

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10

Original Research Article
**Improvement of Nitrogen Use Efficiency
Derived from Ammonium Sulfate Substitute
Fertilizer in Sugarcane Cultivation
through the Addition of Organic
Soil Amendment**

ABSTRACT

For increasing nutrient use efficiency and cane yield on application of ammonium sulfate (AS) fertilizer substitution was performed through addition of soil amendment. A pot experiment was conducted for seven month of sugarcane growth. The experiment used factorial randomized complete block design with three replication. Factor I was the application of AS fertilizer and its substitution which consisted of nine levels : three treatments using AS fertilizer, three treatments of AS substitute fertilizers using the mixture of urea+gypsum and three treatments using the mixture of urea+gypsum+biocompost. Factor II was the kinds of soil amendment which consisted of three levels : calcite, boiler ash, and biochar of sugarcane trash and one control treatment. The measured variables were leaf N content and uptake, nutrient use efficiency, and yield variables. The results of this study showed that the treatment using mixture of urea+gypsum tend a higher N uptake than AS fertilizer. Application of boiler ash and biochar had the highest N nutrient upatake. The highest nutrient use efficiency was found at the lowest rate of mixture of urea+gypsum (100 kg N ha⁻¹) with application of soil amendment using biochar or boiler ash. The average increase in cane yield on this treatment compared to control by 250%. It is suggested that application of organic soil amendment is needed to increase N use efficiency of AS substitute fertilizer.

11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

Keywords: Ammonium Sulfate fertilizer, soil amendment, N use efficiency, cane yield

1. INTRODUCTION

The change from conventional to organic farming in the sugarcane cultivation can not be done directly but requires several stages of substitution that can be started from replacing chemical fertilizers commonly used with a mixture of inorganic and organic fertilizer that is more environmental friendly. The process of these changes require more information about the characteristics and the environmental impact of conventional farming practices in the sugarcane cultivation. For example, the substitution of N fertilizer derived from Ammonium sulfate (AS) with other fertilizers requires knowledge about the negative impact of the AS fertilizer.

Overuse of AS fertilizer in the long-term can have a negative impact on the soil properties. Soil chemical changes under sugarcane is soil acidification. The major cause of soil acidification is the use of N fertilizers producing NH₄⁺ such as Ammonium Sulfate (AS) [1]. Oxidation of N and S derived from AS fertilizer produced HNO₃ and H₂SO₄ by nitrifying and oxidation microorganisms [2], thereby soil pH reduced due to application of AS fertilizer [3]. To improve soil properties is required the addition of soil amendment.

32 Efforts in substitution of AS fertilizer as a source of Nitrogen (N) nutrient in sugarcane
 33 cultivation has been studied by several researcher using urea fertilizer [4], Ammonium
 34 Nitrate fertilizer [5], filter cake of sugar mill [6], and a combination of chemical fertilizer and
 35 organic fertilizer [7]. Substitution of ammonium sulfate fertilizer used combination of urea,
 36 gypsum, and biocompost showed a similar plant growth with the treatment using AS fertilizer
 37 [3]. However, N and S uptake in this treatment is still not optimal [8]. Thus, to increase
 38 nutrient uptake and nutrient use efficiency, soil improvement is needed through application
 39 of soil amendment.

40
 41 Recently, biochar is one of organic soil amendment gets special attention by researcher.
 42 The other soil amendments suggested for improving the soil acidification of sugarcane land
 43 is sugar mill wastes such as boiler ash, filter cake, and sugar cane trash. [9] reported that
 44 the addition of boiler ash raised soil pH and increased crop yields. The effect being greater
 45 at the higher rate. Biochar is charcoal produced during pyrolysis, a process where organic
 46 material is heated under low oxygen conditions. One usage of biochar from crop residues is
 47 as soil amendment. The availability of sugarcane trash every harvest may reach 10-15% of
 48 the total potential of cane yield [10]. Thus, for an area of 1 ha with a yield of 100 tons of
 49 sugarcane, the amount of sugarcane trash as much as 10-15 ton. The great amount of
 50 sugarcane trash has the potential to be used as biochar that can be used as soil
 51 amendments. Biochar has a large surface area and porosity thereby ability adsorb or retain
 52 nutrients and water [11, 12, 13]. In addition, biochar can also improve aggregation, increase
 53 water holding capacity, and decrease soil bulk density [14, 15]. Application of biochar in the
 54 acid soils increase soil pH, base cations and CEC [13,15] and increase crop yield [16, 17].
 55 The objective of this study is to describe the combination effect of N fertilization derived from
 56 AS fertilizer and its substitute fertilizer and some soil amendments on sugarcane crop yield,
 57 N uptake and nitrogen use efficiency.

58 59 **2. MATERIAL AND METHODS**

60 61 **2.1 Study Site and Soil Characteristics**

62
 63 This study is a pot experiment conducted at the experimental field of Agriculture Faculty of
 64 Islamic University of Malang in January-August 2014 with an altitude of 505 m above sea
 65 level, the average temperature of 20°-28° C and rainfall is 1750 mm / year. Soils were
 66 collected from sugarcane land at Karangploso district , Malang regency, East Java. The soils
 67 were chosen to be representative of the group of soils from sugarcane land which have low
 68 soil pH. Samples (0-10 cm) were taken from areas under sugarcane monoculture more than
 69 10 years. The soil had a clay content of 18.1 %, a silt content of 61.4%, and a sand content
 70 of 20.5%. The soils were analyzed for chemical properties and the results are presented in
 71 Table 1. The soil samples were used in a pot experiment in which sugarcane was grown.

72
73
74 **Table 1. Some selected chemical properties of the soils used in this study**

Soil type	pH 1:1		C- Organic (%)	N- total %	C/N	OM content %	P- Bray 1 (mg kg ⁻¹)	K me/100 g	CEC	SO ₄ ²⁻ mg kg ⁻¹
	H ₂ O	KCl								
Inceptisols	4.9	4.5	1	0.12	8.3	1.73	60.56	0.16	18.65	6.20

76 77 **2.2 Soil Amendment Preparation**

78
79 The boiler ash originated from *Kebon Agung* Sugar Mill, Malang regency, East Java, while

80 sugar cane trash was obtained from farmers' sugarcane land. Sugarcane biochar was made
 81 in the Bioenergy Laboratory by pyrolysis process. Sugarcane trash were put in a reactor to
 82 a slow burning process (carbonation) at a temperature of 300 - 400°C for about six hours
 83 with the absence of oxygen. After the combustion, cool charcoal was taken from the
 84 combustion reactor and ready for use. The chemical characteristic of boiler ash and
 85 sugarcane trash biochar is presented in the Table 2.
 86

87 **Table 2. Some chemical properties of soil amendments**

Soil Amendments	pH (H ₂ O)	Total Element Content (%)						C (%)	CEC me/100g	Water Content (%)
		N	P	K	Ca	Mg	Na			
Boiler Ash	7.85	0.05	0.57	0.51	2.27	1.22	0.18	2.24	6.24	7.46
Sugarcane Trash Biochar	8.35	0	0.16	0.18	0.46	0.42	1.4	18.42	17.52	5.42

88

89 2.3 Experimental Design

90

91 This research is a pot experiment which used factorial randomized complete block design
 92 with three replications. The first factor consisted of nine treatments as shown on the Table
 93 3.

94

Table 3. Treatments used in this study for the first factor

Treatments	N rates (kg ha ⁻¹)	S rates (kg ha ⁻¹)	AS fertilizer (kg ha ⁻¹)	Urea fertilizer (kg ha ⁻¹)	Gypsum (kg ha ⁻¹)	Biocompost (kg ha ⁻¹)
T1	100	120	500	-	-	-
T2	140	168	700	-	-	-
T3	180	216	900	-	-	-
T4	100	120	-	223	522	-
T5	140	168	-	312	730	-
T6	180	216	-	400	938	-
T7	100	120	-	110	522	1950
T8	140	168	-	155	730	2750
T9	180	216	-	200	938	3550

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114

Remarks : S content of AS Fertilizer = 24 %; N content of AS fertilizer = 20 %; S content of Gypsum = 19 %; N content of Urea fertilizer = 45%; N content in Biocompost = 2.57%. Gypsum is used as S fertilizer source and Ca content in Gypsum not calculated in the dose of the treatments

The second factor was kind of soil amendments which consisted of three levels that are calcite (A1), boiler ash of sugar industry (A2), and biochar of sugarcane trash (A3). From both factors, 27 treatments were obtained and one control treatment (no fertilizer and soil amendment). Thus, the total of experimental pots used were 84 pots.

104 2.4 Experiment Procedure

For the pot experiment, the soil samples used as growing medium were air-dried and ground. 84 plastic pots (top diameter = 47 cm, bottom diameter = 40 cm, and height = 32 cm) were filled with 40 kg dry soil. Each plastic pot was perforated by 20 holes. The soil amendments were added to the soil one week before planting at rate of 5 ton ha⁻¹, equivalent to 100 g per 40 kg soil on dry weight basis. They were mixed thoroughly with the soil. Sugarcane seeds of BL-red had been the most widely planted sugarcane cultivar in East Java, were planted after seedling for 1 month, and coincided with one week after the application of soil amendments. Each pot was planted by 1 seed sugarcane by digging the soil as deep as 10 cm and then the seeds directly planted. Basal dressing of P and K (15:15)

115 at rates 400 kg ha⁻¹ were applied to each pot. The chemical fertilizer of the treatments were
116 applied at 2 weeks after planting. Rates of chemical fertilizer were applied in accordance
117 with the predetermined treatments. N fertilizer was applied twice at 2 weeks and 6 weeks
118 after transplanting respectively. All fertilizer were banded as deep as 10 cm below surface.
119

120 **2.5 Measurement of Observation Variables**

121
122 The variables of sugarcane yield consisted of leaf N content, fresh weight of cane yield and
123 total biomass, and dry weight of total biomass. Leaf samples from top of the plants were
124 collected for analysis of leaf N content and N uptake at four months of plant age. The leaf
125 samples were chopped, homogenized, and dried at 70°C in a hot-air oven. The dried
126 samples were ground in a stainless steel mill and wet-acid oxidation is based on a Kjeldahl
127 oxidation in concentrated H₂SO₄ for determination of total N [18].
128

129 **2.6 Calculation of Nutrient Use Efficiency**

130
131 Nutrient Use Efficiency was calculated by four agronomic indices : (1) Partial factor
132 productivity (PFP) : kg crop yield per kg nutrients applied, (2) Agronomic efficiency (AE) : kg
133 crop yield increase per kg nutrient applied, (3) Recovery efficiency (RE) : kg nutrient taken
134 up per kg nutrient applied), and (4) Physiological efficiency (PE) : kg yield increase per kg
135 nutrient taken up. Crop removal efficiency : removal of nutrient in harvested crop as % of
136 nutrient applied [19].
137

138 **2.7 Statistical Analysis**

139
140 The collected data was statistically analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) (F-Test) at
141 level (P≤0.05) for the factorial randomized block design and differences in each treatment
142 were adjudged by Tukey test (P≤0.05) using program Minitab Vers.14.12. For statistical
143 analysis of data (charts), Microsoft Excel was employed.
144

145 **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

146

147 **3.1 Effect of Ammonium Sulfate and Its Substitute Fertilizer and Soil** 148 **Amendment on Nutrient Uptake Yield.**

149


150 Based on ANOVA analysis, the fertilization treatment derived from AS and its substitute
151 fertilizer (T) and application of three soil amendments (A) significantly affected N leaf
152 content, N uptake, cane yield, fresh weight of total biomass and dry weight of total biomass.
153 All of treatment combinations were significantly higher than control (Table 4).
154

155 **Table 4. Probabilities of F-values of fixed effects for leaf N content and N uptake,**
156 **cane yield, fresh weight of total biomass, dry weight of total biomass,**
157 **exposed to nine N fertilization treatments derived from AS, the mixture of**
158 **urea+gypsum, and urea+gypsum+biocompost (T) and three kinds of soil**
159 **amendment (A).**
160

Fixed Effect	N Leaf Content	N Uptake	Cane Yield	Fresh Weight of Total Biomass	Dry Weight of Total Biomass
Treatments Vs.Control	43.78**	85.81**	62.02**	69.69**	69.69**
Treatments	9.43**	16.81**	21.56**	21.41**	21.41**
Fertilization (T)	24.29**	46.42**	55.86**	54.93**	54.93**
Soil Amendment (A)	1.96 ^{ns}	13.35**	21.97**	25.47**	25.47**
T x A	2.93*	2.44*	4.36**	4.13**	4.13**

* and ** sign : significant at the P= 0.05 and P= 0.01 probability levels, respectively.

161
162



163

164
165
166
167
168

Fig.1. Effect of AS and its substitute fertilizer (A+C) (LSD=0.14 and 47.16) and soil amendments (B+D) (LSD= 0.06 and 20.24) on leaf N content and N uptake.

The T6 treatment using the mixture of 400 kg urea+938 kg gypsum per ha equivalent to 150 kg N/ha and 216 kg S/ha (Fig. 1A) had the highest leaf N content, whereas the highest N uptake was found at the T4 treatment, but not significantly different with the T5 and T6 treatments (Fig. 1C). The kind of soil amendment did not affect leaf N content (Fig. 1B) but it significantly affected N uptake (Fig. 3 D). Application of biochar and boiler ash had the highest N uptake (Fig. 1D) with the average increase of the T6 treatment and biochar application by 41 % and 73 %, respectively compared to control. This results showed that application of biochar and boiler ash as soil amendment can improve soil properties, thereby it can increase nutrient availability and uptake.

178
179
180

3.2 Effect of Ammonium Sulfate and Its Substitute Fertilizer and Soil Amendment on Nitrogen Use Efficiency.

181 From the ANOVA analysis, there was no interaction effect between fertilization treatment
 182 and soil amendment application, but the fertilization treatment derived from AS and its
 183 substitute fertilizer (T) and application of three soil amendments (A) significantly affected
 184 nutrient use efficiency calculated by Partial Factor Productivity (PFP), Agronomic efficiency
 185 (AE), Recovery efficiency (RE), Physiological Efficiency (PE) and Crop Removal Efficiency
 186 (CRE) : removal of nutrient in harvested crop as % of nutrient applied.

187 The highest nutrient use efficiency was found at the T4 treatment (Table 5). This is caused
 188 by this treatment contains the lowest applied N rate equivalent to 100 kg N ha⁻¹. In line with
 189 this research result, [20] reported that fertilizer use efficiency can be optimized by fertilizer
 190 best management practices that apply nutrient at the right rate. The highest nutrient use
 191 efficiency always occurs at the lowest fertilizer inputs.

192 **Table 5. Effect of AS and its substitute fertilizer (T) and soil amendments (A) on**
 193 **Nitrogen use efficiency**
 194

Treatments	PFP		AE		RE		PE		CRE	
T1	519.44	c	173.61	bcd	1.67	b	40.66	ab	0.83	a
T2	481.15	bc	234.13	d	1.44	b	68.67	bc	1.06	ab
T3	387.35	abc	195.22	cd	1.10	a	76.61	cd	0.79	ab
T4	861.39	d	515.56	e	2.53	c	100.93	d	1.68	bc
T5	511.90	c	264.88	d	1.53	b	76.88	cd	1.85	c
T6	371.91	abc	179.78	bcd	1.32	b	65.35	bc	0.86	ab
T7	441.67	abc	95.83	abc	0.58	a	29.45	a	0.41	a
T8	314.48	ab	67.46	a	0.52	a	28.31	a	0.35	a
T9	285.49	a	93.36	ab	0.65	a	43.96	ab	0.42	a
LSD (<i>P</i> =0.05)	180.31		100.84		0.58		28.62		0.78	
A1	431.32	a	169.66	a	1.09	a	52.55	a	0.97	a
A2	456.98	a	195.32	a	1.30	ab	57.84	ab	0.82	a
A3	503.30	a	241.63	b	1.39	b	66.56	b	0.96	a
LSD (<i>P</i> =0.05)	77.39		43.28		0.24		12.28		0.54	

195 *Means followed by different letters in the same column for each treatment of T and A are*
 196 *statistically significant different at Tukey- test, P=0.05*

197

198 The highest nutrient use efficiency was found at the application soil amendment using
 199 biochar and boiler ash. The beneficial effect of soil amendments was due to rise in the soil
 200 reaction up to 6.5 (unpublished data of this experiment) with an initial pH value of the soil by
 201 4.9, boiler ash by 7.85 and sugarcane trash biochar by 8.35 (Table 2), thereby it increase
 202 availability and N uptake although N applied at a low rate. [21] reported NUE not only
 203 depends on the ability to efficiently take up the nutrient from the soil, but also on transport,
 204 storage, mobilization, usage within the plant and even on the environment. If a plant is grown
 205 at the condition of nutrient deficiency stress, it will efficiently take up the nutrient from the
 206 soil. However, the effectiveness of fertilizers in increasing crop yields and optimizing farmer
 207 profitability should not sacrificed for efficiency alone. There must be a balance optimal
 208 nutrient use efficiency and optimal crop productivity.

209

210 **3.3 Effect of Ammonium Sulfate and Its Substitute Fertilizer and Soil Amendment on** 211 **Yield of Sugarcane.**

212

213

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

230

231

232

233

234

235

236

237

238

239

240

241

242

243

The T4 treatment using the mixture of 223 kg urea+ 522 kg gypsum per ha equivalent to 100 kg N/ha and 120 kg S/ha (Fig. 2A) and application of biochar had the highest cane yield (Fig. 2B) with the average increase of the T4 treatment and biochar application by 250 % and 95 %, respectively compared to control.




Fig 2. Effect of AS and its substitute fertilizer (A) (LSD=0.36) and soil amendments (B) (LSD=0.14) on cane yield at seven months of plant age.

The same results was found on the variables of fresh and dry weight total biomass, which the T4 treatment had the highest fresh and dry weight of total biomass, whereas the treatment of soil amendments showed that the application biochar had the highest of fresh and dry weight of total biomass but not significantly different with the application of boiler ash (Fig.3). Nitrogen is the primary nutrient limiting sugarcane production. It greatly determines the cane yield level achieved as this nutrient can affect tiller formation and stem growth [22]. However, sugarcane response to N fertilization was affected by soil condition such as soil moisture [22]. and soil pH [23]. Application of biochar can improve soil properties such as water holding capacity, soil pH, base cations and CEC [13, 14, 15]. The soil improvement can increase plant growth and yield [16, 17, 15].

244

245

246

247

248

249


250

251

252

253

254



255 Fig.3. Effect of AS and its substitute fertilizer (A+C) (LSD=0.43 and 0.1) and soil
256 amendments (B+D) (LSD= 0.39 and 0.1) on fresh weight and dry weight of total
257 biomass at seven months of plant age.
258

259 4. CONCLUSION

260 Application of biochar and boiler ash increased N uptake and N use efficiency in the
261 application of urea+gypsum mixture as AS substitute fertilizer. This increase had a positive
262 impact on the sugarcane yield when compared with the control and use of AS fertilizer. The
263 highest nitrogen use efficiency and yield improvement were found at the treatments using
264 urea+gypsum mixture at the lowest rate by 223 kg urea + 522 kg gypsum equivalent to 100
265 kg N and 120 kg S per ha with the addition of biochar or boiler ash. This result suggested
266 that the addition of biochar and boiler ash as organic soil amendment in sugarcane
267 cultivation is recommended to optimize the use of AS substitute fertilizer.

268 REFERENCES

- 269
- 270 1. Hartemink AE. Acidification and pH buffering capacity of Alluvial soils under
271 sugarcane. *Experimental Agriculture*. 1998; 34(2): 231-243.
 - 272 2. Summer ME. Opportunities for amelioration of soil physical and chemical constraints
273 under intensive cropping. In: Keating BA, Wilson JR. (eds). *Intensive Sugarcane
274 Production – Meeting the Challenges Beyond 2000*. CAB International, Wallingford,
275 UK.1997.
 - 276 3. Nurhidayati N, Basit A, Sunawan. Substitution of Ammonium sulphate fertilizer on
277 upland sugarcane cultivation and its effects on plant growth, nutrient content and soil
278 chemical properties. *Agrivita*. 2013a;35 (1) : 36-43.
 - 279 4. Vallis I, Catchpoole VR, Hughes RM, Myers RJK, Ridge KR, Weir KL. Recovery in
280 plant and soils of ¹⁵N applied as subsurface bands of urea to sugarcane. *Australian
281 Journal of Agricultural Research*. 1996; 47 (3): 355-370.
 - 282 5. Muchovej RM, Newman PR. Nitrogen fertilization of sugarcane on a sandy soil : II. Soil
283 and Groundwater analyses. *Journal American Society Sugar Cane Technologists*.
284 2004; 24: 225-240.
 - 285 6. Singh KP, Suman A, Singh PN, Srivastava TK. Improving quality of sugarcane
286 growing soils by organic amendments under subtropical climatic conditions of India.
287 *Biology and Fertility of Soils*.2007; 44(2): 367-376.
 - 288 7. Bokhtiar SM, Sakurai K. Effects of Integrated Nutrient Management on Plant Crop and
289 Successive First and Second Ratoon Crops of Sugarcane in Bangladesh. *Journal of
290 Plant Nutrition*. 2007; 32(4): 135–147.
 - 291 8. Nurhidayati N, Basit A, Sunawan. Residual effect of Ammonium sulfate substitution on
292 soil properties and productivity of plant and ratoon cane. *Agricultural Science*. 2013b;
293 1(3) : 1-12.
 - 294 9. Dee BM, Haynes RJ, Meyer JH. Sugar mill wastes can be important soil amendments.
295 *Proc.A.Afr Sug Technol. Ass*. 2002; 76: 51-60.
 - 296 10. Nurhidayati. Soil quality indicators for sustainable soil management of sugarcane land.
297 Ph.D Dissertation, Dept. Soil Sci. Univ. Brawijaya, Malang, East Java. Indonesia.
298 2012.
 - 299 11. Glaser B, Lehmann J, Zech W. Ameliorating physical and chemical properties of highly
300 wethered soils in the tropics with charcoal- a review. *Biology and fertility of Soils*.
301 2002; 35: 219-230.

- 302 12. Lehmann J, da Silva Jr. JP, Steiner C, Nehls T, Zech W, Glaser B. Nutrient availability
303 and leaching in archaeological Anthrosol and Ferralsol of the Central Amazon basin:
304 fertilizer, manure, and charcoal amendments. *Plant and Soil*. 2003;249: 343-357.
- 305 13. Lehmann J, Rondon M. Biochar soil management on highly weathered soils in the
306 humid tropics. In : N.Uphoff *et al.* (eds). *Biological approaches to sustainable soil*
307 *systems*. Florida : CRC Press, Taylor and Francis Group. 2006.
- 308 14. Chan KY, van Zwieten BL, Meszaros I, Downie D, Joseph S. Agronomic values of
309 green waste biochars as a soil amendments. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*.
310 2007;45(4): 629–736.
- 311 15. Masulili A, Utomo WH, Syekhfani MS. Rice Husk Biochar for Rice Based Cropping
312 System in Acid Soil 1. The Characteristics of Rice Husk Biochar and Its Influence on
313 the Properties of Acid Sulfate Soils and Rice Growth in West Kalimantan, Indonesia.
314 *Agricultural Science*. 2010; 2(1) :39-47.
- 315 16. Yamato M, Okimori Y, Wibowo IF, Anshori S, Ogawa M. Effects of the application of
316 charred bark of *Acacia mangium* on the yield of maize, cowpea and peanut, and soil
317 chemical properties in South Sumatra, Indonesia. *Journal Soil Science and Plant*
318 *Nutrition*. 2006; 52: 489–495.
- 319 17. Chan KY, van Zwieten BL, Meszaros I, Downie D, Joseph S. Using poultry litter
320 biochars as soil amendments. *Australian Journal of Soil Research*. 2008;46: 437–444.
- 321 18. Okalebo JR, Gathua KW, Woomer PL. *Laboratory Methods and Soil and Plant*
322 *Analysis : A Working Manual*. 2nd edition. TSBF-CIAT.SSSEA. 2002.
- 323 19. Mosier, AR, Syers JK, Freney JR. *Agriculture and the Nitrogen Cycle. Assessing the*
324 *Impacts of Fertilizer Use on Food Production and the Environment*. Scope-65. Island
325 Press, London. 2004.
- 326 20. Roberts TL. Improving Nutrient Use Efficiency. *Turk J Agric For* .2008;32:177-182.
- 327 21. North KA, Ehling B, Koprivova A, Rennenberg H, Kopriva S. Natural variation in
328 *Arabidopsis* adaptation to growth at low nitrogen conditions. *Plant Physiol. Biochem*.
329 2009;47: 912-918.
- 330 22. Thomas JR, Scott AW, Wiedenfeld RP. Fertilizer requirement of sugarcane in Texas.
331 *J.Am.Soc. Sugar Cane Technol*. 1985; 4:62-72.
- 332 23. Wiedenfeld, RP. Effects of irrigation and fertizer application on sugarcane yield and
333 quality. *Field Crops Res*. 1995; 43:101-108.
- 334 24. Havlin JL, Beaton JD, Tisdale AL, Nelson WL. *Soil Fertility and Fertilizers*. 7th edition.
335 Pearson Prentice Hall. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey. 2005.
- 336
- 337