{3} 56.31 58.92 326.01 329.78 35.33 36.73F_{1} 57.02 59.60 334.68 344.01 35.38 36.84S_{3} F_{2} 57.74 60.31 336.89 343.87 35.62 37.05F_{3} 58.29 61.59 345.09 353.15 35.94 37.48S_{3} F_{2} 57.74 60.31 336.89 343.87 35.62 37.05F_{3} 58.29 61.59 345.09 353.15 35.94 37.48S_{3} F_{2} 57.74 60.31 336.89 343.87 35.62 37.05F_{3} 59.12 52.07 273.38 277.74 31.78 33.09F_{1} 53.11 54.94 300.54 305.70 33.85 35.31F_{3} 53.40 56.08 306.25 311.11 34.23 35.64F_{3} 53.40 56.08 306.25 311.11 34.23 35.64F_{3} 54.78 57.40 316.37 301.33 34.64 36.07F_{1} 54.08 56.54 310.23 315.19 34.51 36.08S_{3} F_{2} 54.71 56.51 311.25 317.53 34.58 35.95F_{3} 54.78 57.40 316.37 301.33 34.64 36.07F_{1} 54.08 56.54 310.23 315.19 34.51 36.08S_{3} F_{2} 54.71 56.51 311.25 317.53 34.58 35.95F_{3} 54.78 57.40 316.37 301.33 34.64 36.07F_{1} 54.08 56.54 310.27 29.074 284.62 31.91 332.1F_{3} 51.19 285.11 32.08 284.91 32.43 33.74F_{3} 51.11 52.82 283.19 288.11 290.87 32.63 33.87S_{3} F_{2} 51.47 53.76 287.12 294.13 32.67 33.93F_{3} 51.99 53.77 290.84 292.04 32.26 33.38F_{3} 51.99 53.77 290.84 292.04 32.26 33.39F_{3} 51.99 53.77 290.84 292.04 32.26 33.93F_{3} 51.99 $	LSD at 5%	b		0.29	0.29	1.26	2.05	0.18	0.21
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $				Folia	ar applications				
$F_{2}Seaweed (1.0 g L^{-1}) = 52.76ab 54.89b 296.59b 302.27b 33.16b 34.46b 55.77b 302.27b 33.16b 34.46b 310.90a 35.54a 34.93a 31.55a 34.93a 31.55a 34.93a 30.27b 33.10 34.41 and a set to a set the set of the $	F1:Contr	ol (without spraying)		52.38b	54.43c	294.31b	300.36b	32.97b	34.33b
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F ₂ :Seaw	eed (1.0 g L^{-1})		52.76ab	54.89b	296.59b	302.27b	33.16b	34.46b
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	F3:Treha	lose (1.0 g L^{-1})		53.20a	55.48a	301.46a	304.30a	33.54a	34.93a
$I_1 = \begin{bmatrix} F_1 & 52.26 & 54.26 & 294.68 & 298.90 & 33.10 & 34.41 \\ F_2 & 52.25 & 54.75 & 295.60 & 299.46 & 33.23 & 34.58 \\ F_3 & 52.93 & 54.81 & 299.47 & 303.85 & 33.61 & 35.14 \\ F_1 & 55.46 & 58.04 & 317.91 & 324.11 & 34.76 & 36.12 \\ F_2 & 56.27 & 58.42 & 320.12 & 326.96 & 34.91 & 36.17 \\ F_3 & 56.31 & 58.92 & 326.01 & 329.78 & 35.33 & 36.73 \\ S_3 & F_2 & 57.74 & 60.31 & 336.89 & 343.87 & 35.62 & 37.05 \\ F_3 & 58.29 & 61.59 & 345.09 & 353.15 & 35.94 & 37.48 \\ S_1 & F_2 & 49.66 & 51.69 & 270.05 & 275.44 & 31.16 & 32.40 \\ F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.16 & 32.40 \\ F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.16 & 32.40 \\ F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.16 & 32.40 \\ F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.68 & 33.09 \\ \hline \\ I_2 & S_2 & F_2 & 53.28 & 55.40 & 303.42 & 307.43 & 34.02 & 35.42 \\ F_3 & 53.40 & 56.08 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline & F_1 & 54.08 & 56.54 & 310.53 & 315.19 & 34.51 & 36.08 \\ S_3 & F_2 & 54.71 & 56.51 & 311.25 & 317.53 & 34.58 & 35.95 \\ \hline & F_1 & 54.08 & 56.54 & 310.53 & 315.19 & 34.51 & 36.08 \\ S_3 & F_2 & 54.71 & 56.51 & 311.25 & 317.53 & 34.58 & 35.95 \\ \hline & F_2 & 54.71 & 55.10 & 274.60 & 284.62 & 31.91 & 33.21 \\ I_3 & S_2 & F_2 & 50.58 & 52.55 & 280.17 & 269.06 & 30.07 & 31.24 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 50.99 & 265.91 & 273.08 & 30.58 & 31.89 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.47 & 53.76 & 287.12 & 294.13 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline & F_3 & 51.99 & 53.77 & 290.84 & 292.04 & 32.86 & 34.21 \\ \hline & & F_3 & 51.99 & 53.77 & 290.84 & 292.04 & 32.86 & 34.21 \\ \hline & & & F_3 & 51.99 & 53.77 & 290.84 & 292.04 & 32.86 & 34.21 \\ \hline & & & & $	LSD at 5%	6		0.39	0.39	2.40	2.31	0.27	0.25
$I_1 = I_2 = I_3 = I_1 = I_1 = I_1 = I_2 $				l	nteraction	0 04 40		22.10	
$I_1 = \begin{bmatrix} S_1 & F_2 & 52.53 & 54.75 & 295.60 & 299.46 & 33.23 & 34.58 \\ F_3 & 52.93 & 54.81 & 299.47 & 303.85 & 33.61 & 35.14 \\ \hline F_1 & 55.46 & 58.04 & 317.91 & 324.11 & 34.76 & 36.12 \\ \hline F_2 & 56.27 & 58.42 & 320.12 & 326.96 & 34.91 & 36.17 \\ \hline F_3 & 56.31 & 58.92 & 326.01 & 329.78 & 35.33 & 36.73 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 57.74 & 60.31 & 336.89 & 343.87 & 35.62 & 37.05 \\ \hline F_3 & 58.29 & 61.59 & 345.09 & 353.15 & 35.94 & 37.48 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 57.74 & 60.31 & 336.89 & 343.87 & 35.62 & 37.05 \\ \hline F_3 & 58.29 & 61.59 & 345.09 & 353.15 & 35.94 & 37.48 \\ \hline S_1 & F_2 & 49.66 & 51.69 & 270.09 & 274.49 & 30.74 & 32.03 \\ \hline S_1 & F_2 & 49.66 & 51.69 & 270.05 & 275.44 & 31.16 & 32.40 \\ \hline F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.78 & 33.09 \\ \hline S_2 & F_2 & 53.28 & 55.40 & 303.42 & 307.43 & 34.02 & 35.42 \\ \hline F_3 & 53.40 & 56.54 & 310.53 & 315.19 & 34.51 & 36.08 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 54.71 & 56.51 & 311.25 & 317.53 & 34.58 & 35.95 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 54.71 & 56.51 & 311.25 & 317.53 & 34.58 & 35.95 \\ \hline S_1 & F_1 & 48.13 & 50.18 & 259.58 & 265.37 & 29.86 & 31.10 \\ \hline S_1 & F_2 & 48.65 & 50.60 & 264.70 & 269.06 & 30.07 & 31.24 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.11 & 52.40 & 274.60 & 284.62 & 31.91 & 33.21 \\ \hline I_3 & S_2 & F_2 & 50.51 & 52.10 & 274.60 & 284.62 & 31.91 & 33.21 \\ \hline I_3 & S_2 & F_2 & 51.47 & 53.76 & 287.12 & 294.13 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.11 & 52.85 & 280.17 & 286.51 & 32.16 & 33.47 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.99 & 53.77 & 29.84 & 29.04 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.99 & 53.77 & 29.84 & 29.04 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.99 & 53.77 & 29.84 & 29.04 & 32.66 & 34.21 \\ \hline ISD _{4.5\%} & 1.17 & 1.18 & 7.19 & 6.94 & 0.72 & 0.74 \\ \hline \end{array}$		a.	F_1	52.26	54.26	294.68	298.90	33.10	34.41
$I_1 = \begin{bmatrix} F_3 & 52.93 & 54.81 & 299.47 & 303.85 & 33.61 & 35.14 \\ F_1 & 55.46 & 58.04 & 317.91 & 324.11 & 34.76 & 36.12 \\ F_2 & 56.27 & 58.42 & 320.12 & 326.96 & 34.91 & 36.17 \\ F_3 & 56.31 & 58.92 & 326.01 & 329.78 & 35.33 & 36.73 \\ \hline F_3 & 56.31 & 58.92 & 326.01 & 329.78 & 35.33 & 36.73 \\ \hline F_3 & 57.74 & 60.31 & 336.89 & 343.87 & 35.62 & 37.05 \\ \hline F_3 & 58.29 & 61.59 & 345.09 & 333.15 & 35.94 & 37.48 \\ \hline F_1 & 49.56 & 50.98 & 270.19 & 274.49 & 30.74 & 32.03 \\ \hline F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.178 & 33.09 \\ \hline F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.78 & 33.09 \\ \hline F_1 & 53.11 & 54.94 & 300.54 & 305.70 & 33.85 & 35.31 \\ \hline I_2 & S_2 & F_2 & 53.28 & 55.40 & 303.42 & 307.43 & 34.02 & 35.42 \\ \hline F_3 & 53.40 & 56.08 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline F_3 & 54.78 & 57.40 & 316.37 & 301.33 & 34.64 & 36.07 \\ \hline S_1 & F_2 & 48.65 & 50.60 & 264.70 & 269.06 & 30.07 & 31.24 \\ \hline F_3 & 49.11 & 50.99 & 265.91 & 273.08 & 30.58 & 31.89 \\ \hline S_1 & F_2 & 48.65 & 50.60 & 264.70 & 269.06 & 30.07 & 31.24 \\ \hline F_3 & 49.11 & 50.99 & 265.91 & 273.08 & 30.58 & 31.89 \\ \hline S_1 & F_2 & 50.58 & 52.55 & 280.17 & 266.51 & 31.24 \\ \hline F_3 & 49.11 & 50.99 & 265.91 & 273.08 & 30.58 & 31.89 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 51.47 & 53.76 & 287.12 & 294.13 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.28 & 53.19 & 286.11 & 290.87 & 32.63 & 33.87 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 51.47 & 53.76 & 287.12 & 294.13 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.99 & 53.77 & 29.84 & 292.04 & 32.86 & 34.21 \\ \hline ISD _{4.5\%} & 1.17 & 1.18 & 7.19 & 6.94 & 0.72 & 0.74 \\ \hline \end{array}$		\mathbf{S}_1	F_2	52.53	54.75	295.60	299.46	33.23	34.58
$I_1 = \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F ₃	52.93	54.81	299.47	303.85	33.61	35.14
$I_1 = \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			F_1	55.46	58.04	317.91	324.11	34.76	36.12
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	I_1	S_2	F_2	56.27	58.42	320.12	326.96	34.91	36.17
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			F ₃	56.31	58.92	326.01	329.78	35.33	36.73
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $			\mathbf{F}_1	57.02	59.60	334.68	344.01	35.38	36.84
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		S ₃	F_2	57.74	60.31	336.89	343.87	35.62	37.05
$I_2 = \begin{matrix} F_1 & 49.56 & 50.98 & 270.19 & 274.49 & 30.74 & 32.03 \\ F_2 & 49.60 & 51.69 & 270.05 & 275.44 & 31.16 & 32.40 \\ F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.78 & 33.09 \\ F_1 & 53.11 & 54.94 & 300.54 & 305.70 & 33.85 & 35.31 \\ S_2 & F_2 & 53.28 & 55.40 & 303.42 & 307.43 & 34.02 & 35.42 \\ F_3 & 53.40 & 56.08 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline F_1 & 54.08 & 56.54 & 310.53 & 315.19 & 34.51 & 36.08 \\ S_3 & F_2 & 54.71 & 56.51 & 311.25 & 317.53 & 34.58 & 35.95 \\ F_3 & 54.78 & 57.40 & 316.37 & 301.33 & 34.64 & 36.07 \\ \hline F_1 & 48.13 & 50.18 & 259.58 & 265.37 & 29.86 & 31.10 \\ S_1 & F_2 & 48.65 & 50.60 & 264.70 & 269.06 & 30.07 & 31.24 \\ F_3 & 49.11 & 50.99 & 265.91 & 273.08 & 30.58 & 31.89 \\ \hline I_3 & S_2 & F_2 & 50.58 & 52.55 & 280.17 & 286.51 & 32.16 & 33.41 \\ F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 288.79 & 32.43 & 33.74 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 51.47 & 53.76 & 287.12 & 294.13 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.99 & 53.77 & 290.84 & 292.04 & 32.86 & 34.21 \\ \hline LSD_{#5\%} & 1.17 & 1.18 & 7.19 & 6.94 & 0.72 & 0.74 \\ \hline \end{tabular}$			F ₃	58.29	61.59	345.09	353.15	35.94	37.48
$I_{2} = \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F_1	49.56	50.98	270.19	274.49	30.74	32.03
$I_2 = \begin{bmatrix} F_3 & 50.12 & 52.07 & 273.38 & 277.74 & 31.78 & 33.09 \\ F_1 & 53.11 & 54.94 & 300.54 & 305.70 & 33.85 & 35.31 \\ F_2 & 53.28 & 55.40 & 303.42 & 307.43 & 34.02 & 35.42 \\ F_3 & 53.40 & 56.08 & 306.25 & 311.11 & 34.23 & 35.60 \\ \hline F_1 & 54.08 & 56.54 & 310.53 & 315.19 & 34.51 & 36.08 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 54.71 & 56.51 & 311.25 & 317.53 & 34.58 & 35.95 \\ \hline F_3 & 54.78 & 57.40 & 316.37 & 301.33 & 34.64 & 36.07 \\ \hline S_1 & F_2 & 48.65 & 50.60 & 264.70 & 269.06 & 30.07 & 31.24 \\ \hline F_3 & 49.11 & 50.99 & 265.91 & 273.08 & 30.58 & 31.89 \\ \hline I_3 & S_2 & F_2 & 50.58 & 52.55 & 280.17 & 286.51 & 32.16 & 33.41 \\ \hline F_3 & 49.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 286.51 & 32.16 & 33.41 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 286.51 & 32.16 & 33.41 \\ \hline F_3 & 51.11 & 52.82 & 283.19 & 286.51 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 51.47 & 53.76 & 287.12 & 294.13 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline S_3 & F_2 & 51.47 & 53.76 & 287.12 & 294.13 & 32.67 & 33.93 \\ \hline LSD_{at.5\%} & 1.17 & 1.18 & 7.19 & 6.94 & 0.72 & 0.74 \\ \hline \end{bmatrix}$		S_1	F_2	49.60	51.69	270.05	275.44	31.16	32.40
$I_2 = \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F ₃	50.12	52.07	273.38	277.74	31.78	33.09
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F_1	53.11	54.94	300.54	305.70	33.85	35.31
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	I_2	S_2	F_2	53.28	55.40	303.42	307.43	34.02	35.42
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F3	53.40	56.08	306.25	311.11	34.23	35.60
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F_1	54.08	56.54	310.53	315.19	34.51	36.08
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		S 3	F_2	54.71	56.51	311.25	317.53	34.58	35.95
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F ₃	54.78	57.40	316.37	301.33	34.64	36.07
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F_1	48.13	50.18	259.58	265.37	29.86	31.10
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		S_1	F_2	48.65	50.60	264.70	269.06	30.07	31.24
$I_{3} = \begin{array}{ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F3	49.11	50.99	265.91	273.08	30.58	31.89
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F_1	50.51	52.10	274.60	284.62	31.91	33.21
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	I ₃	S_2	F_2	50.58	52.55	280.17	286.51	32.16	33.41
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	-	-	$\tilde{F_3}$	51.11	52.82	283.19	288.79	32.43	33.74
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$			F ₁	51.28	53.19	286.11	290.87	32.63	33.87
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		S ₃	F_2	51.47	53.76	287.12	294.13	32.67	33.93
LSD #5% 1.17 1.18 7.19 6.94 0.72 0.74			F3	51.99	53.77	290.84	292.04	32.86	34.21
	LSD at 5%	,)	- 5	1.17	1.18	7.19	6.94	0.72	0.74

Means within a row followed by a different letter (s) are statistically different at a 0.05 level

The I₁ treatment (100% of the irrigation requirements) consistently resulted in the highest plant height, fresh weight and dry weight across both seasons. Specifically, the I1 treatment led to significant increases in plant height, fresh weight, and dry weight compared to the I2 treatment (80% of the irrigation requirements) and I₃ treatment (60% of the irrigation requirements. The reduction in irrigation quantity significantly decreased all measured growth parameters, highlighting the importance of adequate water supply for optimal potato growth. The application of biochar significantly improved the vegetative growth parameters compared to the control (no soil addition). Higher levels of biochar (7 m3 fed-1) recorded the maximum values, with significant increases in plant height, fresh weight, and dry weight. This suggests that biochar can effectively enhance soil properties, leading to improved plant growth, especially under varying irrigation rates. Among the foliar applications, trehalose showed the most substantial positive impact on vegetative growth. Trehalose-treated plants exhibited the highest plant height, fresh weight, and dry weight, followed

by seaweed treatment, with both significantly outperforming the control. The beneficial effects of trehalose, especially under suboptimal irrigation conditions, underscore its role as an osmoprotectant, helping plants mitigate stress and maintain growth.

The interaction effects reveal that the combination of traditional irrigation (I₁ treatment), biochar (7 m³ fed⁻¹) and trehalose resulted in the highest plant growth metrics across both seasons. Even under reduced irrigation conditions, trehalose application combined with biochar improved plant growth parameters compared to traditional irrigation (I₁ treatment) in the absence of both biochar and foliar applications. Generally, the data demonstrate that trehalose, particularly when used in conjunction with biochar, significantly enhances the vegetative growth of potato plants under water deficit conditions. This suggests that trehalose can be an effective foliar treatment to improve crop resilience and productivity, even under less-than-ideal irrigation conditions.

Table 4 provides detailed data on the same studied treatments on the photosynthetic pigments (chlorophyll a,

chlorophyll b and carotene) of potato plants, measured 75 days after planting during the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 growing seasons. The results show that the I₁ treatment (100% of the irrigation requirements) consistently produced the highest levels of chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and carotene across both seasons. The levels of these pigments decreased as the irrigation quantity was reduced, with the 60% of the irrigation requirements showing the lowest pigment concentrations. This trend emphasizes the critical role of

adequate water availability in maintaining optimal photosynthetic activity and pigment production in potato plants. Biochar application had a significant positive effect on the photosynthetic pigments. The higher rate of biochar (7 m³ fed⁻¹) led to the highest concentrations of chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and carotene, surpassing the lower biochar application rate (5 m³ fed⁻¹) which came in the second order followed by the control group (without biochar).

 Table 4. Effect of biochar, trehalose and seaweed on photosynthetic pigments of potato plants grown under different irrigation rates at period of 75 days from planting during seasons of 2021/2022 and 2022/2023

			Chlore	Chlorophyll a Chlorophyll b Caroten					
Treatme	nts				(mg	$(\operatorname{mg} \operatorname{g}^{-1})$			
			1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2^{nd}	
			In	rigation rates					
I1:100% c	of the irrigation requirement	nts	0.954a	1.002a	0.733a	0.770a	0.408a	0.414a	
I ₂ :80% of	the irrigation requirement	S	0.922b	0.966b	0.695b	0.729b	0.379b	0.385b	
I3:60% of	the irrigation requirement	S	0.888c	0.933c	0.654c	0.687c	0.349c	0.355c	
LSD at 5%	U I		0.010	0.004	0.006	0.003	0.003	0.002	
			S	oil additions					
S1:Contro	ol (without)		0.886c	0.930c	0.655c	0.688c	0.350c	0.355c	
S ₂ :Biocha	$ar 5 m^3 \text{ fed}^{-1}$		0.930b	0.977b	0.705b	0.741b	0.387b	0.393b	
S3:Biocha	ar 7 m ³ fed ⁻¹		0.947a	0.994a	0.722a	0.758a	0.399a	0.405a	
LSD at 5%			0.009	0.005	0.007	0.004	0.002	0.002	
			Foli	ar applications					
F1:Contro	ol (without spraying)		0.917b	0.962b	0.689c	0.723c	0.375c	0.381c	
F ₂ :Seawe	$ed (1.0 g L^{-1})$		0.921b	0.967ab	0.694b	0.729b	0.378b	0.385b	
F3:Trehal	ose (1.0 g L^{-1})		0.928a	0.973a	0.701a	0.736a	0.384a	0.390a	
LSD at 5%			0.004	0.006	0.004	0.004	0.003	0.002	
				Interaction					
		\mathbf{F}_1	0.923	0.967	0.688	0.723	0.375	0.380	
	\mathbf{S}_1	F_2	0.926	0.971	0.694	0.726	0.377	0.382	
		F ₃	0.930	0.980	0.697	0.730	0.383	0.387	
		F_1	0.959	1.009	0.740	0.780	0.414	0.421	
I_1	S_2	F_2	0.963	1.012	0.746	0.787	0.417	0.425	
		F ₃	0.966	1.014	0.752	0.787	0.422	0.429	
-		F_1	0.971	1.017	0.756	0.794	0.424	0.430	
	S 3	F ₂	0.974	1.022	0.761	0.800	0.428	0.435	
		F ₃	0.977	1.027	0.765	0.802	0.431	0.438	
		F ₁	0.867	0.908	0.639	0.674	0.340	0.345	
	Si	F ₂	0.872	0.912	0.647	0.681	0 343	0.350	
	51	F3	0.881	0.925	0.653	0.684	0.346	0.353	
-		F1	0.934	0.923	0.000	0.738	0.387	0.393	
Ь	Sa	E2	0.937	0.983	0.704	0.735	0.390	0.395	
12	52	F2	0.937	0.983	0.700	0.750	0.394	0.375	
-		E ₁	0.945	0.903	0.725	0.759	0.399	0.404	
	Sa	F ₁	0.950	1.002	0.720	0.763	0.377	0.411	
	33	1-2 Fa	0.955	1.002	0.729	0.703	0.403	0.411	
		<u> </u>	0.937	0.804	0.734	0.771	0.408	0.414	
	ς.	F1 E	0.852	0.094	0.019	0.040	0.322	0.329	
	51	Г2 Г-	0.801	0.907	0.624	0.033	0.329	0.555	
-		<u>Г3</u> Е	0.805	0.909	0.034	0.000	0.552	0.559	
т	C	Г1 Г	0.800	0.932	0.000	0.080	0.351	0.330	
13	52	F2	0.890	0.938	0.661	0.694	0.353	0.359	
-		F3	0.896	0.940	0.66/	0.702	0.357	0.362	
	a		0.908	0.955	0.6/1	0.709	0.363	0.369	
	S ₃	F2	0.914	0.961	0.678	0.710	0.366	0.371	
		F ₃	0.918	0.962	0.681	0.716	0.371	0.377	
LSD at 5%			0.014	0.019	0.012	0.014	0.008	0.007	

Means within a row followed by a different letter (s) are statistically different at a 0.05 level

This suggests that biochar enhances soil conditions, potentially improving nutrient availability and water retention, which in turn supports better pigment synthesis in the leaves. Foliar spraying with trehalose resulted in the highest concentrations of chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and carotene, followed closely by seaweed treatment and then the control group, which came in the last order. Both treatments significantly outperformed the control group, indicating that these substances may play a role in mitigating stress and supporting pigment production, even under reduced irrigation conditions. The interaction effects reveal that the combination of I₁ treatment (100% of the irrigation requirements), higher biochar application (7 m³ fed⁻¹) and trehalose spraying caused the highest levels of photosynthetic pigments in both seasons. Even under I₂ and I₃ treatments (80% and 60% of the irrigation requirements, respectively), the addition of biochar and foliar applications, particularly trehalose, led to significant improvements in pigment concentrations compared to the control treatments. In summary, the data indicate that both biochar and trehalose have a substantial impact on enhancing the photosynthetic pigments in potato plants. These treatments can potentially improve the plants'

ability to capture and utilize light for photosynthesis, which is crucial for growth and productivity, especially under waterlimited conditions.

Table 5 outlines the effects of biochar, trehalose and seaweed treatments on the chemical constituents (nitrogen, phosphorus, and potassium) in the leaves of potato plants grown under different irrigation rates. The data were collected 75 days after planting during the 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 growing seasons. The I₁ treatment (100% of the irrigation requirements) resulted in the highest concentrations of nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and potassium (K) in the leaves across both seasons. The nutrient content decreased progressively with reduced irrigation quantity, with the I₃ treatment (60% of the irrigation requirements) showing the lowest values. This suggests that sufficient water availability

is crucial for optimal nutrient uptake and assimilation in potato plants. Biochar applications significantly improved the nutrient content in the leaves. The highest rate of biochar (7 m³ fed⁻¹) led to the greatest increases in N, P, and K concentrations, surpassing both the control and the lower biochar rate (5 m³ fed⁻¹). This indicates that biochar enhances soil nutrient availability or retention, contributing to better nutrient absorption by the plants. Trehalose foliar application consistently resulted in the highest concentrations of N, P, and K in the leaves, followed closely by seaweed treatment. Both treatments significantly improved nutrient content compared to the control, indicating that these foliar applications may enhance nutrient assimilation, even under suboptimal irrigation conditions.

Table 5. Effect of biochar, trehalose and seaweed on chemical constitutes in leaves of potato plants grown under different irrigation rates at period of 75 days from planting during seasons of 2021/2022 and 2022/2023

		r]	N]	<u>P</u>]	X
Treatm	ents				(%	(0)		
			1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2^{nd}
			In	rigation rates				
I1:100%	of the irrigation require	ements	3.46a	3.53a	0.400a	0.407a	3.12a	3.18a
I ₂ :80% o	of the irrigation requiren	nents	3.11b	3.18b	0.368b	0.375b	2.88b	2.92b
I3:60% o	of the irrigation requirent	nents	2.68c	2.74c	0.337c	0.343c	2.60c	2.64c
LSD at 59	%		0.08	0.01	0.002	0.002	0.06	0.06
			Se	oil additions				
S1:Conta	rol (without)		2.69c	2.75c	0.335c	0.341c	2.59c	2.63a
S ₂ :Bioch	har 5 m ³ fed ⁻¹		3.20b	3.27b	0.377b	0.384b	2.95b	3.00b
S ₃ :Bioch	nar 7 m ³ fed ⁻¹		3.35a	3.43a	0.393a	0.400a	3.06a	3.11c
LSD at 59	%		0.02	0.02	0.002	0.002	0.04	0.04
			Foli	ar applications				
F ₁ :Cont	rol (without spraying)		3.03c	3.10c	0.364c	0.370c	2.83b	2.88b
F ₂ :Seaw	reed (1.0 g L^{-1})		3.09b	3.15b	0.368b	0.374b	2.87ab	2.92ab
F3:Treha	alose (1.0 g L^{-1})		3.14a	3.21a	0.375a	0.382a	2.91a	2.96a
LSD at 59	%		0.02	0.02	0.003	0.002	0.04	0.04
				Interaction				
		F_1	3.18	3.24	0.365	0.372	2.87	2.91
	S_1	F_2	3.23	3.29	0.370	0.377	2.91	2.95
		F3	3.25	3.33	0.376	0.384	2.93	2.97
		F_1	3.51	3.58	0.407	0.415	3.13	3.19
I_1	S_2	F ₂	3.53	3.60	0.409	0.416	3.20	3.27
		F ₃	3.57	3.64	0.412	0.420	3.22	3.26
		F_1	3.59	3.66	0.415	0.423	3.26	3.33
	S_3	F_2	3.61	3.69	0.420	0.424	3.30	3.37
		F3	3.65	3.74	0.425	0.434	3.32	3.39
		F_1	2.44	2.49	0.319	0.325	2.44	2.48
	S ₁	F ₂	2.51	2.55	0.323	0.329	2.48	2.53
		F3	2.54	2.59	0.327	0.330	2.52	2.56
		Fi	3.38	3.45	0.381	0.389	3.03	3.08
Þ	S2	F ₂	3.40	3.47	0.383	0.387	3.06	3.10
-2	52	F3	3.42	3.49	0.391	0.398	3.06	3.11
		F1	3.42	3 50	0.393	0.400	3.09	3.14
	S2	F2	3.43	3 51	0.396	0.405	3.09	3.14
	55	F3	3.47	3 54	0.404	0411	3.12	316
		F1	2 34	2 39	0.307	0313	2 35	2 39
	S1	E2	2.54	2.39	0.313	0.319	2.35	2.37
	51	F2	2.57	2.41	0.317	0.322	2.37	2.45
		E	2.41	2.46	0.330	0.322	2.12	2.40
Ŀ	S ₂	E	2.01	2.00	0.337	0.335	2.57	2.02
13	52	F2	2.07	2.75	0.337	0.343	2.02	2.00
		<u> </u>	2.12	2.17	0.340	0.355	2.07	2.71
	S.		∠.04 3.07	2.90	0.350	0.303	2.13	2.19
	33	Г2 Е.	3.07	2.15	0.300	0.307	2.70	2.02
LCD		Γ3	3.12	3.10	0.004	0.572	2.03	2.00
LSD at 59	%		0.06	0.07	0.008	0.007	0.13	0.13

Means within a row followed by a different letter (s) are statistically different at a 0.05 level

The interaction effects reveal that the combination of the I₁ treatment (100% of the irrigation requirements), higher biochar application (7 m³ fed⁻¹) and trehalose foliar spraying led to the highest concentrations of N, P, and K in the leaves during both seasons. Even under reduced irrigation rates (I₂ and I₃ treatments), the addition of biochar and trehalose foliar spray contributed to significantly higher nutrient levels compared to the control treatments. Nitrogen levels were highest under I_1 treatment (100% of the irrigation requirements) with the addition of 7 m^3 fed^{-1} biochar and trehalose foliar spraying.

This combination appears to enhance nitrogen uptake or retention in potato plants, critical for growth and development. Phosphorus content followed a similar trend, with the highest values observed in the I_1 treatment (100% of the irrigation requirements), biochar (7 m³ fed⁻¹), and trehalose-treated plants. Phosphorus is essential for energy transfer and root development, making these findings particularly relevant for improving plant resilience under stress. Potassium content was also highest in the same treatment combinations, underscoring the role of biochar and foliar applications in improving nutrient uptake. Potassium is vital for water regulation and enzyme activation in plants, making its adequate presence crucial for maintaining plant health under varying water conditions. Finally, the data suggest that both biochar and trehalose significantly enhance the nutrient content in potato leaves, especially under water-limited scenarios.

Yield and quality traits: On the other hand, all studied treatments significantly affected tuber yield and their characteristics *i.e.*, average weight of one tuber, No. of tuber plant⁻¹, total tuber yield (Table 6) as well as tubers quality parameters such as total carbohydrates, total sugars, DM, TDS and VC, (Table 7) at harvest stage during seasons of 2021/2022 and 2022/2023. The data illustrated that the plants

grown under I1 treatment possessed the maximum values of all aforementioned traits followed by that grown under I2 treatment and lately that grown under I_3 treatment. Concerning biochar treatments, it can be noticed that the soil addition of biochar at rate of 7 m3 fed-1 caused the highest values of average weight of one tuber, No. of tuber plant-1, total tuber yield, total carbohydrates, total sugars, DM, TDS and V.C. While the soil addition of biochar at a rate of 5 m^3 fed⁻¹ came in the second order, ahead of the control treatment, which remained in the last order. Regarding foliar applications, the superior treatment for obtaining the maximum values was trehalose then seaweed, whilst the plants grown without foliar application had the lowest values of average weight of one tuber, No. of tuber plant⁻¹, total tuber yield, total carbohydrates, total sugars, DM, TDS and VC. As for the interaction effect, the highest values were achieved under the combined treatment of I_1 x biochar (7.0m³ fed⁻¹) x trehalose. It worth mentioning that the performance under the combined treatment of I₂ x biochar at both levels x either trehalose or seaweed was superior to that of the I1 treatment without soil and foliar applications (control).

Table 6. Effect of biochar, trehalose and seaweed on tubers yield of potato plants grown under different irrigation rates at harvest stage during seasons of 2021/2022 and 2022/2023

		Average tuber weight		No. of to bound out 1		Yield				
Treatments		(g)	No. of tuber plant -		(Kg	plot ⁻¹)	(metric ton ha ⁻¹)		
			1 st	2 nd	1 st	2^{nd}	1 st	2 nd	1 st	2 nd
				Irrig	ation rates					
I1:100%	of the irrigation requ	uirements	158.75a	156.77a	4.11a	4.59a	39.19a	43.23a	35.53a	39.20a
I2:80%	of the irrigation requi	irements	157.02b	155.03b	3.37b	3.70b	31.86b	34.54b	28.89b	31.31b
I3:60%	of the irrigation requi	irements	153.87c	152.22c	2.67c	2.89c	24.64c	26.42c	22.34c	23.96c
LSD at 5	%		1.18	0.05	0.67	0.70	4.54	6.61	4.12	5.99
				Soil	additions					
S1:Cont	rol (without)		154.39b	152.43b	2.67b	3.00b	24.76b	27.47b	22.44b	24.91b
S2:Bioch	har 5 m ³ fed ⁻¹		157.49a	155.50a	3.56a	3.89a	33.68a	36.41a	30.54a	33.01a
S3:Bioch	har 7 m ³ fed ⁻¹		157.76a	156.09a	3.93a	4.30a	37.25a	40.31a	33.78a	36.55a
LSD at 5	%		0.87	0.69	0.53	0.45	5.10	4.23	4.63	3.84
				Foliar	applications	5				
F1:Cont	rol (without spraying	g)	156.30a	154.47a	3.30a	3.59a	31.02a	33.43a	28.12a	30.31a
F2:Seaw	1.0 g L^{-1}		156.48a	154.63a	3.37a	3.70a	31.76a	34.47a	28.79a	31.26a
F3:Treha	alose (1.0 g L^{-1})		157.03a	154.94a	3.57a	3.89a	33.82a	36.32a	30.66a	32.93a
LSD at 5	%		*NS	*NS	*NS	*NS	*NS	*NS	*NS	*NS
				Int	teraction					
		F_1	156.42	154.61	3.33	3.67	31.36	34.01	28.44	30.84
	\mathbf{S}_1	F_2	156.66	154.93	3.33	3.67	31.29	34.04	28.37	30.87
		F ₃	157.55	155.24	3.67	4.00	34.70	37.22	31.46	33.74
		F_1	159.55	157.44	4.00	4.67	38.19	44.09	34.62	39.97
I_1	S_2	F_2	159.31	157.38	4.33	4.67	41.38	44.02	37.51	39.92
		F ₃	159.82	157.56	4.33	5.00	41.64	47.36	37.75	42.94
	~	F_1	159.75	157.96	4.67	5.00	44.73	47.35	40.55	42.93
	S_3	F_2	159.77	157.83	4.67	5.33	44.69	50.55	40.52	45.83
		F3	159.92	158.01	4.67	5.33	44.70	50.47	40.53	45.76
	~	F_1	154.13	152.01	2.00	2.67	18.36	24.28	16.65	22.02
	S_1	F_2	153.98	152.16	2.67	2.67	24.64	24.30	22.34	22.03
		F3	154.08	152.56	2.67	2.67	24.67	24.41	22.37	22.13
	a	F_1	158.29	155.82	3.67	4.00	34.78	37.42	31.54	33.92
12	S_2	F_2	158.38	156.14	3.67	4.00	34.88	37.51	31.63	34.01
		F3	158.28	156.27	3.6/	4.00	34.90	37.60	31.65	34.09
	C	F ₁	158.45	156.58	4.00	4.33	38.07	40.67	34.51	36.88
	\mathbf{S}_3	F_2	158.58	156.81	4.00	4.33	38.14	40.69	34.58	30.89
		F ₃	158.98	156.92	4.00	4.67	38.28	43.94	34./1	39.83
	C	F1 E	150.90	149.35	2.33	2.33	21.08	20.87	19.11	18.92
	S 1	F2	152.39	150.10	2.00	2.67	18.32	24.06	16.61	21.81
		F3 E	153.38	150.91	2.00	2.07	18.57	24.00	10.05	21.81
L	S.	Г1 Еа	154.08	153.00	2.07	2.07	24.75 24.71	24.32 27.50	22.44	22.23
13	52	Г2 Еа	154.70	152.04	2.07	3.00	24.71	27.59	22.41	25.01
		Г3 Е.	154.40	152.04	2.00	3.00	27.86	27.59	25.21	25.01
	S.	Г1 Еа	154.55	153.42	3.00	3.00	27.00	27.09	25.20	23.11
	D 3	Г2 Е2	154.58	153.40	3.00	3.00	21.74	27.50	23.13	24.93
ISD -		13	3 26	2 71	1.55	1 72	1.64	16.50	14.24	14 54
LADIJ at 5	%		.770	.3./1	1.04	1.14	1.04	10)7	14.24	14

Means within a row followed by a different letter (s) are statistically different at a 0.05 level

*NS= non-significant

Table 7. Effect of biochar, trehalose and seaweed on tube	rs quality of potate	plants grown under	different irrigation
rates at harvest stage during seasons of 2021/2022	and 2022/2023		

Treatments $(\%)$ $100g^{-1}$ $($ 1^{st} 2^{nd} 1^{st} 1^{st} 2^{nd} 1^{st} 2^{nd} 1^{st} 2^{nd} 1^{st} 2^{nd} 1^{st} 2^{nd} 1^{st} 1^{st} 2^{nd} 1^{st} $1^{$	7.94a 7.44b
1st 2nd 1st <th>2nd 7.94a 7.44b 6.66c</th>	2 nd 7.94a 7.44b 6.66c
Irrigation rates	7.94a 7.44b 6.66c
	7.94a 7.44b 6.66c
11:100% of the irrigation requirements 28.02a 28.50a 5.54a 5.77a 21.54a 22.26a 22.79a 23.00a 7.55a	7.44b 6.66c
L2:80% of the irrigation requirements 26.95b 27.39b 5.32b 5.53b 20.64b 21.31b 21.87b 22.15b 7.08b	6.660
I3:60% of the irrigation requirements 25.93c 26.35c 5.11c 5.31c 19.73c 20.34c 21.00c 21.27c 6.35c	0.000
LSD at 5% 0.20 0.17 0.04 0.08 0.06 0.23 0.35 0.08 0.08	0.21
Soil additions	
S1:Control (without) 25.98c 26.39c 5.09c 5.31c 19.70c 20.32c 21.01c 21.27c 6.44c	6.76c
S ₂ :Biochar 5 m ³ fed ⁻¹ 27.25b 27.67b 5.39b 5.61b 20.89b 21.57b 22.14b 22.39b 7.17b	7.52b
S ₃ :Biochar 7 m ³ fed ⁻¹ 27.69a 28.18a 5.48a 5.70a 21.32a 22.03a 22.52a 22.77a 7.37a	7.75a
LSD at 5% 0.17 0.26 0.04 0.03 0.02 0.11 0.13 0.23 0.07	0.04
Foliar applications	
F_1 :Control (without spraying) 26.77b 27.23b 5.28b 5.50b 20.51c 21.16b 21.73c 21.99b 6.92c	7.28c
F_2 :Seaweed (1.0 g L ⁻¹) 26.99a 27.43a 5.33a 5.54a 20.64b 21.30b 21.89b 22.15a 7.00b	7.35b
F_3 : Irehalose (1.0 g L ⁻¹) 27/20a 27.64a 5.37a 5.58a 20.81a 21.49a 22.08a 22.31a 7.09a	7.43a
LSD at 5% 0.20 0.19 0.04 0.05 0.14 0.12 0.15 0.05	0.04
	= 2=
$F_1 = 26.84 = 27.24 = 5.31 = 5.53 = 20.54 = 21.13 = 21.72 = 21.97 = 7.00$	7.37
S_1 F_2 26.87 27.18 5.31 5.54 20.63 21.30 21.85 22.11 7.18	7.54
	7.68
F_1 27.90 28.49 5.56 5.77 21.55 22.29 22.80 23.00 7.68	8.06
$I_1 \qquad S_2 \qquad F_2 \qquad 28.36 28.93 5.60 5.82 21.74 22.44 23.00 23.20 7.72$	8.07
	8.10
$F_1 \qquad 28.52 29.11 5.66 5.90 22.01 22.75 23.25 23.47 7.68$	8.19
$S_3 = F_2 = 29.02 = 29.54 = 5.69 = 5.91 = 22.22 = 22.95 = 23.44 = 23.60 = 7.79$	8.20
F ₃ 29.16 29.80 5.75 5.98 22.50 23.27 23.69 23.90 7.83	8.21
$F_1 \qquad 25.65 26.06 4.98 5.20 19.27 19.85 20.56 20.83 6.10$	6.41
S_1 F_2 25.68 26.17 5.07 5.28 19.56 20.11 20.80 21.07 6.13	6.46
	6.46
$F_1 = 27.22 = 27.66 = 5.39 = 5.61 = 21.01 = 21.65 = 22.20 = 22.49 = 7.45$	7.82
$I_2 \qquad S_2 \qquad F_2 \qquad 27.27 27.66 5.40 5.65 20.99 21.66 22.23 22.56 7.50$	7.87
F_3 27.52 27.93 5.45 5.68 21.14 21.91 22.31 22.68 7.53	7.92
$F_1 = 27.70 28.07 5.45 5.66 21.25 22.01 22.47 22.76 7.60$	7.95
S ₃ F ₂ 27.75 28.20 5.52 5.73 21.47 22.21 22.57 22.82 7.61	8.01
F ₃ 27.85 28.25 5.51 5.73 21.54 22.24 22.76 22.94 7.62	8.02
F ₁ 24.96 25.34 4.85 5.05 18.87 19.47 20.14 20.45 5.99	6.28
S_1 F_2 25.35 25.78 4.92 5.12 18.97 19.57 20.39 20.65 6.05	6.32
F_3 25.43 25.83 4.95 5.15 19.16 19.74 20.56 20.82 6.05	6.34
F ₁ 26.10 26.44 5.13 5.32 19.81 20.42 20.99 21.21 6.21	6.54
I_3 S_2 F_2 26.12 26.49 5.17 5.36 19.88 20.44 21.22 21.46 6.29	6.61
F_3 26.28 26.68 5.22 5.41 20.03 20.60 21.25 21.45 6.36	6.67
F ₁ 26.00 26.68 5.23 5.44 20.26 20.87 21.39 21.74 6.61	6.91
S ₃ F ₂ 26.53 26.89 5.27 5.47 20.32 20.97 21.53 21.86 6.73	7.04
F ₃ 26.64 27.05 5.27 5.48 20.31 21.01 21.54 21.83 6.89	7.24
LSD #5% 0.60 0.56 0.12 0.11 0.16 0.42 0.45 0.44 0.16	0.12

Means within a row followed by a different letter (s) are statistically different at a 0.05 level *TDS = Total Dissolved Solid

Water availability is a critical factor influencing nutrient uptake in plants. Adequate irrigation ensures that nutrients dissolved in the soil solution are readily available for absorption by the plant roots. In the study, the I_1 treatment (100% of the irrigation) resulted in the highest concentrations of nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and potassium (K) in the potato leaves, likely due to the enhanced mobility and availability of these nutrients in the soil under optimal moisture conditions. Reduced irrigation, as seen in the I2 and I_3 treatments (80 and 60% of the irrigation requirements), likely led to reduced soil moisture levels, limiting nutrient solubility and diffusion to the root surface, thereby decreasing nutrient uptake. Furthermore, water stress can reduce root growth and function, further limiting the plant's ability to acquire essential nutrients. The results are in harmony with those of Jalali et al. (2018); Nasir et al. (2022); Bayatani et al. (2023). Biochar is known for its ability to improve soil fertility through multiple mechanisms. Its porous structure enhances soil aeration and water retention, creating a more favorable environment for root growth and nutrient absorption. The high cation exchange capacity (CEC) of biochar also allows it to retain essential nutrients, reducing leaching losses and making them more available to plants (Elsherpiny, 2023). In this study, the application of biochar at 7 m³ fed⁻¹ significantly increased the concentrations of N, P, and K in the leaves, likely due to its role in improving nutrient retention and availability in the soil. Biochar may also enhance microbial activity in the rhizosphere, further contributing to nutrient cycling and availability. Foliar applications of trehalose and seaweed extract were observed to significantly enhance the nutrient content in potato leaves. Trehalose, a disaccharide, acts as an osmoprotectant, helping plants to maintain cellular integrity and function under stress conditions such as drought. By stabilizing cell membranes and proteins, trehalose may improve the efficiency of nutrient assimilation and transport within the plant. Additionally, seaweed extract is rich in bioactive compounds, including hormones, vitamins, and trace elements, which can stimulate plant growth and enhance nutrient uptake. These compounds may activate specific physiological pathways that increase the efficiency of nutrient utilization, even under suboptimal soil moisture conditions. These findings are in accordance with those of Abd El Baky

et al. (2016); Al-Rubaie *et al.* (2023).The combined application of biochar, trehalose, and optimal irrigation resulted in the highest levels of N, P, and K in the potato leaves, indicating a synergistic effect. Biochar improves soil structure and nutrient retention, while trehalose and seaweed extract enhance the plant's physiological capacity to absorb and assimilate these nutrients. This synergism is particularly evident under I₁ treatment (100% of the irrigation), where the availability of water and nutrients is maximized, allowing the plants to fully benefit from the enhanced soil fertility and foliar treatments. Even under reduced irrigation conditions, the combination of biochar and foliar treatments mitigated the adverse effects of water stress on nutrient uptake, demonstrating their potential to enhance plant resilience.

Also, the results of this study demonstrated the potential of biochar application in combination with trehalose or seaweed spray for enhancing drought stress tolerance in potato plants. The findings revealed significant improvements in enzyme levels and tuber yield, and quality traits under the combined treatment of biochar, trehalose, and seaweed. Generally, it can be said that the presence of biochar combined with trehalose or seaweed led to a reduction in the potato plants' self-production of enzymatic antioxidants. However, under conditions of water deficit stress, potato plants exhibited an increase in the production of antioxidants such as PPO and CAT. This adaptive response is aimed at mitigating oxidative damage and scavenging free radicals responsible for such damage. Consequently, the values of PPO and CAT in the leaves were higher under water stress treatments (I_2 and I_3) compared to traditional irrigation (I1). The results obtained are in agreement with the results reported by Ghazi and El-Sherpiny, (2021) and Awwad et al. (2022). MDA serves as a widely utilized biomarker to evaluate oxidative stress and lipid peroxidation in biological systems. It is formed as a byproduct of lipid peroxidation, which occurs when free radicals attack polyunsaturated fatty acids in cell membranes (Singh et al. 2014). Elevated levels of MDA indicate escalated oxidative damage, and it is commonly employed as an indicator of cellular oxidative stress. In line with this, the levels of MDA in the leaves increased under water stress treatments (I_2 and I_3), further demonstrating the occurrence of oxidative stress in those conditions. One possible scientific reason behind these results is the impact of biochar on soil properties and water availability. Biochar has been shown to improve soil waterholding capacity by enhancing soil structure and increasing the retention of moisture. This enables better water availability to the plant roots during periods of water deficit. The improved water availability, in turn, helps to maintain stomatal conductance and photosynthetic activity, reducing the negative effects of drought stress on potato plants. Furthermore, the addition of biochar enhances nutrient retention and availability in the soil, promoting overall plant growth and development even under water-limited conditions. The findings are in harmony with those of Elsherpiny (2023). The foliar application of trehalose or seaweed extracts also played a significant role in enhancing drought stress tolerance in potato plants. These biostimulants contain a range of bioactive compounds, including phytohormones (such as cytokinins and abscisic acid), antioxidants, and osmoprotectants (such as proline and betaines). These compounds act as signaling molecules and protectants, regulating plant physiology and mitigating the adverse effects of drought stress. They can improve stomatal regulation, enhance antioxidant defense mechanisms, and alleviate oxidative damage caused by reactive oxygen species generated under drought conditions. Additionally, they can enhance root development and nutrient uptake efficiency, further supporting plant resilience to water deficit (Elansary et al. 2016). The combined treatment of

biochar, trehalose, and seaweed likely synergistically interacted to maximize the benefits on potato plants under drought stress. Biochar improved soil water retention and nutrient availability, providing a favorable growth environment for the plants. Trehalose or seaweed extracts, when applied foliarly, enhanced physiological responses and stress tolerance mechanisms in the plants, optimizing their water use efficiency and mitigating oxidative damage. The combined effect of these treatments led to improved enzyme activity, increased tuber yield, and enhanced quality traits in the potato plants compared to the control treatment. It is worth noting that the specific mechanisms underlying the observed results may vary depending on various factors such as the specific biochar properties, trehalose or seaweed composition, and the physiological responses of the potato cultivars used. Further research is needed to elucidate the molecular and physiological pathways involved in the enhancement of drought stress tolerance by biochar, trehalose, and seaweed, and to optimize the application methods and dosages for different potato varieties and environmental conditions.

CONCLUSION

This research highlights the importance of combining soil amendments with foliar applications to optimize crop performance and resilience, paving the way for more sustainable and productive agricultural practices. Based on the results, it can be concluded that the treatment combinations involving biochar, trehalose, and seaweed had significant effects on the enzymatic antioxidants, growth parameters, and chemical constituents of leaves, as well as on tuber yield and quality traits of potato plants. The application of biochar, particularly at higher rates, improved soil fertility and nutrient availability, leading to enhanced plant growth and productivity. Foliar applications of trehalose and seaweed extract further bolstered the plants' resilience to water stress, contributing to improved nutrient uptake and tuber quality even under reduced irrigation rates . The synergistic effects of these treatments demonstrate their potential as effective strategies for enhancing potato production, especially in environments facing water scarcity.

Conflicts of interest

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist. The authors contributed equally to put the research methodology and implementing it at all stages.

Formatting of funding sources: The research was funded by personal efforts of the authors.

REFERENCES

- Abd El Baky, H., A Nofal, O., and S El Baroty, G. (2016). Enhancement of antioxidant enzymes activities, drought stress tolerances and quality of potato plants as response to algal foliar application. Recent patents on food, nutrition and agriculture, 8(1), 70-77.
- Alhoshan, M., Zahedi, M., Ramin, A. A., and Sabzalian, M. R. (2019). Effect of soil drought on biomass production, physiological attributes and antioxidant enzymes activities of potato cultivars. Russian Journal of Plant Physiology, 66, 265-277.
- Alici, E. H., and Arabaci, G. (2016). Determination of SOD, POD, PPO and cat enzyme activities in *Rumex obtusifolius* L. Annual Research and Review in Biology, 1-7.
- Al-Rubaie, A. H. S., and Al-Jubouri, K. D. (2023). Effect of tocopherol, trehalose and soil improvement in water productivity and industrial potatoes under water stress. Iraqi Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 54(4), 979-995.

- AOAC, (2000)." Official Methods of Analysis". 18th Ed. Association of Official Analytical Chemists, Inc., Gaithersburg, MD, Method 04.
- Awwad, E. A., Mohamed, I. R., El-Hameed, A., Adel, M., and Zaghloul, E. A. (2022). The co-addition of soil organic amendments and natural bio-stimulants improves the production and defenses of the wheat plant grown under the dual stress of salinity and alkalinity. Egyptian Journal of Soil Science, 62(2), 137-153.
- Bayatani, F., and Nezhad Afzali, K. (2023). The Effects of Climate Change on the Water Requirement of Potato Plants (Case Study: South of Kerman Province). Sustainable Earth Trends, 3(2), 51-60.
- Dane, J. H., and Topp, C. G. (Eds.) (2020). "Methods of soil analysis", Part 4: Physical methods (Vol. 20). John Wiley and Sons.
- Doklega, S. M., Saudy, H. S., El-Sherpiny, M. A., El-Yazied, A. A., Abd El-Gawad, H. G., Ibrahim, M. F., ... and Metwally, A. A. (2024). Rhizospheric addition of hydrogel polymer and zeolite plus glutathione mitigate the hazard effects of water deficiency on common bean plants through enhancing the defensive antioxidants. Journal of Crop Health, 76(1), 235-249.
- Duncan, D. B. (1955). Multiple range and multiple F tests. Biometrics, 11(1), 1-42.
- Elansary, H. O., Skalicka-Woźniak, K., and King, I. W. (2016). Enhancing stress growth traits as well as phytochemical and antioxidant contents of Spiraea and Pittosporum under seaweed extract treatments. Plant Physiology and Biochemistry, 105, 310-320.
- El-Sherbini M. A. A. (2023). Enhancement of heat stress tolerance in common bean plants by trehalose, hydrogen peroxide and salicylic acid treatments. Future J. Biol., 1: 9-21.
- Elsherpiny, M. A. (2023). Role of compost, biochar and sugar alcohols in raising the maize tolerance to water deficit conditions. Egyptian Journal of Soil Science, 63(1), 67-81.
- El-Sherpiny, M. A., Kany, M. A., and Ibrahim, N. R. (2022). Improvement of performance and yield quality of potato plant via foliar application of different boron rates and different potassium sources. Asian Journal of Plant and Soil Sciences, 294-304.
- Garai, S., Brahmachari, K., Sarkar, S., Mondal, M., Banerjee, H., Nanda, M. K., and Chakravarty, K. (2021). Impact of seaweed sap foliar application on growth, yield, and tuber quality of potato (Solanum tuberosum L.). Journal of Applied Phycology, 33, 1893-1904.
- Ghazi, D. A., and El-Sherpiny, M. A. (2021). Improving performance of maize plants grown under deficit water stress. Journal of Soil Sciences and Agricultural Engineering, 12(11), 725-734.

- Gomez, K. A. and Gomez, A. A. (1984). "Statistical procedures for agricultural research". John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York.pp:680.
- Jalali, A. H., Salemi, H., Nikouei, A., Gavangy, S., Rezaei, M., Khodagholi, M., and Toomanian, N. (2018). Potato water requirement in different climate of Isfahan province. Applied Field Crops Research, 30(4), 53-73.
- Mendes, R., Cardoso, C., and Pestana, C. (2009). Measurement of malondialdehyde in fish: A comparison study between HPLC methods and the traditional spectrophotometric test. Food Chemistry, 112(4), 1038-1045.
- Mertens, D. (2005). AOAC official method 922.02. Plants preparation of laboratuary sample. Official Methods of Analysis, 18th edn. Horwitz, W., and GW Latimer, (Eds), 20877-2417.
- Nasir, M. W., and Toth, Z. (2022). Effect of drought stress on potato production: A review. Agronomy, 12(3), 635.
- Peterburgski, A. V. (1968). "Hand Book of Agronomic Chemistry". Kolas Publishing House Moscow, (in Russian).
- Shafiq, S., Akram, N. A., and Ashraf, M. (2015). Does exogenouslyapplied trehalose alter oxidative defense system in the edible part of radish (Raphanus sativus L.) under water-deficit conditions?. Scientia Horticulturae, 185, 68-75.
- Shi, S., Fan, M., Iwama, K., Li, F., Zhang, Z., and Jia, L. (2015). Physiological basis of drought tolerance in potato grown under long-term water deficiency. International Journal of Plant Production, 9(2), 305-320.
- Singh, Z., Karthigesu, I. P., Singh, P., and Rupinder, K. A. U. R. (2014). Use of malondialdehyde as a biomarker for assessing oxidative stress in different disease pathologies: a review. Iranian Journal of Public Health, 43(Supple 3), 7-16.
- Soliman, M. A., El-Sherpiny, M. A., and Khadra, A. B. (2022). Improvement of performance and productivity of potato plants via addition of different organic manures and inorganic potassium sources. Asian Journal of Plant and Soil Sciences, 331-341.
- Sparks, D. L., Page, A. L., Helmke, P. A., and Loeppert, R. H. (Eds.). (2020)."Methods of soil analysis", part 3: Chemical methods (Vol. 14). John Wiley and Sons.
- Sumanta, N., Haque, C. I., Nishika, J., and Suprakash, R. (2014). Spectrophotometric analysis of chlorophylls and carotenoids from commonly grown fem species by using various extracting solvents. Res J Chem Sci, 2231, 606X.
- Yang, X., Zhang, S., Ju, M., and Liu, L. (2019). Preparation and modification of biochar materials and their application in soil remediation. Applied Sciences, 9(7), 1365.
- Zhang, N., Chu, R., Zhang, N., and Yan, J. (2023). Seaweed fertilizer improved drought tolerance of tomato seedlings in sandy soil. Journal of Plant Nutrition, 46(16), 3869-3880.

تأثير إضافة البايوشار إلى التربة، والرش الورقي للتريهالوز ومستخلص الأعشاب البحرية على إنتاجية البطاطس تحت معدلات ري مختلفة

سمر محمد عد الحميد نقليجة 1، همت عد اللطيف البيومي1، هلة عد الغفار السيد 1، حماده ماهر بدير المتولي2و عمر محمد حلمي عد الرحمن1

اقسم الخضر والزينة، كلية الزراعة، جامعة المنصورة، مصر مخسم الخضر ، معهد بحوث البساتين، مركز البحوث الزراعية، الجيزة، مصر

الملخص

لمولجهةندرة لميلهفي لمنطق لجقةوشبه لجقةمثل مصر وتغزيز الأمن لغلثى، تم لجراء تجربة بحثية لثقيم تأثير مستويلت لري لمخلفة وإضبقة لليوشل إلى لتربة، ولرش لورقى بلتريهلوز والأعشاب الجرية علي المواجهة مدره مهدفي لمنطق لجهوسه لحقة من صدر وتعرير الامن لعلي، مهجرا محير معريب مسويت فري مصفقه وضعة اليونس فرقي بعديه ورس فرقي بعريهور والاعسب الجرية عي من ليوشل (30 00 00 70 70 مهذن) وكلك ارش افرقي بمطول الزيهلوز و الأعشب الجرية بتركيز (10 جلوفية إلى معلمة اكترول (بدون ش) معلمة 12 أنت إلى أعلى مسويت أوي مع استقلت معتقة والمواديدهد ، يشا أسفرت معلمة 11 عن قل اقتم أحد زير الدي العشب الجرية بتركيز (10 جلوفية إلى معلمة اكترول (دون)، المتخام التريهوار والأعشب الجرية مع اليوشل إلى تظلي الشط الإثريمي، كما أني الوش الورقي بالزيهاوز والأعشب الجرية المتخام التريهوار والأعشب الجرية مع اليوشل إلى تعليه المنظ الإثريمي، كما أني الوش الورقي بالزيلوز والأعشب الجريق وأضل الصفات الذي وعملة الحيرية مع اليوشل إلى تعظي الشط الإثريمي، كما أني الوش الورقي بالزيلوز والأعشب الجرية (وأضل الصفات الذي ويترك، ولم الورقي كما تحقت أطى معان المنا الإثريمي، كما أني الوش الورقي الأريلون (عالمة الجرية القيم الماليوش إلى تطلي التشط الإثريمي، كما أن والمونديدهد ، يشا أسفرت معلية الحي معاير نو التبية التشط الإثريمي، كما أني الوش الورقي الأريلون (معلمة الاتول الاعرب العريق الم يعمل المعلم الوش الورق المونديدهم التريس الحرية في علي المتخام التريهوار و الأعشب الجرية عمر الورش الورقي بالزيمي الما التريمي، كما أني الوش الورقي الأعشب الجرية الم واضل الصفات الذي ويعرف مع اليوشل الى تحصن معلير نو التبي المعالي الت الحالي معلمة الموري والمورقي كما تحقت أطى التعمل واضل الصفات الذي عنه مثل المريوش الى المورقي، ومتوى في تعلين C ، عد المعلمة المتركة المعالي (20 م الذي الات ال ظروفندرة المبله