

## Effect of Water Stress and Phosphorus Fertilizer Rates on Growth and Seed Yield of Cowpea Under El-Arish Condition

Ibrahim, M. I. M.<sup>1</sup> and M. S. A. El-Kassas<sup>2</sup>

1. Plant Prod. Dept. (Veg.), Fac. Environ. Agric. Sci., El-Arish, Suez Canal Univ., Egypt.

2. Water and Soil Dept., Fac. Environ. Agric. Sci., El-Arish, Suez Canal Univ., Egypt.



### ABSTRACT

Two field experiments were carried out during summer seasons of 2014 and 2015 at Exp. Farm, Fac. Environ. Agric. Sci., El-Arish, North Sinai, Egypt, to study the effect of water stress and phosphorus rates on growth, yield and its components as well as water and phosphorus use efficiency on cowpea cv. "Kafr-El Sheikh" grown under sandy soil conditions using drip irrigation system. The experiment included 12 treatments, which were the combinations of three water levels; viz., 50, 75 and 100 % of irrigation water requirements (IWR) and four rates of phosphorus (0, 20, 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> / fed.). The results show that increasing irrigation deficit increased water saving and water use efficiency (WUE), however it reduce seed yield/fed. The highest value of water saving and WUE was obtained from 50% IWR treatment. However, the highest value of phosphorus use efficiency (PUE) was achieved by treatment received 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed. as well as, significant differences among irrigation water levels and phosphorus rates and their interactions were detected for all studied traits in both seasons. The high level of IWR (100%) gave the best values for all traits under study without significant differences when compared with 75% of IWR for some traits, except protein % which increased with addition of the lowest level (50% IWR) in both seasons. Application of phosphorus at rates of 40 or 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> /fed. exhibited the highest results for all studied characters in both seasons. The best combinations treatments for growth and yield were supplying cowpea plants with 100 % of IWR and fertilizing the highest two rates of phosphorus (40 or 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed. for all traits, followed by the medium level (75% of IWR) with the both high rates of P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>.

**Keywords:** Cowpea, irrigation water levels, phosphorus use efficiency (PUE), water use efficiency (WUE), plant growth, seed yield and its components.

### INTRODUCTION

Cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp.) is one of the important vegetable legumes in Egypt. For the view of nutrition, it is a major source of plant proteins content and B vitamins for man (Singh, 2003). Cowpea provides soil and subsequent plant (in rotation) with atmospheric nitrogen. It can grow well in sandy soils due to its deep root and higher tolerant to drought and low fertilizers requirements than other legumes. North Sinai is a newly reclaimed area with poor soil fertility, high PH, low water quantity and quality especially salinity.

Water stress is one of the important factors that decrease seed yield around the world, especially when water deficit occurs during flowering and maturity stages (Singh *et al.*, 1999). Also, decreasing the irrigation water amount added to plant negatively affected most physiological processes such as leaf water potential, photosynthesis activity and absorption and translocation of nutrients which directly reflected on plant growth (Sivakumar and Shaw, 1998). Water stress decreased the leaf area, shoot dry weight and leaves number/plant (Turk and Hall, 2005). Also, it increased the percentage of protein of grains (Wien *et al.*, 1979), but it decreased seed yield, number of seeds/pod and weight of 1000 grain when cowpea plants exposed to irrigation cut for two weeks at flowering, podding and seed filling stages (Rezaee and Haghghi, 2009). Choudhury *et al.* (2011) reported that under drought stress for various studied bean genotypes, 1000-seeds weight was decreased, and this decrease may be due to the decrease in seed filling. reduction in seed yield because of increasing irrigation interval may be attributed to the decrease in number of pods/ plant and 100 dry seed weight (Khedri and Mojaddam, 2014).

Phosphorus is a major nutrient for legume crops because it is a part of organic compounds of plant (nucleic acids, coenzymes, phosphoproteins and

phospholipids), also it helps in energy transfer in plant cells during respiration and photosynthesis processes (Malavolta *et al.*, 1997). Seed yield of cowpea reached the highest value by using 30 kg P/ha in some varieties and by 60 kg P/ ha in others (Okeleye and Okelana, 1997). Haruna and Aliyu (2011) reported that phosphorus is a major and vital nutrient for stimulation legume growth, initiation of nodule formation and enhancing the efficiency of the rhizobium-legume symbiosis which reflected positively on fruit and seed yield. Benvindo *et al.*(2014) found that as the rates of P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> added to cowpea increased the levels of phosphorous concentration in leaves and seeds, as well as seed yield of cowpea were increased. Nkaa *et al.* (2014) reported that phosphorus fertilizer significantly enhanced plant height, number of leaves, number of pods, length of pod, number of seeds/pod, total seed yield and weight of 50 seeds in all tested varieties.

The interaction effects of water levels and phosphorus fertilization were investigated by Chiulele (2003). In this connection, fertilizing cowpea with high levels of phosphorus survived successively during the periods of drought compared with the other treatments. An increase in phosphorus uptake by plant decreases and adjusts the effects of drought stress and leads to the increase in cowpea root growth (Khedri and Mojaddam, 2014), the interaction between decreasing irrigation interval and increasing phosphorus application rate increased 100-seed weight, number of seeds/ pod and seed yield of cowpea.

Under North Sinai conditions, water shortage and poor soil fertility are important factors that affect negatively plant growth and productivity of cultivated plants. Therefore, this research aimed to study the effect of water stress combined with different phosphorus rates on growth, yield and quality of cowpea crop and to determine the amount of water and the suitable phosphorus rate needed for cowpea to maximize seed

yield and saving water irrigation under North Sinai region.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were carried out during summer seasons of 2014 and 2015 at The Experimental Farm of The Faculty of Environmental Agriculture Sciences, El-Arish, North Sinai, Suez Canal University, Egypt to study the effect of water stress and phosphorus rates on growth and seed yield and its components of cowpea cv." Kafr-El Sheikh" grown under sandy soil conditions using drip irrigation system. Seeds were sown on 24<sup>th</sup> and 29<sup>th</sup> April in the first and second seasons, respectively. Planting was done in rows (120 cm width), each row had two dripper lines. The distance

between each two double dripper lines was 25 cm. After completely emergence, the plants were thinned leaving two plants/ hill (15 cm between hills). Each experimental unit area was 13.2 m<sup>2</sup> (11m length and 1.2m width) with plant density of 22.3 plant /m<sup>2</sup>. The seeds of cowpea were inoculated with N-fixer (*Rhizobium japonica*). Suspension (10<sup>9</sup>CFU/ml<sup>-1</sup>) as recommended using Arabic Gum as an adhesive material, Rhizobia was obtained from General Organization for Agriculture Equalization Fund, Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation. Some physico-chemical properties of the experimental soil cite are shown in Table 1 and chemical analysis of irrigation water is shown in Table 2.

**Table 1: Initial soil physical and chemical analysis.**

| Soil properties                                      | Season     |       |       |       |       |       |
|--|------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
|  | 2014       |       |       | 2015  |       |       |
|  | Depth(cm.) |       |       |       |       |       |
|  | 0-15       | 15-30 | 30-45 | 0-15  | 15-30 | 30-45 |
| Mechanical analysis                                  |            |       |       |       |       |       |
| Coarse sand %  | 67.00      | 68.22 | 62.70 | 66.56 | 67.92 | 66.41 |
| Fine sand %  | 21.60      | 20.41 | 26.90 | 22.98 | 21.02 | 23.12 |
| Silt %   | 4.50       | 4.12  | 3.95  | 4.21  | 4.52  | 3.60  |
| Clay %   | 6.90       | 7.25  | 6.45  | 6.25  | 6.54  | 6.87  |
| Soil texture   | Sandy      | Sandy | Sandy | Sandy | Sandy | Sandy |
| Bulk density (g.cm <sup>-3</sup> )                   | 1.52       | 1.53  | 1.57  | 1.55  | 1.53  | 1.57  |
| Chemical analysis (soluble ions in (1:5) extract)    |            |       |       |       |       |       |
| Ca <sup>++</sup> (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> )              | 2.68       | 3.02  | 2.68  | 3.16  | 3.01  | 2.96  |
| Mg <sup>++</sup> (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> )              | 2.01       | 2.41  | 2.12  | 2.67  | 2.33  | 2.55  |
| Na <sup>+</sup> (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> )               | 1.41       | 1.34  | 1.23  | 2.59  | 2.47  | 1.49  |
| K <sup>+</sup> (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> )                | 0.40       | 0.33  | 0.27  | 0.48  | 0.29  | 0.30  |
| CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>--</sup> (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> ) | -          | -     | -     | -     | -     | -     |
| HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> ) | 2.26       | 2.74  | 2.48  | 2.61  | 2.46  | 2.96  |
| Cl <sup>-</sup> (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> )               | 1.65       | 1.82  | 1.35  | 1.89  | 2.01  | 2.54  |
| SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>--</sup> (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> ) | 2.59       | 2.54  | 2.47  | 4.40  | 3.63  | 2.80  |
| Available N (ppm)                                    | 16.52      | 15.98 | 15.54 | 16.24 | 15.42 | 15.32 |
| Available P (ppm)                                    | 46.50      | 42.12 | 41.52 | 45.21 | 42.01 | 40.21 |
| Available K (ppm)                                    | 97.50      | 95.64 | 94.51 | 96.25 | 94.34 | 94.02 |
| EC(dS m <sup>-1</sup> ) in (1:5) extract)            | 0.65       | 0.71  | 0.63  | 0.89  | 0.81  | 0.83  |
| pH in (1:2.5) extract)                               | 8.21       | 8.36  | 8.49  | 8.12  | 8.24  | 8.40  |
| CaCO <sub>3</sub> %                                  | 6.95       | 8.67  | 7.15  | 6.95  | 8.65  | 7.16  |

**Table 2: Chemical analysis of irrigation water.**

| pH                 | EC                |        | Soluble ions (meq.l <sup>-1</sup> ) |                  |                 |                |                 |                               |                               |                               |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------|-------------------------------------|------------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|                    | dSm <sup>-1</sup> | ppm    | Cations                             |                  |                 |                | Anions          |                               |                               |                               |
|                    |                   |        | Ca <sup>++</sup>                    | Mg <sup>++</sup> | Na <sup>+</sup> | K <sup>+</sup> | Cl <sup>-</sup> | HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> | CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>--</sup> | SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>--</sup> |
| First season 2014  |                   |        |                                     |                  |                 |                |                 |                               |                               |                               |
| 7.2                | 6.14              | 3929.6 | 19.12                               | 23.31            | 18.77           | 0.20           | 43.51           | 7.25                          | -                             | 10.64                         |
| Second season 2015 |                   |        |                                     |                  |                 |                |                 |                               |                               |                               |
| 7.01               | 5.99              | 3833.6 | 18.54                               | 22.91            | 18.23           | 0.22           | 41.61           | 8.15                          | -                             | 10.14                         |

This experiment included 12 treatments, which were the combinations of three levels of irrigation water requirements (IWR) (50, 75 and 100 % of IWR) and four rates of phosphorus fertilizer (0, 20, 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed.). The total amount of phosphorus was added as calcium superphosphate (15.5% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) during soil preparation. However, irrigation treatments application were started at the second true leaf stage. Treatments were randomly arranged in split-plot system in a complete randomized block design with three replicates.

The main plots were assigned to have the irrigation levels, whereas the sub plots were randomly assigned to phosphorus rates. All experimental units received equal amounts of organic fertilizer (compost at 4 tons/fed), ammonium sulphate (20.5%N) and potassium sulphate (48-52% K<sub>2</sub>O) at rates of 60 kg for each of N and K<sub>2</sub>O/fed. One third of N and K<sub>2</sub>O were applied with organic fertilizer (compost) during soil preparation and the other two-thirds were divided into 20 equal portions and added twice weekly through the irrigation water.

The normal agricultural practices were done as needed and similar to those used in commercial cowpea production in El-Arish region.

**Data recorded:**

**Water relationships**

**1. Consumptive use of water (CU):** It was calculated using the equation given by Israelson and Hansen (1962) as follows:

$$CU = D \times AD \times \frac{e_z - e_i}{100}$$

**Where:**

- CU=Consumptive use of water in cm,
- D=Irrigated soil depth in cm,
- AD=Bulk density, gm cm<sup>-3</sup>, of the chosen irrigated soil depth,
- e<sub>z</sub>=Soil moisture percent after irrigation, and
- e<sub>i</sub>=Soil moisture percent before the next irrigation.

**2. Water use efficiency (WUE):** The consumed water by cowpea plant was calculated according to Yaron *et al.* (1973) as follows:

$$WUE = \frac{Y}{ET_a}$$

**Where:**

- Y = Crop yield (kg.fed<sup>-1</sup>), and
- ET<sub>a</sub>= Evapotranspiration (m<sup>3</sup>.fed<sup>-1</sup>.)

The actual evapotranspiration, ET<sub>a</sub>, is assumed to be synonymous to the calculated consumptive use of water (CU). Consequently, daily and monthly consumptive use of water were calculated for specified soil depths for all treatments.

**3. The yield reduction and water saving were calculated from the following equations according to Ismail (2010).**

$$\text{Reduction in yield} = 100 - \frac{\text{Yield of 75 \% of WR or 50\% of WR}}{\text{Yield of 100 \% of WR}} \times 100$$

$$\text{Water saving} = 100 - \frac{\text{Water consumption of 75 \% of WR or 50\% of WR}}{\text{Water consumption of 100 \% of WR}} \times 100$$

**Where:**

WR = Water requirements

**4. Phosphorus use efficiency (PUE):** it was calculated for the three rates of applied phosphorus as follows:

$$PUE = \frac{\text{Yield of applied P} - \text{Yield of control}}{\text{Phosphorus (kg fed}^{-1}\text{)}}$$

**Vegetative growth:** After 40 and 60 days from sowing, samples of three plants from each experimental unit were randomly taken and the following parameters were recorded: plant height (cm), number of leaves/plant, root length (cm). All plant parts were dried at 700 till constant weight and total dry weight (g)/plant was recorded.

**Dry seed yield and its components:** At harvest the following data were recorded: Number of pods/plant, number of seeds/pod, weight of 100 seeds (g) (seed index), pod length (cm) and dry seed yield /fed. (ton).

**Chemical analysis:** Total nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium were determined in dry seeds according to A.O.A.C. (1990), Piper (1950) and Jackson (1970), respectively. Protein percentage% (N x 6.25) was calculated.

**Statistical analysis:** The obtained data were subjected to statistical analysis of variance according to Snedecor and Cochran (1980). Duncan's multiple range tests was used for comparison among means (Duncan, 1958).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Effect of irrigation water levels on yield reduction and water saving: Obviously deficit irrigation saves water but reduces the yield (Table 3). From the present study, it is observed that the highest seed yield was obtained from plants grown with no-stress (100% of IWR). Deficit irrigation tended to decrease the seed yield. Irrigating of cowpea plants with 75% of IWR during growing season led to a reduction of 9.90% and 14.21% of total seed yield in the 1st and 2nd seasons, respectively, while adding water at 50% of IWR reduced the yields by 24.35% and 26.99% in the first and second seasons, respectively. The amount of saved water sharply increased by deficit irrigation treatments, producing about 90.10% and 85.79% of total seed yield led to save 19.65% and 19.88% of IWR in the 1st and 2nd seasons, respectively, while producing about 75.65% and 73.01% of the total yield saved about 59.85% and 58.87% of IWR in the 1st and 2nd seasons, respectively. In conclusion, deficit irrigation could be a suitable irrigation technique for cowpea production where the benefit from saving large amounts of water outweighs the decrease in total yield.

**Table 3: Effect of irrigation water levels on reduction in yield % and water saving % of cowpea during 2014 and 2015 seasons.**

| Irrigation level (%) of IWR* | Yield (kgfed <sup>-1</sup> ) | Total consumed water                | Reduction in yield | Water saving | Yield (kgfed <sup>-1</sup> ) | Total consumed water                | Reduction in yield | Water saving |
|------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|--------------|
|                              |                              | (m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | %                  | %            |                              | (m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | %                  | %            |
|                              |                              | First season 2014                   |                    |              |                              | Second season 2015                  |                    |              |
| 100%                         | 727                          | 1850.42                             | 0.00               | 0.00         | 767                          | 1875.11                             | 0.00               | 0.00         |
| 75%                          | 655                          | 1486.85                             | 9.90               | 19.65        | 658                          | 1502.31                             | 14.21              | 19.88        |
| 50%                          | 550                          | 743.21                              | 24.35              | 59.84        | 560                          | 771.23                              | 26.99              | 58.87        |

\*Irrigation water requirements (IWR) for cowpea =2100 m<sup>3</sup>/fed

**Water use efficiency (WUE):** The water use efficiency for fully and deficit irrigation treatments are presented in Table 4. Increasing the irrigation deficit gained a high increase in the WUE. The highest value of WUE was obtained with 50% of IWR treatment, while the lowest

one was recorded with 100% of IWR treatment. The difference in WUE between 100% of IWR and 75% of IWR was slight compared to that between 75% of IWR and 50% of IWR treatments; however, these differences were significant in the two tested seasons. A sharp

increase in WUE was obtained by deficit irrigation. This indicates that water movement into seeds may be decreased with the progressive in water deficit without effect on the translocation of dry matter into the seed

and this effect resulted in an increase in mass production per unit of water, which in turn increase water use efficiency.

**Table 4: Effect of irrigation water levels on water use efficiency (kg dry seed/m<sup>3</sup> water) and phosphorus use efficiency of cowpea during 2014 and 2015 seasons.**

| Irri. level (%) of IWR | Seed Yield (kg fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | Total consumed water (m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | Water use efficiency (kgm <sup>-3</sup> ) | (Yield of applied P- Yield of control) (kg fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | Phos. use efficiency (kg kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | Seed Yield (kg fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | Total consumed water (m <sup>3</sup> fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | Water use efficiency, (kgm <sup>-3</sup> ) | (Yield of applied P- Yield of control) (kg fed <sup>-1</sup> ) | Phos. use efficiency (kg kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|--|---|------------------------------------|--|--|--|---|
|                        |                                    |  |   |  |   |                                    |  |  |  |   |
| 100%                   | 727                                | 1850.42  | 0.39                                      | 120  | 6.00  | 767                                | 1875.11  | 0.41                                       | 133  | 6.65  |
| 75%                    | 655                                | 1486.85  | 0.44                                      | 315  | 7.88  | 658                                | 1502.31  | 0.44                                       | 305  | 7.63  |
| 50%                    | 550                                | 743.21   | 0.74                                      | 286  | 4.77  | 560                                | 771.23   | 0.73                                       | 284  | 4.73  |

**Effect of phosphorus rates on phosphorus use efficiency (PUE):** The highest average phosphorus use efficiency (PUE) was recorded by application of 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed. followed by 20 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed., in both studied seasons (Table 4). Therefore, it could be recommend that fertilization with 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed was enough to increases in cowpea seed yield. This results agree with the findings of Haruna and Usman (2013) who observed significant and efficient effect due to application of 30 kg P/ha in comparison with 60 kg P/ha.

**Vegetative growth**

**Irrigation levels:** Data presented in Table 5 show significant differences among irrigation water levels for all studied vegetative parameters in both seasons. In this respect, addition of 100% of IWR increased plant height, number of leaves/plant and root length at (40 and 60 days after sowing) in the two seasons. It is clear also that at 40 days after sowing, no significant differences were recorded between 100 and 75% of IWR for root length in both seasons, and plant height in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season as well as number of leaves in the 1<sup>st</sup> one. These results indicate that better root growth was observed under high irrigation

levels which enhanced water and nutrients uptake from the soil and consequently, led to stimulate plant growth. From the previous results it could be suggested that water deficit is more effective on vegetative growth parameters of cowpea crop.

Both irrigation water levels 100 and 75% of IWR recorded the highest dry weight/plant in both seasons at 40 and 60 days after sowing with no significant differences between them. This means that water stress (50% of IWR) decreased plant height, number of leaves and root length which led to decrease in total dry weight of cowpea. These results are in a good line with those of Hussein *et al.* (2014) who observed that cowpea crop subjected to shortage of water decreased plant growth parameters (leaf number, total fresh weight and stem length). Sangakkara *et al.* (2001) refer the reason of negative effect of water stress on cowpea plant growth to its influence on photosynthesis process, and also to its effect on seed yield as well as its quality (Gardner *et al.*, 1985 and Hale and Orcutt, 1987). In this connection, same trend was achieved by Sivakumar and Shaw (1998) on soybean and Turk and Hall (2005) on cowpea.

**Table 5: Effect of irrigation water levels and phosphorus rates on vegetative characters of cowpea plants at 40 and 60 days after sowing during 2014 and 2015 seasons.**

| Treatments         | Plant height (cm) |        | No. leaves/plant |        | Root length (cm) |         | Total dry weight (g) |         |  |
|--------------------|-------------------|--------|------------------|--------|------------------|---------|----------------------|---------|--|
|                    | 40                | 60     | 40               | 60     | 40               | 60      | 40                   | 60      |  |
| Irrigation levels  |                   |        |                  |        |                  |         |                      |         |  |
| First season 2014  |                   |        |                  |        |                  |         |                      |         |  |
| 50%                | 31.69c            | 43.97c | 14.45b           | 23.52c | 6.98b            | 14.08c  | 7.84b                | 26.02b  |  |
| 75%                | 34.21b            | 54.07b | 21.86a           | 35.24b | 9.22a            | 17.49b  | 8.74ab               | 29.08ab |  |
| 100%               | 39.35a            | 63.71a | 23.02a           | 39.06a | 10.13a           | 20.02a  | 10.16a               | 31.11a  |  |
| Phosphorus rates   |                   |        |                  |        |                  |         |                      |         |  |
| 0 kg               | 26.53c            | 44.14c | 15.44c           | 24.78c | 7.04c            | 13.80c  | 6.81d                | 20.41c  |  |
| 20 kg              | 31.10b            | 51.21b | 18.47b           | 30.67b | 8.39b            | 15.99b  | 7.90c                | 26.34b  |  |
| 40 kg              | 41.03a            | 61.99a | 22.59a           | 37.70a | 9.96a            | 20.04a  | 10.98a               | 34.28a  |  |
| 60 kg              | 41.67a            | 58.31a | 22.61a           | 37.29a | 9.72a            | 18.96a  | 9.97b                | 33.92a  |  |
| Irrigation levels  |                   |        |                  |        |                  |         |                      |         |  |
| Second season 2015 |                   |        |                  |        |                  |         |                      |         |  |
| 50%                | 34.47b            | 49.33c | 16.48c           | 23.95c | 6.68b            | 15.22c  | 8.22b                | 28.13b  |  |
| 75%                | 40.18a            | 55.45b | 23.65b           | 36.14b | 8.05ab           | 17.68b  | 9.23ab               | 31.34ab |  |
| 100%               | 44.14a            | 62.61a | 26.53a           | 42.08a | 10.36a           | 19.83a  | 10.56a               | 33.21a  |  |
| Phosphorus rates   |                   |        |                  |        |                  |         |                      |         |  |
| 0 kg               | 33.14c            | 46.64d | 17.42c           | 24.28c | 7.07c            | 13.34c  | 7.28d                | 23.92c  |  |
| 20 kg              | 38.32b            | 52.17c | 20.39b           | 31.47b | 7.92bc           | 16.93b  | 8.51c                | 27.50b  |  |
| 40 kg              | 43.93a            | 62.61a | 25.32a           | 40.02a | 9.07ab           | 20.31a  | 11.32a               | 37.56a  |  |
| 60 kg              | 43.00a            | 61.76b | 25.74a           | 40.46a | 9.39a            | 19.71ab | 10.23b               | 34.60a  |  |

Values having the same alphabetical litter (s) did not significantly different 0.05 level of significance according to Duncan's multiple range test.

**Phosphorus rate:** Phosphorus fertilizer applied to cowpea plant had a significant effects on all recorded vegetative growth parameters in both growing seasons (Table 5). No significant differences were recorded between 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed on all studied traits at 40 and 60 days, except total dry weight/plant at 40 days in both seasons. The highest values of plant height, number of leaves/plant and root length at 40 and 60 days were recorded with application of 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed with no significant difference between them in both seasons. These results may be due to explained that the high amount of phosphorus required for stimulating root and shoot growth in legume plants that affect the efficiency of the Rhizobium-legume symbiosis via energy transfer reactions including activity of nitrogenase enzyme ATP compound store and transfer energy produced through photosynthesis process which reflected directly on plant growth and yield (Leidi and Rodriguez, 2000). For total dry weight, the best phosphorus rate stimulate dry weight

production in cowpea plants was 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed in the two seasons at 40 and 60 days. This means that applying high rates of phosphorus improved root growth at 60 days (Table 5) this was reflected directly on stimulation the root to absorb water and nutrients. Similar result was observed by Nkaa et al.(2014) on cowpea plants

**Interaction between irrigation level and phosphorus rate:** Vegetative characters of cowpea plant in both seasons were significantly affected by the interaction treatments (Table 6). For plant height, leaves number and root length the interaction between the highest level of irrigation water (100% of IWR) with 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed recorded the highest values of the previous mentioned traits (at 40 and 60 days) with no significant difference between them in both growing seasons, except plant height at 60 days in both seasons. Increasing phosphorus application enhance P uptake within plant and reduce and adjusts the harmful effect of drought stress and this in turn lead to promote the root growth (Khedri and Mojaddam, 2014).

**Table 6: Effect of interaction between irrigation water levels and phosphorus rates on vegetative characters of cowpea plants at 40 and 60 days after sowing during 2014 and 2015 seasons.**

| Treatments                |                     | Plant height (cm) |         | No. leaves/plant |         | Root length (cm) |          | Total dry weight (g) |          |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------|------------------|---------|------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| Irrigation levels %       | Phosphorus rates kg | 40                | 60      | 40               | 60      | 40               | 60       | 40                   | 60       |
| <b>First season 2014</b>  |                     |                   |         |                  |         |                  |          |                      |          |
| 50                        | 0                   | 23.80e            | 37.60g  | 10.87e           | 17.67g  | 5.90f            | 10.23g   | 5.97g                | 17.87g   |
|                           | 20                  | 28.17d            | 39.83g  | 13.23e           | 22.07f  | 6.60ef           | 13.67f   | 6.47g                | 23.53ef  |
|                           | 40                  | 37.20b            | 49.63ef | 16.47d           | 28.10e  | 8.10cd           | 16.20d   | 9.87c                | 30.17bcd |
|                           | 60                  | 37.60b            | 48.80ef | 17.23d           | 26.27e  | 7.33de           | 16.23d   | 9.07cd               | 32.53abc |
| 75                        | 0                   | 27.20d            | 45.33f  | 17.20d           | 27.40e  | 7.03def          | 14.27ef  | 6.77fg               | 20.33fg  |
|                           | 20                  | 32.00c            | 50.17e  | 20.27bc          | 31.47d  | 8.73c            | 15.63de  | 8.20de               | 27.20de  |
|                           | 40                  | 38.37b            | 62.90c  | 25.13a           | 41.33bc | 10.30ab          | 20.97b   | 10.93b               | 35.17ab  |
|                           | 60                  | 39.27b            | 57.87d  | 24.83a           | 40.77bc | 10.80ab          | 19.10c   | 9.07cd               | 33.63ab  |
| 100                       | 0                   | 28.60d            | 49.50ef | 18.27cd          | 29.27de | 8.20cd           | 16.90d   | 7.70ef               | 23.03ef  |
|                           | 20                  | 33.13c            | 63.63c  | 21.90b           | 38.47c  | 9.83b            | 18.67c   | 9.03cd               | 28.30cde |
|                           | 40                  | 47.53a            | 73.43a  | 26.17a           | 43.67ab | 11.47a           | 22.97a   | 12.13a               | 37.50a   |
|                           | 60                  | 48.13a            | 68.27b  | 25.77a           | 44.83a  | 11.03a           | 21.53ab  | 11.77ab              | 35.60a   |
| <b>Second season 2015</b> |                     |                   |         |                  |         |                  |          |                      |          |
| 50                        | 0                   | 27.80g            | 41.70k  | 11.73e           | 18.33f  | 4.97f            | 9.70g    | 6.63j                | 21.07f   |
|                           | 20                  | 33.50f            | 46.13j  | 14.43e           | 22.67ef | 5.77f            | 15.27ef  | 7.57hij              | 24.97e   |
|                           | 40                  | 37.87def          | 53.37f  | 19.43d           | 27.47de | 7.30e            | 18.60bcd | 9.70de               | 34.23b   |
|                           | 60                  | 38.73de           | 56.10e  | 20.30d           | 27.33de | 8.67d            | 17.30cde | 8.97efg              | 32.27bc  |
| 75                        | 0                   | 34.03ef           | 48.67i  | 19.60d           | 25.60e  | 7.30e            | 13.80f   | 7.17ij               | 24.67e   |
|                           | 20                  | 40.33cd           | 52.27g  | 21.97cd          | 33.40cd | 8.03de           | 16.50def | 8.47fgh              | 27.93de  |
|                           | 40                  | 44.07bc           | 60.60c  | 26.47b           | 42.10b  | 8.23de           | 20.27abc | 11.03bc              | 38.73a   |
|                           | 60                  | 42.30cd           | 60.27c  | 26.57b           | 43.47b  | 8.63d            | 20.13abc | 10.27cd              | 34.03b   |
| 100                       | 0                   | 37.60def          | 49.57h  | 20.93d           | 28.90de | 8.93cd           | 16.53def | 8.03ghi              | 26.03e   |
|                           | 20                  | 41.13cd           | 58.10d  | 24.77bc          | 38.33bc | 9.97bc           | 19.03a-d | 9.50def              | 29.60cd  |
|                           | 40                  | 49.87a            | 73.87a  | 30.07a           | 50.50a  | 11.67a           | 22.07a   | 13.23a               | 39.70a   |
|                           | 60                  | 47.97ab           | 68.90b  | 30.37a           | 50.57a  | 10.87ab          | 21.70ab  | 11.47b               | 37.50a   |

Values having the same alphabetical litter (s) did not significantly different 0.05 level of significance according to Duncan's multiple range test.

Concerning total dry weight/plant, it is clearly from data in Table 6 that the highest total dry weight was obtained with the combination between 100% of IWR and the high rates of phosphorus (40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed) at 40 and 60 days, as well as 75% of IWR with the same high rates of phosphorus at 60 days in the 1<sup>st</sup> season. However, in the 2<sup>nd</sup> one the best interaction treatments were 100% of IWR with 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed at

40 days, 100% of IWR with 40 and 60 kg P/fed and medium irrigation level (75% of IWR) with 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed at 60 days. These results may indicate that there are positive effects of phosphorus fertilizer at the highest applied level of irrigation water than low level in all tested vegetative traits. The same trend of results was achieved by Hussein *et al.* (2014) who found positive effects of phosphorus fertilizer under normal

irrigation treatments than under stress treatments for plant height, number of leaves and dry weight of plant.

**Yield and its components**

**Irrigation levels:** It is obvious from the data presented in Table 7 that yield and its attributes were significantly affected by irrigation levels in both seasons. The best irrigation water level for enhancing number of pods/plant and seed yield /fed was 100% of IWR, while both of 100% and 75% of IWR were the best levels for number of seeds/pod, weight of 100 seed and pod length in the 1st and 2nd seasons. Application of 100% of IWR did not significantly differ when compared with 75% of IWR for all studied yield traits in the 2nd season, indicating that increases in seed yield with high level of irrigation water were the result of high yield attributes. Exposure cowpea plants to water stress during flowering and pod filling resulted in reducing number of pods/plant. Such effect may be due to flower abscission and reduced in translocation of the carbohydrates to the seed (Turk *et al.*, 1980). Mohamed and Abd El-Hady (2009) found that increasing irrigation intervals significantly decreased fresh pod yield of cowpea. The same trend of results was found in the study of Choudhury *et al.* (2011) and Khedri and Mojaddam (2014).

**Phosphorus rate:** Yield and its components of cowpea plants were increased gradually by the increase in phosphorus rates. Application of 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed recorded the highest number of pods/plant, number of seeds/pod, 100 seed weight, pod length and seed yield/fed with no significant differences between the two rates, followed by 20 kg P/fed for all the previous characters in both seasons. Therefore, phosphorus had a

vital role in several physiological process; viz., cell division and, root growth, root nodule formation, , photosynthesis, starch utilization, initiation of flower and development of seeds (Gangasuresh *et al.*, 2010). Also, phosphorus nutrition increased cowpea yield (Okeleye and Okelana, 1997). Cowpea plants amended with 30 kg P/ha recorded the highest values of number of pods/plant, number of seeds/pod, 100 seed weight and seed yield/ha compared to application of 60 kg P/ha (Haruna and Usman, 2013). Moreover, the maximum seed yield (1.32 ton/ha) was obtained from plants fertilized with 168 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/ha (Benvindo *et al.*, 2014). Also, addition of phosphorus to cowpea plants increased number of pods/plant, pod length, number of seeds/pod, seed yield as well as 50 seed weight (Nkaa *et al.*, 2014). So, responses of yield components to phosphorus application could be attributed to the role of phosphorus in seed filling and formation (Haruna, 2011). In general, cowpea requires phosphorus for plant growth and seed development, so we can conclude that cowpea is phosphorus needed plant.

**Interaction between irrigation level and phosphorus rate**

Interaction between of irrigation with 100% of IWR and 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed in the 1<sup>st</sup> season and with 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season recorded the highest number of pods/plant. No significant differences were found between the treatments of high and medium level of IWR combined with 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed for number of seeds/pod, weight of 100 seeds and pod length in both seasons, except 75% of IWR with 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed for number of seeds/pod in the 1<sup>st</sup> season (Table 7).

**Table 7: Effect of irrigation water levels and phosphorus rates on yield and its components and chemical analysis of cowpea seeds during 2014 and 2015 seasons.**

| Treatments                | Yield and its components |               |                     |                 | Chemical analysis      |           |        |        |
|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-----------|--------|--------|
|                           | No. pods/plant           | No. seeds/pod | Weight 100 seeds(g) | Pod length (cm) | Seed yield /fed. (ton) | Protein % | P      | K      |
| <i>First season 2014</i>  |                          |               |                     |                 |                        |           |        |        |
| Irrigation levels         |                          |               |                     |                 |                        |           |        |        |
| 50%                       | 9.70c                    | 8.93b         | 10.92b              | 13.40b          | 0.550c                 | 24.57a    | 0.417c | 1.198b |
| 75%                       | 10.77b                   | 10.75a        | 12.81ab             | 14.92a          | 0.655b                 | 22.81b    | 0.466b | 1.254a |
| 100%                      | 11.88a                   | 10.98a        | 14.00a              | 15.47a          | 0.727a                 | 22.71b    | 0.560a | 1.268a |
| Phosphorus rates          |                          |               |                     |                 |                        |           |        |        |
| 0 kg                      | 8.38c                    | 8.50c         | 9.81c               | 11.51c          | 0.464c                 | 19.90c    | 0.373c | 1.118c |
| 20 kg                     | 10.20b                   | 9.96b         | 12.13b              | 13.94b          | 0.584b                 | 22.68b    | 0.425b | 1.214b |
| 40 kg                     | 12.50a                   | 11.38a        | 14.31a              | 16.71a          | 0.779a                 | 25.46a    | 0.561a | 1.303a |
| 60 kg                     | 12.07a                   | 11.03a        | 14.04ab             | 16.22a          | 0.750a                 | 25.42a    | 0.564a | 1.324a |
| <i>Second season 2015</i> |                          |               |                     |                 |                        |           |        |        |
| Irrigation levels         |                          |               |                     |                 |                        |           |        |        |
| 50%                       | 9.50b                    | 9.77b         | 11.68b              | 14.08b          | 0.560b                 | 24.90a    | 0.469b | 1.229c |
| 75%                       | 11.24ab                  | 11.18a        | 13.03ab             | 15.19a          | 0.658ab                | 23.40b    | 0.546a | 1.265b |
| 100%                      | 12.87a                   | 11.42a        | 14.51a              | 15.87a          | 0.767a                 | 23.32b    | 0.567a | 1.306a |
| Phosphorus rates          |                          |               |                     |                 |                        |           |        |        |
| 0 kg                      | 8.81c                    | 9.02c         | 10.39c              | 11.93c          | 0.481c                 | 20.14c    | 0.395c | 1.152c |
| 20 kg                     | 10.55b                   | 10.54b        | 12.64b              | 14.77b          | 0.614b                 | 22.86b    | 0.509b | 1.260b |
| 40 kg                     | 12.82a                   | 11.94a        | 14.87a              | 17.04a          | 0.786a                 | 26.40a    | 0.601a | 1.323a |
| 60 kg                     | 12.62a                   | 11.64a        | 14.50ab             | 16.44a          | 0.765a                 | 26.11a    | 0.604a | 1.332a |

Values having the same alphabetical litter (s) did not significantly different 0.05 level of significance according to Duncan's multiple range test.

Regarding seed yield/fed, data in Table 7 revealed that the high level of irrigation water (100% of IWR) combined with high rates of phosphorus (40 and

60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed) gave the highest dry seed productivity, followed by 75% of IWR with the same two high phosphorus rates in both seasons. These results are in

harmony with the finding of Uarrota (2010) on cowpea who reported that the effect of phosphorus fertilizer was more pronounced on seed yield and pod number/plant under irrigated plants compared to control irrigation

treatment. Although, increasing irrigation interval decreased phosphorus uptake from the soil. It decreased the negative impact of water stress on seed yield of cowpea plants (Khedri and Mojaddam 2014).

**Table 8: Effect of interaction between irrigation water levels and phosphorus rates on yield and its components and chemical analysis of cowpea seeds during 2014 and 2015 seasons.**

| Treatments         | Yield and its components |               |                     |                 |                        | Chemical analysis |          |         |         |
|--------------------|--------------------------|---------------|---------------------|-----------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------|---------|---------|
|                    | No. pods/plant           | No. seeds/pod | Weight 100 seeds(g) | Pod length (cm) | Seed yield/ fed. (ton) | Protein %         | P        | K       |         |
| First season 2014  |                          |               |                     |                 |                        |                   |          |         |         |
| 50                 | 0                        | 6.97g         | 7.50e               | 8.87g           | 10.83f                 | 0.431f            | 18.96e   | 0.273i  | 1.110d  |
|                    | 20                       | 9.37f         | 8.17de              | 10.83efg        | 12.70de                | 0.509e            | 25.21b   | 0.417gh | 1.167d  |
|                    | 40                       | 11.20cd       | 10.00c              | 12.03def        | 15.43bc                | 0.635cd           | 28.77a   | 0.499d  | 1.240c  |
|                    | 60                       | 11.27cd       | 10.03c              | 11.93def        | 14.63c                 | 0.625cd           | 25.33b   | 0.478e  | 1.277bc |
| 75                 | 0                        | 8.96f         | 9.00d               | 10.00fg         | 11.80ef                | 0.475ef           | 19.38e   | 0.402h  | 1.117d  |
|                    | 20                       | 10.27e        | 10.83bc             | 12.30cde        | 13.93cd                | 0.584d            | 20.84d   | 0.430fg | 1.240c  |
|                    | 40                       | 12.10c        | 12.10a              | 14.63ab         | 17.20a                 | 0.806b            | 25.63b   | 0.515cd | 1.327ab |
|                    | 60                       | 11.77cd       | 11.07b              | 14.30abc        | 16.73ab                | 0.756b            | 25.42b   | 0.518c  | 1.333ab |
| 100                | 0                        | 9.20f         | 9.00d               | 10.57efg        | 11.90ef                | 0.485ef           | 21.35cd  | 0.445f  | 1.127d  |
|                    | 20                       | 10.97de       | 10.87bc             | 13.27bcd        | 15.20c                 | 0.658c            | 21.98c   | 0.429fg | 1.237c  |
|                    | 40                       | 14.20a        | 12.03a              | 16.27a          | 17.50a                 | 0.898a            | 21.98c   | 0.669b  | 1.343a  |
|                    | 60                       | 13.17b        | 12.00a              | 15.90a          | 17.30a                 | 0.868a            | 25.52b   | 0.697a  | 1.363a  |
| Second season 2015 |                          |               |                     |                 |                        |                   |          |         |         |
| 50                 | 0                        | 6.93f         | 7.87f               | 9.27f           | 11.47e                 | 0.444f            | 19.59f   | 0.334i  | 1.120h  |
|                    | 20                       | 9.15e         | 9.33e               | 11.23ef         | 13.80d                 | 0.535e            | 26.88ab  | 0.481f  | 1.250f  |
|                    | 40                       | 10.57cde      | 10.97d              | 13.17cde        | 15.97bc                | 0.635d            | 27.09a   | 0.536d  | 1.247f  |
|                    | 60                       | 11.33cd       | 10.90d              | 13.03cde        | 15.10cd                | 0.627d            | 26.06bc  | 0.524de | 1.300d  |
| 75                 | 0                        | 9.47e         | 9.63e               | 10.40f          | 12.10e                 | 0.477ef           | 20.84de  | 0.402h  | 1.124h  |
|                    | 20                       | 10.67cde      | 11.20bcd            | 12.60de         | 14.57cd                | 0.614d            | 20.44def | 0.537d  | 1.260ef |
|                    | 40                       | 12.90b        | 12.17abc            | 14.93abc        | 17.30ab                | 0.794b            | 26.46abc | 0.611c  | 1.348b  |
|                    | 60                       | 11.93bc       | 11.73a-d            | 14.20bcd        | 16.80ab                | 0.748bc           | 25.86c   | 0.635b  | 1.327c  |
| 100                | 0                        | 10.03de       | 9.57e               | 11.17ef         | 12.23e                 | 0.521ef           | 20.00ef  | 0.448g  | 1.211g  |
|                    | 20                       | 11.83bc       | 11.10cd             | 14.10cd         | 15.93bc                | 0.694cd           | 21.25d   | 0.510e  | 1.271e  |
|                    | 40                       | 15.00a        | 12.70a              | 16.50a          | 17.87a                 | 0.930a            | 25.65c   | 0.657a  | 1.375a  |
|                    | 60                       | 14.60a        | 12.30ab             | 16.27ab         | 17.43ab                | 0.921a            | 26.40abc | 0.653a  | 1.369a  |

Values having the same alphabetical litter (s) did not significantly different 0.05 level of significance according to Duncan's multiple range test.

**Chemical analysis**

**Irrigation levels:** Results in Table 6 show that, irrigation levels had a significant effect on all traits of chemical analysis. Protein percentage of stressed plants (50% of IWR) was higher (24.57% and 24.90%) than that of plants irrigated with 75 and 100% of IWR (22.81%, 23.40% and 22.71%, 23.32%) in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons, respectively indicating that water stress increased protein percentage in cowpea seeds. The same trend of water stress effects on increasing the seed protein content was found by Wien *et al.* (1979). Supplying 100% of IWR to cowpea plants increased seed P% and K% in both seasons, as well as 75% of IWR increased P % in seed in the 1<sup>st</sup> season.

**Phosphorus rate:** In all studied chemical analysis traits, cowpea plants fertilized with 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed had higher content of P and K compared to those supplied with low rate in both seasons (Table 6). These results were in harmony with the finding of Benvindo *et al.* (2014) who concluded that using high rates of phosphorus increased the phosphorus percentage in cowpea seeds.

**Interaction between irrigation levels and phosphorus rates:** Protein percentage was at its highest value

(28.77% and 27.09%) when cowpea plants received 50% of IWR and 40 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed in both seasons (Table 7). Regarding P and K seed content, data revealed that the highest level of irrigation (100% of IWR) combined with 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed in the 1<sup>st</sup> season and with both 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season were the best interaction treatments for increasing P and K seed content (Table 7), without significant differences when compared with the treatments of 75% of IWR combined 40 and 60 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed for K content in the 1<sup>st</sup> season.

Finally, we can conclude that both of water stress and phosphorus application were important factors limiting the productivity of cowpea plants under North Sinai conditions because they had several effects on physiological process of plant growth, yield and its attributes and protein and minerals content.

**REFERENCES**

A.O.A.C. (1990). Official method of analysis 13<sup>th</sup> ed., Association of Official Agricultural Chemists, Washington D.C.

- Benvindo, R.N.; R.D.P. Prado, J.C.A. Nobrega and R.D. Flores (2014). Phosphorus fertilization on the nutrition and yield of cowpea grown in an Arenosols. *American-Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci.*, 14 (5): 434-439.
- Chiulele, R.M. (2003). Morphological and physiological response of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp) cultivars to induced water stress and phosphorus nutrition. M.Sc. Thesis, Uni. South Africa.
- Choudhury, A. K., M. Abdul Karim, M. M. Haque, Q. Abdul Khaliq, J. U. Ahmed and M. M. Hossain (2011). Genotypic variability in plant water status of French Bean under drought stress. *J. Crop Sci. and Biote.* 14: 17-2.
- Duncan, D.B. (1958). Multiple range and multiple F. Test *Biometrics* 11: 1-42.
- Gangasuresh, P., V.Muthuselvi, E. Muthulakshmi, S. Muthumari and G. Maniammal (2010). Synergistic efficiency of phosphate solubilizer associated with nitrogen fixer on the Growth of soybean (*Glycine max*). *Inter. J. Biol. Techno.*, 1(2): 124-130.
- Gardner, F. P., R. B. Pearce and R. L. Mitchell (1985). *Physiology of crop plants*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Iowa State Uni. Press, Ames.
- Hale, M. G. and D. M. Orcutt (1987). *The physiology of plants under stress*. A. Willey Inter. Sci. Publication, New York.
- Haruna, I. M., (2011). Dry matter partitioning and grain yield potential in sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.) as influenced by poultry manure, nitrogen and phosphorus at Samaru, Nigeria. *J. Agric.Technol.*, 7: 1571-1577.
- Haruna, I.M. and A. Usman (2013). Agronomic efficiency of cowpea varieties (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp) under varying phosphorus rates in Lafia, Nasarawa State, Nigeria. *Asian J. Crop Sci.*, 5 (2):209-215.
- Haruna, I.M. and L. Aliyu (2011). Yield and economic returns of sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.) as influenced by poultry manure, nitrogen and phosphorus at Samaru, Nigeria. *Elixir Agric.*, 39: 4884-4887.
- Hussein, M.M., S. M. Al-Ashery and Camilia, Y. El-Dewiny (2014). Cowpea growth and yield components as affected by drought and PK soil. *Inter. J. Sci. Res.*, 3(12):2200-2207.
- Ismail, S. M. (2010). Influence of deficit irrigation on water use efficiency and bird pepper production (*Capsicum annum* L.), JKAU: Met., Enviro. & Arid Land Agric. Sci., Vol. 21, No. 2, pp: 29-43.
- Israelson, O.W. and V.C. Hansen (1962). *Irrigation principles and practices* 3<sup>rd</sup> ed. John Wiley & Sons Inc. New York, pp 240-253.
- Jackson, M. L. (1970). *Soil Chemical Analysis*. Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Khedri, M. and M. Mojaddam (2014). Evaluation of the yield and yield components of grain sorghum and cowpea intercropping under drought stress and different levels of phosphorus. *Int. J. Fundamental and Appl. Life Sci.* 4: 6-12.
- Leidi, E.O. and D. N. Rodriguez-Navarro (2000). Nitrogen and Phosphorus availability limit N<sub>2</sub> fixation in bean. *New Phytologist*.147: 337-346.
- Malavolta, E., G.C. Vitti and S.A. Oliveira (1997). Assessment of nutritional status of plants: principles and applications. Brazilian Association for Research Potash and Phosphate. Piracicaba, Sao Paulo, Brazil, pp: 201.
- Mohamed, E.I. and M. A. Abd El-Hady (2009). Effect of irrigation intervals and potassium fertilization levels on two pea cultivars under environmental conditions of upper Egypt. *Minufia, J. Agric. Sci.*, 34(2):677-694.
- Nkaa, F. A., O.W. Nwokeocha and O. Ihuoma (2014). Effect of phosphorus fertilizer on growth and yield of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L.). *J. Pharmacy and Biolo. Sci.* 9: 74-82.
- Okeleye, H.A. and M. A. Okelana (1997). Effect of P fertilizer on nodulation, growth and yield of Cowpea. *Indian J. Agric. Sci.*, 67(1): 10–12.
- Piper, C.S. (1950). *Soil and Plant Analysis*. Interscience publishers, Inc., New York.
- Rezaee, A. R. and A. A. K. Haghghi (2009). Humidity effect in different growth stages on beans. *Soil Researches Magazine (Water and Soil Science)* 23(1): 117-124.
- Sangakkara, U.R., M. Frehner, and J. Nosberger (2001). Effect of soil moisture and potassium fertilizer on shoot water potential, photosynthetic and partitioning of carbon in mung bean and cowpea. *J. Agron. and Crop Sci.* Blackwell Wissenschafts-Verlag GmbH, Berlin, Germany, 185(3): 201–207.
- Singh, B. (2003). Improving the production and utilization of cowpea as food and fodder. *Field Crop Res.*, 84: 150-169.
- Singh, B. B., Y. Mai-Kodomi and T. Terao (1999). Relative drought tolerance of major rainfed crops of the semi-arid tropics. *Ind. J. Gen. Plant Breed.* 59:437-444.
- Sivakumar, M. V. K. and R. H. Shaw (1998). Relative evaluation of water stress indicator for soybeans. *Agron J.*, 70: 619-623.
- Snedecor, G.W. and W.G. Cochran. (1980). *Statistical Methods* 7<sup>th</sup> ed. Iowa State Univ. Press. Ames. Iowa, USA.
- Turk, K. J., A. E. Hall and C. W. Asbell (1980). Drought adaptation of cowpea 1. Influence of drought on seed yield. *Agron. J.* 72: 413-420.
- Turk, K.J., A.E. Hall (2005). Drought adaptation of cowpea. *Agron J.*, 76: 557-560.
- Uarrotta, V.G. (2010). Response of cowpea (*Vigna unguiculata* L. Walp) to water stress and phosphorus fertilization. *J. Agron.*, 9:87-91.
- Wien, H.C., E.J. Littleton and A. Ayanaba (1979). Drought stress of cowpea and soybean under tropical conditions. In H. Mussel and R. C. Staples (eds). *Stress physiology in crop plants*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. New York.
- Yaron, B., E. Danfors and Y. Vaddia (1973). *Arid zone irrigation*. Springer-Verlag Berlin, Heidelberg, New York.

تأثير الإجهاد المائي والتسميد الفوسفاتي على النمو والمحصول لنباتات اللوبيا تحت ظروف العريش  
محمود إبراهيم محمود إبراهيم<sup>١</sup> و محمد سعد عبد الحميد القصاص<sup>٢</sup>  
١- قسم الإنتاج النباتي (خضر)- كلية العلوم الزراعية البيئية بالعريش- جامعة قناة السويس  
٢- قسم الأراضي والمياه- كلية العلوم الزراعية البيئية بالعريش- جامعة قناة السويس

أجريت تجربتان حقليتان بالمزرعة التجريبية لكلية العلوم الزراعية البيئية بالعريش، شمال سيناء، خلال الموسم الصيفي ٢٠١٤ و ٢٠١٥ بهدف دراسة تأثير ثلاثة مستويات من مياه الري هي ١٠٠% و ٧٥% و ٥٠% من الاحتياجات المائية مع إضافة الفوسفور بمعدلات صفر و ٢٠ و ٤٠ و ٦٠ كيلوجرام للفدان على النمو والإنتاجية لنباتات اللوبيا النامية في ارض رملية مع استخدام نظام الري بالتنقيط بمنطقة العريش. اشتملت التجربة على ١٢ معاملة وهي كل التوليفات الممكنة بين ٣ مستويات ري و ٤ معدلات فوسفور. تمثلت أهم النتائج المتحصل عليها في تناقص كفاءة استخدام نباتات اللوبيا للمياه مع زيادة كميات المياه المضافة تدريجياً حتى ١٠٠% من الاحتياجات الكلية من المياه وكانت أعلى كفاءة عند مستوى ٥٠%، بينما أدت إضافة ٤٠ كجم فو/ فدان للحصول على أعلى كفاءة لاستخدام الفوسفور مقارنة ب ٢٠ و ٦٠ كجم فو/فدان خلال الموسمين. أدت إضافة مستوى ١٠٠% من الاحتياجات المائية للحصول على أعلى القيم لجميع الصفات تحت الدراسة، والتي لم تختلف معنوياً عن ٧٥% لبعض الصفات خلال موسم الزراعة ما عدا صفة محتوى البروتين بالبذور، حيث أعطى مستوى الري المنخفض ٥٠% أفضل قيمة. أعطت معدلات الفوسفور المرتفعة (٤٠ أو ٦٠ كجم فو/فدان) أفضل القيم لجميع الصفات المدروسة في الموسمين. أما معاملات التفاعل بين المستوى العالي من مياه الري (١٠٠%) وإضافة الفوسفور بمعدل مرتفع (٤٠ أو ٦٠ كجم فو/فدان) في الموسمين فكانت أفضل المعاملات لجميع صفات النمو والإنتاجية والتحليل الكيماوي، والتي لم تختلف معنوياً عن إضافة مستوى ٧٥% من الاحتياجات المائية مع معدلي الفوسفور ٤٠ أو ٦٠ كجم فو/فدان.