## EFFECT OF BIOLOGICAL FERTILIZERS COMPARED WITH MINERAL FERTILIZERS ON HINDI BESINARA MANGO TREES

## By

#### RANIA ABD ELFATTAH ELSAYED

B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Pomology), Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., Egypt, 2002

#### **THESIS**

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

## MASTER OF SCIENCE

In

Agricultural Sciences (Pomology)

Department of Pomology Faculty of Agriculture Cairo University Egypt

2009

#### APPORVAL SHEET

# EFFECT OF BIOLOGICAL FERTILIZERS COMPARED WITH MINERAL FERTILIZERS ON HINDI BESINARA MANGO TREES

M.Sc. THESIS
In
Agric. Sci. (Pomology)

By

#### RANIA ABD ELFATTAH ELSAYED

B.Sc. Agric. Sci. (Pomology), Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., Egypt, 2002

## APPROVAL COMMITTEE

Dr. Samir Zaki EL-Agami Professor of Pomology, Fac. Agric., Assuit University	
Dr. Mohamed Ahmed Fayek	
Professor of Pomology, Fac. Agric., Cairo University	
Dr. Ibrahim EL-Shenawy Ghoniem	
Associate Professor of Pomology, Fac. Agric., Cairo University	
Dr. Ramzy George Stino	
Professor of Pomology, Fac. Agric., Cairo University	

Date: 9 / 7 /2009

#### **SUPERVISION SHEET**

## EFFECT OF BIOLOGICAL FERTILIZERS COMPARED WITH MINERAL FERTILIZERS ON HINDI BESINARA MANGO TREES

M.Sc. THESIS
In
Agric. Sci. (Pomology)

By

#### RANIA ABD ELFATTAH ELSAYED

B.Sc. Agric. Sci (Pomology), Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., Egypt, 2002

### SUPERVISION COMMITTEE

**Dr. RAMZY GEORGE STINO Professor of Pomology, Fac. Agric., Cairo University** 

**Dr. IBRAHIM EL-SHENAWY GHONIEM**Associate Professor of Pomology, Fac. Agric., Cairo University

Dr. HASSAN ALI ABD ELKAREEM Researcher of Pomology, Hort. Res. Inst., Agri. Res. Center, Giza

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I wish to express my thanks; deepest gratitude and appreciation to Dr. RAMZY GEORGE STINO professor of pomology, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University. And Dr. IBRAHIM El-SHENAWY GHONIEM Associate professor of pomology, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University for suggesting the problems, supervision, continued assistance and his guidance through the course of study and revision the manuscript of this thesis. Sincere thanks to Dr. HASSAN ALI ABD-ELKAREEM Associate professor of pomology, Horticulture Researches Institute for sharing in supervision.

I would like to thank staff members of the Central Laboratory, Horticulture Research Institute, Agriculture Research Center, for encouraging, advising and help during the whole period of study.

Grateful appreciation is also extended to all staff members of Pomology Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University.

Special deep appreciation is given to my late father, my mother, my sisters and my brothers and my friends.

Name of Candidate: Rania Abd ElFattah Elsayed Degree: M.Sc.

**Title of Thesis:** Effect of biological fertilizers compared with mineral fertilizers

on Hindi Besinara mango trees

**Supervisors:** Dr. Ramzy George Stino

Dr. Ibrahim El-Shenawy Ghoniem Dr. Hassan Ali Abd Elkareem

**Department:** Pomology **Approval:** 9 / 7 / 2009

#### ABSTRACT

This study was carried out throughout three seasons in 2006, 2007 and 2008. And the experiment was conducted at a private orchard located at El-Mansouria, Giza Governorate, Egypt on 40–years mango trees "Hindi Besinara" cultivar.

This experiment was carried out to evaluate of the organic and biofertilizers on "Hindi Besinara" mango trees in comparison with mineral fertilizers. Eight sources of organic and natural fertilizers, compost "El-Neel" at36.5kg / tree , compost with bio fertilizers ( Nitrobien 10g / tree + phosphoriene 10g / tree ), compost with natural rocks (Feldspar 6.25 kg./ tree ) ,compost + NR + BF, cattle manure 7.50 kg./tree cattle manure + BF, chicken Manure 25.33 kg./tree, chicken manure + BF. These treatments were added to the soil (compared to the mineral fertilization). Compost + NR with BF application increased vegetative growth, yield fruit weight, fruit height and diameter as well as fruit T.S.S, total sugars and carotinoids, specially during the3<sup>rd</sup> season compared to other organic and natural fertilizers with or without bio- fertilizers application. Mineral fertilizer was more effective in this concern than different organic and natural sources. However, the results indicated that organic and bio fertilizer applications had a long term effect successive seasons and could be used instead of mineral fertilization, besides they are human safe. The conclusion of this study was that the best treatment is compost + NR +BF which increased yield, and had effective prosperous on fruits characters.

The recommendation of this study is condensation using organic fertilization at long term treatments that could be equal to mineral fertilization even more effectiveness .on the other hand it is obvious that organic fertilization is cheap, available and safe.

**Key Words: Compost - Cattle- Manure - Natural rocks - Nitrobiene- Phosphoriene- Mango** 

## **CONTENTS**

	Pag
INTRODUCTION	4
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	1
1. Flowering parameters	-
2. Fruit setting parameters	•
	(
3. Fruit quality parameters.	1
4. Vegetative growth parameters	1
5. Leaf chemical contents	2
MATRIALS AND METHODS	3
1. Flowering parameters	3
2. Fruit setting parameters	3
3. Fruiting quality parameters	3
4. Parameters of vegetative growth	3
5. Chemical analysis of leaves	3
6. Statistical design and data analysis	3
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	3
1. Effect of fertilization treatments on some flowering	
parameters	3
2. Effect of fertilization treatments on some fruit setting	
parameters	4
3. Effect of fertilization treatments on some fruit	
characters	
4. Effect of fertilization treatments on some vegetative growth parameters	2
5. Effect of fertilization treatments on some leaf content	8
SAMMARY AND CONCLUSION	{ 1
REFERENCES	1
ARARICSAMMARY	1

## LIST OF TABLES

No.	Title	Page
1.	The Egyptian mango production areas by governorates	4
2.	Physical and chemical analysis of tested soil	38
3.	Chemical characteristics of the used compost, cattle and chicken manure	38
4.	Effect of fertilization treatments on flower panicle length during 2006, 2007 and 2008	40
5.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total number of flowers during 2006 2007 and 2008	42
6.	Effect of fertilization treatments on number of perfect flowers during 2006, 2007 and 2008	44
7.	Effect of fertilization treatments on initial fruit set during 2006, 2007 and 2008	44
8.	Effect of fertilization treatments on retention fruit set during 2006, 2007 and 2008	48
9.	Effect of fertilization treatments on fruit weight and height during 2006, 2007 and 2008	50
10.	Effect of fertilization treatments on fruit width and diameter during 2006, 2007 and 2008	53
11.	Effect of fertilization on flesh weight during 2006, 2007 and 2008	55
12.	Effect of fertilization treatments on seed weight during 2006, 2007 and 2008	56
13.	Effect fertilization treatments on flesh/ seed weight during 2006, 2007 and 2008	58

No.	Title	Page
14.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total acidity and TSS in fruits during 2006, 2007and 2008	60
15.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total carbohydrates and sugars in fruits during 2006, 2007 and 2008	63
16.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total carotinoides and vitamin. C in fruits during 2006, 2007and2008	64
17.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total nitrogen and phosphor in fruits during 2006, 2007 and 2008	66
18.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total potassium and calcium in fruits during 2006, 2007 and 2008	69
19.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total sodium and magnesium in fruits during 2006, 2007 and 2008	72
20.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total cupper and manganese in fruits during 2006, 2007 and 2008	74
21.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total zinc and iron in fruits during 2006, 2007 and 2008	77
22.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total cobalt and cadmium in fruits during 2006, 2007 and 2008	79
23.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total lead in fruits during 2006, 2007 and 2008	81
24.	Effect of fertilization treatments on shoot length during 2006, 2007and2008	83
25.	Effect of fertilization treatments on number of new shoots during 2006, 2007 and 2008	84
26.	Effect of bio fertilization treatments on shoot diameter during 2006, 2007 and 2008	86

No.	Title	Page
27.	Effect of fertilization treatments on number of leaves during 2006, 2007 and 2008	
28.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total nitrogen in	00
	leaves during 2006, 2007 and 2008	89
29.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total phosphors in leaves during 2006, 2007 and 2008	90
30.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total potassium in leaves during 2006, 2007 and 2008	92
31.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total sodium in leaves during 2006, 2007 and 2008	93
32.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total calcium in leaves during 2006, 2007 and 2008	05
33.	Effect of fertilization treatments on total carbohydrates in leaves during 2006, 2007 and 2008	

## LIST OF FIGURES

No.	Title	Page
1.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on panicle length during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	40
2.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on number of total flowers during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	42
3.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on perfect flowers during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	44
4.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on initial fruit set during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	46
5.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on retention fruit set during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	48
6.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on fruit weight during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	50
7.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on fruit height during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	51
8.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on fruit width during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	52
9.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on fruit diameter during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	54
10.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on flesh weight during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	55
11.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on seed weight during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	57
12.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total acidity in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	59

No.	Title	Pag
13.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on T.S.S in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	6
14.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total carbohydrates in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007and2008.	6
15.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total sugars in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	6
16.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total carotinoides in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	6
17.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on vitamin C in fruits during season 2006, 2007 and 2008	6
18.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total nitrogen in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	
19.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total phosphors in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	6
20.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total potassium in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	6
21.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total calcium in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	7
22.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total sodium in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	7
23.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total magnesium in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	7
24.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total cupper in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	7
25.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total manganese in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	7

No.	Title	Pag
26.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total zinc in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	7
27.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total iron in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	7
28.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total cobalt in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	7
29.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total cadmium in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	8
30.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total lead in fruits during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	8
31.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on shoot length during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	8
32.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on number of new shoots during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	8
33.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on shoot diameter during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	8
34.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on number of leaves during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	8
35.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total nitrogen in leaves during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	8
36.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total phosphors in leaves during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	. 9
37.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total potassium in leaves during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	9
38.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total sodium in leaves during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	Q

No.	Title	Page
39.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total calcium in leaves during seasons 2006, 2007 and 2008	95
40.	Average effect of fertilization treatments on total carbohydrates in leaves during seasons 2006, 2007and2008	3 96

### **INTRODUCTION**

Mango (*Mangifera indica L*.) is an important tropical fruit with a high demand in world markets. It is consumed both fresh and in processed form.

However, mango is also cultivated in more than 100 countries at both tropical and sub tropical latitudes Galan (1996).

The largest producing country in the world is India, with over 10 million metric tons, followed by China and Mexico at roughly 1 million metric tons each .Mexico, Egypt still ranks on the world production scale as the 16<sup>th</sup> largest producers of mangos.(Agriculture Technology Utilization and Transfer report "ATUT" 1997).

In Egypt , mango growing areas increased rapidly from year to year to reach 184.204 feddans in 2005 , also the productive area reached 115.529 feddans which produced 532.422 tons / year with an average of 4.61 tons / feddan (Table 1).

It is well known that mangos needs large amounts of fertilizers especially nitrogen so, the major problems facing mango growers are the high cost of excessive manufactured fertilizers needed for mango trees. Besides, these chemical fertilizers are considered as air, soil and water polluting agents during their production and utilization. Consequently, it has drowned the attention of researchers to use the organic fertilizers which are safe for human, animal and environment. Thus, it is preferred to use these natural fertilizers to avoid pollution and to reduce the costs of chemical fertilizers. Organic agriculture has a solid 2% market share and continues to grow at a rate of 20% per year.