Performance of potato cultivars in an organic farming system using organic fertilizers, vermicompost and azolla
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Abstract

The challenges of food shortages and environmental pollution require the development of safe and effective alternatives to chemical fertilizers. Two field experiments were conducted during the summer season of 2019/2020 in two locations on a private farm to evaluate the performance of three potato cultivars (Sponta, Cara, and Elbieda) under different fertilizer treatments. The experiment was laid out in a split-plot design replicated thrice. The main plots had three potato cultivars, while the sub plots were comprised of seven fertilizer treatments. The results showed that the highest vegetative growth characters, viz. plant height, leaf chlorophyll index, and plant dry weight were produced by Sponta, followed by Cara, while the lowest growth attributes were recorded in Elbieda. Compared to the NPK inorganic fertilizer, organic fertilizers significantly improved the vegetative growth characteristics of potato in all treatments. Among the organic treatments, the highest growth parameters were recorded with the application of mixed organic fertilizer, vermicompost, and Azolla pinnatata (T1). The highest yield, viz. tuber yield, number of tubers per plant, and tuber weight, and yield quality characteristics, viz. total carbohydrates, starch, and TSS, were also recorded in T1. Our results demonstrate that the Sponta cultivar grown with the application of mixed organic fertilizer, vermicompost, and Azollapinnata (T1) produced the highest growth, yield, and quality of potato tubers. Thus, we recommend this treatment combination as a sustainable agricultural practice for potato production in similar areas.
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Introduction

Globally, potato (SolanumtuberosumL.) tuber productivity was 377 million tonnes in 2016, ranking as the fourth most productive crop after maize, wheat, and rice (FAO, 2017). Potato yields about 175 kg N/ha, 25 kg P/ha, and 250 kg K/ha (Meena et al., 2016; Romero et al., 2017). Approximately 80% of the tuber weight is water, and starches comprise approximately 70% of the total solids. Due to the high carbohydrate content, potato is a good energy source. Potato is also inexpensive, with high nutritional value and high productivity; thus, contributing to reducing global food shortages and providing food security for a growing world population (Zhang et al., 2018).

Vermicompost is the final product of the biological decomposition of organic materials by earthworms (Meghvansi et al., 2011). This process, called vermicomposting, is widely used to treat various types of organic residues. Vermicomposting is a sustainable, ecologically friendly, and cost-effective process for organic waste management that produces an environmentally safe organic fertilizer for sustainable agricultural practices (Brown, 1995; Tajbaksh et al., 2011; Chaulagain et al., 2017; Abou El-Goud, 2020a, b, and c). Moreover, several studies have demonstrated the favorable effects of vermicompost organic fertilizer on the growth and yield of crops such as African marigold (Sharma et al., 2017), pakchoi (Churilova and Midmore, 2019), canola (Rashbhari et al., 2020), tomato (Ravindran et al., 2019), and potato (Pérez-Gómez et al., 2017; Darabi et al., 2018).

Azolla, also known as water fern, water velvet, or duckweed, is a genus of aquatic plants normally distributed in pools, streams, and paddy water. Azollais known for its rapid biomass production and bioremediation potential (Miranda et al., 2016). Azollaspecies symbiotically coexist with Anabaena azollae alga (Razavipour et al., 2018); the nitrogen-fixing capacity of Anabaena azollae provides fixed nitrogen for Azolla, while Azolla provides fixed carbon and shelter for the algae (Peters, 1978; Pereira et al., 2014). Azolla is a highly efficient biofertilizer due to its rapid growth and high nitrogen-fixation capacity (Wagner, 1997). Azollacan double its biomass every 3–5 daysand fix between 70 and 110 kg N ha−1 (Ventura et al., 1993). Used as abiofertilizer, Azolla increases N, P, K, and micronutrient contents in the soil and enhances microbial activity, porosity, soil water-holding capacity, and water infiltration rate (Mishra et al., 2013; Jumadi et al., 2014). Azolla has been used for centuries as green manure for rice in Vietnam (Lumpkin and Plucknett,
1980). Recently, several studies have confirmed the use of Azolla green manure to improve the growth and yield of maize (Maswada et al., 2021), wheat (Ripley et al., 2003), and chamomile inflorescences (Kawthar et al., 2017).

In this study, we investigate the effects of vermicompost (VC), Azolla (AZ), and mixtures of old organic fertilizers (MOF) on the growth, yield, and quality of three potato cultivars (cv. Cara, Sponta, and Elbieda) under eco-friendly field conditions to enhance crop productivity, produce healthier food, improve soil fertility, and increase farmer income.

Results

Vegetative growth characteristics

Potato vegetative growth characteristics were significantly influenced by the cultivar, fertilizer source, and their interaction (Table 1). The Sponta cultivar, produced the highest plant height (36.44 and 67.83 cm in the first and second location, respectively), dry weight (37.58 and 57.34 g per plant), and leaf chlorophyll index (41.87 and 46.31 SPAD), followed by the Cara cultivar. The Elbeida cultivar produced the lowest growth attributes. Irrespective of potato cultivar, the application of organic fertilizer as MOF + VC+ AZ (T1) produced significantly higher plant height (39.49 and 76.2 cm in the first and second location, respectively), dry weight (43.34 and 68.1 g per plant), and leaf chlorophyll index (45.39 and 54.14 SPAD) than the other fertilizer treatments. Conversely, the inorganic NPK fertilizer (T2) produced significantly lower plant height (23.95 and 41.3 cm, in the first and second location, respectively), dry weight (22.58 and 33.5 g per plant), and leaf chlorophyll index (27.42 and 28.7 SPAD) than all organic fertilizer treatments. The interaction effect between the Sponta cultivar and T1 on potato growth attributes was significantly superior over the other combinations. The lowest growth parameters among all treatment combinations were recorded in the Elbeida cultivar and T2 treatment.

Yield and yield attributes

The yield and yield attributes were also significantly influenced by the cultivar and fertilizer treatments. The highest number of tubers per plant (15.16 and 16.8 in the first and second location, respectively), tuber weight (232 and 249 g), and tuber yield (29.29 and 31.79 ton ha⁻¹), were produced by Sponta, followed by Cara. The Elbeida cultivar produced the lowest yield and yield attributes (Table 2). The highest number of tubers per plant (15.85 and 18.4 in the first and second location, respectively), tuber weight (247 and 281 g), and tuber yield (32.05 and 36.33 ton ha⁻¹) were produced in T1. The lowest number of tubers per plant (9.59 and 9.5 in the first and second location, respectively), tuber weight (146 and 155 g), and tuber yield (19.38 and 20.31 ton ha⁻¹) were produced in T2. Moreover, the interaction effect between Sponta cultivar and T1 on yield and yield attributes was significantly superior over the other treatments. The lowest yield and yield attributes among all treatment combinations were recorded in the Elbeida cultivar with T2.

Tuber quality parameters

The Sponta cultivar produced the best quality tubers, with the highest values of total carbohydrates (59.03 and 51.52% in the first and second location, respectively), starch (12.28 and 14.99 %), and TSS (5.41 and 6.5 %), followed by Cara. Elbeida produced the lowest quality tubers (Table 3). The organic fertilizers in T1 significantly increased the total carbohydrates (66.2 and 61.9 % in the first and second location, respectively), starch (12.91 and 16.85%), and TSS (6.2 and 7.5%) compared with the other fertilizer treatments. The lowest total carbohydrates (40.3 and 33.5% in the first and second location, respectively), starch (7.86 and 9.04%), and TSS (3.6 and 3.6%) were produced in the T1 treatment. Moreover, the highest quality tubers were produced in the treatment combination of Sponta cultivar and T1, while the lowest quality tubers were produced by the Elbeida cultivar and T2.

Tuber nutrient composition

In general, potato cultivars, fertilizer sources, and their interaction influenced tuber N, P, and K content. The Sponta cultivar produced tubers with the highest N (1.61 and 2.15% in the first and second location, respectively), P (0.36 and 0.52%), and K content (2.02 and 2.48%), followed by Cara (Table 4). The lowest NPK content was recorded in Elbeida tubers. The application of inorganic fertilizer (T2) produced tubers with significantly lower N (1.08 and 1.14% in the first and second location, respectively), P (0.24 and 0.27%), and K (1.29 and 1.41%) than those produced in all organic fertilizer treatments. Tubers with the highest N (1.78 and 2.79% in the first and second location, respectively), P (0.40 and 0.57%), and K content (2.13 and 2.81%) were produced in T1.

Discussion

Our experimental results showed that the Sponta cultivar significantly out-performed Cara and Elbeida with respect to growth, yield, tuber quality, and NPK content, regardless of the fertilizer treatment. Cara ranked second, while Elbeida exhibited the lowest growth, yield, tuber quality, and NPK content. These results are consistent with those reported by Yousef et al. (2017), who found that Sponta and Cara cultivars produced the maximum plant height, plant dry weight, yield, and yield attributes. Similar findings were also reported by Marwaha (1998), Swamina than et al. (1999), and Shafeek et al. (2001), who found significant differences in the growth, yield, and yield attributes among potato cultivars. Irrespective of potato cultivar, the application of organic fertilizers improved the growth, yield, yield attributes, tuber quality, and NPK content compared with inorganic fertilizers; these findings are consistent with our previous reports (Abou El-Goud, 2020a, b, and c). Enhanced growth and tuber quality with organic fertilizer application may be due to increased organic matter content, cation exchange capacity, and mineral nutrients in the soil, which in turn support potato growth (Mirdad, 2010). These results support those obtained by Shahein et al. (2014), Amara et al. (2015), Bilki et al. (2018), and Abou El-Goud (2020a, b, and c), who found that the application of organic manure to potato, eggplant, cowpea, and watermelon significantly improved yield and crop characteristics. Organic fertilizer application increases the availability of soil macro- and micro-nutrients and provides nutrients to meet crop requirements, supporting crop production (Mirdad, 2010).

The desired biofertilizer effect of Azolla application can be ascribed to its rapid decomposition, which supplies plants with essential nutrients and enhances the microbial activity, porosity, and water holding capacity of soil (Mishra et al., 2013; Jumadi et al., 2014). de Vries et al. (2016) reported that the application of Azolla with high N content improved soil microbial activity and biodiversity and increased the soil organic matter decomposition and mineralization rates,
Table 1. Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on plant height (cm), plant dry weight (g), and leaf chlorophyll index (SPAD) of three potato cultivars in two locations.

| Treatments | Plant height (cm) | Plant dry weight (g) | Leaf chlorophyll index (SPAD) |
|------------|------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|
|            | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. |
| (A) Cultivars |         |           |          |          |          |          |
| Sponta     | 36.44 a  | 67.83a    | 37.58 a  | 57.34a   | 41.87 a  | 46.31a   |
| Cara       | 30.96 b  | 53.81b    | 32.42 b  | 50.99b   | 35.44 b  | 40.48b   |
| Elbeida    | 26.32 c  | 50.08c    | 27.69 c  | 41.61c   | 30.35c   | 35.90c   |
| LSD <sub>0.05</sub> | 0.19     | 1.47     | 0.66     | 0.44     | 0.24     | 0.76     |
| (B) Fertilizers |         |           |          |          |          |          |
| T<sub>1</sub> | 39.49a   | 76.2a     | 43.34a   | 68.1a    | 45.39a   | 54.14a   |
| T<sub>2</sub> | 36.56b   | 70.2b     | 39.79b   | 61.9b    | 41.81b   | 49.6b    |
| T<sub>3</sub> | 33.43c   | 61.4c     | 35.77c   | 54.7c    | 38.47c   | 44.6c    |
| T<sub>4</sub> | 30.94d   | 56.3d     | 31.53d   | 49.1d    | 35.74d   | 39.9d    |
| T<sub>5</sub> | 28.20e   | 50.4e     | 28.97e   | 43.6e    | 32.68e   | 36.3e    |
| T<sub>6</sub> | 26.13f   | 44.9f     | 25.96f   | 39.04f   | 29.69f   | 33.1f    |
| T<sub>7</sub> | 23.95g   | 41.3g     | 22.58g   | 33.5g    | 27.42g   | 28.7g    |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.53     | 1.27     | 0.49     | 1.41     | 0.55     | 0.84     |
| Interaction (A×B) |         |           |          |          |          |          |
| Sponta     |           |           | 46.1     | 90.9     | 49.5     | 77.3     | 51.94     | 59.73     |
| Cara       |           |           | 42.9     | 83.0     | 45.2     | 72.2     | 49.31     | 56.93     |
| Elbeida    |           |           | 38.5     | 73.8     | 41.6     | 62.8     | 45.16     | 50.13     |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.14     | 0.25     | 0.19     | 0.41     | 0.34     | 0.76     |
| (A) Cultivars |         |           | 36.0     | 67.3     | 36.9     | 56.3     | 41.78     | 45.03     |
| Cara       | 32.9     | 49.4     | 33.8     | 49.4     | 37.7     | 41.97    | 35.74     | 39.13     |
| Elbeida    | 30.7     | 53.0     | 30.3     | 44.5     | 35.17    | 39.13    | 30.38     | 34.58     |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.53     | 0.86     | 0.44     | 0.99     | 0.45     | 0.84     |
|Interaction (A×B) |         |           | 27.9     | 48.4     | 25.8     | 38.9     | 31.96     | 31.27     |
| Sponta     | 39.5     | 72.3     | 43.5     | 69.6     | 45.57    | 54.33    | 30.26     | 33.95     |
| Cara       | 36.3     | 64.8     | 40.2     | 59.0     | 40.72    | 48.40    | 30.65     | 34.40     |
| Elbeida    | 33.0     | 58.5     | 35.5     | 55.3     | 37.98    | 44.30    | 25.98     | 29.60     |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.88     | 2.48     | 1.01     | 1.20     | 1.01     | 1.54     |

Table 2. Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on the number of tubers per plant, tuber weight (g), and tuber yield (ton-ha<sup>-1</sup>) of three potato cultivars in two locations.

| Treatments | Number of tubers per plant | Tuber weight (g) | Tuber yield (ton-ha<sup>-1</sup>) |
|------------|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|
|            | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. |
| (A) Cultivars |         |           |          |          |          |          |
| Sponta     | 15.16 a  | 16.8a    | 232.48 a | 249.2 a  | 29.29a   | 31.79a   |
| Cara       | 12.83 b  | 13.3b    | 190.09 b | 207.6b   | 25.88b   | 26.74b   |
| Elbeida    | 9.59 c   | 11.4c    | 161.67 c | 189.3c   | 20.57c   | 25.02c   |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.35     | 0.06     | 2.30     | 1.27     | 0.19     | 0.10     |
| (B) Fertilizers |         |           |          |          |          |          |
| T<sub>1</sub> | 15.85a  | 18.4a    | 246.78a  | 280.8a   | 32.05a   | 36.33a   |
| T<sub>2</sub> | 14.39 b  | 16.6b    | 227.22b  | 256.1b   | 29.36b   | 32.71b   |
| T<sub>3</sub> | 13.30c  | 14.9c    | 209.89c  | 235.4c   | 27.05c   | 30.74c   |
| T<sub>4</sub> | 12.5d   | 13.7d    | 194.44d  | 212.8d   | 24.90d   | 27.55d   |
| T<sub>5</sub> | 11.51e  | 12.3e    | 179.11e  | 193.8e   | 22.88e   | 24.83e   |
| T<sub>6</sub> | 10.55f  | 11.2f    | 159.33f  | 174.2f   | 21.12f   | 22.50f   |
| T<sub>7</sub> | 9.59g   | 9.5g     | 146.44g  | 154.6g   | 19.38g   | 20.31g   |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.46     | 0.15     | 2.80     | 0.89     | 0.21     | 0.10     |
| Interaction (A×B) |         |           |          |          |          |          |
| Sponta     | 18.8     | 22.6     | 294      | 221      | 37.07    | 39.76    |
| Cara       | 17.5     | 20.3     | 275      | 204      | 33.95    | 35.86    |
| Elbeida    | 15.6     | 18.0     | 253      | 269      | 31.38    | 35.64    |
| T<sub>5</sub> | 15.2     | 16.4     | 235      | 251      | 28.83    | 32.00    |
| T<sub>7</sub> | 14.4     | 14.7     | 217      | 231      | 26.60    | 29.17    |
| Treatments | TSS (%) | Total carbohydrates (%) | Starch (%) |
|------------|---------|-------------------------|------------|
|            | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. | 1st loc. | 2nd loc. |
| **A. Cultivars** |         |           |         |           |         |           |
| Sponta     | 59.03 a  | 51.52a    | 12.28 a | 14.99 a   | 5.41 a  | 6.5a      |
| Cara       | 52.12 b  | 46.83b    | 10.01 b | 12.35b    | 4.72 b  | 5.4b      |
| Elbeida    | 45.92 c  | 39.91c    | 8.33 c  | 10.12c    | 3.87 c  | 4.6c      |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.82 | 0.25    | 5.01    | 1.89      | 0.43    | 0.17      |
| **B. Fertilizers** |         |           |         |           |         |           |
| T<sub>i</sub> | 66.2a    | 61.9a     | 12.91a  | 16.85a    | 6.2 a   | 7.5a      |
| T<sub>j</sub> | 61.1b    | 55.8b     | 11.96b  | 15.04b    | 5.4b    | 6.8b      |
| T<sub>k</sub> | 56.1c    | 51.3c     | 10.88c  | 13.49c    | 5.1c    | 5.9c      |
| T<sub>l</sub> | 51.7d    | 45.3d     | 10.04d  | 12.17d    | 4.6d    | 5.4d      |
| T<sub>m</sub> | 47.2e    | 40.6e     | 9.32e   | 10.89e    | 4.2e    | 4.9e      |
| T<sub>n</sub> | 43.8f    | 34.1f     | 8.49f   | 9.94f     | 3.9f    | 4.4f      |
| T<sub>p</sub> | 40.3g    | 33.5f     | 7.86g   | 9.04g     | 3.6g    | 3.6g      |
| **LSD<sub>0.05</sub>** | 0.63 | 2.15    | 0.15    | 0.16      | 0.11    | 0.099     |
| **Interaction (AxB)** |         |           |         |           |         |           |
| Sponta     | 73.8     | 99.5      | 15.4    | 20.5      | 7.0     | 8.7       |
| Cara       | 68.9     | 62.9      | 14.5    | 18.1      | 6.4     | 7.9       |
| Elbeida    | 63.4     | 56.9      | 13.1    | 16.1      | 5.8     | 6.9       |
| T<sub>i</sub> | 58.6     | 52.4      | 12.1    | 14.7      | 5.2     | 6.4       |
| T<sub>j</sub> | 53.6     | 46.0      | 11.3    | 13.0      | 4.8     | 5.8       |
| T<sub>k</sub> | 49.4     | 35.5      | 10.2    | 11.9      | 4.5     | 5.2       |
| T<sub>l</sub> | 45.5     | 37.0      | 9.4     | 11.0      | 4.2     | 4.5       |
| T<sub>m</sub> | 66.5     | 62.2      | 12.7    | 16.5      | 6.0     | 7.4       |
| T<sub>n</sub> | 60.7     | 56.3      | 11.8    | 14.8      | 5.5     | 6.8       |
| T<sub>p</sub> | 55.6     | 50.4      | 10.6    | 13.5      | 5.1     | 6.0       |
| T<sub>q</sub> | 51.1     | 45.4      | 9.8     | 11.9      | 4.7     | 5.5       |
| T<sub>r</sub> | 47.1     | 41.4      | 9.1     | 10.7      | 4.2     | 4.8       |
| T<sub>s</sub> | 43.8     | 37.8      | 8.4     | 10.0      | 4.0     | 4.4       |
| T<sub>t</sub> | 40.1     | 34.3      | 7.7     | 9.1       | 3.6     | 3.2       |
| Elbeida    | 58.5     | 53.8      | 10.6    | 13.5      | 5.0     | 6.3       |
| T<sub>i</sub> | 53.7     | 48.2      | 9.6     | 12.1      | 4.4     | 5.7       |
| T<sub>j</sub> | 49.4     | 43.6      | 8.9     | 10.9      | 4.2     | 5.0       |
| T<sub>k</sub> | 45.5     | 38.2      | 2.3     | 9.9       | 3.7     | 4.4       |
| T<sub>l</sub> | 41.1     | 34.1      | 7.6     | 8.9       | 3.5     | 4.1       |
| T<sub>m</sub> | 38.1     | 32.2      | 6.9     | 8.1       | 3.1     | 3.7       |
| T<sub>n</sub> | 35.1     | 29.3      | 6.4     | 7.4       | 3.0     | 3.1       |
| **LSD<sub>0.05</sub>** | 1.26 | 3.99    | 0.30    | 0.27      | 0.28    | 0.196     |

**Table 3.** Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on tuber total carbohydrates, starch, and TSS contents of three potato cultivars in two locations.
### Table 4. Effect of organic and inorganic fertilizers on tuber NPK contents of three potato cultivars in two locations.

| Treatments | N in tubers (%) | P in tubers (%) | K in tubers (%) |
|------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|            | 1<sup>st</sup> loc. | 2<sup>nd</sup> loc. | 1<sup>st</sup> loc. | 2<sup>nd</sup> loc. | 1<sup>st</sup> loc. | 2<sup>nd</sup> loc. |
| **(A) Cultivars** | | | | | | |
| Sponta | 1.61 a | 2.15a | 0.36 a | 0.52a | 2.02 a | 2.48a |
| Cara | 1.36 b | 1.82b | 0.31 b | 0.40b | 1.63 b | 2.02b |
| Elbeida | 1.19 c | 1.60c | 0.27 c | 0.33c | 1.39 c | 1.82c |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.23 | 0.20 | 0.012 | 0.021 | 0.022 | 0.049 |
| **(B) Fertilizers** | | | | | | |
| T<sub>1</sub> | 1.78 a | 2.79a | 0.40 a | 0.57a | 2.13 a | 2.81a |
| T<sub>2</sub> | 1.60b | 2.35b | 0.36b | 0.50b | 1.95b | 2.57b |
| T<sub>3</sub> | 1.46c | 2.14c | 0.33c | 0.46c | 1.81c | 2.33c |
| T<sub>4</sub> | 1.37d | 1.8d | 0.31d | 0.41d | 1.67d | 2.09d |
| T<sub>5</sub> | 1.26e | 1.51e | 0.28e | 0.38e | 1.53e | 1.9e |
| T<sub>6</sub> | 1.15f | 1.26f | 0.26f | 0.33f | 1.39f | 1.63f |
| T<sub>7</sub> | 1.08g | 1.14g | 0.24g | 0.27g | 1.29g | 1.41g |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.05 | 0.022 | 0.011 | 0.013 | 0.018 | 0.071 |
| Interaction (A×B) | | | | | | |
| Sponta | T<sub>1</sub> | 2.08 | 3.39 | 0.47 | 0.71 | 2.56 | 3.23 |
| | T<sub>2</sub> | 1.87 | 2.61 | 0.41 | 0.63 | 2.36 | 3.02 |
| | T<sub>3</sub> | 1.70 | 2.54 | 0.38 | 0.57 | 2.17 | 2.75 |
| | T<sub>4</sub> | 1.62 | 2.10 | 0.35 | 0.51 | 2.01 | 2.41 |
| | T<sub>5</sub> | 1.47 | 1.80 | 0.32 | 0.47 | 1.86 | 2.30 |
| | T<sub>6</sub> | 1.31 | 1.34 | 0.29 | 0.41 | 1.66 | 1.94 |
| | T<sub>7</sub> | 1.22 | 1.24 | 0.28 | 0.35 | 1.55 | 1.70 |
| Cara | T<sub>1</sub> | 1.75 | 2.57 | 0.40 | 0.56 | 2.07 | 2.74 |
| | T<sub>2</sub> | 1.58 | 2.28 | 0.36 | 0.48 | 1.89 | 2.42 |
| | T<sub>3</sub> | 1.44 | 1.99 | 0.34 | 0.44 | 1.75 | 2.25 |
| | T<sub>4</sub> | 1.34 | 1.77 | 0.30 | 0.41 | 1.61 | 2.05 |
| | T<sub>5</sub> | 1.23 | 1.51 | 0.28 | 0.37 | 1.46 | 1.80 |
| | T<sub>6</sub> | 1.13 | 1.40 | 0.26 | 0.31 | 1.37 | 1.56 |
| | T<sub>7</sub> | 1.06 | 1.24 | 0.23 | 0.21 | 1.25 | 1.34 |
| Elbeida | T<sub>1</sub> | 1.51 | 2.41 | 0.34 | 0.44 | 1.76 | 2.45 |
| | T<sub>2</sub> | 1.35 | 2.17 | 0.31 | 0.40 | 1.61 | 2.26 |
| | T<sub>3</sub> | 1.25 | 1.90 | 0.29 | 0.36 | 1.50 | 2.00 |
| | T<sub>4</sub> | 1.15 | 1.53 | 0.27 | 0.32 | 1.38 | 1.81 |
| | T<sub>5</sub> | 1.07 | 1.23 | 0.24 | 0.29 | 1.25 | 1.60 |
| | T<sub>6</sub> | 1.02 | 1.03 | 0.23 | 0.27 | 1.15 | 1.39 |
| | T<sub>7</sub> | 0.95 | 0.92 | 0.21 | 0.24 | 1.06 | 1.21 |
| LSD<sub>0.05</sub> | 0.042 | 0.30 | 0.021 | 0.029 | 0.036 | 0.123 |

### Table 5. Physical and chemical characteristics of soil collected from two experimental locations in the summer growing season, 2019.

| Properties | Location 1 | Location 2 | Unit |
|------------|-------------|-------------|------|
| Sand | 49.5 | 47.9 | % |
| Silt | 12.0 | 13.0 | % |
| Clay | 38.5 | 39.1 | % |
| Textural Class | Sandy Clay | | |
| pH | 8.4 | 8.5 | - |
| EC | 0.874 | 0.922 | ds/m |
| O.M. | 1.50 | 1.65 | % |
| O.C. | 0.31 | 0.35 | % |
| C/N ratio | 15/1 | 23.1/1 | - |
| CaCO<sub>3</sub> | 5.26 | 5.41 | % |

**Nutrients available**

| Nutrients | Location 1 | Location 2 | Unit |
|-----------|-------------|-------------|------|
| Nitrogen | 7.4 | 8.1 | (mg/kg) |
| Phosphorus | 30.08 | 28.75 | (mg/kg) |
| Potassium | 550.43 | 547.98 | (mg/kg) |
releasing nutrients, organic acids, enzymes, and hormones in the rhizosphere. Azab and Soror (2020) stated that Azolla has an excellent carbon-nitrogen ratio, which facilitates rapid decomposition and accelerates the decomposition of other organic residues in compost pits. Edwards et al. (2006) demonstrated that crops respond to the application of vermicompost due to the release of substantial quantities of essential nutrients and growth-promoting substances. Additionally, Li et al. (2020) and Abou El-Goud (2020 a, b, and c) found that vermicompost not only contributes to improve soil texture, aeration, and soil compaction, enhancing plant water and nutrient uptake, but also produces hormones, vitamins, plant regulators, antibiotics, and beneficial microbes that further improve plant health. Similarly, Najar and Khan (2013) reported a significant increase in vegetative plant growth of tomato in plots amended with 6 t ha⁻¹ vermicompost. The macronutrients provided by vermicompost improve crop yield via activation of enzymes involved in chlorophyll synthesis, growth, yield, and enzyme system maintenance (Piya et al., 2018; Abou El Goud, 2020 a and c).

Materials and methods

Two field experiments were conducted in two locations on a private farm (Elmawaly) in Kafr El-Dawar, El Bahira, Egypt during the summer growing season of 2019/2020 to investigate the effect of organic fertilizers on the growth, yield, and tuber quality of three potato cultivars, Cara, Elbeida, and Sponta. Experimental observations

Three organic fertilizers i.e. mixed organic fertilizer (MOF), vermicompost (VC), and Azollapinnata (AZ), were selected as eco-friendly and sustainable alternatives to chemical fertilization. A 1:1:1 mixture of cow dump, chicken manure, and plant compost was composted for 25 days to produce the MOF. VC was produced by 2000 red wiggler earthworms Eisenia fetida with a marginal number of other species in the worm compost bin (120-cm length, 70-cm width, and 40-cm height) for two months (Abou El Goud 2020a). The AZ fertilizer was applied as an aqueous suspension. The chemical characteristics of the organic fertilizers are shown in Table 6.

### Table 6. Chemical analysis of mixed organic fertilizers (MOF), vermicompost (VC) and Azolla (AZ).

| Parameters | MOF | VC | AZ | Unit |
|------------|-----|----|----|------|
| pH         | 9.8 | 8.1| 8.3| -    |
| EC         | 6.4 | 5.2| 9.8| ds/m |
| OM         | 28.3| 15.3| 3.2| %    |
| OC         | 16.4| 8.9 | 1.9| %    |
| C/N ratio  | 13.7:1| 3.5:1| 0.7:1| -  |
| Total Nitrogen | 1.2 | 3.5 | 2.9 | % |
| Total Phosphorus | 1.07 | 4.53 | 3.66 | % |
| Total Potassium  | 6.4 | 3.0 | 6.3 | % |

Experimental design

The field experiment was laid out in a split-plot design with three replications. Potato cultivars were arranged as the main factor with fertilizer treatments as a subfactor. The treated potato cultivars were Cara, Elbeida, and Sponta. The fertilizer treatments were as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
T_1 & = MOF (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) + VC (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) + AZ (0.6 \text{ l.m}^{-2}) \\
T_2 & = VC (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) \\
T_3 & = MOF (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) + AZ (0.6 \text{ l.m}^{-2}) \\
T_4 & = VC (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) + MOF (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) \\
T_5 & = VC (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) + MOF (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) \\
T_6 & = MOF (1.6 \text{ kg.m}^{-2}) \\
T_7 & = \text{Recommended doses of NPK chemical fertilizers (Control)}
\end{align*}
\]

Experimental procedure

MOF and VC were applied to the soil 25 days before sowing the potato tubers at rates of 1.6 kg m⁻². AZ was applied as an aqueous suspension at a rate of 200 ml m⁻² for three instalments at 40, 50, and 60 days after sowing as a soil supplement. For the chemical fertilizer treatment, the recommended doses of N, P, and K were applied in the form of ammonium sulfate (33.5% N), super calcium phosphate (15.5% P₂O₅), and potassium sulfate (48% K₂O) at a rate of 440:165:400 kg N, P₂O₅, K₂O per hectare. An area of 4.4 m² (5.5-m length × 0.8-m width) was allocated for each experimental plot. Twelve potato tubers per plot were sown 40 cm apart on December 5, 2019. Organic farming system protocols were followed in all plots throughout the whole growing season. Neem oil (4 ml·L⁻¹) was applied to the leaves to protect plants from pathogens. Plants were also covered with nets for protection from insects (Mrema and Maerere, 2018). All plots were well irrigated throughout the season using a drip-irrigation system. Weeds were controlled by hand-hoeing every 10 days after sowing. Potato tuber yields were harvested on April 5 for Elbeida, April 25 for Sponta, and May 15 for Cara, 2020.

Experimental observations

Three plants were randomly selected from each treatment, and plant height (cm), number of leaves and main stems per plant, and plant fresh and dry weight (g) were measured at 90 days after planting for cv. Elbeida, 120 days after planting for cv. Sponta, and 140 days after planting for cv. Cara. Leaf chlorophyll indication (SPAD) was measured using a chlorophyllimeter (SPAD-502, Minolta Co. Japan) in three recently fully expanded leaves (Yadawa, 1986; Marquard and Tipton, 1987).

Well-matured tubers were collectively harvested from each plot to measure yield. Total tuber number and weight per plot were used to calculate the tuber number per plant, tuber yield per plant (g), and tuber yield per hectare (ton). Standard
methods were followed in measuring tubers tarch (%) (Holm et al., 1986), total carbohydrates (Crinon and Smith, 1979), and total soluble solids (TSS%) (Sugiura et al., 1983).

**Statistical analysis**

Statistical analysis of variance was conducted according to the procedure described by Gomez and Gomez (1984). Treatment means were compared using the least significant differences (LSD) test using the split-plot model and Duncan’s multiple range test. All analyses were conducted using SAS (SAS, 2001) at a 5% level of probability.

**Conclusions**

The responses of potato cultivars to organic fertilizers and mineral NPK fertilizer revealed that organic fertilizer application significantly improved the growth, yield, quality, and NPK content of tubers. Moreover, Sponta cultivar produced the highest growth, yield, tuber quality, and NPK content, followed by Cara, while Elbeida cultivar exhibited the lowest production. The application of mixed organic fertilizer (1.6 kg m⁻²) + vermicompost (1.6 kg m⁻²) + Azollapinnata (0.6 l·m⁻²) in T1 produced significantly higher growth, yield, tuber quality, and NPK content in all potato cultivars, outperforming the other organic and inorganic fertilizer treatments. Therefore, the application of organic fertilizers facilitates the sustainable use of resources while also improving potato growth, yield, and quality.
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