

## Effect of Gibberellic Acid and Chemical Fertilizers on Growth and Chemical Composition of *Cryptostegia grandiflora*, R. Br. Plants

M.M.M. Hussein

Ornamental Horticulture Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University, Egypt

**Abstract:** This study was conducted in the Experimental Nursery of the Ornamental Horticulture Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University, during the two successive seasons of 2006/2007 and 2007/2008. The aim of the study was to investigate the response of *Cryptostegia grandiflora*, R. Br. plants to gibberellic acid spray treatments and NPK fertilization (using conventional and slow-release NPK fertilizers). The plants were fertilized monthly with a conventional NPK fertilizer (18 N – 6 P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> – 6 K<sub>2</sub>O) at rates of 5 and 7 g/plant, or were supplied every 4 months with a commercial slow release fertilizer (Regal Nursery, 24 N -8 P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> -8 K<sub>2</sub>O) at rates of 15 and 21 g/plant. In addition, unfertilized plants were used as the control. Plants receiving each of the NPK fertilization levels were sprayed monthly with gibberellic acid at concentrations of 50 or 100 ppm. Control plants were sprayed with tap water. Results showed that GA<sub>3</sub> and/or chemical fertilization treatments increased the values recorded for most of the different vegetative growth parameters (vine length, number of internodes of main vine, average internode length, stem diameter, number of branches/plant, leaf area, fresh and dry weights of leaves, stems and roots/plant), as well as the N and K percentages in leaves, compared to the untreated plants. In most cases, increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentration resulted in steady increases in these parameters. Total chlorophylls, total carbohydrates and P concentrations were decreased by GA<sub>3</sub> treatments and increased by chemical fertilization treatments. Raising the application rate of each type of chemical fertilizer resulted in steady increases in the values of most of the studied growth parameters. In most cases, at the same fertilization rate, the slow-release fertilizer Regal Nursery gave higher values for most of the vegetative growth and chemical characteristics, compared to the conventional NPK fertilizer. In most cases, combining GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 ppm with the highest rate of Regal Nursery (21 g/plant/4 months) gave values that were insignificantly different than the highest values recorded for most of the vegetative characteristics, which were obtained in plants sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 100 ppm and supplied with the highest rate of Regal Nursery. From the obtained results, it can be recommended that, for the best vegetative growth of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants, the plants should be sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 ppm and supplied with 21 g/plant/ 4 month of the slow- release fertilizer Regal Nursery (24 N -8 P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> -8 K<sub>2</sub>O).

**Key words:** *Cryptostegia grandiflora* • GA<sub>3</sub> • NPK fertilization • Slow release fertilizer • Regal Nursery

### INTRODUCTION

*Cryptostegia grandiflora* (*Nerium grandiflorum*, Roxbg.), a member of the Asclepiadaceae family, is a strong, evergreen (semi-deciduous in Egypt), twining woody climber, which grows to a height of 10 m or more. It has thick-textured, oval, glossy leaves and funnel-shaped, reddish to lilac-purple flowers which appear in summer. Its stems yield poisonous latex that may cause severe discomfort if ingested. In many parts of the world, it is known as the “rubber plant” and in India it is also known as pulay or palay and is widely cultivated as an ornamental plant [1]. In addition, extracts of

*Cryptostegia grandiflora* leaves exhibit significant antibacterial activity against *Pseudomonas cepacia*, *Bacillus megaterium*, *B. subtilis*, *B. coagulans*, *Staphylococcus aureus* and *Escherichia coli* [2]. In another study, Augustus *et al.* [3], evaluated *Cryptostegia grandiflora* as a potential multi-use crop. They found that the plant contained 14.0% protein, 6.5% fixed oil, 6.9% polyphenol and 2.13% hydrocarbon. The hydrocarbon fraction contains natural rubber. The high proportion of saturated fatty acids and the high oil content (> 5.0%) make *C. grandiflora* a potential source for industrial raw material and alternative for conventional oil.

In view of the different possible uses of *C. grandiflora*, it is strange that this plant is not relatively wide spread in Egypt. It is grown in a number of botanical gardens (including El-Zohreya and El-Orman Gardens and – recently – in the Ornamental Plants Nursery, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University), but not in commercial nurseries. The importance of *C. grandiflora* for use in landscape purposes depends primarily on its ability to grow vigorously under stress conditions such as irrigation with saline water [4, 5].

Slow-release fertilizers improved growth of several plant species, including *Araucaria heterophylla* and *Chrysaliocarpus lutescens* [6], *Paspalum vaginatum* [7], *Buxus sempervirens* [8], *Plumbago capensis*, Thunb. [9] and *Zoysia Japonica* [10]. Slow-release fertilizers are safer to handle and labor-saving, compared to conventional NPK fertilizers (only 2-3 applications from the former instead of 8-12 from the latter). However, the price of slow-release fertilizers is higher than other fertilizers. Slow-release fertilizers reduce nitrogen leaching [11-14]. Also, several researchers have reported that conventional fertilization treatments favourably influence the growth of different climbing and vining plants [Brown *et al.* [15] on *Cryptostegia grandiflora*; Pereira *et al.* [16]; Silva *et al.* [17] on *Passiflora edulis*; Hussein [18] on *Cryptostegia grandiflora* and Darwish and Sakr [19] on *Hedera canariensis*].

The effect of GA<sub>3</sub> on the vegetative growth of plants was studied by El-Gendy *et al.* [20] on *Hedera helix* and *Cissus rhombifolia*, who found that GA<sub>3</sub> at 100 ppm significantly increased plant height, number of leaves/plant, as well as fresh and dry weights of aerial parts and roots. Atta-Allah [21] recorded similar results on *Dracaena marginata*, *Ficus benjamina*, *Schefflera arboricola* and *Syngonium podophyllum*. Also, Mogollon and Ojeda [22] on *Spathiphyllum* sp. plants; Srinivasa [23] on *Anthurium* plants and Darwish and Sakr [19] on *Hedera canariensis* reported that GA<sub>3</sub> increased the growth parameters of these plants as well as N and K contents.

This study was conducted to evaluate the effect of different GA<sub>3</sub> levels on growth and chemical composition of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* and to compare the responses of plants to different NPK fertilizer types and levels.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

This study was conducted at the Experimental Nursery of the Ornamental Horticulture Department,

Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University, during the two successive seasons of 2006/2007 and 2007/2008. The aim of the study was to investigate the response of *Cryptostegia grandiflora*, R. Br. plants to gibberellic acid and NPK fertilization.

Seeds of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* were sown on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2006 and 2007 (in the first and second seasons, respectively), in a glasshouse in 8-cm plastic pots filled with a 1:1 (v/v) mixture of sand and clay. On 15<sup>th</sup> May 2006 and 2007 (in the two seasons, respectively), the seedlings (with an average height of 15 cm) were transplanted into perforated polyethylene bags (25-cm diameter) filled with sand + cattle manure (4:1, v/v) as recommended by Hussein [18]. The sand was obtained from the Giza desert, while the cattle manure was obtained from the Animal Production Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Cairo University. The physical and chemical characteristics of the sand are shown in Table 1, while the physical and chemical characteristics of the cattle manure are presented in Table 2.

The plants were moved outdoors to a sunny area on June 1<sup>st</sup> 2006 and 2007 (in the first and second seasons, respectively) and fertilized with two different rates of conventional NPK fertilizer (18 N – 6 P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> – 6 K<sub>2</sub>O), or with two different rates of Regal Nursery (24 N -8 P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> -8 K<sub>2</sub>O) as a commercial slow-release fertilizer (obtained from Regal Nursery Chemical Company, USA). One kilogram of conventional NPK fertilizer was prepared by mixing 391.3 g urea (46% N), 387.1 g calcium superphosphate (15.5% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>), 125 g potassium sulphate (48% K<sub>2</sub>O) and 96.6 g sand as an inert component. Plants receiving conventional the NPK fertilizer were treated with monthly applications of this mixture, at two rates, viz., 5 or 7 g / plant. Regal Nursery was added every four months at two rates, viz., 15 or 21 g fertilizer/plant. These rates of the slow-release fertilizer provided the plants with doses of N, P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and K<sub>2</sub>O equal to those provided by the conventional NPK fertilization treatments. In addition to the four chemical fertilization treatments, unfertilized plants were used as the control.

In both seasons, plants receiving each of the NPK fertilization treatments were sprayed monthly (from 1<sup>st</sup> July, 2006 and 2007 in the first and second seasons, respectively, till 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2007 and 2008, in the two seasons, respectively) with gibberellic acid at concentrations of 50 or 100 ppm. Control plants were sprayed with tap water. On 1<sup>st</sup> August 2006 and 2007 (in the first and second seasons, respectively), wooden rods were inserted in the bags to support the plants.

Table 1: Physical and chemical characteristics of the soil used for growing *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants during the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 seasons

| Physical characteristics        |                    |               |          |          |                       |           |                    |                 |
|---------------------------------|--------------------|---------------|----------|----------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|-----------------|
| Soil texture                    | Coarse sand (%)    | Fine sand (%) | Silt (%) | Clay (%) | CaCO <sub>3</sub> (%) | EC (dS/m) | Field capacity (%) | CEC (meq/100 g) |
| sand                            | 30.6               | 60.6          | 4.3      | 4.5      | 0.62                  | 0.94      | 19.9               | 5.30            |
| Chemical characteristics        |                    |               |          |          |                       |           |                    |                 |
| Available macro-nutrients (ppm) |                    |               |          |          |                       |           |                    |                 |
| pH                              | Organic matter (%) |               |          | N        | P                     |           |                    | K               |
| 7.8                             | 1.34               |               |          | 19.5     | 2.11                  |           |                    | 97.8            |

Table 2: Physical and chemical characteristics of the cattle manure used for growing *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants during the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 seasons

| Physical characteristics     |              | Chemical characteristics |           |       |       |       |          |          |          |          |
|------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------|-----------|-------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| Density (g/cm <sup>3</sup> ) | Humidity (%) | Organic matter (%)       | EC (dS/m) | N (%) | P (%) | K (%) | Fe (ppm) | Zn (ppm) | Mn (ppm) | Cu (ppm) |
| 0.51                         | 10.66        | 61.4                     | 1.11      | 1.9   | 1.3   | 2.1   | 6.50     | 43       | 85       | 19       |

The study consisted of 180 plants. The layout of the experiment was a randomized complete blocks design with 3 blocks (replicates) and 15 treatments (5 fertilization treatments X 3 GA<sub>3</sub> treatments). Each replicate consisted of 4 plants/treatment.

On 1<sup>st</sup> June, 2007 and 2008 (in the two seasons, respectively), the experiment was terminated. The vegetative growth parameters, including vine length, number of internodes of main vine, average internode length (of internodes of main vine, cm), stem diameter (at 5 cm above soil surface), number of branches, average leaf area (of leaves on the fifth, sixth and seventh node from the top of the main stem, cm<sup>2</sup>), as well as fresh and dry weights of leaves, stems and roots/plant were recorded. In addition, chemical analysis of fresh leaf samples was conducted to determine their total chlorophylls concentration [24], while the total carbohydrates percentage was determined in dried leaf samples [25].

Also, dried leaf samples were digested to extract nutrients [26]. The extract was analyzed to determine the percentage of nitrogen [27], phosphorus [28] and potassium [29].

The data on the vegetative growth characteristics were subjected to statistical analysis of variance and the means were compared using the "Least Significant Difference (L.S.D.)" test at the 5% level [30].

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### I-Vegetative Characteristics

**I-Effect of Gibberellic Acid Treatments:** The data presented in Tables 3-6 showed that in both seasons, Spraying *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants with GA<sub>3</sub> had a generally favourable effect on the vegetative

characteristics, as compared to the control plants. In most cases, spraying *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants with GA<sub>3</sub> significantly increased vine length, internode length, stem diameter, number of branches/ plant, leaf area, as well as the fresh and dry weights of leaves, stems and roots/plant compared to the control (in both seasons). Increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentration from 50 to 100 ppm caused only a slight (insignificant) improvement in the vegetative characteristics, in most cases. The favourable effects of GA<sub>3</sub> on vegetative characteristics may be attributed to its role in promoting cambial activity, cell elongation as well as activating RNA and protein synthesis [31].

The above results are in agreement with the findings of El-Gendy *et al.* [20] on *Hedera helix* and *Cissus rhombifolia*. They reported that GA<sub>3</sub> at 100 ppm significantly increased plant height, fresh and dry weights of aerial parts and roots. Similarly, Atta-Allah [21] on *Dracaena marginata*, *Ficus benjamina*, *Schefflera arboricola* and *Syngonium podophyllum*, as well as Mogollon and Ojeda [22] on *Spathiphyllum* sp. plants and Srinivasa [23] on *Anthurium* plants, all reported that GA<sub>3</sub> increased plant growth parameters. Also, Darwish and Sakr [19] on *Hedera canariensis* reported that spraying the plants with GA<sub>3</sub> at the rate of 125 ppm monthly or 250 ppm bimonthly significantly encouraged the vegetative characteristics (plant height, stem diameter, leaf area as well as fresh and dry weights of foliage and roots).

In both seasons, spraying *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants with GA<sub>3</sub> had no significant effect on number of internodes of the main vine, as compared to the control plants. This result revealed that the significant increase in vine length was a result of the GA<sub>3</sub> treatments can be attributed to the increase in internode length. This result is in agreement with Wareing and Phillips [32].

Table 3: Effect of chemical NPK fertilizers and GA<sub>3</sub> on vine length (cm), number of internodes of main vine and average internodes length (cm) of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants during the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 seasons

| Fertilization treatments, (F)     | First season (2006/2007)  |       |       |          | Second season (2007/2008) |       |       |          |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|----------|---------------------------|-------|-------|----------|
|                                   | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |       |       |          | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |       |       |          |
|                                   | 0                         | 50    | 100   | Mean (F) | 0                         | 50    | 100   | Mean (F) |
| Vine length (cm)                  |                           |       |       |          |                           |       |       |          |
| Control                           | 112.1                     | 121.8 | 125.9 | 119.9    | 132.8                     | 141.9 | 147.8 | 140.8    |
| NPK (5g/plant)                    | 182.3                     | 206.1 | 218.4 | 202.3    | 171.0                     | 186.8 | 211.5 | 189.8    |
| NPK (7g/plant)                    | 194.8                     | 215.2 | 221.7 | 210.6    | 185.4                     | 199.1 | 215.2 | 199.9    |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)        | 192.5                     | 218.6 | 219.8 | 210.3    | 164.9                     | 211.1 | 215.6 | 197.2    |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)        | 201.1                     | 225.6 | 232.8 | 219.8    | 189.5                     | 224.8 | 241.0 | 218.4    |
| Mean (G)                          | 176.6                     | 197.5 | 203.7 | ----     | 168.7                     | 192.7 | 206.2 | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G           |                           | 9.2   |       |          |                           | 11.5  |       |          |
| F                                 |                           | 11.8  |       |          |                           | 14.9  |       |          |
| G × F                             |                           | 17.2  |       |          |                           | 19.1  |       |          |
| Number of internodes of main vine |                           |       |       |          |                           |       |       |          |
| Control                           | 14.4                      | 15.0  | 15.2  | 14.9     | 16.6                      | 17.1  | 17.8  | 17.2     |
| NPK (5g/plant)                    | 21.7                      | 21.7  | 22.3  | 21.9     | 20.6                      | 21.5  | 21.6  | 21.2     |
| NPK (7g/plant)                    | 22.4                      | 22.4  | 22.6  | 22.5     | 22.1                      | 22.1  | 22.0  | 22.1     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)        | 22.1                      | 22.3  | 22.4  | 22.3     | 19.6                      | 22.2  | 22.5  | 21.4     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)        | 22.3                      | 22.8  | 22.8  | 22.6     | 21.8                      | 22.9  | 23.2  | 22.6     |
| Mean (G)                          | 20.6                      | 20.8  | 21.1  | ----     | 20.1                      | 21.2  | 21.4  | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G           |                           | NS    |       |          |                           | NS    |       |          |
| F                                 |                           | 1.5   |       |          |                           | 1.8   |       |          |
| G × F                             |                           | 1.9   |       |          |                           | 2.1   |       |          |
| Average internodes length (cm)    |                           |       |       |          |                           |       |       |          |
| Control                           | 7.8                       | 8.1   | 8.3   | 8.1      | 8.0                       | 8.3   | 8.3   | 8.2      |
| NPK (5g/plant)                    | 8.4                       | 9.5   | 9.8   | 9.2      | 8.3                       | 8.7   | 9.8   | 8.9      |
| NPK (7g/plant)                    | 8.7                       | 9.6   | 9.8   | 9.4      | 8.4                       | 9.0   | 9.8   | 9.1      |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)        | 8.7                       | 9.8   | 9.8   | 9.4      | 8.4                       | 9.5   | 9.6   | 9.2      |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)        | 9.0                       | 9.9   | 10.2  | 9.7      | 8.7                       | 9.8   | 10.4  | 9.6      |
| Mean (G)                          | 8.5                       | 9.4   | 9.6   | ----     | 8.4                       | 9.1   | 9.6   | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G           |                           | 0.5   |       |          |                           | 0.4   |       |          |
| F                                 |                           | 0.8   |       |          |                           | 0.6   |       |          |
| G × F                             |                           | 1.1   |       |          |                           | 0.9   |       |          |

Table 4: Effect of chemical NPK fertilizers and GA<sub>3</sub> on stem diameter (mm), number of branches/plant and leaf area (cm<sup>2</sup>) of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants during the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 seasons

| Fertilization treatments, (F) | First season (2006/2007)  |      |      |          | Second season (2007/2008) |      |      |          |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------|------|----------|---------------------------|------|------|----------|
|                               | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |      |      |          | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |      |      |          |
|                               | 0                         | 50   | 100  | Mean (F) | 0                         | 50   | 100  | Mean (F) |
| Stem diameter (mm)            |                           |      |      |          |                           |      |      |          |
| Control                       | 16.4                      | 17.5 | 18.4 | 17.4     | 14.3                      | 15.6 | 16.2 | 15.4     |
| NPK (5g/plant)                | 18.5                      | 20.1 | 21.0 | 19.9     | 16.1                      | 17.8 | 18.4 | 17.4     |
| NPK (7g/plant)                | 19.6                      | 22.2 | 22.8 | 21.5     | 17.4                      | 18.8 | 20.8 | 19.0     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)    | 19.4                      | 23.5 | 23.8 | 22.2     | 17.0                      | 18.5 | 21.3 | 18.9     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)    | 20.8                      | 24.0 | 24.2 | 23.0     | 19.6                      | 20.6 | 22.8 | 21.0     |
| Mean (G)                      | 18.9                      | 21.5 | 22.0 | ----     | 16.9                      | 18.3 | 19.9 | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G       |                           | 1.3  |      |          |                           | 1.2  |      |          |
| F                             |                           | 1.6  |      |          |                           | 1.5  |      |          |
| G × F                         |                           | 2.2  |      |          |                           | 2.1  |      |          |

Table 4: Continued

|                            | Number of branches/ plant    |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Control                    | 6.6                          | 7.8  | 8.6  | 7.7  | 8.2  | 11.5 | 13.3 | 11.0 |
| NPK (5g/plant)             | 10.8                         | 13.0 | 14.4 | 12.7 | 10.4 | 11.8 | 14.3 | 12.2 |
| NPK (7g/plant)             | 12.1                         | 14.5 | 15.6 | 14.1 | 13.8 | 15.1 | 16.6 | 15.2 |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant) | 11.4                         | 13.1 | 15.0 | 13.2 | 11.2 | 13.8 | 15.6 | 13.5 |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant) | 12.8                         | 15.8 | 16.8 | 15.1 | 13.8 | 15.6 | 17.1 | 15.5 |
| Mean (G)                   | 10.7                         | 12.8 | 14.1 | ---- | 11.5 | 13.6 | 15.4 | ---- |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G    |                              | 0.8  |      |      |      | 0.6  |      |      |
| F                          |                              | 1.2  |      |      |      | 1.0  |      |      |
| G × F                      |                              | 1.6  |      |      |      | 1.5  |      |      |
|                            | Leaf area (cm <sup>2</sup> ) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| Control                    | 15.2                         | 16.1 | 17.2 | 16.2 | 14.1 | 16.5 | 16.9 | 15.8 |
| NPK (5g/plant)             | 16.1                         | 19.0 | 20.4 | 18.5 | 15.4 | 17.8 | 18.9 | 17.4 |
| NPK (7g/plant)             | 16.8                         | 19.9 | 20.6 | 19.1 | 16.5 | 18.0 | 19.3 | 17.9 |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant) | 17.4                         | 20.5 | 20.8 | 19.6 | 16.0 | 18.1 | 18.9 | 17.7 |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant) | 17.8                         | 20.7 | 20.9 | 19.8 | 16.5 | 18.5 | 19.6 | 18.2 |
| Mean (G)                   | 16.7                         | 19.2 | 20.0 | ---- | 15.7 | 17.8 | 18.7 | ---- |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G    |                              | 1.3  |      |      |      | 1.1  |      |      |
| F                          |                              | 1.5  |      |      |      | 1.4  |      |      |
| G × F                      |                              | 2.6  |      |      |      | 2.1  |      |      |

Table 5: Effect of chemical NPK fertilizers and GA<sub>3</sub> on fresh weights of leaves, stems and roots (g)/plant of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants during the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 seasons

|                               | First season (2006/2007)         |      |      |          | Second season (2007/2008) |      |      |          |
|-------------------------------|----------------------------------|------|------|----------|---------------------------|------|------|----------|
|                               | -----                            |      |      |          | -----                     |      |      |          |
|                               | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G)        |      |      |          | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |      |      |          |
|                               | -----                            |      |      |          | -----                     |      |      |          |
| Fertilization treatments, (F) | 0                                | 50   | 100  | Mean (F) | 0                         | 50   | 100  | Mean (F) |
|                               | Fresh weight of leaves (g/plant) |      |      |          |                           |      |      |          |
| Control                       | 18.3                             | 21.8 | 19.6 | 19.9     | 14.8                      | 16.9 | 16.1 | 15.9     |
| NPK (5g/plant)                | 32.2                             | 36.4 | 37.2 | 35.3     | 26.5                      | 29.8 | 30.8 | 29.0     |
| NPK (7g/plant)                | 38.5                             | 42.2 | 43.8 | 41.5     | 29.6                      | 31.7 | 33.8 | 31.7     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)    | 36.8                             | 41.9 | 42.8 | 40.5     | 29.0                      | 36.5 | 39.7 | 35.1     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)    | 45.1                             | 48.4 | 48.1 | 47.2     | 38.1                      | 45.3 | 48.0 | 43.8     |
| Mean (G)                      | 34.2                             | 38.1 | 38.3 | ----     | 27.6                      | 32.0 | 33.7 | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G       |                                  | 2.1  |      |          |                           | 1.9  |      |          |
| F                             |                                  | 2.9  |      |          |                           | 2.5  |      |          |
| G × F                         |                                  | 3.4  |      |          |                           | 3.5  |      |          |
|                               | Fresh weight of stems (g/plant)  |      |      |          |                           |      |      |          |
| Control                       | 45.4                             | 48.8 | 50.1 | 48.1     | 51.4                      | 52.8 | 53.6 | 52.6     |
| NPK (5g/plant)                | 69.9                             | 76.8 | 80.1 | 75.6     | 72.6                      | 76.9 | 79.4 | 76.3     |
| NPK (7g/plant)                | 78.6                             | 83.4 | 85.5 | 82.5     | 86.8                      | 89.4 | 91.3 | 89.2     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)    | 74.1                             | 82.0 | 87.3 | 81.1     | 84.4                      | 90.3 | 92.5 | 89.1     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)    | 81.5                             | 87.0 | 88.9 | 85.5     | 89.1                      | 92.5 | 93.4 | 91.7     |
| Mean (G)                      | 69.9                             | 75.6 | 78.4 | ----     | 76.9                      | 80.4 | 82.0 | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G       |                                  | 3.7  |      |          |                           | 4.1  |      |          |
| F                             |                                  | 4.2  |      |          |                           | 5.6  |      |          |
| G × F                         |                                  | 6.7  |      |          |                           | 7.8  |      |          |

Table 5: Continued

|                            | Fresh weight of roots (g/plant) |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Control                    | 32.1                            | 33.5 | 33.5 | 33.0 | 34.5 | 36.8 | 38.9 | 36.7 |
| NPK (5g/plant)             | 45.4                            | 48.5 | 49.5 | 47.8 | 44.4 | 49.6 | 50.3 | 48.1 |
| NPK (7g/plant)             | 51.0                            | 56.4 | 56.9 | 54.8 | 53.0 | 56.8 | 57.9 | 55.9 |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant) | 52.1                            | 54.3 | 56.5 | 54.3 | 46.5 | 53.1 | 56.5 | 52.0 |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant) | 54.2                            | 60.4 | 63.6 | 59.4 | 57.2 | 59.9 | 64.1 | 60.4 |
| Mean (G)                   | 47.0                            | 50.6 | 52.0 | ---- | 47.1 | 51.2 | 53.5 | ---- |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G    |                                 | 3.5  |      |      |      | 3.6  |      |      |
| F                          |                                 | 4.7  |      |      |      | 4.9  |      |      |
| G × F                      |                                 | 6.1  |      |      |      | 6.7  |      |      |

Table 6: Effect of chemical NPK fertilizers and GA<sub>3</sub> on dry weights of leaves, stems and roots (g)/plant of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants during the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 seasons

| Fertilization treatments, (F)  | First season (2006/2007)  |       |       |          | Second season (2007/2008) |       |       |          |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-------|-------|----------|---------------------------|-------|-------|----------|
|                                | -----                     |       |       |          | -----                     |       |       |          |
|                                | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |       |       |          | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |       |       |          |
|                                | -----                     |       |       |          | -----                     |       |       |          |
|                                | 0                         | 50    | 100   | Mean (F) | 0                         | 50    | 100   | Mean (F) |
| dry weight of leaves (g/plant) |                           |       |       |          |                           |       |       |          |
| Control                        | 5.18                      | 5.56  | 5.12  | 5.29     | 3.74                      | 4.58  | 4.27  | 4.20     |
| NPK (5g/plant)                 | 8.73                      | 10.74 | 11.20 | 10.22    | 7.63                      | 9.27  | 10.01 | 8.97     |
| NPK (7g/plant)                 | 10.97                     | 12.79 | 13.84 | 12.53    | 8.64                      | 9.76  | 10.95 | 9.78     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)     | 10.86                     | 13.24 | 13.70 | 12.60    | 8.61                      | 11.38 | 13.42 | 11.14    |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)     | 13.80                     | 15.68 | 16.11 | 15.20    | 11.01                     | 14.72 | 15.26 | 13.66    |
| Mean (G)                       | 9.91                      | 11.60 | 11.99 | ----     | 7.93                      | 9.94  | 10.78 | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G        |                           | 0.82  |       |          |                           | 0.88  |       |          |
| F                              |                           | 0.94  |       |          |                           | 0.96  |       |          |
| G × F                          |                           | 1.54  |       |          |                           | 1.68  |       |          |
| dry weight of stems (g/plant)  |                           |       |       |          |                           |       |       |          |
| Control                        | 12.44                     | 13.91 | 14.08 | 13.48    | 14.65                     | 15.36 | 15.06 | 15.02    |
| NPK (5g/plant)                 | 20.83                     | 23.65 | 24.27 | 22.92    | 22.72                     | 24.99 | 26.84 | 24.85    |
| NPK (7g/plant)                 | 25.55                     | 28.86 | 30.18 | 28.20    | 29.95                     | 32.99 | 32.05 | 31.66    |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)     | 23.19                     | 28.29 | 29.68 | 27.05    | 28.78                     | 32.06 | 33.39 | 31.41    |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)     | 28.16                     | 31.58 | 32.98 | 31.06    | 31.90                     | 34.13 | 33.16 | 33.06    |
| Mean (G)                       | 22.12                     | 25.26 | 26.24 | ----     | 25.60                     | 27.91 | 28.10 | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G        |                           | 1.15  |       |          |                           | 1.23  |       |          |
| F                              |                           | 1.46  |       |          |                           | 1.55  |       |          |
| G × F                          |                           | 2.11  |       |          |                           | 2.24  |       |          |
| dry weight of roots (g/plant)  |                           |       |       |          |                           |       |       |          |
| Control                        | 9.66                      | 10.45 | 11.22 | 10.44    | 10.07                     | 11.59 | 12.76 | 11.47    |
| NPK (5g/plant)                 | 15.71                     | 17.85 | 18.36 | 17.31    | 14.25                     | 17.81 | 19.11 | 17.06    |
| NPK (7g/plant)                 | 18.41                     | 20.98 | 22.13 | 20.51    | 17.76                     | 21.64 | 22.47 | 20.62    |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)     | 18.29                     | 20.91 | 22.09 | 20.43    | 15.86                     | 19.97 | 21.75 | 19.19    |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)     | 20.70                     | 23.86 | 25.76 | 23.44    | 20.71                     | 23.06 | 25.58 | 23.12    |
| Mean (G)                       | 16.55                     | 18.81 | 19.91 | ----     | 15.73                     | 18.81 | 20.33 | ----     |
| LSD <sub>(0.05)</sub> G        |                           | 1.45  |       |          |                           | 1.64  |       |          |
| F                              |                           | 1.84  |       |          |                           | 1.95  |       |          |
| G × F                          |                           | 2.94  |       |          |                           | 3.01  |       |          |

**2-Effect of NPK Fertilizer Treatments:** Data presented in Tables 3-6 indicated that, in both seasons, addition of any rate of the two types of fertilizers (conventional NPK fertilizers or Regal Nursery) significantly increased the values of the vegetative parameters of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants, compared to the unfertilized plants (control). Such results were reported on *Plumbago capensis* [9], *Cryptostegia grandiflora* [18], *Senna sulfurea* [33] and *Senna occidentalis* [34].

Moreover, with either one of the two types of fertilizer, raising the application rate increased the values recorded for all of the vegetative characteristics recorded. In both seasons, raising the application rate of the conventional or slow-release NPK fertilizers resulted in significant increases in number of branches /plant, fresh weight of leaves/plant, dry weight of stems/plant, as well as the fresh and dry weights of roots/plant. Also, raising the application rate of the conventional NPK fertilizer increased stem diameter and fresh weight of stems/plant significantly, while raising the application rate of Regal Nursery increased the dry weight of leaves/plant (in both seasons). The favourable effect of the NPK fertilization treatments on the vegetative growth characteristics (compared to the control) can be explained by the important roles of N, P and K in the different physiological processes within the plant, which in turn affect plant growth. Also, nitrogen is present in the structure of protein molecules, while phosphorus is an essential constituent of nucleic acids and phospholipids and potassium is essential as an activator for enzymes involved in the synthesis of certain peptide bonds [31].

In both seasons, at the same NPK rates, Regal Nursery (slow-release NPK fertilizer) gave better results than conventional NPK fertilization, with no significant difference between them in most cases. In both seasons, using the highest Regal Nursery fertilization rate (21 g/pot/4 months) gave significantly higher fresh and dry weights of leaves /plant, as well as a significantly higher dry weight of roots, compared to the other fertilization treatments.

**3-Effect of Combinations of GA<sub>3</sub> and NPK Fertilizer:** Regarding the interaction between the effects of spraying *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants with GA<sub>3</sub> and the fertilization treatments, the data recorded on the vegetative characteristics (Tables 3-6) showed that, within each GA<sub>3</sub> concentration, fertilization improved vegetative characteristics. Increasing fertilization rate increased the values recorded for the studied parameters. Also, at the

same NPK rates, Regal Nursery (slow-release NPK fertilizer) gave generally better results than conventional NPK fertilization.

In most cases, within each fertilization treatment, increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentration improved the vegetative characteristics.

In both seasons, the highest values recorded for most of the vegetative characteristics were obtained from plants sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 100 ppm and supplied with the highest rate of slow-release fertilizer (Regal Nursery at 21g/plant/4 months). In most cases, plants sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 ppm and supplied with the highest rate of slow-release fertilizer (Regal Nursery at 21g/plant/4 months) gave insignificantly different values, as compared to the highest values recorded for the different vegetative characteristics.

On the other hand, in most cases, the lowest values for the studied vegetative parameters were obtained from untreated plants (control).

## II-Chemical Compositions

**I-Total Chlorophylls Concentration:** The data presented in Table 7 showed that, in both seasons, leaves of untreated *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants had higher total chlorophylls (a+b) concentrations, compared to those of plants sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 or 100 ppm. Moreover, increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentration from 50 to 100 ppm decreased total chlorophylls concentration in leaves. Such results were reported on *Hibiscus syriacus* [35] and *Casuarina equisetifolia*, L. [36].

In most cases, the decrease in the total chlorophylls concentration in fresh leaves as a result of spraying GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 or 100 ppm can be attributed to the role of GA<sub>3</sub> growth stimulation (as previously discussed), which is accompanied by an increase in the total chlorophylls content in all the leaves of the treated plants, as compared to the control plants (which can be confirmed by calculating the total amount of chlorophylls in the leaves, by multiplying the leaves fresh weight by the total chlorophylls concentration). However, the total chlorophylls concentration was reduced because the total chlorophylls content was diluted in a high fresh weight of leaves.

Chemical fertilization increased the total chlorophylls concentration in leaves of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants in both seasons, as compared to the unfertilized plants (Table 7). A similar increase in the chlorophylls concentration as a result of fertilization treatments has been recorded by El-Shewaikh [37]

Table 7: Effect of chemical NPK fertilizers and GA<sub>3</sub> on total chlorophylls concentrations, total carbohydrates percent, N, P, K% in leaves of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants during the 2006/2007 and 2007/2008 seasons

| Fertilization treatments, (F)                         | First season (2006/2007)  |      |      |          | Second season (2007/2008) |      |      |          |
|---|---------------------------|------|------|----------|---------------------------|------|------|----------|
|   | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |      |      |          | GA <sub>3</sub> , ppm (G) |      |      |          |
|   | 0                         | 50   | 100  | Mean (F) | 0                         | 50   | 100  | Mean (F) |
| Total chlorophylls concentration (mg/g fresh matter)) |                           |      |      |          |                           |      |      |          |
| Control   | 1.52                      | 1.40 | 1.21 | 1.38     | 1.61                      | 1.58 | 1.42 | 1.54     |
| NPK (5g/plant)  | 1.64                      | 1.49 | 1.37 | 1.50     | 1.80                      | 1.65 | 1.44 | 1.63     |
| NPK (7g/plant)  | 1.83                      | 1.70 | 1.56 | 1.70     | 1.94                      | 1.86 | 1.64 | 1.81     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)                            | 1.79                      | 1.68 | 1.48 | 1.65     | 1.86                      | 1.70 | 1.51 | 1.69     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)                            | 2.01                      | 1.94 | 1.69 | 1.88     | 1.98                      | 1.86 | 1.70 | 1.85     |
| Mean (G)  | 1.76                      | 1.64 | 1.46 | ----     | 1.84                      | 1.73 | 1.54 | ----     |
| Total carbohydrates (% of dry matter)                 |                           |      |      |          |                           |      |      |          |
| Control   | 35.3                      | 34.2 | 30.0 | 33.2     | 32.7                      | 32.3 | 29.7 | 31.6     |
| NPK (5g/plant)  | 38.9                      | 37.2 | 33.2 | 36.4     | 37.4                      | 36.6 | 33.2 | 35.7     |
| NPK (7g/plant)  | 39.2                      | 37.7 | 33.8 | 36.9     | 38.0                      | 37.1 | 33.3 | 36.1     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)                            | 35.7                      | 33.8 | 32.3 | 33.9     | 35.7                      | 34.5 | 32.7 | 34.3     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)                            | 39.8                      | 38.7 | 34.2 | 37.6     | 38.3                      | 37.7 | 35.7 | 37.2     |
| Mean (G)  | 37.8                      | 36.3 | 32.7 | ----     | 36.4                      | 35.6 | 32.9 | ----     |
| N (% of dry matter)                                   |                           |      |      |          |                           |      |      |          |
| Control   | 1.41                      | 1.48 | 1.56 | 1.48     | 1.31                      | 1.34 | 1.34 | 1.33     |
| NPK (5g/plant)  | 1.85                      | 1.99 | 2.04 | 1.96     | 1.72                      | 1.80 | 1.84 | 1.79     |
| NPK (7g/plant)  | 2.09                      | 2.28 | 2.26 | 2.21     | 1.89                      | 1.96 | 2.13 | 1.99     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)                            | 1.98                      | 2.11 | 2.13 | 2.07     | 1.79                      | 1.98 | 2.11 | 1.96     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)                            | 2.18                      | 2.22 | 2.15 | 2.18     | 1.85                      | 1.98 | 2.23 | 2.02     |
| Mean (G)  | 1.90                      | 2.02 | 2.03 | ----     | 1.71                      | 1.81 | 1.93 | ----     |
| P (% of dry matter)                                   |                           |      |      |          |                           |      |      |          |
| Control   | 0.19                      | 0.16 | 0.15 | 0.17     | 0.22                      | 0.20 | 0.15 | 0.19     |
| NPK (5g/plant)  | 0.23                      | 0.19 | 0.17 | 0.20     | 0.24                      | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.22     |
| NPK (7g/plant)  | 0.25                      | 0.22 | 0.21 | 0.23     | 0.28                      | 0.27 | 0.23 | 0.26     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)                            | 0.26                      | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.23     | 0.26                      | 0.25 | 0.21 | 0.24     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)                            | 0.29                      | 0.25 | 0.23 | 0.26     | 0.29                      | 0.26 | 0.23 | 0.26     |
| Mean (G)  | 0.24                      | 0.21 | 0.19 | ----     | 0.26                      | 0.24 | 0.21 | ----     |
| K (% of dry matter)                                   |                           |      |      |          |                           |      |      |          |
| Control   | 1.53                      | 1.58 | 1.64 | 1.58     | 1.46                      | 1.61 | 1.63 | 1.57     |
| NPK (5g/plant)  | 1.99                      | 2.11 | 2.15 | 2.08     | 1.89                      | 2.06 | 2.16 | 2.04     |
| NPK (7g/plant)  | 2.16                      | 2.20 | 2.28 | 2.21     | 1.95                      | 2.11 | 2.24 | 2.10     |
| Regal Nursery (15 g/plant)                            | 2.01                      | 2.19 | 2.21 | 2.14     | 1.90                      | 2.18 | 2.28 | 2.12     |
| Regal Nursery (21 g/plant)                            | 2.25                      | 2.28 | 2.29 | 2.27     | 2.11                      | 2.21 | 2.29 | 2.20     |
| Mean (G)  | 1.99                      | 2.07 | 2.11 | ----     | 1.86                      | 2.03 | 2.12 | ----     |

on *Brunfelsia calycina*. Within each type of fertilizer, raising the application rate increased the total chlorophylls concentration. The increase in the total chlorophylls concentration as a result of raising the fertilization rate is in agreement with the results reported by Hussein *et al.* [9] on *Plumbago capensis* plants. In both seasons, when the two chemical fertilizers were applied at rates providing equivalent supplies of nutrients, Regal Nursery was more effective than conventional NPK fertilization for increasing the concentrations of total chlorophylls. Consequently, treating *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants with the highest rate of Regal Nursery every 4 months gave the highest concentrations of total chlorophylls.

Regarding the interaction between GA<sub>3</sub> and chemical fertilization, the data in Table 7 showed that in both seasons, within each fertilization treatment, increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentration resulted in a decrease in total chlorophylls concentration. Within each GA<sub>3</sub> concentration, fertilization increased total chlorophylls concentrations of leaves as compared to the control plants, in both seasons. Increasing fertilization rate resulted in an increase in total chlorophylls. Also, at the same NPK rates, Regal Nursery (slow-release NPK fertilizer) gave better results than conventional NPK fertilization. In both seasons, plants that did not receive GA<sub>3</sub> but were fertilized with the highest Regal Nursery rate had the highest total chlorophylls



value, whereas the lowest value was recorded with unfertilized plants that were sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 100 ppm.

**2-Total Carbohydrates Percent:** The data presented in Table 7 showed that, in both seasons, *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants that were not sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> had higher percentage of total carbohydrates in their leaves, compared to plants sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 or 100 ppm. Increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentration steadily decreased total carbohydrates percentage in leaves. Such results were reported on *Hibiscus syriacus* [35]; *Casuarina equisetifolia*, L. [36] and *Dahlia hybrida* [38].

Generally, the decrease in the total carbohydrates percentage in dried leaves as a result of spraying GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 or 100 ppm, compared to the control plants, can be attributed to the dilution effect as previously discussed regarding the total chlorophylls concentration.

The data in Table 7 also showed that chemical fertilization was beneficial for the synthesis and accumulation of carbohydrates in the leaves of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants. In both seasons, the values recorded were higher in plants receiving any of the different chemical fertilization treatments, compared to the control. Similar increases in the carbohydrates percent have been reported by Hussein [34] on *Senna occidentalis* plants.

Within each type of chemical fertilizer, raising the application rate increased the carbohydrates percentage. At the lower fertilization rate, conventional NPK fertilization treatment was more effective than Regal Nursery treatment for increasing the carbohydrates percentage. On the other hand, with using the higher fertilization rate, Regal Nursery was more effective than conventional NPK fertilization treatment for increasing the carbohydrates percentage. In both seasons, the highest values were obtained from plants fertilized with Regal Nursery at 21 g/plant/4 months. The increase in the percentage of total carbohydrates as a result of raising the rate of NPK or slow-release fertilizers is similar to that reported by Hussein *et al.* [9] on *Plumbago capensis* plants.

The favourable effect of the different chemical fertilization treatments on the percentage of total carbohydrates may be indirectly attributed to the increase in the percentage of total chlorophylls as a result of the treatments. As the synthesis of total chlorophylls was promoted, the rate of photosynthesis increased, leading to an increase in carbohydrate synthesis. Also, potassium can act as an activator of several enzymes involved in

carbohydrate metabolism [39]. Moreover, this promotion in the synthesis of total chlorophylls and total carbohydrates as a result of chemical fertilization may explain the increase in vegetative growth that was detected in plants receiving the different chemical fertilization treatments.

As a result of the interaction between the GA<sub>3</sub> treatments and chemical fertilization treatments, the highest total carbohydrates percentage (in both seasons) was obtained from plants receiving no GA<sub>3</sub> treatment, but fertilized with Regal Nursery at 21 g/plant/4 months. On the other hand, the lowest total carbohydrates values were recorded in leaves of unfertilized plants sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 100 ppm.

### **3-N, P and K%**

**a-Effect of Gibberellic Acid Treatments:** The results recorded in the two seasons (Table 7) showed that the uptake and accumulation of N and K in *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants were enhanced by GA<sub>3</sub> treatments, since control plants had lower N and K% than plants sprayed with different GA<sub>3</sub> concentrations. The N and K% were increased with increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentrations. Such results were reported on *Hedera canarensis* [19], *Spathiphyllum* sp. [22] and *Anthurium* plants [23].

Regarding the effect of GA<sub>3</sub> treatments on the P% in the leaves, the data presented in Table 7 showed that, in both seasons, leaves of untreated *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants had higher P%, compared to those of plants sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 or 100 ppm. Increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentration steadily decreased P% in leaves. Such results were reported on sweet basil [40] as well as *Casuarina cunninghamiana* and *C. glauca* plants [41]. Generally, the decrease in the P% in dried leaves as a result of spraying GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 or 100 ppm, in most cases, compared to the control plants can be attributed to the dilution effect as previously discussed regarding the total chlorophylls and total carbohydrates.

**b-Effect of NPK Fertilizer Treatments:** As shown in Table 7, the N, P and K% exhibited a similar trend of response to the different chemical fertilization treatments, in most cases. In both seasons, the lowest percentages of the three nutrients were recorded in the leaves of the control plants. Raising the fertilization rate increased the percentages of the three nutrients, regardless of the type of chemical fertilizer applied. The increase in the percentages of nutrients in the tissues of leaves as a result of increasing fertilization rates can be easily explained, since raising NPK levels in the root medium led

to more vegetative and root growth. This may be accompanied by more absorption of essential elements from the soil and their accumulation in plant tissues [42]. Similar increases in the N, P and K% as a result of raising the fertilization rates have been reported by Hussein *et al.* [9] on *Plumbago capensis* plants. In both seasons, the slow-release NPK fertilizer (Regal Nursery) appeared to be more effective than the conventional NPK fertilizer for increasing the percentages of the three nutrients, since the highest N, P and K% were obtained from the leaves of plants fertilized with the highest rate of Regal Nursery (21 g / plant/ 4 months). The only exception to this general trend was observed in the first season with plants fertilized with the highest rate of the conventional NPK fertilizer (7 g / plant / month) which gave the highest N%.

#### **c-Effect of Combinations of GA<sub>3</sub> and NPK Fertilizer:**

Regarding the interaction between the effects of GA<sub>3</sub> and chemical fertilization on the N, P and K%, the data in Table 7 showed that, within each GA<sub>3</sub> concentration, fertilization increased N, P and K%. Increasing fertilization rate resulted in an increase of the values recorded for the three elements. Also, at the same NPK rates, Regal Nursery (slow-release NPK fertilizer) gave generally better results than conventional NPK fertilization. In most cases, within each fertilization treatment, increasing GA<sub>3</sub> concentration increased the N and K%, but decreased the P%.

In the first season, the highest N% was recorded in the leaves of plants sprayed with 50 ppm GA<sub>3</sub> and supplied with the highest rate of the conventional NPK fertilizer, whereas in the second season, plants sprayed with 100 ppm GA<sub>3</sub> and fertilized with the highest rate of Regal Nursery had the highest N%. In both seasons, plants that received no GA<sub>3</sub> treatment but were fertilized with the highest rate of Regal Nursery gave the highest P%. The highest K% was recorded in leaves of plants sprayed with 100 ppm GA<sub>3</sub> and supplied with the highest rate of Regal Nursery.

In both seasons, untreated *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants had the lowest N and K% in their leaves, whereas the lowest P% was found in unfertilized plants sprayed with 100 ppm GA<sub>3</sub>.

#### **CONCLUSION**

from the above results, it can be recommended that, for the best vegetative characteristics, *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants should be sprayed with GA<sub>3</sub> at 50 ppm and supplied with the highest rate of the slow-release fertilizer Regal Nursery (21g/plant/4 months).

#### **REFERENCES**

1. Brickell, C., 1999. The Royal Horticultural Society New Encyclopedia of Plants and Flowers. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., Dorling Kindersley, Ltd., London, pp: 539.
2. Mukherjee, P.K., R. Gunasekhran, T. Subburaju, S.P. Dhanbal, B. Duraiswamy, P. Vijayan and B. Suresh, 1999. Studies on the antibacterial potential of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* R.Br. (Asclepiadaceae) extract. *Phytotherapy Research*, 13: 70-72.
3. Augustus, G.D.P.S., M. Jayabalan and G.J. Seiler, 2000. *Cryptostegia grandiflora* – a potential multi-use crop. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 11: 59-62.
4. Mansour, H.A., 2003. Effect of irrigation intervals and water salinity on growth and chemical composition of *Cryptostegia grandiflora* plants. *J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ.*, 28: 451-471.
5. Sakr, W.R. and M.A. Darwish, 2008. Tolerance of *Cryptostegia grandiflora*, R. Br. grown in sandy soil to irrigation water salinity. *J. Product. Dev.*, 13: 489-505.
6. Hong, J., J.S. Lee and B.H. Kwack, 1994. Influence of light intensity and quality and fertilizer on growth and leaf variegation of *Codiaeum variegatum* 'Yellow Jade' for indoor landscaping. *J. Korean Soc. Hort. Sci.*, 35: 610-616.
7. Hussein, M.M.M. and H.A. Mansour, 2001. Organic and chemical fertilization of seashore paspalum turfgrass in sandy soil. *Al-Azhar J. Agric. Res.*, 34: 211- 234.
8. Musselwhite, S., R. Harris and R. Wright, 2004. Fertilizer requirements for container-grown *Buxus sp.* *J. Envir. Hort.*, 22: 50- 54.
9. Hussein, M.M.M., H.A. Mansour and H.A. Ashour, 2008. Growth of *Plumbago capensis*, Thunb. in sandy soil as affected by soil amendments and fertilization. *J. Product and Dev.*, 13: 59-77.
10. Sakr, W.R., M.M.M. Hussein and M.M. Kamel, 2008. Response of Japanese lawngrass (*Zoysia japonica*, Steud.) grown in sandy soil to some soil amendments and fertilization treatments. *Am-Euras. J. Agric. and Environ. Sci.*, 3: 298-313.
11. Vallejo, A., M.C. Cartagena, D. Rodriguez and J.A. Diez, 1993. Nitrogen availability of soluble and slow-release nitrogen fertilizers as assessed by electroultrafiltration. *Fertilizer Research*, 34: 121-126.
12. Diez, J.A., R. Roman, M.C. Cartagena, A. Vallejo, A. Bustos and R. Caballero, 1994. Controlling nitrate pollution of aquifers by using different nitrogenous controlled release fertilizers in maize crop. *Agriculture, Ecosystems and Environment*, 48: 49-56.

13. Diez, J.A., R. Roman, M.C. Cartagena, A. Vallejo, A. Bustos and R. Caballero, 1996. Control of nitrate pollution by application of controlled release fertilizer (CRF), compost and an optimized irrigation system. *Fertilizer Research*, 43: 191-195.
14. Volterrani, M., M. Gaetani, N. Grossi, G. Pardini, S. Miele and S. Magni, 1999. The use of organic fertilizers on turf. Dynamics of nitrogen uptake and losses. *Rivista di Agronomia*, 33: 34-39.
15. Brown, J.R., J.C. Scanlan and J.G. McIvor, 1998. Competition by herbs as a limiting factor in shrub invasion in grassland: a test with different growth forms. *J. Vegetation Sci.*, 9: 829-836.
16. Pereira, W.E., S.F. Lima, L.B. Paula and V.V.H. Alvarez, 2000. Growth and mineral composition of passion fruit seedlings in function of Osmocote doses in two substrates. *Revista Ceres*, 47: 311-323.
17. Silva, R.P. da, J.R. Peixoto and N.T.V. Junqueira, 2001. The substrate influence on the development of seedlings of yellow passion fruit (*Passiflora edulis* Sims). *Revista Brasileira de Fruticultura*, 23: 377-381.
18. Hussein, M.M.M., 2002. Growth of *Cryptostegia grandiflora*, R.Br. in sandy soil as affected by fertilization and soil amendments. Proc. of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Cong. on Recent Tech. in Agric., Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., 28-30 October, 2002. *Bull. Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., Egypt*, Special edition: pp: 362-378.
19. Darwish, M.A. and W.R. Sakr, 2008. Effect of commercial fertilizers and gibberellic acid on growth and chemical composition of *Hedera canariensis*, wild plants. *J. Product and Dev.*, 13: 489-505.
20. El-Gendy, W.M.N., M.A. Zaghloul and S.M. Saleh, 1995. Effect of ammonium sulphate and GA<sub>3</sub> on the growth and chemical composition of *Hedera helix* and *Cissus rhombifolia*. *Annals of Agric. Sci., Ain Shams Univ., Cairo*, 40: 385-397.
21. Atta-Allah, H.K., 1997. Effect of fertilization and GA<sub>3</sub> on the vegetative growth and chemical composition of some foliage plants. *Annals Agric. Sci., Moshtohor*, 35: 1513-1530.
22. Mogollon, M.N.J. and M.M.G. Ojeda, 2005. Effect of gibberellic acid and brassinosteroids on the vegetative and reproductive growth of *Spathiphyllum* sp. 'Petite'. *Proceedings of the Inter-American Society for Tropical Horticulture*, 48: 169-172.
23. Srinivasa, V., 2006. Effect of fertilizers on leaf nutrient content in *Anthurium* cv. Chaco. *Crop Research Hisar*, 31: 78-80.
24. Nornai, R., 1982. Formula for determination of total chlorophylls pigments extracted with N.N. dimethyl formamide. *Plant Physiol.*, 69: 1371-1381.
25. Dubois, M., F. Smith, K.A. Gilles, J.K. Hamilton and P.A. Rebers, 1956. Colorimetric method for determination of sugars and related substances. *Annal. Chem.*, 28: 350-356.
26. Piper, C.S., 1947. *Soil and Plant Analysis*. Univ. of Adelaide, Adelaide, Australia, pp: 258-275.
27. Pregl, P., 1945. *Quantitative Organic Micro Analysis*, 4<sup>th</sup> Ed, Churchill Publishing Co., London, pp: 78-85.
28. Jackson, M.L., 1967. *Soil Chemical Analysis*. Prentice Hall, India., pp: 144-197.
29. Chapman, H.D. and P.F. Pratt, 1961. *Methods of Soil, Plants and Water Analysis*. Univ. of California, Division of Agricultural Sciences, pp: 60-69.
30. Little, T.M. and F.J. Hills, 1978. *Agricultural Experimentation – Design and Analysis*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, USA, pp: 61-63.
31. Devlin, R.M., 1975. *Plant Physiology*. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, Affiliated East-West Press Pvt. Ltd., New Delhi, India, pp: 217-234, 268-277, 358-361 and 484.
32. Wareing, P.F. and I.D.J. Phillips, 1973. *The Control of Growth and Differentiation in Plants*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, pp: 102.
33. Mansour, H.A., 2002. Influence of soil amendments and NPK fertilization on the growth and chemical composition of *Senna sulfurea* plants grown in a sandy soil. *Annals Agri. Sci. Moshtohor*, 40: 1779-1796.
34. Hussein, M.M.M., 2003. Growth of *Senna occidentalis* (L.) Link in sandy soil as affected by fertilization and soil amendments. *Bull. Fac. Agric. Cairo Univ.*, 54: 189-216.
35. Lee, H.S. and B.H. Kwack, 1995. Effect of uniconazole and GA<sub>3</sub> on growth and flowering of *Hibiscus syriacus*, L. showing different growing habits. *J. Korean Soc. Hor. Sci.*, 36: 121-131.
36. Asmaael, R.M.E., 1997. Effect of Saline Water Irrigation and Gibberellic Acid on Growth and Chemical Composition of *Casuarina equisetifolia*, L. Seedlings. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., Egypt.
37. El-Shewaikh, Y.M.M.E., 2000. Effect of Mineral Nutrition, Planting Media and Size of Pots on *Brunfelsia calycina*, L. Plants. Ph. D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ., Egypt.
38. Habib, A.M.A., 1997. Effect of Chemical Fertilization and Growth Regulators on Growth, Flowering and Chemical Composition of *Dahlia hybrida* Plants. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ. Egypt.

39. Taiz, L. and E. Zeiger, 1998. Plant Physiology. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., Sinauer Associates, Inc., Publishers, Sunderland, Massachusetts, USA, pp: 67-76, 114-115 and 602- 608.
40. El-Leithy, A.S., 1983. Effect of Some Growth Regulators and Soil Media on Growth, Oil Yield and Constituents of Oil of Sweet Basil Plants (*Ocimum basilicum*). M. Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Cairo Univ. Egypt.
41. Owais, M.H., A.A. Meawad and S. Gwefil, 1991. Gibberellin treatments affecting growth, chemical composition and specific gravity of *Casuarina cunninghamiana* and *C. glauca* seedlings. Zagazig J. Agric. Res., 18: 2267-2281.
42. Jain, V.K., 1983. Fundamentals of Plant Physiology. 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed., S. Chand and Company, Ltd., Ram Nagar, New Delhi, pp: 72-87.