Effect of Soil conditioners and Irrigation Levels on Growth and Productivity of Pomegranate Trees in the New Reclaimed Region

Abd-Ella E.K.Eman.¹

ABSTRACT

This investigation was carried out during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons on ten years old Arabi pomegranate trees, grown in sandy soil under drip irrigation in a private farm located at Alexandria-Matrouh road (about 80Km from Alex.). The experiment was designed to study the effects of different rates from soil conditioners, Hundz soil, (0.0,0.5 and 10Kg /tree) or mixture from (Nile fertile + K₂SO₄) [Zero, (2Kg + 500gm) and (1Kg + 250gm)] under irrigation levels at 50, 75 and 100% of the recommended water level (5.5, 8.25 and 11m³/tree /year) as well as their interactions on growth, leaf component, flowering, fruiting, yield and fruit quality during both seasons. The results indicated that the highest irrigation level of 11m³ /tree /year enhanced vegetative growth, fruit set, yield as well as leaf NPK content and fruit quality (fruit weight, diameter, length, TSS, anthocyanine and V.C.) while fruit acidity and tannins content decreased. Moreover, application of either Hundz soil at rate of 10kg /tree or the mixture of $(NF + K_2SO_4)$ at highest rate (2Kg + 500gm)gave significantly the highest mean values of the above mentioned characters during the two seasons. Comparing with trees irrigated with11m³/tree/year level, adding Hundz soil at 10Kg /tree under irrigation treatment 8.25m³/tree /year gave similar effect on improving all growth characters, fruit set, yield and fruit quality except fruit diameter and V.C. Similar results were found with high rate of the mixture (2Kg NF+500gm K₂SO₄) with the same level of irrigation on all characters except acidity. Date also indicated that the application of Hz soil combined with mixture of $(NF+K_2SO_4)$ at both highest levels for each of them and irrigated with moderate irrigation level 8.25m³ /tree /year gave best growth and produced higher fruit quality as compared with trees irrigated with 100% from recommended water level. Similar effects of combinations between high rate of both Hundz soil and the mixture of Nilefertile + K₂SO₄ under least irrigation treatments 5.5 m³ /tree/year on the previous characters of fruit. Data indicated generally that the best treatment combination was gained from using highest irrigation level (11m³ /tree /year) and 10Kg /tree Hundz soil + 2Kg /tree Nile Fertile + 500gm K₂SO₄which resulted in the highest values for all vegetative growth characters, leaf N P K, chlorophyll and RWC, yield and all fruit quality except leaf proline, juice tannins and acidity in both seasons. It could be recommended to apply 2Kg /tree Hundz soil combined with 2Kg NF + 500 gm K₂SO₄ with irrigation level of 11m³ /tree /year to obtain highest production with good quality of pomegranate fruits as well as to apply 2Kg /tree Hundz soil with 2Kg NF + 500 K₂SO₄ under irrigation 8.25m³ /tree /year or 5.5m³ /tree /year for

saving about 25% - 50% of water to achieve the same yield and fruit quality according to the availability of water, especially in the new reclaimed area.

INTRODUCTION

Water is one of the most important components in the biological function (Salisbury and Ross, 1985). Increasing water use efficiency, fruit management, production and saving irrigation water are important tasks (Devid et al., 1999). Of all the materials used by fruit trees, water seems to be taken up in the largest amounts (Chopade, 2001). Cultivation on arid sandy soil requires large quantities of water. The low water holding capacity of this soil causes rapid infiltration and deep percolation below the root zone (Beaumont, 1993). For production a high crops especially on the sandy soils, the physical-chemical properties of these soils must be modified. The addition of conditioners to such soils enhanced their properties, leading to decrease water infiltration rate, increasing the efficiency of the used water and fertilizers (Laila- Ali et al., 2009).

Recently, the global demand for clean agriculture free from chemical, like fertilizers, pesticides, synthetic soil conditioners, etc., is of much concern at moment to protect the ecosystem from their adverse effects hence, natural soil conditioners are the most effective agents in stabilizing soil organic matter (El-Aggory and Abd El-Rasoul, 2002). Also, Khalifa *et al.*, (1997) suggested that natural soil conditioners increased soil hydraulic conductivity and water diffusivity of sandy soil whereas Laila-Ali *et al.*, (2009) found that applying the combinations of organic source and soil natural conditioners increase yield of wheat plant.

Thus, Hundz soil is a natural soil conditioner that is made out of dry compressed cellulose and recycles agricultural material, shaped in grains and varies in size (0.2-2.0mm)that is capable of penetrating through the sand grains, forming a new media ideal for growing plants, has a balanced pH of 6.8-7.2, water holding capacity of 300% naturally, which will change sandy soil water capacity and does not absorb heat, so water evaporation is dramatically minimized. Hundzsoil retains water longer than regular soil, so plants develop healthy root system. Hundz soil is certified from Soil, Water and Environment Res., Institute, ARC, Giza Egypt.

¹El-SabahiaHort. Res. Stat.Alex.

Received December 15, 2011, Accepted December 31, 2011.

The second soil conditioner is Nilefertile which contains many components as sulfur fertilizer mixture (SFM) in a fine powder form, produced by Giza Technology Co. (Egypt) to be a good substitute for Nile mud (Abd-Allah, 1997). It's containing elemental sulfur (32%)as an acidulous material which is oxidized slowly to sulfuric acid, after its application to soil, thio bacillus ,thio oxidants, autotrophic bacteria and different S-Oxidizing bacteria, which effective especially under alkaline conditions,Bentonite clay or mudstone (18%) as a water absorbent material, a mixture of ground rocks and minerals (45%) that are rich in fertilizer elements:P,K,Mg,Fe ,Ca and Mn and five percent of urea as a source of nitrogen.

As water supply is limited, loss of turgor and wilting are typical symptoms of potassium deficiency and this may be related to the role of K in stomatal regulation which is the major mechanism controlling the water regime of higher plants. In addition, potassium maintains higher tissue water content even under shortage of water (Lindhauer, 1985). Potassium is essential for the synthesis of amino acids, thus plants don't grow well in the absence of potassium (Edmond et al., 1975).A large number of enzymes is either completely dependent on or stimulated by K (Suelter, 1970).

So, the aim of the present study was designed to improve the main characteristics of sandy soil and to increase water use efficiency of pomegranate trees subjected to different irrigation frequencies and different levels of soil conditioners Handz soil, Nilefertile and K_2SO_4 on vegetative growth and fruit quality parameters. Also, to determine whether Handz soil can reduce irrigation frequencies without negative effect on yield and fruit quality.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present study was carried out during 2010 and 2011 successive seasons on ten years old Arabi pomegranate trees (granatumPunica L.), grown in sandy soil of a private farm located at Alex.-Matrouh (about 80Km from Alex.). Trees under road investigation were uniform in shape and size as possible, spaced at 5x5 meters apart and irrigated with drip irrigation. The physical and chemical properties of the experimental soil are presented in Table (1). The trees were annually fertilized with 15m3 / feddan of organic manure (sheep manure) in December of each year with 1.0 Kg/ tree calcium superphosphate(15.5% P₂O₂).Also, 2.0 Kg/ tree ammonium sulphate (20.6% N) and 1.0 Kg/tree of potassium sulphate (48% K₂O)were added in three equal doses at February, April and June. The following treatments were applied:

- 1-Irrigations frequencies were divided into three levels; 50%, 75% and 100% of the recommended rate of irrigations according to the recommendations of the Ministry of Agriculture as follows:
- I₁: 50% of the recommended rate of irrigation (5.5m³ /tree /year)= 924m³/feddan /year.
- I₂: 75% of the recommended rate of irrigation (8.25m³ /tree /year) = $1389m^3$ /feddan /year.
- I₃: 100% of the recommended rate of irrigation (11.0m³ /tree /year) = 1848m³/feddan/ year.

Irrigation treatments varied with the change of the developmental stage of the plant.

2-Hundz soil (HN) conditioner was used at three levels:

HN₀: No addition (control treatment)

- HN₁: 5 Kg / tree Hundz soil
- HN₂:10 Kg / tree Hundz soil

Hundz soil was applied to the soil under drip irrigation lines in January of each year. The chemical analysis of Hundz soil is shown in Table(2)

3- A mixture of Nilefertile $+ K_2SO_4$ was applied together to the wet surface under drip irrigation line at three equal doses at March, May and July of both seasons at three rates:

MX₀: without any addition (control treatment)

 MX_1 : 1 Kg of Nilefertile + 250gm K₂SO₄/tree

MX₂: 2 Kg of Nilefertile + 500gm K₂SO₄/tree

The experimental design was a split-split-plots system in a randomized complete block design (RCBD) with three replications. The experiment consisted of twenty seven treatments; which representing the combinations among the three factors; the first one was the three irrigation levels which arranged as the main plots (I₁, I₂ and I₃). The second one was Hundz soil levels (HN₀, HN₁ and HN₂)were considered as the subplot, while the third factor was three levels of the mixture of Nile fertile + $K_2SO_4(MX_0, MX_1 \text{ and } MX_2)$ were placed as sub - sub plots.

The following parameters were used to evaluate the tested treatments:

1- vegetative growth

In each season of study (on early April) four uniform branches were selected on each tree and tagged at their cardinal points. The average number of new shoots in each of the branches was counted. The length (cm) and diameter (cm) were measured as well as number of leaves/ shoot were counted. Ten leaves were collected randomly from the first mature leaves from the tip of the previously tagged shoots and their areas (cm²) were measured.

		03 %	0.M	1	oluble	Soluble Cations meq/L	meq/L	So	Soluble Anionss meq/L	L	dis	Partical distribution %	11 10 %	Soil	Field	wilting	Avaliable	
(cm)	ds/m ⁻¹	cace	%	K	Na	Mg ²⁺	ca ²⁺	CL2	SO4	HCO3	sand	silt	clay	$K^+ - Na^+ - Mg^{2+} - ca^{2+} - CL_2 - \frac{SO_4}{2} - HCO_3 - sand - silt - clay - Texture$	wapacity %	%	water %	-
0- 30 8.1	0.75		0.53	0.1	2.9	0.6	1.3	3	-	3.5 0.53 0.1 2.9 0.6 1.3 3 1 0.9 93.4 2.2	93.4	2.2	4.4	sandy	9.2	1.9	7.3	
30 - 8.2 60 8.2	0.65		0.49	0.1	1.3	2.8 0.49 0.1 1.3 0.4 0.7 1.2 0.7	0.7	1.2	0.7	0.6	93	2.2	4.8	sandy	8.8	1.6	7.2	
- 00 - 00	0.61		0.35	0.1	1.5	2.7 0.35 0.1 1.5 0.3	0.9	1.4	0.7	0.7	92	2.6	5.4	sandy	7.9	1.3	6.6	

Density (Kg/m3)	sity m3)	pH	EC ⁻¹	SP	Total N %	Total P % Total K %	Total K %	Organic matter %	Carbon %	Ash %	C/N ratio
255	5	7.2	1.4	278	1.28	0.077	0.11	87.16	45.33	21.84	01:35.

553

2-Leaf chemical composition

2.1. Leaf chlorophyll and minerals content

A sample of twenty mature leaves was randomly collected from the middle part of non-fruiting shoots of each replicate tree in May of both seasons to determined total leaf chlorophyll according to the method described by Yadava (1986) using Minolta Chlorophyll Meter Spad.502 (Minolta Camera, LTD Japan). The previous selected fresh leaves were washed with tap water, thereafter with distilled water and dried under a constant temperature 70°C in an electric oven. Each sample of dried leaves was ground to powder using porcelin mortar to avoid contamination. A sample of 0.3gm from the ground leaves was digested using H₂O₂ and H₂SO₄ according to Evenhuis and Dewaard (1980). Aliquots were then taken for mineral determination. Total phosphorus nitrogen and were determined colorimetrically according to Evenhuis (1976)and Murphy and Riley (1962), respectively. Potassium was determined against a standard using flame photometer following Chapman and Pratt, (1961). The concentrations of NPK were expressed as a percentage on dry weight bases.

2.2. Determination of free leaf proline content

A sample of 0.5gm from the dried mature leaves was homogenized in 10ml sulphosalicylic acid (3.5%) and centrifuged for 5 minutes at 300 rpm and decanted then filtered through What-man no.2 filter paper. The supernatant was diluted and injected in Beckman Amino Acid Analyzer 1/9CL. The proline concentration was determined from standard curve and calculated on dry weight basis according to Singh *et al.*, (1973).

2.3. The leaf relative water content(RWC): was calculated as the method described by Smart and Bingham (1974). Ten mature leaves were taken from each replicate, cleaned with tissue paper and their fresh weight was immediately recorded. The turgid weight of these leaves was recorded after floating in water in covered petridish for 24 hours at 4° C. Thereafter, the leaves were weighted and then dried at 70° C to a constant weight and their dry weights were recorded. The leaf relative water content (RWC) was calculated from the following equation:

$RWC = \frac{Fresh weight - Dry weight}{Turgid weight - Dry weight} \times 100$

3-Flowering, fruit set percentages and yield

The total number of flowers per shoot on each tagged branch was counted at full bloom. The numbers of set fruits on the same branches were recorded to calculate fruit set percentage according to the following equation Fruit set % = (No. of developing fruits/total number of flowers) × 100.Total yield (kg) of each replicate tree was determined at fruit maturity stage at the 2^{nd} week of August.

4-Fruit quality

Samples of six fruits from each replicate at harvest time (mid-August) were taken to determine fruit weight (gm), length (cm), diameter (cm) and volume (cm³). In juice of each fruit sample, total soluble solids (TSS) percentage was determined by a hand refractometer and percentage of acidity was measured according to A.O.A.C. (1995).Vitamin C was determined by the titration with dichlorophenol indophenol blue dye and expressed as mg vitamin C/ 100ml juice. Also, total anthocyanin percentage in fruit juice was determined as described by Hsia *et al.*, (1965). Tannins content was measured in the juice by the method described by Winton and Winton, (1945).

Data were statistically analyzed using Co-Stat CoHort Software computer program for statistics (1986). The differences among the means of experimental treatments were separated by LSD test for interpretation of results as explained by Steel and Torrie (1980).

RERSULTS AND DISCUSSION

1-Main effects of different factors on the studied characters

The results of the main effects of the different studied factors; i.e., soil conditioner (Hundz soil), irrigation frequency and mixture of Nilefertile $+K_2SO_4$ on vegetative growth, fruiting, yield, leaves chemical composition and fruit quality of pomegranate trees are shown in Tables 3 to 7.

1-Vegetative growth characters

Concerning the main effects of the three studied factors; i.e. three irrigation levels, three Hundz soil rates and three levels of the mixture of Nilefertile $+K_2SO_4$ on vegetative growth characters (shoot length, diameter, no. of leaves /shoot, no. of shoots/main branch and leaf area) of pomegranate trees, the results generally illustrated that the comparisons among the mean values of the studied characters for each factor appeared to be significant, in both growing seasons(Table3).

The obtained results concerning the main effect of irrigation levels illustrated generally that the highest vegetative growth parameters resulted from the highest irrigation level I_3 ($11m^3$ /tree/year). Meantime, $I_2(8.25m^3$ /tree/year) gave similar effect like I_3 on

Treatments	Shoot length (cm)	igth (cm)	Shoot diameter (cm)	neter (cm)	No. of leaves / shoot	/ shoot	No. of new shoots / branch	ots / branch	leaf area (cm ²)	(cm ²)
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation levels m ³ /tree/year										
I,	12.65b	12.77b	1.41b	1.63c	16.38b	18.01b	9.34a	11.10b	49.7b	5.15b
I2	12.86a	12.99a	1.61a	1.86b	18.07ab	22.17a	9.81a	12.86a	51.8a	5.36a
I ₃	12.98a	13.11a	1.71a	2.02a	21.45a	23.85a	10.37a	13.23a	52.7a	5.47a
Hundz soil kg/tree										
HN ₀	12.48b	12.61b	1.47b	1.73b	17.71b	20.4b	9.50b	11.59b	47.9b	4.98b
HN1	12.86ab	12.99ab	1.57ab	1.87a	18.88ab	21.73a	9.82ab	12.71a	5.18ab	5.37ab
HN ₂	13.14a	13.28a	1.67a	1.90a	19.96a	22.5a	10.19a	12.89a	5.45a	5.63a
Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ Kg/tree										
MX ₀	12.46c	12.59c	1.35c	1.55c	16.18c	18.02c	7.8c	11.07c	4.78c	4.96c
MX	12.90b	13.03b	1.59b	1.86b	19.21b	21.45b	10.02b	12.66b	5.21b	5.40b

ŧ.	-
5	-
Ξ.	2
2	1
2	0
	w
ranate ti	Table 3. Effect of irrigation fi
	-
5	-
5	2
1	č
	-
2	0
2	=
	-
	3
	-
÷	0.0
2	-
۹	-
5	H
₽	-
-	-
-	ē
0	ē
	E
2	0
J	=
0	3
-	~
-	-
1 growing season	tion frequency ,Hundz soil and Mixture of Nile fertile + K2SO4 on v
3	=
2	
	D
÷	
	\$
۳	0
2	=
š	-
•	Ξ
2	ā
	2
	×
	2
	=
	¢.
	-
	×.
	-
	4
	-
	6
	=
	-
	=
	=
	(C)
	+
	<u> </u>
	\mathbf{x}
	N
	5
	0
	4
	2
	<
	0
	00
	1
	20
	getative g
	~
	0
	a.o
	7
	9
	×
	=
	-
	p
	20
	2
	2
	H
	0
	6
	7
	60
	0
	-
	-
	2
	9

vegetative growth parameters except for shoot diameter in the second season. However, there was insignificant difference between different levels of irrigation on number of new shoots/ mainbranch in the 1st season only.Generally, increasing irrigation levels enhanced vegetative growth of pomegranateby increasing shoot length, number of leaves per shoot and leaf area. It can be explained that water stress decreased the cytokinin transport from roots to shoots and increased the amount of leaf abscisic acid. These change in hormone balance caused a reduction in cell growth and leaf expansion. These results agree with those obtained by El-Iraqy et al., (2006) on guava and Khattab et al., (2010) on pomegranate, as they stated that vegetative growth parameters were markedly increased by increasing irrigation rates.

With respect to the main effects of Hundz soil (soil conditioner) on vegetative growth parameters, the results in Table(3) showed that gradual increment of Hundz soil application up to10Kg/ tree resulted in a significant increases of vegetative growth, compared to control, in both seasons. The obtained resultssuggested generally that improving the morphological characters of pomegranate trees after application of Hundz soil may be due to increasecation exchange capacity and mineral nutrients, which in turn encouraged the plant growth. In this respect Kay-Shoemake et al., (2000) found that application of soil conditioner (polyacrylamide PAM)increased the availability of nutrients, especially N via enhancing the activity of soil enzymes (urease and amidase), which involved in N cycling. Besides, the influence of PAM on reducing the leached amount of NH4 and NO3 (Bres and Weston, 1993), especially under the higher intervals of irrigation. Thus, the biosynthesis of proteins DNA and RNA would be enhanced leading to more initiation and division of the apical meristem cells; consequently, the plant height could be increased. Similar trend of results was found by Hoda -Khalil(2005) and Eman-Abd - Ella (2006).

As for the effect of application of both Nilefertile NF + K_2SO_4 on the vegetative growth characters, the results in Table (3) showed that using different levels of Nilefertile + K_2SO_4 significant improving all the vegetative growth characters comparing to the control treatment in both seasons. The maximum values of shoot length, diameter, number of shoots per main branch, number of leaves / shoot and leaf areawere recorded on the trees received Nilefertile (NF₂) at 2 Kg/tree + K_2SO_4 at 500gm/tree compared with those of either control or (1Kg/tree NF + 250gm K₂SO₄/tree) in the two seasons. The Stimulative effects of K_2SO_4 on growth parameters maybe due to that kis essential for the synthesis of amino acids, thus plants don't grow

well in the absence of K (Edmond et al., 1975). Also, it is very important in the plant photosynthesis process and helping plants metabolize their food to get energy. It is involved in many aspects of plant physiology (Marschner, 1995). The positive effect of Nilefertile application on vegetative growth parameters may be due to it contains elemental sulfer (acidulous material) which is oxidized slowly to sulfuric acid after its application to soil. Also, it contains different S-Oxidizing bacteria so it reduced soil pH and increased nutrient availability. Moreover, sulfur is a part of every living cell and required for synthesis of certain amino acids. In this respectit is worthy to note that Abbas (1999), Sherin - Attia (2002) and Wael (2005) found that NF significantly enhanced vegetative growth of olive trees

2-Leaf chemical composition

Data in Table (4) illustrated the main effects of irrigation frequency, Hundz soil and mixture of Nilefertile + K_2SO_4 on leaf chemical composition i.e. leaf N, P, K, total chlorophyll, proline and relative water content in both seasons.

The obtained results concerning the main effects of irrigation frequency revealed that, high irrigation level I_3 (11m³/tree/year) as well as moderate level of irrigation I₂ induced the highest leaf N, P, K, total chlorophyll and relative water content in both seasons with one exception for P in the first one. The increase of leaf N, P, K content with increasing irrigation rate was previously reported by Hussein (2004) on pear, Chauhan et al., (2005) on apple, and Khattab et al.,(2010) on pomegranate as they found that N, P, K contents were increased under the condition of high irrigation treatment. Reduction in leaf element contents with reducing irrigation amount is explained by a substantial decrease in transpiration rates and impaired active transport and membrane permeability, resulting in a reduced root absorbing power of nutrients.

Regarding leaf proline content, irrigation at 5.5 m^3 /tree /year produced the highest proline content over other irrigation levelsin both seasons. Accumulation of proline amino acid in plant parts during water stress is important for absorption and might serve as a storage compound for reduced carbon and nitrogen during stress. El-said *et al.*, (1993) and Hoda- Khalil (2005) on olive revealed that proline accumulation in olive leaves was affected by different water regimes.

Date in Table (4) showed the main effects of soil conditioner, Handz soil on leaf chemical components. Increasing Handz soil up to 10Kg /tree was associated with detected increments in leaf component except leaf

Treatments	z	N %	Р	P %	K	K %	(mg	Chlorophyll (mg/cm²)	Proline mg/g dry weight	ng/g dry ght	Relative Water Content (RWC)%	
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	- 1
Irrigation levels m ³ /tree/year												
I	1.46 b	1.52 b	0.184 a	0.192 b	1.14 b	1.15 b	4.67 b	4.74 b	13.28 a	12.81 a	76.48 b	
I2	1.70 a	1.75 a	0.189 a	0.198 a	1.29 a	1.31 a	4.88 a	4.96 a	13.09 b	12.60 b	89.24 a	
I,	1.85 a	1.91 a	0.194 a	0.203 a	1.39 a	1.39 a	4.99 a	5.10 a	12.92 b	13.38 b	91.55 a	
Hundz soil kg/tree												
HN_0	1.57 b	1.62 b	0.186 b	0.195 b	1.21 b	1.21 b	4.50 b	4.58 b	13.19 a	12.70 a	84.68 b	
HN1	1.70 a	1.76 a	0.189 ab	0.198 ab	1.23 b	1.27 a	4.88 ab	4.97 ab	13.09 ab	12.62 b	85.76 b	
HN2	1.75 a	1.79 a	0.193 a	0.202 a	1.36 a	1.37 a	5.15 a	5.24 a	13.02 b	12.48 b	86.83 a	
Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ Kg/tree												
MXo	1.39 c	1.45 c	0.179 c	0.188 c	1.07 c	1.09 c	4.48 c	4.57 c	13.38 a	12.88 a	83.04 b	
MX1	1.69 b	1.75 b	0.191 b	0.200 b	1.28 b	1.28 b	4.92 b	5.02 b	13.09 b	12.60 b	86.20 a	
MX,	1.93 a	1.99 a	0.198 a	0.207 a	1.45 a	1.47 a	5.14 a	5.20 a	12.83 c	12.32 c	88.03 a	

Ð	T
ome	Table 4.
gran	4
ate tre	Effect
es d	of
uring 2	4. Effect of irrigation
010	on 1
ate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	on frequency
growing s	,Hundz
ease	soil
SUIC	and
	cy ,Hundz soil and Mixture of Nile fertile
	of
	Nile
	fertile
	+
	$e + K_2 SO_4$
	on
	14 on some
	leaf
	components
	of .
	Arabi

proline which showed an opposite trend. Application of Handz soil at rate of 10Kg /tree gave significantly higher mean values of N, P, K, chlorophyll and (RWC) in both seasons. HN1 treatment gave similar trend of effect on leaf N inboth seasons as well as K and relative water content in the second one. Data also indicated that the untreated trees gave the maximum values of leaf proline in both seasons. These results may be due to that soil conditioner reduced the leached amounts of N as NH_4^+ and less as NO_3^- , serves as a nitrogen source and improves the conditions of soil which enhanced the decomposition of organic matter (Wallace and Wallace, 1986) with increasing the activity of soil enzymes such as urease and amidase (Kay- Shoemake et al., 2000), thus N availability and translocation would be increased consequently the N% in the leaves could be increased. Similar trend of results was stated by Silberbush et al., (1993) who reported that large amount of water absorbed by (PAM) soil conditions material (80%-85%) stored in vacuoles within its matrix. Diffusion of water into the soil solution would render water available to plant. Undoubtedly, increasing available soil moisture would ultimately increase nutrients absorption and translocation by plant.

Data in table (4)clearly indicated that increasing the rates of the mixture up to 2Kg /tree Nilefertile + 500gm /tree K₂SO₄ led to progressive significant increases in the value of leaf N, P, K and total chlorophyll in both seasons and relative water content in the second season, compared with the control. Similar trend was obtained on relative water content as a result of application of 1Kg /tree Nilefertile + 250gm /tree K_2SO_4 in the first season. In the meantime, leaf proline showed an opposite trend where control treatment gave the highest percentage than other treatments in both seasons. Gething (1986) reported that K supply to the plants affect nitrogen efficiency, but there is an evidence of a more direct connection between the two elements, that K ion acts as a carrier for nitrate from the root to the leaf, where proteins are synthesized. Also, K ion, being very mobile, promotes the uptake of the nitrate by the root. These results are similar to those of Mohammed and Mohammed (2010) on apples. Moreover, Abbas, (1999) reported that application of Nilefertile to soil increased olive leafN,P, K and chlorophyll and decreased proline content. Also, Wael (2005) found that olive leaf content of N, P and K were increased by increasing levels of NF.

3-Flowering, Fruiting and Yield

The results of main effects of irrigation frequency, Hundz soil and mixture of Nilefertile + K_2SO_4 on number of flower/ shoot, fruit set percentage and yield are presented in Table (5). The obtained results indicated that the highest mean value of number of flowers /shoot, fruit set percentage and yield were associated with highest rate of irrigation level at $11m^3$ /tree/year compared to I₁ (5.5 m³/tree /year), in both seasons. In the meantime, I₂ (8.25 m³ /tree /day) hada similar effect as I₃ on this respect. No significant differences were found between I₃ and I₂ on fruit set percentage and yield in both seasons. Such results are in harmony with Hussein (2004) on pear and Khattab *et al.*,(2010) on pomegranate who found that, increasing the amount of applied water increased flower number per shoot, fruit setting and yield.

Concerning the main effects of Hundz soil onpreviously mentioned parameters, the results in Table (5) illustrated generally that application of Hundz soilat 10Kg/treereflectedsignificant increasing effects on the mean values of the previous characters than other treatments in both seasons. Hundz soil has ahigh cation exchange capacity and hence it willaffect soil nutritional capacity and the supply of nutrients to plants. Also, it has a high water absorbing capacity thus will affect positively the yield (Wafaa El-Etr, 2001) .These results are in correspondence with those obtained by Saddik and Laila –Ali et al., (2009) who found that the yield of peanut and carrot increased significantly by natural amendments application compared to nontreated one.

Regarding the application of Nilefertile $+ K_2SO_4$ levels on no. of flowers /shoot, fruit set percentage and yield (Kg /tree)the data in Table(5) indicated that the mean values of each studied character were high enough to be significant in both seasons. The results revealed that increasing mixture of Nilefertile and K₂SO₄ up to 2kg /tree and 500gm /tree respectively (MX_3) gave maximum values of the studied characters. The superiority of the highest level of the mixture might be referred to application of K₂SO₄ which activates more enzyme systems, aids in photosynthesis, promote water uptake, regulates nutrients translocation in plant, favors carbohydrate transport and increases yield (Marschner, 1995). Similar results were obtained by El-Iraqy et al., (2006), on guava and Mohammed and Mohammed (2010) on Apple.

The favorable influences of Nilefertile application on fruit set and yield could be related to the vital role of a mixture of ground rocks and minerals (45%) in increasing the availability of nutrient supply, improving the efficiency of macro-elements as well as its ability to meet some micro-elements requirements of crop, which in turn, should be reflected on production of high yield. Furthermore, NF contains elemental sulfer (32%) which is oxidized slowly to sulfuric acid, after its application to soil, below the drip lines, that prevented salt

Treatments	Flowers number /shoot	mber /shoot	Fruit	Fruit Set %	Yield Kg/tree	y/tree
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation levels m ³ /tree/year						
I	3.68 b	3.96 b	51.42 b	54.29 b	27.70 b	29.80 b
I2	3.89 a	4.18 a	56.01 a	58.40 ab	29.76 a	31.84 a
I3	3.99 a	4.29 a	58.85 a	61.19 a	30.79 a	32.74 a
Hundz soil kg/tree						
HN ₀	3.51 c	3.80 c	49.49 c	52.11 c	25.97 b	28.07 c
HN ₁	3.89 b	4.18 b	56.22 b	58.94 b	29.76 ab	31.83 b
HN ₂	4.17 a	4.46 a	60.57 a	62.83 a	32.52 a	34.47 a
Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ Kg/tree						
MX ₀	3.49 c	3.79 c	49.23 c	51.87 c	25.78 c	27.84 c
MX ₁	3.93 b	4.23 b	56.98 b	59.61 b	30.13 b	32.30 b
110	4.14 a	4.43 a	60.07 a	62.39 a	32.33 a	34.22 a

meg	ıble
rana	5. E
ite ti	ffect
rees	of
duri	irrig
ng 2	atior
ng 2010 an	fre
Ind 2	quen
2011	icy,
egranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	Hun
ving	dz so
seas	oil a
ons	nd N
	lixtu
	ire o
	fNi
	le fe
	rtile
	+ K
	2SO
	4 ON
	flow
	erin
	g, fr
	uitin
	g ar
	ıd yi
	able 5. Effect of irrigation frequency, Hundz soil and Mixture of Nile fertile + K2SO4 on flowering, fruiting and yield of Arabi
	of A
	rab
	-

accumulation around the roots and sustained the yield. The results are in line with those of Wael (2005) who found that increasing level of NF significantly enhanced olive fruit set and yield.

4-Fruit Physical Properties

Effect of irrigation levels on fruit weight, dimensions and fruit size are illustrated in Table (6). Fruit physical properties gradually increased with increasing irrigation levels in both seasons.Data also indicated that moderate irrigation level (I_2) enhanced fruit physical properties like high irrigation level I_3 however the differences between two irrigation were not big enough to be signification. These resultsare in line with those obtained by Kandil and El-Feky (2006) on apricot and Khattab *et al.*, (2010) on pomegranate as they concluded that fruit physical properties were improved when subjected to the highest irrigation rate.

Data in Table (6) showed that the highest fruit weight, length and diameter were obtained by application of 10 Kg /tree Hundz soil. Significant differences were found between (HN₂) the highest level and the control (HN₀) on fruit physical characteristics in both seasons. Fitzpatrick, (1986) found that Humus (soil conditioners) is capable to absorb large quantities of water; thus increasing the water holding capacity of the soil and therefore crop production.

As for the main effect of application of mixture of Nilefertile + K_2SO_4 the data in table (6) indicated that the highest fruit weight length and diameter were obtained by the addition of 2Kg NF + 500gm K_2SO_4 (MX₃). On the other hand, the least significant values of the fruit physical properties were obtained by the lowest level of the fertilizer mixture (MX₀). No significant differences were found between high level of (NF + K_2SO_4) and the moderate level of (Mx₂) on fruit length in 2nd season and diameter in the 1stone. These results are coincided with El-Iraqy *etal.*,(2006) on guava and Mohammed and Mohammed (2010) on apples as they found that fruit weight and dimensions increased by increasing K levels.

5-Fruit Chemical Composition:

The main effects of different irrigation frequency levels on fruit chemical composition, (total soluble solids, anthocyanin, V.C., acidity and tannins are shown in Table (7).

Data clarified the presence of significant increment in fruit juice total soluble solids, anthocyanin and V.C. as a result of increasing irrigation frequency levels. High irrigation level I_3 (11m³ /tree /year) recorded the highest values of fruit juice anthocyanin in seasons as well as TSS and V.C in the second one. Irrigation level

of 8.25m³ /tree /year behaved the same analogous effect on the previous fruit characteristics. However, in the first season, no significant differences were found between irrigation levels on TSS and V.C. High irrigation level (11m3 /tree /year) decreased significantly acidity and tannins content of pomegranate fruit compared to the rest of treatments during both seasons. The results are in line with those obtained by Lawand and Patil (1996) and Khattab et al., (2010) on pomegranates; they stated that the highest fruit acidity was observed with the lowest irrigation level. Also, El-Khoreiby and Salem (1989) and El-Iraqy et al., (2006) indicated that increasing soil moisture content increased V.C. content as well as decreased tannins content of guava . On the contrary, Khattab et al., (2010) found that anthocyanin content decreased by increasing irrigation levels in pomegranate juice.

Concerning the main effects of application of Hundz soil on fruit chemical composition, the results reflected that Hundz soil at highest rate (10Kg /tree) increased fruit juice TSS and anthocyanin in both seasons. However this trend of increment did not reach the significance level for V.C in the 2^{nd} season. Fruit acidity and tannins were significantly decreased as application ofHundz soil increased. Addition high rate of Hundz soil (10Kg /tree) significantly gave the lowest percent than either of treatment HN₀ or HN₁in both seasons.

The results of the main effects of Nilefertile + K_2SO_4 levels on fruit chemical composition i.e. TSS, anthocyanin and V.C illustrated generally that the comparisons among the mean values of each studied character were high enough to be significant, in both seasons except TSS in the 1stseason which reflected no significant differences between MX2and MX1.The results showed also that the application of 2Kg /tree Nilefertile + 500gm /tree K₂SO₄ was most favorable treatment that gave significant highest mean values of the previous characteristicsin both seasons. However, fruit acidity and tannins content were significantly decreased by application of high rate of Nilefertile and K₂SO₄ in both seasons. The results are in harmony with El-Iraqyet al., (2006) on guava and Mohamed and Mohamed (2010) on apple. They found that K fertilization positively affected fruit chemical composition.

2-First-order interactions effects

2.1. Vegetative growth

Results in Table (8) illustrated the effects of the first-order interactions (Irrigation levels \times Hundz soil, Irrigation levels \times mixture from (Nilefertile + K₂SO₄)

Trootmonto	Fruit Weight (gm)	ight (gm)	Fruit length (cm)	gth (cm)	Fruit Diameter (cm)	ıeter (cm)	Fruit Volume (cm ³)	ıme (cm ³
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation levels m ³ /tree/year								
I	264.82 b	269.68 b	7.66 b	8.01 b	8.56 b	8.86 b	293.30b	312.03b
I_2	286.92 ab	300.90 a	8.08 a	8.46 ab	8.80 a	9.07 a	313.83ab	332.89ab
I_3	315.51 a	320.14 a	8.38 a	8.82 a	8.91 a	9.23 a	324.45a	343.64a
Hundz soil kg/tree								
HN_0	278.06 b	279.27 b	7.73 b	8.21 b	8.69 b	8.92 b	276.35b	295.25b
HN1	288.66 b	297.68 a	8.03 ab	8.49 a	8.75 ab	9.08 a	313.94ab	332.85ab
HN_2	300.54 a	313.78 a	8.37 a	8.59 a	8.82 a	9.16 a	341.45a	360.46a
Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ Kg/tree								
MX_0	260.54 c	268.12 c	7.41 c	7.61 b	8.50 b	8.76 c	274.12c	293.90c
MX ₁	294.26 b	295.49 b	7.92 b	8.65 a	8.81 a	9.06 b	282.98b	338.44b
			0 00			0.01	~~ ~~	222.20

Treatments	TSS	TSS %	Anthocy	Anthocyanine %	V.C mg vc/100ml juice	100ml juice	Acid	Acidity %	Tannins %	ns %
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation levels m ³ /tree/year										
Į.	15.29 a	16.24 b	0.380 b	0388 b	23.63 a	23.97 b	0.88 a	0.96 a	2.28 a	2.14 a
I2	15.94 a	17.95 a	0.401 a	0.409 a	23.78 a	24.35 ab	0.81 a	0.86 ab	2.12 a	1.98 a
I ₃	16.48 a	18.16 a	0.411 a	0.419 a	24.17 a	24.84 a	0.77 b	0.78 b	1.88 b	1.75 b
Hundz soil kg/tree										
HN.	15.49 b	16.71 b	0.363 b	0.371 b	23.37 b	24.24 a	0.86 a	0.92 a	2.18 a	2.04 a
HN	15.89 ab	17.74 ab	0.401 ab	0.408 ab	23.92 a	24.44 a	0.82 b	0.85 b	2.13 a	1.99 a
HN2	16.32 a	17.90 a	0.428 a	0.436 a	24.29 a	24.48 a	0.77 b	0.83 b	1.97 b	1.84 b
Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ Kg/tree										
MX ₀	14.77 b	16.02 c	0.361 c	0.369 c	23.49 b	23.64 c	0.88 a	0.91 a	2.35 a	2.21 a
MX	16.11 a	17.81 b	0.404 b	0.413 b	23.89 ab	24.51 b	0.78 b	0.85 b	2.12 b	1.98 a
MX.	16.82 a	18.52 a	0.426 a	0.434 a	24.19 a	25.01 a	0.78 b	0.83 b	1.82 c	1.68 b

Table 7. Effect of irrigation frequency, Hundz soil and Mixture of Nile fertile + K2SO4 on some fruit chemical propomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	
chemical properties of Arabi	

Treatments	Shoot Length (cm)	ngth (cm)	Shoot diameter (cm)	neter (cm)	No.of leaves /shoot	ves /shoot	No.of new sh	No.of new shoots / branch	Leaf area (cm ²)	8
	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation X Hundz										
$I_1 X HN_0$	12.40 e	12.53 e	1.33 de	1.57 d	15.51 g	17.16 e	9.07 e	9.38 e	4.72 e	
I ₁ X HN ₁	12.59 c	12.72 d	1.40 d	1.63 c	16.55 f	18.28 d	9.41 d	11.94 d	4.91 d	5.10d
$I_1 X HN_2$	12.97 bc	13.07 c	1.50 c	1.69 c	17.09 c	18.59 cd	9.54 d	11.99 d	5.29 bc	5.44c
$I_2 X HN_0$	12.48 de	12.61 de	1.49 c	1.64 c	17.98 d	20.32 c	9.47 d	12.63 c	4.80 de	4.96de
$I_2 X HN_1$	12.96 bc	13.09 c	1.63 b	1.98 b	18.43 c	22.62 b	9.73 c	12.93 bc	6.28 c	5.47bc
$I_2 X HN_2$	13.13 ab	13.27 ab	1.67 ab	1.96 b	19.71 b	23.56 ab	10.24 b	13.03 b	5.45 ab	5.65ab
$I_3 X HN_0$	12.57 c	12.69 d	1.62 b	1.99 b	19.64 b	22.63 b	9.98 bc	12.75 c	4.84 d	5.07d
I ₃ X HN ₁	13.04 ab	13.16 ab	1.67 ab	2.02 ab	21.65 ab	24.36 ab	10.32 b	13.26 b	5.34 b	5.54b
I ₃ X HN ₂	13.32 a	13.49 a	1.85 a	2.06 a	23.07 a	24.61 a	10.80 a	13.68 a	5.63 a	5.80a
Irrigation X Mixture										
$I_1 \ge MX_0$	12.29 e	12.41 e	1.14 e	1.45 e	13.60 e	15.38 e	8.55 e	9.64 f	4.61 f	4.77f
$I_1 X M X_1$	12.72 c	12.86 c	1.48 d	1.61 d	17.33 d	16.49 d	9.34 d	11.15 e	5.04 d	5.24d
$I_1 \ge MX_2$	12.95 bc	13.05 bc	1.61 e	1.83 c	18.22 c	22.17 c	10.14 c	12.52 e	5.27 c	5.43c
$I_2 \ge MX_0$	12.50 d	12.64 d	1.45 d	1.52 d	16.45 d	18.62 d	8.52 e	11.41 e	4.82 e	5.02e
$I_2 \ge MX_1$	12.95 bc	13.08 bc	1.56 c	1.87 c	18.35 c	22.70 c	10.02 c	13.37 b	5.27 c	5.43c
I2 X MX2	13.12 ab	13.25 ab	1.22 ab	2.18 ab	21.32 Ь	25.18 b	10.91 ab	13.78 ab	5.44 ab	5.64ab
$I_3 \ge MX_0$	12.60 cd	12.72 cd	1.46 d	1.69 d	18.49 c	20.07 c	9.29 d	12.16 d	4.91 e	5.10e
$I_3 \ge MX_1$	13.03 b	13.14 b	1.75 b	2.09 b	21.96 b	25.16 b	10.72 ab	13.45 ab	5.33 bc	5.53bc
I ₃ X MX ₂	13.30 a	13.48 a	1.93 a	2.29 a	23.91 a	26.32 a	11.16 a	14.07 a	5.58 a	5.79a
Hundz X Mixture										
$HN_0 \ge MX_0$	12.27 f	12.38 c	1.33 c	1.44 c	15.62 f	17.13 b	8.51 c	10.53 f	4.58 c	4.77c
$HN_0 \ge MX_1$	12.52 c	12.65 d	1.44 d	1.71 c	17.88 ed	19.02 d	9.60 d	11.67 c	4.83 d	5.00d
$HN_0 \ge MX_2$	12.66 d	12.79 d	1.66 bc	2.04 ab	19.62 e	23.96 b	10.41 b	12.56 d	4.94 d	5.16d
$HN_1 \ge MIX_0$	12.34 e	12.47 e	1.34 e	1.59 d	16.29 e	18.30 e	8.82 de	11.35 e	4.65 de	4.86de
$HN_1 X MX_1$	12.96 e	13.16 c	1.61 c	1.94 b	18.95 e	22.40 c	10.06 e	13.08 c	5.28 c	5.48c
HN ₁ X MX ₂	13.29 ab	13.40 ab	1.78 ab	2.09 ab	21.39 ab	24.50 ab	10.58 ab	13.70 ab	5.60 ab	5.78ab
$HN_2 \ge MX_0$	12.79 c	12.91 c	1.37 de	1.63 c	16.63 de	18.63 e	9.02 d	11.34 e	5.10 c	5.26c
	13.21 ab	13.33 Ъ	1.73 b	1.92 в	20.81 Ъ	22.93 c	10.41 в	13.22 в	5.52 в	5.72b
HN ₂ X MX ₁		12 50 5	1 01 2	2172	22 43 0	0 C > C	11 15 2	1/11 2	× 7/ 2	< 012

N,	Tal	
	ble 8.	
n som	First	
e veor	- orde	
viative	r inte	
ornw	ractio	
th cha	n effec	
ract	ts o	
	f the	
K ₂ SO ₄ on some vegetative growth characters of Arabi nomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	Table 8. First- order interaction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mix	
inn	studie	
POTS	ed fa	
inate 1	ictors;	
Trees d	Hun	
II.	ıdz s	
a 20	oil, i	
	rriga	
12	ition	
	freq	
rowin	uency	
O SP3	and	
sons	mixt	
	ure	
	xture of Nile fertile	
	le fe	
	rtile	
	т	

and Hundz soil \times (Nilefertile + K₂SO₄) on vegetative growth characters of Arabi pomegranate trees.

The effects of interactions between irrigation levels and Hundz soil on the characters of shoot length, diameter, number of leaves/ shoot as well as number of shoots/ main branch and leaf area were found to be significant in both seasons when compared with control treatment of any level of irrigation. The combination between high irrigation level 11m³ /tree/ year and Hundz soil at high rate 10Kg/tree (I₃×HN₂) reflected the best interaction, which gave significantly the highest mean values of all vegetative growth characters in both seasons followed by the application of highest rate of Hundz soil (10Kg /tree) combined with the second level of irrigation frequency $8.25m^3$ /tree /year($I_2 \times$ HN₂)which gave higher significant mean values for all the studied vegetative growth parameterscomparied with100% of the recommended irrigation level (I₃× HN0) in both seasons. Similar results were obtained with Hundz soil application at rate of 5Kg /tree in combination with irrigation level $8.25m^3$ /tree/year (I₂× HN_1) in all parameters with exceptions, for number of leaves /shoot and number of new shoots /branch in the 1st season. On the other hand, the least vegetative growth characters were obtained when pomegranate trees irrigated with lowest irrigation level $(I_1 \times HN_0)$ in both seasons. Such results might be contributed to increase available water holding capacity hydraulic conductivity and water diffusivity of sandy soil due to the application of soil conditioner which reflected to the plant growth (Im, 1982).

The interaction effects between irrigation levels and mixture from Nile fertile + K2SO4 treatments are presented in Table (8). The results reflected generally that the application of high rate mixture (2Kg +500gm K_2SO_4) combined with higher irrigation level (11m³) /tree /year) was favorable for the plant trees to express their performance on all vegetative growth characters. Data also indicated that the combination between second irrigation level (I_2) with either application of the mixture at high or low rate $(I_2 \times MX_1 \text{ or } MX_2)$ had similar trend of effects on vegetative growth characters like trees which irrigated with 11m3/tree/year without Nilefertile + K_2SO_4 ($I_3 \times MX_0$) with one exception for no.of leaves/shoot in the1st season. Reversely, the least level of irrigation combined with the least rate of mixture of Nile fertile + K_2SO_4 (I₁× MX₀) decreased significantly all vegetative growth parameters. This may be due to that K nutrition maintains high tissue water content under shortage of water (lindhauer, 1985). These data are coincided with El-Iraqy et al., (2006) on guava.

Regarding the interaction effects between Hundz soil and Nile fertile $+ K_2SO_4$ mixture on vegetative growth characters, the results in Table (8) reflected generally that the comparisons among the mean values for the vegetative growth characters are affected by these factors appeared to be significant in both seasons. The obtained results illustrated that Hundz soil application at rate of 10kg /tree combined with Nile fertile + K₂SO₄ at higher rate reflected the best interaction treatment since it gave the highest mean values for all the studied vegetative growth characters in both seasons. Theseresults reflected partial agreement with those obtained by Wallace and Wallace (1986)who found that applying soil conditioner (PAM) to organic source gave additive effect on growth of tomato and wheat plants and increasing water holding capacity of PAM treated soil reducing the frequency and total amount of irrigation required for several crops. Similarly Abbas (1999) found that using sulfer fertilizer mixture (Nilefertile) increased some growth parameter of olive seedlings due to it prevent salt accumulation around the roots and sustained the growth and yield of cucumber and onion (Badr, 1992).

2.2. Leaf chemical composition

Data in Table (9) indicated the first order interaction effects between irrigation levels \times Hundz soil, irrigation levels \times mixture from Nile fertile + K₂SO₄ and Hundz soil \times mixture of Nile fertile on leaf chemical composition; i.e. N, P, K, Chlorophyll, proline and relative water content in both seasons.

Concerning the interaction effects between irrigation levels and Hundz soil rates, data indicated that values of leaf N, P, K, chlorophyll and RWC for the combination between highest levels of Hundz soil with highest level irrigation ($I_3 \times HN_2$) were significantly higher than those of all other treatment combinations in both seasons. Whereas, leaf proline showed opposite trend, the date also indicated that combination treatment between 8.25m³/tree /year and HZ soil at highest rate ($I_2 \times HN_2$) gave the same characteristics results when compared with 100% of the recommended irrigation level (I₃ x \times HN_0) in both seasons. These results are in line with those of Hoda- Khalil (2005) who found that application of soil conditioner (PAM) increased leaf N, P, K and chlorophyll as well as decreased proline content of olive seedling.

Regarding the interaction effects between irrigation levels and mixture of (Nile fertile + K_2SO_4) on leaf chemical composition, the obtained results indicated that the treatment combination between highest irrigation level combined with the application of Nile fertile + K_2SO_4 at highest rate ($I_3 \times MX_2$) gave the highest values

N%6 P%6 K%6 Chlorophyl (mg/cm ²) Proline (mg/g dry weight) Relath	N0%	6	P96	96	K96	96	Chlorophyl (mg/cm ²	(mg/cm ²)	Proline (mg/g dry weight)	z dry weight)	Relative Water Content (RWC) %	ontent (RWC)
Treatments	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation X Hundz Soil												
I ₁ X HN ₀	1.41e	1.46e	0.181d	0.189d	1.05e	1.04e	4.42e	4.48e	13.35a	12.89a	75.61e	76.15e
I ₁ X HN ₁	1.46d	1.52d	0,185cb	0.194bd	1.12d	1.15d	4.61d	4.68d	13.26b	12.85ab	76.66d	77.18d
I ₁ X HN:	1.52c	1.58c	0,186b	0.195bc	1.32bc	1.376	4.99c	5.05c	13.24b	12.70b	77.16d	77.59d
I ₂ X HN ₀	1.47d	1.52d	0.185cb	0.195bc	1.23c	1.26c	4.50de	4.58e	13.25b	12.75b	88.72c	89.35c
I ₂ X HN ₁	1.81b	1.86b	0.188b	0.197b	1.33bc	1.38b	4.98c	5.05c	13.10c	12.64c	89.85c	91.59c
I; X HN;	1.826	1.88ab	0.193ab	0.202ab	1.39b	1.38b	5.15b	5.24b	12.93d	12.42c	90.15bc	92.53bc
I ₅ X HN ₀	1.82b	1.87b	0.190b	0.199b	1.33bc	1.35bc	4.58d	4.68d	12.98c	12.46c	89.725	91.57b
I ₀ X HN ₁	1.85ab	1.90ab	0.194ab	0.203ab	1.35bc	1.376	5.04bc	5.16b	12.92d	12.37d	91.76ab	93.72ab
I ₀ X HN ₂	1.89a	1.95a	0.199a	0.208a	1.47a	1.46a	5.32a	5.42a	12.86e	12.32	93.17a	93.93a
Irrigation X Mixture	-											
I ₁ X MX ₀	1.29f	1.34f	0.176d	0.184d	0.86e	0.90e	4.31e	4.39e	13.55a	13,08a	73.70e	74.58e
I ₁ X MX ₁	1.44e	1.50f	0.184c	0.193c	1.20cd	1.20d	4.74c	4.81c	13.35b	12.87b	77.41d	75.36d
I ₁ X MX ₂	1.66cd	1.72cd	0.192b	0.2016	1.34b	1.35b	4.97bc	5.01bc	12.95 cd	12.48c	78.33d	P66'08
I ₂ X MX ₀	1.36f	1.42ef	0.176d	0.186d	1.16d	1.18d	4.52d	4.60d	13.47ab	12.97ab	86.86c	87.57c
I ₂ X MX ₁	1.71c	1.77c	0.191b	0.200b	1.21cd	1.22c	4.97bc	5.05bc	13.03c	12.56cd	89.135	91.71b
I2 X MX2	2.026	2.08b	0.200ab	0.209ab	1.49ab	1.52ab	5.14ab	5.22ab	12.79e	12.28d	91.74ab	94.20ab
I ₅ X MX ₆	1.52de	1.58de	0.183c	0.192c	1.18cd	1.22c	4.61d	4.72d	13.12bc	12.58c	88.56c	88.64c
I ₅ X MX ₁	1.92b	1.97b	0.198ab	0.207ab	1.45ab	1.43ab	5.06b	5.18b	12.90d	12.37d	92.07ab	94.80ab
15 X MX2	2.12a	2.18a	0.202a	0.211a	1.54a	1.54a	5.31a	5.37a	12.74e	12.20e	94.01a	95.77a
Hundz X Mixture												
HN ₀ X MX ₀	1.28e	1.34e	0.176d	0.185d	1.05e	1.06e	4.28f	4.36f	13,46a	12.96a	82.66d	82.80d
HN ₀ X MX ₁	1.54c	1.60c	0.187bc	0.196bc	1.21c	1.20c	4.57d	4.66d	13.21b	12.72b	84.995	84.77b
HN ₀ X MX ₂	1.87b	1.926	0.1956	0.204b	1.38b	1.395	4.67d	4.72d	12.92b	12.42b	86.39ab	89.51ab
HN1 X MX6	1.42d	1.484	0.179c	0.188c	1.06d	1.10d	4.35e	4.45e	13.36ab	12.86ab	83.06cd	83.73cd
HN1 X MX1	1.77bc	1.82bc	0.193b	0.2005	1.21c	1.25c	4.98b	5.07c	13.09c	12.63c	85,735	88.26ab
HN1 X MX2	1.92ab	1.99ab	0.194b	0.205b	1.43b	1.46b	5.30ab	5.38ab	12.83d	12.36d	88.48a	90.50a
HN2 X MX0	1.47cd	1.52cd	0.180c	0.190c	1.10cd	1.14cd	4.80c	4.89c	13.31ab	12.80ab	83.40c	84.27c
HN2 X MX1	1.76bc	1.81bc	0.195b	0.204b	1.44b	1.40b	5.22b	5.32b	12.98c	12.45b	87.88ab	88.83ab
		2 074	0.203a	0.212a	1.56a	1.57a	5.43a	5.50a	12.74d	12.19e	89.20a	90.95a

,P,K,	able 9
Chlorophyll,	. First-order
proline and relati	able 9. First-order interaction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + K2SO4) on leaf
ve water conte	s of the three
ents of Arabi	studied factor
pomegranate 1	rs; Hundz so
trees during 2	il, irrigation 1
010 and 2011	requency and
growing sea	I mixture of (
sons	Nile fertile +
	K ₂ SO ₄) on lea
	F,

of all the studied leaf chemical composition, except leaf proline which showed opposite trend in both seasons. On the contrary, the lowest values between the previously mentioned interaction treatments were found with trees irrigated with 50% of the recommended irrigation level solely. In the meantime, irrigation trees with $8.25m^3$ /tree /year combined with application of Nile fertile + K_2SO_4 at both higher rates (MX₁) or (MX₂) gave best results as compared with 100% of the recommend level of irrigation $11m^3$ /tree /year (I₃ × MX₀) in both seasons.

Regarding the interaction effects, between the different rates of Hundz soil and the mixture of (Nile fertile +K₂SO₄) on leaf chemical components are represented in Table (9), the application of Hundz soil at the highest rate 10Kg /tree combined with the highest level from the mixture (2Kg + 500gm /tree) caused a significant increase in leaf N, P, K, chlorophyll and RWC as well as decreased leaf proline as compared with other treatments in both seasons. Meantime, application of the above combination treatments enhanced leaf components as compared with treatments which contain HN soil alone or treatment without any additions $(HN_0 \times F_0)$ in both seasons, these results may be due to the additive effect between soil conditioners which increase water holding capacity, enhance nutrient efficiency and encourage soil microflora in sandy soils (Azzamet al., 1987). Also Hilal et al., (1997) reported that application of sulfur fertilizer mixture (SFM) to the salinity soil led to reduce soil pH and provide oxidizing conditions for the benefit of plant roots development, with corresponding improvement of water and nutrient utilization. While, Abbas (1999) found that using (SFM) increased leaf N, P, K and chlorophyll and decreasedproline of olive. Moreover, Wael (2005) found that increasing level of K and NF enhanced leaf minerals content of olive trees.

2.3. Flowering, Fruiting and Yield

The First order interaction effects among the irrigation levels, Hundz soil and mixture from (Nile fertile and K_2SO_4) on number of flowers /shoot, fruit setpercentage and yield of pomegranate trees are presented in Table (10).

As for the effects between Hundz soil and irrigation levels, the results indicated that the application of the highest rate of Hundz soil 10Kg /tree combined with high irrigation level $(11m^3 / \text{tree} / \text{year})$ gave the most favorable interaction effect ($I_3 \times HN_2$), which showed the significant highest mean values for all the above studied parameter in both seasons. Similar, interaction effect was found between HN soil at both rates combined with either mediumor lower irrigation level $8.25m^3$ or $5.5m^3$ /tree /year on number of flower /shoot,

fruit set % and yield when compared with trees irrigated with control treatment $11m^3$ /tree /year only (I₃× HN₀) with one exception for fruit set %with treatment (I₁× HN₁) in both seasons. On the other hand, 5.5m³ /tree /year level of irrigation without Hundz soil presented the lowest values of the previous mentioned characters in both seasons. The results are in line with Fitzpatrick, (1986) who found that application of Humus is capable of absorbing large quanties of water; thus increasing the water holding capacity of the soil and therefore crop production.

The effects of interactions between irrigation levels and different rates of Nile fertile $+ K_2SO_4$ rates on the number of flowers /shoot, fruit set % and yield of pomegranate trees were found to be significant in the two seasons, as shown in Table (10). The highest level of irrigation combined with the mixture at higher rate (I3 x MX2) showed the highest values of no. of flower /shoot, fruit set % and yield, whereas, the control of the lowest irrigation level without NF or K_2SO_4 (I₁× MX₀) exhibited the least values in both seasons. In the meantime, combination between both levels of the 8.25m³/tree/year mixture with level (I_2) or 5.5m^3 /tree/year (I₁) gave almost the same effect on the above characters when compared with the control of the recommended irrigationlevel $(I_3 \times MX_0)$ with one exception for fruit set percent. Such results generally reflected agreement with those reported by El-Iraqy etal., (2006) on guavaand Khattab et al., (2010) on pomegranate. Theyfound that highest numbers of flowers / shoot were obtained when trees received high rate of K combined with high level of irrigation. Furthermore, Badr (1992) found that mixing sulfur fertilizer mixture (Nile fertile) below the drip lines prevented salt accumulation around the roots and sustained the yield of both cucumber and onion.

As related to the interaction effect between Hundz soil and Nilefertile + K₂SO₄, results in Table (10) indicated that application of 10Kg /tree Hundz soil combined with $2Kg NF + 500gm K_2SO_4 (HN_2 \times MX_2)$ was favorable for plants to express their best performance on no. of flower /shoot ,fruit set and yield as compared with others treatments in both seasons. Data also indicated that higher concentration of Hundz soil combined with lower rate of Nile fertile + K_2SO_4 (HN₂× MX₁) gave similar trend of effect like combination between higher rate of mixture and lower rate of HZ_1 ($HZ_1 \times MX_2$) on the above characters in both seasons. The results are in line with Wael (2005) who found that fruit set and yield of olive trees enhanced with application of NF Whereas, Laila - Ali et al., (2009) who found that the combination treatment between organic and inorganic conditioners increased wheat yield.

Fruit Set % Vield (Kg/tree)	Fruit	Fruit Set %	Yield (Kg/tree)	(a/free)	Flower number/shoot	aher/shoot
Treatments	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation X Hundz Soil						
I ₁ X HN ₀	45.75e	48.89e	25.17e	27.27e	3.43d	3.71d
I ₁ X HN ₁	50,42d	53.76d	27.07c	29.16d	3.62c	3.91c
I ₁ X HN ₂	58.07c	60.22c	30.87b	32.96c	4.00b	4.29b
I2 X HN0	49.15e	51.54e	26.00d	28.10e	3.51cd	3.81cd
I ₂ X HN ₁	58.41c	60.85e	30.80b	32.89c	3.99b	4.28b
I ₂ X HN ₂	60.47ab	62.80ab	32.47ab	34.50ab	4.16ab	4.46ab
L X HN ₀	53.55d	55.89d	26.73c	28.83d	3.59c	3.88c
L ₅ X HN ₁	59.83b	62.235	31.40ab	33,44b	4.05b	4.35b
L X HN;	63.18a	65.46a	34.23a	35.95a	4.34a	4.63a
Irrigation X Mixture						
I ₁ X MX ₀	44.39g	47.50f	24.07e	26.17e	3.32e	3.61e
I ₁ X MX ₁	52.78e	55.88d	28.37c	30.46c	3.75c	4.04c
I ₁ X MX ₂	57.08c	59.48c	30.67b	32.76b	3.98b	4.26b
I ₂ X MX ₀	48.20f	51.07e	26.23d	28,26d	3.53d	3.83d
$I_2 \ge M \times I_1$	59.39bc	61.34b	30.676	32.77b	3.98b	4.276
I ₂ X MX ₂	60.45b	62.79ab	32.37ab	34.46ab	4.15ab	4.44ab
L X MX ₀	55.10d	57.05d	27.03c	29.10c	3.62¢	3,91c
I ₅ X MX ₁	58,785	61.62b	31.375	33.68b	4.04b	4.37b
L X MX ₂	62.67a	64.91a	33.97a	35,44a	4.29a	4.58a
Hundz X Mixture						
HN ₀ X MX ₀	45.83g	48.45g	23.80f	25.90f	3.29e	3.60e
HN ₀ X MX ₁	49.80e	52.63e	26.40d	28.77d	3.58d	3.87d
HN ₀ X MX ₂	52.83d	55.24d	27.70d	29.53d	3.65d	3.94d
HN ₁ X MX ₀	47.47f	50.77f	24.53e	26.63e	3.36e	3.65e
HN ₁ X MX ₁	58.74c	61,61c	30.77c	32.83¢	3.99¢	4.28c
HN ₁ X MX ₂	62.46ab	64.46ab	33.97ab	36.03ab	4.31b	4.60b
	54.40d	56,40d	29.00c	31.00c	3.81cd	4.11cd
HN2 X MIX0	62.41ab	64.60ab	33.23ab	35.30ab	4.23b	4.53b
HN2 X MX0 HN2 X MX1						

able 10. First-order interaction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + 2SO ₄) on flowering , fruiting and yield of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	2SO4	able
irst-order interaction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + flowering , fruiting and yield of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons) on	10. F
order interaction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + rering , fruiting and yield of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	flow	irst-
er interaction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + g , fruiting and yield of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	erin	ord
teraction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + ruiting and yield of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	g, fi	er in
ction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + ng and yield of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	ruiti	tera
effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + nd yield of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	ig ai	ction
ets of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + eld of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	nd yi	effe
of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	ield .	ects .
e three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + rabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	of A	of th
ree studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	abi	e th
tudied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + egranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	pom	ree s
ed factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + nate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	egra	tudio
ctors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	nate	ed fa
s; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + s during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	trees	ctor
undz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + ing 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	dun	s; Hi
soil, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	ring	undz
, irrigation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + and 2011 growing seasons	2010	soil
gation frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + 2011 growing seasons	and	iii.
on frequency and mixture of (Nile fertile + 1 growing seasons	201	gati
equency and mixture of (Nile fertile + owing seasons	1 gr	on fr
ency and mixture of (Nile fertile + g seasons	owin	equ.
and mixture of (Nile fertile + 1sons	g sea	ency
mixture of (Nile fertile +	ISONS	and
ture of (Nile fertile +		mix
of (Nile fertile +		ture
(Nile fertile +		of (
fertile +		Nile
ile +		fert
		ile +

Fruit Weight (gm) Fruit Length (cm) Fruit diameter (cm)	Fruit We	Fruit Weight (gm)	Fruit Length	th (cm)	Fruit diameter (cm)	ieter (cm)	Fruit Volume (cm ³)	Te (
Treatments	2010	2011	2010		2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation X Hundz Soil								
$I_1 X HN_0$	256.00 f	250.30 f	7.58 de	7.78 f	8.48 e	8.76 e	268.0 e	286.3 e
$I_1 X HN_1$	266.53 ef	260.43 e	7.61 de	8.11 e	8.55 d	8.87 cd	286.9 d	306.1 d
I ₁ X HN ₂	271.93 e	298.30 c	7.77 d	8.13 e	8.65 cd	8.95 c	324.9 c	343.7 c
$I_2 \times HN_0$	280.80 d	282.23 d	7.75 d	8.27 d	8.75 c	8.84 cd	276.4 e	295.9 e
$I_2 \times HN_1$	281.90 d	305.83 bc	7.97 c	8.52 c	8.80 bc	9.15 b	324.3 c	341.7 c
I ₂ X HN ₂	298.07 e	314.63 b	8.53 b	8.59 c	8.84 b	9.22 ab	340.8 ab	361.1 ab
$I_3 \times HN_0$	297.37 c	305.27 bc	7.86 cd	8.58 c	8.86 b	9.15 b	284.1 d	303.5 d
$I_3 \times HN_1$	317.53 b	326.77 a	8.50 b	8.85 b	8.90 ab	9.25 ab	330.6 b	350.7 b
I ₃ X HN ₂	331.63 a	328.40 a	8.80 a	9.03 a	8.98 a	9.30 a	358.6 a	376.6 a
Irrigation X Mixture								
$I_1 \ge MX_0$	236.97 f	266.13 c	7.39 e	7.29 f	8.28 e	8.66 d	256.9 f	277.0 e
$I_1 \ge M X_1$	274.30 d	242.53 e	7.40 ed	8.18 d	8.63 d	8.81 c	300.0 d	319.9 c
$I_1 \ge MX_2$	283.20 c	300.37 b	8.23 b	8.56 c	8.76 c	9.11 cb	322.9 c	339.2 b
$I_2 \ge M X_0$	258.80 e	265.23 c	7.34 a	7.64 e	8.60 d	8.72 d	278.5 e	298.3 d
$I_2 \ge M X_1$	287.83 c	306.70 b	7.99 c	8.74 c	8.86 c	9.10 cb	322.9 c	342.5 b
$I_2 \ge MX_2$	314.13 b	330.77 ab	8.92 b	d 66'8	8.93 ab	8.72 d	340.0 b	357.8 ab
$I_3 \ge MIX_0$	285.87 c	273.00 c	7.53 d	7.91 d	8.61 d	8.89 c	286.9 e	306.3 c
$I_3 \ge M X_1$	320.63 b	337.23 ab	8.37 b	9.03 b	8.96 ab	9.29 b	332.6 b	352.9 ab
$I_3 \ge M X_2$	340.03 a	350.20 a	9.26 a	9.51 a	9.17 a	9.52 a	353.8 a	371.6 a
Hundz X Mixture								
$HN_0 \ge MX_0$	253.83 f	250.33 e	7.27 e	7.52 e	8.48 c	8.62 d	254.6 e	273.7 f
$HN_0 \ge MX_1$	283.17 d	269.20 d	7.35 d	8.39 c	8.75 b	8.91 c	283.2 d	303.3 e
$HN_0 \ge MX_2$	297.17 c	318.27 b	8.57 b	8.73 b	8.86 ab	9.22 b	290.8 d	308.7 e
$HN_1 \ge MX_0$	260.53 e	258.70 e	7.40 d	7.62 e	8.49 c	8.79 c	261.6 e	282.1 f
$HN_1 \ge MX_1$	290.53 cd	305.63 c	7.92 c	8.74 b	8.81 b	9.11 b	323.9 b	303.8 c
HN ₁ X MX ₂	314.90 b	328.70 ab	8.77 ab	9.11 ab	8.95 ab	9.37 ab	356.3 ab	372.7 b
$HN_2 \ge MX_0$	267.27 e	295.33 c	7.55 d	7.7 ab	8.52 c	8.86 c	306.2 c	325.9 d
$HN_2 \ge MX_1$	309.07 b	311.63 b	8.49 b	8.83 b	8.88 b	9.18 b	348.5 b	369.2 b
						5		

	K₂SO₄) on some fruit phy :	Fable 11. First-order inte	
Fruit Weight (gm)	sical properties of Arabi po	raction effects of the three	
Fruit Length (cm)	omegranate trees during 2	e studied factors; Hundz s	
Fruit diameter (cm)	K ₂ SO ₄) on some fruit physical properties of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	Fable 11. First-order interaction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixture	
Fruit Volume (cm ³)	IS	1 mixture of (Nile fertile +	

TSS % Anthocyanin % V.C mg.vc/100ml juice Acidity %	TSS	%	Anthocyanin	anin %	V.C mg.vo	V.C mg.vc/100ml juice	Acidity	y %	Tannins	ns %
1 reauments	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
Irrigation X Hundz Soil										
$I_1 X HN_0$	14.81f	14.68f	0.355e	0.363e	23.32e	23.80f	0.96a	1.01a	2.36a	2.22a
$I_1 X HN_1$	15.40e	17.02e	0.374d	0.382d	23.90c	24.10e	0.86b	0.96b	2.28b	2.14ab
$I_1 X HN_2$	15.66d	17.03e	0.412c	0.419c	23.66d	24.02e	0.80c	0.92c	2.21c	2.08b
$I_2 \times HN_0$	15.61d	17.74d	0.363c	0.371e	23.38e	24.26d	0.83d	0.94c	2.22c	2.08b
$I_2 X HN_1$	15.86c	18.04e	0.411c	0.420c	23.45d	24.38c	0.80c	0.83d	2.24c	2.09b
$I_2 X HN_2$	16.33b	18.07e	0.428b	0.436b	24.52ab	24.39c	0.78e	0.81d	1.90e	1.76d
$I_3 X HN_0$	16.07bc	17.75d	0.371d	0.379d	23.41d	24.65b	0.81c	0.81d	1.95d	1.81c
$I_3 X HN_1$	16.41b	18.16b	0.417c	0.425c	24.39b	24.84ab	0.78e	0.77e	1.89e	1.75d
I ₃ X HN ₂	16.96a	18.61a	0.445a	0.453a	24.69a	25.02a	0.71f	0.75e	1.80f	1.68e
Irrigation X Mixture										
$I_1 \ge M X_0$	14.23f	14.80f	0.344f	0.351f	23.84f	23.27f	0.91a	1.03a	2.55a	2.41a
$I_1 \ge M X_1$	15.41d	16.31e	0.387d	0.395d	23.54d	24.10d	0.86b	0.94b	2.35b	2.21b
$I_1 \ge M X_2$	16.22c	17.62c	0.410c	0.418bc	23.50d	24.55c	0.86b	0.92b	1.95c	1.81d
$I_2 \ge M X_0$	14.70e	16.43e	0.365e	0.374	23.23e	23.65e	0.89ab	0.91b	2.44b	2.30ab
$I_2 \ge MIX_1$	16.11c	18.60b	0.410c	0.418bc	23.88c	24.41c	0.77c	0.85c	2.13c	1.99c
$I_2 \ge MX_2$	17.00ab	18.82ab	0.427b	0.435ab	24.24b	24.98b	0.75c	0.81c	1.78e	1.64fe
$I_3 \ge MIX_0$	15.38d	16.83d	0.374d	0.381e	23.42c	23.98d	0.85b	0.80c	2.05c	1.93dc
$I_3 \ge M X_1$	16.81b	18.55b	0.417c	0.425b	24.26b	25.02b	0.72c	0.77d	1.87d	1.73e
$I_3 \ge MIX_2$	17.25a	19.12a	0.443a	0.450a	24.82a	25.50a	0.74c	0.76d	1.72e	1.58f
Hundz X Mixture										
$HN_0 \ge MX_0$	14.31f	15.42f	0.341e	0.349f	23.17f	23.58e	0.93a	0.96a	2.43a	2.29a
$HN_0 \ge MIX_1$	15.69d	16.90d	0.367de	0.375e	23.41e	24.41c	0.78d	0.90b	2.18e	2.04c
$HN_0 \ge MX_2$	16.49bc	17.82cb	0.380d	0.389d	23.53d	24.72b	0.89b	0.89b	1.92d	1.78d
$HN_1 \ge MX_0$	14.85f	16.33e	0.348e	0.357f	23.58d	23.69d	0.89b	0.89b	2.35ab	2.21d
$HN_1 \ge MIX_1$	16.15c	18.20b	0.411c	0.419c	23.99c	24.54c	0.81c	0.86c	2.20c	2.06c
$HN_1 X MX_2$	16.67b	18.70ab	0.443b	0.451ab	24.18b	25.09ab	0.74d	0.81d	1.85d	1.71d
$HN_2 \ge MX_0$	15.14e	16.31e	0.393d	0.400d	23.74c	23.64d	0.84bc	0.88b	2.26b	2.14b
HN ₂ X MX ₁	16.50b	18.30b	0.45b	0.444b	24.28b	23.58c	0.75d	0.81d	1.97d	1.83d

	SO ₄) on some fruit chemical properties of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	ble12. First-order interaction effects of the three studied factors; Hundz soil, irrigation frequency and mixt
	0 (2. F
	I SOI	irst
	ne f	-ord
	ruit	ler
	che	inte
	mic	ract
	al p	ion
	rop	effe
	ertie	cts
	es of	of t
	f Ar	he t
	abi	hre
	pon	e sti
	legr	udie
!	ana	d fa
	te ti	icto
	see.	rs; I
	dur	Iun
1	Bu	dz s
	2010	oil,
) an	irrig
	d 20	gati
	11	on f
	grov	irequ
	ving	lend
	sea	y a
!	son	nd
	s.	mixt
		ure
		of
		Ni
:		e fei
		tile
		+

Irrigation levels	Hundz Soil (HN)	Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄	Shoot ler	Shoot length (cm)	Shoot length (cm)	gth (cm)	No. of leaves/shoot	ves/shoot	No. of leaves/shoot	ves/shoot	Leaf Area (cm ²)	a (cm ²)
m ³ /tree/year	(kg/tree)	Mixture (Kg/tree)	2010		2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
		\mathbf{MX}_0	12.13 k	12.25 k	1.10 h	1.27 h	8.52 gi	8.19 k	13.00 k	14.46 h	4.45 k	4.65 k
	HN_0	MX_1	12.41 hk	12.57 hk	1.36 eh	1.58 fh	8.81 fi	9.20 jk	16.62 hk	15.42 fh	4.73 hk	4.93 hk
		MX_2	12.65 dk	12.76 dk	1.52 bg	1.85 bg	9.88 bh	10.75 gj	16.88 dk	21.61 ah	4.97 dk	5.12 dk
-		$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{X}_0$	12.23 jk	12.35 jk	1.11 h	1.49 gh	8.71 gi	10.42 hj	14.20 jk	16.09 c h	4.55 jk	4.75 jk
50% of recommended irrigation level	HN1	MX1	12.59 fk	12.74 fk	1.47 cg	1.59 fh	9.46 ci	12.09 dh	17.40 fk	16.66 dh	4.91 fk	5.11 fk
= 5.5		MX_2	12.94 bh	13.07 bh	1.61 bf	1.80 bh	12.07 bg	13.30 ad	18.06 bh	22.08 ah	5.26 bh	5.44 bk
		\mathbf{MX}_0	12.50 gk	12.62 gk	1.20 gh	1.58 fh	8.41 hi	10.30 ij	13.59 gk	15.59 eh	4.82 gk	4.92 gk
	HN_2	MIX_1	13.16 ac	13.27 ac	1.60 bf	1.67 dh	9.74 ci	12.15 cg	17.96 ac	17.38 ch	5.47 ac	5.67 ac
		MX_2	13.26 ac	13.33 ac	1.70 bd	1.83 bg	12.46 ae	13.52 ad	19.73 ac	22.81 ah	5.57 ac	5.73 ac
		MX_0	12.29 jk	12.42 jk	1.43 dh	1.32 h	8.24 i	11.30 fi	15.95 jk	17.26 dh	4.61 jk	4.81 jk
	HN_0	MX_1	12.54 gk	12.65 gk	1.31 be	1.58 fh	8.57 ci	13.19 ar	17.66 gk	19.06 bh	4.86 gk	4.94 gk
		MX_2	12.62 ck	12.75 ek	1.72 bd	2.03 af	10.61 ad	13.41 ad	20.33 ek	24.65 ag	4.93 ek	5.14 ck
I ₂		\mathbf{MX}_0	12.35 ik	12.49 ik	1.46 cg	1.59 fh	8.41 hi	11.42 fi	16.26 jk	18.56 bh	4.67 ik	4.87 ik
75% of recommended irrigation level	HN1	MX1	13.11 bd	13.23 bd	1.66 fh	2.11 ae	10.07 bg	13.52 ad	17.76 bd	24.22 ah	5.43 bd	5.62 bd
= 8.25		MX_2	13.42 ac	13.54 ac	1.88 bc	2.23 ac	10.71 ad	13.86 ac	21.26 ac	25.07 af	5.74 ac	5.93 ac
		MX_0	12.87 ci	13.00 ci	1.46 cg	1.66 dh	8.91 ci	11.52 ci	17.13 ci	20.05 bh	5.19 ci	5.38 ci
	HN ₂	MX1	13.19 ad	13.35 ad	1.70 bd	1.92 ag	10.41 af	13.41 ad	19.63 ad	24.83 af	5.51 ad	5.73 ad
		MX_2	13.32 ac	13.46 ac	1.85 ab	2.29 ab	11.40 ab	14.07 ab	22.36 ac	25.81 ac	5.64 ac	5.84 ac
		\mathbf{MX}_0	12.38 ik	12.48 ik	1.46 cg	1.74 ch	8.77 gi	12.09 dh	17.90 ik	19.68 bh	4.69 ik	4.86 ik
	HN ₀	MX1	12.62 dj	12.73 dj	1.66 be	1.98 ag	10.43 ae	12.63 bf	19.36 aj	22.58 ah	4.91 dj	5.12 dj
		MX_2	12.71 ek	12.85 ek	1.74 bd	2.24 ac	10.74 ad	13.52 ad	21.66 ek	25.62 ae	4.93 ek	5.23 ek
I ₃		\mathbf{MX}_0	12.44 gk	12.57 gk	1.45 cg	1.69 dh	9.35 di	12.20 cg	18.40 gk	19.26 bh	4.74 gk	4.95 gk
100% of recommended irrigation	HN1	MX_1	13.19 ad	13.32 ad	1.70 bd	2.12 ae	10.66 ad	13.63 ad	21.70 ad	27.31 ad	5.49 ad	5.70 ad
level = 11		MX_2	13.50 ab	13.60 ab	1.86 ab	2.24 ac	10.96 ac	13.95 ab	24.86 ac	27.36 ac	5.80 ab	5.98 ab
		\mathbf{MX}_{0}	12.99 bg	13.11 bg	1.46 cg	1.64 eh	9.74 ci	12.20 cg	19.16 bg	19.26 bh	5.29 bg	5.49 bg
	HN_2	MX_1	13.29 ac	13.38 ac	1.89 ab	2.16 ad	11.07 ac	14.09 ab	24.83 ac	27.58 ab	5.59 ac	5.76 ac
							11 70 -	14 74 9	25 21 a	07 08 4	× 00 ×	

X	ί
σq	E
VO	fec
f	6
of	fs
	ecc
ab	md
Ĩ,	0
om	rde
leg	Ť.
La I	nte
at	ra
e t	£.
ree	on
b s	be
	ŧ.
100	een
20	Ē.
10	E.
an	ati
ā	on
201	Ŧ
ji i i Mo	equ
	5
-	=
Win	ncy,
wing 9	ncy, H
owing sea	ncy, Hun
owing seasor	ncy, Hundz
ive growth of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons	ncy, Hundz soi
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil a
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and m
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixt
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture o
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of N
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile
wing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fei
wing seasons	13. Effect of second order interaction between irrigation frequency, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertil
wing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile +
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile + K
owing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile + K ₂ St
wing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄
wing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ on
wing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ on so
wing seasons	ncy, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ on some

Parameters of Arabi pomegranate trees during 2010 and 2011 growing seasons

Irrigation levels	(HN)	Nile fertile + K ₂ SO4 Mixture	N%	Ô	Р %	%	К %	0/0	Cholophyll mg/cm ²	phyll cm²	Proline mg/g dry weight	ng/g dry tht	RWC %	%
m ³ /tree/year	(kg/tree)	(Kg/tree)	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
		MX_0	1.13 h	1.18 h	0.176 gi	0.182 i	0.82 h	0.85 h	4.15 k	4.23 k	13.68 a	13.19 a	73.11 k	73.55 h
	HN ₀	MX_1	1.41 fh	1.47 fh	0.179 fi	0.188 fi	1.08 eh	1.03 fh	4.43 hk	4.51 hk	13.45 ad	13.00 ad	76.74 ik	74.51 gh
		MX_2	1.68 bg	1.73 bg	0.189 bh	0.198 bh	1.24 bg	1.23 ch	4.67 dk	4.70 dk	12.93 eh	12.48 dh	76.97 ik	80.40 ch
Ŀ		\mathbf{MX}_0	1.32 gh	1.38 <u>g</u> h	0.178 gi	0.187 gi	0.83 h	0.87 h	4.25 jk	4.33 jk	13.48 ac	13.03 ac	74.31 jk	75.08 fh
50% of recommended	HN_1	MX	1.42 fh	1.47 fh	0.185 ci	0.194 ci	1.19 cg	1.21 dh	4.61 fk	4.69 fk	13.39 ae	12.96 ae	77.51 hk	75.35 dh
irrigation level $= 5.5$		MX_2	1.63 bh	1.71 bh	0.191 bg	0.200 bg	1.33 bf	1.36 bg	4.96 bh	5.02 bh	12.90 dh	12.55 bh	78.17 gk	81.11 ah
		\mathbf{MX}_{0}	1.41 fh	1.47 fh	0.175 hi	0.184 hi	0.94 <u>g</u> h	0.97 gh	4.52 gk	4.60 gk	13.48 ac	13.01 ac	73.68 jk	75.12 eh
	HN2	MX1	1.50 dh	1.55 dh	0.188 ci	0.197 ci	1.34 bf	1.36 bg	5.17 ae	5.25 ae	13.21 ag	12.66 ag	77.97 hk	76.21 dh
		MX_2	1.66 bg	1.71 bg	0.195 ae	0.204 ae	1.45 bd	1.47 ae	5.27 ac	5.31 ad	13.03 ch	12.42 dh	79.84 <u>g</u> k	81.46 ah
		MX_0	1.15 h	1.21 h	0.173 i	0.185 gi	1.12 dh	1.14 fh	4.31 jk	4.39 jk	13.58 ab	13.08 ab	86.96 ek	86.25 bh
	HN ₀	MX	1.41 fh	1.47 fh	0.186 ci	0.195 ci	1.16 cg	1.20 eh	4.56 gk	4.64 gk	13.21 ag	12.71 ag	88.77 ci	88.09 bh
		MX_2	1.86 af	1.91 af	0.197 ad	0.206 ad	1.42 bd	1.45 ae	4.63 ek	4.71 ek	12.95 dh	12.45 eh	90.44 ae	93.71 af
I2		\mathbf{MX}_{0}	1.42 fh	1.47 fh	0.175 hi	0.184 hi	1.18 cg	1.20 eh	4.37 ik	4.45 ik	13.50 ac	13.01 ac	85.37 fk	87.45 bh
75% of recommended	HN1	MX	1.94 ae	1.99 ae	0.191 bg	0.200 bg	1.03 fh	1.13 fh	5.13 bd	5.20 bd	13.00 dh	12.60 bg	86.87 ek	93.22 af
irrigation level = 8.25		MX_2	2.06 ac	2.12 ac	0.193 ad	0.207 ad	1.49 bc	1.51 ac	5.44 ac	5.51 ac	12.80 gh	12.30 fh	92.31 ad	94.10 ae
		MX_0	1.49 dh	1.58 dh	0.180 ei	0.189 ei	1.18 eg	1.21 dh	4.89 ci	4.97 ci	13.32 af	12.81 af	87.24 dk	89.00 ah
	HN2	MX	1.75 ag	1.84 ag	0.195 ae	0.204 ae	1.42 bd	1.32 bh	5.21 ad	5.32 ad	12.87 fh	12.36 fh	90.74 ae	93.81 af
		MX_2	2.12 ab	2.21 ab	0.205 ab	0.214 ab	1.56 ab	1.60 ab	5.34 ac	5.43 ac	12.61 h	12.10 h	92.47 ac	94.78 ae
		MX_0	1.57 ch	1.63 ch	0.178 gi	0.187 gi	1.18 cg	1.20 eh	4.39 ik	4.47 ik	13.12 bg	12.60 bg	87.91 dk	88.59 ah
	HN ₀	MX	1.81 ag	1.86 ag	0.195 ae	0.204 ae	1.37 be	1.38 ag	4.71 dj	4.84 dj	12.96 dh	12.44 dh	89.47 bd	91.70 ag
		MX_2	2.07 ac	2.12 ac	0.198 ad	0.207 ad	1.45 bd	1.48 ad	4.72 dj	4.74 ek	12.87 fh	12.33 fh	91.77 ad	94.42 ae
I_3		MX_0	1.52 dh	1.58 dh	.0184 di	0.193 di	1.17 cg	1.22 dh	4.44 gk	4.57 gk	13.09 bh	12.55 bh	88.51 ci	88.65 ah
100% of recommended	HN_1	MX	1.95 ae	2.00 ae	0.197 ad	0.206 ad	1.42 bd	1.40 af	5.19 ad	5.32 ad	12.88 fh	12.34 fh	91.81 ad	96.22 ad
irrigation level = 11		MX ₂	2.07 ac	2.13 ac	0.200 ac	0.209 ac	1.47 bd	1.50 ac	5.51 ab	5.60 ab	12.78 gh	12.23 gh	94.97 ab	96.28 ac
		MX ₀	1.47 eh	1.52 eh	0.188 ci	0.197 ci	1.18 cg	1.23 ch	5.00 bg	5.11 bg	13.14 bg	12.59 bg	89.27 bg	88.69 ah
	HN2	MX	1.99 ad	2.04 ad	0.201 ac	0.210 ac	1.55 ab	1.51 ac	5.29 ac	5.38 ac	12.87 fh	12.32 fh	94.94 ab	96.48 ab
		MX_2	2.22 a	2.28 a	0.208 a	0.217 a	1.69 a	1.65 a	5.69 a	5.77 a	12.58 h	12.05 h	95.30 a	96.61 a

Irrigation levels	Hundz Soil (HN)	Nile fertile + K ₂ SO ₄ Mixture	No. of Flowers/ Shoot	lowers/ ot	Fruit Set %	Set %	Ka	Yield Kg/tree
m ³ /tree/year	(kg/tree)	(Kg/tree)	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
		MX	3.16 k	3.45k	41.05 k	44.21 k	22.50 k	24.61 k
	HN ₀	MX1	3.44 hk	3.73hk	45.11 ik	48.30 hk	25.3 hk	27.40 hk
		MX_2	3.68 dk	3.96dk	51.09 gk	54.16 dj	27.7 dk	29.90 dk
		MX ₀	3.26 jk	3.55jk	42.12 jk	46.11 jk	23.5 jk	25.59 jk
\mathbf{I}	HN1	MX1	3.62 fk	3.91fk	52.13 fk	56.13 ci	27.1 fk	29.20 fk
2038 OI IECOIIIIIEIINEN HIIBAHOII IEVEI – 212		MX2	3.97 bh	4.26bh	57.02 bh	59.05 bg	30.6 bh	32.70 bh
		MX ₀	3.53 gk	3.83 gk	50.00 hk	52.19 fk	26.2 gk	28.30 gk
	HN ₂	MX1	4.18 ae	4.47ae	61.10 ad	63.22 ae	32.7 ae	34.79 ae
		MX_2	4.28 ac	4.56ac	63.12 ac	65.24 ac	33.7 ac	35.78ac
		MX ₀	3.32 jk	3.63jk	44.21 jk	47.03 ik	24.1 jk	26.19jk
	HN	MX1	3.57 gk	3.86gk	51.14 <u>g</u> k	53.45 ek	26.6 <u>g</u> k	28.70gk
		MX_2	3.64 ek	3.93ek	52.11 fk	54.15 dj	27.3 ek	29.40ek
		MX ₀	3.38 ik	3.66ik	46.19 ik	50.17 gk	24.7 ik	26.79ik
12 12 750% of recommended inviction level = 8.75	HN1	MXi	4.14 bd	4.43bd	63.89 ac	65.26 ac	32.3 bd	34.40bd
		MX2	4.45 ac	4.75ac	65.16 ab	67.11 ab	35.4 ac	37.49ac
		MX	3.90 c	4.21c	54.20 dj	56.00 dk	29.9 ci	31.79ci
	HN ₂	MX	4.22 ad	4.52ad	63.14 ac	65.31 ac	33.1 ad	35.20ad
		MX2	4.35 ac	4.64ac	64.07 ac	67.10 ab	34.4 ac	36.5ac
		MX_0	3.40 ik	3.71ik	52.22 fk	54.12 dj	24.8 ik	26.89ik
	HN	MX1	3.72 dj	4.01dj	53.14 ek	56.15 ci	27.3 dj	30.21dj
		MX2	3.64 ek	3.93ek	55.30 ci	57.41 bh	28.1 ek	29.4ek
I		MX ₀	3.45 gk	3.74gk	54.09 dk	56.04 dk	25.4 hk	27.50hk
1000% of recommended invigation level = 11	HN1	MX1	4.20 ad	4.5ad	60.21 bd	63.43 ad	32.9 ad	34.90ad
100% Of teconinientied intration level -11		MX2	4.51 ab	4.8ab	65.19 ab	67.22 ab	35.9 ab	37.91bg
		MX0	4.00 bg	4.29bg	59.00 bg	61.00 bd	30.9 bg	32.91ab
	HN ₂	MXI	4.30 ac	4.61ac	63.0 ae	65.28 ac	33.9 ac	35.92ac
				•				

Table 15. Effect of second order interaction between irrigation frequency, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile + K2SO4 on

. 3 . C . C C

Irrigation levels	Hundz Soil (HN)	Mixture of Nile fertile +	Fruit weight (gm)	eight 1)	Fruit length (cm)	n)	Fruit diameter (cm)	meter	Fruit (Fruit volume (cm ³)
m ³ /tree/year	(kg/tree)	K ₂ SU ₄ (Kg/tree)	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
		MX ₀	231k	223.6h	7.32 bc	7.24 g	8.25 h	8.50 h	241.1k	261.2k
	HN ₀	MXi	267.3 dk	233.2fh	7.24 ac	8.00 bg	8.51 eh	8.78 eh	269.4hk	289.5hk
		MX_2	269.7jk	294.1gh	8.19 ac	8.11 bg	8.67 bg	9.00 bg	293.6dk	308.1dk
		MX_0	243 fk	239.9eh	7.33 ac	7.33 fg	8.26 h	8.69 gh	251.2jk	271.3jk
50% of recommended irrigation level = 5.5	HN1	MX1	275bh	241.6dh	7.29 ac	8.22 bg	8.62 cg	8.79 fh	287.6fk	307fk
ſ		MX_2	281.6gk	299.8ah	8.22 ac	8.78 a	8.76 bf	9.14 bh	322bh	340.1bh
		MX_0	236.9ae	334.9dh	7.38 bc	7.29 fg	8.34 <u>g</u> h	8.78 fh	278.5gk	298.6gk
	HN_2	MX1	280.6ac	252.8ch	7.66 bc	8.31 cg	8.75 bf	8.87 dh	343.1ae	363.2ae
		MX_2	298.3jk	307.2ah	8.27 ac	8.80 af	8.85 bd	9.20 bg	353.2ac	369.3ac
		MX_0	250.5gk	251.6dh	7.38 bc	7.44 eg	8.58 dh	8.52 h	257.3jk	277.4jk
	HN_0	MX_1	287.6ek	269.6bh	7.27 bc	8.50 ag	8.81 be	8.78 fh	282.5 gk	300gk
		MX_2	304.3jk	325.5ag	8.61 ac	8.88 ac	8.87 bd	9.23 af	289.4ek	310ek
I,		MX_0	253.6bd	264.6bh	7.31 bc	7.66 cg	8.61 cg	8.79 fh	263.3ik	283.4ik
	HN1	MX1	278.6ac	323.2ah	7.77 ac	8.89 ag	8.86 fh	9.22 af	339.1bd	358.3bd
75% of recommended irrigation level = 8.25		MX_2	313.5ci	329.7af	8.83 ac	9.00 ad	8.93 bc	9.43 ac	370.4ac	383.4ac
		MX_0	272.ad	279.5ah	7.33 bc	7.83 dg	8.61 cg	8.86 dh	315ci	334.2ci
	HN_2	MX1	297.3ac	327.3af	8.94 ac	8.84 ag	8.91 bd	9.31 ac	347.2ad	369ad
		MX_2	324.6ik	337.1ae	9.31 ab	9.11 ad	9.00 ab	9.49 ab	360.3ac	380ac
		MX_0	280ik	275.8bh	7.11 c	7.87 bg	8.61 cg	8.84 ch	265.3ik	282.4ik
	HN_0	MX1	294.6aj	304.8ah	7.55 ac	8.66 ag	8.93 be	9.18 ag	297.6dj	320.1dj
		MX_2	317.5ek	335.2ae	8.91 ac	9.21 ac	9.04 bd	9.44 ac	289.5ek	308.1ek
J,		MX_0	285gk	271.6bh	7.55 ac	7.88 cg	8.60 cg	8.89 dh	270.4gk	291.5gk
	HN1	MX1	318ad	352.1ad	8.69 ac	9.11 ad	8.95 bd	9.32 ae	345.1ad	366.2ad
100% of recommended irrigation level = 11		MX ₂	349.6ac	356.6ac	9.27 ab	9.55 ab	9.15 bd	9.54 ac	376.4ab	394.5ab
		MX_0	292.6bg	271.6bh	7.94 ac	7.99 cg	8.61 cg	8.94 eh	325bg	345.1bg
	HN_2	MX1	349.3ac	354.8ab	8.86 ac	9.33 ac	8.99 ab	9.36 ad	355.2ac	372.4ac
		MX_2	353a	358.8a	9.61 a	9.78 a	9.33 a	9.59 a	395.6a	412.3a

Table 16. Effect of second order interaction between irrigation frequency, Hundz soil and mixture of Nile fertile + K2SO4 on some

Irrelation levels Hundz Soil Mixture of Nile TSS Acidity Anthocyania	Hundz Soil	Mixture of Nile	TSS	ŝ	Acidity	lity	Antho	Anthocyanine	V.C	C	Tannins	ling
TLLIBATION JEAERS	(EN)	fertile + K ₂ SO ₄	%	0	%			0	mg vc/10	vc/100ml juice	%	Ĩ
m ³ /tree/year	(kg/tree)	(Kg/tree)	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011	2010	2011
		$\mathbf{M}\mathbf{X}_0$	13.59 gi	13.43 k	0.99 k	1.05 c	0.328 k	0.336 k	23.24g	23.21g	2.65h	2.51h
	\mathbf{HN}_{0}	MX	14.88 fi	14.62 jk	0.93 jk	0.98 c	0.356 hk	0.364 hk	23.63bg	24.10bg	2.42fh	2.28fh
-		MX2	15.95 bh	15.99 gi	0.97 hk	0.99 c	0.386 dk	0.389 dk	23.08bg	24.10bg	2.00bg	1.86bg
50% of recommended		MX_0	14.50 gi	15.63 hj	0.90 jk	1.03 c	0.338 jk	0.346 jk	24.11fg	23.32fg	2.50gh	2.36gh
irrigation level $= 5.5$	HN_1	MX	15.53 ci	17.11 dh	0.85 gk	0.95 bc	0.374 fk	0.383 fk	23.72bg	24.21bg	2.38eh	2.24eh
c		MX ₂	16.16 bg	18.32 ae	0.83 bh	0.89 c	0.409 bh	0.417 bh	23.88af	24.77af	1.95ah	1.81ah
		MX_0	14.60 hi	15.33 ij	0.83 fk	1.00 c	0.365 gk	0.370 gk	24.16fg	23.28fg	2.50h	2.36gh
	HN_2	MX	15.83 ci	17.21 cg	0.80 bd	0.88 ac	0.430 ae	0.438 ae	23.27cg	23.99cg	2.24dh	2.16dh
		MX_2	16.55 ae	18.54 ae	0.78 ad	0.87 ac	0.446 ac	0.448 ac	23.55af	24.79af	1.90af	1.76af
		MX_0	14.48 i	16.13 dh	0.92 jk	1.00 c	0.344 jk	0.352 jk	23.27eg	23.43eg	2.55h	2.41h
	\mathbf{HN}_{0}	MX	15.66 ci	18.43 ae	0.72 ad	0.92 bc	0.369 gk	0.378 gk	23.16ag	24.49ag	2.18dh	2.04dh
		MX_2	16.70 ad	18.65 ad	0.85 gk	0.89 bc	0.376 ek	0.384 ek	23.72ae	24.87ae	1.92ag	1.78ag
\mathbf{I}_2		MX_0	14.62 hi	16.34 cg	0.90 ik	0.87 ac	0.350 ik	0.359 ik	23.20ae	23.88ae	2.49fh	2.35fh
75% of recommended	HN_1	MX_1	16.16 bg	18.71 ad	0.81 bd	0.85 ac	0.426 bd	0.434 bd	23.66ag	18.31ag	2.37eh	2.23eh
irrigation level = 8.25		MX_2	16.80 ad	18.88 ae	0.76 ac	0.78 ab	0.457 ac	0.466 ac	23.50ad	24.96ad	1.85ae	1.71ae
		MX_0	15.00 ei	16.63 cg	0.87 ci	0.87 ac	0.402 ci	0.411 ci	23.22dg	23.65dg	2.29dh	2.15dh
	HN_2	MX1	16.50 ae	18.65 ad	0.78 ad	0.79 ab	0.434 ad	0.442 ad	24.83ag	24.43ag	1.84ad	1.70ad
		MX_2	17.50 ab	18.94 ab	0.70 ac	0.76 a	0.447 ac	0.454 ac	25.5ad	25.10ad	1.58ab	1.44ab
		MX_0	14.86 gi	16.71 fi	0.87 ik	0.83 ac	0.352 ik	0.359 ik	23.00bg	24.10bg	2.09ch	1.95ch
	\mathbf{HN}_{0}	MX1	16.52 ae	17.66 bf	0.70 dj	0.79 ab	0.376 dj	0.384 dj	23.44ag	24.65ag	1.93ag	1.79ag
		MX ₂	16.83 ad	18.81 ad	0.86 ac	0.80 ab	0.384 ek	0.393 ek	23.80ac	25.20ac	1.84ad	1.70ad
I_3		MX_0	15.44 di	16.81 fi	0.87 gk	0.78 ab	0.357 gk	0.365 gk	23.44cg	23.87cg	2.06bh	1.92bh
	HN_1	MX1	16.75 ad	18.77 ad	0.78 ad	0.77 a	0.432 ad	0.439 ad	24.58ad	25.10ad	1.85ae	1.71ae
100% of recommended		MX ₂	17.05 ac	18.89 ab	0.70 ac	0.75 a	0.463 al	0.470 ab	25.16ab	25.54ab	1.75ac	1.61ac
100% of recommended irrigation level = 11		MX_0	15.83 ci	16.96 ei	0.81 bd	0.78 ab	0.412 bg	0.420 bg	23.83cg	23.98cg	2.00bg	1.91bg
100% of recommended irrigation level = 11	HN ₂	MX1	17.16 ac	19.22 ab	0.68 ab	0.75 a	0.442 ac	0.451 ac	24.75ac	25.32ac	1.84ad	1.70ad
100% of recommended irrigation level = 11	•											

2.4. Fruit quality properties

The results of the first-order interaction effects of irrigation frequency, Hundz soil and (Nile fertile + K_2SO_4)on fruit physical and chemical properties of pomegranate are shown in Tables (11 and 12).

As related to the interaction effect, highest irrigation level 11m³ /tree /year) combined with the highest rate of Hundz soil (10Kg /tree) or combined with highest rate of mixture Nile fertile $+ K_2SO_4$ (2Kg + 500gm) caused a significant increase in fruit weight, dimensions, TSS, anthocyanin and V.C. and decreased acidity and tannins content. Reversely, 5.5m³ /tree /year level of irrigation without application of HN ($I^1 \times HN_0$) or NF + K₂SO₄ $(I_1 \times MX_0)$ gave the least significant values of the above mentioned characters in both seasons. Similar trend of response was obtained with the combination between $8.25m^3$ /tree /yearand HN at higher rate (I₂ × HN₂) in enhancing fruit physical and chemical properties except fruit diameter in the 1st season and V.C in the 2nd one. Similarly, combination treatment $(I_2 \times MX_1)$ or $(I_2 \times MX_1)$ MX₂) gave higher fruit quality except acidity and tannin content in both seasons as comparing with 100% of the recommended irrigation solely. The results clarified the beneficial effect of such soil conditioners in increasing hydraulic conductivity and water diffusivity of sandy soils which reflected on yield and fruit quality(Laila -Ali et al., 2009).

The interaction effects between HZ soil and the mixture from(NF + K_2SO_4) on fruit physical and chemical properties are presented in Tables (11 & 12). The statistical analysis of the obtained data revealed that the treatment combinations had significant effects on fruit quality in both seasons. The Application of 10Kg /tree HN soil combined with 2Kg NF + 500gm K₂SO₄ was favorable for trees to express their best performance on fruit physical and chemical characters. Laila – Ali *et al.*, (2009) found that the combination treatments between organic and inorganic soil conditioners increased weight of wheat grains.

3-Second-order interaction effects:

The results presented in Tables (13 to 17) illustrated the effects of the second-order interactions among irrigation levels, Hundz soil and the mixture of Nile fertile + K_2SO_4 on vegetative growth leaf chemical composition, flowering, fruiting, yield and fruit quality of pomegranate trees in 2010 and 2011 seasons.

Data indicated generally that the differences among the mean values of the various treatment combinations of pomegranate growth and productivity were found significant. The best treatment combination was gained from using the highest irrigation level (11m³ /tree /year) and 10Kg /tree Hundz soil plus 2Kg /tree Nile Fertile + 500gm K₂SO₄ (I₃× HN₂× MX₂) which resulted in the highest mean values for all vegetative growth characters, leaf N P K, chlorophyll and RWC, yield and all fruit quality except leaf proline, juice tannins and acidity in both seasons. Date also indicated that the application of Hzsoil combined with mixture of $(NF+K_2SO_4)$ at both highest levels for each of them and irrigated with moderate irrigation level 8.25m³/tree/year gave best growth and produced higher fruit quality as compared with tree irrigated with 100% from recommended water level without soil conditioners (I₃ \times $HZ_0 \times MX_0$). Similar effects of interactions between the application of HN₂ and MX₂ under least irrigation treatments 5.5 m^3 /tree/year on the previous characters of fruit. Those results could be attributed to the role of organic or and inorganic soil conditioners in mineralenrichment, active organic compounds and bio substances which have the ability to chelate nutrients as available strategic storehouse and in turn reflected positively on development of crop yield and its components.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion, pomegranate trees growth, flowering, fruit characteristics were improved in some treatments, especially the low level of irrigation when combined with soil conditioners Hundz soil or NF + K_2SO_4 .

Eventually, it can be recommended that for planting pomegranate trees in the new reclaimed area to add 2 Kg/tree combined with 2 Kg Nilefertile + K_2SO_4 under irrigation level $8.25m^3$ /tree/year.

REFERENCES

- Abbas, W.A. (1999). Effect of some additives on soil to tolerance of olive plants to salinity.M.SC.Thesis, Faculty of Agric. Cairo Univ.
- Abd-Allah, M. A.(1997). Management and fertilizer of salt soils under limited water supply. M.SC. Thesis, Faculty of Agric., Al-Azhar Univ.
- Association of Official Analytical Chemists (AOAC). (1995).Official method of analysis, 15thed.AOAC International Arlington, Verginia,USA.
- Azzam,R.R.,Ayoup, Khallafollah and H. Moawad (1987). Field application of polymeric gel, RAPG in desert plantation.Third Internaional Conf. on Radiation Processing for plastic and rubber.Lodbroke Hotel, Warwick, UK Nov.2-4 UK.
- Badr, M.A. (1992): Effect of soil management and fertilizer treatments on salt movement and accumulation in root zone and their encountered effect on crop yeild. M.Sc. Thesis, Faculty of Agriculture, Al-Azhar University.

Beaumont P. (1993). Dryland Environmental Management and Development. Routledge, London and New York pp.536:210-215.

573

- Bres, W. and Weston, A (1993). Influence of gel additives on nitrate, ammonium and tomato growth in a soilless medium Hort, Science, 28: 1005-1007.
- Chapman, H. D. and R. H. Pratt (1961). Method of analysis for soil, plant and root: shoot ratios. J. Hort.Sci.46:121-130.
- Chauhan P.S., Sud A., Sharma L.K. and Mankotia M.S. (2005).Studies on the effect of micro-irrigation levels on growth, yield, fruit quality and nutrient assimilation of Delicious apple. Proc. VII thon TZFTS. Acta Hort., 696;193-196.
- Chopade S. O., Gorantiwar S. D.,PampattiwarP.S.andSupe V.S.(2001). Response of pomegranate to drip, bubbler and surface irrigation method.Advanced in Hort.And Forestry. Scientific Publishers India Jodhpur, 8: 53-59.
- CoHort Software. (2004). User's manual version.Cohort Tusson, Arizona USA.
- Devid, A.G., Elias F., Merce M. and Moshe G.(1999). Sensitivity of continuous and discrete plant and soil water status monitoring in peach trees subjected to deficit irrigation. J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci., 124:437-444
- Edmond, J.B. Senn T.L. Andrews, F.s. and Halfacre, R.G. (1975). The essential elements. Fundamental of Hort. Mcgraw-Hill, Book Company. 4th ed., 131 pp
- El-Aggory E.G. and SH. M. Abd-Elrasoul (2002). The biopolymer, agar agar as a soil conditioner. Egypt J. Agric. Res., 80(1): 1-12.
- El-Hefnawi, S.M. (1986). Physiological studies on guava. Ph.D. Thesis. Fac. Agric. Ain Shams Univ.
- El-Iraqy M.A.;K.B.Essa and A.M. Abou El-Khashab(2006). Effect of different irrigation levels and potassium fertilization on 'winter guava'. Alex. J. Agric. Res. (51)75-83. Special Issue.
- El-Khoreiby, A. M. and A.T. Salem(1989). Effect of different irrigation regimes on growth, fruiting and fruit quality of seedy guava trees, Ann. Agric. Sci. Fac. Ain Shams Cairo 34(1)133-321.
- El-Said, M.E.; I.SaadEldin; V.F.Noaman and S. sari El-Deen(1993). Different water regimes Annl. Agric. Sci. Moshtohor, Vol. (31) 11-19.
- Eman, Abd-Ella(2006). Effect of soil conditioners and irrigation frequency on the growth of Manzanillo olive seedlings.J. Adv. Agric. Res. Fac. Agric. Saba Bacha.719-736.
- Evenhuis, B. (1976). Nitrogen determination Dept. Agrci. Res. Royal.TropicalInstAmsterdam.
- Evenhuis, B. and P.W. Dewaard (1980). Principal and practices in plant analysis. F.A.O. soil Bull.: 152-162.
- Fitzpatrick, E.A.(1986). An Introduction to Soil Science.2nd ed. John Wiley&Sons.Inc.,New York.pp.108-137.

- Gething, P.A. 1986. Improving returns from nitrogen fertilizer "The potassium nitrogen partnership" IPI research topic No., 13. International Potash institute, Bern/ Switzerland.
- Hilal, M. H., Abdel-Fattah, A. and Korkor, S. A.(1997) .Effect of fine and granular sulphur application on root depth and yield of Lupine in sandy soils. Middle eastSulphur Symposium. Cairo, Egypt. Pp, 207-216.
- Hoda, A. Khalil (2005).Effect of water stress and the soil conditioner, PAM,on growth and chemical composition of young orange and Manzanillo olive trees. M.SC. Thesis. Faculty of Agric. Alex.Univ.
- Hsia, C.L.; B. S. LUH and C.B. Chickester .(1965). Anthocyanine in freestone peaches. J. food, Sci, 30: 5-12.
- Hussein S.M. (2004). Effect of different irrigation levels on the Le-cont pear trees. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Of Agric., Cairo Univ. Egypt.
- Im, J. N.(1982). Organic materials and improvement of soil physical characteristics. F.A.O. Soil Bull.,pp.106-117.
- Kandil, E. A.and U.S. El-Feky(2006). Effect of soil matric potential on Canino apricot trees in sandy soil under drip irrigation. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 31(9)5867-5880.
- Kay-Shoemak, L.; Westwood, Ekilpatrick, I and Harris,K.(2000). Exchangeable ammonia and nitrate from different nitrogen fertilizer prepartion in polyacrylamidtreatment and untreated agricultural soils. Biology and fertility of soils, 31: 245-248.
- Khalifa, E.M., Abo-Zeid, M.I.; Nassar, I. N. and Esmail, S.M.(1997). Effect of a sugarcane industry by-product (filter mud cake)on some physical properties of soils. The First Scientific Conference of Agric. Sci. Fac. Agric. Univ.13-14 December Vol. (1):467-482.
- Khattab, M.M. Shaban, A.E. El-Shreif A. A. and El-Souda A.S.(2010). Effect of irrigation levels on growth and fruiting ofManfalouty pomegranate trees. Bull. Fac. Agric. Cairo Univ. 61:8-16.
- Laila Ali, K.M. Mahrous, S.E. and Ramadan H.M. (2009). Effect of organic and inorganic conditioners on P-release from rock phosphate and its impact on wheat plant. Egypt J. agric. Res.87(1):93-110.
- Lawand B.T. and Patil V.k. (1996).Effect of different water regimes on fruit quality of pomegranate (Punica granatum L.).International Journal of Tropical Agriculture. 14: (1/4): 153-158.
- Lindhauer, M.G. (1985).Influence of K nutrition and drought on water relation and growth of sunflower (*Helianthusannus L.*). Z. pflanzenernahr.Bodenk, 153, 25-32.
- Marschner, H. (1995). Mineral nutrition of higher plant 2nd ed. Academic, Prees, London.
- Mohamed R. El-Shenawi& Mohamed E. Moursy (2010).The effect of organic manure and potassium fertilizers on growth, yield and fruit quality of Anna trees. Alex., Sci. Exchange J. Vol.31 No.4404-415.

- Murphy, J. and J.P. Riley (1962). A modified single solution method for the determine of phosphorus in natural water. Ann.Chem. Acta.27: 31-36.
- Saddik M.A. and K.M. Laila Ali(2004). Effect of some natural soilamendment on some soil physical properties, peanut and carrot yield in sandy soil. Egypt J. Agric. Res., 82(2).
- Salisbury, F.B.and Rose C.W. (1985). Plant Physiology. Wadsworth Pub.Co., USA.185pp.
- Sherin-Attia, A.A.(2002).Studied on growth of olive plants under salt strees. Ph.D. Thesis Fac. of Agrci.Cairo Univ.
- Silberbush, M.; E. Adar, Y. DeMalach (1993). Use of an hydrophilic polymer to improve water storage and availability to crops grown in sand dunes. 1. Corn irrigated by trickling. Agric. Water Management, 23: 303-313.
- Singh, T.N.; L. G. Poleg and D. Aspinall. (1973). Stress metabolism. 1-Nitogen metabolism and growth in the barley plant during water stress. Asut. J. Biol. Sci.(26):45-56.

- Smart, R. E. and G.E. Bingham(1974). Rapid estimates of relative water content. Plant Physiol., 53:258-260.
- Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie (1980). Procedures of statistics 2^{nd} ed. McGraw Hill Book Co., Inc. New York, USA.
- Suelter, C.H.(1970).Enzymes activated by monovalent cation. Science, 168, 789-795.
- Wael A.A. Ali (2005). Improving growth and production of olive orchard under desert conditions.Ph.D.Thesis Agric. Sci.,Cairo Univ.
- Wafaa El-Etr, M.A.(2001)Biological weathering of K-bearing miners. Ph.D.Thesis Agric., AinShamsUinv., Egypt.
- Wallace, A and G. Wallace (1986). Effect of soil conditioners on emergence and growth of tomato, cotton and lettuce seedlings. Soil Sci., Vol.141.No(5).
 *Winton, A.H. and K.B.Winton (1945). Analysis of food. Wiely, New York p:572
- Yadava, U.L. (1986). A rapid and non-destructive method to determine chlorophyll in intact leaves.HortSci., 21:1449-1450.

-

.