

UNIVERSITĂȚII DIN CRAIOVA

VOL. XXIX (LXV) - 2024

# ✓ BIOLOGIE ✓ HORTICULTURĂ

# ✓ TEHNOLOGIA PRELUCRĂRII PRODUSELOR AGRICOLE ✓ INGINERIA MEDIULUI

ANNALES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA

CRAIOVA – 2024 Editura UNIVERSITARIA

#### GENERAL EDITOR: Prof. PhD Sina COSMULESCU EDITOR: Assoc. Prof. PhD. Cristian MĂRĂCINEANU

### SCIENTIFIC BOARD

• Bilal ACAR, Faculty of Agriculture, University of Selcuk, Konya-Turkey

• Adrian ASĂNICĂ - University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Bucharest, Romania

- Valerian BĂLAN Agrarian State University, Republic of Moldova
- Radu SESTRAŞ University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania
- Constantin BĂDUCĂ Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania
- Mihai BOTU Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania

• Liviu Mihai IRIMIA - University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine lasi, Romania

• Dorin CAMEN - Banat University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Timisoara, Romania

- Daniela Doloris CICHI Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania
- Vily CIMPOIAŞU Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania
- Daniela CIUPÉANU CĂLUGĂRU Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania
- Sina COSMULESCU Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania
- Ana-Maria DODOCIOIU Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania

• Lucia DRAGHIA - University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Iasi, Romania

• Alin DOBREI - Banat University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Timisoara, Romania

- Gheorghe GLĂMAN President of the Romanian Horticultural Society, Romania
- Nicolae GIUGEA Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania

• Michèle GUILLOUX - BÉNATIER- Institut Universitaire de la Vigne et du Vin "Jules Guyot", Université Bourgogne, France

• Dorel HOZA - University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Bucharest, Romania

- Stavros LALAS Technological Education Institution of Thessaly, Larissa, Greece
- Cristian MĂRĂCINEANU Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania

• Mugurel JITEA - University of Agronomic Sciences and Veterinary Medicine Cluj-Napoca, Romania

- Ion MITREA Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania
- Violeta NOUR Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania

• Alexandros PAPACHATZIS - Technological Education Institution of Thessaly, Larissa, Greece

• Jocelyne PÉRARD - Responsable de la Chaire UNESCO "Culture et tradition de Vin", Université Bourgogne, France

- Aurel POPA Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania
- Daniel RĂDUŢOIU Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania

• Felicia TUŢULESCU - Faculty of Horticulture, University of Craiova, Romania

• Aurelia DIACONU - Research and Development Station for Plant Culture on Sandy Soils Dabuleni, Romania

• Dorin SUMEDREA - National Research and Development Institute for Biotechnologies in Horticulture, Ștefănești-Argeș, România

#### ANNALS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA – DOLJ

A.I.Cuza Street, No. 13, Code 200585 - Craiova, Romania

ISSN 1453 - 1275

Sections:

BIOLOGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING

HORTICULTURE AND FOOD PRODUCTS PROCESSING TECHNOLOGY

#### Series: ✓Biology

ANNALS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CRAIOVA  ✓Horticulture
✓Food products processing technology
✓Environmental engineering

# Vol. XXIX (LXV) - 2024

# RESULTS REGARDING THE INFLUENCE OF GREEN MANURE USAGE ON MAIZE CROP ON ACIDIC SOILS IN THE NORTHWEST OF THE COUNTRY

Ács Peter-Balázs<sup>1,2'</sup>, Andraş Beniamin-Emanuel<sup>1,2</sup>, Ursan Patrick-Andrei<sup>1,2</sup>, Mondici Susana<sup>1</sup> Păcurar Ioan<sup>2</sup>, Butnar Lucian<sup>3</sup>, Giurgiulescu Liviu<sup>4</sup> <sup>1</sup> Livada Agricultural Research-Development Station, 7 Baia Mare St., Livada <sup>2</sup>The University of Agricultural Sciences and Veterinary Medicine of Cluj-Napoca, 3-5 Calea Mănăştur St, Cluj-Napoca, <sup>3</sup>Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Faculty of Engineering, 62A Dr. Victor Babeş St, Baia Mare, Romania <sup>4</sup>Technical University of Clu-Napoca, Faculty of Science, Victoriei Street 76, Baia Mare, Romania *\*Corresponding author e mail:* acsbalazs24@gmail.com

Keywords: green manure, maize, acidic soil, fertilizers

## ABSTRACT

This paper presents the efficacy of green manures in raising soil fertility and enhancing crop productivity, on the Albic Luvisols in northwestern Romania.Green manures are cover crops that provide various benefits when added to the soil. Peas are especially effective at increasing organic nitrogen in the soil, leaving behind a significant amount of 471.74 kg N(a.s.) per hectare. Regardless of the pressure from the pathogen Fusarium spp. and the pest Ostrinia n. the maize yield was not affected. The incorporated green manures especially peas, significantly raises maize yield surpassing the control with almost 3000 kg. The quality of the maize crop, specifically starch content and hectoliter weight, was not influenced by either green manure or chemical fertilization.

#### INTRODUCTION

Corn (Zea mays), also known as maize, is one of the most significant crops globally, serving as a staple food for humans, a primary feed for livestock, and a crucial raw material for various industrial products (Shiferaw et al., 2011). Its versatility and high yield make it indispensable in both developed and developing countries. However, the intensive cultivation of maize often leads to soil degradation and a decline in soil fertility, necessitating sustainable agricultural practices to maintain productivity.

One such practice is the use of green manures, particularly legumes, which offer numerous benefits over conventional chemical fertilizers. Green manures are crops grown specifically to be incorporated into the soil to improve its organic matter content and nutrient availability (Thorup-Kristensen et al., 2003). The plants used as green manure should produce a rich vegetative mass in as short a time as possible and should not be demanding in terms of soil. The plants used for this purpose are mostly legumes, but other plants can also be used as well. (Dumitru et al., 2003). This technique involves growing plants, such as and subsequently incorporating them into the soil before they reach maturity. The decomposition of these plants

enriches the soil with organic matter, nutrients, and beneficial microorganisms (Drinkwater et. al. 2007).

Leguminous green manures, such as clover and vetch, are especially valuable due to their ability to fix atmospheric nitrogen through symbiotic relationships with Rhizobium bacteria (Peoples et al., 2009). This natural process enriches the soil with nitrogen, a critical nutrient for plant growth, reducing the need for synthetic nitrogen fertilizers (Peoples et al., 2009). Decomposing green manure residues release essential nutrients like nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and potassium (K) that become readily available for succeeding crops (Dong et al., 2021)

Moreover, green manures have a lower environmental impact compared to chemical fertilizers. They enhance soil health by improving soil structure, increasing microbial activity, and preventing erosion (Drinkwater et al., 1998). Brown luvic soils and albic luvisols occupy a percentage of over 35% of the arable land of the counties in NW Romania (Boieriu, 1987). Based on the ratio between humus (%) and total nitrogen (N %), which serves for the indicative assessment of the need for nitrogen fertilizers or organic fertilizers, it is on these soils below 20%, clearly showing the requirement for fertilization with manure to be high compared to nitrogen fertilization (Davidescu, 1981; Alexandrescu, et al. 2023). Research carried out at Livada ARDS, in the interval 1991-1993, demonstrated that the contribution of green fertilizers (lupine) to the improvement of the agrochemical indices of the soil and to the realization of productions is at the level of the use of fertilization with 20 tons/ha of animal manure (Sîrca, 1997).

Unlike chemical fertilizers, which can lead to nutrient leaching and water pollution, green manures release nutrients slowly, ensuring a more sustained and balanced nutrient supply (Crews & Peoples, 2004). Naz et al. (2023) states that green manuring crops are comprised of above- and below-ground biomass. They have the ability to capture solar energy and convert it into carbon flux, which is useful for releasing macro and micronutrients to the soil biota.

#### MATERIAL AND METHODS

The experiment is located in Livada, Satu Mare county, Romania, more precisely the experimental fields of Livada A.R.D.S., on an albic luvisol. Albic Luvisol. classified under the World Reference Base for Soil Resources (WRB), is a type of soil found in various regions around the world. It is characterized by a distinctive horizon known as the albic horizon, which is typically light in color due to leaching of minerals and organic matter. This horizon often exhibits a higher clay content compared to underlying horizons, contributing to its unique properties. (IUSS Working group, 2015) (Fao, 2006). In the upper horizon, there is a low humus content, with a moderate supply of mobile phosphorus, low mobile potassium, and a strongly acidic reaction, with the pH in water of around 5.2. (Boeriu et al., 1987). Soil pH is the most important indicator measured for estimating soil health especially in mine soils, since it has a great influence on key soil processes. (Buta et al., 2019) The pronounced acidification, low supply of humus and potassium, and the defective air-water regime impose serious restrictions on crop cultivation. (Kurtinecz et al., 2022). Additionally, Albic Luvisolsplay a role in carbon sequestration, helping to mitigate climate change. (Arrouays et al., 2002).

The crust formation index has values between 1.8-2.2 (Canarache et al. 1987), often leading to the compromise of crops with epigeic germination, an aspect that can only be improved through the addition of organic matter, which facilitates soil

structure. Additionally, the addition of organic matter improves water permeability, soil warming, and intensifies microbiological activity, which are deficient aspects in these types of soils, where surface puddles or erosions are frequent.

	Та	bl	е	1	
--	----	----	---	---	--

Horizon Horizon depth Sample depth	UM cm cm	Ap 0-18 0-15	A 18- 20-30	o -40 30-40	AB 40-55 40-55	Bt1w 55-70 55-70	Bt2w 70-110 80-95
Humus(Cx1,72)	%	1,82	1,44	0,90	0,90	0,84	3,24
N total	%	0,168	0,102	0,072	0,068	0,064	-
C : N	-	8,21	9,15	10,14	10,34	10,57	-
рН (H <sub>2</sub> O)	-	5,19	6,24	6,65	6,53	5,62	5,28
SB	me/100g soil	5,20	6,26	6,53	8,85	10,23	11,02
Ca²⁺sch	me/100g soil	4,22	5,46	5,41	6,70	7,07	7,25
Mg²⁺sch	me/100g soil	0,77	0,63	0,96	1,91	2,84	3,49
K⁺sch	me/100g soil	0,18	0,12	0,12	0,20	0,25	0,23
Na⁺sch	me/100g soil	0,03	0,05	0,04	0,04	0,06	0,06
V%	% din T	53,5	73,2	77,8	79,8	71,1	69,5
P- AL	ppm	13,6	24,0	10,2	-	-	-
K-AL	ppm	100	87	87	-	-	-
Clay(< 0,002 mm)	% g/g	20,9	21,1	23,1	27,0	32,4	33,1
Apparent density	g/cm³	1,35	1,54	1,49	1,48	-	1,48
Hydraulic conductivity	mm/h	1,3-4,0	5,87	3,11	0,35	-	1,04

he main	physico	-chemical	parameters	of Albic	Luvisol	at Livada ARI	DS
ne main	physico	ononnour	parameters	0174000	Lavisor		20

Т

In terms of temperatures during the vegetation period, a warming trend can be observed with temperatures of even 3 degrees Celsius compared to the multiyear. (Figure 1). The region experiences an average annual temperature range of 8°C to 10°C. The accumulation of heat units above the threshold of 10°C in the plain area varies between 1200 and 1450°C. Over the past six decades, the Livada station has recorded an average temperature of 9.9°C.

Recently, climate changes are becoming more and more evident, and this is perfectly reflected by the lack of precipitation, the installation of the phenomenon of excessive heat and the increase in the average annual temperature. Temperature variations, positive or negative, are reflected in the evolution of the vegetation state of agricultural crops and implicitly in the production capacity.

These climate data stretch us towards new ways of approaching agriculture. Green manures or also called cover crops are beneficial to retain moisture in the soil.



Figure 1. Comparison of maize vegetation period temperature ranges with multiyear trends

In this area, the level of annual precipitation reaches a level of approximately 740-750 liters per square meter, precipitation that in recent years is distributed more and more unevenly. As can be seen from the graph below (Figure 2), the level of precipitation during the maize vegetation period suffered anomalies, especially in May when the level was 19.7 liters and August-September where the deviation from the multi-year average was significant.



Figure 2.Comparison of maize vegetation period precipitation with multi-year averages

The experimental design incorporates tworeplications and employs a splitplot configuration (Figure 3), featuring two distinct experimental factors. These factors are denoted as Factor A, pertaining to the type of green manure utilized; Factor B, concerning the application of chemical fertilizers; The five selected plant species, namely triticale, peas, soybeans, sunflower, and rapeseed, were sown during the summer season and subsequently integrated into the soil at the green growth stage, strategically timed prior to the optimal period for sowing wheat. In terms of chemical fertilization, Calcium ammonium nitrate characterized by a nitrogen content of 27% was employed, administered at a rate of 450 kilograms per hectare (kg/ha) in the spring.

This detailed experimental design seeks to shed light on the complex interactions between green manures and chemical fertilizers, combined with fungicide treatments, and their collective impact on maize cultivation performance and results.

Table 2

Variant	Factor A	Green manure crop	Factor B	Chemical fertilization
1	A1	Control (No groop monuro)	B1	Fertilized
2	A1	Control (No green manure)	B2	Unfertilized
3	A2	Banagaad	B1	Fertilized
4	A2	Rapeseeu	B2	Unfertilized
5	A3	Supflower	B1	Fertilized
6	A3	Sulliowei	B2	Unfertilized
7	A4	Soubcon	B1	Fertilized
8	A4	Soybean	B2	Unfertilized
9	A5	Doop	B1	Fertilized
10	A5	reas	B2	Unfertilized
11	A6	Triticalo	B1	Fertilized
12	A6	Thucale	B2	Unfertilized

#### The variants of the experiment

B1     B2     B1     B2     B1     B       B2     B1     B2     B1     B2     B1     B2     B       B1     B2     B1     B2     B1     B2     B		A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	<b>A6</b>
B2     B1     B2     B1     B2     B       B1     B2     B1     B2     B1     B2     B	D1	B1	B2	B1	B2	B1	B2
B1 B2 B1 B2 B1 B		B2	B1	B2	B1	B2	B1
	<b>D</b> 2	B1	B2	B1	B2	B1	B2
B2 B1 B2 B1 B2 B	RZ	B2	B1	B2	B1	B2	B1
B1 B2 B1 B2 B1 B2 B1 B.	D2	B1	B2	B1	B2	B1	B2
B2 B1 B2 B1 B2 B	R3	B2	B1	B2	B1	B2	B1

Figure 3. Field layout



Figure 4. Drone picture of the experiment

### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Green manures were incorporated by plowing into the soil in the autumn of 2022. Before incorporation, the quantity biomass of each plant species per hectare was quantified using sampling quadrants. (Figure 5). This method allowed us to determine the exact amount of plant material being added to the soil. Additionally, the amount of bioavailable nitrogen, the specific form of nitrogen usable by plants, contributed by each cover crop species was determined. The largest amount of green mass was obtained in the sunflower crop (over 22.7t), followed by peas and then rapeseed.



Figure 5. Quantity of biomass incorporated by plant species

The determination of proteins is carried out by the *Kjeldahl* method, in which the samples are subjected to mineralization in a strongly acidic environment which determines the transformation of protein nitrogen into ammonium ion; after a distillation step, the titration (Figure 5) is carried out with a strong acid. By obtaining the amount of protein, the amount of active substance nitrogen incorporated per hectare was calculated (Table 2). (Pacurar Luana et. al. 2016)

Table 3

	Biomass kg/ha	Dry mass kg/ha	Proteine %	Proteine kg ha	N (a.s.) kg ha
Triticale	4027	2041	13.56	276.81	44.29
Peas	22533	14320	20.59	2948.4	471.74
Soybean	1440	508	21.55	109.54	17.53
Sunflower	22787	4550	12.33	560.98	89.76
Rapeseed	14933	3757	12.95	486.57	77.85

The amount of active substance nitrogen per hectare



Figure 6. Distilled samples

When it come to the diseases of the maize cropin 2023 the most common in the experimental region is the pathogen *Giberellaroseum sp. cerealis*, *Giberellazeae, f.c. Fusariumroseum, f.sp. cerealis graminear.* It occurs more frequently in temperate areas, with high humidity, on numerous plants. Maize can be infected at all stages of growth. This attack comes either from infected seed or from infected soil. *Fusarium* is a genus of fungus that poses a serious threat to maize crops worldwide (Tiru et al 2022). It's not just one species, but a complex of fungal pathogens that can infect various parts of the maize plant, leading to significant yield losses and contamination with harmful toxins (Bryla et al 2022). *Fusarium* infection can cause diseases like ear rot, stalk rot, and seedling blight (Tiru et al 2022). Plants may die before emergence, their roots and cotyledons being invaded by the yellowish-white or pink mycelial sheath. This not only reduces grain yield but also affects the quality of the maize.

The major culprits are *Fusarium verticillioides* (previously known as F. moniliforme) and *Fusarium graminearum* species complex (FGSC) (Bryla et al 2022) (Zhou et. al, 2018). These fungi can infect the maize plant through wounds, insect damage, or naturally occurring openings.

A major concern with *Fusarium* is its ability to produce mycotoxins – toxic secondary metabolites that can harm humans and animals if consumed (Bryla et al 2022). *F. verticillioides* primarily produces fumonisins, while FGSC produces trichothecene mycotoxins (Zhou et. al, 2018).

Controlling *Fusarium* is challenging. Fungicides can be used, but their effectiveness is limited (Tiru et al 2022). Researchers are exploring sustainable approaches like using resistant maize varieties, crop rotation, and biological control agents (Tiru et al 2022).



Figure 7. Infection of Fusarium spp. on the maize cob on the Ostrinia n. attack

The influence of the green manure factor on the degree of *Fusarium* attack in maize fluctuated between the values of 0.87 in the case of pea green manure and 1.36 in the case of soybean. Even if there were differences between the variants compared to the control, these differences did not reach significance levels.

Table 4

Variant	Degree of attack (%)	Difference from the control	Significance
Control	1.18	Control	-
Rapeseed	1.08	-0.10	-
Sunflower	1.18	0	-
Soybean	1.36	0.17	-
Peas	0.87	-0.32	-
Triticale	1.08	-0.11	-
	CL (p 5%)	1,19%	
	CL (p 1%)	1,69%	
	CL (p 0.1	2,44%	

The influence of Factor A on the degree of attack of *Fusarium* 

The application of chemical fertilizers did not influence the degree of attack of the *Fusarium* pathogen at the two grades of fertilized and unfertilized. Regarding the influence of factor B, there are no significant differences between the fertilized and non-fertilized variants.

Table 5

		0	
Variant	Degree of attack (%)	Difference from the control	Significance
Fertilized	1,20	0,08	-
Unfertilized	1,05	-0,08	-
Average	1,13	0	
	CL (p 5%)	0,54%	
	CL (p 1%)	0,75%	
	CL(p 0.1%)	1.06%	

The influence of Factor B on the degree of attack of *Fusarium* spp.

In the case of the interaction of the green manure and chemical fertilizer factors on the degree of *Fusarium* attack on the maize crop, there are no significant differences in any variant, the values are between -1.02 and 0.05 in the case of fertilized variants and -0.05 and 1.37 in the case of chemically fertilized variants.

Table 6a

The interactions of factors A and B on the degree of attack of *Fusarium* 

Variant	Degree of attack (%)	Difference from the control	Significance
Control F	1,72	0	-
Rapeseed F	0,90	-0,82	-
Sunflower F	1,77	0,05	-
Soybean F	0,70	-1,02	-
Peas F	0,72	-1,00	-
Triticale F	1,40	-0,32	-

Table 6b

# The interactions of factors A and B on the degree of attack of *Fusarium*

Variant	Degree of attack (%)	Difference from the control	Significance
ControlUF	0,65	0	-
RapeseedUF	1,27	0,62	-
SunflowerUF	0,60	-0,05	-
SoybeanUF	2,02	1,37	-
PeasUF	1,02	0,37	-
Triticale UF	0,75	0,10	-
	CL (p 5%)	1,51%	
	CL (p 1%)	2,13%	
	CL (p 0.1%)	3,05%	

#### F – fertilized UF – Unfertilized

The European corn borer (*Ostrinia nubilalis*) is a major pest in maize, causing significant yield losses globally. Larvae feed on various parts of the plant, including stems and ears, leading to physical damage and secondary infections. (Hutchison et al., 2010). The larvae bore into the plant, weakening its structure and making it susceptible to diseases. (Siegfried & Hellmich, 2012).In Europe, control strategies focus on crop rotation, biological control using natural predators, and the careful application of insecticides to manage pest populations (Meissle et al., 2011).This pest of maize, quite frequently encountered in the experience area.



Figure 8. Ostrinia n. larvae in the maize plant

From the given table, the green manure factor did not influence the frequency of *Ostrinia nubilalis* in the maize crop. The highest frequency was observed on the green manure soybean with 55% and the lowest being the triticale green manure with 47,5 %, with no significant differences compared to the control variant

Table 7

Variant	Freq. %	Difference from the control		Significance
Control	49,72	0		-
Rapeseed	48,33	-1,38		-
Sunflower	50,45		0,73	-
Soybean	55,00		5,28	-
Peas	40,00		-9,72	-
Triticale	47,50		-2,22	-
	CL	(p 5%)	20,69%	
	CL	(p 1%)	29,41%	
	CL	(p 0.1%)	42,58%	

The influence of factor A on the frequency of Ostrinia n.

The chemical fertilization did not bring any significant differences on the frequency of the *Ostrinia*. The difference compared to the average being of 6,5 % Table 8

111			ia ii.
Variant	Freq. %	Difference from the control	Significance
Fertilized	55,00	6,50	-
Unfertilized	42,00	-6,50	-
Average	48,50	0	
	CL (	(p 5%) 11,81%	
	CL (	(p 1%) 16,57%	
	CL	(p 0.1%) 23,39%	

#### The influence of factor B on the frequency of Ostrinia n.

Table 9a

······································				
Variant	Freq. %	Difference from the control	Significance	
Control F	53,33	0	-	
Rapeseed F	63,33	10,00	-	
Sunflower F	68,33	15,00	-	
Soybean F	56,67	3,33	-	
Peas F	43,33	-10,00	-	
Triticale F	45,00	-8,33	-	

The interactions of factors A and B on the frequency of *Ostrinia* n.

Table 9c

The interactions of factors A and B on the frequency of Ostrinia n.

Variant	Freq. %	Difference from the control	Significance
Control UF	46,10	0	-
Rapeseed UF	33,33	-12,77	-
Sunflower UF	32,57	-13,53	-
Soybean UF	53,33	7,23	-
Peas UF	36,67	-9,43	-
Triticale UF	50	3,90	-
	CL (p	5%) 29,09%	
	CL (p	1%) 41,09%	
	CL (p	0.1%) 58.76%	



Figure 8. Ostrinia n. attack on the maize

Regarding the correlation between the attack of *Fusarium* and the frequency of *Ostrinia*, a linear increase can be observed, so we can say that the damage produced by *Ostrinia* creates optimal conditions for the installation of *Fusarium* on the maize cobs.



Figure 9. Correlation between the frequency of *Ostrinia* n. and the degree of attack of *Fusarium* spp.

The influence of factor A (green manure) on maize production was significant, with increases in production recorded in all tested variants. Production gains varied from distinctly significantly positive in the case of triticale green manure with an increase of 643 kg/ha, to very significantly positive in the version with pea green manure with a difference compared to the control of 2967 kg/ha.

The results obtained demonstrate a positive impact of factor A on maize production, with a particular efficiency in the case of green pea fertilizer, the variant in which production reached the level of 8264 kg/ha.

Table 10

The influence of factor A on the maize yield					
Variant Average kg/ha		Difference from the control	Significance		
Control	5464	-	-		
Rapeseed	8002	2358	***		
Sunflower	7280	1816	***		
Soybean	7789	2324	***		
Peas	8264	2967	***		
Triticale	6107	643	**		
	CL (p 5%)	372 kg			
	CL (p 1%)	528 kg			
	CL (p 0.1%)	765 kg			

Factor B (chemical fertilizer) influenced lead production as expected with a difference from the average between chemically fertilized and unfertilized, of 1307 kg/ha

Table 11

		tor B on the maize yield	
Variant	Average kg/ha	Difference from the control	Significance
Fertilized	8486	1307	***
Unfertilized	5872	-1307	000
Average	7179		
	CL (p 5%)	321kg	
	CL (p 1%)	450 kg	
	CL (p 0.1%)	635 kg	

The influence of factor B on the maize yield

The experiment demonstrated that using green manures significantly impacts maize yield. Fertilized variants like Rapeseed, Sunflower, Soybean, Peas, and Triticale showed substantial yield increases, with Rapeseed F achieving the highest increase of 3488 kg/ha. Unfertilized variants also improved yields, notably Peas UF with a 3286 kg/ha increase. However, Sunflower UF and Triticale UF did not show significant improvements. These results highlight the potential of green manures to enhance crop productivity, especially when fertilized

Table 12a

Variant	Average kg/ha	Difference compared to the control	Significance
Control F	6137	0	-
Rapeseed F	9625	3488	***
Sunflower F	9298	3161	***
Soybean F	8714	2577	***
Peas F	8786	2649	***
Triticale F	8357	2220	***

Table 12b

The interaction of factors A and B on the maize yield

·····				
Average kg/ha	Difference compared to the control	Significance		
4791	0	-		
6379	1587	***		
5262	470	-		
6863	2071	***		
8077	3286	***		
3857	-934	0		
CL (p :	5%) 688 kg			
CL (p	1%) 942 kg			
CL (p	0.1%) 1340 kg			
	Average kg/ha 4791 6379 5262 6863 8077 3857 CL (p CL (p	Average kg/ha     Difference compared to the control       4791     0       6379     1587       5262     470       6863     2071       8077     3286       3857     -934       CL (p 5%)     688 kg       CL (p 1%)     942 kg       CL (p 0.1%)     1340 kg		

Maize production quality index and they were influenced by both A factor green manures and chemical fertilization as well. The amount of starch fluctuates between 74.68% in the case of the pea variety and 75.75 in the control variant, without green manure. Differences are insignificant, except for the pea variant where we have a very significant negative difference with a value of -1.07 % starch compared to the control.

Table 13

The inidence of lactor A on the starth content					
Variant	Starch (%)	Difference compared to the control.	Significance		
Control	75,75	0	-		
Rapeseed	75,68	-0,07	-		
Sunflower	75,72	-0,03	-		
Soybean	75,65	-0,10	-		
Peas	74,68	-1,07	000		
Triticale	75,53	-0,22	-		
		CL (p 5%) 0,46			
		CL (p 1%) 0,66			
		CL (p 0.1%) 0,95			

The influence of factor A on the starch content

The amount of starch was not influenced by chemical fertilization, the obtained difference of only 0.18% compared to the average of the fertilized and non-chemically fertilized variants.

Table 14

The influence of factor B on the starch content					
Variant	Starch (%)	Difference compared to the control.	Significance		
Fertilized	75,32	-0,18	-		
Unfertilized	75,68	0,18	-		
Average	75,5	0			
	C	L (p 5%) 0,31%			
	C	L (p 1%) 0,44%			
	C	L (p 0.1%) 0,62%			

From the influence of factors A and B, a significantly negative difference is observed in the case of the fertilized pea variant and a significantly negative difference in the non-fertilized pea variant, so we can draw the conclusion from all the data that chemical fertilization does not influence the amount of starch in maize at all.

The interpretion of fraters A and D and the struck containts

Table 15a

The interaction of factors A and B on the starch content				
Variant	Starch (%)	Difference compared to the control.	Significance	
Control F	75,77	0,00	-	
Rapeseed F	75,40	-0,37	-	
Sunflower F	75,80	0,03	-	
Soybean F	75,47	-0,30	-	
Peas F	74,37	-1,40	00	
Triticale F	75,13	-0,63	-	

In reference to the hectoliter weight of maize, as shown in the table below, the observed differences between the variants and the control unit are statistically insignificant. Although each variant exhibits a negative deviation, only the pea green manure variant displays a statistically significant negative difference with -1,40%.