# Effect of Different Tillage Depths and Practices on Growth and Productivity of Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.)

Dr. Mona Barakat<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Mohamad Ganem<sup>2</sup>, Dr. Sawsan Soliman<sup>3</sup>, Shaza Asaad<sup>4\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Professor - Department of Soil and Water Sciences - Faculty of Agriculture – Tishreen University - Lattakia –

Syria

<sup>2</sup>Professor - Department of Agricultural Mechanization - Faculty of Technical Engineering - Tartous University - Syria.

<sup>3</sup>Professor - Department of Horticulture - Faculty of Agriculture - Tishreen University -Lattakia – Syria

<sup>4</sup>P.hD Student - Department of Soil and Water Science - Faculty of Agriculture -Tishreen University - Lattakia – Syria.

### ABSTRACT

The effect of different tillage practices with different plowing depth on some potato(Solanum tuberosum L.), growth, yield and quality parameters such as (leaf area, number of stems /plant, plant height /cm ) and (tuber size, tuber numbers/ plant, and total productivity, dry matter and starch content), Were studied in aclay soil of privet field at Yahmoor- Tartous city, Syria, during (2018 and 2019).

Randomized split-plot Design with three replicates were used. Three different tillage practices were effectuated as a main plot {(No tillage (NT) as control, Inversion tillage with Moldboard plow (Mp), Non-inversion tillage with Chisel plow(Cp )}, then these main plots except control were splited into three blocks of tillage depths  $(D_1(0-10) \text{ cm}, D_2 (10-10))$ 15) cm,  $D_3(15-25 \text{ cm})$ . The results showed that All tillage practices increased significantly growth parameters (stems number, leaf area and plant height), yield parameters(tuber numbers, big and medium tubers, total productivity ton/ha), and tuber quality ( tuber content of dry matter and starch) compared to the control (NT). Inversion tillage with Moldboard plow (MP) increased significantly stems number, leaf area, tubers number, big and medium tubers, total productivity (ton/ha), percentage of starch and dry matter), by (1.02 stems /plant, 1290.99 cm<sup>2</sup> / plant, 0.94 tuber / plant, 107.23 g/ plant, 39.67 g/ plant, 4.763 ton /ha, 0.7 % and 0.94 %) respectively, compared to the Chisel plow (Cp). Deep tillage  $D_3$  (15-25 cm) increased significantly number of stems, plant height (3.80 stems /plant, 51.63 cm) and gave the highest leaf area (9410.305  $cm^2$  / plant) compared to other depths.  $D_3$  (15-25cm) as well increased significantly big and medium tubers with (827.39, 192.14 g/plant) respectively and gave the best productivity (40.15 ton/ha) compared other depths. Tubers content of dry matter and starch ( 15.44, 19.51 %) respectively were improved as well compared to other tillage depths. The interaction

between tillage type and depth  $(MpxD_3)$  improved all growth, yield and quality parameters.

**Keyword**: *Mold board plow, Chisel plow, leaf area, potato tuber, Tillage.* 

### I. INTRODUCTION

Potato (*Solanum tuberosum* L.) is one of the most important vegetable crops over the world [1]. It takes the fourth position after wheat, rice and corn ([2], [3]). Potato is cultivated in 140 countries over the world, 100 of them are located in the tropical and subtropical zones [4], with 327 million tons/ha [5]. Potato tuber has high content of dry mater and considered as essential source of starch, protein, vitamins, simple sugars and minerals ([6], [7]).

Potato is a very sensitive to environmental conditions, such as soil properties, because of its has fine, branching root system which damage in compact soils. Under good soil conditions, potato roots grow about1/2 inches per day during the first three weeks after germination [8]. Potato requires loose, deep, aerated and moist soil to product a high yield and marketable tubers. So soil tillage is required prior to potato seeding [9].

Soil tillage is among the most important factors affecting soil physical and mechanical properties [10]. It is defined as mechanical manipulation by creating pressure of the hull plow to provide a suitable germination conditions and provides a good environment for growing roots [11]. The multiplicity of soil types and different climatic conditions have led to use different types of tillage practices, such as (no tillage, inversion tillage, non-inversion tillage) [12]. Which have different effects on soil fertility, therefore the correct tillage equipment suitable to soil type will be choised ([13], [14], [15]).

Inversion tillage with Mold board plow is one of the most important practices, which controls weeds, buries fertilizers and plant residues [16]. Noninversion tillage with Chisel plow is used in dry and solid soils to reverse soil without inversion, and keeps plant residues in the soil and prevent their erosion by water or wind [17].

To produce potato tubers with a high quality, soil must be well prepared prior seeding. Re. [18] indicated that tillage implement had significant effect on potato yield and the highest yield (37.19 t/ha) was obtained when plowing with moldboard plow was used, compared with chisel plow (32.95 t/ha). Similar observation was noticed by re.[19].

Re. [20] observed with using four tillage depths (zero tillage, 10, 20, 30 and 40cm) in potato culture that tilled soil significantly increased crop growth and yield compared to untilled soil. And plants growing in 40cm tillage depth produced the highest fresh potato tuber yield  $(14.5 \text{ tha}^{-1})$ .

Re. [21] reported that all tillage methods reduced soil bulk density and penetration resistance depending on the depth of tillage. In other studies, water infiltration was greater in tilled soil than in untilled soil ([22], [21]). Re. [19] reported that Moald board plow significantly affected soil properties and it decreased bulk density, increased mean weight diameter and hydraulic conductivity by (0.04 g/cm<sup>3</sup>, 0.04 cm/hour, 0.05mm) respectively compared to Chisel plow .

Re. [23] reported that deep tillage had the greatest effect on soil bulk density, organic carbon, infiltration rate, and crop yield compared to semi deep and shallow tillage systems. They also concluded that soil bulk density, infiltration rate, and crop yield improved with increasing the plowing depth.

Re. [24] reported that deep tillage reduced penetration resistance as a result of the dismantling of the soil, and increased pores compared to shallow tillage. As well as, bulk density has also decreased by increasing the depth of tillage as a result of increased micro pores. Similar observation were made by re.[23] who noted that soil bulk density, infiltration rate, and crop yield improved with increasing plowing depth.

This study consequently performed to evaluate the effect of different tillage practices with different plowing depth on some growth parameters of potato such as (leaf area, number of stems /plant, plant height/cm), yield parameters such as ( tuber size, tuber numbers / plant, and total productivity) and tuber quality parameters such as (dry weight and starch content), in a clay soil. And to determine as well the relationship between the plowing depth and tillage type and their effect on the studied parameters.

### **II. MATERIALS AND METHODS**

### A. Experimental site:

The experiment was carried out during 2018 and 2019 in a private field at Tartous Governorate, Syria. This region is characterized by a typical Mediterranean climate, with an average temperature ranging from 14.5 °C in January to 25.9 °C in June. The annual rainfall is 675.7 mm/year.

Soil samples were collected by soil sampling tool from the field at 0-25 cm before tilling and then analyzed in laboratory of Soil Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Tishreen University, Syria. To determinate some physical and chemical soil properties. The Soil is classified as clay soil, and Soil properties are presented in Table (1).

| Parameters                           | Value   | Rating          |
|--------------------------------------|---------|-----------------|
| Sand(%)                              | 38.11   | -               |
| Silt(%)                              | 18.33   | -               |
| Clay(%)                              | 45.56   | -               |
| Textural class                       | Clay    | -               |
| pH                                   | 7.546   | Little Alkaline |
| EC ds/m                              | 0.736   | Low salinity    |
| Organic Matter%                      | 1.95    | low             |
| CEC                                  | 43.20   | high            |
| Bulk density(g/cm <sup>3</sup> )     | 1.42    | high            |
| Particle density(g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) | 2.60    | medium          |
| Total Porosity(%)                    | 45.38   | high            |
| Available P ppm                      | 30.073  | high            |
| Available K ppm                      | 467.871 | high            |
| Total N %                            | 0.193   | medium          |

 Table(1): Some physical - chemical soil properties before tilling

## **B.** Treatments and Experimental Design Used:

The field was divided into different plots. With 14.7 m<sup>2</sup>(7 m  $\times$  2.1m) size, and 2 m separating plots, and 5 m between replicates. Randomized split- plot design with three replicates was used . Three

different practices tillage were used as a main plot {(No tillage (NT) as control, Inversion tillage with Moldboard plow (MP), Non-inversion tillage with Chisel plow (Cp)}, then these main plots except control plot were splited into three blocks of tillage depths ( $D_1$  (0-10) cm ,  $D_2$  (10-15) cm,  $D_3$  (15-25) cm. The treatments were as follows:

1-NT: without tillage (control).

2-MpD<sub>1</sub>: Inversion tillage with Moldboard plow at 10 cm depth.

 $3\text{-MpD}_2$ : Inversion tillage with Moldboard plow at 15 cm

4-MpD<sub>3</sub>: Inversion tillage with Moldboard plow at 25 cm  $\,$ 

5-CpD<sub>1</sub>: Non-inversion tillage with Chisel plow at a depth of 10 cm.

6 -CpD<sub>2</sub>: Non-inversion tillage with Chisel plow at a depth of 15 cm .

7 -CpD<sub>3</sub>: Non-inversion tillage with Chisel plow at a depth of 25 cm .

In no tillage treatment, rows were made without tilling the soil,. The moldboard Plow used for inversion tillage, consisted of 3 shares of 30 cm Length, and 31 cm distance between shares. Plow width was 90 cm and maximum plowing depth was 30 cm. The chisel plow used for non-inversion tillage consisted of 5 shares, and 36 cm as distance between two shares. Plow width was 170 cm and maximum plowing depth was 25 cm. **New Holland tt56** type (Italian-origin) was used for all plows operation.

### C. Potato Planting:

Potato (Spunta variety) seed tubers of 35/55 mm were used (Holland- origin) and planted in 11 February at 8-10 cm depth for both cultivating seasons (2018 and 2019).

Plots were divided into three rows, with 70 cm distance between rows, and 35 cm between tubers. Therefore the experimental plot contained 60 plants.

Fertilizers were implicated as  $(0.026, 0.026 \text{ and } 0.024 \text{ kg/m}^2$  for Urea 46%, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> 46% and, K<sub>2</sub>SO<sub>4</sub>50% respectively) according to re. [25] and the plants were frequently irrigated by surface system every 15 days. DITHANE and RIDOMIL (250 g /100 L) and SENCOR (700 g/ ha) were used against Rodent worms, mildew and weed control respectively.

### D. Potato harvest:

Potato plants were detached and tubers were collected at 30 May after 100 days of planting.

### E. Growth parameter:

Five plants were randomly selected for growth parameters measurement. The mean of plant height /cm, number of stems/plant and leaf area were calculated [26].

Yield parameter were effectuated using ten plants from each treatment, Mean tuber numbers / plant, tuber size, total productivity, tuber dry weight and tuber starch were measured.

**Tuber size**: According to re.[27], tubers of 10 plants per replicates were graded and divided by weight

into three categories: 1) Small tubers <35g); 2), medium tubers (35 to 80 g), 3) large tubers (> 80 g). **Tuber dry matter (%)**: Determined weight of fresh

tuber, weighted and dried at  $(105 \text{ C}^{\circ})$  until stabilization, then calculated as:

## Dry matter %= (weight of dry tuber / weight of wet tuber )\*100

Starch tuber content: was measured according to re. [28] method.

### F. Data Analysis:

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was performed by using COSTAT [29]. Least significance difference (LSD) was used to differential means at the 5% level.

## **III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

## A. Effect of tillage practices and depths tillage on growth parameters of potato:

## Effect of tillage practices and depths on leaf area, number of stems and plant height:

The results presented in table (2) showed, that leaf area, number of stems / plant and plant height increased significantly with type of tillage compared to the control (NT). Mold board plow treatment (Mp) increased significantly leaf area, number of stems / plant by (16.6, 39.87%) respectively, compared to Chisel plow, while no significant difference was recorded between the two types of tillage for plant height. The increase in plant parameters using different tillage types, is due to breaking compaction layer and increase the availability of water and mineral nutrients, as well as improvement soil physical properties (as decrease soil bulk density and increase porosity). Improving soil physical properties lead to a good development of root and shoot system, and as consequence, increase photosynthesis and plant growth ([30], [19]).

The results of table (2) showed that leaf area, number of stems/ plant and plant height increased with the depth of tillage compared to no-tillage treatment. The number of stems and plant height were highest ( 3.80 /plant, 51.63 cm) when Deep tillage D<sub>3</sub> were used compared with other depths. As well as, leaf area (9410.31) cm<sup>2</sup>/plant was significantly higher when depth  $D_3$  was used. Deep tillage play an important role in dismantling the soil layers, and then increase the exploitation of water and mineral nutrients by plants, leading to increase root size, and facilitate the spread of root system which improve plant growth and lead to increase leaf area and stems number. These results are agree with ([31], [32]), who found that the depth of tillage improve the physical properties of soil and thus plant growth rate and productivity.

| Treatments               | growth parameters     |                    |                  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Tillage treatments       | leaf area (cm²/plant) | number stems/plant | plant height(cm) |  |  |  |  |
| NT                       | 5247.714 c            | 2c                 | 39.23c           |  |  |  |  |
| Мр                       | 9062.170a             | 3.55a              | 51.25a           |  |  |  |  |
| Ср                       | 7771.178b             | 2.538b             | 45.94ab          |  |  |  |  |
| LSD5%                    | 337.841               | 0.314              | 5.483            |  |  |  |  |
| D0                       | 5247.714c             | 2 d                | 39.233c          |  |  |  |  |
| $D_1(0-10)$ cm           | 7127.495b             | 2.424c             | 46.091b          |  |  |  |  |
| D <sub>2</sub> (10-15)cm | 8712.221a             | 2.912b             | 48.066b          |  |  |  |  |
| D <sub>3</sub> (15-25)cm | 9410.305a             | 3.80a              | 51.633a          |  |  |  |  |
| LSD5%                    | 891.294               | 0.309              | 3.005            |  |  |  |  |
| NT D0                    | 5247.713f             | 2f                 | 39.23c           |  |  |  |  |
| $MpD_1$                  | 7642.987d             | 2.731d             | 49.5a            |  |  |  |  |
| MpD <sub>2</sub>         | 9122.736b             | 3.458b             | 52.066a          |  |  |  |  |
| MpD <sub>3</sub>         | 10420.786a            | 4.466a             | 52.183a          |  |  |  |  |
| $CpD_1$                  | 6612.003e             | 2.116ef            | 42.683b          |  |  |  |  |
| CpD <sub>2</sub>         | 8301.707cd            | 2.366e             | 44.066b          |  |  |  |  |
| CpD <sub>3</sub>         | 8399.825c             | 3.133c             | 51.083a          |  |  |  |  |
| LSD5%                    | 704.430               | 0.277              | 3.397            |  |  |  |  |

 Table (2): Effect of tillage practices and depths on leaf area, number of stems and plant height average of two years 2018 and 2019).

**P>0.05**, Different letters indicated significant differences within columns.

Interaction between type and depth of tillage showed significant differences in plant high (cm), number of stems/plant and leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>/plant) compared with no tillage (table 2). Highest leaf area and stem numbers (10420.78 cm<sup>2</sup>/ plant, 4.46 stems/ plant) were recorded with (Mp x D<sub>3</sub>) interaction compared with other treatments. Plant height (52.183cm) recorded significant differences compared with (CpxD<sub>1</sub> and CpxD<sub>2</sub>), while there were no significant differences with other treatments.

## **B.**) Effect of tillage practices and depths tillage on yield parameters of potato:

## Effect of tillage practices and depths and their Interaction on (tuber size and their number

The results presented in Table (3) showed that using Mp tillage gave highest big and medium tubers with (791.095, 182.69 g/ plant) respectively, while this treatment resulted less small tubers (36.15g/plant) compared to the NT and Cp. The increase of big and medium tubers when using the Mold board tillage can be attributed to its role of mixing the surface layer that contain organic matter and nutrients compared to deeper soil layers, and Improve soil physical properties which lead to increase root system and increase nutrients and water absorption efficiency, this is reflected positively on shoot growth and plant photosynthesis and carbohydrate translocation toward the tubers. These results are in agree with ([33], [34]).

Concerning tillage depth, the results showed that  $D_3(15-25)$  cm increased significantly big and medium tubers with (827.39, 192.14 g/ plant) respectively. While small tubers were less (32.55 g/plant) compared to  $D_0$ . This result could be attributed to the fact that deep tillage improve soil property like soil aeration and porosity, which is favorable to potato growth. this is in agree with re.[35] who showed that deep tillage (30 cm) gave the greatest weight of big tubers.

| Table (3): Effect o | f tillage practio | ces and depths | tillage on Tuber gradien | t by weight and tuber <b>n</b> | umbers (average of two |
|---------------------|-------------------|----------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
|                     |                   |                | years 2018 and 2019).    |                                |                        |
|                     |                   |                |                          |                                |                        |

|                       | tuber       |                         | Tuber gradation            |          |                            |         |                            |
|-----------------------|-------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|----------|----------------------------|---------|----------------------------|
| Treatments            | numbers     | Big tubers (weight>80g) |                            |          | um tubers<br>r weight <80g |         | all tubers<br>ight<35g)    |
| Tillage<br>treatments | Tuber/plant | g/plant                 | % of plant<br>productivity | g/plant  | % of plant<br>productivity | g/plant | % of plant<br>productivity |
| NT                    | 5.41c       | 301.116c                | 45.85b                     | 130.31c  | 19.84a                     | 225.43a | 34.31a                     |
| Мр                    | 7.365a      | 791.095a                | 78.35a                     | 182.69a  | 18.031b                    | 36.158c | 3. 611c                    |
| Ср                    | 6.436b      | 683.873b                | 75.183a                    | 143.024b | 15.745c                    | 80.26b  | 9.07b                      |

| LSD5%                    | 0.268    | 96.099   | 4.402   | 9.448    | 1.091    | 38.274  | 4.546  |
|--------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|----------|---------|--------|
| Tillage depths           | 5        |          |         |          |          |         |        |
| D0                       | 5.41b    | 301.116c | 45.85c  | 130.31c  | 19.84a   | 225.43a | 34.31a |
| D <sub>1</sub> (0-10)cm  | 5.952b   | 668.036b | 73.32b  | 135.765c | 14.92c   | 104.34b | 11.75b |
| D <sub>2</sub> (10-15)cm | 7.152a   | 717.023b | 78.412a | 160.68b  | 17.46b   | 37.73c  | 4.126c |
| D <sub>3</sub> (15-25)cm | 7.60a    | 827.393a | 78.578a | 192.14a  | 18.275ab | 32.55c  | 3.143c |
| LSD5%                    | 0.66     | 89.498   | 4.402   | 19.036   | 2.386    | 33.976  | 3.480  |
| Interaction tr           | eatments |          |         | ·        |          |         | -      |
| $NTD_0$                  | 5.41d    | 301.116d | 45.85c  | 130.31de | 19.843a  | 225.43a | 34.31a |
| $MpD_1$                  | 6.143c   | 756.603b | 80.233a | 144.69d  | 15.33c   | 42.056c | 4.43c  |
| MpD <sub>2</sub>         | 8.126a   | 726.61b  | 76.58a  | 188.92b  | 19.906a  | 33.373c | 3.513c |
| MpD <sub>3</sub>         | 7.826ab  | 890.073a | 78.256a | 214.486a | 18.85ab  | 33.046c | 2.88c  |
| CpD <sub>1</sub>         | 5.76cd   | 579.47c  | 66.406b | 126.84e  | 14.52c   | 166.62b | 19.07b |
| CpD <sub>2</sub>         | 6.176c   | 707.436b | 80.243a | 132.44de | 15.016c  | 42.093c | 4.74c  |
| CpD <sub>3</sub>         | 7.37b    | 764.713b | 78.9a   | 169.793c | 17.69b   | 32.06c  | 3.40c  |
| LSD5%                    | 0.524    | 81.629   | 4.211   | 15.29    | 1.906    | 31.428  | 3.384  |

P>0.05 Different letters indicated significant difference within columns.

The interaction between type and depth of tillage showed an increase of big and medium tubers weight (890.07- 214.49 g/ plant) respectively for MpD<sub>3</sub>, compared to other treatments. While small tubers were decreased and weighted (33.04g/ plant) compared to NTD<sub>0</sub>. Concerning Cp tillage, CpD<sub>3</sub> gave higher big and medium tubers (764.71- 169.79 g/plant) compared to the control (301.11 and 130.31 g/plant) respectively. The results of the table (3) showed as well a significant increase in the number of tubers according to tillage practices compared with no tillage. Mold board plow(Mp) and chisel plow tillage (Cp), increased significantly tubers numbers (7.36- 6.43 tuber/plant) Respectively compared to the control (5.41 tuber/plant). Mold board plow (Mp) tillage gave better tuber numbers than chisel plow (7.36 and 6.43 Tuber/plant). The increase in tuber numbers/ plant is due to the increase in the stems number, which reached the highest value when using the Mold board plow (Mp), ([36], [37]).

Tillage depths played an important role in influencing tuber numbers formed by the plant, tuber

numbers increased according to tillage depth,  $D_3$  achieved the highest value (7.60 tuber/plant) compared to  $D_1$  (5.95 tuber/plant), these results are in agree with re.[38] who confirmed that there was a significant interaction between the depth of tillage and the number of tubers released in the soil and plant production.

Interaction between  $(MpxD_2)$  gave the highest number of tubers / plant (8.216) compared to NTD0. CpD<sub>3</sub> increased as well tuber numbers (7.37) compared to NTD<sub>0</sub> and CpD<sub>1</sub> and CpD<sub>2</sub>.

## Effect of tillage practices and depths on potato yield:

Potato yield increased significantly when Mold board plow tillage was used. MP and Cp gave higher tuber yield (39.57 and 34.81 ton/ha) respectively (table 4). Marketable yield showed the same results. These results are due to the increase of tuber numbers and weight. the results agreed with re.[39] who confirmed that plant productivity increased according to tillage type.

| Treatments               | Yield     |                   | Marke                | etingYield |                            |
|--------------------------|-----------|-------------------|----------------------|------------|----------------------------|
| Tillage<br>treatments    | g/plant   | Kg/m <sup>2</sup> | ton.ha <sup>-1</sup> | g/plant    | % of plant<br>productivity |
| NT                       | 656.85c   | 2.496c            | 24.98c               | 481.99c    | 73.38c                     |
| Мр                       | 1009.951a | 3.958a            | 39.568a              | 974.216a   | 96.388a                    |
| Ср                       | 907.156b  | 3.48b             | 34.805b              | 843.57b    | 92.828b                    |
| LSD5%                    | 77.425    | 0.15              | 1.54                 | 98.588     | 2.566                      |
| Tillage depths           |           |                   |                      |            |                            |
| D0                       | 656.85c   | 2.496c            | 24.98c               | 481.99c    | 73.388d                    |
| D <sub>1</sub> (0-10)cm  | 908.142b  | 3.54b             | 35.395b              | 829.035b   | 91.155c                    |
| D <sub>2</sub> (10-15)cm | 915.43b   | 3.603b            | 36.02b               | 874.93b    | 95.54b                     |
| D <sub>3</sub> (15-25)cm | 1052.085a | 4.015a            | 40.146a              | 1022.72a   | 97.131a                    |
| LSD5%                    | 97.567    | 0.107             | 1.091                | 93.37      | 1.823                      |

Table (4): Effect of tillage practices and depths on the potato yield (average of two years 2018 and 2019).

| LSD5%              | 83.042    | 0.10   | 0.943   | 84.763    | 1.926    |
|--------------------|-----------|--------|---------|-----------|----------|
| CpD <sub>3</sub>   | 966.567b  | 3.61c  | 36.1c   | 934.506b  | 96.6ab   |
| $CpD_2$            | 881.96c   | 3.396d | 33.98d  | 833.456cd | 94.503c  |
| $CpD_1$            | 872.933c  | 3.43d  | 34.34d  | 762.76d   | 87.383d  |
| $MpD_3$            | 1137.603a | 4.42a  | 44.193a | 1110.936a | 97.663a  |
| $MpD_2$            | 948.9bc   | 3.81b  | 38.06b  | 916.403bc | 96.576ab |
| $MpD_1$            | 943.35bc  | 3.646c | 36.453c | 895.31bc  | 94.926bc |
| NT D0              | 656.85d   | 2.496e | 24.98e  | 481.99e   | 73.38e   |
| Interaction treatm | nents     |        |         |           |          |

**P>0.05** Different letters indicated significant difference within columns.

Soil physical properties change with tillage type, this is in agree with ([18], [19]), who indicated that Mold board plow treatment (Mp) gave the highest tuber productivity compared to other tillage practices, because of its role in establishing the suitable environment for root growth and nutrient absorption, which is reflected positively on shoot growth, and increased leaf area which eventually produce large amounts of carbohydrates trans located and stored in potato tubers, and then increased productivity.

Productivity of potato tubers increased significantly as well according to tillage depth.  $D_3$ depth gave the best productivity (40.15 ton/ha) compared to  $D_0$  (24.98 ton/ha),  $D_1$  (35.39ton/ha) and  $D_2$  (36.02 ton/ha). The increase in tuber yield using the deepest tillage, is due to dismantling the soil and improving its physical properties, which induces better root growth and improves photosynthesis and carbohydrate production and accumulation in tubers. These results agreed with re.[38] who showed a significant interaction between the tillage depth and the number of tubers liberated at the soil and plant productivity. Marketing tuber yield showed the same results as total vield.

The interaction between  $(MpxD_3)$  gave the highest significant yield of potato tubers(44.19 ton/ha) compared to NTD0 (24.98 ton/ha), MpD<sub>1</sub> (36.45 ton/ha) and MpD<sub>2</sub> (38.06 ton/ha). Concerning Cp tillage, the results showed that  $(CpxD_3)$  gave the best yield of potato (36.1 ton/ha) compared to NTD<sub>0</sub> (24.98 ton/ha), CpD<sub>1</sub> and CpD<sub>2</sub>(34.34 and 33.98 ton/ha) respectively. Marketing yield showed the same results as total yield.

## Effect of tillage practices and depths on (tuber content of dry matter and starch):

Tubers content of dry matter and starch increased significantly with type of tillage compared to the control (NT).Mp tillage increased tubers content of dry matter and starch (18.29, 14.49%) respectively, compared to the control(16.08- 12.28%). Cp tillage increased as well dry matter and starch compared to the control(17.35, 13.49%), but this increase was less than Mp tillage.

Tillage depth  $D_3$  (15-25 cm) increased significantly tubers content of dry matter and starch by (19.51, 15.44 %) respectively compared to other tillage depths. Interaction between type and depth of tillage (MpxD<sub>3</sub> -CpxD<sub>3</sub>) improved significantly tubers content of dry matter and starch (19.656-15.73% and 19.35 - 15.16% )respectively, compared to the control and other interaction treatments. The high content of tuber dry matter in the Mp tillage may be attributed to the amelioration of soil properties which cause better root growth, that reflect on the leaf area development, which allowed the plant to receive most of solar radiation and improve organic matter translocation from green shoot to tubers. Generally, starch content is related to dry matter, so, the amelioration in dry matter percentage will increase starch percentage. ([40], [41]).

These results are in agree with [18], who indicated that increasing tillage depth to40 cm depth improve the physical soil properties, which positively affect crop yields and quality.

| Treatments              | dury motton 0/ | Starch%   |  |  |
|-------------------------|----------------|-----------|--|--|
| Tillage treatments      | dry matter%    | Starch 76 |  |  |
| NT                      | 16.068c        | 12.283c   |  |  |
| Мр                      | 18.29a         | 14.494a   |  |  |
| Ср                      | 17.346b        | 13.493b   |  |  |
| LSD5%                   | 0.526          | 0.443     |  |  |
| Tillage depths          | · · ·          |           |  |  |
| D0                      | 16.068c        | 12.283c   |  |  |
| D <sub>1</sub> (0-10)cm | 16.83b         | 13.451b   |  |  |

 Table (5): Effect of tillage practices and depths in the tuber content of dry matter and starch% (average of two years 2018 and 2019).

| LSD5%                    | 0.66    | 0.473    |
|--------------------------|---------|----------|
| CpD <sub>3</sub>         | 19.358a | 15.156b  |
| CpD <sub>2</sub>         | 16.264d | 12.806e  |
| CpD <sub>1</sub>         | 16.415d | 12.516ef |
| MpD <sub>3</sub>         | 19.656a | 15.73a   |
| MpD <sub>2</sub>         | 17.969b | 13.366d  |
| $MpD_1$                  | 17.244c | 14.386c  |
| NT D0                    | 16.068d | 12.283f  |
| Interaction treatments   |         |          |
| LSD5%                    | 0.808   | 0.556    |
| D <sub>3</sub> (15-25)cm | 19.507a | 15.44a   |
| $D_2(10-15)$ cm          | 17.117b | 13.086b  |

**P>0.05** Different letters indicated significant difference within columns

### **IV. CONCLUSIONS**

- 1- Tillage type improved growth and yield parameters such as (stems number, leaf area, plant height) and total and marketable yield. Mold board plow was better in increasing these parameters.
- 2- A positive effect of D<sub>3</sub> was recorded in Shoot growth and yield parameters.
- 3- Potato tuber quality (dry matter and starch) were improved by using Deep mold board tillage compared to Chisel plow.
- 4- The interaction between (MpxD<sub>3</sub>) gave the highest leaf area, stem numbers, Plant height and potato tubers yield, and ameliorate tuber quality like dry matter and starch compared to other interactions.

#### Recommendations

- 1- It is recommended to use Mold board plow at (25) cm depth, when preparing thesoil for potato planting, to have suitable soil for potato growth and development. Because, this plow improve water and nutrient exploitation.
- 2- Advancing this research by using other types of plows and other economic crops.

#### REFERENCE

- Fabeiro, C. M. D. S. O. F., de Santa Olalla, F. M., & De Juan, J. A. (2001). Yield and size of deficit irrigated potatoes. Agricultural Water Management, 48(3), 255-266.
- [2] Kandil, A. A., Attia, A. N., Badawi, M. A., Sharief, A. E., &Abido, W. A. H. (2011). Effect of water stress and fertilization with inorganic nitrogen and organic chicken manure on yield and yield components of potato. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 5(9), 997-1005.
- [3] Karam, F., Massaad, R., Skaf, S., Breidy, J., &Rouphael, Y. (2011). Potato response to potassium application rates and timing under semi-arid conditions. Advances in Horticultural Science, 265-268.
- Beukema, H. P., & van der Zaag, D. E. (1990). Introduction to potato production (No. 633.491 B4). Wageningen: Pudoc.
- [5] FAO. FAO statistics series. Agriculture, Rome; 2006.

- [6] Banjare, S.; Sharma .G. and Verma,S.K. (2014).potato crop growth and yield response to different levels of Nitrogen under chhattisgarh plains Agro- climatic zone. Indian journal of science and technology, vol 7(10) :1504-1508.
- [7] FAO (2013). FAOSTAT Agriculture database http://faostat.fao.org/desktopdefault.spx.
- [8] Stalham,M. (2002).Potato crop growth, development and water use. Proc of the washingtone State Potato conference 41:95-101.
- [9] Balbach, F. W. and Boehn, H.,(1992). Preparations of the potato planter J. Article, 43(3), 144–145.
- [10] Mustafa, G., and Nihat,T. (2007). Effect of Tillage Implements and Operating Speeds on Soil Physical Properties and Wheat Emergence. Turk J Agric For. 31: 399-412.
- [11] Boydas, M, G. &Turgut, N. (2007). Effect of tillage implements and operating speeds on soil physical properties and wheat emergence. Turkish journal of agriculture and forestry, 31(6), 399-412.
- [12] Cooper, J., Baranski, M., Stewart, G., Nobel-de Lange, M., Bàrberi, P., Fließbach, A., & Crowley, O. (2016). Shallow non-inversion tillage in organic farming maintains crop yields and increases soil C stocks: a metaanalysis. Agronomy for Sustainable Development, 36(1), 22
- [13] Jassim, A.; Ali, R; Hameed, K.(2000). Effect of some Plows on soil physical properties and soybean production. Third Scientific Conference of Technical Teaching, Baghdad :30-51.
- [14] Licht, M.A.; AL-kaisi, M.(2005). Strip-tillage effect on seedbed soil temperature -and other soil physical properties. Soil & Tillage Research, 80 (1–2), PP 233-249.
- [15] Jabro, J.D.; StevenŠ,W.A.;Evans,R.G.; Iversen,W.M. Tillage effects on physical properties in two soils of the Northern Great Plains, Applied Engineering in Agriculture, 25 (3),2009, 377–382
- [16] Kepner,R.A.;Bainer,R; Barger,E.I. (2005).principles of farm machinery.3rdEd.Cbs publishers and distributors,pp 527.
- [17] Srivastava, A.K., and C.E. Goering and R.P. Rohrbach.(1993). Engineering Principles of Agricultural Machine. ASAE Textbook, p. 149-219.
- [18] Al-Hamed, S. A.;Wahby, M.F.; and Sayedahmed,A.A. (2016). Effect of three tillage implements on potato yield and water use efficiency.Am. J. Exp. Agric., 12(3): 1–6.
- [19] Ati ,A.S. ; Rawdhan,S.A.; and Dawod, S.S. (2015). Effect of Tillage System on Some Machinery and Soil Physical Properties, Growth and Yield of Potato (SolanumTuberosum .L). IOSR Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science (IOSR-JAVS).Baghdad ,8(4): 63-65
- [20] Ogbodo , E.N (2005). Effect of depth of tillage on soil physical conditions, growth and yield of sweet potato in an

ultisol at Abakaliki, South Eastern Nigeria. JASR. 5(1):41-47.

- [21] Ferreras, L. A., Costa, J. L., Garcia, F. O., & Pecorari, C. (2000). Effect of no-tillage on some soil physical properties of a structural degraded PetrocalcicPaleudoll of the southern "Pampa" of Argentina. Soil and Tillage research, 54(1-2), 31-39.
- [22] Erbach, D. C; J. G. Benjamin, R. M. Cruse, M. A. Elamin, S. Mukhtur; and C. H. Choi (1992). Soil and corn response to tillage with para plow. Transactions of the ASAE ,35:1347–1354.
- [23] Alamouti, M. Y.; and Navabzadeh,M.(2007). Investigating of plowing depth effect on some soil physical properties. Pakistan Journal of Biological Sciences ,10: 4510 -4514.
- [24] Lowery ,B., Schuler, R. T.(1991). Temporal effects of subsoil compaction on soil strength and plant growth. Soil Science Society of American Journal.(55) :216-223.
- [25] AL-Ibrahim,A; AL-Taoel,KH. Techniques for growing and servicing potato crops. Directorate of Agricultural instruction, Department of media, Syria, No( 493), 2011, 3-44.(in Arabic).
- [26] Wallacce. O. H and Munger, H. M. (1965). Studies of the physiological basis for yield differences.1.growth analysis of six dry bean varieties crop sci,343-348.
- [27] Gataolina,G,G;Abdikof,M,C(2005).Practical Application of Crop, Moskwo. Kolos, 304p.
- [28] Badran.W; AL-Gareb. A; Ismail. F;Juma. M (1999) .Study and evaluate the chemical and manufacturing characteristics of potato varieties entering the country and their suitability for manufacture. Publications of the Agricultural Research Directorate, 88 pp(in Arabic).
- [29] CoStat (2008). CoStatversion6.400 Users guide, Statistics CoStat, Inst. Monterey, CA, U.S.A.
- [30] Qin, R., Stamp, P and Richner, W. (2005). Impact of tillage and banded starter fertilizer on maize root in the top 25 centimeters of the soil. Agronomy Journal: 97, p.674-683.
- [31] Saker,S.H; Grad,S.A; ABD ELAZIZ,M.A. Influence of tillage method, depth and timing of nitrogen fertilization on soil bulk density,moisture and peanut crop growth. Tishreen University Journal for Research and Scientific Studies - Biological Sciences Series, Syria, Vol. (35) No. (1) ,2013,111-125. (in Arabic)
- [32] Jabro, J. D., Stevens, W. B., Iversen, W. M., & Evans, R. G. (2010). Tillage depth effects on soil physical properties,

sugarbeet yield, and sugarbeet quality. Communications in soil science and plant analysis, 41(7), 908-916

- [33] Abrougui K., Chehaibi S., Dridi B. and Ben Mbarek K .(2013)Influence of Mechanical Planting Depth on the Agronomic Behavior of a Potato Crop Conducted on Two Soil Types. The Afri J of Plant Sci and Biotech, 7 (1): 75-78.
- [34] Chehaibi S., Hamdi W. and Abrougui K (2013). Effects of planting depth on agronomic performance of two potato varieties grown in the Sahel region of
- [35] Abrougui ,K.; Chehaibi, S; Boukhalfa H.H; Chenini, I; Douh B; and Nemri M.(2014). Soil Bulk Density and Potato Tuber Yield as Influenced by Tillage Systems and Working Depths. Greener Journal of Agricultural Sciences, Vol. 4 (2): 46-51.
- [36] Hossain, A. B. M. S., Hakim, M. A., &Onguso, J. M. (2003). Effect of manure and fertilizers on the growth and yield of potato. Pak. J. Biol. Sci, 6(14), 1243-1246.
- [37] Othman, J.(2010). The effect of Green manure lupinusalbus L.in growth and quality of potato. In early period under coastal region condation.Doctoral thesis,faculty of Agriculture ,Tishreen University 167PP.(in Arabic
- [38] Haider M., Wasim A., Chaudhary M., Pervez MA, Asad HU., Raza SA. and Ashraf I (2012). Impact of foliar application of seaweed extract on growth, yield and quality of potato (SolanumtuberosumL.). Soil &Env, 31(2): 157-162.
- [39] Alam,M.K ; Salahin,N; Rashid,M.H; Salam,M.A.(2013). Effects of different tillage practices and cropping patterns on soil physical properties and crop productivity. Journal of Tropical Resources and Sustainable Science. Malaysia.1(1),51-61.
- [40] Boustani, M., Campbell, N., Munger, S., Maidment, I., & Fox, C. (2008). Impact of anticholinergics on the aging brain: a review and practical application.
- [41] AL-Babili, R; Roukia, N; Boras,M.(2006).The Effect of Sweet Corn Intercropping on Autumn Potato in Terms of Productivity andLand Equivalent Ratio.Tishreen University Journal for Studies and Scientific Research -Biological Science Series Vol. (28) No (1) :175-184.(in Arabic)