Original Research Article

Rationing of irrigation for taro plant to resist stress Conditions

ABSTRACT

Two field experiments were conducted at El-Kanater Vegetables Research Farm, Horticulture Research Institute, Agriculture Research Centre and Agricultural Botany Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Moshtohor, Qalubia Governorate, Egypt during the two growth seasons of 2016 and 2017.

To follow up the effects of different irrigation water levels i.e.,100, 75 and 50 % of the crop evapotranspiration (ETc) and foliar application with some stimulant substances i.e., proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} as well as mulching treatments i.e., black polyethylene plastic, rice straw and sawdust mulches individually or in combination of treatments on vegetative growth characteristics, some bio-constituents and yield components of taro plant have been studied and results interpreted.

Concerning the effect of irrigation water levels, the obtained results showed that increasing water stress level from 75% to 50% of ETc decreased crop output gradually. This has been noticed from all studied growth characteristics of taro plant (i.e., plant height (cm), leaves number $plant^{-1}$ and suckers number $plant^{-1}$ as well as leaf area (cm^2) $plant^{-1}$ compared to the unstressed plant (100% of ETc) in the two seasons. Also, increasing irrigation water regime decreased photosynthetic pigments (chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids) content in taro leaves. Moreover, increasing irrigation water stress level, gradually increased proline content and antioxidant enzymes activity i.e., superoxide dismutase (SOD), peroxidase (POD) and catalase (CAT) in taro leaves compared to the full irrigation level (100% of ETc). In addition, different estimated yield characteristics of taro plant i.e., corm length (cm), corm diameter (cm), corms fresh weight (kg) $plant^{-1}$, corm fresh weight (g), corms fresh weight (kg) $plot^{-1}$, corms fresh yield (ton) $fed.^{-1}$ and corm dry matter % as well as taro corm bio-constituents of N, P, K, crude protein and starch contents decreased under different irrigation water regimes. In this respect, water stress level at 50% of ETc recorded the highest reductions in different estimated characteristics compared to 75% of ETc level and unstressed plant (100% of ETc).

Regarding the effect of foliar application with stimulant substances and mulching treatments, data clearly indicate that all vegetative growth parameters, determined bio-constituents and yield components as well as water use efficiency (WUE) of taro plant increased to reach the level of significance with different applied treatments compared to the untreated plant during 2016 and 2017 seasons. In this respect, proline at 150 mgl^{-1} followed by potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} as well as black polyethylene plastic mulch were the most effective treatments, respectively.

As for the effect of interaction, the obtained results indicated that all the interactions between irrigation water levels and foliar spray with the stimulant materials as well as mulching treatments increased different estimated traits of taro plant i.e., vegetative growth characteristics, bio-constituents, yield and its components as well as water use efficiency compared to the control. In this respect, proline at 150 mgl^{-1} was the most superior treatment followed by putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} and potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} under water stress levels i.e., 75 and 50% of ETc when compared to the untreated plants during 2016 and 2017 seasons.

In general It could be noticed that the applied stimulant substances i.e., proline, putrescine, potassium silicate and black plastic mulch treatments could partially reduce the harmful effects of drought stress on growth, bio-constituents and yield characteristics of taro plant. ***(Border to be removed)***

Key words: Taro plant; Water stress; Proline; Putrescine; Potassium silicate; Mulch; Growth; Bio-constituents and Yield.

1. INTRODUCTION

With ever increasing population, depleting water resources and an increasing doubt that popular way of age old irrigation cannot assure food security, both researchers and Egyptian government felt the need to introduce drought resistant irrigation practices that could ensure good crop output using water rationing stress induced Taro plant cultivation. To achieve this objective the present study has been taken up .Results, given in the subsections bring to light the success of this research initiative.

Taro plant (*Colocasia esculenta* L. Schott) (Fig-1) belongs to Araceae family. It is an important crop with a wide distribution in the tropics and subtropics areas [1]. It is considered a major vegetable grown in Egypt due to its high profitability, cost effective and nutritional values. It is a valuable source of essential minerals [2]. It is high in fiber content and vitamins i.e., A, C, E and B6 [3]. There are some factors limiting taro cultivated area, such as high quantities of irrigation water and fertilizers, in addition to long duration for cultivation, starting from planting to final harvesting (7 to 9 months).

The Egyptian taro is planted in the Nile valley, where the method of surface irrigation is in vogue. In this method entire soil surface is flooded without considering the crops actual consumptive requirements. This practice has created the water logging problems and reduced the irrigation efficiency by 30 %.

Water is the most important component of life as well as vital commodity for crop production. It constituents 90% of living cells and plays an essential role in plant metabolism on the cellular as well as whole plant levels. Agricultural productivity is dependent upon water and it is essential at every stage from germination to plant maturation [4]. Availability of adequate amount of moisture at critical stages of plant growth not only optimizes the plant cell metabolism process, but also increases the effectiveness of nutrients applied to the crops. Consequently, water stress is producing deleterious effects on plant growth and yield [5].

Nowadays, Egypt is facing water scarcity problem. The irrigation water shortage is the most important factor constraining agricultural production in Egypt.Water stress is one of the major a biotic stresses, that adversely affects plant growth and yield [6]. Water is the most important limiting factor [7 &8] to taro yield. It is highly sensitive for water deficiency**.** The plant responses to stresses depending on many factors, such as phonological stage, time and stress strength [9,10]. Drought stress is one of the major causes for crop production losses worldwide as well as yield reduction by 50% and over [11]. Also, drought stress causes oxidative damage of the plant cellular components through inducing of reactive oxygen species generation (ROS) [12]. The ROS as O_2^- and H_2O_2 as well as OH^- radicals are attacking lipids of membranes leading to degradation of protein, inactive enzymes of metabolism and nucleic acids. This negative factor damages the cell growth, finally leading to cell death [13,14].

For alleviating these oxidative effects, plants have developed a series of enzymatic and non enzymatic systems for protecting cells from oxidative damage and counteracting the ROS radicals [15]. Plants have a wide range of resistance mechanisms for productivity maintenance and ensure survival under drought stress conditions. One of the stress defense mechanisms is presence of antioxidants with low molecular weight (non enzymatic) such as glutathione, tocopherol, ascorbate, phenolic and carotenoids as well as antioxidant enzymes such as superoxide dismutase and peroxidase as well as catalase [14,16,17].

Proper use of antioxidants is a new method to assist the plant for tolerating any environmental conditions and increasing plant growth. Antioxidants protect plant from any ROS by increasing sub unit of Rubisco, pigments of photosynthesis, thereby increasing photosynthetic rate and plant productivity [18,19]. So, many strategies have been proposed for alleviating the cellular damage caused by abiotic stress and improving crop drought tolerance. Among them, compatible osmolytes exogenous application such as proline, potassium silicate…. and so on [20,21,22,23, 24]. Several organic compatible solutes, which effectively take place in plant stress tolerance, include proline, glycine betaine and manyothers [25]. One of these organic osmolytes is proline (an amino acid). It is accumulating in large quantities in response to environmental stress as drought [26,27].

Proline is considered an agent of osmoprotection and it is involved in the oxidative damage reducing through free radicals scavenging. Also, it plays a role as protein compatible hydrotrope[25]. It is supporting cytoplasmic acidosis and maintaining appropriate $NADP^+$/NADPH ratios suitable with metabolism. After relief from stress, proline rapid breakdown is occurring and that may give sufficient reducing agents, which take part in oxidative phosphorylation of mitochondria and ATP production for retrieval from stress and restoring of injuries induced by stress [28]. Many scientists reported proline ameliorative effects in different crops such as wheat [29], tobacco [30] and olive [31]. Proline foliar spray is a shotgun approach for minimizing the stress deleterious effects. In addition, plants show resistance for oxidative damage by inducing antioxidants high levels, organic osmolytes accumulation and the toxic ions reduction. Increasing of antioxidant enzymes activity as superoxide dismutase, catalase and peroxidase in response to foliar application with proline under stress was reported by scientists [32,33]. Gamal El-Din KM, Abd El-Wahed MSA,2005[34] concluded that a foliar spray with proline at 100 mgl^{-1} increased vegetative growth characteristics of chamomile plant. Ali Q et al,2007 [35] found that the foliar application with proline at 30 mM (?) was most effective for inducing drought tolerance and enhancing biomass production as well as increasing the rate of photosynthesis of maize plant.

Potassium (K) is essential for several physiological processes such as photosynthesis, metabolism, enzymes activation, synthesis of protein, photo-assimilates translocation into sink organs, regulation of stomata opening and closing, plant water-relation, essential for cell structure. It is also important for regulating several metabolic processes as well as increasing drought tolerance [14,36,37].

Silicon (Si) is an environmental friendly and ecologically compatible agent for stimulating plant growth. It was reported that silicon plays a role in reducing the hazard effects of several a biotic and biotic stresses such as drought stress [38,39]. It has emerged as an important mineral for many horticultural crops [38]. It is contributing elasticity of the cell wall during extension growth. It is interacting with cell constituents such as polyphenols and pectins and increases elasticity of the cell wall. Also, increasing of silicon absorption leads for maintaining erect leaves for leaf angle to photosynthesis [40]. Foliar spray with silicon significantly increased yield and its components of pea plant [41]. Foliar application with potassium silicate ($KSiO_3$) increased growth of sunflower plant [42]. Sayed SM et al, 2018 [43] found that globe artichoke plant sprayed with silicon at 2000 mgl^{-1} recorded the highest increasing in all studied characteristics i.e., growth aspects, chlorophylls content, nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium, total sugars and total amino acids concentrations as well as the yield parameters compared with untreated plant. RemeroAranda MR et al,2006 [44] reported that, Si is improving the storage of water within plant tissues, that allows a higher rate of growth.

Putrescine is playing an important role in plant protecting against several a biotic stresses. It is potent scavenger of ROS and lipid peroxidation inhibitor. The putrescine is alleviating the harmful effects of drought stress in plant by several ways including polyamines scavenging of free radicals [45]. Putrescine is a regulator for the antioxidant enzymes and it is a component for signaling system of stress. It is modulating RNA, DNA functions, proteins synthesis, nucleotide triphosphates and macromolecules protecting under stress conditions [46]. Polyamines high accumulation in plant during a biotic stress has been documented and it is correlated with increasing a biotic stress tolerance [47].

As the world become greatly dependent on the irrigated lands production, it is prudent to make water use efficiency and bring more area under cultivation by introducing advanced irrigation methods and improving practice of apt water managements [48]. The major proportion of irrigation water is lost by evaporation of the surface water and soil moisture, deep percolation and other losses resulting in low irrigation efficiency [49]. Mulching is one of the practices of water management for increasing water use efficiency. Mulch is any material spread on the surface of soil for protecting it from solar radiation or evaporation. Different types of materials such as rice straw, wheat straw, plastic film, wood, grass, sand are used as mulches [50]. Soil surface evaporation may account as much as 50% of the total moisture lost from the soil during the growing season. In this respect, plant residues mulching and synthetic materials is a well-established technique to increase several crops profitability [51]. These effects are contributed to the mulch capacity to conserve moisture of the soil [52]. Moreover, soil temperature is very critical to chemical and biological process, which controls cycling of nutrients [53]. In addition, mulch is improving vegetative growth and roots distribution, thereby increasing nutrients absorption [54]. Also, usage of mulches helps in conservation of moisture and evaporation reduction [55]. Sharma AR et al,2010 [56] concluded that mulch is very beneficial for enhancing moisture and conservation of nutrients resulting in productivity increase and improved soil conditions for better cropping system.

Hence, the present study was conducted to evaluate the effects of different irrigation water levels i.e.,100, 75 and 50 % of the crop evapotranspiration (ETc) and foliar spray with some stimulant substances i.e., proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} as well as mulching treatments i.e., black polyethylene plastic, rice straw and sawdust mulches individually or in combination. Treatments on vegetative growth parameters, chemical compositions and yield components of taro plant have been included as part of the present study to enhance possibility for improving plant tolerance to the harmful effects of water stress and reduced amount of water used for irrigation.

2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were conducted during 2016 and 2017 seasons at El-Kanater Vegetables Research Farm, Horticulture Research Institute, Agriculture Research Centre and Agricultural Botany Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Moshtohor, Qalubia Governorate , Egypt to investigate individual and combined effects of foliar spray with some stimulant substances i.e., proline, potassium silicate and putrescine as well as mulching treatments i.e., black polyethylene plastic, rice straw and sawdust on growth, biochemical constituents and yield characteristics of taro plant *Colocasia esculenta* L. Schott var. esculenta grown under different irrigation water levels i.e., 100, 75 and 50 % of the crop evapotranspiration (ETc).

2.1. Plant materials and procedure:

After selecting good quality seeds during pre planting period taro seed corms (*Colocasia esculenta* L. Schott var. esculenta) cv. Egyptian were planted at the bottom of the ridge at a distance of 30 cm apart (Fig-2) on March 27, 2016, and March 12, 2017, respectively. Corms were irrigated directly after planting. Two weeks later the irrigation procedure was repeated with 10 days interval. All the plots were equally irrigated. The water regime levels began after two months from planting , as shown in Table (3).

The mechanical and chemical analyses of the experimental soil are given in Table (1). Chemical analysis: calculated as mg100g^{-1} soil and determined in soil: water extraction.

Table 1. Mechanical and chemical analysis of the experimental soil

Mechanical analysis				Chemical analysis								
Texture	Sand %	Silt %	Clay %	EC dS/m	Cations (mg100g^{-1} soil)				Anions (mg100g^{-1} soil)			pH soil
					Na^{+}	K^{+}	Ca^{++}	Mg^{++}	Cl^{-}	SO_4^{--}	$HCO3^{-}$	
Clay loam	30.67	22.74	46.59	0.19	0.71	0.61	0.25	0.33	0.51	0.51	0.88	8.30

Source: ???

Table 2. Average temperatures and relative humidity during the growing seasons 2016 and 2017 under Kaliobia Governorate conditions

Month	Season 2016			Season 2017		
	Temperature (°C)		Relative humidity %	Temperature (°C)		Relative humidity %
	Max.	Min.	Average	Max.	Min.	Average
March	22.67	11.03	50.61	20.18	11.33	53.63
April	27.75	13.50	50.00	25.92	13.03	51.87
May	32.13	16.33	51.32	31.23	15.30	50.01
June	43.8	18.5	53.12	39.3	19.1	52.0
July	40.0	22.3	56.00	38.9	21.7	55.0
August	39.2	23.1	56.00	43.5	24.0	52.0
September	32.32	19.13	56.88	32.01	18.34	56.50
October	30.43	16.42	54.00	29.33	15.67	53.45
November	24.60	12.67	52.00	25.13	10.96	52.56

Source:Metrological authority, Cairo, Eygpt.

2.2. The experiment treatments :

The experiment included 21 treatments, which were the combination between three irrigation water levels i.e., 50, 75 and 100% of the crop evapotranspiration (ETc) applied using drip irrigation system and 7 treatments of foliar spray with stimulant substances and mulching. The selection of the concentrations of used foliar application treatments is based on the previous studies ***(Ref..?).***

The irrigation levels were calculated using FAO-CROPWAT software version 8 to calculate the crop irrigation water requirements based on the reference crop evapotranspiration as described by Smith M, Steduto P,2012 [57]. Evapotranspiration was calculated according to the water balance approach as described by James CS, 1995 [58].

The treatments were arranged in split plot design with three replicates; the main plots were assigned to irrigation water levels, while seven treatments of substances foliar spray and mulching treatments were located in subplots. Each sub experimental plot consisted of four ridges; each was 5.84 m in length and 0.8 m in width with an area 14 m^2, since three ridges were planted and the fourth one was left without planting as a guard row for avoiding and preventing the overlapping (interactions of irrigation water). The amount of water applied was increased with increasing of plant growth and declined at the end of the growth season. All plots received 40 m^3 farm yard manure, 64 kg P_2O_5, 120 kg N and 120 kg K_2O fed^{-1} .

Cultivation and all cultural practices except irrigation i.e., weeding, fertilization and pest control were performed according to the recommendations of the Egyptian Agriculture Ministry.

a) Irrigation water levels (irrigation water quantity):

Drip irrigation is a highly efficient method of water application, which is also ideally suited for controlling the placement and supply rate of water-soluble fertilizers. Drip irrigation system was used to apply the levels of irrigation water (quantity of irrigation water applied) in the experiment. Three irrigation levels of water quantity supply was used i.e., 100% of ETc (the control), 75% of ETc (moderate stress) and 50% of ETc (severe stress), respectively of water requirements of taro plant in the two seasons.
Drip tubing (GR type, 0.016 m diameter) with 0.30m emitter spacing built in, each delivering 1.5 L h^{-1} at 1 bar pressure was used (10 drip tubing for each irrigation system). The irrigation water treatments began after two months of planting and continued until harvesting.
Such treatments details are given in Table-3:

Table 3. **Water irrigation levels**

Irrigation water levels	% of ETc	Irrigation water quantity applied $m^3 fed.^{-1}$
1-WL_1 full irrigation (control)	100	Irrigation with 4346.5 m^3 water $fed.^{-1}$
2- WL_2 moderate water stress	75	Irrigation with 3259.9 m^3 water $fed.^{-1}$
3- WL_3 severe water stress	50	Irrigation with 2173.3 m^3 water $fed.^{-1}$

The water requirement of taro plant using drip irrigation system is 4346.5 $m^3 fed.^{-1}$
Details of soil were taken from previous study, as the same location has been used by Abuzeed AMM,2018 [59].

b) The foliar spray stimulant treatments :

1. Control (Tap water) 2. Proline at 150 mgl^{-1} 3. Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}
4. Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}

The foliar spray substances were applied four times using automizer to completely cover the plant foliage; the first was 70 days after planting date and repeated every month.

c) The mulching treatments :

1. Black polyethylene plastic sheet 2. Rice straw 3. sawdust

The treatments of mulching were applied 60 days from planting on the soil, until the season end. Black polyethylene plastic sheet was used to cover soil surface under the plants. The polyethylene plastic sheet was 25 micron in thickness. Rice straw and sawdust mulches with 15 cm thickness were spread out on the soil surface to cover the soil completely. These were spread out for the same period as plastic sheet treatment.

2.3. Sampling and collecting data:

The growth measurements and the chemical analysis were determined at 180 days after planting.

2.3.1. Vegetative growth characteristics:

Different morphological characteristics of taro plants were measured and calculated. Six plants from each treatment were randomly taken and then separated into their organs and the following characteristics were recorded:
Plant height (cm), leaves number $plant^{-1}$ and suckers number $plant^{-1}$ as well as leaf area (cm^2) $plant^{-1}$. The leaf area was determined using the leaf length, width, and a crop coefficient using the following equation: Leaf area = leaf length × leaf width × 0.85 (crop factor) [60].

2.3.2. Chemical compositions:

Chemical analyses were carried out in taro leaves sample at 180 days after planting.

2.3.2.1. Leaves photosynthetic pigments and proline determinations:

The photosynthetic pigments i.e., chlorophyll a, b. and carotenoids were determined and calculated as mgg^{-1} fresh weight during 2016 and 2017 growth seasons according to Wettstein D. 1957 [61]. Free proline content was determined calorimetrically using the method of Bates LS,1973 [62] during 2017 season.

2.3.2.2. Determination of oxidative enzyme activities:

0.5 g of taro leaves were homogenized in 10 $mmoll^{-1}$ potassium phosphate buffer with pH 7.0 containing 4% polyvinyl pyrrolidone. The homogenates were centrifuged at 12 000 × g at 4°C for 15 min and the supernatants were immediately used for determination of enzymes activity. Peroxidase activity was estimated according to the method described by [63]. Catalase was assayed spectrophoto chemically according to [64], superoxide dismutase activity was estimated according to the method described by Beauchamp C, Fridovich I,1971 [65] and Dhindsa RS etal,1981[66] during 2017 season only.

2.3.2.3. Corms bioconstituents determination

At harvest stage, total nitrogen was determined in the digested corms dry matter using microkjeldahl method as described by [67], then the crude protein was calculated according to [68]. Phosphorus was determined calorimetrically according to the method of Nakano Y, Asada K,1980 [69]. Potassium was determined by the flame photometer model Carl-Zeiss according to the method described by Horneck DA, Hanson D,1998 [70]. Starch was determined according to Dubois M et al, 1956 [71].

2.3.3. yield and its components:

At harvest i.e., 240 days after planting in 2016 and 2017 seasons, ten randomly selected plants from each experimental plot were taken for estimating the following characteristics: corm length (cm), corm diameter (cm), corms fresh weight (kg) $plant^{-1}$, corms fresh weight (kg) $plot^{-1}$, corms fresh yield (ton) $fed.^{-1}$ and corm fresh weight (g). The samples of corms were dried in the oven-dried for 48 h in 75°C to a constant weight and then corms dry matter % was calculated. These dry samples of corms were kept for chemical analysis.

2.3.4. Water use efficiency (WUE):

Water use efficiency is used to describe the correlation between production and the amount of irrigation water used (kg yield/m^3 water): ***(Ref..?)***

$$WUE = \frac{\text{Crop yield kgfed.}^{-1}}{\text{Water m}^{3}\text{fed.}^{-1}}$$

2.3.5. Statistical analysis:

Data of morphological and bio-constituents (except proline and antioxidant enzymes activity) as well as yield characteristics were statistically analyzed and the means compared using Least Significant Difference test at 5% according to Snedecor GW, Cochran WG,1998 [72].

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Vegetative growth characteristics

Results in **Table (4)** clearly show the individual and combined effects of using irrigation water levels (i.e., 100, 75 and 50% of ETc), foliar spray with stimulant substances (i.e., proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}) as well as mulching treatments (i.e., black polyethylene plastic, rice straw and sawdust mulches) on vegetative growth characteristics i.e., plant height (cm), leaves number $plant^{-1}$ and suckers number $plant^{-1}$ as well as leaf area (cm^2) $plant^{-1}$ of taro plants at 180 days after planting in the two growing seasons of 2016 and 2017.

As for the effect of water stress levels, data in Table (4) show that increasing water regime levels i.e., 75 and 50% of ETc have significantly decreased vegetative growth parameters gradually of taro plants compared to the full irrigation level (control 100% of ETc). Also, the same results show that the highest water stress level at 50% of ETc was the most effective treatment, which gave the highest reductions in the vegetative growth aspects of taro plant during the two growing seasons. This reduction in the growth characteristics were explained by Hussain M et al, 2008 [73] ,who indicated that drought stress caused impaired mitosis, cell elongation and expansion resulted in reducing of both growth and yield traits. Also, Farooq M et al, 2009 [74] concluded that water deficit stress reduced leaf growth and in turn the plant leaf areas.

Such decrements in all studied growth aspects as a result for decreasing the irrigation water amount may be attributed to the roles of water in increasing macro and micro nutrients absorption from the soil and in turn affect plant growth. Moreover, this effect may be due to the role of water as the main constituent in photosynthetic process, which consequently affects the plant growth. It could be concluded that the sequence of events in the plant tissue subjected to drought stress may be due to: A. The growth of plant depends on cell division, enlargement and differentiation. All of these events are affected by water stress as well as required photosynthetic assimilates for formation of cells and tissues. Cells and tissues are affected by water stress. This process in turn affects all morphological parameters of growing

[6,75]. B. Water stress greatly suppresses expansion of the cell and plant growth due to the low turgor pressure [76]. C. Drought stress may lead to an imbalance between antioxidant defense and ROS amount, causing ROS accumulation , which induces oxidative damage to the components of the cell [14,77]. D. Water stress inhibits enlargement of the cell more than cell division. Water stress reduces plant growth by affecting several physiological and biochemical processes as photosynthesis, translocation, respiration, carbohydrates, ion uptake, metabolism of nutrients and promoters of growth [10,78,79]. E. Water stress causes a change in balance of hormones including increases of ABA and reduces the extensibility of the cell wall, thereby causing leaf elongation decline [80]. Several studies have indicated that soil moisture level depletion reduced growth parameters of common bean [74]; Gadalla AMA,2010 [22] on soybean and Abd-Ellatif ,YMR,2012 [23] on snap bean. These results are in agreement with those reported by many researchers [6,20,73,81,82,83].

Concerning the effect of foliar application with stimulant substances and mulching treatments, data clearly indicate that all vegetative growth parameters were increased to reach the level of significance with different applied treatments during 2016 and 2017 seasons. In this respect, proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}, putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} followed by sawdust and black polyethylene mulches were the most effective treatments, respectively. Moreover, increasing number of formed suckers and leaves on a growing plant could be reversed upon many other characteristics such as leaf area, dry weights and finally the corms yield. Such increments in plant growth aspects as a result for using the tested foliar application and mulching treatments may be due to the main role of the foliar spray materials on reactions of metabolism enzymes in plant and its role in catching and binding as well as scavenging of the reactive oxygen species (ROS) which affect on plant metabolism, vigor and consequently plant growth increasing or may be attributed for increasing of the photosynthetic pigments and the mineral nutrients absorption that affect positively on plant growth.

For proline, it is considered an agent of osmoprotection. It is involved in the oxidative damage reducing through free radicals scavenging. Also, it plays a role as protein compatible hydrotrope[25]. Many scientists reported that proline has ameliorative effects in different crops such as wheat [29], tobacco [30] and olive [31]. Proline foliar spray is a shotgun approach for minimizing the stress deleterious effects. In addition, plants show resistance for oxidative damage by inducing antioxidants high levels, organic osmolytes accumulation and the toxic ions reducing. Gamal El-Din KM, Abd El-Wahed MSA,2005 [34] concluded that a foliar spray with proline at 100 mgl^{-1} increased vegetative growth characteristics of chamomile plant. Ali,Q et al,2007 [35] found that the foliar application with proline at 30 mM was most effective for inducing drought tolerance and enhancing biomass production of maize plant.

Increasing plant growth aspects as a result of foliar spray with potassium silicate may be due to the role of potassium as a macro element in plant nutrition and its effects on different plant physiological and chemical reactions, which affect positively on plant growth [14,36]. Also, Egilla JN et al, 2005 [84] reported that adequate levels of K nutrition enhanced plant drought tolerance and plant growth under drought conditions. This improvement was attributed to the K role in improving stability of cell membranes and the ability of osmotic adjustment. An adequate supply of K is essential for enhancing drought tolerance by increasing root elongation. It was reported that silicon plays a role in reducing the hazard effects of several a biotic and biotic stresses such as drought stress [38,39]. RemeroAranda MR et al,2006 [44] documented that, Si is improving the storage of water within plant tissues, that allows a higher rate of growth.

Putrescine is playing an important role in plant protection against several a biotic stresses.It is a potent scavenger of ROS and lipid peroxidation inhibitor. The putrescine is alleviating the harmful effects of drought stress in plant by several ways including free radicals scavenging [45]. Putrescine is a regulator for the antioxidant enzymes and it is a component for signaling system of stress. It is modulating RNA, DNA functions, proteins synthesis, nucleotide triphosphates and macromolecules protection under stress conditions [46].

Table 4**.** Effect of irrigation water levels, foliar application substances and mulching treatments as well as their interactions on vegetative growth parameters plant^{-1} of taro during 2016 and 2017 growing seasons.

Treatments / Characteristics		Plant height (cm)		Leaves number		Suckers number		Leaf area (cm^2)	
		1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Irrigation water levels [a]									
WL1		148.29	163.90	4.353	6.048	3.531	4.452	2938.22	3682.40
WL2		142.19	154.86	4.258	5.865	3.310	4.008	2548.69	3461.85
WL3		107.71	129.90	3.420	4.905	2.690	3.516	1794.28	2458.92
L.S.D. at 5 %		8.19	15.84	0.607	0.485	0.524	0.457	394.45	378.62
Foliar spray with stimulants and mulching treatments [b]									
Control		109.78	127.67	3.417	4.444	2.750	3.463	1510.38	1726.82
Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}		148.56	165.11	4.278	6.111	3.554	4.389	3169.26	4211.78
Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}		141.33	158.44	4.148	5.686	3.333	4.351	2303.74	2996.91
Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}		139.67	152.78	4.259	5.852	3.000	3.814	3107.80	3706.22
Black polyethylene		133.22	155.00	4.019	5.870	3.019	3.833	2351.74	3990.94
Rice straw		135.44	148.67	3.944	5.500	3.434	4.222	2423.12	3159.46
sawdust		121.11	139.22	4.009	5.777	3.148	3.870	2123.41	2615.26
L.S.D. at 5 %		6.01	12.47	0.494	0.357	0.433	0.589	250.88	310.44
The interaction between irrigation water levels [a] **and stimulants foliar spray as well as mulching treatments** [b]									
WL1	Control	129.67	141.00	3.750	5.000	3.333	3.833	1726.51	2105.28
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	153.33	183.00	4.667	7.000	4.330	5.277	3969.90	5718.04
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	157.33	176.33	4.333	6.000	3.167	4.720	2958.35	3839.35
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	159.67	172.00	4.667	6.333	3.333	4.333	3257.26	3844.56
	Black polyethylene	145.00	166.33	4.390	6.167	3.500	4.167	2970.95	3944.13
	Rice straw	155.00	157.00	4.167	5.833	3.720	4.333	2805.41	3990.00
	sawdust	138.00	151.67	4.500	6.000	3.333	4.500	2879.21	2335.43
WL2	Control	114.33	125.33	3.500	4.277	2.667	3.500	1627.63	1615.29
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	158.00	169.00	4.333	6.167	3.500	3.667	3460.41	3789.07
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	157.33	168.33	4.500	6.057	3.833	4.500	2362.53	3097.51
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	147.00	158.00	4.443	6.057	3.000	4.110	3326.16	4250.75
	Black polyethylene	138.33	160.67	4.333	6.110	3.000	3.833	1986.00	4893.45
	Rice straw	150.67	155.00	4.333	6.333	3.833	4.500	2795.80	3357.06
	sawdust	129.67	147.67	4.360	6.053	3.333	3.943	2282.34	3229.80
WL3	Control	85.33	116.67	3.000	4.057	2.250	3.057	1177.00	1459.88
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	134.33	143.33	3.833	5.167	2.833	4.223	2077.49	3128.22
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	109.33	130.67	3.610	5.000	3.000	3.833	1590.34	2053.89
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	112.33	128.33	3.667	5.167	2.667	3.000	2740.00	3023.36
	Black polyethylene	116.33	138.00	3.333	5.333	2.557	3.500	2098.27	3135.24
	Rice straw	100.67	134.00	3.333	4.333	2.750	3.833	1668.17	2131.32
	sawdust	95.67	118.33	3.167	5.277	2.777	3.167	1208.67	2280.55
L.S.D. at 5 %		10.40	21.59	0.855	0.61	0.74	1.02	434.52	537.68

Where WL1: 100% of ETc, WL2: 75% of ETc and WL3: 50% of ETc.

High accumulation of polyamines in plant during a biotic stress has been documented and it is correlated with increasing a biotic stress tolerance [47].

Regarding increasing plant growth characteristics as a result of mulching treatments, it was reported that mulching is one of the practices of water management for increasing water use efficiency. Mulch is any material spread on the surface of soil for protecting it from solar radiation or evaporation. Different types of materials such as rice straw, wheat straw, plastic film, wood, grass, sand and so on are used as mulches [50]. In this respect, plant residues mulching and synthetic materials is a well-established technique to increase several crops profitability [51]. These effects are contributed to the mulch capacity to conserve moisture of the soil [52]. Moreover, soil temperature is very critical to chemical and biological process, which control cycling of nutrients [53]. In addition, mulch is improving vegetative growth and roots distribution, thereby increasing nutrients absorption [54]. Also, mulch using helps in conservation of moisture and evaporation reduction [55].Sharma,AR et al, 2010 [56] concluded that mulch is very beneficial for enhancing moisture and conservation of nutrients resulting in productivity increasing and improving soil conditions for cropping system.

Regarding the interactions effect, it was clear that the combinations of drought stress levels, foliar spray stimulants and mulching treatments had significant effects on different studied vegetative growth characteristics of taro plant. Foliar application treatments with proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} as well as putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} in combination with either water stress level at 75 or 50 % of ETc gave the highest growth aspects compared to the control and other treatments application during the two seasons. In this respect, the growth promoting effects of foliar spray treatments, especially under water regime levels i.e., 75 and 50% of ETc may be due for enhancing the antioxidant capacity**.** In this regard, Gadalla AMA,2010 [22] found that the interaction of drought stress and antioxidant treatments showed that the applied antioxidants enhanced growth parameter of soybean under drought stress compared with control.

The above mentioned results evidently indicated that the applied treatments greatly increased the ability of tolerance of taro plant against the water stress adverse effects. Also, it was obvious from the same data that control plant was physiologically stressed, resulting in decreasing it's morphological growth aspects.

3.2. Leaves chemical compositions:

Data in Tables (5 and 6) indicate the effect of tested irrigation water levels i.e.,100, 75 and 50% of ETc, foliar application substances i.e., proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} and mulching i.e., black polyethylene plastic sheet, rice straw and sawdust mulches) individually or in combination of treatments on the photosynthetic pigments (i.e., chlorophyll A, B and carotenoids) .Proline contents as well as antioxidant enzymes activity have been noticed in taro plant leaves at 180 days, after planting during both seasons of 2016 and 2017.

3.2.1. photosynthetic pigments content

As shown in **Table (5),** data clearly indicate that the effect of water regime levels, foliar spray materials and mulching treatments individually or in combination on photosynthetic pigments (i.e., chlorophyll a, b, a+b and carotenoids) content are noticed in taro leaves.

Regarding the effect of water stress levels, data show that increasing water stress levels from 75 to 50% of ETc have decreased concentration of photosynthetic pigments (i.e., chlorophyll a, b, a+b and carotenoids) gradually, compared to full irrigation level (100%). In this respect, water stress level at 50% of ETc gave the highest reduction in chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids in taro leaves. These results could be explained by Abd-Ellatif ,YMR,2012 [23] who showed that water stress decreased the content of the photosynthetic pigments in snap bean and cotton plants [85], on soybean [22] and directly related to plant biomass and yield**.** Also, Mafakheri A,2010 [86] indicated that drought stress significantly decreased chlorophyll a, chlorophyll b and total chlorophyll contents. In addition, the decrease in chlorophyll content under drought stress has been considered a typical symptom of oxidative stress and may be the result of pigment photo-oxidation and chlorophyll degradation. Carotenes are a key part of the antioxidant defense system in plant [87].

Regarding the effect of stimulants foliar spray and mulching treatments, as shown in Table (5) different applied treatments increased each of chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids in taro leaves. Also, it could be noticed that maximum increases of all these pigments in taro leaves existed in cases of proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, black polyethylene plastic mulch and potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} followed by putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} treatments. Since, proline at 150 mgl^{-1} was the most

Table 5. Effect of irrigation water levels, foliar application substances and mulching treatments as well as their interactions on photosynthetic pigments content (mgg^{-1} F.W.) of taro plant leaves during 2016 and 2017 seasons.

Treatments	Characteristics	Chlorophyll (a)		Chlorophyll (b)		Chlorophyll (a + b)		Carotenoids	
		1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Irrigation water levels [a]									
WL1		1.05	1.16	0.72	0.74	1.78	1.91	1.06	0.99
WL2		0.85	1.04	0.61	0.63	1.46	1.68	0.80	1.06
WL3		0.79	0.94	0.48	0.48	1.27	1.42	0.78	0.95
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.15	0.13	0.17	0.12	0.26	0.31	0.35	0.13
Foliar spray with stimulants and mulching treatments [b]									
Control		0.79	0.91	0.45	0.55	1.24	1.46	0.75	0.78
Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}		0.97	1.16	0.68	0.65	1.65	1.81	1.16	1.06
Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}		0.94	1.05	0.61	0.59	1.56	1.65	0.95	0.94
Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}		0.85	1.17	0.61	0.64	1.46	1.81	0.82	1.11
Black polyethylene		0.96	1.07	0.65	0.71	1.61	1.78	0.92	1.00
Rice straw		0.87	0.89	0.59	0.57	1.48	1.46	0.79	1.12
sawdust		0.90	1.08	0.63	0.61	1.53	1.69	0.77	0.97
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.03	0.08	0.05	0.10	0.13	0.15	0.03	0.12
The interaction between irrigation water levels [a] and stimulants foliar spray as well as mulching treatments [b]									
WL1	Control	0.85	1.07	0.53	0.67	1.38	1.74	0.83	0.67
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	1.16	1.31	0.88	0.79	2.04	2.10	1.83	1.14
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	1.20	1.14	0.81	0.70	2.01	1.84	1.26	1.05
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	0.98	1.36	0.66	0.74	1.64	2.10	0.82	1.13
	Black polyethylene	1.15	1.06	0.87	0.93	2.02	1.99	1.17	0.98
	Rice straw	0.93	0.81	0.62	0.58	1.55	1.39	0.72	0.94
	sawdust	1.12	1.40	0.70	0.81	1.82	2.21	0.84	1.03
WL2	Control	0.74	0.87	0.46	0.55	1.20	1.42	0.64	0.89
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	0.93	1.05	0.71	0.63	1.64	1.68	0.85	1.08
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	0.81	1.09	0.55	0.62	1.36	1.71	0.78	0.90
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	0.78	1.13	0.62	0.71	1.40	1.84	0.92	1.21
	Black polyethylene	0.96	1.29	0.67	0.70	1.63	1.99	0.89	1.15
	Rice straw	0.95	0.90	0.56	0.69	1.54	1.59	0.81	1.23
	sawdust	0.81	0.97	0.70	0.57	1.51	1.54	0.71	0.96
WL3	Control	0.79	0.81	0.37	0.43	1.16	1.24	0.78	0.79
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	0.83	1.13	0.45	0.54	1.28	1.67	0.81	0.97
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	0.82	0.94	0.49	0.46	1.31	1.40	0.82	0.89
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	0.79	1.02	0.57	0.49	1.36	1.51	0.74	1.01
	Black polyethylene	0.77	0.86	0.41	0.52	1.18	1.38	0.71	0.88
	Rice straw	0.75	0.97	0.60	0.45	1.35	1.42	0.86	1.19
	sawdust	0.79	0.87	0.49	0.47	1.28	1.34	0.77	0.92
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.05	0.13	0.08	0.17	0.22	0.25	0.05	0.20

Where WL1: 100% of ETc, WL2: 75% of ETc and WL3: 50% of ETc

effective treatment, which led to maintain the highest concentrations of the determined photosynthetic pigments.

As for the effect of interaction, data in Table (5**)** clearly show that all the interactions between water stress levels and foliar applications as well as mulching treatments increased the concentration of chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids in taro leaves compared to the control plants. Also, proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} gave the highest concentration of chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids in taro leaves under water stress levels at 75 and 50% during 2016 and 2017 seasons.

Our results are in harmony with those reported by Ali Q, Ashraf M, Athar HUR.2007 [35] who found that the foliar application with proline at 30 mM was most effective for inducing drought tolerance and increasing the rate of photosynthesis of maize plant.

In this respect, the stimulation of photosynthetic pigments formation could be attributed to the vigorous growth obtained in Table (4). Also, increasing of chlorophylls and carotenoids contents may be due for enhancing photosynthesis efficiency through photosynthetic apparatus by protecting plant of any ROS, increasing sub unit of Rubisco, pigments of photosynthesis, thereby increasing photosynthetic rate and plant productivity [18]. So, many strategies have been proposed for alleviating the cellular damage caused by abiotic stress and improving crop drought tolerance. Among them are compatible osmolytes exogenous application such as proline and potassium silicate [20,21,22,23, 24].

. On the other hand, to alleviate these oxidative effects, plants have developed a series of enzymatic and non enzymatic systems for protecting cells from oxidative damage and counteracting the ROS radicals [15]. Plants have a wide range of resistance mechanisms for productivity maintaining and ensure survival under drought stress conditions. One of the stress defense mechanisms is consisting of antioxidants with low molecular weight (non enzymatic) such as glutathione, tocopherol, ascorbate, phenolic and carotenoids as well as antioxidant enzymes such as superoxide dismutase and peroxidase as well as catalase [14,16,17].

In addition, Egilla JN et al,2005 [84] suggested that increasing K^+ concentrations in plant cells with an excess K^+ supply could prevent inhibition of photosynthesis under drought stress. An adaptive K requirement for drought-stressed plants could be related to the role of K in enhancing photosynthetic CO_2 fixation and transport of photosynthates into sink organs and inhibiting the transfer of photosynthetic electrons to O_2, thus reducing ROS production [88]. Also, this increment of photosynthetic pigment contents in response to putrescine and potassium may be due to its action as antioxidants and enhancing antioxidant enzymes activities for protecting chloroplast and photosynthetic system from oxidative damages by free radical [6]. Our results agreed with those reported by earlier researchers [89,90,91]. Also**,** Sayed SM et al,2018 [43] found that globe artichoke plant sprayed with silicon at 2000 mgl^{-1} recorded the highest increasing in chlorophylls content compared with untreated plants.

As for putrescine Kaur-Sawhney R, Galston AW,1991 [92] reported that polyamines are important factor for stabilizing chloroplasts thylakoid membranes and retarding chlorophyll degradation. Zeid IM.,2004 [93] found that application of putrescine at 10^{-2} mM increased leaves chlorophyll a, b and carotenoids contents in stressed bean seedlings.

3.2.2.Proline content

Results in Table (6) reflect the effect of irrigation water levels and foliar spray with stimulant materials as well as mulching treatments individually and their interaction treatments on proline content in taro leaves at 180 days after planting during 2017 season.

As regards to the water regime levels, it could be noticed that by increasing water stress levels from 75% to 50% of ETc, the proline content was gradually increased comparing with the full irrigation level i.e.,100% of ETc. The highest water stress level at 50% gave the highest value of determined proline content in taro leaves. In this connection, under drought stress, the maintenance of leaf turgor may also be achieved by the way of osmotic adjustment in response to proline accumulation, sucrose, soluble carbohydrates, glycine betaine, and other solutes in cytoplasm improving water uptake from drying soil. The process of accumulation of such solutes under drought stress is known as osmotic adjustment, which strongly depends on the rate of water stress.

In this respect, Valentovic P et al, 2006 [94] and Gunes A, et al,2008 [95] concluded that increasing of leaves proline content with decreasing of available water is an efficient mechanism for osmotic regulation, stabilizing of sub cellular structures and cellular adaptation to water stress.

High proline content in plants under water stress has also been reported by other researchers [96,97,98].

Concerning the effect of stimulants foliar spray and mulching treatments the same data (Table-6) show that putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}, proline at 150 mgl^{-1} and black polyethylene plastic mulching treatments gave the highest proline content in leaves of taro plant compared to the control.

The consequences also show the effect of interaction between water regimes and foliar spray with stimulant substances as well as mulching treatments on proline content in taro leaves. In this regard, both of exogenous application substances and mulching treatments significantly increased proline content of taro leaves under water deficit conditions. Black polyethylene plastic mulch, putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}, proline at 150 mgl^{-1} and potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} gave the highest concentrations under water stress level at 50%, when compared to the control and other treatments.

Such accumulation in osmolyte components is necessary for the plants maintenance under water stress conditions due to their important role in osmotic adjustment and osmoregulation, the disturbance in plant osmotica under stress conditions could be attributed to the metabolic processes imbalance, i.e., photosynthesis, respiration, transpiration, hormones and activity of enzymes as well as protein synthesis. This results obtained could be explained by Ashraf M, Foolad MR,2007 [25], who reported that amino acid proline is known to occur widely in higher plants and normally accumulates in large quantities in response to environmental stresses. Proline is one of the commonly occurring compatible solutes and plays a crucial role in osmotolerance and osmoregulation, It protects membranes and proteins against the dehydration destabilizing effects under a biotic stress. In addition, it has ability for scavenging free radicals generated under stress conditions. Also, Zeid IM,2004[93] found that exogenous putrescine treatment at 10^{-2} mM significantly increased bean seedlings content of proline under stress compared to the control plant. Bahadur A et al [89] indicated that several mechanisms have been adopted by drought tolerant plants to adapt water stress including osmolytes accumulation. The osmolytes accumulated include amino acids such as proline, glutamate, glycine betaine and sugars. These compounds are playing a key role in preventing membrane disintegration and enzyme inactivation under water stress conditions. Many strategies have been proposed for alleviating the cellular damage caused by a biotic stress and improving crop drought tolerance. Among them, compatible osmolytes exogenous application such as proline, potassium silicate are noteworthy [20,21,22,23,24].

Table 6**.** Effect of irrigation water levels, foliar application substances and mulching treatments as well as their interactions on proline content (mgg^{-1} F.W.) and antioxidant enzymes activities (unit min^{-1} mg^{-1} protein) of taro plant leaves during 2017 season.

Treatments / **Characteristics**		Control	Proline 150 mgl^{-1}	Potassium silicate 2500 mgl^{-1}	Putrescine 10 mgl^{-1}	Black polyethylene	Rice straw	sawdust
Proline	WL1	0.65	0.73	0.68	0.73	0.85	0.64	0.72
	WL2	0.72	0.76	0.69	0.76	0.66	0.81	0.81
	WL3	0.93	0.96	0.94	1.12	1.06	0.91	0.92
Superoxide dismutase	WL1	0.38	0.49	0.45	0.46	0.51	0.43	0.41
	WL2	0.56	0.59	0.50	0.49	0.55	0.41	0.61
	WL3	0.48	0.52	0.57	0.58	0.62	0.58	0.47
Peroxidase	WL1	0.60	0.74	0.78	0.86	0.68	1.17	1.05
	WL2	0.64	0.81	0.77	0.83	0.76	0.72	0.65
	WL3	0.82	0.85	0.87	1.09	0.83	0.68	1.06
Catalase	WL1	0.69	0.66	0.69	0.88	0.68	0.63	0.70
	WL2	0.71	0.76	0.72	0.97	0.60	0.64	0.75
	WL3	1.07	0.91	0.80	1.12	1.09	0.87	0.85

Where WL1: 100% of ETc, WL2: 75% of ETc and WL3: 50% of ETc

3.2.3. Antioxidant enzymes activity

Plant cells possess several defense mechanisms against the oxidative injury caused by drought stress. Such mechanisms including antioxidant enzymes,namely, superoxide dismutase, peroxidase and catalase, which degrade superoxide radicals and H_2O_2, respectively. Many non enzymatic antioxidants, as the polyphenolic compounds also play an important role [16].

Our obtained data (Table- 6**)** clearly show that those treatments of water regimes, foliar application with stimulant substances as well as mulching treatments and their interactions affected the antioxidant enzymes activity i.e., superoxide dismutase (SOD), peroxidase (POD) and catalase (CAT) in taro leaves at 180 days after planting during 2017 season.

Regarding irrigation water levels the presented results (Table- 6) indicate that all water stress levels increased the activity of the antioxidant enzymes i.e., SOD, POD and CAT in taro leaves. Also, water stress level at 50% of ETc gave the highest values of the activity of those enzymes when compared to the control (100% ETc).

These results are in harmony with those reported by many researchers [14,16,17,99]. **T**hey reported that plants have a wide range of resistance mechanisms for maintaining of productivity and ensure survival under drought stress conditions. One of the stress defense mechanisms consist of antioxidant enzymes such as superoxide dismutase (SOD) and peroxidase (POD) as well as catalase (CAT). Superoxide radicals are scavenged by superoxide dismutase, while the resulting H_2O_2 is reduced to H_2O by CAT and POD.

With regard to stimulants foliar spray and mulching treatments, results show that all applied treatments also increased the activity of antioxidant enzymes i.e., SOD, POD and CAT. Black polyethylene mulch and proline at 150 mgl^{-1} were the most effective treatments when compared to the control.

From the details given above, it is clear that the applied treatments induced the synthesis of antioxidant enzymes as a defensive system. Generally, it could be concluded that different applied treatments were mostly effective, which induced an active metabolism case and an effective antioxidantal mechanism of internal defense.

The effect of interaction between water regimes and foliar spray with stimulant substances as well as mulching treatments on antioxidant enzymes activity i.e., SOD, POD and CAT in taro leaves, both substances foliar application and mulching treatments increased the activity of the antioxidant enzymes under water deficit conditions. Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} ranked the first, followed by potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, especially under water stress level at 50% ETc ,when compared to the control and other treatments.

The presented results indicate that, the foliar application of putrescine, potassium silicate and proline on taro plant under water stress regulate the level of antioxidant enzymes, which involved in scavenging ROS. Also, these results may be attributed to the potential effect of foliar applied substances , which act as free radical scavenger.

The above discussed results evidently indicated that the applied treatments have greatly increased the tolerance ability of taro plant against the water stress adverse effects. Also, it is obvious from the same data that control plants were physiologically stressed. They developed with no or weakly mechanism by which they protected against the prevailing water stress and its probable inducible oxidative nature.

These results are in harmony with those given by the specialists [17,99,100]. Plants protect cellular and sub cellular system from the cyto-toxic effects of active oxygen radicals with anti-oxidative enzymes such as SOD, POX and CAT as well as metabolites like glutathione, ascorbic acid, tocopherol and carotenoids [101].

Proline plays a regulatory role in function and activity of catalase, peroxidase and superoxide dismutase enzymes in plant cells and in their participation in development of metabolic responses for environmental conditions [26].

3.3.**<u>yield and its components</u>**

<u>3.3.1.Effect of applied treatments on taro corms yield</u>

Data presented in Tables (7 and 8) clearly show the effect of tested irrigation water levels (i.e.,100, 75 and 50% of ETc), foliar spray with the stimulant substances (i.e., proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}) and mulching treatments (i.e., black polyethylene plastic sheet, rice straw and sawdust mulches) individually or in combination treatments on different estimated yield characteristics of taro plant i.e., corm length (cm), corm diameter (cm), corms fresh weight (kg) $plant^{-1}$, corm fresh weight (g), corms fresh weight (kg) $plot^{-1}$, corms fresh yield (ton) $fed.^{-1}$ and corm dry matter % as well as water use efficiency kg corms / m^3 water during 2016 and 2017 seasons.

With regard to irrigation water treatments, one could notice that different yield traits of taro corms were significantly decreased gradually with increasing water stress levels from 75 to 50% of ETc compared to the full irrigation level (100% ETc) during the two growth seasons. Also, water regime level at 50% ETc gave the highest reduction in all yield characteristics of taro during 2016 and 2017, when compared to water stress level at 75% ETc and full irrigation level 100% ETc (the control). These results are in agreement with those reported by earlier researchers [23, 81,102,103].They found that decreasing irrigation water level lead for decreasing yield characteristics compared to the control plant (100% WL).

It could be concluded that this reduction in yield and its components due to increasing water stress level was accompanied by decreasing growth parameters Table (4) and photosynthetic pigments Table (5) as well as antioxidant enzymes activity Table (6).

Our results agree with those reported by Turner LB. [4] who reported that water is the most important component of life as well as vital commodity for crop production. Agricultural productivity is dependent upon water and it is essential in every stage from germination to plant maturation**.** Consequently, any degree of water stress is producing deleterious effects on plant yield [5,6]. Drought stress is one of the major causes for crop production losses worldwide as well as yield reducing with 50% and over [11].

As for the effect of foliar spray with stimulant substances and mulching treatments on taro corms yield characteristics, it was clear that different applied treatments were significantly increased all yield characteristics of taro corms and water use efficiency comparing with the control plant during the two seasons of growth. It was obvious from the same data in Tables (7 and 8) that proline at 150 mgl^{-1} ranked the first for increasing the corms yield parameters followed by putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and black polyethylene plastic mulch when compared with the control and other treatments.

Regarding the interaction effect between different water regimes and foliar application with stimulants as well as mulching treatments on corms yield characteristics and water use efficiency, the obtained results show that foliar spray with stimulants and mulching treatments increased corms yield characteristics as well as water use efficiency to reach the level of significance compared to the control plant. Since, one could notice that the highest increasing in yield characteristics existed with proline at 150 mgl^{-1} followed by potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}, putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} and black polyethylene plastic mulch treatments under irrigation water levels at 75 and 50% ETc when compared to the untreated plants.

the same results presented in Table (8) reveal that irrigation water levels at at 75 and 50% of ETc combined with proline at 150 mgl^{-1} followed by potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} treatments gave the best yield (corms kg /m^3 of irrigation water).

The above mentioned results evidently indicate that the applied treatments greatly increased the tolerance ability of taro plant against the water stress adverse effects. Also, it is obvious from the same data that control plants have been physiologically stressed. The plants developed with nil or weak mechanism by which they have been protected against the prevailing water stress and its probable inducible oxidation.

The negative effects of high water stress level on yield and its components may be due for decreasing the number of leaves and leaf area $plant^{-1}$, resulting in supply reduction of photosynthates due for decreasing the net photosynthetic rate. Limited photosynthesis and sucrose accumulation in the leaves may hamper the rate of sucrose export to the sink organs and ultimately affect the reproductive development [74]. Drought stresses not only limits the size of the source and sink tissues, but also the phloem loading and assimilate translocation to reproductive sinks. Yield can be limited by availability of assimilate translocation and biomass accumulation [74]. Drought stress reduces yield by 40-55% [104,105].

In addition, such increases effect proline, putrescine, potassium silicate and mulching treatments on yield and its components. These results may be attributed to their roles in enhancing many physiological and developmental processes in plant under abiotic stress [47,106]**.**

Different scientists reported ameliorative effects of proline in different crops like wheat [29], tobacco [30] and olive [31]. Foliar application of proline is a shotgun approach in minimizing deleterious effects of stress. Gamal El-Din KM, Abd El-Wahed MSA,2005 [34] concluded that a foliar spray with proline at 100 mgl^{-1} increased yield characteristics of chamomile plant.

Table 7**.** Effect of irrigation water levels, foliar application substances and mulching treatments as well as their interactions on yield characteristics of taro plant during 2016 and 2017 seasons.

Treatments	Characteristics	Corm length (cm)		Corm diameter (cm)		Corms F.W. (kg) plant^{-1}		Corm F.W. (g)	
		1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Irrigation water levels [a]									
WL1		9.638	12.348	9.180	11.138	1.616	1.951	979.03	1294.40
WL2		8.438	10.976	8.396	10.519	1.526	1.688	898.62	946.85
WL3		8.036	9.395	7.759	8.643	1.181	1.193	615.23	837.66
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.219	0.743	0.939	1.058	0.241	0.273	83.21	94.25
Foliar spray with stimulants and mulching treatments [b]									
Control		8.122	9.456	7.344	8.833	0.979	1.133	441.06	732.39
Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}		9.500	11.256	8.992	11.144	1.532	1.865	1010.78	1235.67
Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}		8.578	11.667	8.901	10.423	1.536	1.752	833.33	1077.89
Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}		8.967	10.467	9.053	10.678	1.538	1.840	959.84	1234.40
Black polyethylene		8.550	11.678	8.478	10.222	1.491	1.612	1047.94	1092.06
Rice straw		8.600	10.478	8.118	9.521	1.519	1.493	657.37	855.00
sawdust		8.611	11.344	8.226	9.878	1.491	1.580	866.39	956.72
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.205	0.451	0.667	0.961	0.199	0.220	52.51	46.87
The interaction between irrigation water levels [a] and stimulants foliar spray as well as mulching treatments [b]									
WL1	Control	8.833	10.133	7.933	9.433	1.097	1.357	632.17	904.33
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	10.333	13.000	9.767	12.233	1.740	2.348	1115.67	1565.33
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	10.067	13.167	9.653	11.667	1.713	2.138	1075.00	1383.33
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	9.067	12.967	9.657	11.567	1.738	2.412	1136.37	1805.17
	Black polyethylene	9.000	13.100	9.213	11.467	1.667	1.900	1344.00	1266.50
	Rice straw	10.167	12.067	8.933	11.133	1.685	1.760	803.33	1173.33
	sawdust	10.000	12.000	9.100	10.467	1.671	1.744	746.67	962.83
WL2	Control	7.700	9.667	7.267	9.500	1.088	1.172	390.00	712.17
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	8.667	10.800	9.110	11.433	1.612	1.933	1216.67	1266.67
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	8.533	12.533	9.050	11.200	1.623	1.865	975.00	1125.33
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	9.533	11.067	9.003	11.033	1.596	1.813	934.83	813.53
	Black polyethylene	8.400	11.567	8.453	10.400	1.574	1.670	912.33	964.67
	Rice straw	8.233	9.867	7.787	9.533	1.599	1.658	875.00	811.23
	sawdust	8.000	11.333	8.100	10.533	1.590	1.703	986.50	934.33
WL3	Control	7.833	8.567	6.833	7.567	0.752	0.871	301.00	580.67
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	9.500	9.967	8.100	9.767	1.245	1.313	700.00	875.00
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	7.133	9.300	8.000	8.403	1.273	1.253	450.00	725.00
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	8.300	7.367	8.500	9.433	1.279	1.293	808.33	1084.50
	Black polyethylene	8.250	10.367	7.767	8.800	1.231	1.268	887.50	1045.00
	Rice straw	7.400	9.500	7.633	7.897	1.274	1.059	293.77	580.43
	sawdust	7.833	10.700	7.477	8.633	1.213	1.293	866.00	973.00
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.355	0.781	1.155	1.664	0.344	0.381	90.94	81.17

Where WL1: 100% of ETc, WL2: 75% of ETc and WL3: 50% of ETc

Table 8**.** Effect of irrigation water levels, foliar application substances and mulching treatments as well as their interactions on yield parameters and water use efficiency (WUE kg corms m^{3-1} water) of taro plant during 2016 and 2017 seasons.

Treatments \ Characteristics		Corms fresh weight (kg) $plot^{-1}$		Corms fresh yield (ton)$fed.^{-1}$		Corm dry matter %		Water use efficiency	
		1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Irrigation water levels [a]									
WL1		60.60	63.55	17.31	18.16	24.91	27.33	3.97	4.17
WL2		54.19	61.31	15.48	17.51	24.11	25.11	4.74	5.37
WL3		39.78	45.66	11.37	13.05	22.74	23.06	5.22	5.99
L.S.D. at 5 %		4.81	5.59	1.68	1.29	0.86	1.22	0.65	0.78
Foliar spray with stimulants and mulching treatments [b]									
Control		31.28	46.14	8.94	12.85	22.11	23.54	2.72	4.08
Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}		61.35	77.85	17.53	18.91	25.01	25.95	5.50	6.08
Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}		56.81	68.30	16.23	17.84	24.58	26.11	5.08	5.64
Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}		59.69	72.00	17.05	17.90	24.36	25.60	5.41	5.66
Black polyethylene		53.46	56.72	15.27	16.21	23.80	25.26	4.93	5.12
Rice straw		48.16	57.84	13.76	14.53	24.07	25.09	4.38	4.75
sawdust		49.92	62.04	14.26	16.39	23.52	24.60	4.51	4.96
L.S.D. at 5 %		5.89	8.38	1.03	1.54	0.35	1.16	0.43	0.52
The interaction between irrigation water levels [a] and stimulants foliar spray as well as mulching treatments [b]									
WL1	Control	39.83	53.48	11.38	15.28	23.34	25.84	2.61	3.51
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	70.29	70.63	20.08	20.18	25.78	28.35	4.61	4.64
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	67.73	69.65	19.35	19.90	25.31	28.03	4.45	4.57
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	71.59	74.06	20.45	21.16	25.67	27.93	4.70	4.86
	Black polyethylene	57.48	65.80	16.42	18.80	24.44	27.80	3.77	4.32
	Rice straw	55.13	52.92	15.75	15.12	25.23	27.18	3.62	3.47
	sawdust	62.15	58.31	17.76	16.66	24.62	26.14	4.08	3.83
WL2	Control	35.05	44.87	10.01	12.82	21.98	23.69	3.07	3.93
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	69.65	72.80	19.90	20.80	25.48	25.74	6.10	6.38
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	61.43	70.90	17.55	20.26	25.37	25.65	5.38	6.21
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	58.89	64.66	16.83	18.47	24.33	25.50	5.16	5.66
	Black polyethylene	56.67	60.77	16.19	17.36	24.06	25.03	4.96	5.32
	Rice straw	50.61	56.38	14.46	16.11	24.22	25.09	4.43	4.94
	sawdust	47.04	58.82	13.44	16.80	23.35	25.03	4.12	5.15
WL3	Control	18.96	36.58	5.42	10.45	21.03	21.10	2.49	4.80
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	44.10	55.13	12.60	15.75	23.77	23.76	5.79	7.24
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	41.27	46.84	11.79	13.38	23.07	24.64	5.42	6.15
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	48.59	49.27	13.88	14.08	23.08	23.36	6.38	6.47
	Black polyethylene	46.23	43.61	13.21	12.46	22.92	22.95	6.07	5.73
	Rice straw	38.75	43.23	11.07	12.35	22.75	23.00	5.09	5.68
	sawdust	40.56	44.97	11.59	12.85	22.59	22.62	5.33	5.91
L.S.D. at 5 %		10.20	14.51	1.87	2.66	0.60	2.00	0.74	1.34

Where WL1: 100% of ETc, WL2: 75% of ETc and WL3: 50% of ETc

Potassium (K) is an essential element for many physiological processes such as translocation of photosynthetic material into sink organs in plants. This process increases drought tolerance [14,36,37].

Silicon was reported to reduce the hazard effects of various abiotic and biotic stresses. Foliar application of pea plants with silicon significantly increased yield traits fed.$^{-1}$ [41]. Sayed SM et al, 2018 [43] found that globe artichoke plant sprayed with silicon at 2000 mgl^{-1} recorded the highest increasing in yield parameters compared to untreated plant.

Polyamines high accumulation in plant during a biotic stress has been documented and it is correlated with increasing abiotic stress tolerance [47].

Mulching with plant residues and synthetic materials is a well established technique for increasing the profitability of many horticultural crops [51]. Also, mulch is improving roots distribution and their nutrients absorption as well as plant yield [54,55]. Sharma AR et al, 2010 [56] found that mulching is very beneficial for enhancing moisture and nutrient conservation, resulting in productivity increase.

3.3.2.Effect of applied treatments on some bioconstituents of taro corms

Results in Table (9) illustrate the effect of irrigation water levels (i.e.,100, 75 and 50% of ETc) and foliar application with the stimulant materials (i.e., proline at 150 mgl^{-1}, potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} and putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}) and mulching treatments (i.e., black polyethylene plastic sheet, rice straw and sawdust mulches) individually or in combination treatments on some bio-constituents of taro corms i.e., N, P, K, protein and starch % during 2016 and 2017 seasons.

With regard to water regime levels, data clearly indicate that different water stress levels i.e., 75 and 50% of ETc decreased the content of N, P, K, crude protein and starch in corms of taro plants compared to the full irrigation level (100% ETc). Also, the water stress level at 50% of ETc gave the highest reduction in the determined bio-constituents. These results are in agreement with those reported by Farooq M, et al, 2009 [74] showed that drought stress reduces the availability, uptake, translocation, metabolism of nutrients and efficiency of their utilization.

Concerning the effect of stimulants foliar spray and mulching treatments, the obtained data clearly indicate that all applied treatments effectively increased the concentration of N, P, K, crude protein and starch in taro corms of treated plants compared to those of the control. The same data cleared that the most effective treatment, which led to maintain the highest concentrations of the determined bio-constituents was proline at 150 mgl^{-1} followed by potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}, putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} and black polyethylene plastic mulch, respectively.

In this respect, increasing of total carbohydrate with different applied treatments considered a direct result of increasing both photosynthesis rate and efficiency. Also, that was preceded by large photosynthetic area [Table-4] and high content of photosynthetic pigments [Table- 5] as well with different applied treatments. Such promotional effect of applied treatments on determined minerals, protein and carbohydrate concentrations could be due to their similar effect on photosynthetic pigments and number of leaves i.e., surfaces of photoassimilation, thereby, the capacity of Co_2 fixation and carbohydrates synthesis. In addition, increment of determined bio-constituents in taro corms with different applied treatments considered a direct result of the obtained vigorous growth that being accompanied with high photosynthesis efficiency.

Regarding the effect of interaction between water stress levels and stimulants foliar application as well as mulching treatments, the presented data [Table- 9] clearly show that foliar spray with stimulants and mulching treatments increased N, P, K, protein and starch contents in taro corms to reach the level of significance under different irrigation water levels compared to the untreated plants. Since, it is noticed that the highest increasing of the determined bio-constituents existed with proline at 150 mgl^{-1} followed by potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}, putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} and black polyethylene plastic mulch treatments under irrigation water levels i.e., 75 and 50% ETc ,when compared to untreated plants during the two seasons of growth.

The obtained results clearly show the stimulatory effects of foliar spray with stimulants and mulching treatments upon alleviating the adverse effects of the water stress compared to the unstressed plants.

Generally, results indicate that different applied treatments i.e., proline, potassium silicate, putrescine and mulching play a defensive protective role against adverse effects of water stress level via it's antioxidant and regulatory functions, especially at water stress level 50% compared to that of 100% from water requirements.

It was reported that foliar application of proline is a shotgun approach in minimizing stress deleterious effects. Moreover, plants show resistance to drought oxidative damage by organic osmolytes accumulation such as sugars [32,33 ,89].

Table 9**.** Effect of irrigation water levels, foliar application substances and mulching treatments as well as their interactions on some bioconstituents % of taro corms yield during 2016 and 2017 seasons.

Characteristics / **Treatments**		N		P		K		Protein		Starch	
		1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd	1st	2nd
Irrigation water levels [a]											
WL1		1.575	1.519	0.565	0.582	2.791	2.831	9.845	9.491	50.02	53.70
WL2		1.548	1.499	0.554	0.568	2.744	2.784	9.672	9.371	48.29	50.07
WL3		1.462	1.436	0.508	0.530	2.513	2.586	9.137	8.978	45.45	46.08
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.041	0.020	0.017	0.012	0.040	0.098	0.191	0.083	2.14	2.81
Foliar spray with stimulants and mulching treatments [b]											
Control		1.055	1.037	0.440	0.444	2.530	2.599	6.592	6.480	44.03	46.75
Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}		1.674	1.652	0.603	0.617	2.730	2.784	10.463	10.323	49.72	51.13
Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}		1.666	1.633	0.582	0.611	2.819	2.809	10.415	10.209	49.61	51.77
Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}		1.627	1.541	0.583	0.603	2.743	2.779	10.167	9.634	48.64	50.64
Black polyethylene		1.540	1.529	0.526	0.558	2.642	2.728	9.623	9.557	47.91	50.41
Rice straw		1.600	1.472	0.560	0.560	2.692	2.740	9.998	9.203	48.13	49.63
sawdust		1.536	1.529	0.500	0.526	2.621	2.698	9.601	9.554	47.37	49.30
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.091	0.018	0.015	0.033	0.038	0.047	0.122	0.069	2.08	2.15
The interaction between irrigation water levels [a] and stimulants foliar spray as well as mulching treatments [b]											
WL1	Control	1.146	1.112	0.471	0.476	2.788	2.838	7.161	6.951	46.34	50.34
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	1.711	1.684	0.639	0.649	2.813	2.879	10.694	10.526	51.55	54.71
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	1.719	1.673	0.606	0.630	2.920	2.894	10.742	10.456	51.29	55.40
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	1.671	1.564	0.596	0.639	2.809	2.862	10.445	9.775	51.01	54.87
	Black polyethylene	1.565	1.573	0.545	0.577	2.740	2.793	9.780	9.832	49.54	54.94
	Rice straw	1.659	1.466	0.586	0.575	2.754	2.794	10.369	9.162	50.47	53.36
	sawdust	1.556	1.558	0.512	0.528	2.713	2.762	9.726	9.737	49.90	52.27
WL2	Control	1.078	1.084	0.459	0.456	2.788	2.743	6.738	6.774	43.96	47.39
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	1.705	1.682	0.609	0.622	2.769	2.803	10.654	10.511	50.73	50.82
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	1.699	1.658	0.606	0.623	2.828	2.830	10.617	10.364	50.74	50.96
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	1.638	1.546	0.604	0.608	2.770	2.794	10.239	9.661	48.76	50.66
	Black polyethylene	1.538	1.516	0.528	0.560	2.697	2.793	9.615	9.472	48.35	50.40
	Rice straw	1.623	1.467	0.572	0.573	2.691	2.772	10.146	9.170	48.44	49.85
	sawdust	1.551	1.543	0.499	0.534	2.667	2.757	9.695	9.643	47.03	50.40
WL3	Control	0.940	0.914	0.390	0.399	2.015	2.216	5.877	5.715	41.78	42.53
	Proline at 150 mgl^{-1}	1.606	1.589	0.562	0.581	2.608	2.671	10.040	9.931	46.88	47.86
	Potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1}	1.582	1.569	0.534	0.579	2.710	2.703	9.886	9.807	46.80	48.95
	Putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1}	1.571	1.514	0.550	0.563	2.650	2.683	9.816	9.464	46.16	46.39
	Black polyethylene	1.516	1.499	0.505	0.538	2.490	2.599	9.475	9.367	45.83	45.90
	Rice straw	1.517	1.484	0.523	0.530	2.632	2.655	9.479	9.277	45.49	45.67
	sawdust	1.501	1.485	0.490	0.518	2.484	2.575	9.383	9.282	45.18	45.23
L.S.D. at 5 %		0.157	0.031	0.025	0.057	0.065	0.081	0.211	0.119	3.60	3.72

Where WL1: 100% of ETc, WL2: 75% of ETc and WL3: 50% of ETc

Potassium (K) is an essential element for many physiological processes such as protein synthesis, translocation of photo-synthetics into sink organs. It regulates many metabolic processes and increases drought tolerance [14,36,37]. Silicon was reported to reduce the hazard effects of various abiotic and biotic stresses including drought stress [38,39]. Sayed et al., 2018 [43] showed that spraying globe artichoke plant with silicon at 2000 ppm increased nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium and total sugars contents compared to the control plant.

Polyamines can modulate proteins synthesis and protect macromolecules under stress conditions [46]. High accumulation of polyamines in plants during abiotic stress has been well documented and is correlated with increased tolerance to a biotic stress [47].

Also, mulching improved roots absorption of nutrients [54]. Sharma AR et al, 2010 [56] concluded that mulching is very beneficial for enhancing moisture and nutrient conservation, resulting in productivity increase.

4. CONCLUSION

The results from the present study confirm that spraying taro plant grown under water stress levels i.e., 75 and 50% of ETc with proline at 150 mgl^{-1} or potassium silicate at 2500 mgl^{-1} or putrescine at 10 mgl^{-1} as well as black polyethylene plastic mulch, respectively improved plant tolerance to the harmful effects of water stress and reduced the amount of water used for irrigation, especially at 75 of ETc level without significant decreasing in taro yield compared to the full irrigation level (100% ETc).

REFERENCES

1. Matthews PJ, Lockhart P J, Ahmed I. Phylogeography, ethnobotany and linguistics issues arising from research on the natural and cultural history of taro, Colocasia esculenta L. Schott. Man India.2017; 97(1):353-380.
2. Mergedus A, Kristl J, Ivancic A, Sober A, Sustar V, Krizan T, et al. Variation of mineral composition in different parts of taro (*Colocasia esculenta*) corms. Food Chem. 2015; 1(170):37- 46.
3. Lebot V, Lawac F. Quantitative comparison of individual sugars in cultivars and hybrids of taro *Colocasia esculenta* L. Schott. Implications for breeding programs. Euphytica. 2017; 213:147.
4. Turner LB. The effect of water stress on the vegetative growth of white clover (*Trifolium repens* L.): Comparison of long-term water deficit and short-term developing water stress. J. Exp. Bot.1991; 42:311-316.
5. Saif U, Matsudo M, Faros M, Hussain S, Habib A. Effect of planting patterns and different irrigation levels on yield and yield component of maize (*Zea mays* L.). Int. J. Agric. Biol. 2003; 1: 64-69.
6. Abdul Jaleel C, Manivannan P, Wahid A, Farooq M, Al Juburi HJ, Somasundaram R, et al. Drought stress in plants: A Review on morphological characteristics and pigments composition. Int. J. Agric. Biol. 2009; 11:100-105.
7. Lebot V, Tropical Root and Tuber Crops: Cassava and Sweet Potato. In: Yams and Aroids. CABI, Cambridge, UK. 2009; 279-349.
8. Monneveux P, Ramírez DA, Pino MT. Drought tolerance in potato (*S. tuberosum* L.): Can we learn from drought tolerance research in cereals? Plant Science. 2013; 205: 76-86.
9. Torres MA, Jones JD, Dangl JL. Reactive oxygen species signaling in response to pathogens. Plant Physiol. 2006; 141:373-378.
10. Jaleel CA, Manivannan P, Lakshmanan GMA, Gomathinavaam M, Panneerselvam R. Alterations in morphological parameters and photosynthetic pigment responses of *Catharanthus roseus* under soil water deficits. Colloids and Surfaces B Biointerfaces. 2008b; 61:298-303.
11. Wang W, Vinocur B, Altman A. Plant responses to drought, salinity and extreme temperatures: towards genetic engineering for stress tolerance. Planta. 2003; 218 (1):1-14.
12. Asada K. Production and scavenging of reactive oxygen species in chloroplasts and their functions. Plant Physiol. 2006; 141:391-396.
13. Mano J. Early events in environmental stress. Taylor Francis pub. 2002; 217- 45.
14. Waraich EA, Ahmad R, Saifullah, Ashraf MY, Ehsanullah. Role of mineral nutrition in alleviation of drought stress in plants. Australian Journal of Crop Scince (AJCS). 2011; 5(6):764-777.
15. Sairam RK, Tyagi A. Physiology and molecular biology of salinity stress tolerance in plants. Curr. Sci. 2004; 86:407-421.
16. Mittler R. Oxidative stress, antioxidants and stress tolerance. Trends Plant Sci. 2002; 7: 405-410.
17. Apel K, Hirt H. Reactive oxygen species: metabolism, oxidative stress, and signal transduction. Annu. Rev. Plant Biol. 2004; 55:373-399.
18. Chen Z, Gallie DR. Dehydro ascorbate reductase affects leaf growth development and function. Plant Physiol. 2006; 142 (2):775-787.

19. Inskbashi Y, Iwaya M. Ascorbic acid suppresses germination and dynamic states of water in wheat seeds. Plant. Production. Sci. 2006; 9 (2):172-175.
20. El-Shayb OMA. Physiological behavior of some rice varieties under drought condition. Ph.D., Thesis. Fac. Agric. Mansoura Univ. Egypt. 2010.
21. Gill SS, Tuteja N. Polyamines and a biotic stress tolerance in plants. Plant Signal Behav. 2010; 5(1):26-33.
22. Gadalla AMA. Physiological effect of water regime and some antioxidant materials on soybean and maize plants. Ph.D., Thesis. Fac. Agric., Mansoura Univ. Egypt. 2010.
23. Abd-Ellatif YMR. Stimulation of snap bean plant tolerance to some environmental stresses using some bioregulators. Ph.D., Thesis. Fac. Agric. Ain Shams Univ. Egypt. 2012.
24. Ibrahim SAA. Effect of some antioxidant substances on physiological and anatomical characters of wheat plant grown under drought conditions. Ph.D., Thesis. Fac. Agric. Zagazig Univ. Egypt. 2012.
25. Ashraf M, Foolad MR. Roles of glycinebetaine and proline in improving plant a biotic stress resistance. Environ. Exp. Bot. 2007; 59:206-216.
26. Öztürk L, Demir Y. In vivo and in vitro protective role of proline. Plant Growth Regul. 2002; 38:259-264.
27. Kavi-Kishor PB, Sangam S, Amrutha RN, Sri LP, Naidu KR, Rao KRSS, et al. Regulation of proline biosynthesis, degradation, uptake and transport in higher plants: Its implications in plant growth and a biotic stress tolerance. Curr. Sci. 2005; 88:424-438.
28. Lehmann S, Funck D, Szabados L, Rentsch D. Proline metabolism and transport in plant development. Amino Acids. 2010; 39:949-962.
29. Talat A, Nawaz K, Hussian K, Hayat Bhatti K, Siddiqi EH, Khalid A, et al. Foliar application of proline for salt tolerance of two wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) cultivars. World App. Sci. J. 2013; 22:547-554.
30. Okuma E, Murakami Y, Shimoishi Y, Tada M, Murata Y. Effects of exogenous application of proline and betaine on the growth of tobacco cultured cells under saline conditions. Soil Sci. Plant Nutri. 2004; 50:1301-1305.
31. Ahmed BC, Magdich S, Rouina B, Sensoy S, Boukhris M, Abdullah FB. Exogenous proline effects on water relations and ions contents in leaves and roots of young olive. Am. Acids. 2011; 40:565-573.
32. Hoque MA, Banu MN, Okuma E, Amako K, Nakamura Y, Shimoishi Y. Exogenous proline and glycinebetaine increase NaCl-induced ascorbate- glutathione cycle enzyme activities, and proline improves salt tolerance more than glycinebetaine in tobacco Bright Yellow-2 suspension-cultured cells. J. Plant Physiol. 2007; 164:1457-68.
33. Hayat S, Hayat Q, Alyemeni MN, Wani AS, Pichtel J, Ahmad A. Role of proline under changing environments: a review. Plant Signal. Behav. 2012; 7:1456-1466.
34. Gamal El-Din KM, Abd El-Wahed MSA. Effect of some amino acids on growth and essential oil content of chamomile plant. Int. J. Agric. Biol. 2005; 7: 376-380.
35. Ali Q, Ashraf M, Athar HUR. Exogenously applied proline at different growth stages enhances growth of two maize cultivars grown under water deficit conditions. Pak. J. Bot. 2007; 39:1133-1144.
36. Marschner H. Mineral Nutrition of Higher Plants, 2, Academic Press, London, U.K. 1995; 889.
37. Wang M, Zheng Q, Shen Q, Guo S. The critical role of potassium in plant stress response. Int. J. Mol. Sci. 2013; 14:7370-7390.
38. Ma JF. Role of silicon in enhancing the resistance of plants to biotic and a biotic stress. Soil Sci. Plant Nutri. 2004; 50(1):11-18.
39. Etesamy H, Jeong BR. Silicon (Si): Review and future prospects on the action mechanisms in alleviating biotic and a biotic stresses in plants. Eco toxicology and Enviro. Safety. 2018; 147:881-896.
40. Emadian SF, Newton RJ. Growth enhancement of Loblolly pine (Pius taeda L) seedlings by silicon. J. Plant Physiol. 1989; 134: 98-103.
41. Gharib AA, Hanafy Ahmed AH. Response of pea (*Pisum sativum*, L.) to foliar application of putrescine, glucose, foliafeed D and silicon. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ. 2005; 30 (12):7563-7579.
42. Kamenidou S, Cavins TJ. Silicon supplements affect horticultural Traits of greenhouse-produced ornamental sunflowers. Hort. Science. 2008; 43(1):236–239.
43. Sayed SM, Abd El-Dayem HM, El-Desouky SA, Khedr ZM, Samy MM. Effect of silicon and algae extract foliar application on growth and early yield of globe artichoke plants.4th International Conference on Biotechnology Applications in Agriculture (ICBAA), Benha University, Moshtohor and Hurghada, Egypt. 2018; 207-214.
44. RemeroAranda MR, Jurado O, Cuartero J. Silicon alleviates the deleterious salt effect on tomato plant growth by improving plant water status. J. Plant physiol. 2006; 163 (8):847-855.
45. Drolet G, Dumbroff EB, Legge RL, Thompson JE. Radical scavenging properties of polyamines. Phytochemistry. 1986; 25:367-371.
46. Kuznetsov VV, Shevyakova NI. Polyamines and Stress Tolerance of Plants. Plant Stress. 2007; 1 (1):50-71.
47. Ahmad P, Kumar A, Gupta A, Sharma S, Hu X, ul Rehman Hakeem K, et al. Polyamines: Role in plants under a biotic stress. Crop Production for Agricultural Improvement. 2012; 19:491-512.

48. Zaman WU, Arshad M, Saleem A. Distribution of nitrate-nitrogen in the soil profile under different irrigation methods. Int. J. Agric. Biol. 2001;3 (2):208-209.
49. Jain N, Chauhan HS, Singh PK, Shukla KN. Response of tomato under drip irrigation and plastic mulching. In: Proceeding of 6th International Micro-irrigation Congress, Micro-irrigation Technology for Developing Agriculture. 22-27 October, South Africa. 2000.
50. Khurshid K, Iqbal M, Arif MS, Nawaz A. Effect of tillage and mulch on soil physical properties and growth of maize. Int. J. Agric. Biol. 2006; 5: 593-6.
51. Gimenez C, Otto RF, Castilla N. Productivity of leaf and root vegetable crops under direct cover. Scientia Hort. 2002; 94:1-11.
52. Vavrina CS, Roka FM. Comparison of plastic mulch and bare ground production and economics for short-day onion in a semitropical environment. Horticultural Technol. 2000; 10: 326-330.
53. Donk-van SJ, Tollner EW, Steiner JL, Evett SR. Soil temperature under a dormant Bermudagrass mulch: Simulation and measurement. American Society of Agricultural Engineers. 2004; 47(1):91-98.
54. Verma ML, Bhardwaj SP, Thakur BC, Bhandria AR. Nutritional and mulching studies in apple. Indian J. Hort. 2005; 62 (4):332-335.
55. Sinkeviciene A, Jodaugiene D, Pupaliene R, Urboniene M. The influence of organic mulches on soil properties and crop yield. Agron. Res. 2009; 7 (1):485-491.
56. Sharma AR, Singh R, Dhyani SK, Dube RK. Moisture conservation and nitrogen recycling through legume mulching in rainfed maize (*Zea mays*)-wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) cropping system. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystems. 2010; 87:187-197.
57. Smith M, Steduto P. Yield response to water: the original FAO water production function. FAO Irrigation and Drainage, FAO: Rome, Italy. 2012; 66 (5):6-12.
58. James CS. Analytical chemistry of foods. Blokie Academic & Proffessional, London.1995.
59. Abuzeed AMM. Response of taro plants to some plant stimulants and irrigation levels. Ph.D., Thesis. Fac. Agric. Ain Shams Univ. Egypt. 2018.
60. Manyatsi AM, Mhazo N, Mkhatshwa M, Masarirambi MT. The Effect of Different in-situ Water Conservation Tillage Methods on Growth and Development of Taro (*Colocasia esculenta* L.) .Asian Journal of Agricultural Sci. 2011; 3(1):11-18.
61. Wettstein D. Chlorophyll, Letal and dersubmicro-Spische Formmech Sell-derplastideu, Exptl. Cell Res. 1957; 12:427.
62. Bates LS, Waldren RP, Teare ID. Rapid determination of free proline for water stress studies. plant and soil.1973; 39:205-207.
63. Nakano Y, Asada K. Spinach chloroplasts scavenge hy- drogen peroxide on illumination. Plant and Cell Physiology. 1980; 21:1295-1307.
64. Velikova V, Yordanov I, Edreva A. Oxidative stress and some antioxidant systems in acid rain-treated bean plants: protective roles of exogenous polyamines. Plant Science. 2000; 151:59–66.
65. Beauchamp C, Fridovich I. Superoxide dismutase: im- proved assays and an assay applicable to acrylamide gels. Ana- lytical Biochemistry. 1971; 44: 276-287.
66. Dhindsa RS, Plumb-Dhindsa P, Thorpe TA. Leaf se- nescence: correlation with increased levels of membrane permeability and lipid peroxidation and decreased levels of superoxide dismutase and catalase. Journal of Experimental Botany. 1981; 32:93-101.
67. Horneck DA, Miller RO. Determination of total nitrogen in plant tissue. In Handbook of Reference Methods for Plant Analysis. Kalra Y.P.(Ed.). 1998; 75-83.
68. AOAC. Official methods of analysis. 18th ed. ASSOCIATION of Official Agricultural Chemists, Washington, DC, USA. 2005.
69. Sandell R. Colorimetric determination of traces of metal. 2nd Ed. Interscience Publishers., Inc. New York. 1950.
70. Horneck DA, Hanson D. Determination of potassium and sodium by Flame Emission Spectrophotometry. In Handsbook of Reference Methods for Plant Analysis. 1998; 153-155.
71. Dubois M, Giles KA, Hamilton JK, Rebers PA, Smith F. Colorimetric method for determination of sugar and related substances. Analytical Chemistry. 1956; 28:350-356.
72. Snedecor GW, Cochran WG. Statistical methods. 7th Ed. Iowa State Univ. Press Ames. Iowa, USA. 1980.
73. Hussain M, Malik MA, Farooq M, Ashraf MY, Cheema MA. Improving drought tolerance by exogenous application of glycinebetaine and salicylic acid in sunflower. J. Agron. Crop Sci. 2008; 194:193-199.
74. Farooq M, Wahid A, Kobayashi N, Fujita D, Basra SMA. Plant drought stress: effects, mechanisms and management. Agron. Sustain. Dev. 2009; 29: 185-212.
75. Kusaka M, Lalusin AG, Fujimura T. The maintenance of growth and turgor in pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum* (L.) Leeke) cultivars with different root structures and osmo-regulation under drought stress, Plant Science. 2005; 168:1-14.

76. Martínez JP, Lutts S, Schanck A, Bajji M, Kinet JM. Is osmotic adjustment required for water stress resistance in the Mediterranean shrub (*Atriplex halimus* L.)? Plant Physiol., 2004; 161:1041-1051.
77. Mano J, Torii Y, Hayashi S, Takimoto K, Matsui K, Nakamura K, Inzé D, Babiychuk E, Kushnir S, Asada K. The NADPH: Quinone oxidoreductase P1-ζ-crystallin in *Arabidopsis* catalyzes the α, β-hydrogenation of 2-alkenals: Detoxication of the lipid peroxide-derived reactive aldehydes. Plant Cell Physiol. 2002; 43:1445-1455.
78. Lawlor DW. (Limitation to photosynthesis in water-stressed leaves: stomata vs. metabolism and the role of ATP. Annals of Botany. 2002; 89: 871-885.
79. Farooq M, Basra SMA, Wahid A, Cheema ZA, Cheema MA, Khaliq A. Physiological role of exogenously applied glycinebetaine in improving drought tolerance of fine grain aromatic rice (*Oryza sativa* L.). J. Agron. Crop Sci. 2008; 194:325-333.
80. Figueiredo MVB, Burity HA, Martinez CR, Chanway CP. Alleviation of drought stress in the common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) by co-inoculation with Paenibacillus polymyxa and Rhizobium tropici. Appl. Soil Ecol. 2008; 40: 182-188.
81. Emam Y, Shekoofa A, Salehi F, Jalali AH. Water stress effects on two common bean cultivars with contrasting growth habits. American-Eurasian J. Agric. & Environ. Sci. 2010; 9 (5):495-499.
82. D'souza MR, Devaraj VR. Specific and nonspecific responses of Hyacinth bean (*Dolichos lablab*) to drought stress. Indian J. Biotechnol. 2011;10 (1):130-139.
83. Hammad SAR, Ali OAM. Physiological and biochemical studies on drought tolerance of wheat plants by application of amino acids and yeast extract. Annals of Agricultural Science. 2014; 59(1):133-145.
84. Egilla JN, Davies FT, Boutton TW. Drought stress influences leaf water content, photosynthesis, and water-use efficiency of *Hibiscus rosa-sinensis* at three potassium concentrations. Photosynthetica. 2005; 43:135-140.
85. Havargi RS. Mitigation of drought stress through plant growth regulators and vesicular arbuscular mycorrhizae (VAM) in cotton. M.Sc., Thesis. College of Agric., Univ. of Agric. Sci., Dharwad. 2007.
86. Mafakheri A, Siosemardeh A, Bahramnejad B, Struik PC, Sohrabi E. Effect of drought stress on yield, proline and chlorophyll contents in three chickpea cultivars. Australian J. of Crop Sci. 2010; 4(8):580-585.
87. Wahid A, Gelani S, Ashraf M, Foolad MR. Heat tolerance in plants: an overview, Environ. Exp. Bot. 2007; 61:199-223.
88. Cakmak I. The role of potassium in alleviating detrimental effects of a biotic stresses in plants. J. Plant Nutr. Soil Sci. 2005; 168:521-530.
89. Bahadur A, Chatterjee A, Kumar R, Singh M, Naik PS. Physiological and biochemical basis of drought tolerance in vegetables. Vegetable Science, 2011; 38(1) :1-16.
90. Anjum SA, Xiao X, Wang LC, Saleem MF, Chen M, Lei W. Morphological, physiological and biochemical responses of plants to drought stress. African Journal of Agricultural Research. 2011; 6(9):2026-2032.
91. Hanafy Ahmed AH, Nesiem MR, Hewedy AM, Sallam HEl-S. Effect of some simulative compounds on growth, yield and chemical composition of snap bean plants grown under calcareous soil conditions. Journal of American Science. 2010; 6 (10):552-569.
92. Kaur-Sawhney R, Galston AW. Physiological and biochemical studies on the antisenescence properties of polyamines in plants. In: Slocum, R. D. and Flores, H. E. (Eds.): Biochemstry and Physiology of Polyamines in Plants, CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton.1991; 201-211.
93. Zeid IM. Response of bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*, L.) to exogenous putrescine treatment under salinity stress. Pakistan J. Biol. Sci. 2004; 7(2):219-225.
94. Valentovic P, Luxova M, Kolarovic L, Gasparikova O. Effect of osmotic stress on compatible solutes content, membrane stability and water relations in two maize cultivars. Plant Soil Environ. 2006; 4:186-191.
95. Gunes A, Inal A, Adak MS, Bagci EG, Cicek N, Eraslan F. Effect of drought stress implemented at pre- or post- anthesis stage some physiological as screening criteria in chickpea cultivars. Russian J. Plant Physiol. 2008; 55:59-67.
96. Errabii T, Gandonou CB, Essalmani H, Abrini J, Idaomar M, Skali-Senhaji N. Growth, proline and ion accumulation in sugarcane callus cultures under drought-induced osmotic stress and its subsequent relief, Afr. J. Biotechnol. 2006; 5(6):1488-1493.
97. Vendruscolo ACG, Schuster I, Pileggi M, Scapim CA, Molinari HBC, Marur CJ, et al. Stress-induced synthesis of proline confers tolerance to water deficit in transgenic wheat, J. Plant. Physiol. 2007; 164(10):1367-1376.
98. Suriyan C, Thapanee S, Chalermpol K. Glycinebetaine alleviates water deficit stress in indica rice using proline accumulation, photosynthetic efficiencies, growth performances and yield attributes. AJCS. 2013; 7(2):213-218.

99. Gong H, Zhu X, Chen K, Wang S, Zhang C. Silicon alleviates oxidative damage of wheat plants in pots under drought, Plant Sci. 2005; 169: 313-321.
100. Prochazkova D, Sairam RK, Srivastava GC, Singh DV. Oxidative stress and antioxidant activity as the basis of senescence in maize leaves, Plant Sci. 2001; 161:765-771.
101. Alscher RG, Erturk N, Heath LS. Role of superoxide dismutases (SODs) in controlling oxidative stress in plants. Journal of Experimental Botany. 2002; 53(372):331-1341.
102. El-Tohamy WA, El-Greadly NHM. Physiological responses, growth, yield and quality of snap beans in response to foliar application of yeast, vitamin E and zinc under sandy soil conditions. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences. 2007; 1(3):294-299.
103. Philip KS. Physiological responses of common bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.) genotypes to water stress. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Zambia Univ., Lusaka. 2013.
104. Nam NH, Chauhan YS, Johansen C. Effect of timing of drought stress on growth and grain yield of extra-short-duration pigeon pea lines, J. Agr. Sci. 2001; 136:179-189.
105. Martínez JP, Silva H, Ledent JF, Pinto M. Effect of drought stress on the osmotic adjustment, cell wall elasticity and cell volume of six cultivars of common beans (*Phaseolus vulgaris* L.), Eur. J. Agron. 2007; 26:30-38.
106. Alcazar R, Altabella T, Marco F, Bortolotti C, Reymond M, Koncz C, et al. Polyamines: molecules with regulatory functions in plant abiotic stress tolerance. Planta. 2010; 231:1237-1249.