Bean Yield and Soil Parameters as Response to Application of Biogas Residues and Ammonium Nitrate under Different Water Requirements

Mostafa Abd-Eladl, Sara Fouda^{*}, and Nesreen H. Abou-Baker^{**}

Soils, Water and Environment Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center (ARC), Giza, ^{*}Soil Science Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Zagazig University, 44519 and ^{**}Soils and Water Use Department, National Research Centre, El Behoos St. 12311, Dokki, Cairo, Egypt.

> ANAEROBIC digestion is a useful way to treat organic waste matter, resulting in biogas and residue. Two field experiments were carried out for a sandy loam soil under drip irrigation system using faba bean (Vicia faba L.) during 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 seasons at Ismailia Governorate to evaluate the effect of biogas residue (BR) and inorganic fertilizer as ammonium nitrate (AN) individually or in combination with different rates of each other fertilizers and irrigation levels on faba bean production, nutrients uptake and soil fertility after two season of cultivation. The experiment includes two factors; 1st one was N-application with 6 treatments as follows: (1) 100% of N rate as BR, (2) 100% as AN, (3) 75% BR+25% AN, (4) 50% BR + 50 % AN, (5) 25% BR + 75% AN and (6) non-treated (control). The second factor was irrigation levels as follows: 100% from water requirement (WR) and 75% of WR. Main effects of fertilization showed that, the highest plant dry weight, 100- seed weight, seed yield were obtained with 100% of BR followed by 25% AN + 75% BR and lowest plant dry weight was found with unfertilized treatment in both seasons. Similar trend occurred with available N, P and K remaining in soil at harvest. Significant positive correlation was found between soil available N, P and K contents and seed N, P and K. Application of biogas residues is of great benefit to plant and increases soil fertility.

> Keywords: Biogas residues, Water requirement, Faba bean, Yield, Macronutrients availability, Soil fertility.

Faba bean (*Vicia faba* L.) is the most important legumes crop in Egypt. It has become one of its strategic crops. It is important for soil fertility, human nutrition, animal feeding and industry purposes (Sharaan *et al.*, 2004). Soil fertility in Egypt is negatively affected by crop intensification and imbalance use of chemical fertilizers with little or no addition of organic fertilizers. Organic fertilizers including animal manure can provide crops with considerable portions of plant needs of N and P (MØller *et al.*, 2007 and Bauer *et al.*, 2009).

MOSTAFA ABD-ELADL et al.

The biogas produces digested organic matter which is used as compost providing plant nutrients such as N, P and K beside other nutrients (Möller & Müller, 2012 and Bachmann *et al.*, 2011). Biogas residues include solid as well as liquid materials. The organic materials used in Egypt as raw materials for biogas plant are mainly cattle and poultry manure mixed with crop residues. Digestion process of biogas produces materials containing high contents of N. The produced material also contains other macro- and micronutrients important for plant growth. Raw undigested cattle slurry materials have lower pH value, higher NH₄⁺-N as well as C:N ratio compared with digested cattle slurry (Gutser *et al.*, 1987, Asmus *et al.*, 1988 and Möller *et al.*, 2008). It was reported that N uptake by plant from the biogas slurry exceeded that from the unfermented slurry by about 10 to 20%. It is reported that, a higher yield and N uptake after the application of the digested than undigested materials can be occurred (De Boer, 2008).

Irrigation plays an important role in water utilization and consequently on crop yield and quality. Plant height, biological stover and seed yield of bean plants were decreased with decreasing irrigation water rate (Abou-Baker *et al.*, 2012). Abdel-Mawgoud (2006) tested the impact of three irrigation levels (80, 100 and 120 % of class A-pan) on the growth and yield of green bean. Vegetative growth parameters as well as yield components responded positively with increasing the irrigation level. Plant height, number of leaves and fresh and dry weights were increased with increasing irrigation rate.

Therefore, the objective of the present study was to evaluate the integrated effect of biogas residues and inorganic fertilizer individually or in combination as well as irrigation levels on faba bean production, nutrient uptake and soil fertility after two seasons of cultivation.

Materials and Methods

Soil and growth conditions

Two field experiments were conducted at a private farm $(30 \circ 22^{\circ} 02.48^{\circ} N \text{ and } 31 \circ 53^{\circ} 01.19^{\circ} \text{ E})$ in Ismailia Governorate , Egypt during winter seasons 2014/2015 and 2015/2016 to study the response of faba bean (*Vicia faba* L. cv. Giza 716) to application of nitrogen fertilizer from two sources, *i.e.*, ammonium nitrate, (AN) and biogas residue, (BR) at different rates, *i.e.*, 0, 25, 50, 75 and 100 kg N fed⁻¹ under two irrigation levels, *i.e.* 75 and 100% of water requirements (WR) on faba bean productivity and macronutrients content. Also, some soil properties after harvest were taken into consideration. A representative soil sample of the field was taken from 0 – 30 cm layer, air dried, crushed and sieved through a 2 mm sieve and analyzed for determining some physical and chemical properties of studied soil whose results are presented in Table 1 according to Page *et al.* (1982) and Klute (1986).

Egypt. J. Soil Sci. 56, No. 1 (2016)

314

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
Particle Size distribution (%)		Soluble cations and a	anions
Coarse sand	33.6	Ca ⁺⁺	13.6
Fine sand	39.9	Mg ⁺⁺	7.5
Silt	18.0	\mathbf{K}^+	7.9
Clay	8.5	Na^+	45.1
Textural class	Sandy loam	CO3	-
pH (1 : 2.5 soil : water)	8.1	HCO ₃ -	3.2
EC (Soil paste extraction)	7.5	Cl	65.5
		$SO_4^{}$	6.3
Available macronutrients (mg	g kg ⁻¹		
Ν	35.5		
Р	7.2		
K	111.6		

TABLE 1. Physical and chemical characterization of the investigated soil

Used fertilizers

Biogas residue was collected from biogas digester and provided from Moshtohor Research of Agriculture Centre. Cattle residue was used as raw material for fermentation substrates in biogas process. The main hydraulic retention time of the material in the fermenter ranged from about 40-60 day. All organic fertilizers were stored in closed vessels at a temperature of 2 °C. Before the start of the experiment, total N, NH₄⁺-N and NO₃⁻-N were determined in fresh sub samples of the residue using the Kjeldahl technique (Bremner and Mulvaney ,1982). Total P and K were analyzed according to Chapman & Pratt (1961) and Page *et al.* (1982), respectively. The value of pH was determined by pH meter after 1:10 dilution with distilled water. Table 2 shows properties of the BR used in the study.

 TABLE 2. Physical and chemical properties of biogas fertilizer obtained from anaerobic digestion of cattle manure

Properties	Value	Properties	Value
Moisture content (g kg ⁻¹)	219	Macronutrients	(g kg ⁻¹)
pH (1:10)	6.90	Total N	18.5
EC (dSm ⁻¹) of 1:5 extract	1.75	Total P	8.80
Bulk density (Mg m ⁻³)	0.35	Total K	9.20
Organic matter (g kg ⁻¹)	643		
C:N ratio	20.2	$NH_4 (mg kg^{-1})$	55.0
Ash $(g kg^{-1})$	357	$NO_3 (mg kg^{-1})$	18.0
Odor	-	Weed seeds	-

Experimental methods

Seeds of faba bean (*Vicia faba* L. cv. Giza 716) were supplied from Food Legumes Department, Field Crop Research Institute, Agriculture Research Center, Giza, Egypt. It's sown in November 20^{th} and 25^{th} in two seasons 2014/2015 and 2015/2016, respectively. The experiment treatments included actor A: N-fertilization, 6 treatments, *i.e.*, (1) no-fertilization, (2) 100% of N as biogas residue (100% BR), (3) 100% N as mineral form of ammonium nitrate, AN (100% AN), (4) (75% BR+25% AN), (5) (50% BR+50% AN) and (6) (25% BR+75% AN). Factor B includes 2 treatments, *i.e.*, irrigation levels: (1) 75% of water requirement (WR) and (2) 100% WR. Phosphorus fertilizer was added to all plots before sowing at a rate of 100 kg fed⁻¹ as superphosphate (68 g P kg⁻¹). Potassium sulphate (400 g K kg⁻¹) was applied as soil application at rate of 75 kg fed⁻¹ in two equal splits 21 and 45 days after sowing (DAS). Nitrogen fertilizer was added in the form of ammonium nitrate (330 g N kg⁻¹) in three equal splits, 21, 38 and 42, DAS. All agricultural practices for growing faba bean were done as recommended by the Ministry of Agriculture.

Water requirement was calculated by average 10 years of meteorological parameters using CROPWAT computer model (FAO, 1992), based on calculation using Penman Monteith equation and the Kc values illustrated in FAO-56 (Allen *et al.*, 1998) according to the formula; $\text{ETc} = \text{Kc} \times \text{ET}_0$, whereas: ETc = crop evapotranspiration in mm, $\text{ET}_0 = \text{potential evapotranspiration in mm/day}$ and Kc = crop coefficient.

At harvest, ten plants were taken randomly from each plot and tagged for yield assessment. Straw weight, seed weight (g plant-1) and 100 seed weigh were measured. In addition, the middle three rows of each plot were harvested, then seed yield (ton/ha) was estimated. Representative ten plants were taken and macronutrients content of seeds was determined in aliquots of digested solutions resulting from the digestion of seeds samples by a mixture of H2SO4 and HClO4 acids after drying in an oven at 65° C as described by Chapman & and Pratt (1961) and Jackson (1973).

Soil characteristics

After harvest, representative soil samples of the field were taken (0 - 30 cm) from each plot. Samples were analyzed for soil salinity (EC; in soil paste extract), soil acidity (pH; in 1: 2.5, *i.e.*, soil: water suspension), available N, P and K according to Page *et al.* (1982).

Statistical analysis

Results were statistically analyzed using MSTATC software. The ANOVA test was used to determine significantly ($p \le 0.01$ or $p \le 0.05$) treatment effect and least significant difference (LSD) at 0.05 probability level was applied (Gomez and Gomez, 1984).

Results and Discussion

Growth parameters

Plant parameters and traits of faba bean which were recorded after harvest show significant variation among treatments (Table 3). All trails increased by applying N in its various forms. The main effect shows that the highest values among the treatments which Egypt. J. Soil Sci. 56, No. 1 (2016)

316

received N regarding seed weight, seed yield and 100-seed weight were given by 100% BR. The main effect for the N-treatments (average of 2 seasons) shows that 100% BR gave increases of 120.5 for plant dry weight, 220% for seed weight plant⁻¹ and 223% for seed yield. The high WR level surpassed the 75% WR level. The main effect of irrigation levels (average of two seasons) showed that the 100% WR surpassed the 75% WR by 12.2% for plant dry weight, 59.5% for seed weight plant⁻¹ and 59.4% for seed yield. It is reported that, biogas residue leads to increase dry weight of shoots and roots and yield of Indian spinach (Hossain *et al.*, 2014). It is also found that, the application of cattle manure to various crops increased the growth parameters (Islam, 2006). It is also found that, organic manures have the ability to supply all nutrients required for crop growth and development (Parry *et al.*, 2005). Garg *et al.* (2005) reported that soil fertilization with biogas slurry generated from cattle manure improved the yield of wheat over non-modified controls.

Results of the current study indicated that application of BR solely or combined with the mineral source increased all growth parameter compared to 100% mineral source treatment. The effect of biogas residue in increasing crop yield was reported by Montemurro *et al.* (2008) who found that biogas residue increased yield of fodder crops.

With respect to the effect of irrigation levels on vegetative characters, results showed the most effective treatment was irrigation levels 100%. It gave the highest values of plant dry weight; seed weight per plant, 100 seed weight and seed yield. Similar results were recorded by Al-Suhaibani (2009) who reported that plants under higher water supply recorded higher number of leaves per plant and higher leaf area per plant. On the other hand, plants grown under water deficit conditions had less growth parameter. Similar results indicating negative effects caused by water stress on growth of faba beans were reported by Abdel-Mottaleb *et al.* (2000) and Ahmed *et al.* (2008). It is showed that, the reduction in water rate to 80% ETc reduced bean seed by 35.4 % compared with 100% Etc (Rasheed *et al.*, 2010). Hegab *et al.* (2014) found that high irrigation levels increased seed yield of faba bean.

Nitrogen, P and K uptake by bean seeds

Nitrogen uptake by seeds of non-fertilized was averaged 5.63 kg fed⁻¹ as a mean for the two growing seasons (Table 4). The highest N uptake occurred with BR under 100% WR giving a considerable increase averaged nearly nine folds. The 100% WR gave higher N uptake than the 75% WR. With an average of 33.7% over the two seasons, the patterns of P and K uptake were rather similar to that of N uptake. It is found that N uptake by ryegrass from biogas residue was comparable to that from inorganic N fertilizers (Gunnarasson *et al.*, 2010). Rubaek *et al.* (1996) also found that digested slurry increased N uptake compared with the undigested slurry and attributed this to the higher ammonia volatilization from latter source. It is also reported that, the residual effect of N increased with a decreasing short term N release from organic manure further soil microorganisms may have increased in the slurry treatment immobilizing N in their bodies (Gutser *et al.*, 2005). Kocar (2008) compared the fertilizer value of anaerobically digested cattle slurry with those of commercial organic and chemical fertilizers. Higher yields of safflower were obtained with biogas residue than with the commercial fertilizers.

			Plant dry we	ięhi (g)					Seed weig	ht gýp lant		
La contra c						Water requireme	unt (B)		10	10	- 10 - 10	
1 reaument (A)	%00T	75 %	Mean	100 %	75 %	Mean	100%	%5L	Mean	%00T	%5L	Mean
		First season			Second season			First season			second season	
Control	36.17 g	25.34h	30.26 D	23.07 e	26.37 e	2472 E	18.74 i	10.80 j	1477 E	19.24 j	4 61 ZI	15.71 E
100% BR	73.47 a	5473f	63.25 A	629a	53.1d	58.00 BC	61.15 a	33.49 h	47.32 A	<i>58.5</i> 7a	4L7b	50.17 A
100% AN	60.43 d	52.8 f	56.62 C	53.03 d	5L33d	52.18 D	5254h	27.32 h	39.93 C	52.I7 c	36.9g	4457 BC
25% AN+ 75% BR	69.07 h	53.03 f	6L05B	624a	60.6 ab	6150 A	57.70 c	32.33 f	45.01 B	56.70 c	40.2 g	48.46 B
50% AN+ 50% BR	65.67 c	542 f	59.93 B	57.53 bc	60.6 a	59.07 AB	55.42 d	30.19g	42.80 D	5460 d	39.1 h	46.88 C
75%AN+25% BR	63.17 c	57.67 e	60.42 B	5473 cd	5697 c	55.85 C	5207 d	20.27 g	40.67 D	53.62 e	37.8 i	45.71 D
Mean	61.16A	49.63 B		5228 A	51.49 Å		49.60 A	2723B		49.I5 A	34.6 B	
		e.	100 seed we	ięhi (g)					Seed yield	(ton ha')		2
Treatment (4)					Water I	equinement (B)						
	100%	75%	Mean	100%	75%	Mean	100%	75 %	Mean	300%	965L	Mean
		First season			Second season			First season	1.1		Second season	
Control	246 h	216g	23.1E	24.37 j	23.43 k	2.88 D	1.50 g	0.86 h	L18 E	154j	4860	126F
100% BR	8233 d	66.97 a	7465 A	8353 a	22.65 f	9.31 A	489 a	268 e	3.79 A	468 a	3.34f	401 A
100% AN	78.73 e	54.63 c	66.68 C	79.63 e	20.87 i	8.01 BC	420 d	2.18 f	3.19 D	417 i	295 i	356E
25% AN+ 75% BR	7427 f	6463 a	69.46 B	78.3b	2159g	894B	461b	1621	3.60 B	453b	322 g	3.88 B
50% AN+ 50% BR	73.87 f	60.37 b	67.12 C	75.73 c	2L4th	8 <i>5</i> 2 C	4.40 c	242 e	348 C	437 c	3.13 h	3.75 C
75 %AN+25 % BR	3 LL TL	58.53 c	65.15 D	T3.83 d	2132 i	8.12 C	4.17 c	234f	3.26 D	429 d	3.02 i	3.66 E
Mean	67.59 Å	5446B		67.59A	2188B		3.79 A	2.18 B		393 A	277 B	
* BR, biogas resid	tues and AN, amn	norium ritrate	8								2	

TABLE 3. Effect of different levels of biogas residues and AN under two levels of water requirements on fab a bean growth parameters and seed yield.

Egypt. J. Soil Sci. 56, No. 1 (2016)

*Different lower case letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p≤0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between water treatments p ≤ 0.05

Mean	Terminity Mean 100% 75% 310 Mean 100% 75% Control 3016 316 316 <				Nupta	ke (ton ha ⁻¹)	_				P up take) (ton ha ⁻¹)						
	Internet (i) 100% 75% Mean 100% 75% 100% 75% 100% 75% 100% 75% 2332 100% 101% 2335 2336	The second se						Water req	uirement (F	3)								
Image: first sector in the first sector in	Image: first state in the f	(W) IVAMIPAIT	100%	75%	Mean	100%	15%	Mean	100%	75%	Mean	100%	75%	Mean				
Control 399h 76g 579F 692h 402i 547E 099j 070D 096f 0.51g 0.316 100%6RR 3695a 131c 2503d 449a 2031d 3233d 538a 147h 343A 511a 355c 433A 100%6RR 2605a 16.20f 18.51E 32.68d 21.52 35.69f 32.13 35.75 433A 331a	Control 399 76 579 621 402 547 624 402 547 624 623 624 623 623 633 6147 353 114 355 433 100% <bik< td=""> 2693 2316 2316 2354 2315 2316 333 147 333 113 355 433 269% 1236 2364 2356 2374 333 147 365 2374 335 430 50% 1093 1844 1949 3636 2167 3324 2147 305 337 316 346 50% 1806 131 2167 3050 324 2147 305 336 2146 340 50% 1806 1366 2151 2036 324 2147 305 346 2136 346 75% 1806 1366 2151 2167 3267 386 23246 346</bik<>			First seaso	н		Second seaso	н		First season			Second seaso	Ħ				
100% BR 2695 a 231 c 2303 d 449 a 2973 d 373 d 511 a 335 c 433 d 100% AN 2073 d 1629 f 1831 E 3208 d 274 D 368 d 176 g 375 c 335 c 430 A 29% AN + 59% BR 2465 b 2351 E 433 b 3209 f 3328 B 45 b 247 f 366 c 340 f 366 c 340 f 355 c 430 A 366 a 355 c 430 A 366 a 356 c 340 A 366 a 356 c 340 A 366 a 346 A 366 a 374 B 346 A 366 a 356 a 346 A 366 a 346 A		Control	3.99 h	7.6 8	5.79 F	6.92 h	4.02 i	5.47 E	0.92 i	0.49 j	0.70 D	196 f	0.51 g	0.74D				
100% AN 2073 d 16.29 f 18.51 E 32.68 d 22.15 g 37.10 G 36.7 d 36.7 e 37.7 e 30.1 C 25% (M + 75% (M + 75% (M + 75%)) 246.5 b 22.56 d 23.6 f 33.5 c 33.5 c 43.0 A 50% (M + 50% (M + 50% (M + 50%)) 22.15 d 23.6 f 33.5 c 33.5 c 33.5 c 33.5 c 33.6 f 33.		100% BR	26.95 a	23.1 c	25.03 A	44.9 a	29.57 d	37.23 A	5.38 a	1.47 h	3.43 A	5.11 a	3.55 c	4.33 A				
25% 24% <th>25% 246% 246% 245% 345% 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 356 3575 366 3575 366 3575 366 356 3575 366 3575 366 3576 326 3276 3316 1006 7596 Mean 10066 7596 10066 7596 1058 10566 15816 10586</th> <th>100%AN</th> <th>20.73 d</th> <th>16.29 f</th> <th>18.51 E</th> <th>32.68 d</th> <th>22.15 g</th> <th>27.41 D</th> <th>3.68 d</th> <th>1.76 g</th> <th>2.72 C</th> <th>3.65 c</th> <th>2.37 e</th> <th>3.01 C</th>	25% 246% 246% 245% 345% 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 355 356 3575 366 3575 366 3575 366 356 3575 366 3575 366 3576 326 3276 3316 1006 7596 Mean 10066 7596 10066 7596 1058 10566 15816 10586	100%AN	20.73 d	16.29 f	18.51 E	32.68 d	22.15 g	27.41 D	3.68 d	1.76 g	2.72 C	3.65 c	2.37 e	3.01 C				
50% drV + 50% BR 2271 c 2034 d 2132 c 36.8 c 24.9 f 30.59 c 4.21 f 3.16 B 4.22 b 2.74 d 3.48 B 75% drV + 25% BR 20.33 d 18.44 e 19.49 D 36.46 c 24.27 f 30.36 c 39.2 d 2.14 F 3.48 B 75% drV + 25% BR 20.33 d 18.44 e 19.49 D 36.46 c 24.27 f 30.36 c 3.92 d 2.14 f 3.48 B 75% drV + 25% BR 18.06 B 75% Mean 21.67 B 3.77 A 1.73 B 2.324 c 3.41 C Treatment (A) Immov 75% Mean 100% 75% Mean 100% 75% Mean 100% 75% Mean 3.21 E 3.21 C 3.24 C 3.24 C Treatment (B) Immov 75% Mean 105 Mean 1.73 B 2.173 B 1.51 B Total BR 3.01 f 1.08 f 75% Mean 2.15 B 2.15 B 2.15 B 2.15 B Treatment (B) 100% R 15.94 f 2.15 B 1.12 B 2.15 B 2.15 B 2.15 B 2.15 B 2.1	50% 316 316 315 316 <th>250/aAN+ 750/aBR</th> <th>24.65 b</th> <th>22.56 c</th> <th>23.61 B</th> <th>41.35 b</th> <th>25.09 f</th> <th>33.22 B</th> <th>4.5 b</th> <th>2.42 e</th> <th>3.46 A</th> <th>5.06 a</th> <th>3.55 c</th> <th>4.30 A</th>	250/aAN+ 750/aBR	24.65 b	22.56 c	23.61 B	41.35 b	25.09 f	33.22 B	4.5 b	2.42 e	3.46 A	5.06 a	3.55 c	4.30 A				
75% 75% 8036 18,44e 19,49D 36,46c 24,37f 30,36C 32,46 3.14f 3.136c 2.43,46 3.14C 19,92A 18,06B \rightarrow 31,1A 21,67B \rightarrow 37,7A 1.73B 3.81A 2.43,46 3.14C First solution 31,4A 21,67B \rightarrow 37,7A 1.73B 3.81A 2.53B 3.14C Treatment(h) I00% 75% Mean 1.73B 1.73B 3.81A 2.53B 3.14C Treatment(f) 100% 75% Mean 1.73B 1.73B 3.81A 2.53B 3.14C Treatment(f) 100% 75% Mean 1.73B 1.73B 3.81A 3.81A 3.81A 100% 75% Mean 1.58B 1.94B 2.666 1.366 2.43 de 3.14C 100% 75% Mean 2.158 Mean 2.158 3.126 100% 1.54A 2.178 1.096e 1.58	750¢dN+25%0 BR 20.33 d 18.44 e 19.49 D 36.46 c 24.27 f 30.36 C 39.36 f 3.33 d 3.14 c	50% AN+ 50% BR	22.71 c	20.34 d	21.52 C	36.28 c	249 f	30.59 C	4.21 c	2.11 f	3.16 B	4.22 b	2.74 d	3.48 B				
I993A I806B 31A 21.67B 377A 173B 381A 252B First regulement(B) A $I = 0.06$ 7596 $Mean$ 2015 $381A$ $252B$ $252B$ First regulement(B) IO0% 7596 $Mean$ 100% 7596 $Mean$ IO0% 7596 $Mean$ 100% 7596 $Mean$ 2015 2016 $1281A$ IO0%0RR 2016 $1584A$ $2178a$ $1096e$ $1581A$ $215B$ I00%6RN 1036 $1591A$ $215B$ $215B$ $215B$ I00%6NN $1437c$ $683e$ $1066e$ $1581A$ $215B$ I00%6NN $1437c$ $681de$ $1302B$ $1700e$ $1128D$ I00%6NN $1748b$ $2178a$ $1996f$ $1128D$ I00%6NN 11376 $1330B$ $1700e$ $1128D$ I00%6NN $1148b$ 2076	19.93A18.06B33.1A21.67B3.77A1.73B3.81A2.52BTreatment (on ha ²)Mean100%75%Mean3.77A1.73B3.81A2.52BTreatment (D)75%Mean3.75%3.81A2.52B3.25BTenst requirement (B)To man100%75%Mean3.01C1.03%2.55%Mean3.01S2.55%3.00%1.25B3.01S3.02S3.02S3.02S3.02S3.02	75% AN+25% BR	20.53 d	18.44 e	19.49 D	36.46 c	24.27 f	30.36 C	3.92 d	2.14f	3.03 C	3.86 c	2.43 de	3.14 C				
Function in the intermettal state from intermettal intermettal state intermettal state intermettal state intermettal intermetal intermettal intermettal intermettal intermetta	K up take (ton ha ¹)Treatment (A)Water requirement (B)Mater requirement (B)IO0%75%MeanIO0%Treatment (B)Total3016109%75%MeanIO0%Second seasonMeanIO0%Second seasonMeanIO0%10.0%15.4421.7810.9%15.81IO0%B721.7810.9%15.81IO0%18.721.7811.28DIO0%13.7811.28DSecond seasonMeanSecond seasonMean25%Mean100%15.8114.8713.03B17.0611.58DSecond season11.28DSecond seasonSecond seasonSecond seasonSecond season100%13.7817.12819.6613.5814.87.07611.6613.58 <th <="" colspan="4" th=""><th></th><th>19.93A</th><th>18.06B</th><th></th><th>33.1A</th><th>21.67B</th><th></th><th>3.77A</th><th>1.73B</th><th></th><th>3.81A</th><th>2.52B</th><th></th></th>	<th></th> <th>19.93A</th> <th>18.06B</th> <th></th> <th>33.1A</th> <th>21.67B</th> <th></th> <th>3.77A</th> <th>1.73B</th> <th></th> <th>3.81A</th> <th>2.52B</th> <th></th>					19.93A	18.06B		33.1A	21.67B		3.77A	1.73B		3.81A	2.52B	
Water requirement (B) Treatment (A) Mater requirement (B) Mater requirement (B) IO00% Test ment (B) First season Mean Control 3015 Mean JO00% BR 3016 J100% Second season Mean JO00% BR 3016 J100% J154A 2178 a J158A JO00% BR 1303E J100% C J158B J00% BR J1303B J100% J1128D J00% ARM + 50% BR J1303B J1706 J135B J138 J1666 J157C J1436 J1436 J1436 J1436 J1436 J1436 J1436 J1436 J1436	Water requirement (B)Treatment (A)Water requirement (B)100%To 00%To 00%10.051.53.09.36.61.13.81100%BR 17.461.13.81.13.811.13.81100%1.13.781.13.811.13.815.9%1.13.381.13.811.13.781.13.951.13.58Mean1.13.811.13.58Mean1.13.811.13.58Mean1.13.811.13.58Mean1.13.811.13.58Mean1.13.811.13.58Mean1.13.58Mean1.13.811.13.58Mean1.13.811.13.58Mean1.13.811.13.58Mean1.13.81<th colspan="4</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Kupta</th> <th>ke (ton ha⁻¹)</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>				Kupta	ke (ton ha ⁻¹)												
Iteatment (A) 100% 75% Mean 100% 75% Mean First season Mean Second season Mean Second season Mean Control 3.01 f 1.08 g 2.05 D 3.00 g 1.59 h 2.15 E 100% BR 2.03 a 10.05 d 15.44 A 2.178 a 10.96 e 15.81 A 100% BR 2.03 a 10.51 d 15.44 A 2.178 a 10.96 e 15.81 A 26% AN + 75% BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 19.6 C 15.23 d 9.36 f 11.28 D 26% AN + 75% BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.9 6 b 9.6 f 14.1 B 26% AN + 25% BR 17.44 b 8.10 c 11.66 c 13.58 B 17.0 c 11.66 c 13.57 B 75% AN + 25% BR 14.48 c 7.07 c 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.57 C Mean 14.8 A 7.25 B 17.00 c 11.66 c 13.55 B *BR, biograst esidues send Ab, arm or intrate 14.8 A 8.87 B <	Iteatment (A)100%75%Mean75%MeanFirst seasonMeanSecond seasonMean $rist seasonMeanSecond seasonMean100% BR201 f10.8 g20.5 D3.00 g1.59 h2.15 E100% BR2083 a10.05 d15.44 A2.178 a10.96 e15.81 A100% BR2083 a10.05 d15.23 d9.36 f11.28 D25% ANH + 75% BR18.7 b9.9 d14.3 AB17.96 b9.67 f14.1 B26% ANH + 50% BR17.44 b8.61 d13.03 B17.96 b9.67 f14.1 B50% ANH + 50% BR14.48 c7.07 c10.70 c11.66 c13.55 B75% ANH + 55% BR14.48 c7.07 c10.70 c11.66 c13.55 B75% ANH + 25% BR14.88 c7.07 c10.77 c16.44 c9.98 f11.75 cMean14.88 c7.07 c10.77 c14.8 B8.87 B11.75 cMean14.88 c7.07 c14.8 a8.87 BMean14.8 c7.07 c14.8 a8.87 B* BR, biogas residues end AN, ammonium nitrate*14.7 b* BR, biogas reseletters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistical differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital le$	H			Water re) tuament (B)											
First season Mean Second season Mean Control 301f 108 g 205D 300 g 159 h 2.15 E 100% BR 301f 108 g 205D 300 g 159 h 2.15 E 100% BR 2083 a 10.5 d 15.4 A 2178 a 10.9 6 e 15.81 A 100% AN 14.37 c 6.83 e 10.6 C 15.23 d 9.36 f 11.28 D 25% AN+ 75% BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.96 b 9.67 f 14.1 B 50% AN+ 50% BR 17.4 b 8.61 de 13.03 B 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75% AN+ 25% BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 c 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8 A 7.25 B 7.07 e 10.78 d 8.87 B 11.75 C	First seasonMeanSecond seasonMeanControl $301f$ $108g$ $205D$ $300g$ $159h$ $215E$ $100%6BR$ $203a$ $1003d$ $154A$ $2178a$ $1096e$ $15.81A$ $100%6BR$ $203a$ $10.05d$ $15.4A$ $2178a$ $1096e$ $15.81A$ $100%6BR$ $203a$ $10.6C$ $15.23d$ $9.36f$ $11.28D$ $25%ANH + 59%BR$ $187b$ $9.9d$ $14.3AB$ $29.6d$ $11.28D$ $50%ANH + 50%BR$ $17.4b$ $8.61 de$ $15.76b$ $9.67f$ $14.1B$ $50%ANH + 50%BR$ $17.4b$ $8.61 de$ $12.03B$ $17.00c$ $11.66e$ $13.55B$ $75%ANH + 59%BR$ $14.48c$ $7.07e$ $11.66e$ $13.55B$ $11.75C$ 8.0000 $11.66e$ $11.75C$ $11.75C$ $11.75C$ Mean $14.8A$ $7.23B$ $17.00c$ $11.66e$ $11.75C$ Mean $14.8A$ $7.23B$ $11.75C$ $11.75C$ Mean $14.8A$ $7.23B$ $11.75C$ $11.75C$ Mean $14.8A$ $7.23B$ $11.88A$ $11.75C$ Mean $14.8A$ $7.23B$ $14.8A$ $8.87B$ $11.75C$ *BR, biogast residues and AN, ammonium nitrate.* $11.75C$ $11.75C$ *BR, biogast reselters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistical statistical differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistical d	lreatment (A)	100%	75 %	Mean	100%	75%	Mean										
Control 3.01 f 1.08 g 2.05 D 3.00 g 1.59 h 2.15 E 100% BR 2.083 a 10.05 d 15.44 A 21.78 a 10.96 e 15.81 A 100% AN 14.37 c 6.83 e 10.6C 15.23 d 9.36 f 11.28 D 25% AN+ 75% BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.96 b 9.67 f 14.1 B 50% AN+ 50% BR 17.4 b 8.61 de 13.03 B 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75% AN+ 25% BR 17.44 b 8.61 de 13.03 B 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75% AN+ 25% BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8 A 7.25 B 7.07 e 10.78 A 8.87 B 11.75 C	Control 301 f 108 g 205 D 300 g 159 h 2.15 E 100% BR 2083 a 10.6 d 15.44 A 2178 a 10.96 e 15.81 A 100% BR 2083 a 10.6 d 15.44 A 2178 a 10.96 e 15.81 A 25% AN 1437 b 6.83 e 10.6 C 15.23 d 9.67 f 14.1 B 50% AN 17.36 B 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.96 b 9.67 f 14.1 B 50% AN 17.36 BR 17.41 b 8.61 d 13.03 B 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75% AN 17.48 b 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.88 7 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C * BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium nitrate 14.88 8.87 B 8.87 B 11.75 C		First	season	Mean	Second	Season	Mean										
100% BR 20.83 a 10.05 d 15.44 A 21.78 a 10.96 e 15.81 A 100% AN 14.37 c 6.83 e 10.6C 15.23 d 9.36 f 11.28 D 25% AN+ 75% BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.96 b 9.67 f 14.1 B 50% AN+ 50% BR 17.44 b 8.61 de 13.03 B 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75% AN+ 25% BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8A 7.25 B 7.07 e 10.48 A 8.87 B 11.75 C * BR, biogast estatestand AN 3.4montime initate. 8.87 B 11.75 C 14.8 A 8.87 B	100% BR 2033a 10.05 d 15.44 A 21.78 a 10.96 e 15.81 A 100% AN 14.37 c 6.83 e 10.6 C 15.23 d 9.36 f 11.28 D 25% AN + 75% BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 A 9.67 f 14.1 B 50% AN + 75% BR 17.44 b 9.67 f 11.28 D 9.67 f 11.38 D 50% AN + 75% BR 17.44 b 8.61 de 17.96 b 9.67 f 11.35 D 50% AN + 75% BR 17.44 b 8.67 b 11.75 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C 75% AN + 25% BR 14.88 c 7.07 c 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.88 c 7.07 b 14.8 A 8.87 B 11.75 C Mean 14.88 c 7.25 B 14.8 A 8.87 B 17.55 B * BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium nitrate 14.8 A 8.87 B 17.55 C 14.8 A * BR, biogas residues cataistically significant differences between treatments (p5.0.05). Capital lett as indical statistically significant differences between water	Control	3.01 f	1.08 g	2.05 D	3.00 g	1.59 h	2.15 E										
100%AN 14.37c 6.83e 10.6C 15.23 d 9.36f 11.28 D 25%AN+75%BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.96 b 9.67 f 14.1 B 50%AN+50%BR 17.44 b 8.61 de 13.03 B 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75%AN+25%BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8A 7.25 B 10.37 C 16.44 c 9.87 B 11.75 C *BR, biogastesidues residues and AM, ammonium mittate. 7.25 B 14.8A 8.87 B 11.75 C	100%AN 14.37c 6.83 e 10.6C 15.33 d 9.36 f 11.28 D 25%ANH 75%BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.96 b 9.67 f 14.1 B 50%ANH 55%BR 13.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75%ANH 55%BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 11.66 e 13.55 B 75%ANH 25%BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 11.66 e 13.55 B 75%ANH 25%BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8 A 7.25 B 13.8 B 8.87 B 11.75 C * BR, biogas residues An Annonium nitrate 14.8 A 8.87 B 11.75 C	100% BR	20.83 a	10.05 d	15.44.A	21.78 a	10.96 e	15.81 A										
250%ANH 75%BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.96 b 9.67 f 14.1 B 50%ANH 50%BR 17.44 b 8.61 de 13.03 B 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75%ANH 25%BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8A 7.25 B 7.07 e 14.8A 8.87 B 11.75 C *BR, biogastesidates and AN, ammonium mittate. 14.8A 8.87 B 14.75 C 14.8A 8.87 B	250%ANH 750%BR 18.7 b 9.9 d 14.3 AB 17.96 b 9.67 f 14.1 B 50%ANH 50%BR 17.44 b 8.61 de 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75%ANH 50%BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.88 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C * BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium nitrate 14.8A 8.87 B 8.87 B 11.75 C * BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium nitrate 14.8A 8.87 B 0.05 Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between water	100%AN	1437 c	6.83 e	10.6 C	15.23 d	936f	11.28 D										
50% Art 80% 8.61 de 17.00 11.66 13.55 17.00 17.00 11.66 13.55 17.00 17.00 11.66 13.55 17.00 11.66 13.55 17.00 11.66 13.55 17.00 11.66 13.55 17.00 11.66 13.55 17.50 16.44 9.98 11.75 17.00 11.75 14.84 7.25 14.8A 7.25 14.8A 8.87 11.75 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 8.87 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84 14.84<	50%ANH 50%BR 17.44 b 8.61 de 13.03 B 17.00 c 11.66 e 13.55 B 75%ANH 25% BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8A 7.25 B 14.8A 8.87 B 8.87 B 11.75 C * BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium nitrate. * BR, biogas reselters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between water	25% AN+ 75% BR	18.7 b	9.9 d	14.3 AB	17.96 b	9.67 f	14.1 B										
75%aAN+25%bBR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8A 7.25B 14.8A 8.87B 14.75 C *BR, biogasresidues and AN, ammonium nitrate. 14.8A 8.87B 11.75 C	75%edN+25% BR 14.48 c 7.07 e 10.77 C 16.44 c 9.98 f 11.75 C Mean 14.8A 7.25B 14.8A 8.87B 8.87B * BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium nitrate. * 14.8A 8.87B 14.8A	50%AN+ 50%BR	17.44 b	8.61 de	13.03 B	17.00 c	11.66 e	13.55 B										
Mean 14.8.A 7.25B 14.8.A 8.87B * BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium nitrate.	Mean 14.8A 7.25B 14.8A 8.87B * BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium mitrate. * Different lower case letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p≤ 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between water	75 % AN+25% BR	14.48 c	7.07 e	10.77 C	16.44 c	9.98 f	11.75 C										
* BR, biogas residues and AN, annuonium nitrate.	* BR, biogas residues and AN, ammonium nitrate. * Different lower case letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p≤ 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between water	Mean	14.8A	7.25B		14.8A	8.87B											
	* Different lower case letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p5 0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between water	* BR, biogas residues a	nd AN, am	monium nita	rate.													

÷ , d ų, Ē 4 4 ith -filia Ĵ, ÷ idu f his ÷ +1. Alfr. 1 TARTE 4 Fff.

Egypt. J. Soil Sci. 56, No.1 (2016)

BEAN YIELD AND SOIL PARAMETERS AS RESPONSE TO APPLICATION $\ldots~319$

MOSTAFA ABD-ELADL et al.

Soil nutrients accumulation after harvest

At the end of the experiment after harvest, available N, P and K contents in soil were greater in fertilized treatments (organic or mineral N) particularly when added 100% of water requirement (Table 5). Significant effect observed between all treatments in available N, P and K contents in soil. Hence, the increases in biogas residues proportion, the increases were in available N, P and K content. Most of the N remaining in the soil at end of crop season was reported by Morvan *et al.* (1997) to accumulate in soil. Dick (1992) noted a positive relationship between soil organic matter content and soil microbial biomass and concluded that practices that increase soil biological activity in the soil. Organic and inorganic input of N, when combined with appropriate management increases the amount of residue returning to the soil and thus increases the soil biological activity (Fouda, 2011). Sørensen and Jensen (1996) attribute the higher N mineralization in manure-treated soils compared to the mineral fertilizer treated ones to the mineralization processes occurred to organic N in manure.

Relationship between soil N, P and K content after harvest and seed N, P and K uptake

Correlation analysis between soil available N, P and K and seed N, P and K contents was concerning the treatments which received N (Fig. 1). Results show that in nearly all cases, there were significant positive correlation between soil contents of NPK and their uptake by seeds.

Conclusion

Biogas residues are considered one of the great sources for nutrients in agriculture. Amending soils with biogas plant residues enhanced the vegetative growth of faba bean. Fertilization with biogas residues alone resulted in more available mineral N, P and K in soil after harvest compared with addition of mineral fertilizer solely. After two seasons, a positive correlation between soil available N, P and K content and their uptake by plant seeds from biogas residues indicated that the accumulation of N_{org} from biogas residues leads to an increase of N release from the soil N pool. The authors propose that the input of chemical fertilizers should decrease with the use of anaerobically digested residues, whereas soil texture is improved.

	250	Total N (ton ha	(₁)	L	otal P (ton ha ^{.1}			Total K (ton ha	l) (1
T				Wa	tter requiremen	t (B)			
(v) mampart	9/0001	75 %	Mean	9⁄0001	75%	Mean	100%	75%	Mean
		Second season		1. A.	Second season			Second season	
Control	37.13 e	31.43 f	34.28 E	4.93 f	4.60 f	34.28 F	4.93 i	4.60 i	127.92 F
100% BR	89.70 a	86.77 a	88.23 A	18.07 a	18.23 a	88.23 A	18.07 a	18.23 h	177.88 A
100%AN	34.23 ef	34.63 ef	34.43 D	6.20 e	6.67 e	34.43 E	6.20 h	6.67 h	81.12 E
25% AN+ 75% BR	87.43 a	74.47 b	80.95 B	17.57 a	15.97 b	80.95 B	17.57 b	15.97 c	154.89 B
50%AN+ 50% BR	75.00 b	63.33 c	69.17 C	16.70 b	14.50 c	69.17 C	16.70 d	14.50 e	135.62 C
75% AN+25% BR	63.33 c	59.03 d	61.18 D	14.07 c	10.50 d	61.18 E	14.07 f	10.50 g	107.38 D
Mean	64.47A	58.28B		12.92A	11.74B		286.99A	268.44B	
* BR, triogas residues a	rnd AN, ammori	um nitrate.					1		

TABLE 5. Effects of different levels of biogas residues and inorganic fertilizer with two levels of water requirements on soil nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium after harvest .

* Different lower case letters indicate statistically significant differences between treatments (p≤0.05). Capital letters indicate statistically significant differences between water treatments or amendment treatments p ≤ 0.05.

Egypt. J. Soil Sci. 56, No.1 (2016)



Fig. 1. Correlation between soil available nutrients and content of nutrients in seeds of faba bean (in treatments receiving N fertilizers)

References

- Abdel-Mawgoud, A.M.R. (2006) Growth, yield and quality of green bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) in response to irrigation and compost applications. J. Appl. Sci. 2 (7), 443–450.
- Abdel-Mottaleb, M.A., Fayed, R.M., El-Tapey, H.M.A. and Rizk, A.H. (2000) Effect irrigation water salinity and soil moisture content on yield and NPK contents of wheat and broad bean crops. *Egypt. J. Appl. Sci.* 15 (6), 327–337.
- Abou-Baker, N.H., Abd-Eladl, M. and Eid, T.A. (2012) Silicon and water regime responses in bean production under soil saline condition. *Journal of Applied Sciences Research*, 8 (12), 5698-5707.
- Ahmed, A.K., Tawfik, K.M. and Abd El-Gawad, Z.A. (2008) Tolerance of seven faba bean varities to drought and salt stresses. *Res. J. Agric. Biol. Sci.* 4 (2), 175–186.
- Allen, R.G., Pereira, L.S., Raes, D. and Smith, M. (1998) Crop Evapotranspiration. Guidelines for Computing Crop Water Requirements, in: Irrigation and Drainage, FAO, Rome, Italy. 56, 300.
- Al-Suhaibani, N.A. (2009) Influence of early water deficit on seed yield and quality of faba bean under arid environment of Saudi Arabia. Am.-Eur. J. Agric. Environ. Sci. 5 (5), 649–654.
- Asmus, F., Linke, B. and Dunkel, H. (1988) Eigenschaften und Düngerwirkung von ausgefaulter Gülleaus der Biogasgewinnung. Arch Acker- Pflanzenbau Bondenkd Berlin. 32, 527–532.
- Bachmann S., Wentzel S., and Eichler-Löbermann B. (2011) Co-digested dairy slurry as a phosphorus and nitrogen source for Zea mays L. and Amaranthuscruentus L. J. *Plant Nutr. Soil Sci.* 174 (6), 908–15.
- Bauer, A., Mayr, H., Hopfner-Sixt, K. and Amon, T. (2009) Detailed monitoring of two biogas plants and mechanical solid–liquid separation of fermentation residues. J. Biochem. 142, 56–63.
- Bremner, J.M. and Mulvaney, C.S. (1982) Methods of Soil Analysis, part 2: Chemical and Microbiological Properties, 595-624.
- De Boer, H.C. (2008) Co-digestion of animal slurry can increase short-term nitrogen recovery by crops. J. Environ. Qual. 37, 1968–1973.
- **Dick, R.P.** (1992) A review: Long-term effects of agricultural systems on soil biochemical and microbial parameters. *Agric. Ecosyst. Environ.* 40, 25–36.
- Chapman, H.D. and Pratt, P.F. (1961) Methods of Analysis for Soils, Plants and Waters. Division of Agricultural Sciences, University of California, Riverside.

- FAO. (1992) Waste water treatments and use in agriculture, in: Irrigation and drainage, 47, 125.
- Fouda, S. (2011) Nitrogen availability of biogas residues. *Ph.D. Thesis*, Technische Universitat München, 2011, Germany.
- Garg, R.N., Pathak, H., Das, D.K. and Tomar, R.K. (2005) Use of flyash and biogas slurry for improving wheat yield and physical properties of soil. *Environ. Monit.* Assess., 107, 1-9.
- Gunnarsson, A., Bengtsson, F. and Caspersen, S. (2010) Use efficiency of nitrogen from biodigested plant material by ryegrass. *J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci.* 173, 113–119.
- Gutser, R., Amberger, A. and Vilsmeier, K. (1987) Wirkungunter schiedlichauf bereiteter Wirkungunterschiedlichaufbereiteter Gülleim Gefä ßversuchzu Hafer und Weidelgras. Landw. Forschung, Kongreßb and VDLUFA-Schriftenreihe (German Associated of Agriculture research). 23, 279–296.
- Gutser, R., Ebertseder, Th., Weber, A., Schraml, M. and Schmidhalter, U. (2005) Short-term and residual availability of nitrogen after long term application of organic fertilizers on arable land. J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci. 186, 439–446.
- Hossain, N., Islam, M., Alamgir, M. and Kibria, M.G. (2014) Growth response of Indian spinach to biogas plant residues. *Journal of Pharmacy and Biological Sciences*, 9, 2278-3008.
- Hegab, A.S.A., Fayed, M.T.B, Maha, M.A., Hamada, M.A. and Abdrabbo, A. (2014) Productivity and irrigation requirements of faba-bean in North Delta of Egypt in relation to planting dates. *Annals of Agricultural Science*, 59,185–193.
- **Islam, S. (2006)** Use of bio-slurry as organic fertilizer in Bangladesh agriculture, *Proc. international workshop on the use of bio-slurry for domestic bio-slurry program, Bangkok*, Thailand, 27-28.
- Klute, A. (1986) *Methods of Soil Analysis*, (second ed.) American Society of Agronomy, Inc. Soil Science Society of America. Madison, Wisconsin. USA.
- Kocar, G. (2008) Anaerobic digesters: from waste to energy crops as an alternative energy source. Energy Sour.t A: Recov. Util. *Environ. Effects.* **30**, 660-669.
- MØller, H.B., Hansen, J.D. and Sorensen, C.A.G. (2007) Nutrient recovery by solid-liquid separation and methane productivity of solids. Am. Soc. Agr. Bio. Eng. 50, 193–200.
- Möller, K., Stinner, W. and Deuker, A. (2008) Effects of different manuring systems with and without biogas digestion on nitrogen cycle and crop yield in mixed organic dairy farming systems. *Nutr. Cycl. Agrecosys.* 82, 209–232.
- Möller, K. and Müller, T. (2012) Effects of anaerobic digestion on digestate nutrien, availability and crop growth: A review. Eng. Life Sci. 12, 242–257.

- Montemurro, F., Canali, S., Convertini, G., Ferri, D., Tittarelli, F. and Vitti, C. (2008) Anaerobic digestates application on fodder crops: effects on plant and soil. *Agrochemica*, 52, 97-312.
- Page, A.L., Miller, R.H. and Keeney, D.R. (1982) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2: Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Second edition. Agronomy J. 9, 2, Am. Soc. Agron. Inc., Soil Sci. Soc. Am. Inc. Pub. Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Parry, M.A.J., Flexas, J. and Medrano H. (2005) Prospects for crop production under drought: research priorities and future directions, *Annual Applied Biology*, 147, 211-226.
- Jackson, T.L. (1973) Soil Chemical Analysis. Prentice-Hall of India Private Limited. New Delhi.
- Garg, R.N., Pathak, H., Das, D.K. and Tomar, R.K. (2005) Use of flyash and biogas slurry for improving wheat yield and physical properties of soil. *Environ. Monit.* Assess. 107, 1-9.
- Gomez, K.A. and A.A. Gomez, (1984) Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research (2 ed.). John wiley and sons, NewYork, 680p.
- Gunnarsson, A., Bengtsson, F. and Caspersen, S. (2010) Use efficiency of nitrogen from biodigested plant material by ryegrass. *J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci.* 173, 113–119.
- Morvan, T., Letrme, Ph., Arsene, G.G. and Mary, B. (1997) Nitrogen transformations after the spreading of pig slurry on bare soil and ryegrass using ¹⁵N-labelled ammonium. *Eur. J. Agron.* 7, 181–188.
- Rasheed, M.A., Youssef, R.A., Gaber, E.I., Abd El Kader, A.A., Silva, J.A.T. and Abou-Baker, N.H. (2010) The combined effect of organic and chemical fertilizers in relation to water irrigation on nutrients uptake of corn and bean plants. *Plant Stress*, 4 (1), 64-71.
- Rivard, C.J., Rodriguez, J.B., Nagle, N.J., Self, J.R., Kay, B.D., Soltanpour, P.N. and Nieves, R.A. (1995) Anaerobic digestion of municipal solid waste. Utility of process residues as a soil amendment, *Applied Biochemistry Biotechnology*, **51**, 125-135.
- Rubaek, G.H., Henriksen, K., Petersen, J., Rasmussen, B. and Sommer, S.G. (1996) Effects of application technique and anaerobic digestion on gaseous nitrogen loss from animal slurry applied to ryegrass (*Loliumperenne*). J. Agric. Sci. 126, 481–492.
- Sharaan, A.N., Ekram, A., Megawer, H.A.S. and Hemida, Z.A. (2004) Seed yield, yield components and quality character as affected by cultivars, sowing dates and planting distances in faba bean. *Bull. Agric. Econ. Min. Agric. Egypt.*
- Sørensen, P. and Jensen, E.S. (1996) The fate of fresh and stored 15N labelled sheep urine and urea applied to a sandy and a sandy loam soil using different application strategies. *Plant and Soil*, 183, 210–220.

(*Received*: 11/4/2016; *accepted*: 9/10/2016)

MOSTAFA ABD-ELADL et al.

Egypt. J. Soil Sci. 56, No. 1 (2016)

326