

INFLUENCE POTASSIUM HUMATE ON ROSEMARY PLANTS GROWN IN SANDY SOIL UNDER IRRIGATION WITH SALINE WATER

M.A.H. Abdou*, A.F.A. Abdel-Rahim** and A.M.O. Gahory***

* Hort. Dept., Fac. Agric., Minia Univ., Egypt

** Soil and Water Sciences Dept., Experiment and Research Center, Minia Univ., Egypt

*** Hort. Dept., Fac. Agric. and Natural Resources, Aswan Univ., Egypt



Scientific J. Flowers &
Ornamental Plants,
11(1):1-15 (2024).

Received:

1/2/2024

Accepted:

1/3/2024

Corresponding author:

A.F.A. Abdel-Rahim
am.fahmed@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT: To examine the ability of potassium humate (0, 1000, 2000 and 3000 ppm) for lessening the deleterious impacts of saline water (0, 1.4, 2.8 and 4.2 dS/m) on *Rosmarinus officinalis* plant, a pot study was undertaken at the Nursery of Ornamental Plants, Fac. Agric., Minia Univ. during the two experimental seasons 2022 and 2023. Data showed that all examined traits of vegetation development (plant height, branches number/plant, and herb fresh and dry weights) were decreased by increasing salinity levels (2.8 and 4.2 dS/m) compared with control in both cuts during both seasons. Opposite trend was obtained with the low concentration (1.4 dS/m). It was found that, while the essential oil (%) and its yield/plant were increased under (1.4 and 2.8 dS/m), the essential oil (%) and yield were significantly decreased under (4.2 dS/m) in both cuts during both seasons. The pigments content and NPK (%) took the same trend of the vegetative growth. While both Na (%) and proline content ($\mu\text{g/g}$) in dry leaves were increased by increasing salinity levels during the second cut in both seasons. All of the aforementioned characteristics of vegetation development, essential oil output and some chemical compositions were significantly improved by potassium humate treatments, with the exception of Na% and proline content ($\mu\text{g/g}$) over both seasons. In this concern, 3000 ppm potassium humate was the most effective treatment. There was a notable interaction impact between the two parameters under investigation for all examined parameters, with the best interaction treatment recorded with 1.4 dS/m in combination with potassium humate (3000 ppm). In conclusion, the negative effects of salinity stress may be mitigated by spraying plants with 3000 ppm of potassium humate.

Keywords: Rosemary, salinity, water quality, potassium humate

INTRODUCTION

The perennial herb plant rosemary, *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. is a member of the Lamiaceae family (Abdelkader *et al.*, 2019). Rosemary is growing well in all areas of the Mediterranean Sea (Al-Fraihat *et al.* 2023). Rosemary plants and their essential oil are utilized in flavor, fragrance, and medicinal industries (Lee *et al.* 2011).

Because of the impacts, nutritional imponderables, low osmotic potential of soil solution, and assimilation of these agents, water salinity has a detrimental impact on plant growth and development as well as yield (Ashraf and Harris, 2004). According to studies by Abdelkader *et al.* (2019), Chetouani *et al.* (2019), and El-Kholy *et al.* (2020), salinity stress considerably decreased the total chlorophylls content, volatile oil

percentage, and growth features of rosemary. By strengthening the cohesive interactions between the tiny soil particles, humates lessen soil erosion. By boosting buffering characteristics and exchange capacity, humate improves the chelation of several nutrients and increases their availability to plants, so it improves the physical properties of the soil structure. It is also employed in situations when salt has detrimental effects on plant development and nutrient absorption. It frequently serves as a key ingredient in formulations of biostimulants like auxin and cytokinin. It has been suggested that potassium humate is a workable and affordable solution for restoring damaged land resources. Additionally, studies by Said-Al Ahl *et al.* (2009), Badran *et al.* (2019), Shyala *et al.* (2019), Wei *et al.* (2021), and Shalaby *et al.* (2023) have shown that potassium humate is a common organic fertilizer that may be improved.

Therefore, this study aimed to evaluate the response of rosemary plants to potassium humate under irrigation with saline water.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The goal of this investigation was to determine how potassium humate affected the growth parameters, essential oil productivity, and chemical composition of *Rosmarinus officinalis* plants irrigated with salinized water. The study was carried out at the Ornamental Plants Nursery, Faculty of Agriculture, Minia University during the 2022 and 2023 growing seasons.

Terminal rooted cuttings of *Rosmarinus officinalis* plant averaging 8 cm in height, 2 mm in diameter and have 9 leaves were cultivated on 20th February of the two seasons of 2022 and 2023 in plastic pots of 15-cm-diameter filled with 1.50 kg of sandy soil (one cutting/pot). The physical and chemical analyses of the used soil were performed according to the methods described by ICARDA (2013) as presented in Table (a).

A split plot in a complete randomized block design with three replicates was used and included 16 treatments (4 × 4). There were 6 pots (6 plants) in each plot, so the total number of used plants was 288 plants. Four salinized water treatments (0, 1.4, 2.8 and 4.2 dS/m, NaCl) and four potassium humate (0, 1000, 2000, and 3000 ppm) were allocated in the sub-plots and the main plots, respectively. The sodium chloride was obtained from El-Gomhouria Co. for Trading Drugs, Chemicals and Medical Supplies (Al Amiriyyah, Egypt) and humic acid was released from Star Gold for Agricultural Development, Assiut District, Assiut Governorate, Egypt.

The soluble potassium humate employed in this experiment had the following chemical constituents: humic acid 82%, K₂O 10-12%, moisture 5-6%, density of 0.83 g/ml, and more than 98% water solubility.

The plants were irrigated (with 300 cm³ each/pot) two times weekly. All treatments were irrigated with tap water for two weeks (20th February - 5th March), after that the plants were irrigated with examined salinized water starting from 6th March according to the

Table a. The physical and chemical analysis of the used soil in the study during the first and second seasons (2022 and 2023).

Soil character	Values		Soil character	Values	
	2022	2023		2022	2023
Physical properties			Nutrients		
Sand (%)	88.50	89.50	Total N (%)	0.01	0.01
Silt (%)	7.90	7.10	Available P (ppm)	2.71	2.86
Clay (%)	3.60	3.40	Na ⁺ (mg/100 g soil)	2.35	2.46
Soil type	Sandy	sandy	K ⁺ (mg/100 g soil)	0.72	0.76
Chemical properties			DTPA-Extractable nutrients		
pH (1:2.5)	8.18	8.21	Fe (ppm)	1.04	1.10
E.C. (dS/m)	1.09	1.11	Cu (ppm)	0.32	0.36
O.M.	0.02	0.03	Zn (ppm)	0.35	0.32
CaCO ₃	11.35	11.63	Mn (ppm)	0.55	0.62

assigned concentration till the end of the experiment. All plants were sprayed six times (3 times on 21st March, 6th April, and 21st April before the first cut and 3 times later on 21st June, 6th July and 21st July). The plants were harvested twice in both seasons by cutting plants at 4 cm above the soil surface. The two cuts were done in the first week of June and September in both seasons.

The following data were recorded for each cut of plant, vegetative growth [plant height (cm), branches number/plant, and herb fresh and dry weights (g)], essential oil production (percent and yield/plant) in both cuts during both seasons, as well as some chemical constituents of photosynthetic pigments in fresh leaves (chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids; mg/g), proline content ($\mu\text{g/g}$) and NPK (%), while Na percentages in dry leaves were measured in second cut only during both seasons.

The pigment contents were measured colorimetrically according to Fadl and Sari El-Deen (1979). Macro-elements (N, P, K and Na) percentages in dry leaves were measured as defined by ICARDA (2013). Proline ($\mu\text{g/g}$) was measured in the second cut defined by Bates *et al.* (1973).

Statistical analysis:

The LSD test at 0.05 was used to compare the treatment means after our data were tabulated and exposed to statistical analysis by MSTAT-C (1986).

RESULTS

1. Vegetative growth parameters:

Data shown in Tables (1 and 2) revealed that irrigation with saline water led to a significant increase under (1.4 dS/m), and decreased by upper concentrations (2.8 and 4.2 dS/m) for all characteristics of vegetative development (plant, branches number, and weights of fresh and dry shoots) as relative to control (tab water) in the two cuttings during both experimental seasons. Irrigated plants with 4.2 dS/m recorded the highest reduction compared with other salinity levels.

The gained findings are in harmony with those described by Aziz and Youssef (2001), Kiarostami *et al.* (2010), Langroudi and Sedaghatoor (2012), Ali and Attia (2015), Abdelkader *et al.* (2019), and El-Kholy *et al.* (2020) on *Rosmarinus officinalis*; Hendawy and Khalid (2005) on sage plant; and Shalan *et al.* (2006), Massoud *et al.* (2009), Jelali *et al.* (2011) on marjoram plants. In contrast, Hendawy *et al.* (2019) revealed that chamomile plants were highly resistant to salinity stress as increased flower yields were observed under high-salinity stress.

As for potassium humate treatments, data in Tables (1 and 2) proved that all treatments (1000, 2000 and 3000 ppm) significantly increased all studied vegetative growth parameters facing untreated plants during both cuttings throughout the two experimental seasons. Generally, the treatment of 3000 ppm proved more successful than other treatments in improving abovementioned vegetative growth parameters.

Our findings are similar to those obtained by Said-Al Ahl *et al.* (2009) on oregano; Zaghoul *et al.* (2009) on shrubs Thuja; Mohsen *et al.* (2017) and Abdelkader (2019) on garlic; and Shyala *et al.* (2019) and Shalaby *et al.* (2023) on marigold (*Tagetes erecta*).

For every investigated vegetative growth parameter in both cuttings during the course of the two growing seasons, there was a substantial interaction between the potassium humate and water salinity treatments. Generally, the greatest values were achieved with the interaction treatment of salinized water at 1.4 dS/m in combination with potassium humate at 3000 ppm.

Similar findings were recorded by Burhan and Al-Taey (2018) on dill and Badran *et al.* (2019) on calendula plant.

2. Essential oil productivity:

a. Essential oil percentage:

Data presented in Table (3), indicated that salinized water (1.4 and 2.8 dS/m)

Table 1. Response of plant height and number of branches/plant of *Rosmarinus officinalis* to salinized water and potassium humate treatments in the two cuts during 2022 and 2023 seasons.

Potassium humate treatments (ppm)	Salinized water treatments (dS/m) (A)										
	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	
	The 1 st cut					The 2 nd cut					
	The first growing season (2022)										
	Plant height (cm)										
Control	26.0	27.2	22.1	19.2	23.6	26.0	27.2	22.1	19.1	23.6	
Humic acid 1000	27.2	28.6	23.2	20.2	24.8	27.4	28.9	23.3	20.4	25.0	
Humic acid 2000	28.1	29.5	25.3	21.2	26.1	28.6	30.0	25.8	21.5	26.5	
Humic acid 3000	28.6	31.5	25.8	21.6	26.9	29.4	32.3	26.5	22.1	27.6	
Mean (A)	27.5	29.2	24.1	20.5	25.4	27.8	29.6	24.4	20.8	25.7	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 1.6		B: 0.9		AB: 1.8		A: 1.7		B: 1.1		AB: 2.2
	Number of branches/plant										
Control	2.9	3.1	2.4	2.1	2.6	3.1	3.3	2.5	2.3	2.8	
Humic acid 1000	3.1	3.3	2.5	2.2	2.8	3.2	3.5	2.6	2.4	2.9	
Humic acid 2000	3.2	3.4	2.6	2.3	2.9	3.4	3.7	2.8	2.5	3.1	
Humic acid 3000	3.4	3.6	2.7	2.5	3.0	3.6	3.8	2.9	2.6	3.2	
Mean (A)	3.2	3.4	2.5	2.3	2.8	3.3	3.6	2.7	2.5	3.0	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.19		B: 0.08		AB: 0.16		A: 0.23		B: 0.04		AB: 0.08
	The second growing season (2023)										
	Plant height (cm)										
Control	29.9	31.4	25.5	22.1	27.2	30.2	31.7	25.8	22.2	27.4	
Humic acid 1000	31.4	32.9	26.7	23.2	28.5	31.9	33.6	27.1	23.7	29.1	
Humic acid 2000	32.3	33.9	29.1	24.3	29.9	33.3	34.9	30.0	25.0	30.8	
Humic acid 3000	32.9	36.2	29.6	24.8	30.9	34.2	37.6	30.8	25.8	32.1	
Mean (A)	31.7	33.6	27.7	23.6	29.1	32.4	34.5	28.4	24.2	29.9	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 2.0		B: 1.0		AB: 2.0		A: 1.9		B: 1.2		AB: 2.4
	Number of branches/plant										
Control	3.0	3.2	2.4	2.1	2.7	3.3	3.5	2.6	2.4	3.0	
Humic acid 1000	3.1	3.4	2.5	2.3	2.8	3.5	3.7	2.8	2.5	3.1	
Humic acid 2000	3.3	3.6	2.7	2.4	3.0	3.7	3.9	3.0	2.7	3.3	
Humic acid 3000	3.5	3.8	2.8	2.6	3.2	3.9	4.2	3.2	2.9	3.5	
Mean (A)	3.3	3.5	2.6	2.3	2.9	3.6	3.8	2.9	2.6	3.2	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.20		B: 0.09		AB: 0.18		A: 0.20		B: 0.09		AB: 0.18

Table 2. Response of herb fresh and dry weights/plant of *Rosmarinus officinalis* to salinized water and potassium humate treatments in the two cuts during 2022 and 2023 seasons.

Potassium humate treatments (ppm)	Salinized water treatments (dS/m) (A)										
	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	
	The 1 st cut					The 2 nd cut					
	The first growing season (2022)										
	Herb fresh weight/plant (g)										
Control	11.66	12.23	9.94	8.60	10.60	11.77	12.35	10.05	8.67	10.71	
Humic acid 1000	12.26	12.88	10.43	9.08	11.16	12.50	13.14	10.61	9.27	11.38	
Humic acid 2000	12.68	13.29	11.41	9.53	11.73	13.06	13.68	11.76	9.80	12.07	
Humic acid 3000	12.94	14.21	11.63	9.74	12.13	13.45	14.79	12.09	10.13	12.61	
Mean (A)	12.39	13.15	10.85	9.24	11.41	12.69	13.48	11.13	9.47	11.69	
L.S.D. at 5 %	A: 0.77		B: 0.45		AB: 0.90		A: 0.80		B: 0.54		AB: 1.08
	Herb dry weight/plant (g)										
Control	6.42	6.72	5.47	4.73	5.83	6.48	6.79	5.53	4.77	5.89	
Humic acid 1000	6.75	7.10	5.74	5.01	6.15	6.89	7.24	5.85	5.11	6.27	
Humic acid 2000	7.00	7.34	6.30	5.26	6.47	7.21	7.56	6.49	5.41	6.66	
Humic acid 3000	7.15	7.86	6.43	5.39	6.70	7.44	8.17	6.68	5.61	6.98	
Mean (A)	6.83	7.25	5.99	5.10	6.29	7.00	7.44	6.13	5.22	6.45	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.41		B: 0.25		AB: 0.50		A: 0.43		B: 0.30		AB: 0.60
	The second growing season (2023)										
	Herb fresh weight/plant (g)										
Control	10.13	10.62	8.63	7.49	9.22	10.13	10.62	8.63	7.46	9.21	
Humic acid 1000	10.65	11.19	9.08	7.89	9.70	10.73	11.30	9.12	7.97	9.78	
Humic acid 2000	11.03	11.56	9.91	8.30	10.20	11.22	11.76	10.10	8.41	10.37	
Humic acid 3000	11.25	12.37	10.13	8.48	10.55	11.55	12.71	10.40	8.70	10.84	
Mean (A)	10.76	11.44	9.44	8.04	9.92	10.91	11.60	9.56	8.13	10.05	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.68		B: 0.38		AB: 0.76		A: 0.71		B: 0.45		AB: 0.90
	Herb dry weight/plant (g)										
Control	5.58	5.84	4.75	4.12	5.07	5.58	5.84	4.75	4.11	5.07	
Humic acid 1000	5.87	6.16	5.01	4.35	5.35	5.91	6.22	5.03	4.39	5.39	
Humic acid 2000	6.09	6.38	5.47	4.59	5.63	6.19	6.49	5.58	4.65	5.72	
Humic acid 3000	6.22	6.84	5.61	4.68	5.84	6.39	7.03	5.75	4.81	6.00	
Mean (A)	5.94	6.31	5.20	4.43	5.47	6.02	6.40	5.27	4.49	5.55	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.37		B: 0.21		AB: 0.42		A: 0.39		B: 0.25		AB: 0.50

Table 3. Response of essential oil (%) and its yield/plant of *Rosmarinus officinalis* to salinized water and potassium humate treatments in the two cuts during 2022 and 2023 seasons.

Potassium humate treatments (ppm)	Salinized water treatments (dS/m) (A)										
	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	
	The 1 st cut					The 2 nd cut					
	The first growing season (2022)										
	Essential oil (%)										
Control	1.01	1.15	1.17	0.88	1.05	1.02	1.16	1.18	0.89	1.06	
Humic acid 1000	1.06	1.20	1.21	1.00	1.12	1.08	1.22	1.23	1.02	1.14	
Humic acid 2000	1.12	1.25	1.27	1.09	1.19	1.14	1.28	1.30	1.11	1.21	
Humic acid 3000	1.17	1.32	1.34	1.11	1.23	1.21	1.36	1.38	1.14	1.27	
Mean (A)	1.09	1.23	1.24	1.02	1.15	1.11	1.25	1.27	1.04	1.17	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.06		B: 0.03		AB: 0.06		A: 0.07		B: 0.03		AB: 0.06
	Essential oil yield (ml/plant)										
Control	0.058	0.069	0.057	0.037	0.055	0.068	0.080	0.067	0.043	0.065	
Humic acid 1000	0.064	0.075	0.062	0.044	0.061	0.075	0.090	0.074	0.053	0.073	
Humic acid 2000	0.070	0.081	0.072	0.051	0.069	0.083	0.099	0.086	0.061	0.082	
Humic acid 3000	0.074	0.092	0.076	0.053	0.074	0.091	0.114	0.094	0.065	0.091	
Mean (A)	0.066	0.079	0.067	0.046	0.065	0.079	0.096	0.080	0.056	0.077	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.015		B: 0.005		AB: 0.010		A: 0.016		B: 0.007		AB: 0.014
	The second growing season (2023)										
	Essential oil (%)										
Control	1.03	1.17	1.19	0.90	1.07	1.04	1.18	1.20	0.91	1.08	
Humic acid 1000	1.09	1.23	1.24	1.03	1.15	1.12	1.26	1.27	1.06	1.18	
Humic acid 2000	1.17	1.30	1.32	1.13	1.23	1.20	1.35	1.37	1.17	1.26	
Humic acid 3000	1.23	1.39	1.41	1.17	1.29	1.27	1.44	1.46	1.21	1.35	
Mean (A)	1.13	1.27	1.29	1.06	1.19	1.16	1.31	1.32	1.09	1.22	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.07		B: 0.04		AB: 0.08		A: 0.06		B: 0.04		AB: 0.08
	Essential oil yield (ml/plant)										
Control	0.058	0.07	0.057	0.037	0.056	0.059	0.071	0.058	0.038	0.056	
Humic acid 1000	0.065	0.077	0.064	0.046	0.063	0.068	0.080	0.066	0.047	0.065	
Humic acid 2000	0.073	0.085	0.074	0.053	0.071	0.075	0.089	0.078	0.055	0.074	
Humic acid 3000	0.077	0.097	0.08	0.056	0.078	0.083	0.103	0.085	0.059	0.083	
Mean (A)	0.068	0.082	0.069	0.048	0.067	0.071	0.086	0.072	0.050	0.070	
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.012		B: 0.006		AB: 0.012		A: 0.015		B: 0.007		AB: 0.014

significantly increased the essential oil (%) in the herb in both cuttings throughout both seasons facing the control. In contrast, the essential oil percentage significantly decreased under 4.2 dS/m during both cuttings and seasons relative to irrigation with tap water.

Aziz and Youssef (2001), Tounekti *et al.* (2008), Ali and Attia (2015), Abdelkader *et al.* (2019), Sarmoum *et al.* (2019), El-Kholy *et al.* (2020) on *Rosmarinus officinalis*; Hendawy and Khalid (2005) on *Salvia officinalis* and Baâtour *et al.* (2011) and Mohsen *et al.* (2017) on *Majorana hortensis* highlighted the influence of salinized water on essential oil percentage, concluding that essential oil (%) was significantly lessened by rising salinity level. However, Bidgoli *et al.* (2019) and Al-Fraihat *et al.* (2023) on *Rosmarinus officinalis*, mentioned that essential oil percentage was increased under low salinity concentration. In addition, Hendawy *et al.* (2019) on chamomile observed high essential oil contents under high-salinity stress compared to normal conditions.

In light of the impact of potassium humate, listed data in Table (3) proved that all three used concentrations of potassium humate (1000, 2000 and 3000 ppm) considerably enhanced essential oil percentage compared with untreated plants during both cuts throughout both seasons.

Potassium humate treatments had positive effect on essential oil percentage as reported by Said-Al Ahl *et al.* (2009) on oregano; Zaghloul *et al.* (2009) on shrubs Thuja; Abou-Sreea *et al.* (2017) on coriander; El-Sawy *et al.* (2021) on sweet fennel; Retab *et al.* (2022) on roselle; and Shyala *et al.* (2019) and Shalaby *et al.* (2023) on marigold (*Tagetes Erecta*).

For essential oil percentage, the relationship between the main and subplot treatments was substantial in both cuts during both seasons. The high overall percentages were achieved with plants watered with 1.4 or

2.8 dS/m and sprayed with 3000 potassium humate.

Similar results were reported by Said-Al Ahl and Hussein (2010) on oregano, and Burhan and Al-Taey (2018) on dill.

b. Essential oil yield (ml/plant):

Regarding the effect of water salinity stress, data presented in Table (3) proved that the essential oil yield (ml/plant) in the rosemary herb significantly increased in both cuts during both seasons facing the control (tap water) for 1.4 dS/m. While, under 2.8 dS/m, it was slightly increased, moreover, 4.2 dS/m significantly decreased essential oil yield relative to the control.

The damaging effect of high levels of saline water on essential oil yield was obtained by Aziz and Youssef (2001), Ali and Attia (2015), Abdelkader *et al.* (2019), Sarmoum *et al.* (2019), and El-Kholy *et al.* (2020) on *Rosmarinus officinalis*; Hendawy and Khalid (2005) on *Salvia officinalis* and Baâtour *et al.* (2011) and Mohsen *et al.* (2017) on *Majorana hortensis*.

The data in Table (3) on the effects of potassium humate on essential oil yield showed that when compared to the control, the three potassium humate concentrations (1000, 2000, and 3000 ppm) significantly boosted the output of essential oil. In this sense, the 3000 ppm worked better than the other treatments.

Application of potassium humate increased essential oil yield as proved by Said-Al Ahl *et al.* (2009) on oregano; Zaghloul *et al.* (2009) on Thuja; Abou-Sreea *et al.* (2017) on coriander; El-Sawy *et al.* (2021) on sweet fennel; and Shyala *et al.* (2019) and Shalaby *et al.* (2023) on marigold (*Tagetes Erecta*).

In both cuttings over both seasons, there was a substantial interaction between the salinized water and potassium humate treatments on essential oil yield/plant. In every instance, plants that were treated with 2000 or 3000 ppm potassium humate and watered by 1.4 dS/m had the highest values.

Similar findings were recorded by Said-Al Ahl and Hussein (2010) on oregano; Burhan and Al-Taey (2018) on dill, Badran *et al.* (2019) on calendula plant, and Reyes-Pérez *et al.* (2021) on basil.

3. Chemical constituents:

a. Chlorophylls and N, P and K%:

Data displayed in Tables (4 and 5) demonstrated that irrigation water salinity at 1.4 dS/m during the second cut throughout both seasons confronting the control resulted in a significant enhancement of photosynthetic pigments content (carotenoids, chlorophyll a, and chlorophyll

b) and NPK%. Conversely, relative to controls, irrigated plants with 2.8 and 4.2 dS/m dramatically decreased the aforementioned metrics in the second cut of both experimental seasons.

Salinity stress has been found to have detrimental impacts on photosynthetic pigments and NPK% as mentioned by Aziz and Youssef (2001), Tounekti *et al.* (2011), Langroudi and Sedaghatthoor (2012), Chetouani *et al.* (2019), and El-Kholy *et al.* (2020) on rosemary; Nazarbeygi *et al.* (2011) on canola plants; and Kamkari *et al.* (2016) on pot marigold.

Table 4. Response of photosynthetic pigments of *Rosmarinus officinalis* fresh leaves to salinized water and potassium humate treatments in the second cut during 2022 and 2023 seasons.

Potassium humate treatments (ppm)	Salinized water treatments (dS/m) (A)									
	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)
	The first growing season (2022)					The second growing season (2023)				
	Chlorophyll a (mg/g f.w.)									
Control	3.068	3.223	3.062	2.908	3.065	3.167	3.326	3.160	3.002	3.163
Humic acid 1000	3.283	3.447	3.119	3.093	3.235	3.388	3.557	3.219	3.193	3.340
Humic acid 2000	3.447	3.653	3.288	3.124	3.378	3.557	3.771	3.394	3.224	3.487
Humic acid 3000	3.619	3.800	3.420	3.250	3.522	3.772	3.960	3.565	3.387	3.671
Mean (A)	3.346	3.521	3.213	3.086	3.292	3.471	3.653	3.334	3.202	3.415
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.105		B: 0.070		AB: 0.140	A: 0.115		B: 0.095		AB: 0.190
	Chlorophyll b (mg/g f.w.)									
Control	1.019	1.074	1.020	0.969	1.021	1.053	1.108	1.054	1.001	1.054
Humic acid 1000	1.094	1.150	1.038	0.987	1.067	1.129	1.186	1.072	1.018	1.102
Humic acid 2000	1.150	1.205	1.085	1.030	1.117	1.186	1.244	1.120	1.063	1.153
Humic acid 3000	1.206	1.266	1.140	1.083	1.174	1.257	1.320	1.188	1.128	1.223
Mean (A)	1.114	1.171	1.068	1.014	1.092	1.156	1.214	1.108	1.053	1.133
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.038		B: 0.030		AB: 0.060	A: 0.055		B: 0.035		AB: 0.070
	Carotenoids (mg/g f.w.)									
Control	1.012	1.094	1.041	0.989	1.034	1.025	1.106	1.053	1.001	1.046
Humic acid 1000	1.113	1.168	1.058	1.005	1.086	1.127	1.182	1.071	1.016	1.099
Humic acid 2000	1.169	1.225	1.104	1.051	1.137	1.183	1.240	1.118	1.062	1.151
Humic acid 3000	1.227	1.287	1.159	1.103	1.194	1.241	1.301	1.173	1.115	1.207
Mean (A)	1.127	1.191	1.088	1.034	1.109	1.144	1.207	1.103	1.049	1.126
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.035		B: 0.030		AB: 0.060	A: 0.038		B: 0.030		AB: 0.060

Table 5. Response of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium (%) of *Rosmarinus officinalis* dry leaves to salinized water and potassium humate treatments in the second cut during 2022 and 2023 seasons.

Potassium humate treatments (ppm)	Salinized water treatments (dS/m) (A)									
	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)
	The first growing season (2022)					The second growing season (2023)				
	Nitrogen (%)									
Control	2.349	2.470	2.208	2.098	2.281	2.377	2.499	2.234	2.124	2.309
Humic acid 1000	2.467	2.590	2.319	2.203	2.395	2.521	2.647	2.370	2.251	2.447
Humic acid 2000	2.615	2.745	2.458	2.335	2.538	2.698	2.833	2.536	2.410	2.620
Humic acid 3000	2.798	2.940	2.630	2.499	2.717	2.916	3.063	2.741	2.604	2.831
Mean (A)	2.557	2.686	2.404	2.284	2.482	2.582	2.713	2.427	2.307	2.508
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.130		B: 0.094		AB: 0.188	A: 0.142		B: 0.115		AB: 0.230
	Phosphorus (%)									
Control	0.244	0.259	0.230	0.208	0.235	0.246	0.262	0.232	0.210	0.237
Humic acid 1000	0.256	0.271	0.240	0.217	0.246	0.259	0.274	0.243	0.220	0.249
Humic acid 2000	0.269	0.284	0.253	0.227	0.259	0.273	0.290	0.258	0.232	0.264
Humic acid 3000	0.282	0.299	0.265	0.238	0.271	0.291	0.309	0.273	0.246	0.279
Mean (A)	0.263	0.278	0.247	0.222	0.253	0.266	0.281	0.250	0.224	0.255
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.008		B: 0.006		AB: 0.012	A: 0.009		B: 0.008		AB: 0.016
	Potassium (%)									
Control	2.265	2.401	2.129	2.001	2.199	2.287	2.432	2.161	2.045	2.231
Humic acid 1000	2.378	2.522	2.270	2.133	2.326	2.402	2.554	2.304	2.181	2.360
Humic acid 2000	2.498	2.648	2.383	2.240	2.442	2.523	2.682	2.419	2.289	2.478
Humic acid 3000	2.622	2.780	2.502	2.353	2.565	2.675	2.817	2.539	2.405	2.609
Mean (A)	2.441	2.588	2.321	2.182	2.383	2.466	2.614	2.344	2.204	2.407
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.102		B: 0.015		AB: 0.030	A: 0.110		B: 0.017		AB: 0.034

As demonstrated in Tables (4 and 5), data on the impact of potassium humate spraying at 1000, 2000, and 3000 ppm revealed that pigment contents and NPK% were significantly raised in the second cut throughout both seasons. Spraying plants with 3000 ppm potassium humate produced the highest contents overall.

Comparable outcomes were attained by Zaghoul *et al.* (2009) on *Thuja orientalis*; Abou-Sreea *et al.* (2017) on coriander plant; Shyala *et al.* (2019) and Shalaby *et al.* (2023) on marigold (*Tagetes erecta*); El-Sawy *et al.* (2021) on sweet fennel; and Retab *et al.* (2022) on roselle.

The interaction effect between the two variables treatments was significant for photosynthetic pigments (chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids) as well as NPK% in the second cut during the two seasons (Tables, 4 and 5). The interaction treatment of 1.4 dS/m with 3000 ppm potassium humate produced the highest values.

Close results were obtained by Burhan and Al-Taey (2018) on dill, Badran *et al.* (2019) on calendula plant, and Reyes-Pérez *et al.* (2021) on basil plant.

b. Sodium (%) and proline content ($\mu\text{g/g}$):

The findings in Table (6) showed that, in contrast to the prior chemical components, salinized water (1.4, 2.8, and 4.2 dS/m) considerably increased the proline content ($\mu\text{g/g}$) and sodium (%) in both seasons relative to the control treatment.

These outcomes are in the line with those noted by Aziz and Youssef (2001), Langroudi and Sedaghatoor (2012), Chetouani *et al.* (2019) Al-Fraihat *et al.* (2023) on *Rosmarinus officinalis*; Hendawy and Khalid (2005) on sage plant and Nazarbeygi *et al.* (2011) on canola plants

According to Table (6), potassium humate treatments were beneficial in lowering the proline content ($\mu\text{g/g}$) and Na (%) relative to untreated plants in the second cut during the two seasons. It has been observed that the application of a high concentration of potassium humate (3000

ppm) proved to be more efficacious than that of 2000 or 1000 ppm.

Said-Al Ahl *et al.* (2009) on oregano and Mohsen *et al.* (2017) on marjoram produced findings that were comparable.

For both Na (%) and proline ($\mu\text{g/g}$) in the second cut throughout the two experimental seasons, there was a substantial interaction between the salinized water and potassium humate treatments. Plants that were watered with 4.2 dS/m without any humic acid spray throughout both seasons had the greatest amounts of Na and proline. Conversely, the plants that were sprayed with 3000 ppm potassium humate and watered with tap water had the lowest values of both features.

Many authors stated that salt stress increased Na concentration and proline content and found that potassium humate ameliorate the harmful impacts of salinity, such as Burhan and Al-Taey (2018) on dill, Hassan (2019) on caraway, Hegazy *et al.*

Table 6. Response of sodium (%) and proline content ($\mu\text{g/g}$) of *Rosmarinus officinalis* dry leaves to salinized water and potassium humate treatments in the second cut during 2022 and 2023 seasons.

Potassium humate treatments (ppm)	Salinized water treatments (dS/m) (A)									
	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)	0.0	1.2	2.8	4.2	Mean (B)
	The first growing season (2022)					The second growing season (2023)				
	Sodium (%)									
Control	1.843	1.954	2.091	2.279	2.042	1.862	1.974	2.112	2.302	2.063
Humic acid 1000	1.751	1.837	1.966	2.142	1.924	1.772	1.858	1.989	2.168	1.947
Humic acid 2000	1.646	1.744	1.868	2.035	1.824	1.670	1.769	1.894	2.064	1.849
Humic acid 3000	1.581	1.675	1.793	1.954	1.751	1.615	1.712	1.833	1.997	1.789
Mean (A)	1.705	1.802	1.930	2.103	1.886	1.723	1.821	1.949	2.124	1.904
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 0.095		B: 0.040		AB: 0.080	A: 0.098		B: 0.023		AB: 0.046
	Proline content ($\mu\text{g/g}$)									
Control	252.8	268.5	283.2	308.7	278.3	255.8	271.5	286.2	311.6	281.3
Humic acid 1000	238.1	253.8	266.6	290.1	262.6	243.0	258.7	271.5	296.0	267.5
Humic acid 2000	223.4	240.1	249.9	272.4	247.0	230.3	247.0	257.7	280.3	253.8
Humic acid 3000	205.8	220.5	226.4	235.2	222.5	213.6	229.3	235.2	245.0	231.3
Mean (A)	230.3	246.0	256.8	276.4	251.9	232.3	247.9	258.7	279.3	254.8
L.S.D. at 5%	A: 11.0		B: 7.0		AB: 14.0	A: 13.0		B: 9.0		AB: 18.0

(2021) on *Salvia officinalis* and Reyes-Pérez *et al.* (2021) on basil plant.

DISCUSSION

Salinity reduces leaf water potential and modifies a number of metabolic processes, including ionic imbalances, changes in solute buildup, and the inhibition of enzyme activity, all of which impede growth (Vinocur and Altman, 2005; Munns *et al.*, 2006). Reactive oxygen species have been shown to cause oxidative damage to plant cells under salt stress, which can lower plant yield (Azevedo-Neto *et al.*, 2006). Proline accumulation in plants under salt stress may be the cause of the notable rise in proline content seen in water as NaCl concentration rose (Ali and Attia, 2015). Soliman *et al.* (2018) suggested that salinity tolerance and avoidance mechanisms contribute towards salinity resistance, and that variation in salinity stress resistance is attributed to differences in proline content.

When applied as an organic potash (K) fertilizer, potassium humate may provide plants with large, easily absorbed amounts of soluble potassium, allowing them to quickly absorb and use potassium within their tissues. Plant growth and productivity are enhanced by potassium humate due to its improvements in photosynthesis, chlorophyll density, and plant root respiration (Hashish *et al.*, 2015 and Shajari *et al.*, 2016).

CONCLUSION

It is possible to draw the conclusion that potassium humate can boost growth and production under normal conditions in addition mitigating the harmful effects of saline water.

REFERENCES

- Abdelkader, A.E. (2019). Effect of different levels of farmyard manure, mineral fertilization and potassium humate on growth and productivity of garlic. *Sciences*, 9(2):287-296.
- Abdelkader, M.A.I.; Hassan, H.M.S. and Elboraie, E.A.H. (2019). Using proline treatments to promote growth and productivity of *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. plant grown under soil salinity conditions. *Middle East J. Appl. Sci.*, 9(3):700-710.
- Abou-Sreea, A.I.B.; Yassen, A.A. and El-Kazzaz, A.A. (2017). Effects of iron (II) sulfate and potassium humate on growth and chemical composition of *Coriandrum sativum* L. *International Journal of Agricultural Research*, 12(4):136-145. <https://doi.org/10.3923/ijar.2017.136.145>
- Al-Fraihat, A.H.; Al-Dalain, S.Y.; Zatimeh, A.A. and Haddad, M.A. (2023). Enhancing rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis*, L.) growth and volatile oil constituents grown under soil salinity stress by some amino acids. *Horticulturae*, 9(2):1-14. <https://doi.org/10.3390/horticulturae9020252>
- Ali, H.M. and Attia, M.G. (2015). Response of salt stressed rosemary plants to antistress agents. *Scientific Journal of Flowers and Ornamental Plants*, 2(3):249-264.
- Ashraf, M. and Harris, P.J.C. (2004). Potential biochemical indicators of salinity tolerance in plants. *Plant Sci.*, 166:3-16.
- Azevedo-Neto, D.J.; Prisco, J.; Eneas, C.D. and Gomes, E. (2006). Effect of salt stress on antioxidative enzymes and lipid peroxidation in leaves and roots of salt tolerant and salt sensitive maize varieties. *Environ. Exp. Bot.*, 56:87-94.
- Aziz, E.E. and Youssef, A.A. (2001). Growth, yield and chemical composition of *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. plant as affected with sulphur, nitrogen and phosphorus fertilization under saline water irrigation. *Journal of Plant Production*, 26(11):7221-7235. <http://dx.doi.org/10.21608/jpp.2001.258125>
- Baâtour, O.; Kaddour, R.; Mahmoudi, H.; Tarchoun, I.; Bettaieb, I.; Nasri, N.; Mrah, S.; Hamdaoui, G.; Lachaal, M. and

- Marzouk, B. (2011). Salt effects on *Origanum majorana* fatty acid and essential oil composition. *Journal of The Science of Food and Agriculture*, 91(14):2613-2620.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jsfa.4495>
- Badran, W.A.; Selim, S.M.; Abdella, E.M. and Matter, F.M.A. (2019). The influence of ammonium nitrate and potassium humate on chemical composition of *Calendula officinalis*, L. plant under two types of soil conditions. *Fayoum Journal of Agricultural Research and Development*, 33(2):130-147.
- Bates, L.S.; Waldren, R.P. and Teare, I.D. (1973). Rapid determination of free proline for water-stress studies. *Plant and Soil*, 39(1):205-207.
- Bidgoli, R.; Azarnezhad, N.; Akhbari, M. and Ghorbani, M. (2019). Salinity stress and PGPR effects on essential oil changes in *Rosmarinus officinalis* L. *Agriculture and Food Security*, 8(1):1-7.
- Burhan, A.K. and Al-Taey, D.K. (2018). Effect of Potassium humate, humic acid, and compost of rice wastes in the growth and yield of two cultivars of Dill under salt stress conditions. *Advances in Natural and Applied Sciences*, 12(11):1-6.
- Chetouani, M.; Mzabri, I.; Aamar, A.; Boukroute, A.; Kouddane, N. and Berrichi, A. (2019). Morphological-physiological and biochemical responses of rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis*) to salt stress. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 13: 752-761.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.matpr.2019.04.037>
- El-Kholy, S.E.; Mazrou, M.M.; Afify, M.M.; Said, N.A.E. and Zedan, H.M. (2020). Effect of irrigation with magnetic water on vegetative growth, chemical contents and essential oil in rosemary grown in different levels of salinity. *Menoufia Journal of Plant Production*, 5(4):143-157.
- El-Sawy, S.M.; El-Bassiony, A.M.; Fawzy, Z.F. and Shedeed, S.I. (2021). Improving yield, physical and chemical qualities of sweet fennel bulbs by spraying of potassium humate. *Journal of Horticultural Science and Ornamental Plants*, 13(3):272-281.
- Fadl, M.S. and Sari El-Deen, S.A. (1979). Effect of N-benzyladenine on photosynthetic pigments and total soluble sugars of olive seedlings grown under saline conditions. *Egyptian Journal of Horticulture*, 6(2):169-183.
- Hashish, K.I.; El-Quesni, E.M.F. and Azza, M.M. (2015). Influence of potassium humate on growth and chemical constituents of *Jatropha curcus* L. *Int. J. Chem. Technol. Res.*, 8:279-283.
- Hassan, A.A. (2019). Effects of irrigation water salinity and humic acid treatments on caraway plants. *Journal of Plant Production*, 10(7):523-528.
<https://doi.org/10.21608/JPP.2019.53548>
- Hegazy, H.A.; Awad, A.E. and Abdelkader, M.A.I. (2021). Using salicylic acid and humic acid as foliar application in amending the harmful influence of soil salinity stress in common sage (*Salvia officinalis* L.). *Plant Archives*, 21(1):1882-1891.
<https://doi.org/10.51470/PLANTARCHIVES.2021.v21.no1.262>
- Hendawy, S.F. and Khalid, K.A. (2005). Response of sage (*Salvia officinalis* L.) plants to zinc application under different salinity levels. *J. Appl. Sci. Res.*, 1(2):147-155.
- Hendawy, S.F.; Hussein, M.S.; Amer, H.M.; El-Gohary, A.E. and Soliman, W.S. (2017). Effect of soil type on growth, yield, and essential oil yield and constituents of *Rosmarinus officinalis*. *Asian Journal of Agriculture and Biology*, 5(4):303-311.
- Hendawy, S.F.; Omer, E.A.; El-Gohary, A.E.; El-Gendy, A.G.; Hussein, M.S.; Salaheldin, S. and Soliman, W.S. (2019).

- Effect of soil and irrigation water salinity in the productivity and essential oil constituents of chamomile (*Chamomilla recutita* L.). Journal of Essential Oil Bearing Plants, 22(4):962-971.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/0972060X.2019.1646165>
- ICARDA (2013). Methods of Soil, Plant and Water Analysis: A Manual for the West Asia and North Africa Region, Third edition, International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas, Beirut, Lebanon, 243 p.
- Jelali, N.; Dhifi, W.; Chahed, T. and Marzouk, B. (2011). Salinity effects on growth, essential oil yield and composition and phenolic compounds content of marjoram (*Origanum majorana* L.) leaves. Journal of Food Biochemistry, 35(5):1443-1450.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-4514.2010.00465.x>
- Kamkari, B.; Asgharzadeh, A. and Azimzadeh, M. (2016). Effects of salt stress and salicylic acid on vegetative and reproductive traits of pot marigold. Institute of Integrative Omics and Applied Biotechnology Journal, 7:34-41.
- Kiarostami, K.; Mohseni, R. and Saboora, A. (2010). Biochemical changes of *Rosmarinus officinalis* under salt stress. Journal of Stress Physiology and Biochemistry, 6 (3):114-122.
- Langroudi, M.E. and Sedaghatoor, S. (2012). Effect of different media and salinity levels on growth traits of rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis* L.). American-Eurasian J. Agric. and Environ. Sci., 12(9):1134-1142.
- Lee, C.J.; Chen, L.G.; Chang, T.L.; Ke, W.M.; Lo, Y.F.; Wang, C.C. (2011). The correlation between skin-care effects and phytochemical contents in Lamiaceae plants. Food Chem., 124:833-841.
- Massoud, H.Y.; Shalan, M.N.; El-Hindi, K.M. and Dapour, A.E.E. (2009). Effect of salinity and some bio-compounds on growth, essential oil yield and chemical composition of marjoram plants. Journal of Plant Production, 34(5):5033-5048.
- Mohsen, A.A.; Ibraheim, S.K.A. and Abdel-Fattah, M.K. (2017). Effect of potassium humate, nitrogen biofertilizer and molybdenum on growth and productivity of garlic (*Allium sativum* L.). Curr. Sci. Int., 6(1):75-85.
- MSTAT-C (1986). A microcomputer program for the design management and analysis of Agronomic Research Experiments (version 4.0), Michigan State Univ., U.S.A.
- Munns, R.; James, R.A. and Lauchli, A. (2006). Approaches to increasing the salt tolerance of wheat and other cereals. J. Exp. Bot., 57:1025-1043.
- Nazarbeygi, E.; Yazdi, H.L.; Naseri, R. and Soleimani, R. (2011). The effects of different levels of salinity on proline and A-, B-chlorophylls in canola. American-Eurasian J. Agric. and Environ. Sci., 10(1):70-74.
- Retab, Y.; Selim, S.H.; Matter, F. and Hassanein, M. (2022). Influence of sulphur, potassium humate and their interactions on growth, flowering and chemical constituents of roselle plant (*Hibiscus sabdariffa*). Fayoum Journal of Agricultural Research and Development, 36(1):34-48.
- Reyes-Pérez, J.J.; Murillo-Amador, B.; Nieto-Garibay, A.; Hernandez-Montiel, L.G.; Ruiz-Espinoza, F.H. and Rueda-Puente, E.O. (2021). Influence of humates to mitigate NaCl-induced adverse effects on *Ocimum basilicum* L.: relative water content and photosynthetic pigments. Pak. J. Bot., 53(4):1159-1165.
- Said-Al Ahl, H.A.H. and Hussein, M.S. (2010). Effect of water stress and potassium humate on the productivity of oregano plant using saline and fresh water irrigation. Ozean Journal of Applied Sciences, 3(1):125-141.

- Said-Al Ahl, H.A.H.; Ayad, H.S. and Hendawy, S.F. (2009). Effect of potassium humate and nitrogen fertilizer on herb and essential oil of oregano under different irrigation intervals. *Journal of Applied Sciences*, 2(3):319-323.
- Sarmoum, R.; Haid, S.; Biche, M.; Djazouli, Z.; Zebib, B. and Merah, O. (2019). Effect of salinity and water stress on the essential oil components of rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis* L.). *Agronomy*, 9(5):1-10. <https://doi.org/10.3390/agronomy9050214>
- Shajari, A.M.; Moghaddam, R.P.; Ghorbani, R. and Mahallati, R.P. (2016). Effects of single and combined application of organic, biological and chemical fertilizers on quantitative and qualitative yield of coriander (*Coriandrum sativum*). *J. Hortic. Sci.*, 4:80-81.
- Shalaby, T.A.; El-Newiry, N.A.; El-Tarawy, M.; El-Mahrouk, M.E.; Shala, A.Y.; El-Beltagi, H.S.; Rezk, A.A.; Abd El-Ramadan, K.M.; Shehata, W.F. and El-Ramady, H. (2023). Biochemical and physiological response of marigold (*Tagetes erecta* L.) to foliar application of salicylic acid and potassium humate in different soil growth media. *Gesunde Pflanzen*, 75(2):223-236. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10343-022-00693-4>
- Shalan, M.N.; Abdel-Latif, T.A. and El-Ghadban, E.M.A. (2006). Effect of water salinity and some nutritional compounds on the growth and production of sweet marjoram plants (*Majorana hortensis* L.). *Egyptian Journal of Agricultural Research*, 84(3):959-975. <https://doi.org/10.21608/ejar.2006.232209>
- Shyala, M.R.; Dhanasekaran, D. and Rameshkumar, S. (2019). Effect of foliar application of micronutrients and potassium humate on growth and flower yield of African marigold (*Tagetes erecta* L.). *Ann. Plant Soil Res.*, 21(2):101-107.
- Soliman, W.S.; Sugiyama, S. and Abbas, A.M. (2018). Contribution of avoidance and tolerance strategies towards salinity stress resistance in eight C₃ turfgrass species. *Horticulture, Environment, and Biotechnology*, 59(1):29-36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13580-018-0004-4>
- Tounekti, T.; Vadel, A.M.; Bedoui, A. and Khemira, H. (2008). NaCl stress affects growth and essential oil composition in rosemary (*Rosmarinus officinalis* L.). *The Journal of Horticultural Science and Biotechnology*, 83(2):267-273. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14620316.2008.1512379>
- Tounekti, T.; Vadel, A.M.; Oñate, M.; Khemira, H. and Munné-Bosch, S. (2011). Salt-induced oxidative stress in rosemary plants: damage or protection?. *Environmental and experimental Botany*, 71 (2):298-305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2010.12.016>
- Vinocur, B. and Altman, A. (2005). Recent advances in engineering plant tolerance to abiotic stress: achievements and limitations. *Curr. Opin. Biotechnol.*, 16:123-132.
- Wei, K.; Zhang, J.H.; Wang, Q.J.; Chen, Y.; Guo, Y. and Sun, Y. (2021). Effects of potassium humate on cotton (*Gossypium hirsutum* L.) growth and yield and soil salinity under film-mulched drip irrigation with brackish water in northwest China. *Applied Ecology and Environmental Research*, 19(5):3879-3895. http://dx.doi.org/10.15666/aeer/1905_38793895
- Zaghloul, S.M.; El-Quesni, F.E.M. and Mazhar, A.A.M. (2009). Influence of potassium humate on growth and chemical constituents of *Thuja orientalis* L. seedlings. *Ozean Journal of Applied Sciences*, 2(1):73-78.

تأثير هيومات البوتاسيوم علي نباتات الحاصلبان النامية في الأرض الرملية تحت الري بماء مالح

محمود عبد الهادي حسن عبده*، أمير فتح الباب أحمد عبدالرحيم**، عبدالله محمد عثمان جهوري***
* قسم البساتين، كلية الزراعة، جامعة المنيا، مصر
** قسم علوم الأراضي والمياه، مركز التجارب والبحوث الزراعية، جامعة المنيا، مصر
*** قسم البساتين، كلية الزراعة والموارد الطبيعية، جامعة أسوان، مصر

لإختبار قدرة هيومات البوتاسيوم (٠، ١٠٠٠، ٢٠٠٠، ٣٠٠٠ جزء في المليون) علي تقليل الآثار الضارة لماء الري المملح (ماء الصنبور، ١،٤، ٢،٨، ٤،٢ ديسيسيمنز/متر) علي نباتات الحاصلبان، أجريت تجربة أصص بمشتل نباتات الزينة، كلية الزراعة، جامعة المنيا، خلال موسمي ٢٠٢٢ و ٢٠٢٣. أظهرت النتائج أن جميع الصفات المختبرة للنمو الخضري (ارتفاع النبات، عدد الأفرع/نبات، والأوزان الطازجة والجافة للعشب) قد انخفضت بزيادة مستوي الملوحة (٢،٨ و ٤،٢ ديسيسيمنز/متر) مقارنة بالكنترول في الحشتين خلال موسمي النمو. وفي الاتجاه المضاد، وُجد أن الصفات المذكورة قد زادت مع المستوى المنخفض من الملوحة (١،٤ و ٢،٨ ديسيسيمنز/متر). وقد وُجد أن النسبة المئوية للزيت وإنتاجية الزيت الطيار قد زادت مع تركيزات (١،٤ و ٢،٨ و ديسيسيمنز/متر)، فقد انخفضا معنوياً تحت تركيز (٤،٢ ديسيسيمنز/متر) مقارنة بالكنترول في الحشتين خلال موسمي النمو. والمحتوي من الصبغات والنسبة المئوية للنيتروجين، الفوسفور والبوتاسيوم قد أخذت نفس اتجاه صفات النمو الخضري، بينما النسبة المئوية للصدويوم ومحتوي البرولين (ملجم/جم) في الأوراق الجافة قد زادا نتيجة لارتفاع تركيز الملوحة في الحشة الثانية خلال موسمي النمو. كل الصفات المدروسة للنمو الخضري وإنتاجية الزيت الطيار، وكذلك العديد من المكونات الكيميائية المذكورة أعلاه، قد تحسنت معنوياً نتيجة معاملات هيومات البوتاسيوم، ماعدا النسبة المئوية للصدويوم والمحتوي من البرولين (ملجم/جم) في الأوراق الجافة خلال موسمي النمو. وفي هذا الشأن، تركيز ٣٠٠٠ جزء في المليون من هيومات البوتاسيوم كان أكثر تأثيراً. وكان تأثير التداخل معنوياً لكل الصفات المدروسة، مع أفضل معاملة تداخل هي الري بماء مملح (١،٤ ديسيسيمنز/متر) مع الرش بهيومات البوتاسيوم (٣٠٠٠ جزء في المليون). ويمكن تلخيص أن التأثير السلبي للملوحة من الممكن تقليله برش النبات بهيومات البوتاسيوم بتركيز ٣٠٠٠ جزء في المليون.