EVALUATION OF VEGITATIVE GROWTH AND COMPARATIVE STUDIES OF BIOMASS OF SOME Eucalyptus species SEEDLINGS PLANTED IN DIFFERENT GROWING MEDIA

Shehata, M.S.*; A. El- Tantawy ** and O. A. Radwan*

* Forest. And Timber Trees Dep. Hort. Res. Inst

**Ornam. Plant. Dep. Fac. Agric. Cairo Univ

ABSTRACT

This trial was carried out at Experimental area of Ornamental Plants Department Faculty of Agriculture Cairo University throughout two successive seasons of 1996 and 1997. Four months uniform seedlings of 4 introduced Eucalyptus species namely Eucalyptus incana, E.camaldulensis, E.citriodora and E.gomphocephala were planted in 4 different growing media i.e. sand, clay, the mixture of them 1:1 and 2:1 (v/v).

The obtained results demonstrated that the mixture of sand and clay 1:1(v/v) enhanced the growth parameters viz. plant height, leaves area, root length, fresh and dry weight of stems and fresh weight of roots where the increases were 10.4, 62.09, 27.99, 99.2, 17.3, and 44.2% respectively attributed to those detected corresponding to sandy growing media while seedlings growing in clay media gave the superior values in stem diameter, branches number, fresh and dry weight of leaves and dry weight of roots since the increases attained 11.6, 52.15, 53.5, 52.3, and 51.0% respectively more than sandy soil which diminished all growth parameters. Mixture of 2:1 resulted in the intermediate values irrespective the effect of different species. Biomass of both *E.gomphocephala* and *E. incana* increased to maximized values due to clay or the mixture of 1:1 (v/v) whereas the mixture of 2:1 or clay media enhanced much more the biomass of *E. citriodora*. On the other hand *E. camaldulences* had the superior biomass due to the mixture of 1:1 or 2:1.

Evaluation of *Eucalyptus species* revealed that *E. camaldulensis* had the best values in plant height and fresh and dry weight of roots. *E. gomphocephala* pronounced the maximum values in branches number, root length and fresh and dry weight of leaves, branches, and stems. *E. incana* had the superior values in stem diameter while *E. citriodora* gave the least values of growth with leaf area exception.

From the heretofore results it can be concluded that *E. camaldulensis* seedlings should be planted in the mixture of sand and clay at portion 1:1 or 2:1(v/v). Both of *E.incana and E. gomphocephala* being best in clay or the mixture of 1:1whereas *E. citriodora* preferable to be planted in the mixture of 2:1(v/v)

Clay and the mixture of sand and clay 1:1 media performed the highest values of chlorophyll A, B and total sugars compared with those of sandy soil which declined

them. Leaves of E. gomphocephala contained highest chlorophylls.

Therefore it might be recommended to improve the physical and chemical properties of sandy media by adding clay as portion of 1:1 or 2:1 and also to enhance the traits of clay media by adding sand to make a suitable growing media

INTRODUCTION

The genus of Eucalyptus belong to Myrtaceae family and it well represented in Australia, widely distribution in the warmer parts of the world and extend from moist coastal to deserts area and from cool temperature to equatorial climates.

There are some familiar of Eucalyptus species introduced into Egypt and planted increasingly as exotic trees viz: Eucalyptus camaldulensis Dehn, E. citriodora Hook, E.gomphocephala Dc and new Eucalyptus incana. Eucalyptus camaldulesis is the most wide spread species in the genus to be used for rehabilitation of moderately saline sites Criag et al (1990) and for the stabilization of sand dunes, as windbreaks and shelter belts as well as the numerous species of trees are useful for planting. In hospitable environment

The wood is hard and durable and has been used for many purposes, including railway sleeper, flooring fencing, plywood, veneer, turnery and firewood, the trees are good producers of pollens and nectar for

honey.

Because of increasing the desert lands as a sandy soil in which the sand is the major component and poor in nutrient content, many investigations were conducted to improve the characteristics of sandy soils by mixing it by clay. In this respect, Shehata (1972) on Eucalyptus camaldulensis and Casuarina equisetifolia and El-Bana (1979) on E. camaldulensis, Casuarina. cunninghamiana, Tipuana speciosa and Taxodium distichum cleared that the tallest seedlings and heaviest dry weight obtained in clay soil but the least values exhibited in sandy soil. El Tantawy (1981) found that the mixture of sand + clay (1:1) improved the vegetative growth of Casuarina equisetifolia and Cupressus sempervirens compared to sandy soil. El-Khteeb(1983) recorded similar results on Eucalyptus torquata and Eucalyptus angulosa, also Farahat (1986) on Eucalyptus camaldulensis pointed out that the mixture of sand and clay produced the best vegetative growth compared to sand soil, Gupta et al (1986) demonstrated that clay soil improved the vegetative growth of E. tereticornis

Mohamed, (1993) on some ornamental plants indicated that the mixture of sand + clay (1:1) had an effect on increasing plant height, and

fresh and dry weight of roots, stems and leaves

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This trial was carried out at the Experimental area of Ornamental Horticulture Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University in two

successive seasons of 1996 and 1997

The objectives of this investigation are the classification and evaluation of vegetative growth for some introduced Eucalyptus species viz. Eucalyptus incana E.cmaldulensis, E.citriodora and E. gomphocephala seedlings growing in different media namely, sand, clay, and the mixture of both at 1:1 and 2:1 (v/v) and to determine the biomass of plants through the experiment period.

Four months old uniform seedlings of Eucalyptus species were planted individually on February, 1st 1996 and 1997 in 30 cm (diameter) plastic pots.

The physical and chemical analysis of these growing media (Table, A)

were performed as described by Piper (1947)

The soil surface was covered with sheets of thick polyethylene to prevent the penetration growing roots into soil under pots. The following data were recorded after 10 months from seedlings planting

J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 27(4), April, 2002

Table (A) Physical and Chemical Analysis of used growing media

Analysis	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1
Coarse sand %	40.30	11.10	29.60	36.40
Fine sand %	47.80	37.90	33.50	40.80
Clay %	5.30	38.40	26.70	15.60
Silt %	6.60	12.60	10.20	7.20
E.C.(mmhos /cm)	0.36	0.31	0.73	0.42
pH	7.70	8.00	7.90	7.80
Field capacity	28.00	42.00	36.00	32.
Mineral content (ppm)	The second		1 2 3 7	
Nitrogen	11.3	52.7	33.4	26.3
Phosphorus	16.5	37.4	22.2	18.6
Potassium	2.3	5.7	6.4	5.5
Sodium	53.8	73.5	68.2	59.7
Calcium	43.5	54.1	48.3	45.6
Magnesium	26.6	38.4	31.8	29.4

I-Vegetative growth

- 1 -Plant height (cm)
- 2 -Stem diameter (mm)
- 3- Leaf area (cm²) where samples of Eucalyptus species leaves were taken from the medium part of seedling. Each sample comprise 30 leaves from each treatment the leaf area was estimated by a plane meter
- 4- Branches number/ plant
- 5- Root length (cm) where the roots were carefully washed and the root length have determined from soil surface to the farthest point
- 6- Fresh and dry weight (g) of leaves, stems and roots were determined
- 7-Biomass of seedlings was determined for the different *Eucalyptus species* (a/plant).

II-Chemical composition

- 1-Chlorophyll A and B content in leaves were determined (mg/g F.W) according to Saric (1976)
- 2-Total sugars percent in leaves were determined by method of Smith et al (1956)

The lay out of the experiment was completely randomized design of two affecting factors (4 growing media and 4 species of *Eucalyptus*). Each treatment embodied 30 plants in 3 replicates. The statistical analysis of mean values were conducted by L.S.D according to Steel and Torrie (1980)

Table (1) :Effect of growing media on plant height (cm), stem diameter (mm) and leave area (cm²) of some Eucalyptus species in 1996 and 1997 seasons

88.81 84.4	NAME OF TAXABLE PARTY.	12.85	00.61 80.01 71.2	48.01	10.97 EE.11	\$8.01 \\ \(\) \(42.11 8.11 8.1	36.01	96.08	S5.28 75.39	90.10 98.54 2.30	70.87 86.89	73.26	gomphocephala Mean G.D at 0.05 for (A)
95.9 20.6 04.81 68.8		11.88	71.8	11.21	11.14	10.24	12.44	17.9	67.111 68.69	101.28	122.30	116.36	107.20 89.56	camaldulensis citriodora
1.05 9.95	13.29	6.93	Sandy 8.53	Mean 11.53	F: Z	79.11	13.02 13.02	11.50	05-88 88.49	2:1 92.84	F: F 86.68	Clay 84.26	88.88	Species (B)

				17.1 2.91				₽7.↑ 97. ↑ 99. ↑					2.05 2.34 3.69	2	(A) 101 50.0 at 0.2 (B) 101 50.0 at 0.2 (B.A) 101 50.0 ts 0.2
A Property of the Party of the	14.41	15.53	12.33	11.05		70.11	61.11	33.11	87.01		77.29	86.38	40.79	06.38	Vean
15.12	13.20	80.71	80.91	14.12	17.01	10.62	10.01	19.11	10.01	99.08	94.38	91.68	38.47	72.74	-gomphocephala
17.53	20.67	22.07	14.31	13.08	10.32	10.52	10.30	14.01	10.05	98.89	01.69	08.16	116.56	82,13	E. citriodora
04.6	99.01	10.17	10.82	96'9	11.06	10.55	11.34	11.02	11.34	69,701	102.43	71.11	112,68	104.48	sisnaldulensis
10.03	10.12	12.83	8.12	90'6	11.22	09'6	11.06	11.51	11.11	96.78	01.06	93.40	40.48	84.28	incana .
Mean	7:2	1:1	Clay	Sandy	Mean	2:1	1:1	Clay	Sandy	Mean	1:2	1:1	Clay	Sandy	Species (B)
-		lana females a	ies (cm,)	Leave a			(ww	ameter (i	Stem dia		(cm)	t height	Plan		Grown media (A)
77				1				266	ı						

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I- Vegetative growth

1- Plant height

Data presented in Table (1) illustrated that using clay soil and the mixture of sand and clay (1:1) or (2:1) as growing media induced the best height of investigated *Eucalyptus species* seedlings in which produced the tallest seedlings(98.35, 98.54 and 95.37 cm respectively) while sandy soil resulted the shortest height 89.22 and 85.9cm in the first and second season respectively regardless the effect of different species and there are significant differences between clay and sandy soils or the mixture while there are no significant differences between clay soil and the mixture of sand and clay either the portion of (1:1) or (2:1) in the first season but in the second one the significance different exhibited between the two later media.

Concerning the species of Eucalyptus, the results presented in Table (1) apparently cleared that *Eucalyptus camaldulensis* seedlings were considerable the tallest 111.79 and 107.69 cm followed by *E.citriodora* 99.53 and 95.85 cm, whereas *E. incana* was the intermediate 88.49 and 87.95 cm. On the other hand *E.gomphocephala* was the shortest seedling 80.96 and 80.55 cm in the first and second season respectively. All the investigated

species differed significantly in between in both seasons.

Regarding the interaction between the different species and different growing media the results showed that the differences were highly significant and *E.camaldulensis* seedlings cultivated in mixture of sand and clay (1:1 v/v) were the superior in height 122.3 cm in the first season while *E. citriodora* planted in mixture of sand and clay (1:1 v/v) exhibited the tallest 116.56 cm. in the second one

From the above mentioned results it can be concluded that the mixture of sand and clay (1:1 v/v) gave the preferable results than clay or sand alone, meaning that adding clay to sand improved the characteristics of sandy soil in agreement with the findings of El-Bana (1979) on E. camaldulensis, Casuarina. cunninghamiana and Cupressus sempervirens, Townsend (1984) on Gleditcia triacanthos, Farahat, (1986) on E. camaldulensis and Mohamed, (1993) on some ornamental shrubs

2- Stem diameter

Data presented in Table (1) showed that grown media had an effect on stem diameter, the mean values of stem diameter ranged from 10.65mm in sandy soil to 11.89mm in clay soil. Plants grown in clay and mixture of sand and clay 1:1 v/v media produced significantly the thickest stems (11.89 and 11.37mm) respectively compared with those in sandy soil, which gave the thinnest stem 10.65mm.In the second season a similar trend was recorded.

Concerning stem diameter of Eucalyptus species it can be noticed from Table (2) that Eucalyptus incana seedlings had the thickest stem followed by E. camaldulensis, while E. gomphocephala was the intermediate the E. citriodora was the thinnest stem, and the results were confirmed in both

seasons.

Table (2): Effect of growing media on branches number, root length (cm) and fresh weight of leaves on some Eucalyptus species in 1996 and 1997 seasons

1996 Grown media (A)		Bran	ches nu	mber		Root len	gth (cm)			Fresh w	eight of	leaves (gm)	
Species (B)	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean
E. incana	9.25	10.57	10.60	7.60	9.50	59.50	78.54	62.50	70.50	67.76	28.31	32.80	23.37	20.62	26.27
E.camaldulensis	6.00	11.33	7.25	8.57	8.28	55.45	60.87	73.52	57.14	61.74	30.25	41.56	22.22	22.02	29.01
E. citriodora	4.40	7.00	7.20	5.80	6.10	45.50	43.25	76.45	57.36	55.64	20.98	22.73	18.84	10.05	18.15
E.gomphocephaL	13.80	19.00	15.00	10.33	14.53	69.23	67.15	84.12	104.2	81.18	44.52	90.23	73.30	42.62	70.16
Mean	8.36	12.72	10.01	8.57		58.17	62.45	74.64	72.31		31.02	46.83	34.43	23.82	
L.S.D at 0.05 for (A)	-	1.6	0			3.41				1.82					
L.S.D at 0.05 for (B)		1.8				3.36				2.45					
L.S.D at 0.05 for (AxB)	2.1				3.73				2.67					

Grown media(A)		Bran	ches nu	mhers		13	97 Roc	t length	(cm)		Fr	esh wei	aht of le	eaves (g	m)
Species (B)	Sandy	Clav	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean
E. incana	9.80	10.00	9.00	7.00	8.95	46.89	45.78	67.21	69.58	57.36	35.15	42.12	32.69	27.84	34.45
E. camaldulensis		11.00	9.25	9.00	8.93	66.54	72.21	93.15	63.51	73.85	21.90	46.91	35.94	30.01	33.69
E. citriodora	1	7.16	7.80	5.60	6.44	62.53	53.15	49.36	54.56	54.90	15.07	15.14	14.59	15.82	15.15
E.gomphocephala		17.66	13.60	12.00	14.25	74.23	97.55	96.25	82.53	87.64	68.49	95.19	97.91	52.17	78.44
Mean	8.81	12.20	9.91	8.90		62.55	67.17	76.49	67.54		52.26	49.84	45.28	31.46	
L.S.D at 0.05 for (A)	-	1.	35			2.6	64				1.14				
L.S.D at 0.05 for (B)		1.	49			3.2	21				1.59				
L.S.D at 0.05 for (AxB)		1.	76			3.8	35				2.73				

The interaction between different species and soil types it might be observed that *E. incana* planted in clay media produced the thickest stem (13.o2 and 13.11mm) in both seasons respectively, while *E. citriodora* grown in sandy soil resulted in the thinnest stem 9.71 and 10.05mm in both seasons.

From the above-mentioned results it can be concluded that clay soil or the mixture of sand+ clay 1:1 (v/v) as a favorable media for Eucalyptus planting were in accordance with those obtained by Singh and Sharama (1984) on Populus ciliata. Gupta et al. (1986) on Leucaena leucacephala, Peltphorum pterocarum, Eucalyptus tereticornis, Azaderachta indica and Albizzia lebbeck

3-Leaf area

Data of Table (1) indicated that leaf area was affected by growing media as the plants grown in mixture of sand and clay (1:1 v/v) and (2:1 v/v) media produced significantly the largest average leaf area 16.29 and 13.53 cm² respectively followed by clay media 12.89cm² whereas sandy soil reduced leaf area to 10.05 cm². The same trend approximately exhibited in the second season.

Regarding the effect of *Eucalyptus species* on leaf area it can be noticed that *E. citriodora* and *E.gomphocephala* had significantly the biggest leaf area (16.4 and 15.81cm² v/v) in first season respectively compared with *E. camaldulensis* and *E. incana* which had the smallest leaf area. The results of the second season have taken the same trend nearly.

The interaction between *Eucalyptuses species* x growing media, the results cleared that *E. citriodora* planted in mixture of sand+ clay (1:1 v/v) resulted the maximum leaf area 22.58cm² whereas *E. camaldulensis* planted in sandy soil had the smallest leaf area 5.17 cm². The obtained results of the second season were similar to those of the first one.

4-Branches number/ plant

As shown in Table (2) it is evident in the first season that the plants, which planted in clay soil, attained to significantly the maximum mean value (12.72) of branches number/ plant compared to sandy soil which produced the least value of 8.36.

The mixture of sand and clay (1:1 v/v)as growing media gave also branches number/ plant more than those produced from sandy soil. The results of second season have taken the same trend of the first one regardless the effect of different species.

In this regard *E. gomphocephal*a had the largest branches number/plant followed by *E. incana* and *E. camaldulensis* while *E. citriodor*a produced the lowest one.

The interaction between *Eucalyptus species* and growing media revealed that *E. gomphocephala* seedlings which were planted in clay soil resulted the highest branches number/ plant while *E. citriodora* seedlings planted in sandy soil had the least value.

5-Root length

Data presented in Table (2) obviously cleared in the first season that grown media had a pronounced effect on root length where the seedlings grown in mixture of sand and clay (1:1 and 2:1 v/v) produced significantly the longest roots 74.64 and 72.31 cm respectively compared to those obtained from clay media which had the intermediate value of 62.45 cm, whereas sandy soil gave the shortest roots of 58.17 cm. These results were emphasized in second season as the same trend was found nearly.

The former results coincided with those obtained by Singh and Sharama (1984) on *Populus ciliata*, Witt (1987) on *Taxus baccata* where all of them confirmed that root length improved by adding clay or peat moss to

sandy soil.

As for the *Eucalyptus species*, the results indicated that the longest roots appeared in *E.gomphocephala* 81.18 cm followed by *E.incana* 67.76 cm whereas *E.camaldulensis* was the intermediate and *E. citriodora* had the shortest roots.

Concerning the interaction between *Eucalyptus species* x growing media the results illustrated that the differences were highly significant and *E.gomphocephala* planted in mixture of sand and clay (2:1 v/v) had the longest roots 104.25 cm while *E. citriodora* grown in clay soil resulted in the shortest roots 43.25 cm

6-Fresh and dry weight of leaves

It is cleared from Table (2) that both fresh and dry weight of leaves was significantly the heaviest in clay soil (46.83and 49.84 gm) for fresh weight and (15.32 and 15.10 gm) for dry weight in first and second season respectively compared with those obtained by sandy soil which produced the lightest fresh (30.51 and 35.15) and dry weight (10.06 and 11.49 gm) while the mixture of sand and clay either I: 1 or 2:1 (v/v) resulted in the intermediate in fresh and dry weight.

Concerning the effect of *Eucalyptus species*, the results showed that *E.gomphocephla* gave significantly the heaviest fresh (70.16 and 80.94 gm) and dry weight (20.53 and 25.39 gm) in both season respectively compared with the others species, while both of *E.camaldulensis* and *E. incana* had the intermediate values, meantime, *E. citriodora* had the lightest fresh (18.15 and 15.16 gm) and dry weights (8.47 and 8.09 gm) in both seasons regardless

the effect of different soils.

In this regard, the interaction between *Eucalyptus species* and growing media, it can be concluded that *E. gomphocephala* grown in either clay or the mixture of sand and clay 1:1 v/v produced the heaviest fresh and dry weight.

The previous results were in harmony with the findings of Mohamed (1993) on some ornamental plants that reported that the mixture of sand and clay 1:1 v/v had an effect on increasing fresh and dry weight of leaves.

7-Fresh and dry weight of stem

Data of Tables (3,4) illustrated that grown media was more effective on fresh and dry weights of stem where the mixture of sand and clay media 1:1v/v resulted in significantly the heaviest fresh (68.91 and 61.34 gm) and dry weight (22.71 and 20.33 gm) in first and second season respectively

Table (3): Effect of growing media on fresh weight of stems and roots(g/plant) of some Eucalyptus species in 1996 and 1997 seasons

						19	1996				Photography of the state of the				
Grown media (A)	T.	esh we	Fresh weight of branches	branche		Fresh v	veight c	Fresh weight of stems (gm	(gm)		Fresh y	Fresh weight of roots	of roots		
Species (B)	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean
E incana	11.02	-	27.87	10.37	16.68	24.35	49.00	64.88	39.34	44.39	39.60	58.86	28.11	31.87	39.61
E. camaldulensis	13.67	11.95	11.08	22.04	14.68	39.26	64.14	57.59	89.97	62.74	60.58	52.48	102.22	47.46	65.68
E citriodora	3.59	3.77	3.40	6.72	4.37	35.64	47.05	57.60	67.10	51.84	28.55	65.87	42.34	51.28	48.26
E.gomphocephala	24.02	19.79		17.52	17.86	39.15	90.40	95.58	31.07	64.05	40.16	84.99	35.15	55.15	53.80
Mean	13.07	13.24	13.11	14.16		34.60	34.60 62.64	68.91	56.87		42.22	65.55	53.21	46.44	
L.S.D at 0.05 for (A)			N.S			3.51	-		1.5	3	3.47				
L.S.D at 0.05 for (B)			2.37			3.84	*			3	3.55				
L.S.D at 0.05 for (AxB)			2.85			4.12				3	3.84				
				The state of the s	N. S.	19	1997								
Grown media (A)	Fre	ssh weig	Fresh weight of branches (qm)	inches (c	(mb	4	resh we	Fresh weight of stems (gm	tems (gn	(u		Fresh	Fresh weight of roots	f roots	
Species (B)	Sandv	Clav	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean
E incana	18.76	18.25	23.36	19.97	20.08	26.35	50.58	54.31	40.50	42.93		55.25	32.41	38.66	41.36
E. camaldulensis		14.15	13.02	23.06	16.19	42.07	63.68	50.40	84.23	60.10	52.14	44.27	113.18	53.19	69.59
E citriodora		3.40	3.91	5.20	3.66	42.33	37.60	40.60	76.53	49.27	35.80	70.54	31.15	58.39	48.97
E. gomphocephala		23.30	15.86	10.97	16.91	32.61	80.10	100.06	36.14	62.23	30.40	82.15	65.26	55.56	58.34
Mean	13.24	14.77	14.03	14.80		35.83	57.99	61.34	59.35	Harris .	39.36	63.05	60.50	52.20	
L.S.D at 0.05 for (A)			N.S			3.84				3	3.84				
L.S.D at 0.05 for (B)		2	2.41			3.85				3.72	2				
L.S.D at 0.05 for (AxB)		64	2.61			4.29				e,	96				

Table (4): Effect of growing media on dry weight of leaves, stems and roots (g/plant) of some Eucalyptus species in1996 and 1997 seasons

Species (B) Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 3:2 3:2 3:3	IAI Cham amore						18	1996				-				
Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Sandy	Grown media (A)		Dry we	ight of le	eaves (gr	_			ght of st	tems (gn	(1		Dry weig	th of roc	ots (am)	
9.43 10.93 7.44 6.87 10.91 8.21 16.11 21.62 13.15 14.77 13.20 18.65 10.62 9.27 10.00 17.30 34.17 15.52 10.60 17.30 34.17 15.52 10.00 17.30 34.17 15.52 10.00 17.30 34.17 15.52 10.00 17.30 34.17 15.52 10.00 17.30 13.18 17.10 17.30 13.18 17.30 13.18 17.30 13.18 17.30 13.18 17.30 13.18 17.30 13.18 17.30 13.18 17.30 13.14 11.20 13.30 13.20 13.14 11.30 15.25 11.30 13.32 12.30 13.32 12.30 13.14 11.30 15.25 11.30 1	obecies (B)	Sandy	_	-	- 1	Mean		_	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clav	1.1	2.4	Mean
10.00 13.58 7.30 7.34 9.55 13.18 19.10 29.30 20.74 20.00 17.30 34.17 15.52 14.62 29.41 24.11 14.00 20.53 13.50 30.13 31.35 10.22 21.30 13.18 27.33 11.21 18.18 10.00 1.95 13.50 20.74 20.00 17.30 34.17 15.52 16.52 19.80 22.17 17.10 9.41 20.95 15.51 15.16 18.18 1.95 13.24 21.35 10.25 13.34 21.35 13	ncana	9.43	-	_		10.91	_	16.11	21.62	13.15	1477	13.20	-	10.62	70.0	1000
Columbia	. camaldulensis	10.00	-	_		9.55	_	_	19 10	20 30	20 74	2000	17.00	20.02	3.21	25.33
14.52 29.41 24.11 14.00 20.53 13.50 30.13 31.35 10.22 21.30 13.18 27.33 11.21 18.18 27.33 11.21 18.18 27.33 11.21 18.18 27.33 11.21 18.18 27.34 24.11 13.04 21.05 22.24 22.2	citriodora	6.32	_	_	_	2 47	11 75	-	000	_	41.07	20.00	17.30	34.17	15.52	71.14
10.06 15.32 10.45 11.34 19.36 20.82 22.71 18.71 13.94 27.33 11.21 18.18 1.95 1.96 1.35 10.22 21.30 13.18 27.33 11.21 18.18 1.95 1.95 1.35 10.22 21.30 13.14 13.94 21.05 18.37 15.28 13.14 11.26 13.94 21.05 13.14 13.24 21.05 18.07 13.94 21.05 18.37 15.28 19.85 17.38 14.11 21.1 11.28 13.27 12.55 11.98 10.00 11.13 13.17 21.30 16.64 28.31 19.85 17.38 14.11 37.22 17.31 11.49 15.10 14.83 17.27 25.39 11.25 11.30 14.66 14.30 13.04 15.55 13.04 14.10 15.25 14.18 14.15 14.18 14.15 14.18 14.11 14.88 14.11 14.11 14.11 14.	domohocenhala	14 53	-	_	_	200	_	_	10.00	_	01.71	9.41	20.95	15.51	15.16	15.25
A) 1.21 1.34 1.95 20.82 22.71 18.71 18.71 19.26 18.37 15.28	pinidos de	70.00	+	+	+	20.53	+	-	31.35	-	21.30	13.18	27.33	11.21	18.18	17.74
AXB) 1.21 AXB) 2.26 B) 1.96. 1.85 2.14 2.29. 2.14 2.29. 2.14 2.14 2.14 2.14 2.29. 2.29. 2.248 2.14 2.17 2.14 2.14 2.14 2.14 2.14 2.17 2.18 2.17 2.17 2.18 2.17 2.18	Call	10.06	15.32	-	-		19.36	_	22.71	18.71		13.94	21 05	18 37	15 28	
AxB) 1.96. 1.85 2.29 2.29 2.29 2.29 2.29 2.29 2.29 2.2	S.D at 0.05 for (A)		1.	21			1.72					1.92				
AxB) 2.26	S.D at 0.05 for (B)		-	.96			1.85					214				
(A) Dry weight of leaves (gm) Dry weight of stems (gm) Dry weight of stems (gm) Dry weight of leaves (gm) 11.73 9.28 10.89 13.14 11.26 8.34 16.20 18.00 14.66 14.30 13.14 18.1 2:1 7.30 15.25 11.98 10.00 11.13 13.17 21.30 16.64 28.31 19.85 17.38 14.11 25.5 5.12 5.14 4.86 17.27 8.09 13.32 12.50 13.95 25.37 16.28 11.51 22.51 9.39 19.46 11.49 15.10 14.83 17.27 25.39 10.11 14.88 32.75 11.14 17.22 10.10 20.75 9.38 18.52 11.49 15.10 14.83 17.39 11.23 16.22 20.33 19.87 13.03 18.78 16.96 AxB) 2.54 2.33 19.87 13.03 18.78 16.92 16.96	S.D at 0.05 for (AxB)		2.3	56			2.29					2.48				
Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Sandy San							19	97								
Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 2:1 1.73 9.28 10.89 13.14 11.26 8.34 16.20 18.00 14.66 14.30 13.14 18.14 10.12 12.55 17.30 15.25 11.98 10.00 11.13 13.17 21.30 16.64 28.31 19.85 17.38 14.11 37.22 17.31 21.83 30.73 31.61 17.27 8.09 13.32 12.50 13.95 25.37 16.28 11.51 22.51 9.39 19.46 11.49 15.10 14.83 17.39 17.39 11.23 16.22 20.33 19.87 13.03 18.78 16.52 16.96 AxB) 2.39 1.40 2.31		0	ry weig	ht of lea	ves (gm)		_	Dry weig	ht of ste	(ms (gm)		0	ry weigh	nt of leav	es (am)	
11.73 9.28 10.89 13.14 11.26 8.34 16.20 18.00 14.66 14.30 13.14 10.12 12.55 7.30 15.25 11.98 10.00 11.13 13.17 21.30 16.64 28.31 19.85 17.38 14.11 37.22 17.31 5.12 5.14 4.86 17.27 8.09 13.32 12.50 13.95 25.37 16.28 11.51 22.51 9.39 19.46 11.49 15.10 14.83 17.39 11.23 16.22 20.33 19.87 13.03 18.78 16.52 16.96 AxB 2.51 2.51 2.32 2.33 2.38 2.38 1.10 2.51 2.31 2.32 2.33 2.38 2.30 2.31 2.31 2.32 2.33 2.38 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30 3.30	cles (B)	_	Clay		2:1	Mean		Clav	1:1	2.1		Sandy	Clar		2.4	BROOM
7.30 15.25 11.98 10.00 11.13 13.17 21.30 16.64 28.31 19.85 17.38 14.11 37.22 17.31 5.12 5.14 4.86 17.27 8.09 13.32 12.50 13.95 25.37 16.28 11.51 22.51 9.39 19.46 21.83 30.73 31.61 17.27 25.39 10.11 14.88 32.75 11.14 17.22 10.10 20.75 9.38 18.52 16.96 4.38 11.49 15.10 14.83 17.39 16.22 20.33 19.87 13.03 18.78 16.52 16.96 11.10 20.75 2.39 14.05 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 11.00 20.75 2.38 18.52 20.33 19.87 2.38 2.38 2.38 2.38 2.38 2.38 2.38 2.38	incana	11.73	9.28	10.89	13.14	11.26	8 34	16.20	18 00	14 66	14 30	12 14	1044		40.5	Medi
5.12 5.14 4.86 17.27 8.09 13.32 12.50 13.95 25.37 16.28 11.51 22.51 9.39 19.46 17.27 25.39 10.11 14.88 32.75 11.14 17.22 10.10 20.75 9.38 18.52 16.96 11.49 15.10 14.83 17.39 11.23 16.22 20.33 19.87 13.03 18.78 16.52 16.96 11.10 14.00 20.15 2.39 13.03 18.78 16.52 16.96 11.10 14.00 20.15 2.38	camaldulensis	7.30	15.25	11 98	10 00	11 13	13 17	2130	16.64	20.00	200	10.1	10.14	10.12	12.33	13.48
1.49 15.10 14.83 17.27 25.39 1.40 1.40 1.1	citriodora	5 12	5 14	4 86	17.27	000	1000	20.00	10.04	20.31	19.00	17.38	14.11	31.22	17.31	21.50
11.49 15.10 14.83 17.27 25.39 10.11 14.88 32.75 11.14 17.22 10.10 20.75 9.38 18.52 18.52 11.49 15.10 14.83 17.39 11.23 16.22 20.33 19.87 13.03 18.78 16.52 16.96 16.96 14.00 1.10 1.10 1.40 20.38 18.52 16.96 14.00 20.38 18.52 16.96 14.00 1.40 2.51 2.11	ole decondence	_	200	20.70	17.71	60.03	3.32	06.21	13.95	25.37	16.28	11.51	22.51	9.39	19.46	15.72
at 0.05 for (A) 2.39 17.39 11.23 16.22 20.33 19.87 13.03 18.78 16.52 16.96 at 0.05 for (B) 1.10 1.40 2.51 2.51 2.51	gomphocephala	+	30.73	31.61	17.21	25.39	10.11	14.88	32.75	11.14	17.22	10.10	20.75	9.38	18.52	14.68
2.39 1.85 1.16 1.10. 1.40 2.02 2.51 2.11 2.11	ean	11.49	15.10	14.83	17.39		11.23	16.22	20.33	19.87		13.03	18 78	16.52	16 96	
2.51 2.11	S.D at 0.05 for (A)		2.3	6			1.85					1.16				
2.51	S.D at 0.05 for (B)		1.1	0.			1.40					202				
	S.D at 0.05 for (AxB)		2.51				2.11					2 28				

compared to sandy soil which gave the inferior values of fresh (34.16 and 35.83 gm) and dry weight (19.36 and 11.23 gm) in both seasons

respectively.

Regarding the effect of *Eucalyptus species*, the results apparently cleared that *E. gomphocephala* seedlings had significantly the highest values in fresh (64.05 and 62.23 gm) and dry weight (21.3 and 19.85 gm) in both seasons respectively comparable with those of *E. incana* and *E. citriodora* which produced the least values while *E. camaldulensis* seedlings were the medium in fresh and dry weight.

The interaction between Eucalyptus species x growing media indicated that E. gomphocephala seedlings growing in the mixture of 1:1 (v/v) had the superior values in fresh and dry weight of stems while E. incana grown in

sandy soil had the inferior values.

The previous results were in accordance with those obtained by El-Afghany (1981) on *E. camaldulensis*, El-khateeb (1983) on *E. angulosa*, Chong et al (1991) on *Cornus alba*, and *Potentilla fruticosa* and Mohamed (1993) on *Nerium oleander*, and *Adhatoda vasica*. All of them confirmed that the mixture of sand and clay or peat moss increased fresh and dry weights of stems compared with sandy soil alone.

8-Fresh and dry weight of roots.

It is obviously cleared from data of Tables (3,4) that both fresh and dry weights of roots were more affected by different growing media as the averages of fresh weight ranged from 42.22 and 39.36 gm in sandy soil to the maximum 65.55 and 63.05 gm in the clay soil followed by the mixture 1:1 (v/v) which was preferable than either the mixture of 2:1 (v/v) or sandy soil alone. The results were confirmed in the second one.

Dry weight of roots was the best significantly in clay soil compared with sandy soil where the mean values were 21.05 and 18.78gm in both seasons respectively followed by the mixture of sand and clay 1:1 or 2:1 while the least values 13.94 and 13.03 gm were accompanied with sandy soil alone.

As for Eucalyptus species effect it can be resulting that E. camaldulensis seedlings had significantly the heaviest fresh (65.68 and 65.69 gm) and dry weight (21.74 and 21.50 gm) in both season respectively compared with the others species followed by E. gomphocephala and E. citriodora while E.

incana produced the lightest fresh and dry weight.

In this respect *E. camaldulensis* seedlings planted in the mixture of sand and clay 1:1 as growing media induced the maximum fresh (102.22 and 113.18 gm) and dry weight (34.17 and 37.22 gm) in first and second season respectively, while the minimum fresh weight of roots exhibited in *E.incana* planted in sandy soil which gave 28.11 gm in the first season. These results were in the same line of those obtained by Heikal *et al* (1978) on *E. citriodora*, Tesi and Tosi (1985) on *Chamaedorea elegans*, Chong *et al*(1991) on *Cornus alba* and *Physocarpus* and Mohamed (1993) on *Lantana camara* and *Adhatoda vasica* where both of them indicated that the mixture of sand + clay as growing media improved the characteristics of sandy soil and increased the fresh and dry weight of roots.

Table (5): Effect of growing media on chlorophyll A, B and total sugars of some Eucalyptus species in 1996 and

Species (B) Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:2 1							18	1996								
Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Sandy Clay 1:2 Sandy Sandy Sandy Sandy Sandy Clay Sandy Sandy Clay Cla	Grown media (A)		hloroph	INI A (m	ng/g F.W	(Chlorop	hyll B (m	M'd B/B	(Total su	gars mg	W.G 6	
1.08 1.24 1.15 1.09 1.14 0.63 0.84 0.71 0.67 0.71 89.50 80.08 79.91 80.13 1.21 1.39 1.32 1.28 1.30 0.65 0.87 0.81 0.76 0.77 76.20 80.10 85.00 76.60 1.52 1.91 1.26 0.68 0.87 0.81 0.75 0.79 0.79 81.50 84.10 82.41 1.22 1.41 1.31 1.26 0.68 0.87 0.81 0.75 0.79 0.79 81.50 84.65 82.41 82.41 82.41 1.22 1.41 1.31 1.26 0.68 0.87 0.81 0.75 1.18 1.18 1.26 0.60 0.65 0.80 0.75 1.18 1.18 1.26 0.80 0.87 0.75 1.18 1.18 1.26 0.80 0.87 0.75 1.18 1.18 1.26 0.80 0.87 0.75	Species (B)	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean
1.21 1.39 1.32 1.28 1.30 0.65 0.86 0.81 0.76 0.76 81.20 94.31 87.00 84.10 1.52 1.91 1.09 1.08 1.09 0.65 0.87 0.81 0.76 0.77 76.20 80.10 85.00 76.60 1.52 1.91 1.26 1.61 1.68 0.68 0.87 0.81 0.79 81.50 83.34 82.16 82.41 1.52 1.91 1.26 0.65 0.86 0.78 0.78 0.79 81.50 84.65 83.51 80.74 1.52 1.91 1.26 0.20 N.S 1.18 1.28 0.80 0.78 0.78 0.79 81.50 84.65 83.51 80.74 1.53 1.54 1.25 1.40 1.43 1.25 0.65 0.65 0.66 0.68 77.30 78.59 94.10 77.23 1.52 1.87 1.75 1.31 1.56 0.73 0.67 0.65 0.78 0.65 0.79 81.35 80.51 1.51 1.52 1.44 1.25 0.64 0.73 0.67 0.65 0.76 0.75 0.76 0.75 0.75 1.51 1.57 1.44 1.25 0.64 0.73 0.67 0.65 0.75 0	E. incana	1.08	1.24	1.15	1.09	1.14	0.63	0.84	0.71	0.67	0.71	89.50	8.0.86	79.91	80.13	80.15
1.07 1.11 1.09 1.08 1.08 0.65 0.87 0.81 0.76 0.77 76.20 80.10 85.00 76.60 1.52 1.91 1.69 1.61 1.68 0.68 0.87 0.81 0.79 0.79 81.50 83.34 82.16 82.41 1.22 1.41 1.31 1.26 0.65 0.86 0.78 0.75 1.18 AXB 1.52 1.41 1.31 1.26 0.65 0.86 0.78 0.75 1.41 1.52 1.41 1.31 1.26 0.65 0.86 0.78 0.75 1.48 1.52 1.41 1.31 1.26 0.85 0.86 0.78 0.75 1.18 1.52 1.41 1.31 1.25 1.42 0.65 0.74 0.67 0.66 0.68 77.30 78.59 94.10 77.23 1.15 1.47 1.33 1.19 1.25 0.65 0.74 0.67 0.65 0.6	E. camaldulensis	1.21	1.39	1.32	1.28	1.30	0.67	0.86	0.81	0.78	0.78	81.20	94.31	87.00	84.10	86.56
1.52 1.91 1.69 1.61 1.68 0.68 0.87 0.79 0.79 81.50 83.34 82.41	E. citriodora	1.07	1.11	1.09	1.08	1.09	0.65	0.87	0.81	0.76	0.77	76.20	80.10	85.00	76.60	79.58
A	E. gomphocephala	1.52	1.91	1.69	1.61	1.68	0.68	0.87	0.81	0.79	0.79	81.50	83.34	82.16	82.41	82.36
N.S	 Mean	1.22	1.41	1.31	1.26		0.65	0.86	0.78	0.75		79.60	84.65	83.51	80.74	
0.05 for (AXB) 0.30 N.S 1.18 1.76 n media (A) Chlorophyll A (Lay 1.13) 2.11 Mean Sandy Clay 1.11 Z:1 Mean Sandy Clay I.11 Z:1 Mean Sandy Clay I.11 Z:1 III Z:1 Mean Sandy Clay I.11 Z:1 Z:2 Z	 L.S.D at 0.05 for (A)		Z	s.			0.20				1.18					
N.S. 1.76 1.27 1.34 1.15 1.44 1.28 1.25 1.45 1.27 1.37 1.28 1.27 1.37 1.28 1.28 1.27 1.37 1.44 1.28 1.28 1.28 1.28 1.28 1.29 1.25 1.40 1.44 1.28 1.28 1.29 1.25 1.44 1.28 1.28 1.29 1.25 1.44 1.28 1.28 1.29 1.25 1.44 1.28 1.24 1.25 1.44 1.28 1.24 1.25 1.44 1.28 1.24 1.25 1.44 1.28 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25 1.24 1.25	L.S.D AT 0.05 for (B)		0	.30			N.S.				1.18					
Page 1 Page 2 Page 3 Page 3 Page 3 Page 3 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page 4 Page	L.S.D at 0.05 for (AXB)		0	.60			S.S.				1.76					
ies (B) Chlorophyll A (mg/g F.W) Chlorophyll B (mg/g F.W) Chlorophyll B (mg/g F.W) Total sugars (mg/g D.W) ies (B) Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 1:1 2:1 1:1 2:1 1:1 2:1 1:1 2:1 1:1 2:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1 3:1							15	397								
les (B) Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1 Mean Sandy Clay 1:1 2:1	Grown media (A)	0	hloroph	VII A (II	W. J B/BL		O	hloroph	yll B (m	g/g F.W)		-	otal suga	ars (mg/	g D.W)	
ulensis 1.15 1.47 1.33 1.19 1.29 0.65 0.74 0.67 0.66 0.68 77.30 78.59 94.10 77.23 real 1.31 1.55 1.40 1.43 1.42 0.60 0.74 0.64 0.61 0.65 99.60 109.82 109.2 95.2 recephala 1.32 1.32 1.31 1.56 0.73 0.81 0.76 0.75	Species (B)	Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1		Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1		Sandy	Clay	1:1	2:1	Mean
ulensis 1.31 1.55 1.40 1.43 1.42 0.60 0.74 0.64 0.61 0.65 99.60 109.82 109.2 95.2 ra 1.08 1.42 1.32 1.19 1.25 0.69 0.65 0.63 0.60 0.62 78.60 91.90 90.54 90.22 cephala 1.32 1.87 1.72 1.31 1.56 0.73 0.81 0.76 0.75 0.76 77.90 81.93 81.56 81.80 LOS for (A) 0.31 0.64 0.73 0.67 0.65 83.35 90.56 93.85 86.11 LOS for (B) 0.24 0.64 0.73 0.67 0.65 2.89 ANS ANS A.5 3.10 3.26 90.56 93.85 86.11	E. incana	1.15	1.47	1.33	1.19	1.29	0.65	0.74	0.67	99.0	0.68	77.30	78.59	94.10	77.23	77.89
1.08 1.42 1.32 1.19 1.25 0.59 0.65 0.63 0.60 0.62 78.60 91.90 90.54 90.22 1.32 1.87 1.72 1.31 1.56 0.73 0.81 0.76 0.75 0.75 0.75 0.75 81.93 81.56 81.80 1.21 1.57 1.44 1.28 N.S 2.89 AxB 0.24 0.73 0.67 0.65 2.89 3.10 3.10 3.45 0.54 0.55 0.50 0.50 3.10 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 4.20 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 5.20 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 5.20 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 5.20 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 5.20 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 0.60 5.20 0.60 0	E. camaldulensis	1.31	1.55	1.40	1.43	1.42	09.0	0.74	0.64	0.61	0.65	99.60	109.82	109.2	95.2	104.38
1.32 1.87 1.72 1.31 1.56 0.73 0.81 0.76 0.75 0.75 0.77 0.77 81.93 81.56 81.80 (A) 1.21 1.57 1.44 1.28 0.64 0.73 0.67 0.65 83.35 90.56 93.85 86.11 (A) 0.31 N.S 2.89 (B) 0.24 N.S 2.63 AxB) 0.68 0.72 3.10	E. citriodora	1.08	1.42	1.32	1.19	1.25	0.59	0.65	0.63	09.0	0.62	78.60	91.90	90.54	90.22	87.82
at 0.05 for (A) 0.34 0.24. 0.58 0.67 0.65 83.35 90.56 93.85 83.85 90.56 93.85 83.85 90.56 93.85 93.85 90.56 90.56 90	E.gomphocephala	1.32	1.87	1.72	1.31	1.56	0.73	0.81	92.0	0.75	92.0	77.90	81.93	81.56	81.80	80.80
0.31 N.S 0.24. 0.12 0.68 N.S	Mean	1.21	1.57	1.44	1.28		0.64	0.73	0.67	0.65		83.35	90.56	93.85	86.11	
0.24. 0.12 0.68 N.S	L.S.D at 0.05 for (A)		0.31				N.S		7		2.8	6				
0.68 N.S	L.S.D at 0.05 for (B)		0.24				0.12				2.5	8				
	L.S.D at 0.05 for (AxB)		0.68				S.S.				3.1	0				

10-Biomass of plant

As shown in Table (5) biomass of *Eucalyptus species* planted in either clay or mixture of 1:1 v/v attained significantly the maximum values that recorded (187.35 and 169.67 gm/ plant) respectively in the first season compared to those obtained from sandy soil (120.91 gm/plant), whereas the mixture of 2:1 growing media was the intermediate 141.13 and 157.06gm in the first and second season respectively.

Concerning the influence of *Eucalyptus species* on biomass. The results indicated that *E. gomphocephala* had the highest values (198.44 and 215.92 gm/plant followed by E. camaldulensis 172.2 and 175.68 while *E. 1ncana* was the intermediate126.96 and 138.83 gm. / plant then E. citriodora was the last one in the first and second season respectively regardless the effect of

different growing media

The interaction between growing media and *Eucalyptus speci*es illustrated that clay soil or the mixture of 1:1 was preferable growing media for *E incana* and *E. gomphocephla* where both of them recorded maximum biomass whereas clay and the mixture of 2:1 was the favorable growing media for *E. citriodora* on the other hand the mixture of 1:1 or 2:1 was optimum for *E. camaldulensis* where the biomass of plants was the highest (193.11 and 215.92 gm./ plant) respectively

II- Chemical constituents 1-Chlorophyll leaf contents

Data which are given in Table (6) indicated that both chlorophyll a and b increased to maximum in clay soil (1.41 and 0.86 mg/g F.W) followed by the mixture of sand and clay 1:1 or 2:1 while the minimum values were recorded in sandy soil (1.22 and 0.65 respectively. The same trend was obtained in second season nearly.

Eucalyptus species differed significantly in chlorophyll a or b content as E. gomphocephala achieved significantly the heaviest values of chlorophyll a (1.68 mg/g. F.W) more than any of the other taxa in first season, whereas in the second seas on the differences were significant between

E.gomphocephala and E. citriodora or E. incana.

In this respect it is realized that Eucalyptus species did not vary significantly in chlorophyll b between different the 4 taxa of Eucalyptus, however *E. gomphocephala* was surpassed (81 mg/g. F.w) while *E.incana* seedlings had the lowest values of

0.71 mg /g. F.w. The same trend was obtained in the second season as of

first one approximately ...

The interaction between *Eucalyptus species* x growing media, it is obviously that *E. gomphocephala* planted in clay soil recorded the highest mean values of chlorophyll A (1.91 and 1.87 mg/g. F.W) while *E. citriodora* planted in sandy soil contained the lowest values of 1.07 and 1.08 mg/g. F.W in both seasons respectively. In this regard chlorophyll b content in leaves was the maximum (0.87 and 0.81 mg/g. F.W)

In E. gomphocephala cultivated in clay soil whereas the inferior values (0.65 and 0.59 mg/l) in both season respectively were recorded in E. citriodora

planted in sandy soil

As inferred previously it can be stated that both chlorophyll A and B were exceeded as inference to cultivating Eucalyptus species in clay soil and adding clay to sand ameliorated the growing media subsequently chlorophyll a and b raised up in leaves in agreement with those obtained by Farahat (1986) on E.camaldulensis, Mohamed, (1992) on Asparagus spengeri and Mohamed (1993) on Nerium oleander and adhatoda vasica where they found that the seedlings grown in clay or the mixture of sand and clay 1:1(v/v) increased the chlorophylls in leaves.

2-Total sugars

As shown in Table (6) it is evident that different growing media were more effective on total sugars since clay or the mixture of sand and clay 1:1 (v/v) significantly increased total sugars comparable with sandy soil, which deduced the minimum values in both seasons. In this regard it can be noticed that E. camaldulensis produced significantly the maximum values of 86.56 and 104.38 mg/g D.W, in first and second season respectively compared to E. citriodora, which had the minimum values of 79.58 mg/g D.W in the first season while E. gomphocephala was the intermediate

E. camaldulensis seedlings, which were cultivated in clay soil, resulted significantly the highest values of total sugars 94.31 and 109.82 mg//g D.W in the first and second season respectively whereas the minimum values were

recorded in leaves of E. citriodora planted in sandy soil.

From the heretofore results it might be concluded that planting Eucalyptus species in clay soil resulted in an increase sin soluble, nonsoluble and total sugars whereas the planting in sandy soil decreased the here above chemical characteristics, herewith adding clay to sand enhanced the properties of sandy soil and resulted excessive values of sugars in the leaves.

The here above obtained results were in harmony with many investigators such as El-Tantawy (1981) on Casuarina equesitifolia and Cupressus sempervirens who reported that soluble and non-soluble sugars increased by using clay as growing media, Farahat (1986) on E.camaldulensis stated that plants growing in clay soil performed the highest content in non-soluble and total sugars also the highest content of soluble sugars of leaves, stems and roots had been shown in plants grown in the mixture of clay and sand, also Nabil and El-khateeb (1991) cleared that soluble sugars content decreased due to planting in sandy soil.

Table (6): Effect of different growing media on biomass (g/plant) of some Eucalyptus species in 1996 and 1997 Mean 38.83 175.68 117.05 215.92 157.06 2:1 90.49 55.94 154.84 26.87 181.16 1997 279.09 212.54 42.77 90.25 185.66 Clay 126.68 166.20 169.01 9.65 7.98 11.24 123.60 Sandy 30.66 95.34 149.02 119.37 Mean 126.96 172.20 122.62 205.19 141.13 2:1 181.49 39.15 146.36 102.20 169.67 1996 7 193.11 127.18 214.14 144.23 187.35 Clay 170.45 35.42 285.41 158.13 8.54 6.37 8.12 143.76 147.85 103.28 120.91 Sandy 88.76 Grown media (A) L.S.D at 0.05 for (A) L.S.D at 0.05 for (B) L.S.D at 0.05 for (AxB) Species (B) seasons Mean E. gomphocephala camaldulensis E. citriodora incana

REFERENCES

- Chong, C.;R.A.Cline;D.L. Rinker and O.B. Allen (1991). Growth and mineral nutrient status of containerized woody species in media amended with mushrum compost.J. Amer. Soc. Hort. Sci., 116 (2): 242-247
- Criag, G.F; D.T. Bell and C.A. Atkin (1990). Response to salt and water logging stress of 10 Taxa from naturally saline areas of western Australia, Aust. J. of Botany 38 (6) 619-630
- El-Afghany, S.A. (1981). Effect of soil mixture on the growth of *Eucalyptus* camaldulensis and *Cupressus sempervirens* transplants in the nursery. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Al-Fateh Univ.Libia.
- El-Bana, A. M. (1979). Effect of soil type and fertilization on growth and NPK content of some timber trees seedlings, M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric Al-Azhar Univ.
- El-Khateeb, M.A. (1983). Effect of salinity, irrigation, chemical composition and essential oil of *E. torquata* and *E. angulosa*. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric. Cairo Univ.
- El-Tantawy, A. (1981). Effect of chemical fertilization, soil media and gibberellic acid on growth of some tree seedlings. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric. Cairo, Univ.
- Farahat, M.M. (1986). Some studies on *Eucalyptus camaldulensis*. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ.
- Gupta, G.N.; K.G. Prasad; S. Mohan and P. Manivachakam (1986). Salt tolerance in some tree species at seedlings stage Ind. Forest., 112 (2): 101-113. (Forest. Abst., 1987, 48:843)
- Heikal, I.A., M.E. Imam and G.H. El-Sherbini (1978). The influence of soil types on raising *E. citriodora* seedlings. Agric. Res. Rev.57(3):
- Mohamed, M. F. (1993). Effect of salinity on growth and chemical composition of some ornamental shrubs. M.Sc Thesis, Fac.Agric. Cairo, Univ.
- Mohamed, T.A. (1992). Effect of growing media and chemical fertilization on vegetative growth and chemical composition of *Asparagus spengeri* and *Chlorophytum comosum*. M. Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ.
- Nabil, A. and M.A. El-khateeb (1991). Effect of different planting media and planting dates on rooting, vegetative growth and chemical constituents f philodendron erubesces cv Emerald queen. J.Agric. Res., 17 (3): 747-766, Tanta Univ.
- Piper, C. S. (1947). Soil and Plant Analysis. The University of Adelaida, pp. 258 275.
- Saric, M.; R. Kastrori; R. Curic; T. Cupina and I. Geric (1976). Chlorophyll determination, Univ. U. Noven Sadu Praktikum is Fiziolgize Bilijaka, Beogard, Haucha, Anjiga, pp. 215
- Shehata, N.Y. (1972). Effect of soil type and water table level on three tree species. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Alex. Univ.
- Singh, R. V. and K. C. Sharama (1984). Effect of soil- mix on the growth of Populus ciliata in the nursery. Ind. J. Forest. 7 (2): 102-105. (Soil and Fert. 1985, 48: 5572)

Smith, F.; M. A. Gillea; D.K.Hamilton and P.A.Gadar (1956). Colorimitric method for determination of sugars and related substances Ann. Chem.:28:350

Steel, R.G.D. and S. H. Torrie (1980). Principles and Procedures of Statistics

. Second Edition, Mc Graw-Hill, Inc.

Tesi, R. and T. Tosi (1985). The effect of porosity of substrate and rate of basal fertilizer dressing on the growth of *Chamaedorea elegans* Hort. Abst., 57:1291

Townsend , A. M. (1984). Effect of sodium chloride on tree seedlings in two potting media. Environ. poll . A, 34 (4),333-344. (Forest. Abst., 1985)

.46:2008)

Witt , H.H. (1987). Demand oriented fertilizing of container plants. Deutsche Baumschle, 39 (5): 211-214. (Hort. Abst. 1989 , 59: 3205)

تقييم النمو الخضري ودراسات مقارنة للكتلة الحية لبعض أنواع الكافور النامية في أوساط نمو مختلفة

محمد سكران شحاتة *، عبد الله الطنطاوي **، أسامة احمد رضوان ** * قسم الغابات والأشجار الخشبية معهد بحوث البساتين مركز البحوث الزراعية

** قسم بساتين الزينة كلية الزراعة جامعة القاهرة

أجريت هذه التجربة في مشتل قسم بساتين الزينة بكلية الزراعــة جامعــة القــاهرة خــلال موســمي ١٩٩٦ و١٩٩٧ حيث زرعت شتلات متجانسة لأربعة أنواع من الكافور المدخلة لمصر بعمر أربعة شهور وهي:- gomphocephala - citriodora- camaldulensis-1ncana فـــي أربعــة أوســاط زراعة هي المرمل - الطين خليط منهما بنسبة ١: ١ و ٢-١ بالحجم.

أوضحت النتائج أن زراعة الشتلات في تربة مكنونة من الرمل والطين بنسبة ١:١ قد حسنت مسن عناصر النمو مثل ارتفاع النبات المساحة الورقية طول الجذر الوزن الطازج والجاف للسيقان السوزن الطازج للجذور حيث زادت هذه العناصر بنسسبة ١٤٠٥ - ١٩ و ٢٦- ١٩ و ٢٧ - ٢٥ و ١٩ - ٢٥ و ١٤ الماروعة في التربة الما بنية قد أعط الترتيب عن تلك النباتات المزروعة في التربة الرملية بينما الشتلات المزروعة في التربة الما بنية قد أعط تنافضل القيم في قطر الساق عدد الفروع لكل نبات الوزن الطازج والجاف للأوراق الوزن الجاف للجذور حيث بغت الزيادة آو ١١ - ١٥ و ٥ - ٥ و ٥ - ٣ و ٥ - ١٥ هلى الترتيب عن تلك المنزرعة في التربة الرملية والتي خفضت كل عناصر النمو وأعطت التربة الخليط ١:١ قيم متوسطة للصغات المدروسة .

زادت الكتلة الحية لكلا النوعين gomphocephala, Incan للدرجة القصوى عند الزراعة في التربة الطينية أو الخليط بنسبة ١:١ بينما الزراعة في التربة الطينية أو الخليط بنسبة ١:١ قد حسن كثيرا من الكتلة الحية للنوع citriodora. في حين كانت الكتلة الحية للنوع camaldulensis أفضل عند الزراعة في التربة الخليط بنسبة ١:١ أو ١:٢.

وبتقييم أنواع الكافور المختلفة وجد أن الكافور camaldulensis كان احسن ا لأنواع في ارتفاع النبات الوزن الطازج و الجاف للحذر - طول الجذر - الوزن الطازج والجاف لمسافوراق وعدد الأفرع والسيقان ولكن النوع incana كانت سيقانه اكثر سمكا وان أوراق الكافور الليموني citriodora كانت الثر مساحة ، ومسن النتائج السابقة يمكن أن نستنتج انه يجبب زراعة الكافور العادى اكثر مساحة ومسن النتائج المسابقة يمكن أن نستنتج انه يجبب زراعة الكافور العادى agmphocephala, incana في التربة الطينية أو التربة الخليط بنسبة ١:١ أو ١:٢ بينما يفضل زراعته في تربة خليط من الرمل و الطين بنسبة ١:١ أعطت التربة الطينية و الخليسط دا أعلى القيم في نسبة الكلوروفيل وكذلك في نسبة السكريات الكلية إذا ما قورنت بالتربة الرملية وان الكافور المعادى camaldulensis اعطى أعلى النسب لهذه المكونات.

و يمكن التوصية بإضافة الطين إلى التربة الرملية حتى نحسن من صفاتها الطبيعية والكيماوية وكذلك إضافة الرمل إلى التربة الطبنية لنحسن من خواصها لإيجاد وسط مناسب للنمو.