ISSN: 1812-5379 (Print) ISSN: 1812-5417 (Online) http://ansijournals.com/ja

# JOURNAL OF AGRONOMY



ANSIMet

Asian Network for Scientific Information 308 Lasani Town, Sargodha Road, Faisalabad - Pakistan

# Nitrogen and Plant Density Effects on Sorghum

<sup>1</sup>M. Güler, <sup>2</sup>İ. Gül, <sup>3</sup>Ş. Yılmaz, <sup>1</sup>H. Y. Emeklier and <sup>1</sup>G. Akdoğan <sup>1</sup>Department of Field Crops, Faculty of Agriculture, Ankara University, 06110 Ankara, Turkey <sup>2</sup>Department of Field Crops, Faculty of Agriculture, Dicle University, 21280 Diyarbakır, Turkey <sup>3</sup>Department of Field Crops, Faculty of Agriculture, Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey

**Abstract:** The aim of this study was to evaluate the effect of nitrogen and plant density on some morphological and agronomic characteristics of grain sorghum in the years 2001-2002. Experimental design was a split-split, randomized complete block with three replications. Three nitrogen levels (0, 75 and 150 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) and plant densities (70×10, 70×20 and 70×30 cm) were applied in three grain sorghum cultivars. Generally, nitrogen and plant density had no effect on plant height and stalk length. The effect of nitrogen on grain yield per plant was usually non-significant and increased plant densities tended to increase grain yield per plant. Both nitrogen and plant density have positively affected grain yield per unit area. The effects of cultivar, nitrogen level and plant density on flag leaf area were changeable and dependent on both years and locations. One thousand grain weight was mainly determined by both cultivar and plant density. It may be concluded that increased nitrogen and plant density levels generally give the best results in grain yield and yield components in sorghum.

Key words: Dryland, nitrogen levels, sorghum cultivars, yield, yield components

### INTRODUCTION

Sorghum is usually grown in dryland conditions around the world and is used in different ways in many countries. Even though grain sorghum is commonly consumed as foodstuff in developing or less developed countries, it is used as forage and raw material in industry in developed countries. Since sorghum is more tolerant to extreme hot conditions, it has been replaced by corn in most regions of the world. The response of grain sorghum to nitrogen is high and nitrogen fertilization is a major factor determining grain yield in sorghum. It has been reported that increased nitrogen dose positively affected plant height and sugar yield in sweet sorghum (Abbas and Al-Youris, 1989). Baytekin et al. (1995) found that the most suitable nitrogen dose for grain sorghum was 200 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> under irrigated conditions. Inorganic nitrogen application was very important for sorghum and affected positively grain yield, biomass and thousand grain weight (Lehmann et al., 1999). The response of sorghum to nitrogen varied depending on years and locations, however high nitrogen doses generally increased grain yields of sorghum (Khosla et al., 2000).

Cultural practices also determine grain sorghum yields and plant density is one of the major elements required for plant growth and yield. Narrow row spacings or high plant densities affected positively grain sorghum yield in some studies (Foale and French, 1985; Ramshe et al., 1986; Valesco-Lizama and Ramirez-Diaz, 1986; Nema et al., 1987; Huda, 1988; Tsukov and Petkova, 1988; Kizil and Tansi, 1997). In contrary, some studies showed that wide row spacings or low plant densities increased grain yield in sorghum (Muchow et al., 1982; Machado et al., 1986; Rees, 1986; Singh et al., 1986). Ramshe et al. (1985), Gupta and Sharma (1986), Gomase et al. (1987), Desiderio and Ventura (1992) and Soltero-Diaz (1994) found that plant densities have no effect on grain yield of sorghum. The objective of this study was to determine the effects of nitrogen doses and plant densities on sorghum.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiments were conducted under dryland conditions in 2001 and 2002 at Ankara, Hatay and Diyarbakır locations, Turkey. Ankara is at 39° 55′ N lat and 32° 40′ E long and 860 m above mean sea level (Central Anatolian region). The soil was clay loam with a pH of 7.8 and an organic matter content of 1.6%. Hatay is located in the southern part of Turkey (36° 15′ N lat and 36° 07′ E long and 100 m above mean sea level). The soil of experimental site was clay with a pH of 7.7 and an organic matter content of 2.0%. Diyarbakır is at 37° 55′ N lat and 40° 12′ E long and 660 m above mean sea level (South-

Eastern Anatolian region). The soil was clay with a pH of 7.7 and an organic matter content of 1.6%. Annual precipitations in 2001 and 2002 in Ankara were generally higher (437.4 and 387.9 mm, respectively) than the long-term average (377.6 mm). Mean monthly air temperatures for 2001, 2002 and the past years were 13.5, 11.9 and 11.7°C, respectively. Total annual precipitations of Hatay location were higher (1730.3, 1006.1 and 1124.1 mm) than the other two locations. Mean air temperature values were 17.6, 18.6 and 18.2°C (for growing years and long-term). 605.3, 383.7 and 488.6 mm of annual precipitations and 16.1, 15.9 and 15.8°C of mean monthly air temperatures were observed for growing years and long-term in Diyarbakır.

The experiments were conducted in a split-split plot arrangement of treatments in a randomized complete block design with three replications.  $P_2O_5$  of 60 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> was given prior to planting in whole plots. The main plot treatments included three sorghum cultivars, Beydam ( $C_1$ ), Hatay ( $C_2$ ) and Diyarbakır ( $C_3$ ). Nitrogen levels of 0 ( $N_0$ ), 75 ( $N_1$ ) and 150 ( $N_2$ ) kg ha<sup>-1</sup> were applied to the subplots. The sub-subplot treatments were three different plant

densities, 70×10 (D<sub>1</sub>), 70×20 (D<sub>2</sub>) and 70×30 (D<sub>3</sub>) cm. Each plot was 5 m in length and consisted of 4 rows. Planting dates were dependent on climatic conditions and were in April, May and June at three locations. Plants were harvested by hand between August and October. Measurements and observations were made from five plants randomly chosen in each plot. In this study, plant characteristics measured were as follows: plant height (cm), flag leaf area (cm²), stalk length (cm), grain yield per plant (g), 1000 grain weight (g) and grain yield per unit area (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Mstat-C (5.0 Version, 1986, USA) statistical program was used for statistical analysis in the study.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**Plant height:** The results of analysis of variance showed that there were significant differences between cultivars in both years at Ankara location (Table 1). Nitrogen and plant densities did not have effect on plant height. In 2001, plant heights of cultivars varied from 74.7 cm to 121.6 cm. The greatest plant heights were obtained at  $C_2$  (121.6 cm) and  $C_3$  (106.8 cm) while  $C_1$  had the lowest plant

		Ankara plar	-			Hatay plant	•			Diyarbakır p	•		
			D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)	D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)	Mean		D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)				D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)	D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)	Mean
2001													
$C_1$	$N_0$	$77.2 \pm 8.1$	74.0±3.6	77.7±4.3	76.3±2.9	79.6±2.4	81.7±0.6	82.7±4.6	81.3±1.6	63.2±1.8	62.3±2.1	61.0±1.5	62.2±1.0
	$N_1$	72.2±4.5	74.3±1.9	73.0±4.2	73.2±1.9	78.5±2.9	76.4±2.7	77.8±2.2	77.6±1.3	50.7±10.9	62.2±3.0	60.7±2.3	57.9±3.8
	$N_2$	77.6±0.2	71.1±5.5	75.3±4.9	74.6±2.3	80.7±1.4	83.2±2.3	86.2±4.7	83.4±1.8	61.5±1.6	61.3±1.0	63.6±1.0	62.1±0.7
	Mean	75.7±2.8	73.1±2.0	75.3±2.3	74.7±1.4b	79.6±1.2	80.5±1.5	82.2±2.4	80.8±1.0c	58.5±3.8	61.9±1.1	61.8±1.0	60.7±1.3c*
$C_2$	$N_0$	109.4±22.2	121.9±16.9	114.0±14.3	115.1±9.2	147.7±6.3	142.2±6.4	137.4±1.8	142.4±3.0	144.3±6.4	145.8±2.5	147.9±8.1	146.0±3.1
	$N_1$	140.2±0.8	134.9±8.3	127.2±6.9	134.1±1.5	136.2±5.1	146.9±3.0	134.8±2.1	139.3±2.6	154.7±3.6	149.7±2.7	159.3±3.8	154.6±1.2
	$N_2$	135.0±3.6	92.5±40.5	119.4±12.5	115.6±3.6	144.7±6.1	141.7±6.7	141.5±7.8	142.6±3.5	150.9±3.5	150.3±1.7	149.3±4.5	150.2±2.2
	Mean	$128.2 \pm 8.1$	116.4±14.3	120.2±6.1	121.6±5.7a	142.9±3.4	143.6±2.9	137.9±2.6	141.5±1.7a	150.0±2.8	148.6±1.4	152.2±3.4	150.3±1.5a
$C_3$	$N_0$	93.6±16.0	90.1±14.8	106.1±8.7	96.6±7.2	104.6±8.3	100.8±7.6	100.1±3.4	101.8±3.5	126.9±4.3	118.7±6.9	120.3±3.6	121.9±2.9
	$N_1$	119.9±7.2	115.1±6.5	111.2±5.9	115.4±3.5	100.2±3.2	102.9±5.5	100.7±3.2	101.3±1.2	126.4±9.7	123.1±7.2	122.3±1.2	124.0±3.6
	$N_2$	106.4±2.8	105.7±4.4	113.5±4.7	108.5±2.4	105.0±2.8	113.4±6.5	101.9±4.1	106.8±2.1	113.5±3.8	134.0±15.8	127.5±4.3	125.0±5.7
	Mean	106.6±6.4	103.6±6.1	110.2±3.5	106.8±3.1a	103.3±2.8	105.7±3.8	100.9±1.8	103.3±1.7b	122.2±3.9	125.3±5.9	123.4±2.0	123.6±2.4b
	Mean	103.5±5.4	97.7±6.2	101.9±4.5		108.6±5.3	109.9±5.3	107.0±4.7		110.2±7.8	111.9±7.4	112.4±7.5	
	$N_0$	93.4±9.5	95.3±9.6	99.3±7.4	96.0±5.0	110.6±10.4	108.2±9.4	106.7±8.3	108.5±5.2	111.5±12.5	108.9±12.5	109.7±13.1	110.0±7.1
	$N_1$	110.8±10.4	108.1±9.4	103.8±7.7	107.5±5.3	105.0±8.6	108.7±10.5	104.4±9.6	106.0±5.1	110.6±16.1	111.7±13.2	114.1±11.9	112.1±8.1
	$N_2$	106.3±8.4	89.8±12.9	102.7±8.0	99.6±5.7	110.2±9.5	112.8±8.9	109.9±8.7	110.9±5.0	108.6±13.1	115.2±14.4	113.5±13.0	112.4±7.5
2002													
$C_1$	$N_0$	72.4±1.4	73.9±2.3	73.7±2.2	73.4±1.0	93.3±14.3	97.3±13.8	97.9±11.9	96.2±6.7	106.6±5.6	106.4±1.4	119.8±1.9	110.9±2.8
	$N_1$	69.3±1.9	74.2±6.1	72.3±1.3	71.9±2.0	97.5±9.7	83.2±4.0	90.0±7.5	90.2±4.3	119.9±1.0	124.3±7.2	107.1±7.9	117.1±4.0
	$N_2$	74.1±3.1	74.2±2.6	73.7±4.5	74.0±1.7	90.3±6.2	90.5±3.2	83.8±12.0	88.2±4.1	121.1±9.4	119.6±2.6	109.4±3.8	116.7±3.5
	Mean	72.0±1.3	74.1±2.0	73.2±1.5	73.1±0.9 b	93.7±5.4	90.3±4.7	90.6±5.7	91.5±3.0c	115.9±3.9	116.8±3.5	112.1±3.2	114.9±2.0b
$C_2$	$N_0$	149.2±15.4	134.5±6.6	133.5±7.4	139.1±5.9	145.1±11.0	147.3±6.2	150.2±4.3	147.5±3.9	187.5±24.2	196.4±9.2	216.7±17.4	200.2±10.0
	$N_1$	128.3±1.7	139.7±15.3	149.3±12.1	139.1±2.0	148.1±3.5	155.9±14.5	154.3±7.2	152.8±4.9	168.3±11.6	181.2±10.5	182.6±11.5	177.4±4.9
	$N_2$	146.5±23.5	135.8±7.1	142.0±8.0	141.4±6.4	149.7±6.9	162.1±9.6	140.3±1.8	150.7±4.7	183.5±21.6	194.2±24.5	186.5±13.1	188.1±6.0
	Mean	141.3±8.8	136.7±5.3	141.6±5.2	139.9±3.7a	147.6±3.9	155.1±5.7	148.3±3.2	150.3±2.5a	179.8±10.4	190.6±8.5	195.3±8.9	188.6±5.3a
$C_3$	$N_0$	114.5±15.3	115.4±14.4	124.3±11.7	118.1±7.1	121.9±1.2	129.0±12.8	129.6±9.1	126.8±4.7	168.4±8.1	165.3±10.3	169.9±30.1	167.9±9.5
	$N_1$	111.2±6.1	122.3±9.6	106.7±5.8	113.4±4.4	119.9±2.7	115.5±3.5	113.5±4.2	116.3±3.2	166.5±4.7	155.7±9.5	165.4±12.9	162.6±5.1
	$N_2$	124.7±15.4	125.2±8.5	121.6±4.1	123.8±5.2	112.3±3.6	126.4±5.7	114.5±2.9	117.7±2.0	163.7±8.3	177.1±19.3	152.9±18.5	164.6±8.8
	Mean	116.8±6.8	121.0±5.8	117.5±4.8	118.4±3.3a	118.1±2.0	123.6±4.7	119.2±4.0	120.3±2.1b	166.2±3.7	166.1±7.5	162.7±11.1	165.0±4.5a
	Mean	110.0±6.7	110.6±5.8	110.8±6.0		119.8±4.9	123.0±5.9	119.4±5.2		154.0±6.6	157.8±7.1	156.7±8.2	
	$N_0$	112.0±12.8	108.0±10.1	110.5±10.1	110.2±6.1	120.1±9.1	124.5±9.3	125.9±8.8	123.5±5.1	154.2±14.4	156.0±13.8	168.8±17.2	159.7±8.5
	$N_1$	102.9±9.0	112.1±11.2	109.4±10.7	108.1±6.0	121.8±7.9	118.2±11.4	119.3±8.4	119.8±5.5	151.6±8.7	153.8±9.4	151.7±16.1	152.3±5.8
	N <sub>2</sub>	115.1±13.5		112.4±10.5		117.4±9.1	126.3±10.9	112.9±8.9	118.9±5.5	156.1±11.7	163.6±14.4	149.6±13.0	156.4±7.3

<sup>\*</sup>p<0.05

height (74.7 cm). Nitrogen levels had no significant effect on plant height and N<sub>1</sub> treatment gave the slightly highest plant height (107.5 cm). The lowest plant height was obtained from without nitrogen addition (96.0 cm). The effect of plant density on plant height was non-significant in 2001 and mean values for plant height varied from 97.7 to 103.5 cm. Cultivar effects on plant height were significant in 2002 and C<sub>2</sub> (139.9 cm) and C<sub>3</sub> (118.4 cm) had the highest plant heights. The lowest plant height was obtained from C<sub>1</sub> cultivar (73.1 cm). Increased levels of nitrogen had no effect on plant height. Concerning plant heights, there were no significant differences between plant densities.

Significant differences between cultivars were found for plant height in both years at Hatay location. Among all cultivars, C<sub>2</sub> gave the highest plant height (141.5 cm) whereas C<sub>1</sub> had the lowest plant height (80.8 cm) in 2001. No nitrogen effect was found for plant height and plant height values varied from 106.0 to 110.9 cm. Nonsignificant differences between plant densities were observed in plant height in 2001. In the second year, there were highly significant differences between cultivars (ranged from 91.5 to 150.3 cm). Both nitrogen and plant densities did not significantly affect plant height in 2002 (Table 1). There were significant differences between cultivars in plant height for both years in Diyarbakır location. The greatest plant height was found for C<sub>2</sub> (150.3 cm) and C<sub>1</sub> had the lowest plant height (60.7 cm) in 2001. Small but non-significant differences were observed between both nitrogen levels and plant densities in plant height. In 2002, the greatest plant heights were obtained from C<sub>2</sub> (188.6 cm) and C<sub>3</sub> (165.0 cm), respectively. C<sub>1</sub> (114.9 cm) had the lowest plant height. The effects of nitrogen and plant densities on plant height were nonsignificant in the second year (Table 1). As a result, both nitrogen and plant density had no effect on plant height of sorghum for three locations. Present plant height results are not in agreement with the findings of Abbas and Al-Younis (1989).

Stalk length: There were significant differences between cultivars in stalk length at Ankara location in 2001. The greatest stalk length was found for  $C_2$  (22.3 cm) whereas  $C_3$  had the lowest value (14.1 cm). Non-significant differences were observed between nitrogen levels and stalk lengths varied from 17.5 to 18.2 cm. Differences in stalk length between plant densities were not significant. Stalk length results of 2002 were similar to that of previous year. Among all cultivars, the highest and the lowest stalk lengths were obtained from  $C_2$  and  $C_3$ , respectively. Small and non-significant differences were observed between nitrogen treatments in stalk length. The effect of plant density on stalk length was not significant (Table 2).

Similarly, significant differences were found between cultivars for stalk length in both years at Hatay location. In 2001, C<sub>2</sub> and C<sub>1</sub> had the greatest stalk length values, respectively. The effects of both nitrogen and plant densities on stalk length were not significant. The responses of cultivars in stalk length were similar to that of previous year in 2002. Neither nitrogen levels nor plant densities had significant effect on stalk length in the second year.

Differences in stalk length between cultivars were significant for Diyarbakır location in the first year. C<sub>2</sub> cultivar had the highest stalk length (22.0 cm). Stalk length of C<sub>3</sub> was rather low (14.4 cm) in comparison with the other cultivars. Small but non-significant differences were found between nitrogen levels. Higher plant densities had positive effect on stalk length and the greatest stalk length (19.5 cm) was obtained from D<sub>3</sub> treatment. In the second year, the three treatments significantly affected stalk length and Cultivar×nitrogen×plant density interaction was significant (Table 2). Generally, the greatest stalk lengths were achieved by different nitrogen levels and plant densities at C2 cultivar. Also, the higher stalk length values were in the same statistical group. The treatment of C2 with N1 and D3 had the greatest stalk length (23.9 cm) in all treatments. The lowest stalk lengths were observed at the treatments of C<sub>3</sub> applied different nitrogen levels and plant densities (Table 2).

**Grain yield per plant:** There were no significant differences between treatments in both years for Ankara location (Table 3). In 2001, the effect of cultivars on grain yield per plant was not significant and  $C_3$  and  $C_1$  had the highest and the lowest grain yields per plant, respectively. Increased nitrogen levels ( $N_1$  and  $N_2$ ) had generally the greatest grain yields per plant. Similarly, the highest grain yields were obtained with increased plant densities.

The grain yields per plant of cultivars in 2002 were similar to the previous year's results. The effects of both nitrogen and plant density on grain yield were nonsignificant and the greatest values were determined with increased nitrogen levels and plant densities. In 2001, differences between plant densities and Cultivar×plant density interaction were significant at Hatay location. Grain yield per plant was dependent on both cultivar and plant density and the greatest values were generally obtained from the cultivars with increased plant densities. The treatment of C2 with D3 had the highest grain yield (47.1 g) in all treatments. The cultivars with decreased plant densities had the lowest grain yields. Nitrogen levels had no effect on grain yield per plant and higher nitrogen amounts generally increased grain yields in Hatay. Significant differences between cultivars were

Table 2: Effect of different nitrogen levels and plant densities on stalk length of grain sorghum

		-	Ankara plant density				density			Diyarbakır plant density				
			D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)				D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)				D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)			
2001														
$C_1$	$N_0$	17.8±1.2	17.2±0.5	17.8±1.1	17.6±0.5	16.9±1.1	16.1±1.6	16.9±0.2	16.7±0.6	18.8±0.6	18.6±0.5	18.8±1.0	18.7±0.4	
	$N_1$	16.8±1.6	17.6±0.2	17.0±0.9	17.1±0.5	$17.0\pm0.8$	17.3±1.0	17.8±1.0	17.4±0.5	19.0±0.4	18.7±0.6	22.2±0.8	19.9±0.6	
	$N_2$	17.5±0.8	17.1±0.8	17.7±1.7	17.4±0.6	18.2±0.5	17.5±0.4	18.3±0.3	$18.0 \pm 0.2$	16.4±1.1	17.3±0.7	18.4±0.7	17.4±0.5	
	Mean	17.4±0.6	17.3±0.3	17.5±0.6	17.4±0.3b	17.4±0.5	17.0±0.6	17.7±0.4	17.3±0.3a	18.1±0.6	18.2±0.4	19.8±0.7	18.7±0.4b*	
$C_2$	$N_0$	20.4±2.0	22.8±0.6	21.9±1.1	21.7±0.8	17.4±1.7	16.1±1.6	17.0±1.6	16.8±0.8	19.9±0.5	22.0±1.1	23.5±0.7	21.8±0.7	
	$N_1$	23.0±0.8	24.8±1.2	21.9±0.9	23.2±0.3	18.3±1.1	17.6±0.5	19.1±1.0	18.3±0.5	21.0±1.8	20.5±0.7	22.9±0.4	21.5±0.9	
	$N_2$	22.4±0.8	21.9±1.1	21.5±1.9	21.9±0.6	19.2±0.5	20.4±0.8	20.0±0.8	19.9±0.4	22.2±1.1	22.3±0.3	23.6±1.0	22.7±0.7	
	Mean	21.9±0.8	23.2±0.7	21.8±0.7	22.3±0.4a	18.3±0.7	$18.0\pm0.8$	18.7±0.8	18.4±0.4a	21.0±0.7	21.6±0.5	23.3±0.4	22.0±0.4a	
$C_3$	$N_0$	13.3±1.2	12.4±1.3	13.9±0.5	13.2±0.6	$11.3 \pm 0.1$	12.6±0.9	11.6±0.7	11.8±0.4	13.6±1.3	14.0±0.8	14.8±0.7	14.2±0.5	
	$N_1$	13.8±0.6	14.8±0.7	13.8±1.1	14.1±0.4	11.6±0.3	12.0±0.4	12.2±0.5	11.9±0.5	14.9±1.6	13.4±0.2	15.9±0.9	14.7±0.6	
	$N_2$	14.7±0.6	14.4±0.2	15.6±0.6	14.9±0.3	11.5±0.4	13.1±0.8	12.5±1.1	12.4±0.2	12.9±0.7	14.7±0.5	15.2±1.0	14.3±0.5	
	Mean	13.9±0.5	13.9±0.6	14.5±0.5	14.1±0.3c	11.5±0.2	12.5±0.4	12.1±0.4	12.0±0.2b	13.8±0.7	14.0±0.3	15.3±0.5	14.4±0.3c	
	Mean	17.7±0.7	18.1±0.8	17.9±0.7		15.7±0.6	15.8±0.6	16.2±0.6		17.6±0.7b	17.9±0.6b	19.5±0.7a		
	$N_0$	17.2±1.3	17.5±1.6	17.9±1.3	17.5±0.8	15.2±1.1	14.9±0.9	15.2±1.0	15.1±0.6	17.4±1.1	18.2±1.2	19.0±1.3	$18.2 \pm 0.7$	
	$N_1$	17.9±1.5	19.1±1.5	17.6±1.3	$18.2 \pm 0.8$	15.6±1.1	15.6±1.0	16.4±1.0	15.9±0.6	18.3±1.1	17.5±1.1	20.3±1.4	18.7±0.7	
	$N_2$	18.2±1.2	17.8±1.2	18.3±1.1	18.1±0.6	16.3±1.2	17.0±1.1	16.9±1.2	16.7±0.7	17.2±1.4	18.1±1.2	19.1±1.3	18.1±0.7	
2002														
$C_1$	$N_0$	16.2±0.2	16.4±0.0	16.4±1.1	16.3±0.3	19.3±1.6	19.4±2.0	19.8±1.4	19.5±0.9	16.5±0.6hi	17.5±0.3fgh	20.6±0.7b-f	18.2±0.7	
	$N_1$	16.5±0.2	17.9±1.7	17.0±0.2	17.1±0.5	16.9±0.1	17.0±1.1	18.3±1.2	17.4±0.5	20.9±0.8a-d	20.7±0.8a-e	18.6±0.6d-h	20.1±0.5	
	$N_2$	16.4±0.2	17.3±0.3	17.2±1.1	17.0±0.4	18.6±2.1	18.9±1.3	17.7±2.1	18.4±1.0	$17.4 \pm 0.1$ gh	17.7±1.7e-h	19.2±2.6c-h	18.1±0.9	
	Mean	16.4±0.1	17.2±0.5	16.9±0.5	16.8±0.2b	18.3±0.9	18.4±0.8	18.6±0.9	18.4±0.5a	18.3±0.7	18.7±0.7	19.5±0.8	18.8±0.4	
$C_2$	$N_0$	19.8±0.7	19.2±0.6	19.7±0.8	19.5±0.4	17.5±1.3	21.6±0.9	21.3±0.5	20.1±0.8	21.9±0.5abc	23.0±1.2ab	21.3±0.6a-d	22.0±0.5	
	$N_1$	18.6±0.2	19.5±1.0	20.0±0.8	19.4±0.5	18.7±0.9	19.7±2.1	18.5±0.7	19.0±0.7	22.3±1.1 abc	21.4±0.8a-d	23.9±1.3a	22.5±0.6	
	$N_2$	19.0±0.4	18.7±0.2	17.8±3.1	18.5±0.4	18.4±0.9	20.3±1.5	16.4±1.5	18.4±0.9	22.7±0.7ab	19.8±1.2b-g	22.6±1.4ab	21.7±0.7	
	Mean	19.1±0.3	19.1±0.4	19.2±1.0	19.1±0.4a	18.2±0.6	20.5±0.8	18.8±0.9	19.2±0.5a	22.3±0.4	21.4±0.7	22.6±0.7	22.1±0.4	
$C_3$	$N_0$	11.9±0.8	12.3±0.6	13.7±0.6	12.6±0.4	12.1±0.7	12.4±0.8	12.9±1.1	12.5±0.5	13.6±0.7ij	13.9±0.3ij	13.0±0.5j	13.5±0.3	
	$N_1$	13.1±0.9	14.1±1.0	12.5±0.4	13.2±0.5	13.8±1.1	13.0±0.7	13.2±0.1	13.3±0.8	12.9±0.4j	12.9±0.7j	13.1±0.5j	13.0±0.3	
	$N_2$	11.8±0.3	14.3±1.7	12.7±0.8	12.9±0.7	12.4±0.3	12.3±1.5	12.0±0.1	12.2±0.4	13.6±0.4ij	13.9±0.4ij	13.4±1.1j	13.7±0.4	
	Mean	12.3±0.4	13.5±0.7	13.0±0.4	12.9±0.3c	12.8±0.5	12.5±0.5	12.7±0.4	12.7±0.3b	13.4±0.3	13.6±0.3	13.2±0.4	13.4±0.2	
	Mean	15.9±0.6	16.6±0.5	16.3±0.6		16.4±0.6	17.2±0.8	16.7±0.7		18.0±0.8	17.9±0.7	18.4±0.9		
	$N_0$	15.9±1.2	15.9±1.0	16.6±1.0	16.2±0.6	16.3±1.2	17.8±1.6	18.0±1.4	17.4±0.8	17.3±1.3	18.1±1.4	18.3±1.4	17.9±0.7	
	$N_1$	16.1±0.8	17.1±1.0	16.5±1.0	16.6±0.6	16.4±0.8	16.6±1.2	16.7±1.4	16.6±0.6	18.7±1.5	18.3±1.4	18.6±1.3	18.5±0.8	
	N,	15.7±1.1	16.8±0.8	15.9±1.3	16.1±0.6	16.5±1.2	17.2±1.4	15.4±1.2	16.3±0.7	17.9±1.3	17.2±1.1	18.4±1.6	17.8±0.8	

found for grain yield per plant in second year. The greatest grain yield were obtained with  $C_2$  and  $C_1$  and  $C_3$  cultivars followed it. The effect of both nitrogen and plant density on grain yield per plant were changeable. Different nitrogen levels with increased plant densities had generally the greatest grain yields and the treatment of  $N_0$  with  $D_3$  had the highest value (50.1 g) in all treatments. The lowest grain yield per plant was determined with the treatment of  $N_2$  with  $D_1$  (34.6 g).

There were significant differences between cultivars in grain yield per plant in 2001 for Diyarbakır location. The greatest grain yield values were 33.2 g (C<sub>2</sub>) and 31.8 g (C<sub>3</sub>) and C<sub>1</sub> had the lowest grain yield per plant (15.4 g). The effect of nitrogen on grain yield per plant was non-significant and grain yields varied between 29.1 and 25.3 g. Significant differences in grain yield per plant were observed with plant densities. Increased plant densities had the highest grain yields and lower plant densities decreased grain yields. In 2002, non-significant differences were observed between cultivars. Both nitrogen and plant density had no effect on grain yield per

plant in the second year (Table 3). Cultivar and plant density generally affected grain yield per plant for all locations while no nitrogen effect was detected. These results are not similar to the findings of several studies (Baytekin *et al.*, 1995; Lehmann *et al.*, 1999; Khosla *et al.*, 2000).

Grain yield per unit area: Significant differences were observed between treatments in grain yield per unit area in both years for Ankara location (Table 4). The differences between plant densities and Cultivar× nitrogen and nitrogen×plant density interactions were significant in 2001. Though there were the several higher grain yields per unit area in the same statistical group the treatment of C<sub>3</sub> with N<sub>1</sub> had the greatest grain yield per unit area (16.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in all treatments. Similarly, the lowest grain yield values were in the other statistical group and the treatment of C<sub>2</sub> with N<sub>2</sub> had the lowest grain yield per unit area (9.6 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The effects of both nitrogen and plant density on grain yield per unit area were significant and the greatest grain yield was obtained

Table 3: Effect of different nitrogen levels and plant densities on grain yield per plant of grain sorghum

		Ankara plant density				Hatay plant	-			Diyarbakır plant density			
				D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)			D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)		Mean			D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)	
2001													
$C_1$	$N_0$	30.0±4.2	26.3±5.5	32.4±6.6	29.6±2.9	30.7±0.2	32.1±2.0	40.0±0.6	34.3±1.6	11.1±0.7	17.1±3.7	16.7±4.2	14.9±1.9
	$N_1$	26.1±7.3	27.6±1.4	29.2±4.6	27.6±2.6	29.1±0.8	37.7±1.7	44.6±0.9	37.1±2.3	17.0±3.3	18.4±1.6	20.1±5.4	18.5±1.9
	$N_2$	31.5±1.9	28.0±7.0	33.5±12.0	31.0±4.1	36.4±2.9	40.4±2.0	47.5±2.2	41.4±2.0	9.2±1.5	14.7±1.3	14.2±1.4	12.7±1.1
	Mean	29.2±2.6	27.3±2.6	31.7±4.2	29.4±1.8	32.1±1.4f	36.7±1.5d	44.0±1.3b	37.6±1.2	12.4±1.6	16.7±1.3	$17.0\pm2.2$	15.4±1.0 b
$C_2$	$N_0$	27.7±10.0	38.9±4.5	31.5±6.0	32.7±4.0	29.8±0.2	34.7±0.5	42.3±0.7	35.6±1.8	20.5±1.2	32.4±6.9	32.6±3.7	28.5±3.0
	$N_1$	44.2±5.4	41.2±5.0	43.9±8.0	43.1±1.6	31.8±1.3	40.9±2.1	46.9±0.6	39.8±2.3	26.1±4.7	31.2±7.2	45.4±5.2	34.2±2.4
	$N_2$	33.6±6.8	26.3±7.6	40.6±13.0	33.5±3.2	37.3±0.5	43.4±1.6	52.2±0.6	44.3±2.2	35.0±3.6	35.4±4.3	40.3±3.7	36.9±4.1
	Mean	35.2±4.5	35.5±3.7	38.7±5.1	36.4±2.5	32.9±1.2f	39.7±1.5c	47.1±1.5a	39.9±1.4	27.2±2.7	33.0±3.2	39.4±2.8	33.2±1.9a
$C_3$	$N_0$	35.1±8.7	34.4±8.9	43.3±8.3	37.6±4.6	33.0±1.2	39.6±1.2	43.6±1.4	38.7±1.7	32.2±12.4	37.2±6.5	34.2±3.6	34.5±4.2
	$N_1$	35.7±6.9	58.2±3.5	35.9±8.3	43.3±5.0	35.1±0.2	38.8±1.3	45.1±0.6	39.6±1.6	33.4±3.9	28.3±4.3	42.1±6.6	34.6±3.2
	$N_2$	47.1±6.7	43.6±6.2	56.0±6.9	48.9±3.8	35.9±1.3	41.6±1.8	45.6±2.8	41.0±1.5	21.2±3.6	30.2±5.0	27.8±4.6	26.4±2.6
	Mean	39.3±4.2	45.4±4.8	45.1±4.9	43.3±2.6	34.6±0.7e	40.0±0.8c	44.7±1.0b	39.8±0.9	28.9±4.3	31.9±3.0	34.7±3.3	31.8±2.0a
	Mean	34.6±2.3	36.1±2.6	38.5±2.8		33.2±0.7	38.8±0.8	45.3±0.7		22.9±2.3b	27.2±2.1a	30.4±2.5a	
	$N_0$	30.9±4.2	33.2±3.8	35.7±4.0	33.3±2.2	31.1±0.6	35.5±1.3	42.0±0.7	36.2±1.0	21.2±4.7	28.9±4.2	27.8±3.4	26.0±2.4
	$N_1$	35.4±4.2	42.3±4.8	36.3±3.9	38.0±2.5	32.0±1.0	39.1±1.0	45.5±1.2	38.9±1.2	25.5±3.1	26.0±3.1	35.9±3.2	29.1±2.3
	$N_2$	37.4±3.7	32.6±4.4	43.4±6.4	37.8±2.9	36.5±0.9	41.8±1.0	48.4±1.4	42.3±1.1	21.8±4.0	26.8±3.7	27.4±4.2	25.3±2.3
2002													
$C_1$	$N_0$	21.3±1.8	27.5±5.2	30.3±4.5	26.4±2.4	35.9±5.6	37.7±5.8	49.8±3.2	41.1±3.3	23.9±1.5	26.9±1.7	33.9±2.4	28.2±1.7
	$N_1$	21.9±0.8	32.6±9.0	28.0±3.6	27.5±3.2	42.6±2.7	30.3±3.2	32.5±4.5	35.1±2.6	29.9±1.3	31.0±3.9	25.4±1.0	28.8±1.5
	$N_2$	25.3±4.0	25.8±4.2	32.5±6.1	27.9±2.7	36.2±1.3	44.8±3.3	47.4±1.0	42.8±2.0	27.5±1.8	33.2±3.4	32.2±0.5	31.0±1.4
	Mean	22.8±1.4	28.6±3.4	30.3±2.5	27.2±1.6	38.2±2.1	37.6±3.0	43.2±3.1	39.7±1.6b	27.1±1.2	30.4±1.8	30.5±1.5	29.3±0.9
$C_2$	$N_0$	26.3±6.1	25.3±1.4	32.7±6.0	28.1±2.7	45.8±3.8	49.5±7.1	58.6±1.0	51.3±3.0	29.6±3.3	30.0±2.2	30.0±7.6	29.9±2.5
	$N_1$	23.3±3.5	27.5±2.7	32.0±6.0	27.6±3.2	45.4±6.4	42.6±1.6	43.3±4.1	43.8±2.3	33.7±7.1	37.9±7.8	28.4±2.9	33.3±1.5
	$N_2$	27.1±3.6	24.8±2.0	29.5±6.9	27.1±2.5	38.8±7.3	48.9±1.7	46.8±4.8	44.8±3.0	42.1±9.7	30.1±1.8	33.6±1.3	35.3±3.4
	Mean	25.6±2.3	25.9±1.1	31.4±3.2	27.6±1.4	43.3±3.2	47.0±2.4	49.6±3.0	46.6±1.7a	35.1±4.0	32.7±2.7	30.6±2.5	32.8±1.8
$C_3$	$N_0$	24.5±1.1	28.1±3.0	27.2±6.9	26.6±2.3	30.7±4.6	34.6±1.6	41.8±4.6	35.7±2.5	27.7±3.2	20.3±3.2	21.7±1.8	23.3±1.8
	$N_1$	30.1±2.2	31.6±7.4	30.4±4.8	30.7±2.6	39.1±2.6	43.0±5.0	40.2±1.0	40.8±1.8	20.5±1.3	22.9±1.7	23.6±5.8	22.3±1.8
	$N_2$	28.8±6.9	39.5±16.7	30.1±4.6	32.8±5.6	28.9±0.3	37.1±3.9	39.4±2.6	35.1±1.8	20.6±2.4	24.1±6.8	18.4±2.3	21.0±2.3
	Mean	27.8±2.3	33.1±5.6	29.2±2.8	30.0±2.2	32.9±2.2	38.3±2.3	40.5±1.6	37.2±1.3b	22.9±1.7	22.5±2.3	21.2±2.0	22.2±1.1
	Mean	25.4±1.2	29.2±2.2	30.3±1.6		38.2±1.6	40.9±1.7	44.4±1.7		28.4±1.8	28.5±1.5	27.5±1.4	
	$N_0$	24.1±2.0	27.0±1.8	30.0±3.0	27.0±1.4	37.5±3.2cd	40.6±3.5bcd	50.1±2.9a	42.7±2.1	27.1±1.6	25.8±1.9	28.5±3.0	27.1±1.3
	$N_1$	25.1±1.8	30.6±3.5	30.1±3.1	28.6±1.6	42.4±2.3bc	38.6±2.7bcd	38.7±2.9bcd	39.9±1.4	28.0±2.9	30.6±3.4	25.8±3.0	28.1±1.6
	$N_2$	27.0±2.6	30.0±5.5	30.7±3.0	29.3±2.2	34.6±2.6c	43.6±2.3bc	44.5±2.1ab	40.9±1.6	30.1±4.3	29.1±2.6	28.1±2.6	29.1±1.8

with the treatment of  $N_1$  and  $D_2$  (15.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) whereas the treatment of  $N_0$  with  $D_3$  had the lowest grain yield value (9.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in all treatments. For the second year, cultivars had no effect on grain yield per unit area and grain yields of cultivars varied from 13.7 kg ha<sup>-1</sup> ( $C_1$ ) to 11.9 (kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) ( $C_3$ ). Differences in grain yield per unit area between nitrogen levels were significant. Higher nitrogen levels considerably increased grain yield per unit area from 10.6 to 15.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>. The effect of plant density on grain yield per unit area was not significant and the highest grain yield was determined with  $D_2$  treatment (13.1 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

Differences between nitrogen levels and plant densities and Nitrogen×plant density interaction were significant at Hatay location in 2001. Cultivar effects on grain yield per unit area were non-significant and the highest and lowest grain yields were obtained with  $C_3$  and  $C_2$ , respectively. Both nitrogen and plant density significantly affected grain yield per unit area in the first year. There were considerable differences in grain yields in Hatay location in 2001. The highest grain yield per unit area was found for the  $N_2$  with  $D_1$  treatment (33.2 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>).

The  $N_0$  with  $D_3$  treatment had the lowest grain yield (20.0 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) in all treatments. Cultivar×nitrogen and nitrogen×plant density interactions were significant in grain yield per unit area in 2002. The cultivars with increased nitrogen levels generally had the greatest grain yield values and the  $C_3$  with  $N_2$  treatment gave the highest yield (36.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>) whereas the cultivars with no nitrogen addition had the lowest grain yields per unit area. Increased nitrogen levels with different plant densities positively affected grain yields and the greatest grain yield per unit area was obtained from the treatment of  $N_2$   $D_1$  (37.4 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). Non-nitrogen applications with different plant densities commonly had the lowest grain yield values in all treatments.

In 2001, differences between cultivars and Cultivar× nitrogen, cultivar×plant density, nitrogen x plant density and cultivar×nitrogen×plant density interactions in grain yield per unit area were significant at Diyarbakır location. There were considerable differences between the treatments in grain yield per unit area (Table 4). The C<sub>2</sub> cultivar with different nitrogen levels and plant densities generally had highest grain yield values. The treatment of

Table 4: Effect of different nitrogen levels and plant densities on grain yield per unit area of grain sorghum

		Ankara plant	density			Hatay plant				Diyarbakır plant density			
				D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)			D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)			D <sub>1</sub> (70×10)	D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)		Mean
200	1												
$C_1$	$N_0$	15.9±0.4	10.5±3.1	9.3±1.6	11.9±1.4ab	24.9±0.6	22.6±1.7	18.5±0.5	$22.0 \pm 1.1$	12.9±1.6jk	17.5±1.9g-k	14.5±1.5ijk*	$15.0 \pm 1.1$
	$N_1$	10.3±1.2	11.4±1.4	10.0±1.8	10.6±0.8b	27.0±1.1	27.3±0.9	23.7±2.8	26.0±1.1	18.3±3.7g-k	19.1±0.7g-j	16.5±3.5g-k	$18.0 \pm 1.5$
	$N_2$	13.8±3.0	11.5±2.8	16.0±3.2	13.7±1.6ab	35.5±1.7	29.2±0.8	25.4±0.6	30.0±1.6	10.5±1.3k	12.6±0.7jk	12.3±1.5jk	$11.8 \pm 0.7$
	Mean	13.3±1.3	11.1±1.3	11.8±1.6	12.1±0.8	29.1±1.7	26.4±1.2	22.5±1.3	26.0±1.0	13.9±1.7	16.4±1.2	14.4±1.3	14.9±0.8
$C_2$	$N_0$	11.9±1.8	15.0±2.0	9.8±2.0	12.2±1.2ab	24.8±0.7	23.2±0.8	19.7±1.1	22.6±0.9	22.8±2.0e-h	31.6±4.8cd	29.6±5.4 cde	28.0±2.5
	$N_1$	17.3±1.4	15.2±2.5	10.6±0.7	14.4±1.2ab	26.0±0.4	25.9±2.3	21.2±0.4	24.4±1.0	35.1±6.1 cd	32.1±4.7 cd	48.3±4.3a	38.5±1.7
	$N_2$	12.4±1.6	7.3±1.3	9.2±1.3	9.6±1.3b	30.1±1.7	27.8±0.4	24.2±0.8	27.4±1.0	43.3±3.2ab	36.8±5.2bc	34.0±1.3cd	38.1±3.6
	Mean	13.9±1.2	12.5±1.6	9.9±0.8	12.1±0.8	27.0±1.0	25.6±1.0	21.7±0.8	24.8±0.7	33.8±3.6	33.5±2.6	37.3±3.5	34.9±1.8
$C_3$	$N_0$	12.8±3.8	10.6±2.4	9.0±1.4	10.8±1.5b	27.4±1.0	27.3±1.2	21.8±1.4	25.5±1.1	28.0±7.5 def	21.4±0.8f-i	15.0±1.0h-k	21.5±2.9
	$N_1$	17.1±3.7	18.9±2.9	13.7±4.2	16.6±2.0a	29.6±1.2	29.0±0.2	21.6±1.2	26.7±2.0	24.1±1.0efg	19.8±1.7g-j	22.1±2.5f-i	22.0±1.1
	$N_2$	16.1±1.6	11.7±2.2	13.6±2.1	13.8±1.2ab	33.9±2.9	28.2±1.7	24.5±1.3	28.8±1.4	24.3±2.9efg	20.1±2.8g-j	16.5±1.8g-k	20.3±1.7
	Mean	15.3±1.7	13.7±1.8	12.1±1.6	13.7±1.0	30.3±1.3	28.2±0.6	22.6±0.8	27.0±0.8	25.5±2.4	20.5±1.0	17.9±1.4	21.3±1.1
	Mean	14.2±0.8	12.5±0.9	11.2±0.8		28.8±0.8	26.7±0.6	22.3±0.6		24.4±2.2	23.5±1.7	23.2±2.4	
	$N_0$	13.5±1.4abc	12.0±1.5b-e	9.4±0.9e	11.6±0.8	25.7±0.6cd	24.4±1.0d	$20.0 \pm 0.7 f$	23.4±0.6	21.2±3.2	23.5±2.6	19.7±3.0	21.5±1.7
	$N_1$	14.9±1.7ab	15.1±1.6a	11.5±1.1cde	13.8±0.9	27.6±0.7bc	27.4±0.8bc	22.2±1.3e	25.7±0.7	25.8±3.2	23.7±2.6	28.9±2.8	26.1±2.2
	$N_2$	14.1±1.2abc	10.2±1.3de	12.9±1.5a-d	12.4±0.8	33.2±1.4a	28.4±0.6b	24.7±0.5d	28.8±0.8	26.0±4.9	23.2±4.0	20.9±3.4	23.4±2.3
200	2												
$C_1$	$N_0$	10.0±1.4	$11.9 \pm 0.3$	11.6±0.5	11.2±0.5	25.0±0.8	26.7±2.8	19.1±0.8	23.6±1.5d	32.7±2.1d-j	43.4±4.4a-g	55.9±12.2ab	$44.0 \pm 5.1$
	$N_1$	14.2±1.1	15.6±0.9	12.8±1.4	14.2±0.7	29.3±1.0	32.1±1.8	26.9±1.3	29.4±1.0bc	46.2±2.8a-d	33.8±1.4c-j	31.8±2.0d-j	37.3±2.5
	$N_2$	16.3±1.3	$15.0\pm0.1$	15.9±0.6	15.7±0.5	39.1±1.3	35.5±1.3	32.2±2.0	35.6±1.3a	39.5±3.4b-c	59.3±5.4a	55.3±2.8ab	51.4±3.6
	Mean	13.5±1.1	14.1±0.6	13.5±0.8	13.7±0.5	31.1±2.2	31.4±1.7	26.1±2.1	29.5±1.2	39.5±2.4	45.5±4.2	47.7±5.4	44.2±2.4
$C_2$	$N_0$	11.5±1.2	10.8±0.4	8.2±0.8	10.2±0.7	24.9±0.8	24.4±3.1	21.4±0.8	23.6±1.1d	40.9±5.1b-i	41.9±1.6b-h	44.7±13.3a-e	42.5±4.2
	$N_1$	12.5±0.7	13.0±2.9	14.9±1.7	13.4±0.8	30.3±1.0	33.9±0.7	27.4±1.4	30.6±1.1b	44.2±8.1a-f	51.6±12.5ab	43.7±8.1a-f	46.5±1.7
	$N_2$	15.4±2.3	16.7±1.7	13.5±1.4	15.2±1.1	33.7±2.2	31.0±0.6	29.4±0.9	31.4±0.9b	50.4±10.8abc	39.1±1.2 b-j	46.3±2.0 a-d	45.3±5.1
	Mean	13.1±1.0	13.5±1.3	12.2±1.2	12.9±0.7	29.6±1.5	29.8±1.7	26.1±1.3	28.5±0.9	45.2±4.4	44.2±4.1	44.9±4.6	44.8±2.4
$C_3$	$N_0$	11.4±1.6	10.2±2.3	$9.7 \pm 1.0$	10.4±0.9	26.2±0.9	22.3±1.3	21.7±0.6	23.4±0.9d	27.4±3.3f-j	24.4±4.6ij	25.6±3.1hij	25.8±1.9
	$N_1$	10.0±1.7	11.0±1.5	12.0±0.5	11.0±0.7	28.2±0.4	30.0±1.5	23.6±0.9	27.3±1.9c	23.8±2.7j	29.2±2.6e-j	23.1±6.4j	25.4±2.3
	$N_2$	14.1±0.9	13.6±1.3	15.4±1.0	14.3±0.6	39.3±0.6	37.1±2.2	32.7±2.4	36.4±1.1a	28.1±4.2e-j	26.6±3.4g-j	24.2±2.0ij	26.3±1.7
	Mean	$11.8\pm0.9$	11.6±1.0	12.3±0.9	11.9±0.5	31.2±2.1	29.8±2.3	26.0±1.9	29.0±1.2	26.4±1.9	26.8±1.9	24.3±2.1	25.8±1.1
	Mean	12.8±0.6	13.1±0.6	12.7±0.6		30.7±1.1	30.3±1.1	26.0±1.0		37.0±2.3	38.8±2.6	39.0±3.1	
	$N_0$	$11.0\pm0.7$	$11.0\pm0.7$	9.8±0.6	10.6±0.4c	25.4±0.5e	24.5±1.4e	$20.7 \pm 0.6 f$	23.5±0.6	33.7±2.7	36.5±3.6	42.0±6.9	37.4±2.7
	$N_1$	12.2±0.9	13.2±1.2	13.2±0.7	12.9±0.5b	29.3±0.5 d	32.0±0.9c	26.0±1.2e	29.1±0.6	38.1±4.4	38.2±5.0	32.9±7.1	36.4±2.6
	$N_2$	15.3±0.9	15.1±0.8	14.9±0.7	15.1±0.4a	37.4±1.2a	34.5±1.2b	31.4±1.1cd	34.4±0.8	39.3±4.8	41.7±5.1	42.0±4.8	41.0±2.7

C<sub>2</sub> with N<sub>1</sub> and D<sub>3</sub> gave the greatest grain yield per unit area in all treatments (48.3 kg ha<sup>-1</sup>). The treatments of C<sub>1</sub> with different nitrogen levels and plant densities generally had lowest grain yields per unit area. Similarly, Cultivar× nitrogen×plant density interaction was significant in grain yield per unit area in second year. C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub> cultivars treated with different nitrogen levels and plant densities generally had highest grain yields per unit area whereas C<sub>3</sub> cultivar with different nitrogen levels and plant densities had lowest grain yield per unit area in all treatments.

Increased nitrogen levels and plant densities positively affected grain yield per unit area for locations. Our grain yield results are similar to the reports of several authors (Baytekin *et al.*, 1995; Lehmann *et al.*, 1999; Khosla *et al.*, 2000; Foale and French, 1985; Ramshe *et al.*, 1986; Valesco-Lizama and Ramirez-Diaz, 1986; Nema *et al.*, 1987; Huda, 1988; Tsukov and Petkova, 1988; Kizil and Tansi, 1997), while the results of some studies (Ramshe *et al.*, 1985; Gupta and Sharma, 1986; Gomase *et al.*, 1987; Desiderio and Ventura; 1992; Soltero-Diaz, 1994) differed from our findings.

Flag leaf area: There were no significant differences between cultivars in flag leaf area in 2001 at Ankara location (Table 5). Flag leaf areas of cultivars varied from 78.8 to 113.9 cm² and the highest flag leaf area was obtained from  $C_2$ . The effect of nitrogen on flag leaf area was non-significant and the  $N_1$  treatment gave the best result concerning flag leaf area. Significant differences were found between plant densities for flag leaf area in 2001 in Ankara. The treatment of  $D_2$  had the highest flag leaf area (110.0 cm²). Significant differences between cultivars were found for flag leaf area in 2002. Of all cultivars.  $C_2$  had the greatest flag leaf area (113.5 cm²). The effects of both nitrogen and plant density were non-significant in second year.

Significant differences between cultivars were found for flag leaf area in 2001 in Hatay location.  $C_1$  had the highest flag leaf area (209.9 cm²) whereas the lowest flag leaf areas were determined by  $C_3$  (131.4 cm²) and  $C_2$  (124.7 cm²) cultivars respectively. Both nitrogen and plant density had no effect on flag leaf area in Hatay location. The effects of both cultivar and nitrogen on flag leaf area were significant in 2002.  $C_1$  gave the best result in flag leaf

Table 5: Effect of different nitrogen levels and plant densities on flag leaf area of grain sorghum

		Ankara plan	t density			Hatay plant	-			Diyarbakır plant density				
			D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)					D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)				D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)		
200	1													
$C_1$	$N_0$	82.1±8.6	72.9±4.7	88.4±6.0	81.1±4.0	192.6±17.7	193.9±16.9	218.9±14.5	201.8±9.3	30.6±0.7	29.9±1.3	31.9±1.8	$30.8 \pm 0.7$	
	$N_1$	82.9±14.6	84.2±1.2	72.8±7.2	80.0±5.0	195.7±27.9	205.2±12.5	222.6±5.7	207.8±9.8	30.4±1.4	31.2±1.3	30.1±1.6	$30.6\pm0.7$	
	$N_2$	67.0±4.8	73.8±2.4	84.8±17.0	75.2±5.8	221.0±32.5	215.3±11.7	224.4±12.8	220.2±10.7	31.3±0.9	29.2±1.0	32.3±1.3	$30.9 \pm 0.7$	
	Mean	77.3±5.7	77.0±2.4	82.0±6.1	78.8±2.8	203.1±14.1	204.8±7.6	222.0±5.9	209.9±5.7a	30.8±0.5	30.1±0.7	31.4±0.8	30.8±0.4b	
$C_2$	$N_0$	92.5±11.9	132.1±18.2	98.7±11.7	107.8±9.4	105.6±5.1	116.3±8.3	113.9±16.0	111.9±5.6	95.8±11.5	77.4±8.3	102.1±13.9	91.8±6.8	
	$N_1$	120.9±4.4	145.1±29.9	104.4±9.1	123.5±3.6	115.7±3.9	140.8±12.1	124.1±14.7	126.9±6.7	116.9±15.0	108.7±5.3	115.0±26.4	113.5±0.7	
	$N_2$	107.9±6.6	121.5±13.5	102.4±17.1	110.6±10.9	132.8±4.4	121.2±5.3	151.5±6.2	135.2±5.2	104.5±8.2	107.0±8.8	115.5±11.5	109.0±9.0	
	Mean	107.1±5.8	132.9±11.4	101.8±6.6	113.9±5.3	118.0±4.6	126.1±5.9	129.8±8.6	124.7±3.8b	105.7±6.7	97.7±6.3	110.9±9.5	104.8±4.4a	
$C_3$	$N_0$	91.3±29.1	93.2±18.0	101.5±16.6	95.3±11.1	128.8±16.1	128.2±4.6	137.0±4.5	131.3±5.2	102.9±15.4	115.4±19.2	95.1±13.9	104.5±8.7	
	$N_1$	125.4±17.8	156.8±17.6	113.0±13.5	131.7±10.5	$133.0 \pm 15.0$	124.5±10.5	113.8±5.3	123.8±10.6	111.7±9.5	97.3±12.0	119.6±10.4	109.5±6.3	
	$N_2$	108.1±10.4	110.4±9.9	119.2±14.4	112.6±6.1	152.7±3.3	133.6±16.2	130.6±10.6	139.0±6.2	85.3±23.7	86.1±9.0	81.4±18.3	84.3±9.1	
	Mean	108.3±11.4	120.1±12.3	111.2±7.9	113.2±6.0	138.2±7.4	128.8±5.9	127.1±5.0	131.4±3.6b	100.0±9.5	99.6±8.2	98.7±9.2	99.4±5.0a	
	Mean	97.5±5.3b	110.0±7.2a	98.3±4.5b		153.1±8.9	153.2±8.0	159.6±9.4		78.8±7.6	75.8±7.2	$80.3 \pm 8.1$		
	$N_0$	88.6±9.5	99.4±11.5	96.2±6.4	94.7±5.3	142.3±14.8	146.1±13.3	156.6±17.2	148.4±8.5	76.4±12.8	74.2±13.8	76.4±12.5	75.7±7.2	
	$N_1$	109.7±9.6	128.7±15.1	96.7±6.8	111.7±6.8	148.1±15.2	156.8±13.6	153.5±18.3	152.8±8.7	86.3±14.9	79.0±12.7	88.2±12.6	84.5±8.3	
	$N_2$	94.3±7.8	101.9±8.7	102.1±9.5	99.4±4.9	168.8±16.4	156.7±15.9	168.8±15.1	164.8±8.8	73.7±13.1	74.1±12.2	76.4±13.6	74.7±7.2	
200	2													
$C_1$	$N_0$	82.8±2.4	75.0±7.0	80.5±1.9	79.4±2.5	177.5±9.2	197.3±7.3	200.9±5.6	191.9±5.2	232.8±39.7	223.1±7.3	256.0±10.2	237.3±13.0	
	$N_1$	56.9±3.5	107.3±31.7	83.1±11.4	82.4±12.2	191.9±17.7	205.9±11.7	211.9±7.3	203.2±7.1	259.4±4.0	254.9±16.0	284.0±29.2	266.1±10.7	
	$N_2$	68.6±12.9	87.8±20.0	78.5±11.1	78.3±8.1	211.1±11.3	204.5±3.3	210.8±19.7	208.8±6.7	293.9±19.8	267.9±38.6	252.0±18.8	271.3±15.0	
	Mean	69.4±5.4	90.0±12.0	80.7±4.7	80.1±4.8b	193.5±8.2	202.6±4.3	207.9±6.5	201.3±3.8a	262.0±15.6	248.7±13.9	264.0±11.6	258.2±7.8b	
$C_2$	$N_0$	97.0±14.4	120.5±7.0	126.0±24.1	114.5±9.5	114.6±3.4	116.0±2.1	127.1±11.3	119.3±4.0	256.3±28.3	232.7±24.9	260.8±49.9	249.9±18.6	
	$N_1$	123.8±19.7	109.1±13.0	132.6±14.2	121.8±11.8	118.5±6.3	148.6±11.6	139.2±14.7	135.4±7.2	313.0±28.4	267.8±31.1	286.7±35.7	289.2±12.6	
	$N_2$	95.0±6.0	113.7±10.0	104.0±23.0	104.2±8.7	144.1±2.8	129.4±5.7	$158.9 \pm 8.0$	144.1±5.2	283.8±13.3	286.3±15.0	302.0±42.1	290.7±17.2	
	Mean	105.3±8.6	114.5±5.4	120.9±11.3	113.5±5.0a	125.7±5.1	131.3±6.0	141.7±7.4	132.9±3.7b	284.4±14.7	262.2±14.6	283.1±22.3	276.6±9.9a	
$C_3$	$N_0$	61.6±7.5	62.7±7.4	107.7±2.6	77.3±8.2	132.3±12.9	126.0±5.3	138.6±2.0	132.3±4.5	234.6±2.1	230.6±11.1	184.8±27.4	216.7±11.7	
	$N_1$	66.8±6.0	87.8±8.6	82.5±11.7	79.0±5.5	131.4±5.6	122.1±6.8	125.3±5.5	126.2±5.2	223.6±27.7	228.8±48.7	209.7±6.7	220.7±16.5	
	$N_2$	76.3±12.4	85.7±2.9	76.1±8.5	79.4±4.7	149.1±4.7	141.1±4.8	133.7±1.5	141.3±3.3	219.5±31.9	200.8±33.1	212.9±10.4	211.1±13.9	
	Mean	68.2±5.0	78.7±5.3	88.8±6.4	78.6±3.5b	137.6±5.2	129.7±4.1	132.5±2.6	133.3±2.4b	225.9±12.4	220.1±18.0	202.5±9.7	216.2±7.9c	
	Mean	81.0±5.0	94.4±5.4	96.8±5.6		152.3±6.8	154.5±7.2	160.7±7.4		257.4±9.2	243.7±9.3	249.9±11.0		
	$N_0$	80.5±7.0	86.1±9.5	104.7±9.6	90.4±5.3	141.5±10.5	146.4±13.1	155.6±12.0	147.8±6.7b	241.2±14.6	228.8±8.3	233.9±20.7	234.6±8.6	
	$N_1$	82.5±12.0	101.4±10.8	99.4±11.2	94.4±6.4	147.2±12.6	158.9±13.4	158.8±13.4	155.0±7.6b	265.3±17.4	250.5±18.2	260.1±19.9	258.7±10.1	
	$N_2$	80.0±6.7	95.7±7.9	86.2±9.0	87.3±4.6	168.1±11.4	158.3±11.9	167.8±12.9	164.7±6.8a	265.7±16.4	251.7±20.1	255.6±18.8	257.7±10.3	

\*p<0.05

area (201.3 cm<sup>2</sup>). Higher nitrogen levels increased flag leaf area in grain sorghum and the highest flag leaf area was obtained from N<sub>2</sub> treatment (164.7 cm<sup>2</sup>). Plant density had no effect on the flag leaf area.

Differences in flag leaf area between cultivars were significant for Diyarbakır location in the first year. The greatest flag leaf areas were determined by  $C_2$  (104.8 cm²) and  $C_3$  (99.4 cm²) cultivars, respectively. The effects of nitrogen and plant density on flag leaf area were non-significant. Similarly, there were significant differences between cultivars in flag leaf area in 2002.  $C_2$  gave the highest flag leaf area (276.6 cm²) and  $C_3$  had the lowest flag leaf area (216.2 cm²). Non-significant differences between nitrogen and plant densities were observed in flag leaf area in 2002.

1000 grain weight: There were significant differences between only cultivars in 1000 grain weight for 2001 in Ankara location (Table 6). C<sub>3</sub> had the highest 1000 grain weight and the lowest one was determined with C<sub>1</sub> cultivar (22.1 g) in all cultivars. The effects of nitrogen and plant density on 1000 grain weight were non-significant. In 2002, no cultivar effect was found for 1000 grain weight

and the values varied from 22.9 to 23.8 g. Nitrogen levels had no effect on 1000 grain weight. Also, there were small but non-significant differences between plant densities in 1000 grain weight.

Differences between cultivars and Nitrogen×plant density interaction were significant for 1000 grain weight at Hatay location in 2001. Of all cultivars, C3 and C2 cultivars gave the highest 1000 grain weights, respectively. Even though nitrogen×plant density interaction was significant there were small but significant differences between treatments in 1000 grain weight. The treatment of N<sub>2</sub> and D<sub>2</sub> had the greatest 1000 grain weight (22.8 g) whereas the lowest value (19.5 g) was obtained from N<sub>1</sub> D<sub>1</sub> in all treatments. Differences in 1000 grain weight between cultivars and Cultivar×plant density were significant for Hatay location in second year. 1000 grain weight was mainly dependent on both cultivar and plant density and the greatest values were generally obtained from the cultivars with increased plant densities. The treatment of C<sub>3</sub> and D<sub>2</sub> had the best result for 1000 grain weight in all treatments. Small but non-significant differences were observed between nitrogen levels in 1000 grain weight.

Table 6: Effect of different nitrogen levels and plant densities on 1000 grain weight of grain sorghum

		Ankara plant density				Hatay plant	density			Diyarbakır plant density				
		D <sub>1</sub> (70×10)		D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)			D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)			D <sub>1</sub> (70×10)	D <sub>2</sub> (70×20)	D <sub>3</sub> (70×30)	Mean	
200	1													
$C_1$	$N_0$	24.9±2.1	21.8±1.6	23.3±1.5	23.3±1.0	19.1±1.7	17.5±0.4	18.1±1.1	$18.2 \pm 0.7$	17.5±0.4	20.4±1.5	18.3±0.7	18.7±0.6	
	$N_1$	22.2±1.2	21.4±1.1	21.7±0.6	21.8±0.5	17.4±0.6	18.4±1.6	19.4±1.0	18.4±0.6	18.3±1.0	19.3±0.9	20.1±1.2	19.2±0.6	
	$N_2$	21.4±1.1	20.6±1.4	21.4±1.2	21.1±0.6	17.8±0.7	19.0±1.0	19.7±0.5	18.8±0.5	$18.0 \pm 1.3$	19.1±0.4	18.4±0.3	18.5±0.4	
	Mean	22.8±0.9	21.2±0.7	22.1±0.7	22.1±0.5b	18.1±0.6	18.3±0.6	19.0±0.5	18.5±0.3b	17.9±0.5	19.6±0.6	18.9±0.5	18.8±0.3c*	
$C_2$	$N_0$	24.7±2.6	24.3±1.1	25.3±1.2	24.8±0.9	24.7±1.2	24.4±1.6	24.8±1.7	24.6±0.7	21.2±0.4	20.3±1.0	22.7±0.6	21.4±0.5	
	$N_1$	22.1±1.3	24.2±0.9	27.6±1.2	24.6±0.5	19.9±0.8	24.1±0.9	23.7±0.9	22.6±0.8	20.8±0.7	21.5±0.4	22.2±1.0	21.5±0.6	
	$N_2$	25.7±3.7	22.0±0.9	25.3±1.3	24.3±1.0	23.0±0.4	23.1±0.7	22.8±2.4	23.0±0.7	21.8±1.0	21.6±1.4	22.3±0.3	21.9±0.4	
	Mean	24.2±1.5	23.5±0.6	26.0±0.7	24.6±0.6ab	22.5±0.8	23.9±0.6	23.7±0.9	23.4±0.5a	21.2±0.4	21.1±0.5	22.4±0.4	21.6±0.3b	
$C_3$	$N_0$	24.0±1.8	24.4±1.9	24.8±2.6	24.4±1.1	24.3±2.0	21.7±2.2	21.8±2.1	22.6±1.1	24.9±1.3	25.5±1.9	25.9±1.2	25.4±0.8	
	$N_1$	25.1±1.6	31.8±1.2	26.3±1.1	27.7±1.2	21.1±2.0	24.1±2.9	23.2±1.5	22.8±0.6	25.1±0.4	26.8±1.5	29.3±0.5	27.1±0.8	
	$N_2$	27.8±3.5	26.7±0.9	32.4±2.6	28.9±1.6	24.6±1.3	26.3±0.5	24.7±1.0	25.2±1.2	26.6±1.4	27.8±0.7	28.3±0.6	27.6±0.6	
	Mean	25.6±1.3	27.6±1.3	27.8±1.6	27.0±0.8a	23.3±1.1	24.0±1.2	23.2±0.9	23.5±0.6a	25.5±0.6	26.7±0.8	27.8±0.7	26.7±0.4a	
	Mean	24.2±0.7	24.1±0.7	25.3±0.8		21.3±0.7	22.1±0.7	22.0±0.6		21.6±0.7b	22.5±0.7a	23.0±0.8a		
	$N_0$	24.5±1.1	23.5±0.9	24.5±1.0	24.2±0.6	22.7±1.2a	21.2±1.3ab	21.6±1.3a	21.8±0.7	21.2±1.1	22.1±1.1	22.3±1.2	21.8±0.7	
	$N_1$	23.2±0.8	25.8±1.6	25.2±1.1	24.7±0.7	19.5±0.8b	22.2±1.4a	22.1±1.4a	21.2±0.6	21.4±1.1	22.5±1.2	23.8±1.2	22.6±0.7	
	$N_2$	25.0±1.8	23.1±1.1	26.4±1.8	24.8±0.9	21.8±1.1a	22.8±1.1a	22.4±1.1a	22.3±0.6	22.1±1.4	22.8±1.4	23.0±1.4	22.6±0.8	
200	2													
$C_1$	$N_0$	22.7±1.1	21.4±1.0	21.9±0.2	22.0±0.5	26.0±2.6	23.9±0.9	23.1±1.6	24.4±1.0	23.2±0.5	21.7±0.5	20.8±0.9	21.9±0.5	
	$N_1$	22.3±0.8	25.0±0.8	22.8±1.2	23.3±0.6	21.4±1.2	21.6±0.8	21.3±0.6	21.4±0.4	20.0±0.3	20.1±0.6	21.3±0.1	20.4±0.3	
	$N_2$	22.5±1.5	23.8±1.0	23.7±1.4	23.3±0.7	25.1±2.4	22.3±0.8	22.2±0.5	23.2±0.9	22.3±0.6	20.2±0.5	21.3±0.7	21.2±0.4	
	Mean	22.5±0.6	23.4±0.7	22.8±0.6	22.9±0.4	24.2±1.3de	22.6±0.5e	22.2±0.6e	23.0±0.5	21.8±0.5	20.6±0.4	21.1±0.3	21.2±0.3c	
$C_2$	$N_0$	24.9±0.4	21.5±1.5	23.9±2.0	23.5±0.9	26.1±1.6	23.9±0.9	25.6±0.6	25.2±0.6	23.3±0.2	24.9±2.4	25.3±1.4	24.5±0.9	
	$N_1$	24.2±2.7	25.8±1.1	24.6±0.4	24.9±0.7	28.4±1.0	29.0±0.8	25.8±0.9	27.7±0.7	26.2±1.3	26.3±2.3	24.2±3.2	25.5±0.4	
	$N_2$	22.0±1.6	23.3±1.8	24.3±3.3	23.2±0.9	26.0±2.3	28.2±1.7	28.1±1.0	27.4±0.9	26.8±4.1	25.3±1.3	25.5±0.6	25.9±1.2	
	Mean	23.7±1.0	23.5±1.0	24.3±1.1	23.8±0.6	26.8±0.9bc	27.0±1.0abc	26.5±0.6c	26.8±0.5	25.4±1.4	25.5±1.0	25.0±1.0	25.3±0.6b	
C <sub>3</sub>	$N_0$	19.3±1.4	23.8±3.1	23.9±1.7	22.4±1.3	26.9±2.2	28.5±2.0	29.3±1.3	28.2±1.0	32.1±1.2	30.8±2.2	30.3±2.8	31.1±1.1	
	$N_1$	28.5±1.0	25.2±2.6	23.6±1.8	25.8±1.2	23.6±0.4	28.6±1.8	27.8±0.7	26.7±1.0	28.2±1.2	27.9±0.7	30.4±1.7	28.8±0.8	
	$N_2$	22.1±2.0	23.7±3.4	22.8±4.2	22.9±1.7	25.5±0.7	30.0±0.7	29.6±1.1	28.4±1.0	31.2±1.7	27.0±0.3	30.4±0.4	29.5±0.8	
	Mean	23.3±1.6	24.2±1.5	23.5±1.4	23.7±0.8	25.3±0.8cd	29.0±0.8a	28.9±0.6ab	27.8±0.5	30.5±0.9	28.6±0.9	30.4±1.0	29.8±0.5a	
	Mean	23.2±0.6	23.7±0.6	23.5±0.6		25.4±0.6	26.2±0.7	25.9±0.6		25.9±0.9	24.9±0.8	25.5±0.9		
	$N_0$	22.3±1.0	22.2±1.1	23.3±0.8	22.6±0.5	26.4±1.1	25.4±1.0	26.0±1.1	25.9±0.6	26.2±1.5	25.8±1.6	25.4±1.7	25.8±0.9	
	$N_1$	25.0±1.3	25.3±0.9	23.7±1.0	24.7±0.6	24.5±1.1	26.4±1.3	25.0±1.2	25.3±0.7	24.8±1.3	24.8±1.4	25.3±1.5	24.9±0.8	
	$N_2$	22.2±0.9	23.6±1.1	23.6±1.6	23.1±0.7	25.5±1.0	26.8±1.3	26.6±1.2	26.3±0.7	26.7±1.8	24.2±1.1	25.7±1.4	25.5±0.8	

Significant differences between cultivars and plant densities were found for 1000 grain weight in 2001 in Diyarbakır location. 1000 grain weights of cultivars varied from 18.8 to 26.7 g and the greatest 1000 grain weight was obtained at C<sub>3</sub>. No nitrogen effect was found for 1000 grain weight. Plant density effect on 1000 grain weight was significant and increased plant densities positively affected 1000 grain weight. Similarly, there were significant differences between cultivars in 1000 grain weight and C<sub>3</sub> had the greatest 1000 grain weight (29.8 g) in all cultivars in 2002. Nitrogen and plant density had no effect on 1000 grain weight in second year (Table 6). Present findings related to nitrogen effect are not in agreement with those of Lehmann *et al.* (1999).

# CONCLUSION

Different nitrogen and plant density treatments affected grain yield and some yield components in grain sorghum and there were significant differences among cultivars, nitrogen levels and plant densities in most characteristics in this study. Generally, increased nitrogen levels positively affected grain yield and some grain yield components and the greatest grain yields were obtained under 75 and 150 kg ha $^{-1}$  N application. Similarly, higher plant densities increased grain yields and  $D_2 \, (70 \times 20 \, \text{cm})$  and  $D_3 \, (70 \times 30 \, \text{cm})$  gave the best results in almost characteristics. The response of cultivars to grain yield and yield components were changeable and dependent on year and location. In addition, the results of first year differed from second ones due to different climate conditions in locations. Therefore, higher nitrogen levels and plant densities could be used for high grain yield in sorghum and also high quality cultivars should be recommended in sorghum cultivation.

# REFERENCES

Abbas, H.A. and A.H. Al-Younis, 1989. Effect of nitrogen fertilization and plant populations on yield and quality of sweet sorghum. Field Crop Abstr., 42: 1725-1725.

- Baytekin, H., G. Bengisu and I. Gül, 1995. Effects of different nitrogen doses on grain yield and some agronomic characteristics of grain sorghum cultivated as a second crop under harran irrigated conditions (Harran ovasi sulu kosullarında ikinci ürün olarak yetistirilen tane sorgumda farkli azot dozlarının verim ve bazi tarimsal karakterlere etkisi). J. Agric. Sci., 1: 198-211.
- Desiderio, E. and A. Ventura, 1992. Fitness of plants and sowing pattern in grain sorghum crop without additional water. Field Crop Abstr., 45: 4457-4457.
- Foale, M.A. and A.V. French, 1985. Row spacing for dryland grain sorghum in queensland. Field Crop Abst., 38: 250-251.
- Gomase, B.P., M.R. Dhawase and B.M. Patil, 1987. Response of high yielding varieties of sorghum under varying levels of fertility and plant density. Field Crop Abst., 40: 910-910.
- Gupta, M.L. and O.L. Sharma, 1986. Studies on sorghum/pigeonpea intercropping under rainfed conditions. Field Crop Abst., 39: 223-223.
- Huda, A.K.S., 1988. Simulating growth and yield responses of sorghum to changes in plant density. Agron. J., 80: 541-547.
- Khosla, R.M., A. Mark and H.D. Paul, 2000. Nitrogen management in no-tillage grain sorghum production: I. Rate and time of application. Agron. J., 92: 321-328.
- Kizil, S. and V. Tansi, 1997. Effects of various plant densities on yield of some grain and silage sorghum cultivars (Sorghum bicolor L.) cultivated in the second crop growth season under cukurova conditions (Çukurova kosullarinda ikinci ürün sezonunda yetistirilen bazi tane ve silaj sorgum (Sorghum bicolor L.) çesitlerinde farkli ekim sikliklarinin verim üzerine olan etkileri). The 2nd Field Crops Congress of Turkey, 1997, Samsun, pp: 472-476.
- Lehmann, J., T. Feilner, G. Gebauer and W. Zech, 1999. Nitrogen uptake of sorghum (Sorghum bicolor L.) from tree mulch and mineral fertilizer under high leaching conditions estimated by nitrogen-15 enrichment. Biol. Fert. Soils, 30: 90-95.

- Machado, J.R., C.A. Rosolem, O. Brinholi, J., Nakagawa and D.A.S. Marcondes, 1986. Spacing between rows and plant density in the rows in grain sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench). Field Crop Abst., 39: 676-676.
- Muchow, R.C., D.B. Coates, G.L. Wilson and M.A. Foale, 1982. Growth and productivity of irrigated *Sorghum bicolor* (L. Moench) Northern Australia. I. Plant density and arrangement effects on light interception and distribution and grain yield, in the hybrid texas 610sr in low and medium latitudes. Aust. J. Agric. Res., 33: 773-784.
- Nema, V.P., R.V. Singh, R.S. Rathore and C.L. Parmar, 1987. Response of sorghum varieties to plant population. Indian J. Agron., 32: 102-104.
- Ramshe, D.G., S.S. Mane and P.S. Pol, 1985. Irrigation studies on rabi (Winter) sorghum. Field Crop Abst., 38: 831-831.
- Ramshe, D.G., S.S. Mane and P.S. Pol, 1986. Effect of plant density and nitrogen fertilization on yield and yield components of rabi sorghum. Field Crop Abstr., 39: 224-224.
- Rees, D.J., 1986. Crop growth, development and yield in semiarid conditions in botswana. I. The effect of population density and row spacing on *Sorghum bicolor*. Exp. Agric., 22: 169-177.
- Singh, M., T. Singh and H. Singh, 1986. Studies on plant geometry and nitrogen fertilization of hybrid sorghum. Indian J. Agron., 31: 33-36.
- Soltero-Diaz, L., 1994. Interaction between sowing density and genotype in sorghum for grain in ocatlon, Jalisco. Plant Breed. Abst., 64: 948-948.
- Tsukov, Z. and N. Petkova, 1988. Assessment of proper plant density and inter-row spacing for sorghum hybrid pleven 76 grown for grain production in central Northern Bulgaria. Field Crop Abstr., 41: 646-646.
- Valesco-Lizama, V.R. and J.L. Ramirez-Diaz, 1986.
  Response of 12 varieties of sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench), to 4 systems of sowing in tmatlan, Jalisco. Field Crop Abst., 39: 769-769.