Effect of seeding times, foliar treatments (with salicylic acid, humic acid and high phosphorus fertilizer) and their interaction on mung bean (*Vignaradiata* L. Wilczek) yield

Ali HusainJasim and Nagham A. Muhsen^{*1}

Prof. Dr. and MSc student, Agric. Coll., Babylon University, Iraq

Abstract: The experiment was conductedina field Crop Science Department in AbuGharaq/Hella/Babylon provinceduring 2013to study the effectof foursowing dates(15/5 , 15/6, 15/7 and 15/8), five spraying treatments(salicylic acid0.5 and 0.1mM, humicacid, highphosphorus fertilizer, in addition to control)and their interaction on yield of mung bean plants. Randomized complete block design under split plot arrangement in triplicate was used. Plants were sprayed twice (after 30and 45 daysof seeding) and therequired measurementswere analyzedandthe results showed that: Second time of seeding was superior in the number of pods.plant⁻¹, 100 seeds weight, seed protein content and seed yield. Forth seeding time was superior in pod seed number , pod length, protein percentage and seed yield. Humic acid was superior in 100 seeds weight. The interaction of high phosphate in second seeding was superior in the number of pods.plant⁻¹, 100 seeds weight.

Key words: foliar fertilizer, mung bean, seeding time, salicylic acid, humic acid,

I. Introduction

Mungbean(Vignaradiata L. Wilczek) is one of the most important pulse crops for protein supplement in subtropical zones of the world. It is widely grown as a short duration catch crop between two principal crops. it contains 51% carbohydrate, 24-26% protein, 4% mineral, and 3% vitamins [1]. In order to increase the productivity of this crop, it has become necessary tostudy its requirements for growth and production. Seeding date is animportant factors affecting growth and yield traits which vary depending on the environmental conditionsassociated with theappointmentof agriculture, particularly temperature, light and humidity, which determines the best time for mungbean cultivation. Growth is affected negatively or positivelybyplant growthregulators includingsalicylic acidwhich works toimprove the productivity ofcropthroughits theimportant physiologicalprocess plantsuch growth. effect on inthe as photosynthesis, flowering and drought resistance [2]. The nutrients is no less important for growth regulators and the plants need it in variousstages of growth, if it is added to thesoilorsprayedon the plant. The most importantof thesenutrientsare nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, humic substances. Phosphorusisneeded by plantsin large quantities and plays an important role in the life of the plantas itenters in the composition of many important organic compounds in the biological process. Humic substancesplay a key roleinsoil fertility and plant nutrition, and thathumichad a direct impact onplant growth[3], and indirect effects through the improvement of soil propertiessuch asventilation, permeability and water holding capacity[4]. Because of the lack ofstudieson this topic, we have proposed this study to determine the effect of planting dates and spraying stimuli compounds on growth and yield of mungbean.

II. Materialsandmethods

The experimentwas conducted in the province of Babylon/Hilla/Abo-gharaq (10 km west of Hilla city)at 2013according tosplit plot design with arrangement of randomizedblock design. Planting dates represented within the main plots and the spraying treatments (salicylic acid 0.5 and 1mM, humicacid, highphosphorus and control) within subplots, with three replicates. The experimental unitare awas $6m^2(3m \times 2m)$. Table (1) shows some chemical and physical characteristics of the soil before planting and at the end of the experiment. After plowed and divided the soil, local mungbean seeds were seeding at the dates of (15 / 5, 15 / 6, 15 / 7 and 15 / 8), in lines (150 cm length an 50 cm between) at the quantity of seed 5g perline. NPK (18-18-18) Fertilizer at 200 kg/ha with 100 kg/ha urea was used before seeding and mixed with the soil. Spraying treatments was done twice (after 30 and 45 days from sowing). Tenplant sper experimental unit were selected randomlyto determine pods number. Plant⁻¹, the average length of pod(cm), number of seeds.pod⁻¹, 100 seed weight. Dry seed yield was

^{*&}lt;sup>1</sup> Part of M. Sci. thesis of the second author

calculated from the fourth internalline of each experimental unitanditwas attributed to hectare. The results were analyzed statistically, and the average had been compared according to the essignificant difference (LSD) at probability of 0.05%.

Tuble (1)some enemieatante physicalenaraetensitesor the som								
	Before sowing		After harvesting					
$EC (dS.m^{-1})$	1.2		1.0					
pH	7.8		7.0					
Soil texture	sand	silt		clay				
Silty loam	336	518		146				

 Table (1)some chemicaland physicalcharacteristics of the soil

III. Results and Discussion

Table (2) showed that the second date 15/6 was superior upon the rest other dates in increasing pods number.plant⁻¹ which reached14.8 with a percentage increase of 20.3% compared to the firstdate, which gave alower averagenumberofpods12.3. There were no differences between the third and fourth dates ,but they were significant superiority upon the first date. It is noted from the tablethat allspraying treatments led to a significant increase in pods number.plant⁻¹ compared to control, and spraying highphosphorus fertilizer was superior compared to other spraying , which gave 15.7 with a percentage increase of 36.5% compared to control that gave the lowest value of 11.5 . The interaction between treatments had asignificant effect and the treatment of highphosphorus fertilizer at second date(15/6) was superior by giving 16.3pod.plant⁻¹, while the lowest number resulted from controlint he first date (15/5) which gave 9.3.

Table (2):Effect of planting dates and, some stimuli and their interaction in the number of pods. plant⁻¹

В	control	SA 0.5mM	SA 1 mM	Humic acid	High P fert.	average
A					-	-
15/5	9.3	12.4	11.4	13.9	14.5	12.3
15/6	13.1	14.2	14.5	15.8	16.3	14.8
15/7	11.1	13.3	12.7	14.7	15.5	13.5
15/8	12.6	13.6	13.4	15.5	15.6	14.1
average	11.5	13.4	13.0	15.0	15.7	
LSD _{0.05}	A=0.5743B= 0.6102AB=1.1843					

Table (3) shows that fourth date was outweigh compared tofirst and thirddate in the number of seeds.pod⁻¹(9.1 seeds.pod⁻¹) withan increase percentage of 9.6% compared to the firstdate, which gave the lowest(8.3seeds.pod⁻¹). It is noted from the table, there were significant differences between thespraying treatments, as its urpassed treatments of highphosphorus fertilizer and humussignificantly on the rest others praying, which gave an average number of seeds 9.3and 9.1seeds.pod⁻¹ with an increase percentage of 12.0 and 9.6%, respectively, compared to control treatment. The interaction between treatmentshad a significant effect and spraying high-phosphorus fertilizer fourth date 15/8 was superior on most interactions , which gave 9.8 seed.pod⁻¹, while control treatments at third date gave the fewest 8.1.

Table (3):The effect ofplanting dates, some stimuli spraying and their interactions on seeds number.pod⁻¹

В	control	SA 0.5mM	SA 1 mM	Humic acid	High P fert.	average
A					-	-
15/5	8.5	7.7	8.5	8.4	8.4	8.3
15/6	8.2	8.9	8.4	9.5	9.6	8.9
15/7	8.1	8.6	8.4	9.2	9.3	8.7
15/8	8.3	8.8	9.0	9.4	9.8	9.1
average	8.3	8.5	8.6	9.1	9.3	
LSD _{0.05}	A=0.1618 B=0.2239AB=0.4203					

Notesfrom table(4) showed that fourth date 15/8 was superior on the rest other seeding dates in the average of pod length (7.70 cm) with percentage increase of 12.6% compared to the first datewhich gaveless length (6.84 cm). There were no differences between second and third date, butthey were superior compared to the first date . There were asignificant differences between spraying treatments and the treatments of spraying highphosphorus fertilizer and humuswere superior significantly compared to the other, which gave 7.38 and 7.31 cm , respectively, with a percentage increase of 4.6% and 3.7% compared to control treatment. The interaction between the treatments had significant effect, which spraying high-phosphorus fertilizer fourth date (15/8) was superior upon the rest interactions and gave an average length of 8.16 cm, while the shorterpod length (6.1cm) resulted from control treatment the first date.

Tuble (1	Tuble (4) encer of planting dates, some stimum spraying and then interactions on pod length (enr)							
B	control	SA 0.5mM	SA 1 mM	Humic acid	High P fert.	average		
15/5	6.10	6.51	7.23	6.71	7.64	6.84		
15/6	6.75	6.70	7.23	7.47	7.15	7.06		
15/7	7.54	7.45	6.86	7.23	6.58	7.13		
15/8	7.80	7.49	7.24	7.83	8.16	7.70		
average	7.05	7.04	7.14	7.31	7.38			
$LSD_{0.05}$			A=0.1154 B=0.	1275AB=0.2460				

Table (4) effect of planting dates, some stimuli spraying and their interactions on pod length (cm)

Table (5) showed that second date 15/6 was superior significantly upon the rest other date in the average of 100 seed weight (3.89g) with a percentage increase of 9.27% compared to the first date 15/5, which gave lessweight(3.55g). On the other hand, thirddatewassuperior upon first datesignificantly. Allspraying treatments had a significant effect compared to control. Sprayhumusand high phosphorus fertilizer gave the highest value of 100 seed weight (3.81, and 3.78g, respectively) with a percentage increase of 9.8% and 8.9% compared to control treatment. The interaction between planting dates and spraying treatments hadsignificant effect on 100 seed weight, and the interaction between spraying high phosphorus fertilizer * second date 15/6 was superior significantly (4.10) on the other interactions , while control treatments at all planting dates gave lowervalues (ranging between 3.20 - 3.66g).

Table (5):Effect of planting dates, some stimuli spraying and their interactions on 100 seed weight (g)

В	control	SA 0.5mM	SA 1 mM	Humic acid	High P fert.	average
A						
15/5	3.55	3.55	3.27	3.67	3.87	3.56
15/6	3.66	3.93	3.93	3.84	4.10	3.89
15/7	3.20	3.82	3.76	3.93	3.83	3.71
15/8	3.45	3.73	3.69	3.41	3.30	3.61
average	3.47	3.76	3.66	3.81	3.78	
LSD _{0.05}	A=0.1405B= 0.1455 AB=0.2836					

Table(6) showed that first dategavelessseed yield significantly compared to otherdates. Second date wassuperior upon other dates which gave 1315.8kg.ha⁻¹ with an increase of 25.6% compared to the first date. On the other hand, allsprayingtreatments had a significant increase compared to control. Spraying highphosphorus fertilizer was superior significantly compares to other spraying treatments, and gave 1260kg.ha⁻¹. Spraying humic acid were superior also and gave 1228.6 kg.ha⁻¹ compared tosalicylic acid 1mM. The interaction had significant effect , and spraying of highphosphorus fertilizer * second datewas superior compared to other interactions which gave 1477 kg.ha⁻¹, while control treatments at first date gaveless value (763.9 kg.ha⁻¹).

В	control	SA 0.5mM	SA 1 mM	Humic acid	High P fert.	average
A						
15/5	763.9	856.0	913.2	1044.2	995.3	914.5
15/6	1141.9	1403.9	1158.0	1398.1	1477.0	1315.8
15/7	993.7	1261.7	1175.4	1213.9	1194.6	1167.9
15/8	1057.4	1238.2	1374.1	1258.1	1373,0	1260.2
average	989.2	1190.0	1155.2	1228.6	1260.0	
LSD _{0.05}		A	=56.2 B=62	2.8 AB= 125	5.6	

Table (6):Effect of planting dates, some stimuli spraying and their interactions on seed yield $(k \mid g)$

Table(7) showed that second date 15/6 was superior compared to the other dates in the proportion ofprotein (21.58%) with an increase of 5.3% compared to the thirddate, which gave the lowest averagepercentage ofprotein (20.49%). The table also showed that salicylic acid treatments had no significant effecton proportion ofprotein, but tendto increase, while spraying highphosphorusfertilizer and humic acid increased it significantly(22.93 and 21.16%) compared to control treatment. The interaction between treatments had significant effects spraying high phosphorus fertilizer third date 15/7 was superior (23.15%), while the control treatmentat firstdate gave lessvalue(18.46).

 Table (7):Effect ofplanting dates, some stimuli spraying and their interactions on protein content %

В	control	SA 0.5mM	SA 1 mM	Humic acid	High P fert.	average
A					_	_
15/5	18.46	22.39	19.74	19.03	23.37	20.60
15/6	20.15	20.52	22.59	21.93	22.71	21.58
15/7	19.98	19.21	20.64	22.46	23.15	20.49
15/8	20.35	19.85	18.75	21.21	22.48	20.53
average	19.74	20.49	20.43	21.16	22.93	
LSD _{0.05}	A=0.820B=0.860 AB=1.673					

Notes from the results of tables (2-7) showed that second datewas superior significantly inpods number.plant⁻¹, 100 seed weightand dry seed yield. It wasattributed increase the production of dry matterat physiological maturitystage as a result of the length of growth period, which led to increase photosynthetic efficiency and readiness of their products transferred to the stem and leaves thereby increasing their contribution to the food processing plant[5]. These results are consistent with [6, 7]. It is noted from the results of table (3,4) outweigh the fourthdate significantly innumber of seeds.pod⁻¹ and pod length, which attributed to the exposure of plantstof avorable environmental conditions that encouraged to increase photosynthesis and thus increase food processing [5]. These results are consistent with the results of [8, 9].

Spraying highphosphorusfertilizerwas superior significantly in pods number.plant⁻¹, pod length, 100 seed weightanddry seed yield (table 2, 4, 5, 6). It wasattributedtothe impact ofphosphate fertilizerin improving plant growthandthereby increase podsyield [10].The increasehappeningwhensprayinghighphosphorus fertilizerreturns to the role in the transfer of materialsmanufactured from leafs to seed formed [11], in addition to the role ofphosphorus in the synthesis ofnucleic acidswhich is important in the process of proteins formation [12]. This wasconsistent with the findings of [13, 14 and 15]. The superiority of humic acidspraying inmost of the traitsattributed to the role of of ganic matterin increasing the shoot, which increases the amount of objection to the light the number of seeds.pod⁻¹ and increase 100-seed weight therefore reflected in high yield, as well as its role in increasing the permeability of cell membranes, which facilitates and acceleratestheabsorption of nutrients and increase the proportion of protein [16]. This was consistent with the results of [17 and 18].

References

- [1]. Anjum, M.S., Z. I. Ahmed, and C. A. Rauf, 2006. "Effect of Rhizobium inoculation and nitrogen fertilizer on yield and yield components of mungbean," Int. J. Agric. and Biol., 8(2): 238–240.
- [2]. El-Shraiy, A. M.and Hegazi, A. M. 2009. Effect of acetylsalicylic acid, indole-3- butyric acid and gibberellic acid on plant growth and yield of pea (*PisumsativumL.*). Aust. J. Bas. Appl. Sci., 3(4): 3514-3523.
- [3]. Chen, Y. and Aviad T. (1990). Effects of humic substance on plant growth. In McCarthy, CE Clapp, RL Malcolm, PR Bloom (eds.). Humic substances in soil and crop sciences. Soil Sci. Soc.Amer. pp.161-186.
- [4]. Tan, K. H. (2003). Humic Matter in Soil Environment, Principles and Controversies, Marcel Dekker, Inc. 270 Madison Avenue, New York.
- [5]. Aochalm, S.N. 2006. Growth, yield and quality of different genotypesfrom rapeseed by the effect of planting date. PhD thesis. Faculty of Agriculture. University of Baghdad/Iraq.
- [6]. Rabbani ,M.G., A.K.M.S.H. Chowdhury, M.A. Bari and M.A. Salam. 2013. Effect of variety and sowing date on the growth and yield of summer mung bean (*VignaradiataL*. Wilczek). J. Agrofor. Environ. 7 (1): 27-30, 2013.
- [7]. Ali ,S. ; T. Khaliq; A. Ahmad1; M. Rehman1, S. Hussain; K. Rehman and M. Wajid . 2014 . Genotypic variations in mungbean yield and its attributes in response to different sowing times. Res. J. Agric. and Environ. Manage., 3(5): 255-258.
- [8]. Sarkar, M. A. R., M. H. Kabir, M. Begum and M. A. Salam. 2004. Yield performance of mung bean as affected by planting date, variety and plant density. J. Agro., 3(1): 18-24.
- [9]. Harunor, R.M.; M.S. Aktar; I. Hossain; M.M. Rahmam; M.R. Hasnat and R.M. Nair .2013. Effect of dates of sowing on incidence and severity of mungbeanyellow mosaic virus and cercosporaleaf spot of mung bean. Int. J. Adv. Res. & Tech., 2(9): 2278-7763.
- [10]. Badr, M.M.; S.A.A. Bassal and E.M. Ibrahim. 2003. Effect of preceding winter crops, nitrogen and phosphorous fertilizer levels on growth and yield of maize (*Zea mays L.*). J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 28(9): 6591-6601.
- [11]. Peng Z, Li C (2005) Transport and partitioning of phosphorus in wheat as affected by P withdrawal during flag-leaf expansion. Plant and Soil , 268, 1-11.
- [12]. Gad, N.; M.R. Abdel-Moez and H. Kandil (2012). Influence of cobalt and mycrorrhizae mediated phosphorus on some higher plants growth and yield. J. Basic. Appl. Sci. Res., 2(11):11942-11951.
- [13]. Shafeek, M.R., F.S. Abdel-Al and A.H. Ali, 2004. The productivity of broad bean plant as affected by chemical and or natural phosphorus with different bio fertilizer. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 29: 2727-2740.
- [14]. Beheidi, M.A., A.A. El-Mansi, E.A. El-Ghamriny, F.F. Mohamed and M. M.Ramadan .2005. Effect of mineral and biofertilizers on growth yield and quality of pea plants under sandy soil conditions .Zagazig J. Agric. Res., 32(5): 1453-1473.
- [15]. Hashemabadi, D. 2013. Phosphorus fertilizers effect on the yield and yield components of faba bean (Viciafaba L.). Ann. Bio. Res., 4 (2):181-184.
- [16]. Esmaeilian, Y.; A.R. Sirousmehr and M.R. Asghripour. 2012. Comparison of sole and combined nutrient application on yield and biochemical composition of sunflower under water stress . J. Appl. Sci. and Tech.,2(3):50-62.
- [17]. Anju. S and A. Vijayalakshmi .2013.Residual effect of integrated nutrient management with farmyard manure , coir pith and press mud compost on cluster bean. I. J. S. N., Vol., 4(3):405-407.
- [18]. Hak, S.H. Gad, A.M. Ahmed, Y.M.M. Moustafa. 2012. Effect of foliar application with two antioxidants and humic acid on growth, yieldand yield components of peas (*PisumsativumL*).