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ABSTRACT

The present study was carried out at Antoniadas Research Branch, Alexandria, Egypt during two successive seasons (2005/06 – 2006/07) to study the effect of saline irrigation water at four levels of EC [0 (tap water), 3, 6 and 9 mmhos/cm] with different sources of organic manure (cattle, poultry and green manures) at the rate of 15g/pot and their interaction on the vegetative growth, flowering and chemical composition of Euphorbia pulchrrima, Willd. Grown in sandy desert soils.

The obtained results can be summarized as follows:

- Poinsettia transplants tolerated all used EC levels. Manure caused increasing in survival percentage under different level of 3 to 9 mmhos/cm. Meanwhile manure improved vegetative growth traits, especially at high level and had the most pronounced effect on growth of transplants.

- The data suggested that manure promoted salt stress avoidance in all plants by reducing the accumulation of harmful Na⁺ and Cl⁻ ions in the leaves of plants and improved N, P and K uptake. For interaction, the treatment tap water combined with manure at 3 mmhos/cm gave the highest values of most vegetative, flowering parameters and N, P, K, % chlorophyll and total carbohydrates.

- The highest and lowest values of Ca, Na and proline resulted from the treatments EC 9 mmhos/cm and tap water combined with types of different manure. Also the highest
and lowest of relative water content (R.W.C %) resulted from the treatments of EC 3 mmhos/cm combined with manure (cattle manure) and EC 9dsm⁻¹ without manure during the two seasons.

- So, it can be recommended to use manure (cattle manure) for growing one year old poinsettia transplanting which will be irrigated by saline water of EC 3 mmhos/cm in sandy desert soils.
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**INTRODUCTION**

The need for maximizing agricultural especially those concerning with food crops has become urgent in order to meet the uprising requirements of rapidly increasing population under the Egyptian condition. However, expansion in newly lands in Egypt is becoming limited to areas characterized by unfavorable conditions either in soil or in water. The available soils are however sandy to sandy calcareous, which have poor properties and water have poor quality.

Establishing new communities in these desert areas is necessary to meet people requirements. One of these necessary requirements is the use of flower and ornamental plants. Poinsettia (*Euphorbia pulcherrima* Willd) plants are widely used as flowering shrubs in gardens in late fall and winter seasons, as flowering pot plants for internal and external designing especially in Christmas and as a cut flower. Also, a redish purple dye is extracted from its bracts.

Whereas, Lee et al., (1996) studied the effect of EC and physical properties in the mixed media made of organic materials on the growth of *Euphorbia pulcherrima*. They reported that EC decreased in all media with cultivation. Conte e Castro et al., (2001) found that poultry manure, hog manure, bovine manure urban waste compost (all at 10 t/ha) substantially increased plant height and diameter, bulb diameter, number of floral buttons and dry weight of aerial parts and bulbs of gladiolus cv. Red Beauty. Kim Jhhyoug et al., (2000) cleared that growth and development of poinsettia
Eu phorbia pulcherrima (Wild) as affected by application of waste nutrient solution. Growth characteristics and nutrient uptake were produced the tallest plants with longest branches, higher leaf numbers and fresh and dry weights. Starkey and Nielson (2001) showed that reduced N and K application increase the uptake Ca and improves the quality of poinsettia (Euphorbia Pulcherrima Wild).

However, no research work has been done on the effect of the interaction between saline water irrigation and manure on poinsettia (Euphorbia pulcherrima Wild) production.

Therefore, the objectives of this study were to investigate the effects of water salinity, different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) and their interaction on the vegetative growth, flowering parameters and chemical constituents of poinsettia (Euphorbia Pulcherrima Wild).

**MATERIAL AND METHODS**

This work was carried out at Antoniadis Garden; Ornamental plants Research Branch, Horticultural Research Institute, Alexandria, Egypt. The experiments were repeated for two successive seasons (2005/06 and 2006/07) plants were used in the study are poinsettia (Euphorbia pulcherrima, wild).

Sandy desert soils were collected from the surface layer (0 – 20 cm) from the 86km area west the Alexandria city (Table 1, 2).

### Table 1: chemical properties of studied soils:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>EC mmhos/cm</th>
<th>Cations</th>
<th>Anions</th>
<th>CaCO₃</th>
<th>pH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2: physical properties of studied soils:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil</th>
<th>F.C</th>
<th>Course sand</th>
<th>Fine sand</th>
<th>Silt</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>texture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sandy</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Sandy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
preparation of plant for experiments:
Uniform stem cuttings of a local variety of poinsettia (*Euphorbia pulcherrima* Wild) plant were taken on April 10 for both seasons, with average length of 15 cm and 4 leaves per cutting. The bases of the used cuttings were dipped in idol butyric acid (IBA) solution at 2500 ppm for 10 seconds (Mostafa 2002). Then, the cuttings were planted in seed pans (15 cuttings/seed pans) using a mixture of sand and peat at 3:1 (v/v).

The seed pans were set under the plastic house conditions and irrigated thoroughly. Seven weeks later (on May 29, 2005), the rooted cutting were transplanted to 10 cm diameter pots (one rooted cutting/pot) containing 660 of sandy soil. These rooted cuttings were irrigated with normal (canal) water for one month, and then irrigated with different saline irrigation water. The plants were repotted again to pots 25 cm diameter containing 3.75 kg sandy soil. One-week later after potting, all auxiliary shoots were removed except one on each plant.

The soil was amended with three different types of manure, cattle manure (CM), poultry manure (PM) and green manure (GM) at the rate of 15 g/pot.

The chemical analysis of the different sources of manure used in present investigation is presented in Table (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manure</th>
<th>O.M%</th>
<th>N%</th>
<th>P%</th>
<th>K%</th>
<th>C:N ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green manure</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>13 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry manure</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>7 : 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle manure</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>10 : 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The plants were irrigated after one month of transplanting with salty water to soil field capacity. The sandy soil pots were irrigated with 300 ml every two days. Four levels of salinity were used in irrigation water as follows: 0 (tap water), 3, 6, 9 mmhos/cm. A mixture of sodium chloride (NaCl with purity 95%) and calcium chloride (anhydrous CaCl2 with purity 90%) were used the ratio of 2:1 (w/w) for producing salinity (Mostafa 2002) the salt was dissolved in normal irrigation water (0.6 mmhos/cm) to produce different levels of water salinity.
All the plants under the experiment received 2 g/pot at one month intervals of a complete mineral fertilizer 19:19:19: (N: P₂O₅: K₂O) as dressing application. The fertilization started after one month from the final transplanting.

**Experimental layout:**
The experimental layout was split-plot design for arrangement of pots with three replicates. Ten plants were used for each treatment in the replicate (Snedecor cochrans, 1974). Types of manure were arranged in the main treatments, while the water salinity concentrations were randomly distributed in the sub-treatments and all were treated under open field condition.

**Determinations and measurements:**
Measurements of plant height (cm) and dry weight of leaves (g)/plant while, the flowering date were included inflorescence diameter (cm) at full opening (a distance between the two distal ends of the faced expanded bracts), bracts number/inflorescence, inflorescence duration in day (from the date of inflorescence showing colour in bracts to date of their fading) and dry weight of inflorescence (g).

Also, roots length (cm) and dry weight (g)/plant were recorded then the percentage of relative water content (RWC%) was determined by taken 5 discs of leaf tissue each in 1.0 cm diameter, weighed fresh and then floated on distilled water for 4 hr to become fully turgid. Discs were weighed again, dried at 70°C and then weighed a find time. RWC% was calculated as maintained by Barrs (1968) as follows:

\[
RWC\% = \frac{(\text{Fresh wt} - \text{dry wt.})}{(\text{turgid wt} - \text{dry wt})} \times 100
\]

The first two expanded leaves beneath the basal bracts were collected at the stage of forests chlorophyll, K, Na, N, Ca and total carbohydrates (Cox and Seeley, 1984). The total chlorophyll in the leaves blades was determined using apparatus of chlorophyll meter, Minolta SPAD – 501 according to Yadava (1986).

While for K, Ca, Na determination, sample of 0.3(g) from the oven dried leaves was taken and digested with sulphuric acid by hydrogen peroxide according to Evenhuis and Deward (1980).
Potassium and sodium were determined using a flam photometer, while, the verse Nate method was used for Ca determination (Cheng and Bray 1951). A sample of 0.5g leaves a dry weight was taken for the determination of total carbohydrates were mathematically calculated as percentage (Dubios et al., 1956). The same steps and techniques of the first experimental year (2005-2006) were followed in the second one (2006-2007).

The among treatments of individual factors and their interaction were compared by L.S.D. at 5 %level of probability for both seasons according to Snedecor cohran (1974).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Vegetative growth

1-Plant height

The data in Table (4) show that saline water of EC 6 mmhos/cm and 9 mmhos/cm significantly decreased plant height to 64.83 and 49.90 cm comparing with 72.50 cm for tap water , and to 70.33 and 58.00 cm comparing with 81.75 cm in the first and second seasons, respectively. Meanwhile, the contrary action was a result of receiving the plants 3EC treatment. It increased the values to 112.50 and 116.29 cm in both seasons, respectively.

Data of two experimental seasons cleared that adding cattle manure ( CM) gave the maximum increase in plant height treatments . The values reached to 82.23 and 93.08 cm against to 66.92 and 72.25 cm resulted from the control treatment in the first and second seasons, respectively. Also it was noticed that applying poultry manure (PM) and green manure ( GM ) resulted in a significant increase in plant height as compared to control in both seasons. These results are in parallel line with those Starkey and Nielsen (2001) on poinsettia plant.

Concerning the interaction between water saline and different types of manure treatments it is evident from the data of Table (4), the great influence of receiving the plants EC 3 mmhos/cm combined with cattle manure in both experimental
field for increasing plant height. The values reached to 139.67 and 144.00 cm in both seasons, respectively.

2- Leaves dry weight

Data presented in Table (4) clearly indicated that leaves dry weight of poinsettia plants decreased significantly with increasing of EC concentration, except EC 3 mmhos/cm as compared to control (tap water) in the two seasons. The treatment of EC 3 mmhos/cm gave the heaviest leaves dry weight as 10.36 and 9.68 g/plant in the first and second seasons, respectively.

Evidently, data in Table (4) reveal the significant increment of leaves dry weight in both seasons, resulting from growing the plants in cattle manure. It increased the values to 9.48 and 8.11 g in the first and second seasons, respectively.

The interaction between the water saline and types of manure revealed the great influence of receiving the plants saline water of EC 3 mmhos/cm with cattle manure for increasing leaves dry weight in both experimental fields. This treatment increased the values to 12.23 and 10.46 g in the first and second seasons, respectively.

Flowering characteristics

1. Inflorescence diameter

Data in Table (5), show the increment on the diameter of inflorescences due to using water saline at 3EC as the values reached to 24.67 and 24.88 cm in the first and second seasons, respectively. Meanwhile, applying the highest concentration of EC (9 mmhos/cm) recorded the lowest values in this respect as they reached to only 13.91 and 14.83 cm in both seasons, respectively.

While, no significant effects were recorded on inflorescence diameter resulting from using different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure and green manure) for plantation, in both experimental trials as seen in Table (5).
Table (4) Effect of water salinity, different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) and their interaction on plant height (g) and leaves dry weight (g) of poinsettia plants in sandy desert soils during 2005/06 and 2006/07.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water EC mmhos/cm</th>
<th>Manure</th>
<th>Plant height (cm)</th>
<th>Leaves dry weight (g plant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1st season)</td>
<td>(2nd season)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0 CM</td>
<td>PM GM Mean</td>
<td>0.0 CM PM GM Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W 74.00</td>
<td>65.33</td>
<td>75.33 74.33</td>
<td>77.24 78.00 77.67 76.33 81.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 76.00</td>
<td>139.67</td>
<td>121.33 113.0</td>
<td>112.5 79.00 144.0 124.17 118.0 116.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 63.00</td>
<td>68.33</td>
<td>65.00 63.00</td>
<td>64.83 69.00 74.67 71.00 66.67 70.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 54.67</td>
<td>55.60</td>
<td>46.00 43.33</td>
<td>51.15 63.00 58.67 55.00 55.33 35.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 66.90</td>
<td>87.20</td>
<td>76.90 73.40</td>
<td>72.25 93.08 80.80 79.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salinity LSD 5% 3.40 3.30
Manure LSD 5% 3.00 3.21
(S) × (M) LSD 5% 6.60 6.67

Leaves dry weight (g plant)

| 6 6.76            | 7.54 6.070 6.19 | 6.64 5.70 6.74 6.55 6.28 6.31 |
| 9 6.18            | 6.83 5.32 3.55  | 5.47 4.98 5.65 5.40 5.34 5.34 |
| Mean 7.22         | 9.47 8.19 6.78  | 7.08 8.10 7.60 7.54          |

Salinity LSD 5% 0.76 750
Manure LSD 5% 0.59 0.60
(S) × (M) LSD 5% 0.56 1.20

For the interaction, data of the seasons in Table (5) clear that highest increase in the diameter of inflorescence (highest terminal bracts) was obtained of EC 3 mmhos/cm with adding cattle manure compared with the other treatments in both plantations. They reached to 26.37 and 27.30 cm in the first and second seasons, respectively. This result may be probably due to the influence of low of water salinity level and manure at suitable rates on increasing the length and/or width of the produced
terminal bracts, consequently the diameter of inflorescence could be increased. Similar trend of results was stated by Kageyama et al., (1995) on chrysanthemum plant.

2. Number of bracts / in florescence

It is evident from the obtained data in Table (5) that number of bracts / inflorescence decreased with increasing of EC concentration, except EC 3 mmhos/cm in both seasons. The differences between treatments of tap water and 3EC were nonsignificant in the first and second seasons. While the lowest ones resulted from applied water 9EC as gave 15.58 and 15.96 / plant in both seasons, respectively.

Insignificant effects were recorded on number bracts / inflorescence of due to different types manure compared with control in both seasons as indicated in Table (3).

Data presented in Table (5) show that the highest number of bracts / inflorescence was given by adding of EC 3 mmhos/cm of water salinity level plus cattle manure. Such treatment significantly increased the values comparing with that recorded from the other treatments (18.69 and 18.58) in both seasons, respectively. This treatment increased the produced bracts (per inflorescence) over the control (as average for two seasons). This result may be attributed to the influence of cattle manure in enhancing the biosynthesis and translocation of assimilates leading to initiation of more bracts primodias, consequently the produced number of bracts could be increased , similar trend of results was stated by Wissemeier and Marienfeld (1998) on poinsettia plants.
Table (5) Effect of water salinity, different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) and their interaction on inflorescence diameter (cm) and number of bracts/inflorescence of poinsettia plants in sandy desert soils during 2005/6 and 2006/07.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>water EC mmhos/cm</th>
<th>Manure</th>
<th>Inflorescence diameter (cm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1st season)</td>
<td>(2nd season)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W 20.70</td>
<td>25.46</td>
<td>23.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 20.10</td>
<td>20.17</td>
<td>24.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 18.60</td>
<td>23.04</td>
<td>22.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 20.55</td>
<td>23.76</td>
<td>23.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salinity LSD 5% 0.7
Manure LSD 5% NS
(S) × (M) LSD 5% 1.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of bracts/inflorescence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T.W 16.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 15.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 13.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 15.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salinity LSD 5% 1.1
Manure LSD 5% NS
(S) × (M) LSD 5% 2.2

3. Inflorescence duration

Data presented in Table (6) revealed that irrigation with saline water of EC6 and/or 9 mmhos/cm, significantly decreased inflorescence duration form 67.93 (control) to 62.21 day at (9 mmhos/cm) and from 66.78 to 61.41 day in the first and second seasons, respectively.

Negligible and insignificant effect, on the other hand, was detected on the obtained values in both plantations due to receiving the plants the different manure treatments as indicated in Table (6).
Data of the two experimental seasons in clear that the longest period of inflorescence (including bracts) duration on poinsettia plant was obtained by adding water salinity of EC 3 mmhos/cm combined with cattle manure (68.90 and 70.55 day) comparing with other treatment in both seasons, respectively, Table (6). The previous result may be related to the influence of a suitable rate of manure with low water salinity level on enhancing turgor of bract cells with supplying it with sugars (Hartt, 1969). Besides, they influence water movement in bract cells (Bennett, 1993) thus, the inflorescence could be lasted for a longer period. Similar trend of results was found by Kageyama et al., (1995) on Chrysanthemum plants.

4. Inflorescence dry weight

Effects of saline water on inflorescence dry weight were presented in Table (6). It is clear from the data that salinity significantly decreased inflorescence dry weight form 5.95 (control) to 5.46 g at (9 mmhos/cm) and from 5.98 to 5.82 g in the first and second seasons, respectively. The heaviest inflorescence dry weight was recorded for the plants irrigated by saline water of 3EC as gave 6.43 and 6.73 g in the first and second seasons, respectively.

Data in Table (4) reveal the significant increment of inflorescence dry weight in both seasons, resulting from growing the plants in cattle manure. It increased the values to 6.52 and 6.62 g against to 5.63 and 5.71 g resulted from the control treatment in the first and second seasons, respectively.

Data of the two seasons presented in Table (6) show that the heaviest inflorescence (including bracts) dry matter was obtained by application of water salinity of EC 3 mmhos/cm combined with cattle manure as compared with the other treatments. This treatment increased the values to 7.36 and 7.37 g in the first and second seasons, respectively. This result may be probably due to the effect of water salinity of EC 3 mmhos/cm (low level of salinity) and types of different manure especially cattle manure on enhancing the accumulation of biosynthesizes and / or increasing the bracts number, consequently the
Inflorescence dry matter could be increased. Similar trend of results was stated by Yelanich and Biernbaum (1990) on poinsettia plants.

**Table (6)** Effect of water salinity, different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) and their interaction on inflorescence duration (days) and inflorescence dry weight (g/plant) of poinsettia plants in sandy desert soils during 2005/6 and 2006/07.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water EC (mmhos/cm)</th>
<th>Manure</th>
<th>Inflorescence duration (days)</th>
<th>Inflorescence dry weight (g/plant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0 CM</td>
<td>0.0 CM</td>
<td>0.0 CM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1st season)</td>
<td>(2nd season)</td>
<td>(1st season)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W 67.50</td>
<td>68.90</td>
<td>68.60</td>
<td>67.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>68.00</td>
<td>68.20</td>
<td>67.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.34</td>
<td>67.77</td>
<td>67.27</td>
<td>66.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.24</td>
<td>64.61</td>
<td>63.60</td>
<td>62.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 64.65</td>
<td>67.32</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>65.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salinity LSD 5% 0.80 Manure LSD 5% NS (S) × (M) LSD 5% NS 1.60

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water EC (mmhos/cm)</th>
<th>Inflorescence dry weight (g/plant)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1st season)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W 5.62</td>
<td>6.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>7.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>6.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>6.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean 5.63</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Salinity LSD 5% 0.42 Manure LSD 5% 0.40 (S) × (M) LSD 5% 0.84 0.86
Roots characteristics

1. Root length (cm)

Data in Table (7) show the significant increment of root length resulting from 3EC saline water. Such treatment significantly increased the values comparing with that recorded from the other irrigation saline water treatments (40.90 and 40.17 cm) in both seasons, respectively. Whereas, the lowest values were obtained as a result from using saline water irrigation of EC 9 mhos/cm. They decreased root length to only 18.16 and 14.33 cm in the first and second seasons, respectively.

Using the cattle manure treatment (CM) significantly increased root length compared with that obtained from the other manure (poultry manure and green manure) in both experimental trials, Table (7). These results may be attributed to the enhancement effect of manure on the synthesis and activation of RNA and various enzyme proteins in root cell, consequently cells division and elongation could be increased (Scott, 1972). Similar trend of result was found by Wang (1992) on pittosporum tobira.

Referring the interaction, it could be concluded that receiving the plants 3EC of irrigation saline water combined with cattle manure were the best treatments for increasing the root length in both experimental trials (45.67 and 43.67 cm, respectively) as seen in Table (7). These results may be attributed to the enhancement effect of cattle manure on the synthesis and activation of RNA and various enzyme proteins in root cell, consequently cells division and elongation could be increased. Whereas, the contrary action on the root length was observed on the obtained values resulting from receiving the plants 9EC irrigation saline water without manure, as the values were decreased to only 15.33 and 11.00 cm in the first and second seasons, respectively. These results may be due to the toxic effects of Na and Ca ions accumulated in the cytoplasm of root cells, besides the reduction of the total water uptake by rooted cuttings leading to a reduction in root cells division and elongation (Khan et al., 2002).
Table (7) Effect of water salinity, different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) and their interaction on root length (cm) and roots dry weight (g) of poinsettia plants in sandy desert soils during 2005/06 and 2006/07.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water EC mmhos/cm</th>
<th>Manure</th>
<th>Root length (cm)</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Roots dry weight (g)</th>
<th>(S) × (M) LSD 5%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>CM   PM  GM  Mean</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>CM   PM  GM  Mean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1st) season</td>
<td>(2nd) season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W 36.67</td>
<td>42.33</td>
<td>39.00 37.00 38.70</td>
<td>37.67</td>
<td>41.00 37.33 36.33</td>
<td>38.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.67</td>
<td>45.67</td>
<td>39.00 38.33 40.90</td>
<td>39.67</td>
<td>43.67 39.67 37.67</td>
<td>40.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.33</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>31.67 30.00 31.90</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>28.00 26.00 25.00</td>
<td>25.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>18.67 18.00 18.16</td>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>17.00 15.67 13.67</td>
<td>14.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>30.50</td>
<td>35.90 32.08 30.80</td>
<td>28.16</td>
<td>32.40 29.66 28.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity LSD 5%</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manure LSD 5%</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) × (M) LSD 5%</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W 7.08</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>8.25  5.37  7.16</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>8.60  7.53  7.72</td>
<td>7.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>7.46</td>
<td>7.33  7.14  7.22</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>7.70  6.31  6.07</td>
<td>6.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.14  4.94  5.20</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>7.43  5.94  4.77</td>
<td>5.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.95</td>
<td>7.78  7.66  6.75</td>
<td>6.57</td>
<td>8.42  7.23  6.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinity LSD 5%</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manure LSD 5%</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(S) × (M) LSD 5%</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Root dry weight (g)

Data in Table (7), revealed that EC levels affected on root dry weight, while higher EC level (9mmhos/cm) decreased it as compared to tap water (control) . The highest root dry weight resulted from the plants irrigated by saline water of EC 3 mmhos/cm as gave 9.56 and 8.78 g/plant in both seasons, respectively. While the plants irrigated by saline water of 9EC recorded the lowest root dry weight as gave 5.20 and 5.96 g in the first and second seasons, respectively.
Growing the plants in cattle manure increased root dry weight than that obtained from the other manure used in cultivation compared with control treatment in both seasons as can be seen in Table (7).

The heaviest root dry weight was obtained by irrigation saline water at level of EC 3 mmhos/cm combined with cattle manure as compared with the other treatments as recorded 10.17 and 9.94 g in the two seasons, respectively. Table (7). This result may be attributed to the influence of manure on enhancing the length and/or thickness of roots, consequently root dry matter could be increased. Similar trend of results was cleared by Starkey and Nielsen (2001) on poinsettia plants.

**Chemical analysis**

1. **Nitrogen percentage**

Data in Table (8) mentioned that N% of poinsettia leaves decreased gradually with increasing salinity concentration in the irrigation water during the two successive seasons. The values recorded decline from 3.33 (control) to 2.46 , 2.63 and 2.46 % as treated with 3, 6 and 9 mmhos/cm in the first seasons, and from 3.43 to 3.55,2.65 and 2.43 in the second season, respectively.

Meanwhile, manure treatments increased N% of leaves in the two seasons. The highest N % was found in plants grown in cattle manure which recorded 3.97 and 3.11 % against 2.58 and 2.62 fore control in both seasons, respectively.

As for the interaction data in Table (8 )showed that the plants irrigated by tap water combined with cattle manure gave highest N% in the leaves of poinsettia, as compared with other treatments. Such treatment increased the values to 3.79 and 3.70 % in both seasons, respectively. These results may be due to the effect of manure , consequently increasing the absorbed amount of N, especially under the lower values of salinity. On the other hand, the highest level of salinity may reduce the availability of elements and growth of roots, resulted in a lower N content. Similar trend of results was reported by Bertram(1992).
2. Potassium percentage

The effect of saline water on K % presented in Table (8). The data showed that salinity negatively affected K % of leaves in the two seasons. As well as K% decreased gradually and continuously with the increasing of irrigation water salinity concentration. K content decline from 1.38 (control ) to 1.35, 1.25 and 1.24% at EC3.6 and 9 mmhos/cm, and from 1.44 to 1.42, 1.34 and 1.27% in the first and second seasons, respectively.

On the other side, the different types manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) increased leaves K% in the two seasons. The highest values of leaves k% was (1.40 and 1.46 %), which were observed in the plants grown in poultry manure in the two seasons, respectively.

Data of the two season presented in Table (8) indicate that the highest percentage of potassium content (K%) in the leaves of poinsettia plant was obtained by tap water with different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) comparing with the other treatments. The previous result may be due to the presence of high concentration of manure in the rooting medium, consequently the plant could absorb a high amount of it besides, the highly mobility and translocation of K in the plant tissue led to increase it (Kemmler et al., 1977). Furthermore, the lower concentration of Ca may synergistic the uptake of K via regulation the cellular processes (Barwe et al., 2001) thus, the absorbed amount of K would be increased, hence the content of K in the leaves could be increased. similar trend of results was stated by Wissemeier and Marinfeld (1998) on poinsettia plants.
3. Calcium percentage

Data presented in Table (8) reflected the influence of saline water on Ca % of poinsettia leaves, these data showed that the accumulation of Ca % tended to increasing the salinity concentration in the used water. The highest values of Ca % were 1.16 and 1.24 % as a result of treatment with EC 9 mmhos/cm of saline water comparing with 1.06 and 1.13% in control in the first and second seasons, respectively. Evidently, data in table (8) show the superiority of planting in different types of manure for increasing Ca % of poinsettia leaves in both cultivations, it could be concluded that cattle manure was the best manure for increasing Ca % of poinsettia leaves in both plantations. It increased the values to 1.34 and 1.43 % comparing with 0.53 and 0.59 % in control in the first and second seasons, respectively as illustrated in Table (8).

Concerning the interaction, it could be concluded that receiving the plants the highest concentration of salinity treatment (9 mmhos/cm) with cattle manure was the best treatment for increasing Ca % of poinsettia leaves. Such treatment increased the values to 1.35 and 1.49 % leaves in the first and second seasons, respectively. These results are in agreement with those obtained Bierman et al., (1989) on poinsettia plant and Khalafatta et al., (1998) on Thevetia nercifolia.

4. Sodium percentage

According to data in Table (8) it is obvious that Na% of poinsettia leaves increased gradually with increasing of salinity concentration in irrigation water in the two seasons. The highest value was recorded in leaves in the treatment of EC 9 mmhos/cm which equal 0.47 and .0.51 % in the first and second seasons, respectively. Also, data indicated that, different types manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) decreased leaves Na% in the two seasons. The lowest leaves Na% was (0.37%), which were observed in the plants grown in cattle manure in the two seasons.
Data in Table (8) indicated that, the highest leaves Na% of poinsettia was resulted by irrigation saline water of EC 9 mmhos/cm without adding manure as gave 0.49 and 0.54 % compared to 0.37 and 0.38% in control for both seasons, respectively. While leaves Na% decreased with treatment of tap water combined with types of different manure in the first and second seasons respectively. Similar findings were obtained by Singh (2000) on *Eucalypta hybrid*. These results may be due to the excess percentage of Na ion which has the ability to enter the root cells through several channels via plasma membrane ATP ase, hence translocated and accumulated in leaves tissues (B1umwuld *et al.*, 2000). Similar trend of results was found by Koyro (2000) and Mostafa. (2002).

5. **Relative water content (%)**

Applying saline water at the rate 6 and 9 EC reduced the relative water content (R.W.C) percentages as compared with the control. Whereas, the lowest values were obtained as a result of EC 9 mmhos/cm. This decreased relative water content (R.W.C) percentages to 52.15 and 51.06 (%) in the first and second seasons, respectively. The highest R.W.C( %) were 71.14 and 71.66 % for 3 EC against 69.99and 70.04% for tap water in both seasons, respectively as indicated in Table (9) . These results are somewhat looks like that observed by EL-sayed (2003) on *Murraya exotica*.
Table (8) Effect of water salinity, different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure and their interaction on N, K, Ca and Na (%) in the leaves of poinsettia plants in sandy desert soils during 2005/06 and 2006/07.

| Water EC mmhos/cm | Manure | N% | 0.0 | CM | PM | GM | Mean | 0.0 | CM | PM | GM | Mean |
|-------------------|--------|----|-----|----|----|----|------|-----|----|----|----|-----|------|
|                   |        | (1st season) |     | (2nd season) |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
|                   |        | 2005/06 |     | 2006/07 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| T.W               |        |         |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| 3                 | 2.81   | 3.79    | 3.34| 3.41   | 3.33| 3.80| 3.70| 3.6  | 3.65| 3.43|      |      |      |
| 6                 | 2.65   | 2.08    | 2.88| 2.92   | 2.63| 2.75| 3.55| 3.30 | 3.55| 3.55| 2.82 |      |      |
| 9                 | 2.42   | 2.50    | 2.46| 2.47   | 2.46| 2.30| 2.55| 2.40 | 2.45| 2.45| 2.43 |      |      |
| Mean              | 2.58   | 3.97    | 2.82| 4.40   | 2.62| 3.11| 2.90| 3.06 |      |      |      |
|                   |        |         |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| K%                |        | 2006/07 |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| T.W               | 1.25   | 1.45    | 1.40| 1.38   | 1.31| 1.50| 1.50| 1.44 | 1.44|      |      |      |      |
| 3                 | 1.20   | 1.40    | 1.39| 1.40   | 1.35| 1.30| 1.45| 1.49 | 1.44| 1.42 |      |      |      |
| 6                 | 0.99   | 1.35    | 1.37| 1.35   | 1.25| 1.20| 1.37| 1.42 | 1.37| 1.34 |      |      |      |
| 9                 | 0.98   | 1.30    | 1.35| 1.34   | 1.24| 1.00| 1.32| 1.41 | 1.35| 1.27 |      |      |      |
| Mean              | 1.09   | 1.37    | 1.40| 1.37   | 1.20| 1.40| 1.46| 1.40 |      |      |      |
|                   |        |         |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Ca%               |        | 2005/06 |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| T.W               | 0.45   | 1.34    | 1.25| 1.22   | 1.06| 0.49| 1.38| 1.36 | 1.31| 1.13 |      |      |      |
| 3                 | 0.5    | 1.35    | 1.28| 1.26   | 1.08| 0.53| 1.40| 1.39 | 1.35| 1.17 |      |      |      |
| 6                 | 0.55   | 1.34    | 1.29| 1.37   | 1.13| 0.57| 1.44| 1.40 | 1.40| 1.20 |      |      |      |
| 9                 | 0.6    | 1.35    | 1.30| 1.39   | 1.16| 0.59| 1.45| 1.45 | 1.45| 1.24 |      |      |      |
| Mean              | 0.53   | 1.34    | 1.28| 1.31   | 0.54| 1.43| 1.40| 1.38 |      |      |      |
|                   |        |         |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| Ca%               |        | 2006/07 |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| T.W               | 0.37   | 0.28    | 0.21| 0.28   | 0.28| 0.38| 0.25| 0.30 | 0.30| 0.31 |      |      |      |
| 3                 | 0.40   | 0.32    | 0.32| 0.38   | 0.35| 0.48| 0.33| 0.35 | 0.35| 0.39 |      |      |      |
| 6                 | 0.45   | 0.44    | 0.4 | 0.44   | 0.43| 0.47| 0.40| 0.43 | 0.46| 0.44 |      |      |      |
| 9                 | 0.49   | 0.45    | 0.46| 0.49   | 0.47| 0.54| 0.49| 0.50 | 0.50| 0.51 |      |      |      |
| Mean              | 0.43   | 0.37    | 0.35| 0.39   | 0.48| 0.37| 0.39| 0.41 |      |      |      |      |
|                   |        |         |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
|                   |        | 2006/07 |     |         |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |      |
| T.W               | 0.38   | 0.25    | 0.3 | 0.3    | 0.31| 0.45| 0.3  | 0.38 | 0.40| 0.38 |      |      |      |
| 3                 | 0.48   | 0.33    | 0.35| 0.39   | 0.39| 0.49| 0.35| 0.43 | 0.43| 0.44 |      |      |      |
| 6                 | 0.47   | 0.40    | 0.43| 0.46   | 0.44| 0.51| 0.37| 0.39 | 0.48| 0.44 |      |      |      |
| 9                 | 0.54   | 0.49    | 0.49| 0.5   | 0.51| 0.550| 0.40| 0.50 | 0.5  | 0.49 |      |      |      |
| Mean              | 0.48   | 0.37    | 0.39| 0.41   | 0.5 | 0.36| 0.43| 0.46 |      |      |      |      |
In addition, the same data reflect that types of manure as cattle manure, poultry manure and green manure increased the relative water content (R.W.C) % from 56.52 (control) to 72.15, 59.98 and 58.37 % in the first season, respectively and from 55.20 to 72.56, 62.22 and 58.90 % in the second season, respectively.

Concerning the interaction, it could be concluded that receiving the plants saline water of EC 3 mmhos/cm water with plants grown in cattle manure were the best treatments for increasing the relative water content (R.W.C) % in both seasons. Such treatment increased the values to 82.60 and 83.40 % in the first and second seasons, respectively as seen in Table (9).

These results may be due to the effect of salinity stress on increasing the osmotic potential in the rooting medium and reducing the hydraulic conductivity of roots which led to a reduction in the flux of water into roots consequently reduced the turgidity of leaf cell, resulted in lower values of R.W.C%.

Flowers et al., (1986) similar trend of results was found by Khan et al., (2000).

6. Total chlorophyll content in leaves

It is evident from the obtained data the increment on total chlorophylls content of leaves due to receiving the plants saline water at level of EC 3 mmhos/cm. Such treatment increased the values to 48.40 and 48.53 in the first and second seasons, respectively as presented in Table (9).

Growing the plants in different types of manure increased total chlorophyll content in leaves compared with the control for both seasons. the great influence of receiving the plants grown in cattle manure. This treatment increased the values to 48.07 and 47.93 against to 44.85 and 45.57 resulted from the control in the first and second seasons, respectively.
From the interaction, it could be concluded from the tabulated data, the great influence of receiving the plants grown under saline water of EC 3 mmhos/cm combined with cattle manure. Such treatment increased total chlorophylls content to 49.95 and 49.90 in the first and second seasons, respectively. The contrary action was detected as a result of receiving the plants 9EC with out manure (42.80 and 43.00) in both seasons, respectively as seen in Table (9). the previous result may be due to the influence of Ca on the synthesis of a bound calcium dependent protein kinase, which activates the cellular processes (Barwe et al, 2001). Besides, Ca may be enhance the uptake of N, and it is necessary for chlorophyll formation (Bennett, 1993) thus, the synthesis of the green pigment could be enhanced. Similar trend of results was stated by Bierman et al., (1989) on poinsettia plants.

7. Total carbohydrates content in leaves (%)

Data in Table (9), revealed that EC levels affected on leaf carbohydrates content, while higher EC levels (6-9 mmhos/cm) notably decreased it as compared to tap water. The highest leaf carbohydrates contents resulted from the treatments of EC 3 mmhos/cm as gave 9.10 and 8.93 in both seasons, respectively. While the plants irrigated by water of 9EC recorded the lowest leaf carbohydrates contents (6.22 and 8.12 %)

Obviously data in table (9), indicate the superiority of using cattle manure in plantation in both seasons. It considerably increment total carbohydrates in leaves comparing with that recorded from the other treatments used in cultivation. The values reached to 8.65. and 9.52 % in the first and second seasons, respectively.

For the interaction, data in Table (9) cleared that leaf carbohydrate content differently affected by application the different treatments of salinity combined with manure. The highest carbohydrate content resulted from the salinity treatments of EC 3 mmhos/cm combined with cattle manure in the first season and T.W. with cattle manure in the second one as recorded 9.90 and 9.86 % respectively as compared to the other
treatments. This result may be attributed to influence of manure on increasing the concentrations of glucose-6-phosphates fructose-6-phosphate and raffinose. Besides, it promotes the synthesis of ATP, UTP, and UDP-glucose (Mengel and Haeder, 1977). Similarly, EC influences water movement in cells and counteracts the effect of alkali salts and organic acids within the plant (Bennett, 1993), thus the synthesis and accumulation of carbohydrates would be enhanced. Similar trend of results was stated by Wisemeier and Marienfeld (1998) on poinsettia plants.

8. Proline contents (µ molle / 100 g. fresh weight)

Data presented in Table (9) reflect clearly the influence of salinity on proline accumulation in the leaves of poinsettia. The data showed that increasing the salinity level in the irrigation water was associated with an obvious increase in proline contents in leaves. Higher levels of EC (9 mmhos/cm) caused a marked increase in proline contents (8.84 and 9.08 µ molle / 100 g. F.W.) in the first and second season, respectively. These results are in line with those reported by EL-sayed (2003) on murraya exotica.

Meanwhile, types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure and green manure) markedly decreased leaves contents of proline in the two seasons. The lowest contents of proline were found in plants grown on sandy soil with cattle manure and reached 6.76 and 7.87 µ molle / 100 g. F.W. in the first and second season, respectively. Regarding the interaction, data in Table (9) indicated that leaf proline contents differently affect by using different treatments of EC combined with manure (cattle manure, poultry manure and green manure). Under the same treatment of manure, proline content decreased as types of different manure. The highest proline content resulted from the treatment of EC 9 mmhos/cm without manure in the two seasons. On the other hand, the plants irrigated by tap water combined with cattle manure had the lowest proline contents (5.10 and 6.60 µ molle / 100 g. F.W.) for the both seasons, respectively. Similar results were reported

able (9) Effect of water salinity, different types of manure (cattle manure, poultry manure, green manure) and their interaction on relative water content (R.W.C %), total chlorophyll (SPAD), total carbohydrates (mg/g. dry weight) and proline (µ molle/100 g. fresh weight) of poinsettia plants in sandy desert soils during 2005/06 and 2006/07.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water EC (mmhos/cm)</th>
<th>Manure</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>GM</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>PM</th>
<th>GM</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R.W.C (%)</td>
<td>(1st) season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2nd) season</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.W</td>
<td>65.60</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>69.99</td>
<td>66.70</td>
<td>80.71</td>
<td>66.98</td>
<td>65.79</td>
<td>74.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>65.80</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>68.31</td>
<td>67.88</td>
<td>71.14</td>
<td>67.31</td>
<td>83.40</td>
<td>68.11</td>
<td>67.83</td>
<td>71.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>47.60</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>54.43</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>53.72</td>
<td>48.33</td>
<td>65.71</td>
<td>58.19</td>
<td>54.66</td>
<td>56.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.01</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>52.15</td>
<td>40.51</td>
<td>60.81</td>
<td>55.63</td>
<td>47.39</td>
<td>51.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>72.15</td>
<td>59.98</td>
<td>58.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total chlorophyll (SPAD) | | | | | | | | | | |
| T.W | 45.10 | 48.60 | 47.22 | 47.20 | 47.03 | 46.10 | 48.10 | 47.70 | 47.30 | 47.30 |
| 3 | 46.00 | 49.95 | 48.80 | 48.89 | 48.40 | 47.30 | 49.90 | 48.80 | 48.12 | 48.53 |
| 6 | 45.51 | 47.90 | 47.51 | 47.44 | 47.09 | 45.90 | 47.10 | 46.36 | 46.45 | 46.50 |
| 9 | 42.80 | 46.00 | 45.67 | 45.55 | 45.00 | 43.00 | 46.60 | 45.90 | 45.02 | 45.03 |
| Mean | 44.85 | 48.07 | 47.33 | 47.27 | | | | | | |

| Total carbohydrates (mg/g. dry weight) | | | | | | | | | | |
| T.W | 8.20 | 9.60 | 8.97 | 8.90 | 8.92 | 7.90 | 9.86 | 9.34 | 8.49 | 8.89 |
| 3 | 7.70 | 9.90 | 9.43 | 9.36 | 9.10 | 7.77 | 9.50 | 9.46 | 8.98 | 8.93 |
| 6 | 6.82 | 8.45 | 8.48 | 8.22 | 7.99 | 7.16 | 9.43 | 8.55 | 8.20 | 8.53 |
| Mean | 7.07 | 8.65 | 8.37 | 8.14 | | | | | | |

| Proline (µ molle/100 g. fresh weight) | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2005/06 | | | | | | | | | | |
| T.W | 6.35 | 5.10 | 6.50 | 6.50 | 6.10 | 8.31 | 6.60 | 7.63 | 7.41 | 7.49 |
| 3 | 7.80 | 6.65 | 7.17 | 7.15 | 7.19 | 8.44 | 7.75 | 7.77 | 7.68 | 7.90 |
| 6 | 9.30 | 7.10 | 8.02 | 7.16 | 7.89 | 9.01 | 8.11 | 8.13 | 8.23 | 8.37 |
| 9 | 10.04 | 8.20 | 8.50 | 8.62 | 8.84 | 9.15 | 9.01 | 9.03 | 9.12 | 9.07 |
| Mean | 8.37 | 6.76 | 7.55 | 7.36 | | | | | | |
REFERENCES


EL-Khateeb M.A..(1993). Response of Murraya exotica L. seedlings to saline water irrigation Bull, Fac Agric , Univ of Cairo , 45 (1): 139-149.


sinesis L. Plants and some chemical properties of the Soil. J. Agric Res. Tanta Univ. 18(1):193-204.


Jimenez M.S. and H. Gonzales (1997). Evaluation of chlorophyll fluorescence as cool for salt stress detection in roses photosynthetic. 33,(2) : 291-301


Khan, A; A. Ungar, and M. Showalter (2000). The effect of salinity on the growth, water status and ion content of a
leaf succulent perennial halophyte suada fruticosa (L) forssk J.Arid Environ, 45: 73-84.


Starkey R. and E. Nielsn (2001). Reduced N and K application increases the uptake of Ca and improves the quality of poinsettia (Euphorbic pulchrima Willd Ex Klotzsch) Ornamental Horticulture) crop physiology (C.F.CAB internationa ) .


المملوء العربً

استجابة نباتات بنت القنصل للري بالماء المالح والاسمنتة العضوية النامية
في الأراضي الرملية الصحراوية

سَهْر جمعة السُّد

** مركز البحوث الزراعية – معهد بحوث البساتين - فرع بحوث حدائق انطونٍادس
** قسم الزهور زنوات الزٌنة وتنسق الحدائق – كلٌة الزراعة (الشاطبً) – جامعة الأسكندرٌة


- زيادة تركيز الملوحة في مياه الري أدى إلى انخفاض معنوي في صفات النمو الخضرى والزهري والجذري والتركيب الكيميائي ولكن استخدام السماد العضوي قلل من تأثير الملوحة المستخدمة.

- أدى استخدام السماد العضوي إلى زيادة نسبة بقاء النباتات النامية تحت مستوى الملوحة من 3 مليمولوم/سم 9.

- أدى استعمال الأسمنتة العضوية إلى تحسن صفات النمو الخضرى تحت تأثير المياه المالحة .

- كانت أفضل المعاملات مع التسميد الحيويان.

- أيضاً تحسنت صفات النمو الخضرى والزهري والكيميائي في المعاملات التي استخدمت السماد العضوي وتم التسميد بالصرف الصحي بكميات من الفوسفور والكلوروفيل والكربوهيدرات والبرولين.

- في النتائج وجدت أن استخدام السماد العضوي زاد من نسب زائدة للملوحة في مياه الري بقليل تراكم.

- على ما يتضح من التسميد العضوي زاد من تحمل النباتات للملوحة في مياه الري بتقليل تراكم

- أيونات الصوديوم والكلوريد الضارة في الأراضي وآخذ من الامتصاص النيتروجين والفاتورا والبوتاسوم .

- أعلى وقلل الفيم النيتت من المعاملة بتكرير 9 مليمولوم/سم مع C₃ ، N₄، البرولين .

- تتسم نسب الفيم المئوية من C₃ ، N₄، البرولين .

- التسميد العضوي الحيويان وأعلى نسبة من الفيم المئوية للمحتوى المائي تنتج من المعاملة بتكرير مليمولوم/سم 3 مع التسميد العضوي الحيويان وماية الصرف الصحي.

- وكذلك ثبت تحسين الفيمات بالتمديد السري العضوي الحيويان والري بمواج الذهب النسبية الأراضي 3 مليمولوم/سم وزراعتها في أرض رملية وذلك بعد 30 يوم من نقل الشمائل لتحسين الصفات الخضرى والزهري والكيميائية وانخفاض ضرر الملوحة .