Study the Effects of Fulvic Acid on QualitativeTraits of *Citrus medica* under Lime Condition

Mehran Mahmoudi*[1], Maziar Nazarmohammadi[2]

Abstract— The effects of soil application of fulvic acid on Physiological traits of *Citrus medica plants* grown at various lime conditions were examined. Lime concentrations were 0, 15 and 30%. The liquid fulvic acid were put into the soil pots three times on 15, 30 and 45th day after bud emerged. The application doses of fulvic acid were 0, 50 and 100 mg/l. Each application consists of four replications. The experiment was conducted in Pot experiment under controlled conditions in completely randomized factorial design in mazandaran province. The interaction effect between lime & spray for N and RWC was not found statistically significant ($P < 0.05$) and the interaction effects between lime & spray for chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b was found statistically significant ($P<0.01$). According to the analysis results, the most measurement of chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and RWC in the level of lime (0%) and the least measurement of chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and RWC by the level of lime (30%) obtained (table2).

Keywords— *Citrus medica*, Fulvic Acid, Lime, Quality.

I. Introduction

MANY studies showed that fulvic acids increase the growth and developement of plants, therefore improving the nutritional status and quality of the plant (Maggioni et al. 1987;Mackowiak et al. 2001, Rauthan and Schnitzer,1982). Fulvic acids may also reduce plant uptake of certain toxic metal ions, adsorbing them from the soil solution (Strickland et al., 1979).

High amounts of lime in soils have negative effects on the plant growth. The plant growth and yield are reduced in lime-affected soils because of the excess uptake of potentially toxic ions (Grattan & Grieve 1999). A high lime content decreases the osmotic potential of the soil water and, consequently, this reduces the availability of the soil water for plants. One negative effect of increasing lime concentration is inhibited uptake of essential micronutrients such as N, P, and K (Ahmad, et al.,1981; Peacock et al., 1993). Briefly, high lime concentrations in the soil reduce the absorption of nutrients by plants which negatively affects the fertility of the soil (KHaled and Hassan, 2011). Many laboratory and glasshouse studies have shown that high amounts of lime can reduce total nitrogen accumulation (Alam 1994), P concentrations and the uptake of K in plants (Lopez & Satti 1996). In lime soil, the content of water is particularly low and the plants grown in these soils often show deficiencies of Relative Water Content (Page et al. 1990). Fulvic acids may enhance uptake of chlorophyll a and chlorophyll b, one might reason that application of fulvic acid could improve plant response to lime. However, there is a lack of research regarding fulvic acid and application and its impacts on Citrus medica under lime tolerance. So, The goal of this study was to compare the effect of fulvic acid on the qualitative traits of Citrus medica under lime condition

II. Material And Methods

The soil used in this study was collected from 0–30 cm depth of the field located in mazandaran province. The planting dates were on 15th March, 2015. The physical and chemical traits of the soil were determined and as a basal fertilization, the fertilizer crystalon comprised of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, Fe, Mn and Cu were applied to the pots before planting. The experiment was conducted in Pot experiment under controlled conditions in completely randomized factorial design with three soil application doses of fulvic Acid 0, 50, and 100mg/l, and three lime doses 0, 15, and 30%. Each application consists of four replications. All pots were irrigated with distilled water during the experiment. The soil applied fulvic acid was prepared from humax company (United states). Air-dried soil samples were passed through 2 mm sieve. For soil applications, fulvic acid was solved into distilled water according to the application doses. The plants into polyethylene covered plastic pots sprayed based on the application doses. Lime were added to the pots according to the application doses. Fulvic acid was sprayed three times (15 ,30 and 45 days) after bud emerged (Beginning in late march). After two months vegetation period, the plants were discarded and dried at 60°C and samples were wet digested by using HNO 3 + HCIO 4 (4:1) and RWC was determined by comparing wet and dry weight, N by kjeldahl and the manner of titration and chlorophyll a and b by spectrophotometre (Hanlon ,1998). The statistical analysis was performed using EXCEL, SAS, MSTATC statistical soft wares, and the mean values were

[1]Mehran. mahmoudi is with the department of Agronomy, College of Agriculture, Ayatollah Amoli Branch, Islamic Azad University, Amol, Iran. Email:mehran.mahmoudi@yahoo.com

[2]Maziar. Nazarmohammadi is with the department of food science ,Ayatollah Amoli Branch, Islamic Azad University, Amol, Iran.).

grouped with Duncan multiple range test ($P < 0.05$).

III. Results And Discussion

According to the analysis results, the most measurement of RWC in T0f50 treatment, and the least measurment by the treatment of T30blank obtained (table2). These Results corroborate findings of Chen & Aviad (1990), Fagbenro & Agboda (1993) & David et al., (1994) regarding RWC of plants. According to the analysis results, the measurement of N in every treatment was the same statistically, and the differences between treatments were Nonsignificant (table2). These results corroborate findings of Chen & Aviad (1990), Fagbenro & Agboda (1993) & David et al.,(1994) Regarding N uptake of plants. According to the analysis results, the most measurement of chlorophyll a in T0f100 treatment, and the least measurment by the treatment of T30f100 obtained (table2). According to the analysis results, the most measurement of chlorophyll b in T0f100 and T30h100 treatment, and the least measurment by the treatment of T30f100 obtained (table2). These Results approve findings of Chen & Aviad (1990), Fagbenro & Agboda (1993) & David et al.,(1994) regarding chlorophyll content of plants. Also Khaled and Fawy (2011) reported that application in 0.1% fulvic acid treatment increased N amounts in plants which 30% lime treatment when compared with the control and 0.2% fulvic acid treatment. Liu and Cooper (2002) in creeping bentgrass reported that lime did not affect the content of N and other elements. Neeraja et al., (2005) found that foliar and root application of organic acids product from animal origin led to a severe plant growth depression. Anjum et al., (2008) in citrus reported that lime condition increased the accumulation of chlorophyll b, but decreased chlorophyll a and RWC. Abdalhamid et al., (2003) reported that the application of exogenous organic acid on desert plants stimulated the growth and water content by neutralizing destructive effects of lime.

IV. Conclusion

Fulvic acids can ameliorate negative soil properties and improve qualitative traits. They may be used in the case of the negative effect of lime that would inhibit growth and development of plants. Regarding our finding, fulvic acids are ineffective on N uptake. This study indicated that the application doses are important for deriving benefit from fulvic acid under lime conditions. However, there are not many researches into fulvic acid application and its effects on plant lime tolerance. So, more research is necessary to explain the positive impacts of fulvic acid on citrus plants under lime condition.

References

[1] A.0.A.C.2010,Official methods of analysis.Association of official analytical chemists,Incorporated.Virginia.

[2] Abdelhamid A, Khedr M, Amal A, Abdelwahid W, Paul MA,2003. Proline induces the expression of salt stress responsive proteins and may improve the adaptation of pancratium to salt stress.J exp bot.392:2553-2562.

[3] Ahmad I, Wainwright SJ, Stewart GR, 2001. The solute and water relations of Agrostis stolonifera ecotypes differing in their salt tolerance.New Phytol.87:615–629.

[4] Alam SM, 2004. Nutrient by plant under stress condition.Hand book of Plant and Crop Stress. MarcelDekker,NewYork.227–246.

[5] Arancon NQ,Edwards CA, Bierman P, Welch C, Metzger JD,2004.Influences of vermicomposts on field strawberries.BioresourceTechnol.93(2):145-153.

[6] Cerdán M, Sánchez SA, Oliver M, Juárez M, Sánchez AJJ,2006. Effect of foliar and root application of organic acids on iron uptake by tomato plants. Acta Hort. 830: 481-488.

[7] Chen Y, Aviad T.2000. Effects of Humic Substances on Plant Growth. American Soc of Agro, Madison WI. p. 161-186.

[8] Cooper RI, Liu C, Fisher DS,2008. Influence of humic substances on rooting and nutrient content of creeping bentgrass. Crop Sci.38: 1639–1644.

[9] David PP, Nelson PV, Sanders DC,2004. A humic acid improves growth of tomato seedling in solution culture.JofPlantNutr.17:173–184.

[10] Jensen A,1978.Chlorophylls and carotenoides,In Handbook of physiological methods.physio and biochem methods.Cambridge Univ Press.

[11] Linchan DJ, 1978.Humic acid and nutrient uptake by plants.Plant and Soil. 50: 663-670.

[12] Mackowiak CL, Grossl PR , Bugbee BG,.2001. Beneficial effects of humic acid on micronutrient availability to wheat. Soil Sci Soc of Amer J.56: 1744–1750.

[13] Maggioni A, Varanini Z, Nardi S, Pinton R,1987. Action of soil humic matter on plant roots:Stimulation of ion uptake and effects on (Mg 2+, K+) ATPase activity. Sci of the Total Environ.62:355–363.

[14] Marcum KB, Murdoch CL,1994. Salinity tolerance mechanism of six C4 turfgrasses. J. Amer Soc Hort Sci.119:779–784.

[15] Nasirkhan M, Manzer H, Seddiqui F, Msroor M,2007. Salinity Induced Changes in growth,EnzymeActivities,Photosynthesis,Proline accumulation and yield in Linsead Genotypes.World J of Agr Sci.3(5):685-695.

[16] Neeraja GIP, Reddy BG,2005. Effect of growth promoters on growth and yield of tomato cv. Marutham. J Res.33(3):68-70.

TABLE I
THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF QUALITATIVE TRAITS

	N	CHLb	CHLa	RWC
Lime	2.81**	0.083**	0.00111**	369.33**
Spray	2.78**	0.003**	0.000017**	602.64**
Spray*Lime	0.108ns	0.004**	0.000011**	11.20ns
Error	0.166	0.0000067	0.00000001	16.66
CV	14.74	1.08	1.15	5.00

Ns,*,**Nonsignificant or significant at P = 0.05, 0.01 respectively

TABLE II
THE COMPARATIVE MEAN OF QUALITATIVE TRAITS

Lime*Spray	N	CHLb	CHLa	RWC
T0blank	2.18a	0.112e	0.0112e	69.44ef
T0f100	3.60a	0.189a	0.0195a	85.66b
T0f50	3.00a	0.158b	0.0160c	89.80a
T15blank	2.02a	0.096f	0.0029g	72.66ef
T15f100	2.96a	0.043i	0.0049f	81.00d
T15f50	2.74a	0.064h	0.0036f	88.40ab
T30blank	1.80a	0.088g	0.0011i	68.14f
T30f100	2.60a	0.009l	0.0009ij	74.60e
T30f50	2.30a	0.112e	0.0021h	84.00bc

F50 & F100 = fulvic acid 50 & 100 mg/l, T0, T15 & T30 = lime %, respectively, chlorophylls= (ppm),N&RWC=%.