

Implications of water stress and foliar application with some stimulants on productivity, fruit quality and water use efficiency of some tomato genotypes

* Arab, Z.E., Nadia, S.A. Shafshak, M. M. El Nagar and A. S. Shams

Horticulture Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Benha University, Moshtohor, 13736 Qalyubia, Egypt

*Corresponding author: Zeinabarab@yahoo.com

Received on: 2-5-2022

Accepted on: 15-5-2022

ABSTRACT

A field experiment was carried out on tomato plants (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) during summer seasons of 2020 and 2021 at the experimental farm of the Faculty of Agriculture, Benha University, Moshtohor, Touch, Kalubia Governorate, Egypt, in order to investigate the response of genotypes, three tomato genotype (Alia 123 F1, Arwa F1 and Super strain B) to deficit irrigation and foliar application with stimulate and their interaction on yield, fruit quality and water use efficiency of tomato plants grown under drip irrigation system in clay soil conditions. Obtained results showed that treatments that received 80% WR + amino acids as foliar spraying of Alia 123 recorded superior effects on early yield, marketable and total yield. The highest water use efficiency was recorded when using 80% WR and the foliar application of amino for Alia 123 cultivar with significant deferent as compared with all other treatments. Irrigation with 60% of the WR with the foliar application of any of the used foliar sprays i.e. amino, humic and calcium+boron on any of the used genotypes resulted the highest increases in TSS of tomato fruits. The same trend was found with the 100% of WR on vitamin C. highest acidity was found with 60% of WR with calcium boron or deionized water as a spray on super strain B with significant variations in the second growing season.

KEYWORDS: tomato, deficit irrigation, genotypes, biostimulants and water use efficiency

1. INTRODUCTION

Tomato (*Solanum lycopersicum* L.) is an herbaceous plant and a member of the solanaceae family that includes eggplant, peppers, Irish potato and tobacco (Dobson *et al.*, 2002). Fresh tomatoes and other processed tomato products make a significant contribution to human nutrition owing to the concentration and availability of several nutrients in these products and to their widespread consumption. Tissues of most herbaceous vegetables have about 90% in their vacuoles.

Water deficits and insufficient water are the main limiting factors affecting worldwide crop production (Nuruddin *et al.* 2001). Plants growing under suboptimal water levels are associated with slow growth and, in severe cases, dieback of stems, such plants are more susceptible to disease and less tolerant of insect feeding. In crops, water stress has been associated with reduced yields and possible crop failure. The effects of water stress however vary between plant species. As the plant undergoes water stress, the water pressure inside the leaves decreases and the plant wilts. The main consequence of moisture stress is decreased growth and development caused by reduced photosynthesis, a process in which plants combine water, carbon dioxide and light to make carbohydrates for energy.

Tomatoes are very sensitive to water deficits during and immediately after transplanting, at flowering and during fruit development (Nuruddin *et al.* 2001). According to (Shamsul *et al.* 2008), the water stress at earlier stage of growth (20 day stage) is more inhibitory compared to the later stage (30 day stage). Photosynthetic response to drought is a highly complex in plants. Thus, at present, new agronomic strategies are being designed and evaluated, among these new agronomic strategies, we find the use of stimulants (Lucini *et al.*, 2015). It has been observed that the use of these products significantly improves the performance of crops, as they have beneficial effects on the physiological processes of plants, such as the absorption of water and nutrients, among others (Mutale-Joan *et al.*, 2020).

Biostimulants are composed of bioactive compounds such as humic acids, can be applied in Amino acids have been considered as precursors and constituents of proteins and other nitrogen compounds e.g., nucleic acids. Plants subjected to stress show accumulation of proline and other amino acids. The role played by accumulated amino acids in plants varied from acting as osmolyte, regulation of ion transport, modulating stomatal opening and detoxification of heavy metals. Amino acids also affected synthesis of some enzymes, gene expression and redox-homeostasis (Rai *et al.* 2002).

Calcium (Ca) is a plant nutrient required as a structural component in the cell wall and membranes, counter ion in storage organelles and signalling molecule in the cytosol (White et al 2001). Conditions that restrict the Ca uptake, such as high salinity, excess or lack of moisture, root diseases, high temperatures and low levels of Ca in the soil, may cause Ca deficiency symptoms in plants (Saure 2014). These symptoms may occur even at ideal levels of Ca in the soil for the normal plant growth and development (Suzuki et al 2003).

Humic acid, which has hormone-like activity, not only enhances plant growth and nutrient uptake but also improves stress tolerance. The significance of humic acids is not limited to their function as a reservoir of mineral plant nutrients and regulator of their liberation. Recent literature has shown that humic acid could be used as a growth regulator to regulate hormone levels, improve plant growth and enhance stress tolerance (Serenella et al., 2002). Studies indicate that humic acid (HA) was in general not only beneficial to shoot and root growth but also

nutrient uptake of vegetable crops (Cimrin & Yilmaz, 2005).

The main objective of this study improving quality, productivity and water use efficiency of some tomato genotypes under water stress by using some stimulants.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was carried out during summer seasons of 2020 and 2021 at the experimental farm of the Faculty of Agriculture, Benha University, Egypt, in order to investigate the response of three tomato cultivars namely Alia 123 F1, Arwa F1 and Super strain B to deficit irrigation (three levels, i.e.100, 80 and 60% of ETo) and foliar application with biostimulants, i.e., Amino power (0.5 cm³/l), Hummer (0.25 g/l), Caly-Bor (2.5 cm³/l) and distilled water and their interaction on vegetative growth and chemical characteristics of tomato plant foliage grown under drip irrigation system in heavy clay soil conditions. Samples analyses of soil are shown in Table (1).

Table 1. Physical and chemical properties of experimental soil analysis.

| | |
|--|------------|
| Clay % | 51.0 |
| Silt % | 24.6 |
| Sand % | 24.4 |
| Soil texture | Heavy clay |
| pH (1:2.5 w:v) | 7.9 |
| EC* (dSm ⁻¹) | 2.16 |
| OM (gkg ⁻¹) | 1.41 |
| CaCO ₃ (gkg ⁻¹) | 1.53 |
| Available N (mg kg ⁻¹) | 23 |
| Available P (mg kg ⁻¹) | 9 |
| Available K (mg kg ⁻¹) | 120 |
| Field capacity, FC (cm ³ cm ⁻³) | 37.89 |
| Wetting point, WP (cm ³ cm ⁻³) | 14.74 |
| Saturation capacitance | 69.78 |

*Texture using International Soil Texture Triangle (Moeys 2016); EC of paste extract; NPK Extractants are KCl (N), NaHCO₃(P), NH₄Ac (K).

Tomato plants were sown on first and second of February for the first and second seasons, respectively in the nursery. The experiment was laid out in a split-split plot design with three replicates. Genotypes were arranged in the main plots, while, Deficit irrigation treatments were randomly distributed in the sup-plots and foliar application treatments were randomly assigned in the sub-sub plots. The area of the experimentation plot was 12 m² consisted of one row with 10 m length and 1.2 m width and the plants were transplanted 50 cm spaced in the rows. The experimental plots received three amount of water i.e. 100, 80 and 60 % ETo, using

drip irrigation system; the used lines of irrigation were of model GR 16 mm and the flow rate of drippers was 4ℓ / hour. Water pressure 1.5 bar when all lines were opened and irrigation rate was two times weekly. Class A pan evapotranspiration equation was used to calculate daily irrigation water amount, according to local weather station data, which located near the experimental of the Faculty of Agriculture, Egypt. That affiliated to the Central Laboratory for Agricultural Climate (C.L.A.C) Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation.

Table 2. Irrigation requirements (liter/plant per day) for irrigation treatments (100%, 80%, and 60% of ET_o) for tomato plants under open field conditions during both seasons of 2020 and 2021.

| Month* | The first season (2020) | | | The second season (2021) | | |
|-------------------------------|-------------------------|----------|----------|--------------------------|---------|----------|
| | 100% | 80% | 60% | 100% | 80% | 60% |
| March | 0.263 | 0.211 | 0.158 | 0.283 | 0.226 | 0.169 |
| April | 1.215 | 0.972 | 0.729 | 1.185 | 0.948 | 0.711 |
| May | 2.504 | 2.003 | 1.502 | 2.268 | 1.814 | 1.361 |
| June | 3.073 | 2.458 | 1.844 | 3.408 | 2.726 | 2.045 |
| July | 2.491 | 1.993 | 1.494 | 2.734 | 2.187 | 1.641 |
| Total m ³ per fed. | 1905.782 | 1524.625 | 1143.469 | 1962.812 | 1570.25 | 1177.687 |

*Starting from 17th and 18th of March (2020 and 2021 for the first and second seasons, respectively).

A commercial Amino power® consists of (free amino acids 19 %, micro elements 1500 ppm and potassium citrate 3.5 %). Hummer ® (humic acid 92 % and potassium humat 8 %). Caly-Bor ® consists of 10% Ca, 1%B, 6% N and amino acids. Foliar applications were added three times started after 30 days from transplanted and every 15 days intervals.

2.1. Data recorded

2.1.1. Yield and its components:

1- Average fruit weight (g): five fruit from each treatment were taken randomly from third picking as representative sample for determined average weight (g).

2- Early yield was calculated as the fruit yield of the first two picking as kg/plant and then calculated as kg plant and ton/fed.

3- Total fruit yield (ton/fed.) as the whole picked fruits, all over the season from each plot and then calculated per fed.

4- Marketable fruit yield per fed(ton/ fed): it was calculated as weight of harvested fruits after discarding the injured and misshaped fruits

5- Unmarketable yield per fed (ton/ fed): it was calculated as weight of discarded the all injured and misshaped fruits.

6- Water use efficiency (WUE) (kg/m³):

Irrigation water use efficiency under deficit irrigation treatments were determined using the following equations given by Howell *et al.* (1990):

WUE = Yield (kg/fed.)/Applied irrigation water amount (m³/fed.).

2.1.2. Fruit chemical constituents

Three fruits of each treatment were taken at full- ripe maturity stage from the forth harvest to determine the following parameters:

1. Determination of total soluble solids (T.S.S %):

Total soluble solids (T.S.S %), was determined the percentage of soluble solids in juice by using hand refractometer according A.O.A.C. (1990)

2. Determination of titratable acidity:

Titratable acidity (g citric acid/100 g fresh weight), was determined by titration of the blended flesh against NaOH 0.01 N. using Phenolphthaline as an indicator A.O.A.C. (1990).

3. Determination of ascorbic acid (V.C.):

Ascorbic acid (mg/100g), was determined in fresh weight by using the 2, 6 Dichlorophenol-indolphenol methods described in A.O.A.C. (1990).

4. Determination of lycopene:

Lycopene concentration (mg kg⁻¹ F.W.) in fruit was extracted as follows: samples were first chopped and homogenized in a laboratory homogenizer: Approximately 0.3 to 0.6 g samples were weighted and 5 ml of 0.05%(w/v) BHT in acetone, 5 ml of ethanol and 10ml of hexane were added. The recipient was introduced in ice and stirred on a magnetic stirring plate for 15 min. After shaking, 3 ml of deionized water were added to each vial and the samples were shaken for 5 min on ice. Samples were then left at room temperature for 5 min to allow the separation of both phase sand quantified spectrophotometrically at 472 nm. Apparatus UV-Vis. Spectral analysis has been done using a Janways spectrophotometer (Ravelo-Pérez *et al.*, 2008). Lycopene content (mg/kg) = absorption reading at 503* 31.2/g tissue

2.2. Statistical analysis:

Analysis of variance of the obtained data from each attribute was computed using the MSTAT-C Computer Program (1988). The Duncan's New Multiple Range test at 5% level of probability was used to test the significance of differences among mean values of treatments (Gomez and Gomez, 1984).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Yield and its compounds

Effect of genotype

By watching the results of Table (3) you will find that the results indicate that there were no significant variations in yield and its components (average fruit weight, the early yield and the marketable yield as well as the total yield and water use efficiency) between Alia 123 and Arwa hybrids in the first season only. Super Strain B recorded the least productivity in the two seasons of study. The reduction in photosynthesis during stress may decrease the availability of assimilates to the developing floral organs and leads to the abscission of flower and flower buds in susceptible genotypes of tomato. Sivakumar *et al.* (2016).

Effect of water requirement

For water inputs, it was noted that reducing the level of irrigation from 100 to 60% led to concurrent reductions in yield and yield components following the sequence of 100>80>60% of the WR. On the other hand, water use efficiency and the unmarketable product increased in the pattern of 60>80>100 WR during the two seasons of study.

This could be due to high up take of nutrients and build-up of sufficient photosynthates, enabling increase in size of fruit (length and breadth) resulting increased fruit weight and volume. Fruit weight plays an important role in the total yield of tomato and, therefore, similar trend was recorded for fruit yield per square meter area and fruit yield ton per hectare. Obtained results are in agreement with those reported by Celebi *et al.* (2014), Al-Omran *et al.* (2010) and Shahein *et al.* (2012).

Over-irrigation has been reported to result in lower water productivity, while a lack of irrigation caused very low water productivity on tomato plant. (Hamdi, 2017).

Effect of foliar spray treatments

Spraying plants with amino recorded the highest increases in yield and its component (average fruit weight, early yield, marketable yield and total yield) for the investigated two seasons. Spraying plants with humic recorded comparable effects to the ones that received amino as a foliar spray in average fruit weight, early yield, marketable yield and total yield during the first season while early yield in the second one. On the contrary, the highest water use efficiency was attained for either of the foliar applications in the two growing season versus the deionized water foliar application. The foliar application with "calcium+boron" recorded

comparable effect for humic in average fruit weight, marketable yield and total yield in the first season and marketable yield and total yield in the second season. Spraying plants with any of the three foliar application recorded positive results versus deionized water as a foliar spray for early yield and unmarketable yield in both seasons of study.

Hildebrandt *et al.* (2015) suggested other useful functions of amino acids in plant cells, such as protein biosynthesis, signaling processes, energy producers, auxin biosynthesis and enzyme regulation influencing physiological processes, plant growth and development. micronutrients have tonic effects on the photosynthetic rate producing higher carbohydrate accumulation and its translocation from leaves (source) to fruits (sink) increasing the total yield (Marschner, 1995; Uchida, 2000; Jadhav *et al.*, 2014; Sidhu *et al.*, 2019).

Calcium may also inhibit tomato flower abscission and, thus, results in increased fruits plant-1 (Smit and Combrink, 2005). The foliar application of Boron enhances sugars levels of the stigma and helps in tomato fruit set by promoting the pollen tube growth along with pollen germination (Singh *et al.*, 2013).

(Yildirim, 2007) foliar application with humic acids improve tomato plant physiological processes by enhancing the availability of major and minor nutrients as well as enhances the uptake vitamins, amino acids and also auxine, cytokinine and ABA contents of the plant.

Effect of the interaction

By watching the results of Tables (4 & 5) you will find that the results indicate that the treatments that received 100% WR + amino as a foliar spray in case of Alia 123 and Arwa genotypes recorded superior effects on average fruit weight, early yield, marketable and total yield in the two seasons under investigation. Similar results were attained for the foliar application of tomato plants (cv. Alia 123 F1) with amino and irrigated with 80% WR in marketable and total yield in the second growing season. Also, the highest early yield was recorded with any of used genotypes when irrigated with either 100 or 80% WR and spraying plants with any of the foliar application treatments i.e. amino, humic or calcium + boron. The highest water use efficiency was recorded when using 80% WR and the foliar application of amino for Alia 123 cultivar with significant deferent as compared with all other treatments in the first season of study. The least values were recorded for all genotypes in yield and its component when irrigated with 60% WR and deionized water as foliar spray in both seasons of study.

Table 3. Effect of genotypes, water requirement or foliar spray treatments on yield and its components of tomato plants during the summer seasons of 2020 & 2021.

| Characteristics Treatments | Average fruit weight(g) | Early yield/ kg plant | Un marketable yield (t/ fed) | Marketable yield (t/ fed) | Total yield (ton/ fed) | WUE Kg/m ³ | Average fruit weight(g) | Early yield/ kg plant | Un marketable yield (t/ fed) | Marketable yield (t/ fed) | Total yield (ton/ fed) | WUE Kg /m ³ |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| | The first Seasons (2020) | | | | | | The second season(2021) | | | | | |
| Genotypes | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Aliaa 123 | 97.433 a | 11.829 a | 2.381 a | 22.654 a | 25.035a | 16.609a | 89.463 a | 11.57 a | 2.051 b | 22.497 a | 24.548a | 15.651 a |
| Arwa | 95.956 a | 11.542ab | 2.448 a | 22.282 a | 24.731a | 16.398a | 84.204 a | 11.44 a | 2.110 b | 22.223 a | 24.334a | 15.616 a |
| Super strain | 84.532 b | 11.197 b | 2.361 a | 18.314 b | 20.675b | 13.949b | 71.772 b | 10.87 b | 2.446 a | 18.046 b | 20.493b | 13.153 b |
| Water requirements (WR) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 100% WR | 121.008 a | 14.666 a | 2.107 c | 24.428 a | 26.535a | 13.923b | 104.75 a | 14.083a | 2.028 b | 25.092 a | 27.12 a | 13.817 b |
| 80% WR | 101.268b | 13.254 b | 2.309 b | 22.226 b | 24.535b | 16.093a | 87.152 b | 13.202b | 2.068 b | 22.783 b | 24.851b | 15.826 a |
| 60% WR | 55.645 c | 6.649 c | 2.773 a | 16.597 c | 19.37 c | 16.94 a | 53.536 c | 6.815 c | 2.511 a | 14.892 c | 17.403c | 14.777 a |
| Foliar application | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Amino acid | 97.581 a | 12.9433a | 2.151 b | 24.064 a | 26.215a | 17.389a | 87.863 a | 12.943a | 2.053 b | 22.978 a | 25.032a | 16.082 a |
| Humic acid | 94.012 ab | 12.6505a | 2.202 b | 21.936 ab | 24.138ab | 16.123ab | 82.102 b | 12.651a | 2.058 b | 21.337 b | 23.396b | 14.966ab |
| Calcium+ poron | 90.908 bc | 11.9704b | 1.947 c | 20.18 bc | 22.127bc | 14.772ab | 78.98 c | 11.97 b | 1.663 c | 20.643 b | 22.306bc | 14.267ab |
| Distilled water | 88.061 c | 8.52911c | 3.286 a | 18.154 c | 21.441 c | 14.324 b | 78.307 c | 7.242 c | 3.035 a | 18.73 c | 21.765 c | 13.912b |

Tale 4. Effect of interaction among water requirement, genotypes and foliar spray treatments on yield and its components of tomato plants during the summer seasons of 2020.

| Genotypes | water requirements | Foliar application | Average fruit | Early yield | Un marketable | Marketable yield | Total yield | WUE (kg/m3) |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|------------------|-------------|-------------|
| | | | weight(g) | kg /plant | yield (t/ fed) | (t/ fed) | (t/ fed) | |
| The first Seasons (2020) | | | | | | | | |
| Aliaa 123 | 100% WR | Amino acid | 137.8 a | 16.39 a | 1.912 c | 30.198 a | 32.110 a | 16.848b-g |
| | | Humic acid | 130.6abc | 16.37 a | 1.972 c | 26.968 c | 28.940bc | 15.185 g-k |
| | | Calcium+poron | 121.7cde | 15.38 ab | 1.763 c | 25.667 cd | 27.430 bcd | 14.393 h-l |
| | | Distilled water water | 120.4 de | 11.83 b-f | 2.320abc | 24.100def | 26.420c-f | 13.863 i-l |
| | 80% WR | Amino acid | 108.6 fg | 15.46 ab | 2.065 c | 29.965 ab | 32.030 a | 21.008 a |
| | | Humic acid | 106.0fgh | 14.98 ab | 2.163 c | 25.927 cd | 28.090 bcd | 18.424 bc |
| | | Calcium+poron | 103.5ghi | 14.39a-d | 1.969 c | 21.731 f-i | 23.700 fgh | 15.544d-k |
| | | Distilled water water | 100.5g-k | 9.21 e-h | 2.987abc | 19.443 h-l | 22.430 g-j | 14.711 g-l |
| | 60% WR | Amino acid | 65.70 l | 8.164 f-i | 2.468abc | 18.792 jkl | 21.260 h-k | 18.592 b |
| | | Humic acid | 60.8 lm | 7.607ghi | 2.427abc | 17.943klm | 20.370 i-o | 17.814bcd |
| | | Calcium+poron | 58.2 lmn | 7.17 g-j | 2.037 c | 17.113k-n | 19.150 k-o | 16.747 b-g |
| | | Distilled water water | 55.2 mn | 5.00 ij | 4.489ab | 14.011 o | 18.510 o | 16.178 c-h |
| Arwa | 100% WR | Amino acid | 134.0 ab | 16.33 a | 1.962 c | 31.428 a | 33.390 a | 17.52 b-f |
| | | Humic acid | 129.0 a-d | 16.26 a | 2.001 c | 27.279 bc | 29.280 b | 15.363 f-k |
| | | Calcium+poron | 126.7 bcd | 15.53 ab | 1.599 c | 25.381 cde | 26.980 b-e | 14.156 h-l |
| | | Distilled water water | 121.6 cde | 10.81 c-g | 3.299 abc | 22.841 efg | 26.140 def | 13.716 jkl |
| | 80% WR | Amino acid | 109.6 fg | 14.94 ab | 2.246 abc | 25.844 cd | 28.090 bcd | 18.424 bc |
| | | Humic acid | 107.1 fg | 14.96 ab | 2.334 abc | 25.706 cd | 28.040 bcd | 18.391 bc |
| | | Calcium+poron | 104.7 f-i | 13.84 a-d | 2.172 bc | 20.898 g-j | 23.070 ghi | 15.131 g-k |
| | | Distilled water water | 100.7 g-j | 9.21e-h | 3.402 abc | 19.218 i-l | 22.620 g-j | 14.836 g-l |
| | 60% WR | Amino acid | 57.9 lmn | 8.08 f-i | 2.462 abc | 18.868 jkl | 21.330 h-k | 18.653 b |
| | | Humic acid | 56.8 lmn | 7.89 ghi | 2.322 abc | 17.918 klm | 20.240 j-o | 17.700 b-e |
| | | Calcium+poron | 53.6 mn | 7.10 g-j | 2.060 c | 17.100 k-n | 19.160 k-o | 16.756 b-g |
| | | Distilled water water | 50.3 n | 3.63 j | 3.527 abc | 14.913 no | 18.440 mno | 16.126 c-i |
| Super strain | 100% WR | Amino acid | 113.6 ef | 15.31 ab | 2.107 c | 22.163 fgh | 24.270 efg | 12.734 l-o |
| | | Humic acid | 109.0 fg | 15.08 ab | 2.075 c | 19.665 h-k | 21.740 g-k | 11.407 mno |
| | | Calcium+poron | 104.5 f-i | 14.61 abc | 1.820 c | 19.44 h-l | 21.260 h-k | 11.155 no |
| | | Distilled water water | 102.6 ghi | 12.10 b-e | 2.461 abc | 18.009 klm | 20.470 i-n | 10.741 o |
| | 80% WR | Amino acid | 97.09 h-k | 14.29 a-d | 1.746 c | 22.414 fg | 24.160 fg | 15.846 d-j |
| | | Humic acid | 95.02 ijk | 13.77 a-d | 2.101 c | 19.119 i-l | 21.220 h-l | 13.918 h-l |
| | | Calcium+poron | 92.5 jk | 13.39 a-d | 2.040 c | 18.62 jkl | 20.660 i-m | 13.55 j-m |
| | | Distilled water water | 90.5 k | 10.70 d-g | 2.487 abc | 17.833 klm | 20.320 j-o | 13.327 k-n |
| | 60% WR | Amino acid | 54.4 mn | 7.52 ghi | 2.393 abc | 16.907 lmn | 19.300 k-o | 16.878 b-g |
| | | Humic acid | 51.0 mn | 6.93 g-j | 2.424 abc | 16.906 lmn | 19.330 k-o | 16.904 b-g |
| | | Calcium+poron | 52.7 mn | 6.319 hij | 2.070 c | 15.671 mno | 17.741 no | 15.515 d-k |
| | | Distilled water water | 50.6 n | 4.35 ij | 4.604 a | 13.026 o | 17.630 o | 15.417 e-k |

Table 5. Effect of interaction among water requirement, genotypes and foliar spray treatments on yield and its components of tomato plants during the summer seasons of 2021.

| Genotypes | % water requirement | Foliar application | Average fruit weight(g) | Early yield kg/ plant | Un marketable yield (t/ fed) | Marketable yield (t/ fed) | Total yield (t/ fed) | WUE (kg/m ³) |
|--------------|---------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|
| | | | | | | | | |
| Aliaa 123 | 100% WR | Amino acid | 126.4 a | 16.39 a | 1.704 f-j | 29.666 a | 31.37 a | 15.982 b-i |
| | | Humic acid | 111.8 cd | 16.37 a | 1.724 e-j | 27.926 abc | 29.65 abc | 15.105 d-l |
| | | Calcium+poron | 111.4 cd | 15.38 a | 1.360 ij | 27.340 bcd | 28.70 b-e | 14.621 e-m |
| | | Distilled water | 110.5 cd | 10.83 bc | 2.200 d-h | 25.980 cde | 28.18 b-f | 14.356 f-m |
| | 80% WR | Amino acid | 105.5 d | 15.46 a | 1.878 e-j | 25.792 def | 27.67 c-f | 17.621 abc |
| | | Humic acid | 93.9 ef | 14.98 a | 1.826 e-j | 25.204 efg | 27.03 d-g | 17.213 a-d |
| | | Calcium+poron | 86.4 ghi | 14.39 a | 1.781 e-j | 23.769 fgh | 25.55 ghi | 16.271 a-g |
| | | Distilled water | 85.9 ghi | 8.21 cde | 2.185 d-h | 22.485 hij | 24.67 hij | 15.710 b-i |
| | 60% WR | Amino acid | 62.4 k | 8.16 cde | 2.426 c-g | 17.064 no | 19.49 no | 16.549 a-f |
| | | Humic acid | 62.1 k | 7.60 de | 2.373 c-g | 15.957 op | 18.33 op | 15.564 c-j |
| | | Calcium+poron | 59.0 kl | 7.17 def | 1.823 e-j | 15.347 opq | 17.17 pqr | 14.579 e-m |
| | | Distilled water | 58.0 klm | 4.00 f | 3.331 a | 13.439 qr | 16.77 p-s | 14.239 f-m |
| Arwa | 100% WR | Amino acid | 120.7 ab | 16.33 a | 1.738 e-j | 28.242 ab | 29.98 ab | 15.274 c-k |
| | | Humic acid | 116.6 bc | 16.26 a | 1.538 hij | 27.272 bcd | 28.81 bcd | 14.677 e-m |
| | | Calcium+poron | 106.4 d | 15.53 a | 1.247 j | 25.913 cde | 27.16 d-g | 13.837 g-o |
| | | Distilled water | 105.0 d | 9.81 cd | 2.889 a-d | 23.791 fgh | 26.68 e-h | 13.592 h-o |
| | 80% WR | Amino acid | 94.8 e | 14.94 a | 1.775 e-j | 26.795 b-e | 28.57 b-f | 18.194 ab |
| | | Humic acid | 86.6 ghi | 14.96 a | 1.627 g-j | 24.953 efg | 26.58 fgh | 16.927 a-e |
| | | Calcium+poron | 83.6 g-j | 13.84 ab | 1.366 ij | 23.774 fgh | 25.14 ghi | 16.010 b-h |
| | | Distilled water | 83.1 g-j | 7.00 def | 3.070 abc | 21.670 i-l | 24.74 hij | 15.755 b-i |
| | 60% WR | Amino acid | 57.1 k-n | 8.08 cde | 2.335 c-h | 19.705 lm | 22.04 klm | 18.714 a |
| | | Humic acid | 54.3 l-o | 8.08 cde | 2.516 b-e | 15.564 op | 18.08 op | 15.352 c-k |
| | | Calcium+poron | 51.5 m-p | 7.10 def | 1.699 f-j | 15.661 op | 17.36 pq | 14.74 d-l |
| | | Distilled water | 50.5 nop | 5.63 ef | 3.523 a | 13.347 qr | 16.87 p-s | 14.324 f-m |
| Super strain | 100% WR | Amino acid | 89.4 efg | 15.31 a | 2.175 d-h | 23.445 ghi | 25.62 ghi | 13.052 k-o |
| | | Humic acid | 87.4 fgh | 15.08 a | 2.31 c-h | 21.680 i-l | 23.99 ijk | 12.222 mno |
| | | Calcium+poron | 85.3 g-j | 14.61 a | 1.982 e-j | 20.858 j-m | 22.84 jkl | 11.636 no |
| | | Distilled water | 85.9 ghi | 7.10 def | 3.475 a | 18.995 mn | 22.47 klm | 11.447 o |
| | 80% WR | Amino acid | 85.9 ghi | 14.29 a | 2.109 d-i | 21.831 h-k | 23.94 ijk | 15.245 c-k |
| | | Humic acid | 78.8 j | 13.77 ab | 2.121 d-i | 20.099 klm | 22.22 klm | 14.15 f-m |
| | | Calcium+poron | 80.8 hij | 13.39 ab | 1.787 e-j | 19.753 lm | 21.54 lm | 13.717 h-o |
| | | Distilled water | 80.1 ij | 6.71 def | 3.295 ab | 17.275 no | 20.57 mn | 13.099 j-o |
| | 60% WR | Amino acid | 48.2 op | 7.52 de | 2.341 c-h | 14.269 pq | 16.61 p-s | 14.103 f-n |
| | | Humic acid | 47.2 p | 6.93 def | 2.494 b-f | 13.386 qr | 15.88 qrs | 13.484 i-o |
| | | Calcium+poron | 46.1 p | 6.31 ef | 1.922 e-j | 13.378 qr | 15.30 rs | 12.991 k-o |
| | | Distilled water | 45.6 p | 5.35 ef | 3.352 a | 11.588 r | 14.94 s | 12.685 l-o |

3.2. Fruit chemical constituents

Effect of genotypes

Results presented in Table (6) show that the three cultivars recorded comparable TSS contents in fruits. Alia 123 and Arwa exhibited the highest content of vitamin C in the second season only. The highest acidity was found in Super strain B in the second growing season and also recorded the highest content of lycopoin in the first growing season

Effect of water requirement

By decreasing the level of irrigation from 100 to 80 and 60%, the TSS, acidity and lycopoin in fruits increased while the fruit content in vitamin C decreased in the two seasons of study. Among of plant antioxidants, ascorbic acid (Vitamin C) is amajor antioxidant playing a vital role in protecting against various environmental abiotic stresses (Venkatesh&Park 2014). This increase could be a result of the oxidative stress- induced formation of reactive oxygen species (ROS), where lycopene and B-carotene could also contribute to antioxidant defense mechanisms in fruits

Effect of foliar spray treatments

Foliar application with amino, humic or calcium+boron resulted in the highest values of TSS and vitamin C while decreased acidity versus spray with deionized water. Spraying plants with amino recorded positive results in lycopoin versus deionized water in the first growing season

Effect of the interaction

Data in Tables (7 & 8) it appears that irrigation with 60% of the WR with the foliar application of any of the used foliar sprays i.e. amino, humic and calcium+boron on any of the used cultivars resulted the highest increases in TSS in fruits. The same trend was found with the 100% of WR on vitamin C. The highest acidity was found with 60% of WR with calcium+boron or deionized water as a spray on superstream B with significant variations in the second growing season. There was no definite trend recorded for lecoben pigment in fruits among the three factors of study (irrigation level × cultivar × foliar application).

Table 6. Effect of genotypes, water requirement or foliar spray treatments on fruit chemical constituents of tomato plants during the summer seasons of 2020 & 2021.

| Characteristics Treatments | T.S.S (%) | V.C (mg/100g) | Acidity (%) | Lycopoin (mg/100g.f.w) | T.S.S (%) | V.C (mg/100g) | Acidity (%) | Lycopoin (mg/100g.f.w) |
|--------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------|
| | The first Seasons (2020) | | | | The second season(2021) | | | |
| Genotypes | | | | | | | | |
| Aliaa 123 | 4.192 A | 26.95 A | 1.528 A | 4.967 C | 4.811 A | 29.28 A | 1.353 B | 5.783 A |
| Arwa | 4.292 A | 27.11 A | 1.631 A | 5.550 B | 4.678 A | 28.64AB | 1.375 B | 5.539 A |
| Super strain | 4.103 A | 27.38 A | 1.661 A | 6.067 A | 4.764 A | 27.56 B | 1.603 A | 5.261 B |
| Water requirements (WR) | | | | | | | | |
| 100% WR | 3.706 C | 31.25 A | 1.269 C | 4.878 C | 3.911 C | 32.96 A | 0.994 C | 4.967 C |
| 80% WR | 4.158 B | 24.78 B | 1.531 B | 5.694 B | 4.742 B | 28.77 B | 1.497 B | 5.550 B |
| 60% WR | 4.722 A | 25.41 B | 2.019 A | 6.164 A | 5.600A | 23.77 C | 1.839 A | 6.067 A |
| Foliar application | | | | | | | | |
| Amino acid | 4.448 A | 28.48 A | 1.426 C | 5.841 A | 5.063 A | 31.01 A | 1.315 C | 5.652 A |
| Humic acid | 4.219AB | 27.97 A | 1.556BC | 5.596 AB | 4.919AB | 29.43AB | 1.400BC | 5.641 A |
| Calcium+poron | 4.237AB | 26.87 B | 1.674AB | 5.496 AB | 4.578BC | 27.61 BC | 1.470 B | 5.433 A |
| Distilled water | 3.878 B | 25.27 C | 1.770 A | 5.381 B | 4.444 C | 25.94 C | 1.589 A | 5.385 A |

Table 7. Effect of the third order interaction between tomato water requirements, genotypes and foliar application level treatments on chemical fruit characters in tomato plant during 2020 seasons.

| Genotypes | Water requirements | Foliar application | T.S.S (%) | V.C | Acidity | Lycopene | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| | | | | (mg/100g) | (%) | (mg/100f.w) | |
| The first Seasons (2020) | | | | | | | |
| Aliaa 123 | 100% water requirements | Amino acid | 3.867 g-l | 32.40 ab | 0.9333 i | 5.733 f-j | |
| | | Humic acid | 3.633 j-m | 31.87 abc | 1.100 hi | 5.533 f-l | |
| | | Calcium+poron | 3.533 klm | 31.73 abc | 1.200 f-i | 5.100 k-p | |
| | 80% water requirements | Distilled water | 3.300 lm | 31.10 a-d | 1.267 f-i | 5.200 i-o | |
| | | Amino acid | 4.500 b-g | 25.50 efg | 1.300 f-i | 6.067 d-g | |
| | | Humic acid | 4.067 f-k | 25.00 efg | 1.433 f-h | 5.867 e-h | |
| | 60% water requirements | Calcium+poron | 4.433 b-g | 24.53 efg | 1.500 efg | 5.967 efg | |
| | | Distilled water | 3.867 g-l | 22.43 g | 1.567 c-f | 5.700 f-k | |
| | | Amino acid | 5.167 a | 26.07 d-g | 1.933abc | 6.400 a-e | |
| | Arwa | 100% water requirements | Humic acid | 4.967 abc | 25.40 efg | 1.900 bcd | 6.367 b-e |
| | | | Calcium+poron | 4.767 a-e | 24.53 efg | 2.100 ab | 5.967 efg |
| | | | Distilled water | 4.200 e-k | 22.87 g | 2.100 ab | 7.000 a |
| 80% water requirements | | Amino acid | 4.100 f-k | 32.97 a | 1.000 i | 5.067 l-p | |
| | | Humic acid | 3.867 g-l | 32.43 ab | 1.167 ghi | 4.633 opq | |
| | | Calcium+poron | 3.767 h-m | 29.53 a-f | 1.433 fgh | 5.133 j-o | |
| 60% water requirements | | Distilled water | 3.633 j-m | 24.97 efg | 1.567 c-f | 4.700 n-q | |
| | | Amino acid | 4.400 c-h | 26.10 d-g | 1.433 fgh | 6.600 a-d | |
| | | Humic acid | 4.200 e-j | 25.30 efg | 1.567 c-f | 6.133 c-f | |
| Super strain | | 100% water requirements | Calcium+poron | 4.200 e-j | 25.07 efg | 1.567 c-f | 5.700 f-k |
| | | | Distilled water | 3.767h-m | 24.83 efg | 1.567 c-f | 5.267 h-n |
| | | | Amino acid | 5.067 ab | 27.10 c-g | 1.833 b-e | 6.967 ab |
| | 80% water requirements | Humic acid | 4.867 a-d | 27.00 c-g | 2.067 ab | 6.700 abc | |
| | | Calcium+poron | 4.867 a-d | 25.20 efg | 2.067 ab | 5.933 efg | |
| | | Distilled water | 4.767a-e | 24.77 efg | 2.300 a | 5.800 e-i | |
| | 60% water requirements | Amino acid | 4.200 e-j | 33.43 a | 1.167 ghi | 3.933 r | |
| | | Humic acid | 3.733 i-m | 33.30 a | 1.300 f-i | 4.133 qr | |
| | | Calcium+poron | 3.633 i-m | 32.07 abc | 1.567 c-f | 4.867 m-p | |
| | Super strain | 100% water requirements | Distilled water | 3.200 m | 29.20 a-f | 1.533 d-g | 4.500 pqr |
| | | | Amino acid | 4.100 f-k | 25.53 efg | 1.400 fgh | 5.833 e-h |
| | | | Humic acid | 4.100 f-k | 24.57 efg | 1.567 c-f | 5.467 g-m |
| 80% water requirements | | Calcium+poron | 4.400 c-h | 24.30 efg | 1.533 d-g | 4.933 l-p | |
| | | Distilled water | 3.867 g-l | 24.20 fg | 1.933 abc | 4.800 nop | |
| | | Amino acid | 4.633 a-f | 27.20 b-g | 1.833 b-e | 5.967 efg | |
| 60% water requirements | | Humic acid | 4.533 a-f | 26.83 c-g | 1.900 bcd | 5.533 f-l | |
| | | Calcium+poron | 4.533 a-f | 24.87 efg | 2.100 ab | 5.867 e-h | |
| | | Distilled water | 4.300 d-i | 23.07 g | 2.100 ab | 5.467 g-m | |

Table 8. Effect of the third order interaction between tomato water requirements, genotypes and foliar application level treatments on chemical fruit characters in tomato plant during 2021 seasons.

| Genotypes | Water requirements | Foliar application | T.S.S | V.C | Acidity | Lycopene |
|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|-------------|
| | | | (%) | (mg/100g) | (%) | (mg/100f.w) |
| The second season(2021) | | | | | | |
| Aliaa 123 | 100% water requirements | Amino acid | 4.300 h-o | 34.93 ab | 0.700 q | 5.500 c-h |
| | | Humic acid | 4.533 f-m | 34.40 a-d | 0.800 pq | 5.633 b-g |
| | | Calcium+poron | 3.633mno | 32.40 b-g | 0.933nop | 5.133 f-j |
| | 80% water requirements | Distilled water | 3.867 k-o | 31.50 e-h | 1.067 no | 4.667 ij |
| | | Amino acid | 5.200 b-h | 32.10 c-h | 1.400 jkl | 6.200 abc |
| | | Humic acid | 4.867 c-j | 30.67 f-i | 1.400 jkl | 6.100 a-d |
| | 80% water requirements | Calcium+poron | 4.400 g-n | 29.53 h-l | 1.400 jkl | 5.733 a-g |
| | | Distilled water | 4.633 e-l | 27.73 j-m | 1.600 e-j | 5.633 b-g |
| | | Amino acid | 5.667 a-d | 27.10 klm | 1.667 d-h | 6.267 ab |
| | 80% water requirements | Humic acid | 5.667 a-d | 25.10 mno | 1.767 c-f | 6.200 abc |
| | | Calcium+poron | 5.867 ab | 23.87 op | 1.733 c-f | 6.300 ab |
| | | Distilled water | 5.100 b-h | 22.07 pqr | 1.767 c-f | 6.033 a-e |
| Arwa | 100% water requirements | Amino acid | 4.300 h-o | 35.30 a | 0.700 q | 4.833 hij |
| | | Humic acid | 4.067 i-o | 34.20 a-e | 0.866opq | 5.233 f-i |
| | | Calcium+poron | 3.833 l-o | 32.73 a-f | 0.800 pq | 5.300 e-i |
| | 80% water requirements | Distilled water | 3.400 o | 30.40 f-j | 1.10 mn | 4.700 ij |
| | | Amino acid | 4.967 b-i | 31.77 d-h | 1.367 kl | 5.000 g-j |
| | | Humic acid | 4.767 d-k | 28.67 i-l | 1.433 ijkl | 5.300 e-i |
| | 80% water requirements | Calcium+poron | 4.433 g-n | 27.07 klm | 1.50 g-l | 5.167 f-j |
| | | Distilled water | 4.300 h-o | 25.40 mno | 1.567 f-k | 6.100 a-d |
| | | Amino acid | 5.667 a-d | 27.20 klm | 1.767 c-f | 6.133 abc |
| | 60% water requirements | Humic acid | 5.767 abc | 25.73 mno | 1.733 c-f | 6.233 abc |
| | | Calcium+poron | 5.433 a-f | 24.20 nop | 1.8 cde | 6.200 abc |
| | | Distilled water | 5.200 b-h | 21.07 qr | 1.867 cd | 6.267 ab |
| Super strain | 100% water requirements | Amino acid | 3.967 j-o | 34.53 abc | 1.067 no | 5.033 g-j |
| | | Humic acid | 3.967 j-o | 34.07 a-e | 1.10 mn | 4.633 ij |
| | | Calcium+poron | 3.533 no | 31.30 f-i | 1.300 lm | 4.467 j |
| | 80% water requirements | Distilled water | 3.533 no | 29.73 g-k | 1.50 g-l | 4.467 j |
| | | Amino acid | 5.300 a-g | 30.83 f-i | 1.467 h-l | 5.500 c-h |
| | | Humic acid | 4.967 b-i | 28.73 i-l | 1.567 f-k | 5.633 b-g |
| | 80% water requirements | Calcium+poron | 4.533 f-m | 26.87 lmn | 1.633 e-i | 5.367 d-i |
| | | Distilled water | 4.533 f-m | 25.83 mno | 1.633 e-i | 4.867 hij |
| | | Amino acid | 6.200 a | 25.30 mno | 1.700 d-g | 6.400 a |
| | 60% water requirements | Humic acid | 5.667 a-d | 23.30 opq | 1.933 bc | 5.800 a-f |
| | | Calcium+poron | 5.533 a-e | 20.53 r | 2.133 ab | 5.233 f-i |
| | | Distilled water | 5.433 a-f | 19.73 r | 2.200 a | 5.733 a-g |

4. CONCLUSION

It could be concluded that in summer season, tomato plants cv. Alia 123 F1 responded better when sprayed with Amino power® (0.5 cm³/l) three times at 15 days intervals starting 30 days after transplanting and irrigated with 80% of water requirements. Such treatments induced the best results regarding total, marketable yield and water use efficiency as well as fruit quality of tomato when grown under drip irrigation systems in heavy clay soil.

5. REFERENCES

- A.O.A.C. (1990).** Association of official analytical chemists. Official methods of analysis. 15th ed. Washington D.C., USA.
- Al- Omran A.M., Al-harbi A.R., Wahb- Allah M.A., Nadeem M., Al-Eter A. (2010).** Impact of irrigation water quality, irrigation system, irrigation rates and soil amendements on tomato production in sandy calcareous soil. *Turk. J. Agric.*, (34): 59-73.
- Celebi M. (2014).** The effect of water stress on tomato under different emitter discharges and semiarid climate condition. *Bulg. J. Agric. Sci.*, Vol. (20): 1151-1157.
- Cimrin K.M., Yilmaz I. (2005).** Humic acid applications to lettuce do not improve yield but do improve phosphorus availability. *Acta Agriculturae Scandinavica, Section B, Soil and Plant Science*, 55, 58_63.
- Dobson H., Cooper J., Manyangirirwa W., Karuma J., Chiimba W. (2002).** Integrated vegetable Pest Management: safe and sustainable protection of smallscale brassicas and tomatoes, NRI, university of Greenwich, Chatman Maritime, Kent ME 4 4TB, UK., 179pp
- Gomez K.A. Gomez A.A. (1984).** Statistical procedures for agricultural research (2 ed.). John Wiley and sons, NewYork, 680p
- Hamdi G.J. (2017).** Effect of perlite in reducing water stress for three genotypes of tomato. M.Sc. Thesis. Baqubah, Iraq: College of Agriculture, University of Diyala.
- Hildebrandt T.M., Nunes Nesi A., Araujo W.L., Braun H.P. (2015).** Amino acid catabolism in plants. *Molecular Plant*, 8: 1563–1579.
- Howell T.A., Cuenca R.H., Solomon K.H. (1990).** Crop yield response. In: Hoffman, G.J., T.A. and K.H. Solomon. (Eds.), *Management of farm irrigation systems*, American Society of Agricultural Engineers, (ASAE), 93-122.
- Jadhav P.B., Saravaiya S.N., Wakchaure S.S., Tekale G.S., Patil N.B., Dekhane S.S., Patel D.J. (2014).** influence of foliar application of micronutrients on tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill.) CV. “GUJARAT TOMATO 2” *International Journal of Development Research*, 4(8): 1539-1542.
- Lucini L., Roupheal Y., Cardarelli M., Canaguier R., Kumar P., Colla G. (2015).** The effect of a plant-derived biostimulant on metabolic profiling and crop performance of lettuce grown under saline conditions. *Sci. Hort.* 182, 124–133. doi: 10.1016/j.scienta.2014.11.022.
- Marschner H. (1995).** *Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants*. 2nd Edn., Academic Press td., London, UK., ISBN-13: 978-0124735439, Pages: 889.
- Moeys J. (2016).** The soil texture wizard: R-functions for plotting, classifying transforming and exploring soil texture data. *Swedish Univ. of Agric. Sci., Uppsala, Sweden*.
- Mutale-Joan C., Redouane B., Najib E., Yassine K., Lyamlouli K., Laila S. (2020).** Screening of microalgae liquid extracts for their bio stimulant properties on plant growth, nutrient uptake and metabolite profile of *Solanum lycopersicum* L. *Sci. Rep.* 10:1. doi: 10.1038/s41598-020-59840-4.
- Nuruddin M.M., Madramootoo C.A., Doods G.T. (2001).** Effects of water stress at different growth stages on greenhouse tomato yield and quality. *American Society of Horticultural Science* (abstract).
- Rai V.K. (2002).** Role of amino acids in plant responses to stress. *Biologia Plantarum*, 45, 4: 487.
- Ravelo-Pérez L.M., Hernández-Borges J., Rodríguez-Delgado M.A., Borges-Miquel T. (2008).** Spectrophotometric analysis of lycopene in tomatoes and watermelons: a practical class. *Chem. Educ.* 13:11–13
- Saure M. (2014).** Why calcium deficiency is not the cause of blossom-end rot in tomato and pepper fruit: a reappraisal. *Scientia Horticulturae*, v. 174, n. 1, p. 65-89, 2014.
- Serenella N., Pizzeghello D., Muscolob A., Vianello A. (2002).** Physiological effects of humic substances on higher plants. *Soil Biology & Biochemistry*, 34, 1527_15
- Shahein M.M., Abuarab M.E., Hassan A.M. (2012).** Effects of regulated deficit irrigation and phosphorus fertilizers on water use efficiency, yield and total soluble solids of tomato. *American- Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci.*, Vol. 12 (10): 1295-1304.
- Shamsul, H., A.H. Syed, F. Qazi, and A. Agil, (2008).** Growth of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*) in response to salicylic acid under water stress. *Journal of plant interactions*, 3(4), 297-304.

- Sidhu M.K., Raturi H.Ch., Kachwaya D.S., Sharma A. (2019).** Role of micronutrients in vegetable production: A review. *Journal of Pharmacognosy and Phytochemistry*, SP1: 8(1): 332-340.
- Singh H.M., Tiwari J.K. (2013).** Impact of micronutrient spray on growth, yield and quality of tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum* Mill). *Hort. Flora. Res. Spectrum*. 2(1): 87-89.
- Sivakumar R.S. Srividhya (2016).** Impact of drought on flowering , yield and quality parameters in diverse genotypes of tomato . *Adv. Hort. Sci.*, 30(1): 3-11.
- Smit J.N., Combrink N.J.J. (2005).** Pollination and yield of winter-grown greenhouse tomatoes as affected by boron nutrition, cluster vibration and relative humidity. *South Afr. J. Plant Soil*. 22: 110–115.
- Suzuki K. (2003).** Localization of calcium in the pericarp cells of tomato fruits during the development of blossomend rot. *Protoplasma*, v. 222, n. 3, p. 149-156, 2003.
- Uchida R. (2000).** Essential nutrients for plant growth: Nutrient functions and deficiency symptoms. In "Plant Nutrient Management in Hawaii's Soils, Approaches for Tropical and Subtropical Agriculture", J.A. Silva and R. Uchida (Eds.), College of Tropical Agriculture and Human Resources, University of Hawaii at Manoa.
- Venkatesh J., Park S.W. (2014).** Role of L-ascorbate in alleviating abiotic stresses in crop plants. *J. Bota. Studies*. 55(38): 1-19.
- White P. (2001).** The pathways of calcium movement to the xylem. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, v. 52, n. 358, p. 891-899.
- Yildirim E. (2007).** Foliar and soil fertilization of humic acid affect productivity and quality of tomato. *J. Acta Agr. Scandinavica Sction B- Soil and plant Sci.*, Vol. (57): 182-186.

الملخص العربي

تأثير الإجهاد المائي والرش الورقي ببعض المنشطات علي الإنتاجية وجوده الثمار وكفاءة استخدام مياه الري لبعض اصناف الطماطم

زينب إبراهيم عرب، نادية سعد عبدالرزاق شفشق، مهران مختار النجار وعبدالحكيم سعد شمس

قسم البساتين، كلية الزراعة بمشتر، جامعه بنها، مصر.

أجريت تجربته حقلية خلال الموسمين الصيفي ٢٠٢٠ و ٢٠٢١ في المزرعة البحثية بكلية الزراعة جامعه بنها- مصر، لدراسة تأثير بعض الطرز الوراثية للطماطم مثل عاليًا ١٢٣ وأروي والصنف سوبر إسترين بي بنقص المياه و استخدام الرش ببعض المنشطات الحيوية (الاحماض الامينية و الهيومك والكالسيوم+ بورون) والتفاعل بينهم علي المحصول وصفات الجوده وكفاءة استخدام مياه الري لنباتات الطماطم المنزرعة تحت ظروف الري بالتنقيط في التربه الطينية.

أوضحت النتائج ان إعطاء النبات ٨٠% من إحتياجاتها المائية مع الرش بالاحماض الأمينية مع الهجين عاليًا ١٢٣ أعطي تفوق ملحوظ في المحصول المبكر المحصول التسويقي والمحصول الكلي خلال الموسم الثاني و أعلى كفاءه للإستخدام المياه في الموسم الأول. إستخدام مستوي الري ٦٠% من الإحتياج المائي والرش بأي من مركبات الرش ولكنها حسنت من نسبة المواد الصلبه الذائبه مع أي من الطرز الثلاثه ونسبه الحموضه عند الرش بالكالسيوم أو الماء المقطر علي الصنف سوبر إسترين بي . كما حدثت زياده في محتوى الثمار من فيتامين سي عند الري ب ١٠٠% من الإحتياجات المائية مع الطرز الثلاثه (عاليًا ١٢٣ - أروي - سوبر إسترين بي) والرش بأي من المركبات (الاحماض الامينية - الهيومك - الكالسيوم بورو).

الكلمات المفتاحية: الطماطم- نقص المياه- الطرز الوراثية- المنشطات الحيوية- كفاءة استخدام مياه الري