Optimisation of N application for a maize crop grown in a shallow, irrigated soil
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Abstract

A method of evaluating net nitrogen (N) mineralisation in shallow petrocalcic soils, based on N balances in non-fertilized plots, is proposed. During 1999, 2000 and 2001, estimated N mineralised in an irrigated maize crop (6.5 months) in Central Spain was: 73.3, 56.2 and 60.5 kg ha⁻¹, respectively. The relationship between EUF-Norg (organic nitrogen extracted from soil by electroultrafiltration) and mean mineralised N, in this experiment during the three seasons, was 1 mg EUF-Norg 100 g⁻¹ soil equivalent to 30 kg N ha⁻¹. The calibration was applied to EUF-Norg values from soil samples analysed before sowing. These values, together with the mineral N, were used to estimate available N and consequently the optimal N rate. To evaluate the effect of N fertiliser rate on NO₃ leaching and in N fertiliser-use efficiency (NFUE) three different rates of N were tested in 2000 and 2001: optimal N rate (N₀), conventional N rate (N_c) and a control no N (C). The N₀ rates for the maize crop were 150 and 130 kg N ha⁻¹ in 2000 and 2001, respectively. Nitrogen losses of nitrate due to leaching were lower with N₀ than with the N_c rate of 300 kg N ha⁻¹. The NFUE values were higher for N₀ at 78.8% and 83.5% in 2000 and 2001, respectively than for N_c at 48.7% and 49.3% in 2000 and 2001, respectively). However, in spite of the different levels of applied N, there was no difference in grain yield among treatments.
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Resumen

Optimización de la dosis de nitrógeno en suelos poco profundos, irrigados, bajo cultivo de maíz

Se propone una metodología para evaluar el nitrógeno (N) mineralizado en suelos petrocálcicos poco profundos, basada en los balances de N en parcelas no fertilizadas. Durante los años 1999, 2000 y 2001 el N mineralizado en un cultivo de maíz irrigado (6,5 meses) en la zona centro de España fue 73,3, 56,2 y 60,5 kg ha⁻¹, respectivamente. La relación observada en este experimento, entre EUF-Norg (nitrógeno orgánico extraído por electroultrafiltración) y el N mineralizado durante los tres periodos de cultivo (valores medios), fue 1 mg EUF-Norg 100 g⁻¹ suelo = 30 kg N ha⁻¹. Esta calibración se aplicó a los valores de EUF-Norg correspondientes a las muestras de suelo tomadas antes del cultivo. Para evaluar el efecto de las dosis de fertilizante sobre la lixiviación de nitrato y la eficiencia del uso de fertilizante nitrogenado (NFUE), se determinó el N asimilable y la dosis óptima de N, en base a esta calibración, junto con el N mineral del suelo. Los tratamientos aplicados fueron los siguientes: dosis óptima de N (N₀), dosis convencional (N_c) y control sin fertilizar (C). Las N₀ estimadas fueron 150 y 130 kg ha⁻¹, en 2000 y 2001, respectivamente. El nitrato perdido por lixiviación fue menor en la N₀ que en la N_c de 300 kg N ha⁻¹. Los valores de NFUE fueron más altos para N₀ (78,8% y 83,5% en 2000 y 2001, respectivamente) que para N_c (48,7% y 49,3% en 2000 y 2001, respectivamente). Sin embargo, a pesar de las diferencias en las dosis de N aplicadas en ambos tratamientos, no se observó ningún efecto sobre la producción de grano.

Palabras clave adicionales: balance de N, dosis óptima, EUF, suelos mediterráneos.

Introduction

In irrigated soils the mineralization of soil organic N during the growing season must be taken into account to determine available N and improve fertilizer efficiency. In these soils, net N mineralization is often very high in summer, due to soil moisture and temperature conditions. Even in soils with a low organic matter content, net N mineralisation can be high. Sánchez et al. (1998) estimated a net mineralization of 165 kg N ha⁻¹ during a maize (Zea mays L.) growing season from
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an irrigated sandy loam under Mediterranean climatic conditions. Quantification of net mineralised N under field conditions is difficult, although methods based on mineral N balance during the growing season for consecutive years have given useful results (Sánchez et al., 1998). Sánchez et al. (1998) determined N balance using: nitrate leaching, N mineral exchange in the soil during crop growth and crop N uptake. However, the method needs revision for stony and/or shallow soils. A high soil stone content or the presence of a petrocalcic horizon complicates the installation of the ceramic candles, which are necessary to measure nitrate leaching by this method. When stones are in contact with the ceramic candles a vacuum is not maintained during sampling and water is not collected in the candle. These complicated soils occupy large areas, especially in Mediterranean countries, where there is often a petrocalcic horizon close to the soil surface. Net N mineralization has not been determined for these soils.

Various soil tests have been proposed to estimate N available (Nav) for a crop, such as incubation (Stanford, 1982), or soil extraction methods (Németh, 1979; Houba et al., 1986; Mengel, 1991; Khan et al., 2001). The electro-ultrafiltration (EUF) extraction method proposed by Németh (1979) gives reliable information on different soil N forms. By applying an electric field, inorganic ions (NO$_3^-$ and NH$_4^+$) and organic N compounds (mainly peptides and proteins) are desorbed from soil colloids. Satisfactory relationships between analyses of EUF extracts (Total EUF-N in extracts, EUF-NO$_3^-$, EUF-NH$_4^+$ and EUF-N$_{org}$) and plant N uptake have been reported (Wiklicky and Németh, 1981; Wiklicky et al., 1983; Fürstenfeld and Németh, 1984; Poletschny and Fabian, 1989; Ziegler et al., 1992). To estimate Nav, Wiklicky and Németh (1981) proposed the equation:

$$\text{Nav} = (\text{EUF-NO}_3^-) \times a + (\text{EUF-N}_\text{org}) \times b$$  \[1\]

The Nav is the crop available N, in kg N ha$^{-1}$. The EUF-NH$_4^+$ was included in the EUF-N$_{org}$ fraction to calculate available N. The parameter a is used to obtain the amount of NO$_3^-$ in the upper part of the soil in kg N ha$^{-1}$, while b estimates kg N ha$^{-1}$ from organic matter. A relationship has been observed between b and mineralized N from organic matter (Nemeth, 1979). Wiklicky and Németh (1981) estimated a value of b of 50 for a sugar beet crop (Beta vulgaris L.) in a loess in Austria. The results of numerous recent field experiments showed that b differed with growing season, geographical region, management practices and soil type. Theoretically, for each combination of these factors, a separate calibration is necessary (Appel and Mengel, 1998).

Spanish soil conditions are very different from central European soils where most of the calibrations estimating available N using the EUF method were obtained.

The aims of this study were: i) to assess mineralised N in calcareous soils with a petrocalcic horizon at 50 cm under a Mediterranean-climate, based on the N balance of non-fertilized plots under field conditions; ii) to calibrate the EUF method for these soils, and iii) to assess the optimum N rate by means of the available soil N calculated from the sum of mineralised N and mineral N.

### Material and Methods

#### Soil characteristics

The experiments were conducted on an irrigated maize crop at Las Tiesas Field Station (5 km East of Albacete, Spain) in 1999, 2000 and 2001. The soil (Calcic Xerosol) is shallow. Soil depth was 50-55 cm, below which there was a 1-3 m thick petrocalcic horizon. This horizon gave a high degree of soil stoniness (20-30%). The soil pH was basic, with a high carbonate level and a bulk density of 1.30. It was a sandy loam.

#### Experimental design

Three N fertilizer treatments were evaluated in a randomized block design with three replicates. The experiment occupied 100 m$^2$ in 2000 and 2001. Treatments were: a non-fertilized control (C), conventional N rate (NC, 300 kg N ha$^{-1}$) in three split applications of 100 kg N ha$^{-1}$ (NH$_4$NO$_3$ 33.5% N) and an optimal dose (NO) applied as a single application 40 days after sowing, with the same fertiliser. The conventional rate is the mean rate used by farmers in the region. The optimal dose was estimated by difference between plant N uptake and available N. The available N was calculated by the EUF technique [Equation 1] using the previous year’s results. In 1999, three plots were used to estimate mineralised soil N in an unfertilised soil (C) during the maize cropping season, from 20 April to 30 October. The data were used to calculate the optimal N rate for 2000. Data from control plots in 2000 were used to estimate mineralised N in 2001. The value of b in Equation 1 was then recalibrated for the
next experimental year with mineralised N from the previous year. The \( \text{NO}_3 \) rates for the maize crop were 150 and 130 kg N ha\(^{-1}\) in 2000 and 2001, respectively.

**Crops and irrigation management**

Maize cv Pregia was sown at 86,580 seeds ha\(^{-1}\) into the previous year’s stubble on 25 April 1999, 8 May 2000 and 30 April 2001. The seedbed in all plots was fertilized with calcium superphosphate and potassium sulphate at 87 kg P ha\(^{-1}\) and 85 kg K ha\(^{-1}\). Plots were treated with a combination of 48% Alachlor (3 L ha\(^{-1}\)), 33% Pendimetaline (3 L ha\(^{-1}\)) and 24% Bromoxynil (0.75 L ha\(^{-1}\)), pre-emergence for weed control. Methylchloropyriphites (48%) and Cypermethrine (10%) were applied in irrigation water (dissolved in 70 m\(^3\) ha\(^{-1}\)) to control European corn borer (*Ostrinia nubilalis* Hübner). Crops were harvested in October.

Plots were watered periodically (9 irrigations in 1999, 10 in 2000 and 12 in 2001) depending of crop evapotranspiration (ETc). The amounts of irrigation water each year are included in Table 2. Crops were irrigated with an overhead mobile-line sprinkler system. Crop ETc was estimated via the crop coefficient Kc using the Penman-Monteith model (de Juan et al., 1996) with data from a meteorological station situated in the experimental field. The Kc was 0.40 for the first 70 days. It increased to 1.20 to maturity (130 days), and was 0.70 at harvest.

A year prior to the start of the experiment, a system for monitoring soil water-content in real time, using semipermanent multisensor capacitance probes (EnviroSCAN, Sentek Pty Ltd, South Australia) was installed (Buss, 1993). Four of the nine experimental plots were fitted with probes (50 mm interior diameter) to 50 cm depth, the \( \text{NO}_3 \) and \( \text{NC} \) treatments had 1 probe and there were 2 probes in C. Sensors were located in the probes at 5, 15, 35 and 45 cm depth (Fig. 1). The frequency signal (FS) from the apparatus was converted into a measure of the volumetric moisture content \( (\theta_v) \) using the calibration equation of Paltineau and Starr (1997) from a soil with similar texture. Measurements were taken hourly throughout crop growth in each year. Data was recorded on a data logger. Drainage was calculated from the water content curves from the EnviroSCAN (Sentek, 2000) data during crop growth. The EnviroSCAN system made it unnecessary to install tensiometers to determine the direction of soil water-flux, as this information was provided by the system. To calculate drainage the decrease in water reserve curves corresponding to sensors located near the drainage zone (45 cm depth) were used. Drainage (\( D \)) was calculated through the water balance of the soil profile (Arauzo et al., 2003) by:

\[
D = R + I - \text{ET} \pm \Delta S \tag{2}
\]

where \( R \) is rainfall (mm), \( I \) is irrigation (mm), \( \text{ET} \) evapotranspiration (mm) and \( \Delta S \) changes in soil water (mm) from 0 to 50 cm depth.

The determination of \( \text{NO}_3 \) leaching required the method to be adapted to the soil type. Three ceramic candles (63 mm interior diameter) were installed in each plot at a soil depth of 45 cm to obtain soil solution samples. To ensure a vacuum it was necessary to ensure there was no contact between the ceramic candle and the petrocalcic horizon. Water samples were taken weekly from the ceramic candles and nitrate concentration determined. Leaching of \( \text{NO}_3 \) was calculated as the product of drained water and \( \text{NO}_3 \) concentration in the soil solution (Díez et al., 1996, 2000).

**Soil sampling and analysis**

In March, in each year, soil samples were taken from control plots to characterize the soil and establish N mineralised by N balance. Fresh soil samples were air-dried and sieved through a 2 mm. Soil characteristics are shown in Table 1.

Soil pH was determined in water by a calomel glass electrode (ISO 10390, 1994). Soil organic matter content was determined following ISO 14235 (1998). Carbonates were measured by gasometry (ISO 10693, 1995). Particle size distribution was measured using a Robinson pipette (ISO 11277, 1998). Total N (\( N_t \)) in the EUF
extracts was determined by UV radiation digestion and subsequent oxidation with potassium persulphate in an alkaline medium (Díez, 1988). The N determination in extracts was done colourimetrically using an AAII Autoanalyzer (Technicon Hispania, Madrid) with N1-naphthylethylenediamine. Analysis for NH4-N was performed using the same device but with nitroprussiate. The EUF-Norg was estimated as the difference between EUF-N and EUF-(NO3– plus NH4+).

The EUF method used was that of Németh (1979). Samples were taken from the ploughed soil layer (0-30 cm) in March. A 5 g sample of air-dried soil (< 1 mm) was weighed and introduced into an EUF cell (Vogel S-724).

The soil profile was divided into two sections (0-30 cm and 30-50 cm) to determine N balance. In the first section, samples were taken at 15 cm for EUF extraction of Ninitial and Nfinal. The level of NO3–, NH4+ and organic N were also determined. The second section was sampled at 40 cm. Samples were dried, passed through a 2 mm sieve and extracted with 2M KCl 1:5 solution/soil ratio and shaken for 2 h. Samples were centrifuged and NO3–, NH4+ were analysed. There was little organic matter at this soil depth.

**Nitrogen balance**

Nitrogen balance was measured, in the control plots, to estimate mineralised N and thus estimate b. The balance was calculated following Sánchez et al. (1998):

\[
N_{\text{min}} = (N_i - N_f) + N_{\text{leached}} + N_{\text{taken up}}
\]

where \(N_{\text{min}}\) = mineralised N, \(N_i\) = soil initial mineral N content and \(N_f\) = soil final mineral N content. Initial and final refer to the soil N before sowing and after harvest, respectively.

The mineral N level in the 0-30 cm soil section was obtained by the EUF method. Values for the 30-50 cm section were obtained through extraction with 2M KCl solution. The values \(N_{\text{min}}, N_{\text{leached}}\) and \(N_{\text{taken up}}\) refer to the crop growth period. Denitrification and volatilisation were not considered as they are generally negligible in Mediterranean climates from non-fertilised soils (Arcara et al., 1999; Sánchez et al., 2001).

Plant N uptake (aboveground biomass) was measured in 10 randomly selected plants, from a 5 m strip of two adjacent rows in the middle of each plot. Samples were divided into: stalk, leaf, bract, cob and grain, and oven-dried for 24 h at 60°C and 2 h at 80°C to determine crop dry matter (DM). Nitrogen concentration in plant fractions was measured by the Kjeldahl method (AOAC, 1990). Samples were pre-treated with a solution of salicylic and sulphuric acids (Bremner, 1965). Plant N uptake was calculated by multiplying plant fraction yields by their N concentration. Grain yield was calculated at the standard grain moisture content of 14%.

The value of \(b\) [Equation 1] was calculated by dividing \(N_{\text{min}}\) by \(N_{\text{org}}\) extracted by EUF. With this method, N available in the following year was determined using a recalibrated \(b\).

Nitrogen fertiliser-use efficiency (NFUE) was determined for each treatment and each year (Garabet et al., 1998).

\[
\text{NFUE} = \frac{(N \text{ uptake in fertilised plot} - N \text{ uptake in control plot})}{(\text{applied } N)} \times 100
\]

**Results**

Mean cumulative drainage during crop growth was 158, 119 and 78 mm in 1999, 2000 and 2001, respectively. This was 28.5%, 15.1% and 9.6% of total water applied. Table 2 shows the water balance for each year and also rainfall and irrigation for the three years of the experiment. Water NO3– concentration in irrigation water was < than 3 mg L\(^{-1}\).

The NO3– concentration in solutions from the ceramic candles were generally low (Table 3), especially

### Table 1. Physicochemical properties of the soil at the start of the experiment in the ploughed soil layer (Mean ± SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH (H2O)</td>
<td>7.7 ± 0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk density (Mg m(^{-3}))</td>
<td>1.30 ± 0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C (g kg(^{-1}))</td>
<td>8.70 ± 0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic matter (g kg(^{-1}))</td>
<td>15.0 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay (%)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silt (%)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand (%)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2. Water balance during the experiment (mm). Drainage calculated by EnviroSCAN (Sentek, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Rain</th>
<th>Irrigation</th>
<th>Drainage</th>
<th>ETc</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>683</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in the control and N\textsubscript{O} treatment plots. The N\textsubscript{C} plots had higher NO\textsubscript{3} levels due to the higher applied N. The low soil NO\textsubscript{3} concentration and a control of irrigation diminished NO\textsubscript{3} leaching. Average crop season NO\textsubscript{3} losses during 2000 and 2001 were 2.1, 11.1 and 3.6 kg N ha\textsuperscript{-1} for the C, N\textsubscript{C} and N\textsubscript{O} treatments, respectively.

Table 4 shows the N balance of non-fertilised maize plots during crop growth. Variations in soil mineral N for the maize were negative, at –22.1 kg N ha\textsuperscript{-1} in 1999, –43.9 kg in 2000 and –23.5 in 2001. This suggests that available N reserves were decreased in the soil during crop growth. This was mainly due to N uptake by the maize, whereas leaching losses were small.

Table 3 shows the N balance of non-fertilised maize plots during crop growth, 1999, 2000 and 2001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatments\textsuperscript{2}</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[\text{NO}_3\text{-N}] &amp; NO\textsubscript{3}-leached &amp; [\text{NO}_3\text{-N}] &amp; NO\textsubscript{3}-leached &amp; [\text{NO}_3\text{-N}] &amp; NO\textsubscript{3}-leached</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C              &amp; 5.7 ± 5.2 &amp; 3.2 ± 0.5 &amp; 4.8 ± 4.8 &amp; 2.6 ± 0.3 &amp; 0.94 ± 1.2 &amp; 1.65 ± 0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N\textsubscript{C}     &amp; 18.1\textsuperscript{a} ± 16 &amp; 7.9 ± 0.6 &amp; 17.0\textsuperscript{b} ± 7.5 &amp; 14.30 ± 2.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N\textsubscript{O}     &amp; 6.6\textsuperscript{a} ± 6.6 &amp; 5.5 ± 0.2 &amp; 1.1\textsuperscript{a} ± 1.8 &amp; 1.70 ± 0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1} Mean ± standard deviation. Data based on 7 samples in 1999 and 2000 and 11 samples in 2001 with nine replicate extraction cups per fertiliser. \textsuperscript{2} C: control; N\textsubscript{C}: conventional nitrogen rate; N\textsubscript{O}: optimal nitrogen rate. \textsuperscript{a,b}: in each column [\[\text{NO}_3\text{-N}\]], mean values followed by the same letter are not significantly different (\(P > 0.05\), Duncan test).

Table 4 shows: \(\Delta N\) (Table 4), N leached (Table 3), crop N uptake, mineralised N \([\text{Equation (3)}]\), EUF-N\textsubscript{org} and \(b\) values, corresponding to each year’s crop in which N balance was monitored.

Data for grain production and N absorbed in each treatment for each year is shown in Figure 2. In 2000 there was a decrease in both absorbed N and grain production in control plots (Table 6), due to a N deficit. In the same year there were significant differences (\(P < 0.01\)) in N absorbed between the N\textsubscript{O} and N\textsubscript{C} treatment plots. However, this did not translate into differences in grain production. This means that the N\textsubscript{C} plants had «luxury» N absorption. In 2001 these results were repeated, i.e., there were no significant difference in


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Depth (cm)</th>
<th>Mineral N (mg N 100 g\textsuperscript{-1})</th>
<th>(\Sigma N) (0-50)</th>
<th>Nf – Ni</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>12.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nf</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nf</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>1.10\textsuperscript{a} ± 0.12</td>
<td>42.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>0.70\textsuperscript{b} ± 0.17</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td>61.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nf</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>0.32 ± 0.07</td>
<td>12.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nf</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.05</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>18.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>0.92 ± 0.08</td>
<td>35.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ni</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>0.60 ± 0.09</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>51.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nf</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>0.55 ± 0.14</td>
<td>21.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nf</td>
<td>30-50</td>
<td>0.25 ± 0.05</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>27.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} 1 mg N 100 g\textsuperscript{-1} = 30 (cm depth) × 1.3 (bulk density) kg ha\textsuperscript{-1}. \textsuperscript{b} 1 mg N 100 g\textsuperscript{-1} = 20 (cm depth) × 1.3 (bulk density) kg ha\textsuperscript{-1}. Ni: initial N before sowing. N\textsubscript{c}: final N, after crop growth.
grain production between the $N_C$ and $N_O$ plots, despite the difference in applied N.

The results show that optimal dose of N ($N_O$) obtained by taking N mineralised into account ($b$) represents a better NFUE, 78.8 and 83.5 in 2000 and 2001, respectively, than the conventional N doses ($N_C$) which were 48.7 and 49.3 respectively for the same years.

Discussion

Table 2 shows that drainage was higher in 1999 (158 mm) due to rainfall of 198 mm. In this area, under conventional irrigation practice, drainage usually exceeds 20% of applied water (Román et al., 1996). However, during crop growth in 2000 and 2001 drainage was < 20%.

The generally low NO$_3$ concentration in this shallow soil (Table 3) can be explained because the high level of stones and the shallow soil depth may have stimulated maize roots to grow into all of the available soil above the limestone crust, removing NO$_3$.

The amount of mineralised N was similar over the three years at 73.3 kg N ha$^{-1}$ in 1999, 56.2 kg in 2000 and 60.5 kg in 2001) (Table 5). This indicates that N mineralisation is characteristic of the soil under these weather conditions for maize in this area. The values are lower than that of Sánchez et al. (1998) for maize of 160 kg ha$^{-1}$ in a deep (2 m) stoneless soil. A comparison of the two situations indicates that the soil volume involved in N mineralisation was less in this work because of the shallow, stony soil, typical of this area.

The parameter $b$ [Eq. 1] was calculated from $N_{min}$: $b = N_{min}/EUF-N_{org}$. It varied between 27.2 in 2000 and 33.2 in 2001 (Table 5). In 2000, available N was calculated using the $b$ value estimated from the previous year ($b = 29.3, N_{av} = 122$ kg ha$^{-1}$). An optimum dose of 150 kg N ha$^{-1}$ was established, assuming an efficiency for N fertiliser of 70%, as estimated in previous experiments (Sánchez et al., 1998). In 2001, available N was estimated from the previous year's N balance of the control plots ($b = 27$). The N optimal value ($N_O$) was 130 kg N ha$^{-1}$.

Some authors have reported $b$ differed depending on growing season, geographical region, climatology, management practices and soil type (Table 6). Generally, high $b$ values are associated with irrigated summer crops (e.g. maize) in hot climates (Sánchez et al., 1998).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>$\Delta N$ (kg ha$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>N leached (kg ha$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>N uptake (kg ha$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>N mineralised (kg ha$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>EUF-$N_{org}$ (mg 100 g$^{-1}$)</th>
<th>$b$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>−32.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>−42.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>−23.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\Delta N$ (see Table 4); N leached (see Table 3); N uptake (Fig. 2). Mineralised N = $\Delta N$ + leached N + N uptake. $b$ = N mineralised/EUF-Norg.

Figure 2. Nitrogen uptake and grain yield under different nitrogen treatments ($\pm$ SD) in 1999, 2000 and 2001. Control: unfertilized; $N_C$: conventional N rate of 300 kg N ha$^{-1}$, and $N_O$: optimal N rate of 150 and 130 kg N ha$^{-1}$ in 2000 and 2001, respectively. Different letters above bars indicate statistically different values (P < 0.05).
et al., 1998). Unirrigated winter cereals (e.g. wheat, Triticum aestivum L.) give low $b$ values (Steffens et al., 1990; Sánchez et al., 1998). Unirrigated maize and sugar beet grown in central Europe, in summer, give intermediate $b$ values (Wiklicky et al., 1983; Horn, 1990). This work gives a $b$ value $\approx 30$ (27.2 to 33.2), for the following combination of factors: a summer irrigated maize crop, grown in a shallow stony soil. The results show that shallow irrigated soil must be included as a factor which can affect $b$. These calibrations for $b$ can be used in areas with the same irrigated crop and with similar climatic conditions.

The method proposed in this paper, based on N balance in unfertilised plots under field conditions, can determine net mineralised N in shallow irrigated soils. Net mineralised N during crop growth was similar over the three years, but was less than reported in deeper soils.

Soil tests based on the EUF method could be used to estimate available N and $b$ in the Wiklicky and Németh (1981) equation recalculated for shallow soils. It was nearly 30 (1 mg EUF-Norg-N 100g$^{-1}$ soil = 30 kg N ha$^{-1}$).

Optimal N ($N_o$) application gave a similar grain production to the conventional rate ($N_c$). This was despite an appreciable difference in the amount of fertiliser N applied. However, there were significant differences in absorbed N due to «luxury» absorption by plants in plots given the conventional 300 kg N ha$^{-1}$. Optimisation of N fertiliser application, based on determination of available N, reduces N losses leaching and improves the efficiency (NFUE) of the applied fertiliser. As soil mineralised N is low compared to N uptake by maize, in this agroecosystem it is common to fertilise with higher N rates than in deeper soils.

Over the two years 2000 and 2001, with N fertilisation, the $N_o$ treatment gave higher NFUE values (79.1 and 58.2), than the $N_c$ treatment (48.8 and 49.3 in 2000 and 2001, respectively). The NFUE usually ranges from 40 to 70 with an upper limit of 80 (Greenwood and Draycott, 1989).

### Acknowledgements

The authors thank the Castilla La Mancha Regional Government and the FEDER program for funding (Project Nº 1FD97-0921-C02-01). They also wish to thank the Agroforestry Department of Castilla La Mancha University and Las Tiesas Experimental Field (Albacete) for their help with fieldwork, and M.D. Atienza for laboratory assistance.

### References


### Table 6. Reported $b$ values for different crops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crop</th>
<th>Soil type</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Irrigation</th>
<th>Growth period</th>
<th>$b$</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sugar beet</td>
<td>Loess</td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Wiklicky and Németh (1981)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>Xerofluvent</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Spring-Summer</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Sánchez et al. (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter wheat</td>
<td>Xerofluvent</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Sánchez et al. (1998)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maize</td>
<td>Loess</td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Horn (1990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winter wheat</td>
<td></td>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Steffens et al. (1990)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


