© 2007 Asian Network for Scientific Information

# Study of Calendula and Gaillardia Growth in Two Composts Prepared from Agroindustrial Wastes

<sup>1</sup>O. Nouri Roudsari and <sup>2</sup>B. Akbari <sup>1</sup>Environmental Sciences Research Institute, Shahid Beheshti University, Evin, Tehran, Iran <sup>2</sup>Natural Resource and Agricultural Research of Guilan Province, Rasht, Iran

**Abstract:** Two composts prepared from agroindustrial wastes were assayed as substrates:  $C_1$  from brewing waste (yeast and malt) plus lemon tree pruning and  $C_2$  from the solid fraction of olive mill wastewater plus olive leaves. Sixteen substrates were prepared by combining each compost with *Sphagnum* peat or a Commercial Substrate (CS) in different proportions. The nutrients (N and K) provided by the composts, which acted as slow-release fertilizers, influenced especially the development of calendula, although the physical and physicochemical properties such as total pore space and Electrical Conductivity (EC) were also relevant. On the other hand, in the salt-sensitive Gaillardia hybrid, EC and chloride concentration were the main factors influencing growth. The best results were found in substrates prepared by mixing  $C_1$  at up to 75% with peat, or at up to 50% with CS, or by mixing  $C_2$  at up to 50% with peat or CS, for calendula. For salt-sensitive species such as Gaillardia, adequate substrates for plant development were found for  $C_1$  at up to 50% with peat or CS, but the use of  $C_2$  should be limited to 25% in mixtures with peat or CS. Therefore, composts of agroindustrial origin such as these can be used as an alternative to peat and CSs for growing ornamental plants, provided the mixture contains at least 25% peat or CS.

**Key words:** Compost, substrate, agroindustrial waste, calendula, gaillardia, salinity

## INTRODUCTION

Soil-less substrates are used in horticulture for growing seedlings, plant propagation, vegetable production and the production of ornamental plants in pots. The most common substrate for such cultures is prepared with Sphagnum peat, due to its high physical and chemical stability and low degradation rate. The cost of high quality peat for horticultural use, together with the declining availability of peat in the near future due to environmental constraints, especially in countries without peat moss resources (such as Iran), make it necessary to look for alternative materials (Raviv et al., 1986; Padasht Dehkaei, 1998; Abad et al., 2001; Hasandokht et al., 2005; Mahbob Khomami, 2005). As a consequence, composted organic wastes are increasing in value commercially because the Organic Matter (OM) and nutrients from the organic wastes are recycled (Nappi and Barberis, 1993). Additionally there is evidence in the literature which shows that, unlike peat, composts possess plant growth regulators and properties which suppress soil-borne plant pathogens (Lumsden et al., 1986; Atiyeh et al., 2001).

Composts used as substrates should have a high degree of maturity and adequate physical and chemical

properties, such as particle size, porosity, water-holding capacity, air capacity, Electrical Conductivity (EC) and pH, even more important than concentrations of nutrients, because these latter can be added by fertilization (Gouin, 1998; Padasht Dehkaei, 1998; Mahbob Khomami, 2005). Composts usually show a high porosity and air capacity and a low water-holding capacity (Abad et al., 2001). They also have a high salt and nutrient content (López-Real et al., 1989). EC has been shown to be an important factor when compost is used as a substrate for horticultural plants and seedlings (Eklind et al., 1998). Composts often require leaching or mixing with nutrientpoor material in order to become suitable substrates with better physico-chemical properties for container-grown vegetables and flowers. Composts from many different origins, like sewage sludge, sweet sorghum bagasse, Municipal Solid Waste (MSW), wood bark, garden waste and manure, as well as vermicompost, have been assayed as substrates, good results often being obtained by mixing with peat (López-Real et al., 1989; Nappi and Barberis, 1993; Eklind et al., 1998; Padasht Dehkaei, 1998; Atiyeh et al., 2001; Nadi and Golchin, 2005; Keshavarzi et al., 2005). For ornamental plants,

Pinamonti et al. (1997) reported a good production of plants with 50% sewage sludge and poplar bark compost. Klock (1997) suggested that impatiens and snapdragons can be grown successfully in 100% compost made from biosolids and garden wastes. There is a wide range of wastes of agroindustrial origin, but information concerning the feasibility of the use of composts prepared from such wastes as substrates is scarce. Abad et al. (2001) prepared an inventory of materials suitable for use as growing media for ornamental plant production, which included agroindustrial wastes such as bagasse, slaughter waste, brewing waste, etc.

The aim of the present work was, therefore, to evaluate the use of composts made from some agroindustrial wastes in the preparation of substrates for ornamental plants, as a peat substitute and as an alternative to commercial composts used as substrates and to determine any limitation to their use.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two mature composts from different agroindustrial wastes were studied:

- C<sub>1</sub>: 2.5% brewing waste (yeast+ malt)+97.5% lemon tree prunings (dry weight basis);
- C<sub>2</sub>: 65% solid fraction of olive mill wastewater+35% olive leaves (dry weight basis).

The brewing waste was a mixture of yeast and residual malt from the fermentation process. These mixtures were composted in a pilot plant by the static pile system, with forced aeration and controlled temperature (Finstein et al., 1983), for 90 and 190 days (C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub>, respectively) and then for two months more of maturation. Both composts reached a good degree of maturity according to the following criteria: total organic carbon to total nitrogen ratio (TOC/TN) of C<sub>1</sub>= 16.7 and C<sub>2</sub>= 14.1, cation exchange capacity (CEC) >67 cmol<sub>c</sub> kg<sup>-1</sup> on an ashfree basis (123 and 150 in C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub>, respectively), CEC/TOC ratio>1.9 (2.2 and 2.6 in C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub>, respectively) and a germination index (GI) > 50% (89 and 95 in  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , respectively) (Zucconi et al., 1981; Iglesias-Jiménez and Pérez-García, 1992). The nutrient concentrations of both composts (g kg<sup>-1</sup>) were the following:

$$C_1$$
:TN = 24.9, P = 2.1, K = 8.5,  $Ca$  = 75.3,  $Mg$  = 6.8,  $Na$  = 0.7, Fe = 1.2;

$$C_2$$
:TN = 17.6, P = 1.5, K = 12.6,  $Ca = 127.5$ ,  $Mg = 6.8$ ,  $Na = 1.1$ , Fe= 9.1.

The composts were mixed in different proportions with *Sphagnum* peat (pH 3.8), without any fertilization, or with a Commercial Substrate (CS). The CS is widely used as an organic fertilizer and as a substrate in growing media. Sixteen substrates were then prepared from combinations of two composts ( $C_1$  and  $C_2$ ), two diluents (peat and CS) and four different proportions of compost (25, 50, 75 and 100% v/v compost). Pure peat (pH corrected with dolomite; Table 1) and CS were also tested as controls. All the substrates were fertilized before planting with a slow-release fertilizer (15:11:13+ micronutrients) (Osmocote Plus, 3-4 months) at a rate of 1.5 kg m<sup>-3</sup> substrate.

Two plant species of differing salt sensitivities were selected: the less sensitive calendula (var. Nana Bonthe salt-sensitive Gaillardia (dwarf). Bon) and Commercial seedlings (calendula, height = 6 cm, Gaillardia, height = 4 cm) were planted in pots of 0.4 1 capacity, containing the different substrates and then watered with tap water. The experiments were run in a glasshouse, using a randomized block design of three replicates per treatment in three blocks (9 pots per treatment and per plant species). The pots were watered as required and no extra fertilization was applied. Plant height was measured from the point where the stem entered the substrate to the upper tip of the plant. The experiments lasted three months. When the plants had flowers of commercial size the aerial parts of the plants were weighed fresh, the flowers were counted and the quality of roots was evaluated according to the following criteria:

- Visible root density at the substrate surfaces (1-low, 5-high).
- Kind of roots (1-thin and weak, 5-thick and strong).
- Colour of roots (1-dark, 5-white).

Compost EC and pH were determined in a water-soluble extract 1:10 (w/v). Dry matter was calculated by drying at 105°C for 12 h and organic matter (OM) content by loss on ignition at 430°C for 24 h (Navarro *et al.*, 1993). TN and TOC were determined by an automatic microanalyzis method (Navarro *et al.*, 1991). NH<sub>4</sub><sup>+</sup>-N was extracted with 2 M KCl and determined by a colorimetric method based on Berthelot's reaction (Sommers *et al.*, 1992). NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N was determined by ion chromatography in a 1:20 (w/v) water extract. After HNO<sub>3</sub>/HClO<sub>4</sub> digestion, P was determined colorimetrically by the method of Kitson and Mellon (1944), Na and K by flame photometry and Ca, Mg and Fe by atomic absorption spectrophotometry. The CEC was

Table 1: Physico-chemical and chemical characteristics of the substrates: ideal substrate (IS), Sphagnum peat (P), commercial substrate (CS) and compost

| Sub stratus              | pН      | EC (dS m <sup>-1</sup> ) | OM (%) | NO <sub>3</sub> <sup></sup> -N (μg mL <sup>-1</sup> ) | K+ (μg mL <sup>-1</sup> ) | Na+ (μg mL-1) | Cl <sup>-</sup> (µg mL <sup>-1</sup> ) | SO <sup>2-</sup> <sub>4</sub> S (μg mL <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|--------|---|---------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| IS                       | 5.2-6.3 | 0.75-3.49                | >80    | 100-199   | 150-249                   | <115          | <180                                   | <960   |
| Peat                     | 5.10    | 0.14                     | 94.27  | 20  | 42                        | 6             | 39                                     | 36   |
| CS                       | 6.16    | 3.98                     | 67.76  | 418   | 420                       | 210           | 404                                    | 390  |
| $C_1$                    | 8.05    | 4.26                     | 74.71  | 42  | 1540                      | 88            | 328                                    | 331  |
| $C_2$                    | 7.54    | 3.70                     | 42.31  | 20  | 1420                      | 210           | 715                                    | 333  |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (25%)  | 5.01    | 0.68                     | 89.77  | 6   | 260                       | 25            | 68                                     | 53   |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (50%)  | 6.67    | 1.31                     | 83.46  | 18  | 360                       | 49            | 131                                    | 159  |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (75%)  | 7.40    | 2.48                     | 76.87  | 9   | 820                       | 70            | 147                                    | 168  |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (25%)  | 6.61    | 0.46                     | 74.97  | 0   | 200                       | 53            | 110                                    | 53   |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (50%)  | 6.84    | 2.63                     | 58.64  | 15  | 840                       | 130           | 246                                    | 100  |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (75%)  | 7.32    | 3.65                     | 42.84  | 9   | 920                       | 140           | 343                                    | 112  |
| C <sub>1</sub> +CS (25%) | 6.83    | 5.33                     | 64.70  | 314   | 680                       | 210           | 381                                    | 564  |
| C <sub>1</sub> +CS (50%) | 7.21    | 5.60                     | 70.79  | 211   | 1340                      | 230           | 454                                    | 738  |
| C <sub>1</sub> +CS (75%) | 7.51    | 5.88                     | 73.42  | 73  | 1840                      | 240           | 437                                    | 612  |
| C2+CS (25%)              | 6.92    | 4.95                     | 60.45  | 338   | 800                       | 370           | 466                                    | 592  |
| C2+CS (50%)              | 7.15    | 4.45                     | 54.19  | 313   | 1100                      | 200           | 767                                    | 657  |
| C <sub>2</sub> +CS (75%) | 7.33    | 4.10                     | 45.32  | 39  | 1900                      | 380           | 536                                    | 500  |

Cation and anion concentrations refer to the water saturated extract. N-NH<sub>4</sub> $^+$ : 152 and 34 mg kg $^{-1}$  in  $C_1$  and  $C_2$ , respectively. Soluble phosphorus <0.5  $\mu$ g mL $^{-1}$  in all substrates

Table 2: Physical characteristics of the substrates: ideal substrate (IS), Sphagnum peat (P), commercial substrate (CS) and compost (C<sub>1</sub> y C<sub>2</sub>)

| Sub stratus              | Bulk density(g cm <sup>-3</sup> ) | Particle density(g cm <sup>-3</sup> ) | Total pore space (% v/v) | Air capacity (% v/v) | Total water-holding capacity (mL L-1) |
|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------------|
| IS                       | < 0.40                            | 1.4-2.0                               | >85                      | 20-30                | 600-1000                              |
| Peat                     | 0.10                              | 1.49                                  | 93                       | 18                   | 760                                   |
| CS                       | 0.24                              | 1.70                                  | 86                       | 47                   | 392                                   |
| $C_1$                    | 0.15                              | 1.64                                  | 91                       | 47<br>65             | 258                                   |
| $C_2$                    | 0.37                              | 1.96                                  | 81                       | 31                   | 505                                   |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (25%)  | 0.10                              | 1.52                                  | 93                       | 38                   | 553                                   |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (50%)  | 0.11                              | 1.57                                  | 93                       | 46                   | 464                                   |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (75%)  | 0.13                              | 1.62                                  | 92                       | 51                   | 413                                   |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (25%)  | 0.15                              | 1.64                                  | 91                       | 45                   | 464                                   |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (50%)  | 0.21                              | 1.78                                  | 88                       | 43                   | 458                                   |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (75%)  | 0.29                              | 1.96                                  | 85                       | 37                   | 484                                   |
| C1+CS (25%)              | 0.24                              | 1.73                                  | 86                       | 40                   | 463                                   |
| C <sub>1</sub> +CS (50%) | 0.20                              | 1.67                                  | 88                       | 44                   | 437                                   |
| C <sub>1</sub> +CS (75%) | 0.18                              | 1.65                                  | 89                       | 53                   | 365                                   |
| C2+CS (25%)              | 0.29                              | 1,77                                  | 84                       | 41                   | 424                                   |
| C2+CS (50%)              | 0.31                              | 1.83                                  | 83                       | 44                   | 395                                   |
| C2+CS (75%)              | 0.34                              | 1.93                                  | 82                       | 38                   | 438                                   |

determinated with BaCl<sub>2</sub>-triethanolamine (Lax *et al.*, 1986). The GI (Germination index) was calculated using seeds of *Lepidium sativum L.* (Zucconi *et al.*, 1981). Substrate pH, EC and the NO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>-N, Cl<sup>-</sup>, SO<sub>4</sub><sup>2</sup>--S, P, K and Na concentrations were determined in the water-saturated extracts. The physical properties of the materials were determined according to the methods of Verdonck and Gabriels (1992) All analyzes were done at least in duplicate.

### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The pH values of C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub> were greater than the established limits for an ideal substrate (IS) (Abad *et al.*, 2001), whilst CS was in the upper range for an IS (Table 1). The pH decreased when the composts were mixed with peat or CS. The EC values of the composts (C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub>), the CS and their mixtures were higher than the limit for an IS, due to their high

concentrations of soluble salts (Cl<sup>-</sup> and  $SO_4^{2-}$ -S) and nutrients ( $NO_3^-$ -N and  $K^+$ ) in the water-saturated extract (Table 1). Of note is the high chloride content of  $C_2$ , potassium contents of  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  and nitrate content of CS, probably added previously to CS as fertilizer. Mixing  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  with peat improved these properties to values within the range of an IS.

In C<sub>2</sub> and CS the OM concentration was very low and the substrates prepared from them had values below the level for an IS. This may have led to high air capacity and low total water-holding capacity in most of the substrates (Table 2); even mixing with peat hardly improved these properties. This means that water should be applied frequently and in small amounts, as leaching may easily occur. Bulk density, particle density and total pore space were adequate in most of the substrates. In general, the characteristics of the composts assayed are common to a large variety of organic waste materials and composts (Abad *et al.*, 2001).

Table 3: Effect of the different growing media on the growth and nutritional state of calendula (9 plants per treatment)

| Sub stratus             | Fresh weight (g/plant) | Root quality | Flower No.  | Na (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | P (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | N (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | K (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Peat                    | 13.24b                 | 4.52b        | 1.11a-d     | 28.7g                    | 1.7a                    | 32.0fg                  | 20.8                    |
| CS                      | 17.28b-e               | 4.94a        | 1.17a-c     | 32.8e-g                  | 3.9e                    | 27.5g                   | 21.5                    |
| $C_1$                   | 16.79c-f               | 3.46f-h      | 1.12a-d     | 41.9a                    | 1.9hi                   | 65.6bc                  | 20.1                    |
| $C_2$                   | 14.62e-h               | 3.29h        | 0.56c       | 37.1b-e                  | 2. 0hi                  | 77.7a                   | 20.8                    |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (25%) | 15.97e-h               | 4.62ab       | 1.11a-d     | 30.4fg                   | 2.3e-g                  | 30.1fg                  | 23.2                    |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (50%) | 14.27f-h               | 3.96с-е      | 1.00b-e     | 32.8f-h                  | 2.4ef                   | 51.3de                  | 22.9                    |
| C <sub>1</sub> +P (75%) | 20.82a                 | 4.07c        | 1.56a       | 37.2b-e                  | 2.2e-h                  | 60.7b-d                 | 23.2                    |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (25%) | 13.80gh                | 4.09c        | 1.11a-d     | 35.0c-f                  | 2. 0hi                  | 39.6f                   | 18.9                    |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (50%) | 16.49d-g               | 3.69d-g      | 1.00b-e     | 38.0a-d                  | 2.0g-i                  | 55.7c-e                 | 19.9                    |
| C <sub>2</sub> +P (75%) | 16.50d-g               | 3.35gh       | 0.78c-e     | 39.7ab                   | 2.1 f-h                 | 67.9ab                  | 20.9                    |
| $C_1CS+(25\%)$          | 19.09a-c               | 4.08c        | 1.33ab      | 37.8a-d                  | 3.5b                    | 53.6de                  | 19.0                    |
| C <sub>1</sub> CS+(50%) | 19.87ab                | 3.80c-f      | 1.33ab      | 38.8a-d                  | 2.8cd                   | 58.2b-e                 | 22.9                    |
| $C_1CS+(75\%)$          | 14.61e-h               | 3.59c-h      | 1.00b-e     | 37.6a-d                  | 2.8cd                   | 50.5e                   | 18.8                    |
| C2CS+(25%)              | 17.54b-d               | 3.87c-e      | 1.00a-d     | 34.3d-f                  | 3.4b                    | 51.2de                  | 22.5                    |
| C2CS+(50%)              | 14.84a-d               | 4.06cd       | 1.22a-c     | 39.3a-c                  | 2.9e                    | 56.3с-е                 | 19.7                    |
| C2CS+(75%)              | 13.35b                 | 3.59e-h      | 0.67d       | 41.6ab                   | 2.5de                   | 55.5de                  | 17.8                    |
| ANOVA                   | aje aje                | oje oje oje  | ole ole ole | oje oje oje              | of c of c of c          | ***                     | n.s                     |
| LSD                     | 2.935                  | 0.400        | 0.416       | 4.62                     | 0.38                    | 10.26                   |                         |

<sup>\*\*\*, \*, \*:</sup> p0.001, 0.01, 0.05. LSD: least significant difference. Values followed by the same letter are not statistically different according to the Waller-Duncan test at p0.05

Table 4:Effect of the different growing media on the growth and nutritional state of Gaillardia (9 plants per treatment)

| Sub stratus     | Fresh weight (g/plant) | Root quality | Flower number   | Na (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | P (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | N (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) | K (g kg <sup>-1</sup> ) |
|-----------------|------------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| Peat            | 10.78ef                | 4.00ab       | 1.78ef          | 18.1c-f                  | 1.3de                   | 20.0i                   | 5.4e                    |
| CS              | 14.52de                | 3.57bc       | 4.17 <b>d-f</b> | 22.8a-d                  | 5.2a                    | 50.0d-g                 | 6.5c-e                  |
| $C_1$           | 0.74i                  | 1.11fg       | 0.25ef          | 19.0b-e                  | 2.2cd                   | 65.8a                   | 12.7a                   |
| $C_2$           | 2.61hi                 | 1.48ef       | 0.22ef          | 14.2ef                   | 1.6cde                  | 39.8h                   | 7.4cd                   |
| $C_1+P(25\%)$   | 19.74a-c               | 4.09a        | 8.37cd          | 13.5f                    | 1.2e                    | 26.5i                   | 6.3de                   |
| $C_1+P(50\%)$   | 21.68a                 | 2.69d        | 14.87ab         | 17.3d-f                  | 1.3de                   | 40.2gh                  | 7.0cd                   |
| $C_1+P(75\%)$   | 13.46de                | 2.71d        | 8.62b-d         | 17.3d-f                  | 1.6c-e                  | 51.7c-f                 | 7.9c                    |
| $C_2+P(25\%)$   | 21.83a                 | 3.81 a-c     | 9.14a-d         | 17.9c-f                  | 1.0e                    | 45.8e-h                 | 6.5c-e                  |
| $C_2+P(50\%)$   | 16.78b-d               | 2.81d        | 5.89d-f         | 17.9c-f                  | 1.2e                    | 50.0c-f                 | 6.9c-e                  |
| $C_2 + P(75\%)$ | 5.22gh                 | 1.33e-g      | 0.44ef          | 20.4b-d                  | 1.7c-e                  | 46.2e-h                 | 7.9c                    |
| $C_1CS+(25\%)$  | 20.87ab                | 3.82a-c      | 6.50de          | 23.1a-c                  | 1.6c-e                  | 53.3с-е                 | 7.3cd                   |
| $C_1CS+(50\%)$  | 19.57a-c               | 2.81d        | 13.0a-c         | 13.2a-c                  | 2.3bc                   | 52.7c-e                 | 7.5cd                   |
| $C_1CS+(75\%)$  | 8.98fg                 | 1.74e        | 4.78d-f         | 24.5ab                   | 2.5bc                   | 63.6ab                  | 10.0b                   |
| $C_2CS+(25\%)$  | 16.74cd                | 3.41c        | 15.22a          | 19.7b-e                  | 3.3b                    | 55.9b-d                 | 7.5cd                   |
| $C_2CS+(50\%)$  | 13.66de                | 2.52d        | 8.56b-d         | 20.5b                    | 2.5bc                   | 56.3a-c                 | 702.0cd                 |
| $C_2CS+(75\%)$  | 2.26hi                 | 1.00g        | 0.18f           | 19.8b-e                  | 1.6c-e                  | 42.0f-h                 | 7.9c                    |
| ANOVA           | No ales ale            | ***          | ***             | मंद भंद संद              | ste ste ste             | ale ale ale             | alcolo alc              |
| LSD             | 4.552                  | 0.527        | 6.199           | 5.08                     | 0.96                    | 10.11                   | 1.50                    |

<sup>\*\*\*, \*, \*:</sup> p<0.001, 0.05. LSD: least significant difference. Values followed by the same letter are not statistically different according to the Waller-Duncan test at p0.05

After three months, the height of calendula plants was similar in all substrates, ranging from 12.6 cm in  $C_1+CS$  (25%) to 8.8 cm in  $C_1+P$  (50%). The yields of calendula, expressed as fresh weight of the aerial part, did not differ statistically in  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  and CS, but only peat, of the pure substrates, produced a rather lower yield (Table 3). The highest yields of calendula were obtained in  $C_1+P$  (75%),  $C_2+P$  (50-75%) and in both composts+CS (50%), all producing an acceptable degree of root quality and number of flowers (Table 3). These results may be due to the great contribution of nutrients, N and K, by the composts (Table 1).

Higher yields of broccoli seedlings was observed with increasing proportions of composts in the substrates and associated this with the increased amount of nutrients (Sánchez-Monedero *et al.*, 2004). Tomatoes

have also been shown to grow better with the higher nutritional input of increasing proportions of vermicompost (Atiyeh *et al.*, 2001).

Highly significant differences (p<0.001) in the N, P and K concentrations were observed in the calendula plants (Table 3). The highest N concentration was obtained in plants grown in pure  $C_1$ , due to the high total and inorganic nitrogen concentrations of this compost, followed by  $C_2$ , while the lowest levels were for plants grown in peat. The concentration of P in calendula plants was greatest with pure CS and its mixtures (Table 3), also no significant differences were observed in the plants grown on  $C_1$ ,  $C_2$  peat or their mixtures. The highest K concentration was exhibited in the plants grown in the pure  $C_2$  compost (Table 3), due to the high K content of the olive mill waste (Paredes *et al.*, 1999). In the mixtures

containing either C<sub>1</sub> or C<sub>2</sub> and peat, the N and K concentrations of the plants increased with increasing proportions of compost. Therefore, plants assimilated the nutrients provided by both composts and the CS, which improved growth. The lower weight of the calendula plants grown on peat compared with C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub> might have been due to lower availability of macronutrients. Regarding Na, no significant differences were observed between the different treatments (Table 3), due to its low concentration in the composts, well below those of K, Ca and Mg.

Since no differences in the nutrient levels of the plants grown in mixtures C<sub>1</sub> or C<sub>2</sub> with CS were observed (Table 3), the fall in yield at 75% compost could be due to the physical properties of the substrates, such as low total pore space in the case of C<sub>2</sub>+CS (75%) or excessive EC in the case of C<sub>1</sub>+CS (75%). Eklind et al. (1998) also observed a fall in yield and a reduction in the number of flowers in marguerite as the proportion of compost increased in mixtures with peat, due to excess salinity. However, the Na concentration of calendula, a salttolerant species, was not affected by the composition of the substrates (Table 3). It was not only the fertilizing effect of the composts that influenced yield and root quality, but also the physical and chemical properties of the mixtures as a whole, as the lowest yields and root quality of plants were obtained in 100% compost (Table 3).

For Gaillardia, maximum height was achieved in plants grown in mixtures at 25% compost (4.1-5.3 cm), especially with CS, while plants grown in pure compost (1.7-1.9 cm) and in the mixtures at 75% (1.6-3.8 cm) were the smallest. Therefore, the fresh weights of Gaillardia obtained in pure C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub> were the lowest (Table 4). The maximum yields for C<sub>1</sub> were obtained at 50 or 25 % compost mixed with peat or CS and for C<sub>2</sub> at 25% with peat or CS, with a good number of flowers, as happened with calendula. The EC values of the composts may have affected plant growth in substrates with peat, as the best results were obtained in mixtures with the lowest EC, C<sub>1</sub>+P (25-50%)  $(EC 0.68-1.31 dS m^{-1} and C<sub>2</sub>+P (25\%) (EC 0.46 dS m^{-1})$ Higher proportions of compost resulted in higher EC values and lower yields. Therefore, Gaillardia behaved as a salt-sensitive species. High yields were also obtained for C<sub>1</sub>+CS (50%) and C<sub>2</sub>+CS (25%), which had higher EC values, of 5.60 and 4.95 dS m<sup>-1</sup>, respectively. It is possible that the cations and anions contributing to the EC in CS were mainly nutrients such as K+ and NO-3-N and thus had a beneficial effect which over-compensated for the osmotic effect. The fall in yield in the 75% compost mixtures may have been due to excess salinity, which, in this case, may have caused an osmotic imbalance, or the

high level of a particular ion such as chloride (François and Maas, 1994). Chloride was the main anion contributing to the EC in C<sub>2</sub> and this may have been responsible for the low yield of Gaillardia grown in substrate with a high proportion of C<sub>2</sub>, by the additive effects of osmotic stress and specific ion toxicity.

The quality of the roots decreased with increasing compost rate in both CS and peat mixtures (Table 4). The best root quality of the plants occurred in the controls, peat and CS, meaning that the negative effect of high EC of the composts had an effect first at root level. These results agree with those of López-Real *et al.* (1989), who found that the root weight of geranium, petunia and coleus increased as the proportion of a sewage sludge plus straw compost increased up to 50% in peat, while with 75% compost the yield decreased.

The highest concentrations of N and P in Gaillardia were observed in plants grown on CS, alone or mixed with compost (Table 4). There were no significant differences between the different proportions of compost in the substrates. Thus, the lower yield and root quality observed in Gaillardia grown in pure compost and its mixtures with a high proportion of compost would not have been due to a deficit of nitrogen but to the physicochemical properties of the substrates already discussed. The highest K concentrations were in plants grown on C<sub>1</sub> followed by CS and C2, all of which had high levels of available K (Table 1). In the treatments involving C<sub>2</sub>, lower K concentrations than expected were recorded, given the high levels of available K in the compost (Table 1). Maybe the high K concentrations in these substrates contributed to a high EC and this, together with the high Na content in the C2 saturation extracts (Table 1), may have had an osmotic effect on plant growth in C2 and mixtures of C<sub>2</sub>+CS (Table 4). The Na content was noticeably lower in Gaillardia than in calendula.

It can be concluded, from the results obtained here, that the composts used in the preparation of substrates were not phytotoxic and permitted the plants to grow disease-free and with no weeds. Due to their physical and chemical characteristics, the composts prepared from brewing waste and from the solid fraction of olive mill wastewater may be considered as partial peat substitutes and as an alternative to other CSs. Among the advantages which these composts can provide are the nutrients, mainly N and K and thus they act as slow-release organic fertilizers. Their use as substrates depends on the species to be cultivated, as the EC is the main limiting factor. For their use as substrates to grow ornamental plants the best results were found in substrates prepared by mixing C1 at up to 75% with peat, or at up to 50% with CS, or by mixing C<sub>2</sub> at up to 50% with peat or CS, for plant species moderately tolerant to salinity. For salt-sensitive species such as Gaillardia, adequate substrates for plant development were found for  $C_1$  at up to 50% with peat or CS, but the use of  $C_2$  should be limited to 25% in mixtures with peat or CS.

Considering the use of compost in substrate preparation, the EC is the main factor which can limit their use and the presence of certain anions such as chloride should be minimized to avoid phytotoxic effects.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors wish to thank the council of ornamental plants and flower of north of Iran for financial supporting this work and Dr. A.M. Mahdavi Damghani for the English revision.

#### REFERENCES

- Abad, M., P. Noguera and S. Burés, 2001. National inventory of organic wastes for use as growing media for ornamental potted plant production: Case study in Spain. Biores. Technol., 77: 197-200.
- Atiyeh, R.M., C.A. Edwards, S. Subler and J.D. Metzger, 2001. Pig manure vermicompost as a component of a horticultural bedding plant medium: Effects on physicochemical properties and plant growth. Biores. Technol., 78: 11-20.
- Eklind, Y., L. Salomonsson, M. Wivstad and B. Rämert, 1998. Use of herbage compost as horticultural substrate and source of plant nutrients. Biol. Agric. Hortic., 16: 269-290.
- Finstein, M.S., F.C. Miller, P.F. Strom, S.T. Mcgregor and K.M. Psarianos, 1983. Composting ecosystems management for waste treatment. Biotechno., 11: 347-353.
- François, L.E. and E.V. Maas, 1994 Crop Response and Management on Salt-affected Soils. In: Handbook of Plant and Crop Stress. Pessarakli, M. (Ed.), Marcel Dekker, New York, pp: 149-181.
- Gouin, F.R., 1998. Using Compost in the Ornamental Horticulture Industry. In: Beneficial Co-Utilization of Agricultural, Municipal and Industrial By-products. Brown, S., J.S. Angle and L. Jacobs (Eds.), Kluwer Academic Publishers, Netherlands, pp. 131-138.
- Hasandokht, M.R., F. Mastouri and M.N. Padasht Dehkaei, 2005. Effect of the application of agricultural waste compost on greenhouse lettuce yield. In: Proceedings of 2nd National Symposium on Losses of Agricultural Products, 17 November 2005, Tarbiat Modarres University, Tehran, Iran, pp. 317-322.
- Iglesias-Jiménez, E. and V. Pérez-García, 1992. Determination of maturity indices for city refuse compost. Agric. Ecosys. Environ., 38: 331-343.

- Keshavarzi, M., J. Tabatabaei and M. Bagheri, 2005. Effect use of several quantities Municipal Solid Waste (MSW) in media, on growth and quality Narcissus flower 'Golden harvest'. In: Proceedings 4th Iranian Horticultural Sciences Congress. 8-10 November 2005 Ferdowsi University, Mashhad, Iran, pp: 349-350.
- Kitson, R.E. and M.G. Mellon, 1944. Colorimetric determination of P as a molybdovanadato phosphoric acid. Ind. Eng. Chem. Anal., 16: 379-383.
- Klock, K.A., 1997. Growth of salt sensitive bedding plants in media amended with composted urban waste. Compost. Sci. Util., 5: 55-59.
- Lax, A., A. Roig and F. Costa, 1986. A method for determining the cation-exchange capacity of organic materials. Plant Soil, 94: 349-355.
- López-Real, J.M., E. Witter, F.N. Midmer and B.A.O. Hewett, 1989. Evaluation of composted sewage sludge/straw mixture for horticultural utilisation. Water Sci. Tech., 21: 889-897.
- Lumsden, R.D., P.D. Millner and J.A. Lewis, 1986. Suppression of lettuce drop caused by Sclerotinia-minor with composted sewage sludge. Plant Dis., 70: 197-201.
- Mahbob Khomami, A., 2005. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer and application of compost derived of agricultural and industrial waste instead of peat on Azalea growth indexes. In: Proceedings of 2nd National Symposium on Losses of Agricultural Products, 17 November 2005, Tarbiat Modarres University, Tehran, Iran, pp: 368-381.
- Nadi, M. and A. Golchin, 2005. The use of vemicompost as a potting media. In: Proceedings of 1st National Technology of Greenhouse Production, 29 September 2005, Guilan University, Rasht, Iran, pp: 151-162.
- Nappi, P. and R. Barberis, 1993. Compost as growing medium: Chemical, physical and biological aspects. Acta Hortic., 342: 249-256.
- Navarro, A.F., J. Cegarra, A. Roig and M.P. Bernal, 1991. An automatic microanalyzis method for the determination of organic carbon in wastes. Commun. Soil Sci. Plant Anal., 22: 2137-2144.
- Navarro, A.F., J. Cegarra, A. Roig and D. Garcia, 1993. Relationships between organic matter and carbon contents of organic wastes. Biores. Technol., 44: 203-207.
- Padasht Dehkaei, M.N., 1998. Evaluation of some properties of compost for greenhouse production. Msc. Thesis, Tehran University, Tehran, Iran.
- Paredes, C., J. Cegarra, A. Roig, M.A. Sánchez-Monedero and M.P. Bernal, 1999. Characterization of olive mill wastewater (alpechin) and its sludge for agricultural purposes. Biores. Technol., 67: 111-115.
- Pinamonti, F., G. Stringari and G. Zorzi, 1997. Use of compost in soilless cultivation. Compost Sci. Util., 5: 38-46.

Raviv, M., Y. Chen and Y. Inbar, 1986. Peat and Peat Substitutes as Growth Media for Container-grown Plants. In: The Role of Organics Matter in Modern Agriculture. Chen, Y. and Y. Avnimelech (Eds.), Martinus Nijhoff Publications, The Hague (Netherland), pp: 257-287.

Sánchez-Monedero, M.A., C. Mondini, M. de Nobili, L. Leita and A. Roig, 2004. Land application of biosolids. Soil response to different stabilization degree of the treated organic matter. Waste Manage., 24: 325-332.

Sommers, S.G., V. Kjellerup and O. Kristjansen, 1992. Determination of total ammonium nitrogen in pig and slurry: sample preparation and analyzes. Proc. Agric. Scand. Sect. B: Soil Plant Sci., 42: 146-151.

Verdonck, O. and R., Gabriels, 1992. I. Reference method for the determination of physical properties of plant substrates. II. Reference method for the determination of chemical properties of plant substrates. Acta Hortic., 302: 169-179.

Zucconi, F., A. Pera, M. Forte and M. de Bertoldi, 1981. Evaluating toxicity of immature compost. BioCycle, 22: 54-57.

