Response of Soil Macro and Micro-Aggregates and Dispersion Ratio to 3 Solid Cattle Manure in Cultivated and Non- cultivated Soils

4 Mohamed Ahmed Mohamed Bassouny^{1*}

¹ D**5** partment of Soil and Water, Faculty of Agriculture, Moshtohor, Benha University, Egypt

* C6rresponding author:

E- mail: mohamed.bassuony@fagr.bu.edu.eg;bassouny_ma86@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Manure application is important factors for maintaining enance and improving ement of soil quality and aggregation. $A \underline{T}$ two field experiments were carried out on a silty clay loam soil during the two successive summer seasons of 2016 and 2017 -to examine the influence of solid2cattle manure (SCM) on soil macro and micro-aggregates (Large soil macro-aggregates >2 fram, small macro-aggregates 0.25-2 mm and soil micro-aggregates < 0.053- 0.25 mm) and 14 spersion ratio in cultivated and non- cultivated soil. The first was designed to study the effets of SCM on soil aggregation (non- cultivated soil), and the second was to study the effett6 of SCM and added to the growning potato on soil aggregation (cultivated soil). Four rates 7 of SCM were added to the soil before tilth: 0, 12, 24 and 36 Mg ha⁻¹. The SCM app**h** $\mathbf{8}$ ation significantly (P < 0.05) affected soil physical properties after 2 years application. iner a soil-Soil porosity, and saturated hydraulic conductivity increased, -while bulk denedoy_decreased bulk density due to increasing aggregation in the non-cultivated soil complared to the cultivated one. The aggregates large soil macro-aggregates, small macroaggregates and soil micro-aggregates significantly ($P \le 0.05$) increased by the application of SCMB The effect application of SCM decreased significantly the dispersion ratio. The SCM incr24sed significantly the structure coefficient in the non- cultivated compared to the cultized soil. The SCM has a major direct effect on soil macro and micro-aggregates under

pota26 production, particularly at high rates of SCM. The organic matter showed highly sign27/ficant positive correlations with macro and micro-aggregates and highly negative one with28/lispersion ratio. The strong positive correlation was between the number of tubers and disp29/sion ratio, as well as between potato yield and soil aggregation, which indicated that the orga00 c matter addition increased the potato yield and decreased the dispersion ratio. In con81/usion, the SCM improved/s soil aggregation and dispersion ratio in cultivated and non-cultibated soils with increase potato yield.

Key33Words: Macro-aggregates; Micro-aggregates; Dispersion ratio; Structure coefficient; Hydraulic conductivity; Bulk density; Solid cattle manure; Potato yield

1. INSTRODUCTION

The **36** pplication of animal manure to agricultural lands has been viewed as an excellent way strated by to recycle nutrients and organic matter that can support crop production and maintain or in **186** prove soil quality [1]. Generally, soil organic matter and biological activity increase, and **36** one soil physical properties improve following manure applications. Aggregation is perlate properties affected by organic matter additions because due to improving moies affected by organic matter additions because due to improving moies affected by organic matter additions because due to improving moies and nutrient dynamics, maintaining soil tilth-maintainence, and soil reducing erose and nutrient for animal manure into the soil alleviates the negative effects and improves soil aggregation.

-Sol46 cattle manure (SCM) is an excellent soil amendment capable of increasing soil quality. Mar46 studies have shown that balanced application of organic fertilizers can increase soil orgat7ic carbon and maintain soil productivity [3], either directly through supplying nutrients or 46 directly through modifying soil physical properties that can improve the root envi49 nument and stimulate plant growth [4]. Organic applications to soils increase organic mat66 contents of soils, which can bind soil particles together_sforming aggregates. This can imp**5**ave soil structure and favors increasing the downward flow of water into soils [5]. Org**5**aic-<u>The</u> application <u>also</u> increases soil porosity, pore size distribution and saturated hyd**5**aulic conductivity and reduces bulk density [6,7]. Overall, physical, chemical and, biol**5**gical properties of the soil could be improved by organic fertilization [8].

Soil5§tructure is defined as the size and arrangement of particles and pores in soils [9]._Good stru5€ure for plant growth on loams and clays can be defined in terms of the presence of pores for fb7e storage of water available to plants, pores for the transmission of water and air, and por€8 in which roots can grow [10]. A desirable range of pore sizes for a tilled layer occurs whe59most of the clay fraction is flocculated into micro-aggregates, defined as < 0.25 mm in diar60 ter, and secondly these micro-aggregates and other particles are bound together into mac60-aggregates > 0.25 mm in diameter [11].

Soil62ggregation is a key indicator of good soil quality since it increases water and nutrient retension, and offers suitable habitats for microbial activity[12]. Aggregations have been studied by Zhang and Peng [13] and Huang *et al.* [14] who stated that the internal microsstructure of aggregates can provide information regarding soil aggregation processes and 660 il quality. Water stable aggregates are major factors that influence soil productivity. Formization, size and stability of aggregates are affected by physical, chemical and environmental conditions [15, 16]- that are directly affected by organic matter application Pagina *et al.* [17] reported that organic manure improved soil structure.

Tubzoculous crops have a significant effect on soil aggregation and dispersion ratio, partizeularly in <u>potato cultivationssoils cultivated with potato</u>. Potato (*Solatium tuberosun* L.) is on the major world food crops. <u>Potato It</u> is an economical food and it<u>that</u> provides a sounce of low cost energy to the human diet. Organic manures like cattle manure can play an impost and impost of productivity. These sources can reduce the deficiency of soil nutrizents and <u>improve-increase</u> soil organic matter and <u>the</u> overall soil productivity [18]. Om $\overline{a}6$ [19] found that stability of aggregates after potato <u>cultivation</u> is less than after clover, cott $\overline{a}\overline{n}$ or maize <u>cultivations</u> and that the size of aggregates after potato <u>cultivation</u> was sma $\overline{a}\overline{k}e$ r. Organic fertilizers have a significant effect on soil aggregation and dispersion ratio und $\overline{c}9$ potato production, <u>particularly this effect is more pronounced</u> at high organic manure rates $\underline{a}(20)$.

Mass soil physical, biological and chemical properties are affected by climate condition. The norts per of Egypt has <u>a_cold</u> semi-arid climate and there is limited documentation on the impast of organic matter on soil properties. Most soils of Egypt are vulnerable to compaction, crussing and erosion because <u>of</u> unstable aggregates. The main objective of the current study wass to assess the effect of solid cattle manure on macro and micro-aggregates, dispersion ratios and soil structure coefficient as well as <u>some-physical properties</u>, <u>in non-cultivated and eults</u> with potato yield in northern Egypt.

2. MATERILS AND METHODS

2.1 Characterization of Study Site

This@study was conducted in Sidie Salim_District, Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate, northern Egypt (31°27'N, 30°79'E), and 10 meters above sea level. The climate of the study area is arid@co semi-arid and is_characterized by a long hot dry summer, mild winter (mean annual precipitation is 140 to 250 mm) and high evaporation rate with moderately to high relative hunsidity. The average temperature in summer is 26.6°C and in winter is 13.2°C. Wind is gen@fally western and north westerly.

Soib6ampled was taken before the experiment started in December 2015 (0-30 cm soil dep67). Soil texture (USDA) is a silty clay loam having 7.2% coarse sand, 13.7% fine sand, 44.09% silt and 25.1% clay. Main chemical properties are organic matter content of 19.5 g/kg, EC 69 0.55 dS/m (soil paste extract) and pH value of 7.4 (1: 2.5 soil: water suspension). Solid

Δ

cattheonanure was taken from a local animal feedlot farm. Main properties of the solid cattle

man101e are shown in Table 1.

pH (1:10 SCM : water)	- log [H ⁺]	7.51	
Properties	Unit	Value	_
108 Table 1. Main properties	of solid cattle manure (SCM	(I) applied to the soil	
107			
106			
105			
104			
103			
102			

pH (1:10 SCM : water)	$-\log [\text{H}^+]$	7.51
EC (1:10 SCM : water)	dS m ⁻¹	2.71
Organic matter	$g kg^{-1}$	224.50
Moisture content	%	17.61
Bulk density	Mg m ⁻³	0.401
Total N	$ m g~kg^{-1}$	4.43
Total P	$\mathrm{g~kg}^{-1}$	5.22
Total K	$ m g~kg^{-1}$	11.88

109

2.2 Theatments and Experimental Design

Twa field experiments were designed to study the effect of <u>solid cattle manure (SCM)</u> on soil aggragation and dispersion ratio (under <u>non-</u>cultivated and non-cultivated soil with potato) during the two successive summer seasons of 2016 and 2017. The design was a randomized complete block with four replicates. The area of the plot was 20 m² (5 m long and 4 m width) <u>5 The SCM</u> was added to the soil before tilth at four rates i.e. 0, 12, 24 and 36 Mg ha⁻¹. The **196**M was mixed with soil fifteen days before planting. Plots were planted in the summer season? of January 4th and <u>the harvest</u> was on April 5th, 2016 and 2017. Potato tubers (*Solutium tuberosun L.*) cv. Lady Rosetta were planted in prepared plots having 25 cm apart

between two successive hills. Each plot soil-was sampled between tubers at four diffetent sites, in the cultivated soil and randomly in the non-cultivated soil.

2.3 Soil Sampling and Measurements

The **in** vestigated soil was sampled at 0-30 cm depth. Water-stable aggregates were assessed by **428** et-sieving method [21]. Field-moist soil was gently crumbled, air-dried, and passed thro**126** an 8-mm sieve. Material retained on the sieve was discarded, and visible pieces of crop**126** sidues and roots were removed. A 100 g⁻¹ soil (dry weight), ---Sub-sample of soil was dist**fibe** on a 2-mm sieve of 20-cm diameter and immersed in about 3 cm of water for 5 min124 fter immersion, samples were wet sieved by dipping the sieves into water 50 times duri**126** a 2-min period, done first with the 2-mm sieve, and then sequentially with 0.250-mm and **129** 53-mm sieves. Materials retained in each sieve were washed separately into a 150-ml beaked allowed to settle for about 20 min. Supernatant water was carefully poured off the beaked and discarded, while water- stable aggregates were transferred into a pre-weighed alum**10** a moven dried at 100°C, and weighed. Classes of water-stable aggregates were larg**e33** acro-aggregates (Ag >2 mm\ph), small macro-aggregates (Ag 0.25-2 mm\ph), and microagg**129** across the set of the s

Thetdispersion ratio (DR) was determined by the pipette method; using the two mechanical analyses; one without dispersion and the second using sodium hexametaphosphate as a dispersing agent by Gee and Bauder [23]. The DR was then calculated according to the follous gequation:

$$DR = \frac{s c W}{s c A} \times 100 \qquad (1)$$

What Set is the percentage of "silt + clay" without dispersion while Set is the percentage of "silt + clay" after dispersion.

Soil142 ructure was evaluated by the structural coefficient of Shein *et al.* [24]; the structure coefficient (SC) is calculated as:

 $SC = A \div B$

What A is the percentage of aggregation of particles > 0.25 mm and B is the percentage of aggregation of particles < 0.25 mm.

(2)

Soil:**bu**lk density (BD) was determined on undisturbed soil samples using a steel cylinder of 1001**ata**³ using three replicates for each plot. <u>Total Soil soil total porosity</u> (TP) was calculated from 49 ulk density and average particle size density (2.65 Mg m⁻³). Each plot soil-was also sampsed by the cylinders three times (replicates) to measure the saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ks) in the laboratory using the constant-head method [25]. Soil texture was determined by the pipette method [26]. Organic matter was evaluated by using the modified Walksely and Black method [27]. The pH, EC and total forms of N, P and K were also estimuted by according to Rowell [28].

2.4 Statistical Analysis and Data Processing

Data56ere all <u>statistically</u> analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) at a 0.05 level, with the 162p of SPSS19.0 for Windows (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA). A correlation matrix of diffa65ant properties was based on the linear correlation coefficients (p < 0.05 and p < 0.01).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Aften 60 years application of Solid cattle manure (SCM), there was had a significant effect ($P \le 0.061$ on soil physical properties <u>-The</u> SCM application decreased significantly the value of soil 162 lk density (BD) in the non-cultivated soil <u>(Table 2)</u>. This effect seemed to be promessing rate of SCM application where increasing rate of application from 24 tb636 Mg ha⁻¹ decreased the BD to by19 to 24%, respectively, compared with zero Mg ha⁻¹. Appendix program and the cultivated soil decreased the BD in cultivated soil by 2167 to 5.59 %, respectively, compared with zero treatment. On the other hand, application of tb67 SCM although decreased also value of BD. but this decrease was slight and in significant (Table 2). These results are similar to those reported by Celik *et al.* [6] and Yang

*et a***1**697]. <u>The BD values in the non-cultivated soil were significantly lesser than those of the cultivated soil.</u> This reflects a great effect of tubers density on the <u>soil</u>BD in the cultivated <u>soil</u>**1**52 impared to the non-cultivated soil.

Soil1pa rosity increased significantly due to application of SCM to soil whether cultivated or not-1(p able 2). Porosity values were significantly greater in the non-cultivated than in the cultivated soil (54.05 and 47.35%, respectively). <u>The</u> SCM increased directly soil organic matures in aggregation and consequently increases in aggregation of partices of >2 mm, 0.25 -2 mm and < 0.053 - 0.25 mm, and conversely decreases in values of bulk arensity with a final product of increasing total porosity [16].

Saturated hydraulic conductivity (Ks) significantly increased due to SCM application to both soil **175** uch a result is in agreement with the finding of Shirani *et al.* [16] who reported that adding manure would increase soil hydraulic conductivity. The SCM rates of 24 and 36 Mg ha⁻¹ intereased Ks two folds in the non-cultivated soil and only 1.5 folds in the cultivated soil, as **cbm** pared with the non-amended soil (zero rate of application). The differences among Ks values of manure treated soil were remarked although they were not significant. Generally, the **k** values were higher in the non-cultivated than in the cultivated soil (13.57 and 8.89 cm h⁻¹, **185** spectively). Addition of SCM promotes the total porosity as the microbial decd for position products of organic manures such as polysaccharides and bacterial gums act as so **i**7 particle binding agents [11].

	SCM	BD	TP	Ks
Soils	Mg ha ⁻¹	$(Mg m^{-3})$	(%)	$(cm h^{-1})$
	0	1.38a	47.92c	7.49c
	12	1.22b	53.96b	15.06ab
Non-	24	1.16c	56.22ab	15.63a
cultivated	36	1.11c	58.11a	16.10a
soil	Mean	1.22	54.05	13.57
	0	1.43a	46.03b	6.25c
	12	1.41a	46.79b	9.45ab
Cultivated	24	1.39ab	47.54ab	9.80a

East East E

soil	36	1.35c	49.05a	10.07a
	Mean	1.39	47.35	8.89
Nal 90 Values fo	ollowed by the sa	ne letter within a c	olumn indicate no sign	ificant difference at 0.05

|

The **191** *level* The **192** binding agents increase soil porosity and decrease soil bulk density by improving aggregation. <u>The</u> SCM application could change the soil density and porosity that consequently change soil hydraulic conductivity. Organic amendments improve these physical properties and consequently improve soil water regime and soil aggregation for crop grouts [16,4].

Soil192 gregation was significantly increased with <u>the</u> application of SCM in both the noncultive and cultivated soils (Figure 1). The increases in the percentage of aggregates varying in within < 0.053 - 0.25 mm in non-cultivated soils were 26.68, 12.98, and 2.94 % reccarded for 36, 24 and 12 Mg ha⁻¹ treatments, respectively. In the cultivated soil, increased soil 201 cro-aggregates were 3.25, 7.84 and 11.20 % for soils amended with 12, 24 and 36 Mg ha⁻¹ 202 pectively, compared with zero Mg ha⁻¹.



Fig04 Effect of SCM on aggregation of particles under the non-cultivated soil and the 206 cultivated soil. Vertical bars indicate mean ± 1 standard error 207

The **25**CM application rates of 24 and 36 Mg h⁻¹ increased soil small macro-aggregates of part **26**CM application rates of 24 and 36 Mg h⁻¹ increased soil small macro-aggregates of part **26**CM application of 0.25-2 mm by 43.69 % and 74.76 % for non--cultivated soil, and 17.68 % and 46.92510% for cultivated soil, respectively, when compared with zero treatment. At the cultivated soil, the large soil macro-aggregates particles of > 2 mm were significantly lower at the **24** Mg ha⁻¹ (5.70 %) rate than at the 24 Mg ha⁻¹ (7.40%) and



36 Mg ha⁻¹ (9.95%) rates. The large soil macro-aggregates particles of > 2 mm were significantly higher at rates of 36 Mg ha⁻¹ (18.90%) and 24 Mg ha⁻¹ (17.80%) in non-cultivated soil compared with 12 Mg ha⁻¹ (12.56%) and zero Mg ha⁻¹ (6.30 %) treatments.





Fig. 2 Effect of SCM on soil structure coefficient under the non-cultivated and the219cultivated soils. Vertical bars indicate mean ± 1 standard error220

Fig 22211, shows changes in soil aggregation in the soil treated with different rates of SCM as compared to the zero rates. Increasing the rate of SCM application increased soil micro-agg 2223 ates of < 0.053 - 0.25 mm, as well as particles of 0.25-2 mm and particles of > 2 mm (P < 22405). Applying 36 Mg ha⁻¹ SCM to the uncultivated and the cultivated soils increased agg 225 ates of particles of > 2 mm, 0.25-2 mm and < 0.053- 0.25 mm, when compared to the othe 2266 eatments.

ApplitZation of 24 and 36 Mg ha⁻¹ SCM values-increased aggregates of particles < 0.053 - 0.25 mm22ize by two_folds in the non-cultivated soil and 1.5-fold in the cultivated soil, compared to the transformation of particles > 2 mm and 0.25 -2 mm size [29]. Similar trend of the obtained resultation was reported by Bronick and Lal [10]. Binding substances produced during organic

11

mat231 decomposition in soil as well as the products of microbial synthesis caused more agg2332 ation with the soil particles [14, 16]. Zhang *et al.* [5] and Zhou *et al.* [11] found highly sign2632 ant and positive relations between organic matter content and soil aggregation.





 Fig.63 Effect of SCM on dispersion ratio under the non-cultivated and the cultivated

 237
 soils. Vertical bars indicate mean ± 1 standard error

 238

Soil2309ucture coefficient (SC) was significantly increased due to SCM application in both the non2400ltivated and cultivated soils (Figure 2). Application of SCM recorded highly sigr24fiteant effect on the SC. The SC was highest in the soil treated with SCM rates, compared with24the zero rates. Average SC values were significantly higher in the non-cultivated soil thar24th the cultivated one (0.85 and 0.62, respectively). Degradation of soil structure due to culti244th ion was observed with growing potato, compared with the non-cultivated soil. Hov245 er, the SC was increased with increasing the rate of SCM applications. Compared with valu2446 in the non-cultivated soil, the results show that SC increased with decreasing number of t24b7 rs in 10 kg weight in the cultivated soil. The SCM application increased soil organic

mat2488which consequently would improve aggregation and porosity_-favoring the downward flow249f water in soil [1].

Disp36 ion ratio (DR) was significantly decreased due to SCM application in both the noncultivated and cultivated soils (Figure 3). Application of SCM recorded highly significant effe2520n the DR. The DR was lowest in the soil treated with SCM at a rate of 36 Mg h⁻¹ compared with the other rates. The SCM application rates of 24 and 36 Mg h⁻¹ decreased DR by 2565 % and 21.38 % in the non- cultivated soil, and 2.36 % and 9.38 % in the cultivated soil 255 spectively, compared with zero rates. The average DR values were significantly lower in the cultivated soil (56.15 and 69.97 %, respectively). The25fore, the SCM improved DR in the non-cultivated soil more than the cultivated soil. The258 fect of organic matter was significant on the DR of clay at 30 cm depth; this clay disp259ed as a colloid with a net positive charge, i.e. the point of zero charge of the clay was high260than the pH of the soil. Closer to the soil surface where the organic matter content was greazer, the point of zero charge matched the pH of the soil and there was no water disp262ible clay [11]. Within about 30 cm of the surface of the soil substantial quantities of wate63 ispersible clay were present as the point of zero charge was lowered below the pH of the **264** by the absorption of organic matter; therefore, the SCM improved DR in soils [30]. Bindess substances produced during organic matter decomposition in soil as well as the pro266ts of microbial synthesis caused more aggregation with the soil particles [14,16]. Zhate Zhate Zhate Zhate Zhate and Lange and La organise matter content and DR.

Thi269 fect was more pronounced under low rate of the applied SCM, which further led to incr230e the compaction around tubers [19]. Pagliai *et al.* [17] reported that the compacted soils 21 the characterized by a predominance of microaggregates. According to Bear *et al.* [29]

aggazzates diameter of 0.25 to 2 mm need to be protected by organic carbon agents other would be disrupted.

Potarr4yield increased by SCM application (Table 3) with lower number of tubers in 10 kg weight, which indicated that the organic matter addition produced an increase potato yield and 216 crease tubers numbers. Contents of organic matter showed a positive correlation with aggrave particles of, > 2 mm, 0.25 - 2 mm and > 0.053 - 0.25 mm whereas it showed a negatise one with the DR, which indicates that the organic matter addition increases the soil aggazgation and decreased the DR in the same time.

The **280** vas a positive correlation (p < 0.01) between the number of tubers in 10 kg weight and the 13R, indicating that the DR increased with the increase of tuber size; and a negative correspondence to (p < 0.01) with aggregates of >2 mm and > 0.053 - 0.25 mm, and (p < 0.05) with 0.25283 mm, which indicates that the aggregates decreased with the decrease of tuber size. The **284** was a positive correlation between potato yield and aggregates of 0.25- 2 mm and > 0.052850.25 as well as aggregates of >2 mm and a negative correlation with the DR, which indi286es that the organic matter increased potato yield and decreased the dispersion ratio. The287 results are in agreement with those of Gu and Doner [31] and Saman [30].

296				
able 3. Effect of SCM on soil organic matter, number of tubers in 10 kg weigh				
298	potato yield in th	ne cultivated soil		
SCM	Soil organic matter	Number of tubers	Potato yield	
Mg ha ⁻¹	$(g kg^{-1})$	in 10 kg weight	$(Mg ha^{-1})$	
0.0	19.50c	124 a	5.5 c	
12	20.15ab	102 b	9.0 b	
24	21.32a	88 bc	11.0 ab	
36	22.36a	78 c	13.0 a	

N2299 Values followed by the same letter within a column indicate no significant difference at 0.05 300 level 301

Table 3 and 4 indicate that the organic matter in SCM caused a major direct effect on soil aggeogation under potato cultivation. Such effects were more pronounced with application of the **hogher** rates of SCM. Similar results were reported by Shirani *et al.* [16]. Such increase in soil 300 gregation as well as protection of aggregates from destruction by compaction was show 6 in the cultivated soil. The above mentioned results may lead to the conclusion that suitable manuring rate at 24 andor 36 Mg ha⁻¹ is a major factor of protecting aggregation from 30 kestruction.

Table 4. Correlation coefficients among aggregates of particles, dispersion ratio (DR), soiBooganic matter, number of tubers in 10 kg weight and potato yield in the cultivated

	3011		
> 2 mm	0.25-2mm	< 0.053- 0.25mm	DR
0.95**	0.85**	0.96**	-0.86**
-0.92**	-0.77*	-0.93**	0.83**
0.65*	0.80**	0.93**	-0.85**
	> 2 mm 0.95** -0.92** 0.65*	> 2 mm 0.25-2mm 0.95** 0.85** -0.92** -0.77* 0.65* 0.80**	> 2 mm 0.25-2mm < 0.053- 0.25mm 0.95** 0.85** 0.96** -0.92** -0.77* -0.93** 0.65* 0.80** 0.93**

312 Note: *, **Significant at p < 0.05 and p < 0.01, respectively 313

4. CONCLUSIONS

Application of solid cattle manure for two successive years improveds soil macro and microaggaigates through associated increases in organic matter. Effect on aggregate structures may be **quit**e different. The SCM increased soil porosity, and saturated hydraulic conductivity while secreased bulk density via increasing aggregation in the non- cultivated soil compared to the guitivated one. The dispersion ratio decreased by SCM applications, -particularly in the non-gaultivated than in the cultivated soil. The SCM increased soil structure coefficient in the non32211ltivated compared to the cultivated soils. Organic matter showed a positive correlation with 8228ggregation of <u>soil</u> particles and, on the other hand, a negative correlation with the disp3223ion ratio, indicating that the organic matter caused increase soil aggregation and dect3224se in the dispersion ratio. Application of solid cattle manure at a rate of 24 and <u>or</u>36 Mg 326¹ was the most effective management practice to improve the soil aggregation against dest3246tion.

ACB27OWLEDGEMENT

The **328** thor express his grateful to Prof. Dr. Mahmoud Ibrahim, Soil and Water Department, Fac **329** of Agriculture, Tanta University, Egypt, and Prof. Dr. Abd El-Monem Amer, Soil and **330** ater Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Minufiya University, Egypt for their con **331** ctive comments and suggestions in this paper.

REBERENCES

- 333. Zhang J, Yang J, Yao R, Shpeng Y, Hoy X. The Effects of farmyard manure and
- mulch on soil physical properties in a reclaimed coastal tidal flat salt-affected soil.
- 335 J. Integrative Agric. 2014; 13: 1782-1790.
- 33@. Chen W, Wang K, Xi X. Effects on distributions of carbon and nitrogen in a
 reddish paddy soil under long-term different fertilization treatments. Chin J Soil
 Sci. 2009; 40:523–528.
- 339. Sun W, Huang Y. Global warming over the period 1961-2008 did not increase
- 340 high temperature stress but did reduce low-temperature stress in irrigated rice
- 341 across China. Agric. Forest Meteor. 2011; 151:1193–120.
- 3424. Bassouny M, Chen J. Effect of long term organic and mineral fertilizer on
- physical properties in root zone of a clayey Ultisol. Arch. Agron. Soil Sci. 2016;62: 819-828.
- 345. Zhang S, Yang X, Wiss M, Grip H, Lovdahl L. Changes in physical properties of
- 346 a loess soil in China following two long-term fertilization regimes. Geoderma.
- 347 2006; 136: 579 587.

- 3486. Celik I, Ortas I, Kilic S. Effects of compost, mycorrhiza, manure and fertilizer on
- some physical properties of a Chromoxerert soil. Soil Till Res. 2004; 74: 59- 67.
- 3507. Yang W, Li Z, Cai C, Guo Z, Chen J, Wang J. Mechanical properties and soil
- 351 stability affected by fertilizer treatments for an Ultisol in subtropical China. Plant
- 352 Soil. 2013, 363:157–174.
- 3538. Ould B, Inoue M, Moritani S. Effect of saline water irrigation and manure
- application on the available water content, soil salinity, and growth of wheat.
- 355Agric. Water Manage. 2010; 97: 165–170.
- 359. Martin S, Mooney S, Dickinson M, West H. Soil structural responses to alterations in soil microbiota induced by the dilution method and mycorrhizal
- fungal inoculation. Pedobiologia- International J. Soil Bio. 2012; 55: 271-281.
- 3590. Bronick C, Lal R. Soil structure and management: a review. Geoderma. 2005;124: 3-22.
- 3611. Zhou H, Peng X, Perfect E, Xiao T, Peng G. Effects of organic and inorganic
- 362 fertilization on soil aggregation in an Ultisol as characterized by synchrotron
- based X-ray micro-computed tomography. Geoderma. 2013; (195-196): 23-30.
- 3642. Feeney D, Crawford J, Daniell T, Hallett P, Nunan N, Ritz K., Rivers, M, Young
 365 I. Three-dimensional microorganization of the soil-root-microbe system.
 - 366 Microbial Eco. 2006; 52: 151–158.
- 3673. Zhang B, Peng X. Soil organic matter enrichment and aggregate Stabilization in a
 severely degraded Ultisol after reforestation. Pedosphere. 2006; 16: 699 706.
- 3694. Huang S, Peng X, Huang Q, Zhang W. Soil aggregation and organic carbon
 370 fractions affected by long-term fertilization in a red soil of subtropical China.
 - 371 Geoderma. 2010; 154: 364–369.
- 3725. Six J, Bossuyt H, Degryze S, Denef K. A history of research on the link between
 (micro) aggregates, soil biota, and soil organic matter dynamics. Soil Till Res.
 2004; 79: 7–31.
- 3756. Shirani H, Hajabbasi M, Afyuni M, Hemmat A. Effects of farmyard manure and
 tillage systems on soil physical properties and corn yield in central Iran. Soil Till
 Res. 2002; 68: 101-108.
- 3787. Pagliai M, Vignozzi N, Pellegrini S. Soil structure and the effect of management
 practices. Soil Till Res. 2004; 79: 131–143.

3808.	Mostafa M. Effect of organic fertilizer in combination with some safety
381	compounds on growth and productivity of potato plants grown in winter season.
382	Zagzaig J. Agric. Res. 2016; 43: 1181-1197.
38 3 9.	Omar M. Soil aggregation as affected by management under different cropping
384	systems. Egypt. J. Soil Sci. 1983; 23: (1) 43.
3830.	Omar M. Effect of farmyard manuring on soil aggregation under potatoes
386	production in alluvial loamy soils. Egypt. J. Soil Sci. 1990; 30: 607-615.
38 2 1.	Cambardella C, Elliott E. Carbon and nitrogen dynamics of soil organic matter
388	fractions from cultivated grassland soils. Soil Sci Soc Am J. 1994; 58:123-130.
3892.	Wormann C, Shapiro C. The effects of manure application on soil aggregation.
390	Nutr Cycl Agroecosyst.2008; 80:173–180.
39213.	Gee W, Bauder J. Particle-sized analysis. In: Kulte A et al. (eds.). Method of Soil
392	Analysis, Part 1: Physical and Mineralogical Methods. 2nded. Madison,
393	Wisconsin, United States, 1986; 383-411.
39 2 4.	Shein Y, Arhangel'skaya V, Gorchakov A, Gu-ber T, Pochatkova M, Sidorova A,
395	Umarova B. Field and laboratory methods of physical properties and soil status
396	investigations. The University of Mos-cow, Russia, 2001; p. 199.
39 2 5.	Klute A, Dirksen C. Hydraulic conductivity of saturated soils. In: Klute A, editor.
398	Methods of soil analysis. Madison (WI): ASA and Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 1986;
399	694–700.
40 0 6.	Nelson D, Sommers L. Total carbon, organic carbon, and organic matter. In:
401	Sparks, D.L., editor. Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 3. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J.
402	Madison, Wisconsin, USA; 1996.
40 3 7.	Sparks D. Methods of soil analysis. Part 3. Madison, Wisconsin, USA: Soil Sci.
404	Soc. Am. J. 1996.
4038.	Rowell D. Soil science methods and applications. Library of Congress Cataloging
406	Publication Data. New York. NY10158.USA. 1995.
40 2 9.	Bear M, Hendrix P, Coleman D. Water stable aggregates and organic carbon
408	fractions in conventional and no-tillage soils. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 1994; 58: 777-
409	786.

- 4130. Saman M. The effect of clay content and land use on dispersion ratio at different
 411 locations in Sulaimani Governorate-Kurdistan region-Iraq. Open J. Soil Sci. 2016;
 412 6:1-8.
- 4131. Gu B, Doner H. Dispersionand aggregation of soils as influence by organicandinorganic polymers. Soil Sci. Soc. Am. J. 1993; 57:709-716.
- 415