



**THE ROLE OF PROLINE CONCENTRATIONS IN IMPROVING THE YIELD OF MAIZE (*ZEA MAYS L.*) PLANT UNDER WATER STRESS CONDITIONS**  
**Raisan Ahmed Al-Zobiady<sup>1</sup>, Ahmed habeeb Al-mamoori<sup>2</sup>, Karrar Falah Hadi Alkhafagi<sup>3</sup> and Ahmad Jaafar Sadeq Abakah<sup>4</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Drug Control, Ministry of Interior, Iraq.

<sup>2</sup>Department of Biology, College of Science for women, University of Babylon, Iraq.

<sup>3</sup>College of Agriculture, Al-Qasim Green University, Iraq

<sup>4</sup>Directorate of Agriculture, Babylon, Iraq

**Abstract**

A field experiment was carried out during the autumn season (2016 -2017) in the field of one of farmers in the Nile - Mahaouil –Babylon province within line latitude north 32.31' and east longitude 44.21' .To study the role of proline acid in improving the yield of maize (*Zea mays L.*) under conditions of water stress, according to the randomized complete block design (RCBD) Factorial experiments with three replicates, The first factor Extended irrigation frequency was repeated every 6 days, irrigated every 12 days and irrigated once every 6 days, followed by a 12-day regimen (I<sub>1</sub>, I<sub>2</sub> and I<sub>3</sub>) respectively. The second factor sprayed with concentrations proline acid of (0.50.100 and 150) mg.L<sup>-1</sup> symbol with code (P<sub>0</sub>, P<sub>1</sub>, P<sub>2</sub> and P<sub>3</sub>) respectively. The results showed that plant height and surface characteristics And the chlorophyll content index in the leaf under the cannula reached with mean (192.81 cm, 4868 cm<sup>2</sup>, 60.42 SPAD),The yield of I<sub>1</sub> irrigation was higher in the number of rows in Ear, the number of grains in the row, the number of grains in Ear and the grain yield in giving the highest averages (15.01 rows. ear<sup>-1</sup>, 36.64 grain. row<sup>-1</sup>, 541.1 grain. ear<sup>-1</sup>, 6.43 tons E<sup>-1</sup>) respectively, whereas the proline was superior to the concentration P<sub>2</sub> in plant height and chlorophyll content index in the leaf under the clover with mean (172.03 cm, 50.10 SPAD) respectively, while P<sub>3</sub> was higher than the total leaf area of the plant,While the concentration of P<sub>3</sub> above the characteristics of the above and gave the highest averages (14.03 rows. ear<sup>-1</sup>, 29.62 grain. row<sup>-1</sup>, 393.1 grain. ear<sup>-1</sup>, 5.12 tons E<sup>-1</sup>) sequentially which was not significantly different with P<sub>2</sub> concentration. Interference does not interfere with the irrigation duration and concentration of proline used.

**Keywords:** Irrigation timing, spraying proline, growth maize.

**Introduction**

Water is very important to plant survival as solvent and vector liquid for most materials, it is prepared to energy of carbonic synthesis which is important mechanism for making organic food (Daryanto *et al.*, 2016).

The water loss in plant protoplast under drought conditions (Absence of moisture which important for plant growth ) leads to raise ions concentration in protoplast caused toxicity, protein degradation and membranes fusion (AL-Sahoki *et al.*, 2009), addition to its negative effect in metabolism processes which included synthesis efficiency reduction and accumulation of organic acids like (malate, citrate, lactate etc.), resulting in the lack of protein production plant in general (Fereses and Soriano, 2007).

Iraq site is located into dry area, so this was making it threatened by lack water because the Receding of Seasonal rains to low levels (under 100

mm) and Climate Variations like high heat with lack in rivers water, so the farming of any summer crop is risked under lack water conditions, this conditions lead to search new methods in water use such as deficit irrigation Which means not to give the crop the full needs of water, but the deletion of the effects of the least impact on the yield (Almini, 2004).

Water stress on corn crop lead to increase free amino acid such as proline which increase its level in leaves 10 more than in leaves of wheat, rice and bean with 100 more than in sunflower and tobacco (Taie *et al.*, 2013). Another studies indicated increase proline under stress conditions, so any external addition of proline will be increasing stress tolerance (Zadehbaghri *et al.*, 2014) from decrease in osmotic stress in cells (increase the moisture effort) and increase cell ability to pull water because a proline is Considered as osmotic regulator and cell membranes stability in maize (Shahid *et al.*, 2014; Al-Shaheen *et al.*, 2014) and many physiological, morphological changes which caused

from proline, the treatment in proline lead to growth improvement and increase yield, its composite in many crops (Farhad *et al.*, 2015; Abbas and Alak, 2016; Al-Meini, 2009), noted the increase period among irrigation from 7 to 14 days with 200 kg nitrogen fertilizer caused reduction in plant height, leaf area, yield and its composite in maize.

Studies showed that the number of ears/plant did not change much under the prevailing stress conditions for water stress and nutrients, but the effectiveness of the ear in containing the number of grains/ear is the most affected by the stress (Alousi, 2005). Also found that the decrease in maize grains yield by 24% Rows in ear, number of grains per row and weight of grain, which resulted from water stress due to water occlusion during different growth stages (Kebede *et al.*, 2014).

Hayat *et al.* (2012) note any addition proline kept plants from water stress effects and increase its tolerant, proline do not only work as osmotic regular but it work as claw for metals, antioxidant, transduction molecular, improvement of mitochondria functions, effect in plant growth and increase activity of gene expression in some genes responsible for abiotic stress tolerance and the basic role of proline is modification of cell effort under abiotic stress (Savaure and Szabados, 2009).

Another studies indicator spray proline on plants improve the tolerance of negative effects from water stress (Ali *et al.*, 2013; Ashraf and Fooleed, 2007). Mohammad, (2014) found spray proline on plants 200 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> with 20 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> abscisic acid decreased from water stress under loss 75% available water and it gave increase in plant height, leaf area and grains yield. noted spray proline 200 mm on maize plans gave increase in plant height, leaf area, chlorophyll content and grains yield with composite (number of classes/ear, number grains/ear, grain 100 weight and plant yield), Saddon and Zakaria, (2016) indicator to increase in plant height in maize under 200 mg.L<sup>-1</sup> proline spry caused increase in number of leaves, leaf area Compared to did not spraying and these results are similar to those obtained (Mohammad, 2014).

Maize is one of summer crops needs high water requirements (750-900 mm), it need different irrigation methods to less water use from the crop for getting high water efficiency, so this study conducted to study effect increase period among irrigations and spray proline on some vegetative and yield traits in middle areas of Iraq.

### Materials and Methods

Field experiment was carried out during the autumn season (2016) in the field of one of the farmers located in the Nile / Hilla district /Babil province, In order to study the effect of different concentrations of

propylene acid and its relationship with water stress in some of the characteristics of growth and yield and components of maize crop, A sample of the soil was taken at a depth of 0-0.50 m randomly and from several areas prior to the beginning of the cultivation process to identify some physical and chemical field soil properties. After mixing, the sample was taken as representative and the results were as in Table (1).

**Table 1 :** Some chemical and physical properties of soil

The value	Unit	Property
161	gm.kg <sup>-1</sup> soil	Sand
480	gm.kg <sup>-1</sup> soil	Salt
359	gm.kg <sup>-1</sup> soil	Clay
Saltly clay mix		Tissue
36	mg.Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil	N Actve
28	mg.Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil	P Actve
156	mg.Kg <sup>-1</sup> soil	K Actve
3.30	dc.m <sup>-1</sup>	Electrical conductivity (soil paste extract)
7.8		PH

\*Soil analysis was conducted in the central laboratory of the Department of Soil and Water Resources / Faculty of Agriculture / AL-Qassem Green University

The soil of the experiment was plowed by two orthogonal plows using the plowshare plow and was fitted with disk compartments and was sorted and divided into experimental units according to the design of the randomized complete block design RCBD in the order of the global experiments and three replicates, planted the seeds of yellow maize (dawn-1) on 23 July 2016 (first irrigation) on lines and the area of experimental unit 3 m × 4m, Which included 5 lines length of three meters and the distance between the line and another 0.75 m, between Joura and another 0.25 m to obtain the density of plant 44000 plant hectares.1.5 m intervals were left between experimental units and 3 m intervals were left between the replicates to prevent leakage of water between the plates. The plants were reduced to one plant after 14 days of germination.

Add urea fertilizer at a rate of 400 kg. Ha<sup>-1</sup> and in two batches: the first consisted of 200 kg. Ha<sup>-1</sup> with 260 kg. Ha<sup>-1</sup> of the triple superphosphate in agriculture. The second batch was added after five weeks of planting Seamier Critic L., a yellow corn stalker, was tested using 10% effective diazinon and 6 kg. Ha<sup>-1</sup> received at the heart of the plant after 20 days of planting and three times and with a time interval of 10 days. The bush was removed by hand. The experiment included three irrigation regimens (6 days), irrigating every 12 days and irrigation, alternating once every 6 days, followed by irrigation every 12 days. (I1, I2, and I3) respectively, while the second factor represented four proline

spraying factors: 0, 50, 100 and 150 mg. Its code (P0, P1, P2 and P3) is sequentially.

The concentration of the proline acid was prepared from a primary solution of 1000 mg / l. -1 by dissolving 1 g of propylene acid at 1000 mg / l. In accordance with the mitigation law, the concentrations used were as follows:-

Add the turbo-propylene acid to the vegetative group in the eight-leaf phase and re-spray to the same concentrations in the stage of 12 sheets, put the solution in a 16-liter backlit spray, taking into account the times of early morning or evening spraying to avoid high temperatures and the impact of high winds, A spray material (Zahi) was added to the spray solution in a quantity of 15 cm<sup>3</sup> per 100 liters to reduce the surface tension of the water and to ensure the complete wetness of the leaves

#### Attributes Studied

**Plant height (cm):** Taken as an average of ten plants from each experimental unit and measured from the surface level of the soil to the lower node of the male bulb

**The total leaf area of the plant (cm<sup>2</sup>):** Calculated after the completion of the female reproduction of the following equation taken from EL-Sahookie (1985) by multiplying the length of the leaf (cm) in the maximum width (cm) of the leaf under the main clove  $\times 0.75$

**Directory of Chlorophyll content in the leaf under the SPAD:** was measured using a Japanese portable device manufactured by the company (Minolta) as an average of three readings per leaf and ten sample plants in the stage of female flowering

**Number of rows (row. ear<sup>-1</sup>):** As of five Aranis of the intermediate lines and extracted the average.

**The number of grains per row (P<sup>1</sup>):** calculated as the mean of five Aranis of the middle lines.

**The number of grains in Ear (Ear 1):** was calculated from the number of grains multiplied by the row and the number of rows in Ear as an average of five Aranos from the intermediate lines.

**Weight of grain (gm):** 500 tablets were taken randomly from the seeds of Aranis plants of the lines guarded from each experimental unit secondary and dried the electric oven at a temperature of 65 m 0 and until the stability of weight.

**Total grain yield (kg.ha<sup>-1</sup>):** The weight of grain was extracted after subtraction of five arabes, which was taken randomly from each experimental unit and about to hectare<sup>-1</sup> on the basis of the density used in the study

**Biological yield (kg.ha<sup>-1</sup>):** harvested five plants taken randomly (all parts of the plant except roots), then dried the initial drying under the sun and then dried in an oven at 65 °C for 72 hours, and dried at 105 °C for three hours Weight after weight stability (AOAC, 1975) and weights were then weighed to the number of plants per hectare.

**Harvesting index (%):** By dividing the grain yield on the biological score multiplied by 100. (Statistical data were statistically analyzed using the GenStat program and the mean was measured by LSD at a probability level of (0.05).

#### Results

The table of arithmetic averages table (3) shows significant differences in irrigation intervals in most studied traits, as She excelled The irrigation treatment (I<sub>1</sub>) in the plant height, total leaf area of the plant and the chlorophyll content index in the leaf under the ear were superior. The average yield was 192.81 cm, 4868 cm<sup>2</sup> and 60 SPAD, Sequentially Compared to the irrigation treatment (I<sub>2</sub>) given lowest mean of the above characteristics was 149.81 cm, 3974 cm<sup>2</sup> and 36.63 SPAD respectively. This result is consistent with the results of the mechanisms of Ali *et al.* (2007), which indicated that low photosynthesis Due to the effect of drought on the chloroplast the leaf thus reduced the chlorophyll content of the leaf and change p The gaps are reduced by reducing the leaf area (Dawood, 2016; Anjum *et al.*, 2011; Hayat *et al.*, 2012).

The same table (3) indicates the significant effect of proline concentrations in both plant height, chlorophyll content index and leaf area. The concentration of proline P<sub>2</sub> did not differ significantly from P<sub>3</sub> concentration and gave the highest height of the plant and the largest guide of chlorophyll content of the leaf under the ears with averages of (172.03 cm and 50.10 cm<sup>2</sup>), while the non-spray treatment P<sub>0</sub> (comparison) Less means (164.60 cm and 46.11 cm<sup>2</sup>), while the leaf area gave P<sub>3</sub> the highest mean (4477 SPAD) and did not differ significantly with the P<sub>2</sub> concentration while the non-spray treatment P<sub>0</sub> (comparison), With a mean average of 4255 SPAD. This corresponds to the results of the mechanisms of (Ashraf and Foolad, 2007) In addition, some studies have suggested that propylene spray leads to a hormonal balance by controlling the opening and closing of the stomata and thus maintaining the chlorophyll ratio of the decrease and thus increasing the leaf area (Sadon and Zuraini, 2016).

The results of Table (4) showed a significant effect of irrigation periods on both yield traits and components, while these dates did not have a significant effect on grain weight. The irrigation duration (I<sub>1</sub>)

recorded the highest mean number of rows in ear, number of grains per row, 15.01, ear<sup>-1</sup>, 36.64 grains, 541.1 grains. ear<sup>-1</sup>, 6.43 tons<sup>-1</sup>) respectively, which differed significantly with the duration of irrigation (I<sub>2</sub>) and (I<sub>3</sub>).

Table (4) shows that there is a significant effect of the proline concentrations in the traits of the crop and its components. P<sub>3</sub> gave the highest average number of rows of ear, the number of grains in the row, the number of grains in the ear, and the grain yield reached (14.03 rows. ear<sup>-1</sup>, 29.62 grains. row, 393.1 grain.ear<sup>-1</sup> 1, 5.12 tons.hI<sup>-1</sup>) respectively, which differed significantly from the rest of the concentrations while the non-spraying P<sub>0</sub> (comparison) gave the lowest arithmetic mean (14.03 rows. ear<sup>-1</sup>, 29.62 grains. row, 393.1 grain.ear<sup>-1</sup> 1, 5.12 tons.hI<sup>-1</sup>).

The results of Table (4) indicate that the spacing of the irrigation periods caused a significant reduction in the biological yield and the harvest index. The irrigation period (I<sub>1</sub>) recorded the highest biological yield and harvest index with an average of 17.82 tons.hI<sup>-1</sup> and

38.3% Which differed significantly with the treatment (I<sub>3</sub>). While the irrigation treatment (I<sub>2</sub>) gave the lowest average of 13.44 tons.hI<sup>-1</sup> and 27.7% The decrease in the biological yield is due to the decrease of the components of the dry matter represented by the height of the plant. Table 3 The leaf area Table (3) The number of rows in ear and the number of grains in the row reflected the total yield.

The results of Table (4) showed that there was a significant effect of the proline concentrations in the biological yield and the harvest index. Concentration (P<sub>3</sub>) gave the highest mean of the biological yield (16.91 tons.hI<sup>-1</sup>). It did not differ significantly from the (P<sub>2</sub>) While the treatment of non-spraying P<sub>0</sub> (comparison) The lowest average biological yield reached (14.87 tons.hI<sup>-1</sup>), The harvest index gave the spray with the proline when treatment (P<sub>2</sub>) Highest value reached (34.2)% did not differ significantly from the concentration P<sub>3</sub> while the non-spray P<sub>0</sub> (comparison) gave the lowest value (32.6%).

**Table 3:** Effect of irrigation period and proline precipitation in some growth and yield of maize

Number of grain per ear	Number of row per ear	guide of Chlorophyll content in the leaf under the ear (SPAD)	Total leaf area of plant (cm <sup>2</sup> )	Plant Height (cm)	Concentration of proline acid	irrigation period
35.53	13.73	58.03	4832	188.97	P <sub>0</sub>	I <sub>1</sub>
36.10	14.63	59.09	4885	191.07	P <sub>1</sub>	
36.40	15.10	62.57	4733	196.17	P <sub>2</sub>	
38.53	16.57	61.99	5020	195.03	P <sub>3</sub>	
19.83	9.93	34.50	3821	146.33	P <sub>0</sub>	I <sub>2</sub>
20.73	10.30	35.13	3911	147.87	P <sub>1</sub>	
21.70	10.50	38.20	4138	156.00	P <sub>2</sub>	
22.53	11.60	38.70	4025	149.03	P <sub>3</sub>	
26.27	11.93	45.81	4111	158.50	P <sub>0</sub>	I <sub>3</sub>
27.03	12.97	46.92	4175	160.23	P <sub>1</sub>	
28.47	13.20	49.53	4338	163.93	P <sub>2</sub>	
27.80	13.93	48.27	4387	165.73	P <sub>3</sub>	
<b>Ns</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>LSD 0.05</b>	
36.64	15.01	60.42	4868	192.81	I <sub>1</sub>	
21.20	10.58	36.63	3974	149.81	I <sub>2</sub>	
27.39	13.01	47.63	4253	162.10	I <sub>3</sub>	
<b>1.12</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>2.820</b>	<b>104.4</b>	<b>4.506</b>	<b>LSD 0.05</b>	
27.21	11.87	46.11	4255	164.60	P <sub>0</sub>	
27.96	12.63	47.05	4324	166.39	P <sub>1</sub>	
28.86	12.93	50.10	4403	172.03	P <sub>2</sub>	
29.62	14.03	49.65	4477	169.93	P <sub>3</sub>	
<b>1.31</b>	<b>1.10</b>	<b>3.25</b>	<b>120.6</b>	<b>5.04</b>	<b>LSD 0.05</b>	

**Table 4:** Effect of irrigation period and proline acid in Characteristics and yield of maize

Harvest Index (%)	Biological yield (ton.ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Grain Yield (ton.ha <sup>-1</sup> )	Weight 500 grain(g)	Number of grain per ear	Concentration of proline acid	Irrigation period
37.1	16.89	6.21	110.40	510.0	P <sub>0</sub>	<b>I<sub>1</sub></b>
38.1	16.93	6.31	112.07	528.3	P <sub>1</sub>	
37.6	18.26	6.63	110.77	563.3	P <sub>2</sub>	
42.0	19.20	6.57	109.33	563.0	P <sub>3</sub>	
<b>Separator</b>						
24.8	13.10	3.25	102.60	196.6	P <sub>0</sub>	<b>I<sub>2</sub></b>
25.1	13.20	3.31	101.63	214.0	P <sub>1</sub>	
31.5	14.09	3.41	100.13	236.0	P <sub>2</sub>	
31.3	13.36	3.64	106.33	238.7	P <sub>3</sub>	
<b>Separator</b>						
33.0	14.63	4.78	103.37	331.9	P <sub>0</sub>	<b>I<sub>3</sub></b>
33.6	14.77	4.85	105.13	350.5	P <sub>1</sub>	
31.5	17.67	4.77	109.80	373.0	P <sub>2</sub>	
34.7	18.17	5.15	105.40	377.7	P <sub>3</sub>	
<b>Ns</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>1.075</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>LSD 0.05</b>	
38.3	17.82	6.43	110.64	541.1	<b>I<sub>1</sub></b>	
27.7	13.44	3.40	102.67	221.3	<b>I<sub>2</sub></b>	
34.6	16.31	4.89	105.92	358.3	<b>I<sub>3</sub></b>	
<b>3.40</b>	<b>1.41</b>	<b>0.193</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>37.79</b>	<b>LSD 0.05</b>	
32.6	14.87	4.75	105.46	346.2	<b>P<sub>0</sub></b>	
33.2	14.97	4.82	106.28	364.3	<b>P<sub>1</sub></b>	
34.2	16.67	4.94	106.90	390.8	<b>P<sub>2</sub></b>	
34.1	16.91	5.12	107.02	393.1	<b>P<sub>3</sub></b>	
<b>Ns</b>	<b>1.63</b>	<b>0.223</b>	<b>Ns</b>	<b>43.64</b>	<b>LSD 0.05</b>	

### Discussions

The highest yield was achieved in the treatment of I<sub>1</sub>. This was because of short-term irrigation increased the water availability of the plant and did not suffer from stress, which reduces the growth rate, and increasing the frequency of irrigation with spaced time I<sub>2</sub> resulted to a significant decrease in grain yield 47% compared to the I<sub>1</sub> treatment.

The results of Table (4) showed This is due to the decrease in its components. The number of rows decreased by the number of grains, the number of grains per row, and the decrease in the number of grains of ears is due to the reduction of the number of ears in the ear that resulted. (Alusi, 2005). Because the number of grains is related to the number of grain sites that arise early and the exposure to stress at this stage causes a decrease in the length of the ears and the number of grain sites, (Carpici, 2009 and Okay, 2006).

Studies suggest that exposure of maize plant to water stress during of the drought-induced shortage of fertile flowers and the number of grains in plants exposed to water stress before flowering and single-grain weight when exposed to post-flower stress can be

attributed to Hormonal effects (Kaya, 2006), in addition to the tension at the time of flowering lead to the drying of pollen and then increase in the interval of female flowers anthesis and loss of leaves in early time and then the number of grains (Araus *et al.*, 2012).

As well as the water stress, which may lead to the failure of the pollination and fertilization, which is related to the availability of moisture at this stage, pollen grains to moisture to stick to the anthers in addition to the evolution of the tube after the pollination of pollen when the lack of moisture Turgut and others (2005).

The oxidative processes which presumably increased during aging stress, increase in aging period caused an increased in solute leakage and a decrease in germination percentage in maize, sun flower, and cucumber seeds subjected to accelerated aging conditions (Sahib and Hussein, 2014; Hussein *et al.*, 2012a; Hussein *et al.*, 2011). Accelerated ageing of seeds up to three days had significant effect on Amadori products and glutathione reductase and peroxidase activity in maize and sunflower seeds (Hussein *et al.*, 2012b; Hussein *et al.*, 2012c). Al-Delaimy and Al-Mamoori (2018) mention that there is a significant

increase in rooting response of aged mung bean cuttings by using different concentration of  $H_3PO_4$ . The decrease in the height of the ears and its diameter, which is distributed over the grain sites, indicates that the water stress lead to decrease the leaf of leaf area lack of (Table 3), plant height (Table 3) and chlorophyll content index (Table 3). This is reflected in the efficiency of the photosynthesis process and the lack of dry matter formed in the ears and therefore Reducing the size of the droplets, which causes the reduction of the microprocessor, which causes the reduction of  $CO_2$  transport carriers and low concentration in the leaf, thus reducing the rate of transpiration (Anjum and others, 2011)

That achieve a big ears (the increase in the number of grains and the number of row) depends on the supply of photosynthetic products. This mechanism has to be through the surface of the surfaces (Green tent) and its effectiveness in intercepting light and converting solar energy into dry matter in the period between the evolution and development of the ears (V8 - V14). This is what Muhammad (2013) said. The small size of the leaf area and the low growth rates caused by water stress, Cereals in the row, number of rows and then number total grains.

The increase in the result of sprinkling of the prolin is due to the increase of its components represented by the number of grains in ears, which consists of the number of grains in the row and the number of rows in ears and increasing them increase the diameter of the ears and thus the number of rows and the number of pills more and this reflects the total grain yield as the spraying prolin preserves the materials produced and easy to transfer. To increase the number of fertile grains and increase their number. These results were consistent with Asadi (2015), noting that spraying of prolin with relatively increased concentrations increased the total number of grains of ears by increasing the proportion of nutrients and their fertilization as well as the source of nitrogen helps the formation of protein and make use of them in the formation of the origins of flowers during the fertile phase of the contract (Abbas and Alec, 2016 and Dmello, 2015) found that spraying of the leaf proline increases the number of grains per plant.

Prolin spray on the leaves increased concentration of chlorophyll and preserves cells. Proline increases its concentration in the leaf, improves its water content and prolongs the period in which the leaf remains effective and delays. Aging of leaf (Sun and Hong, 2010). Proline spray on leaf increases the concentration of chlorophyll and preserves cells from apoptosis through the promotion of free radicals. Kishor *et al.* (2014) and

Kaya *et al.* (2006). Proline spraying reduces the process of protein degradation, which leads to the production of harmful acids such as clotamics, aspartic acid, and converting them into proline is a defensive method to reduce the effect of these acids (Stewart, 1983).

## References

- A.O.A.C. (1975). Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Official method of analysis. A.O.A.C. 10th (Ed.) republished by A.O.A.C. Washington, D.C., U.S.A., V. 58 (4). 115.
- Abbas, Hawra Ali and Makiya Khazem Alak (2016). The role of proline acid in improving the yield of the sun flower and its components under water stress conditions. *Iraq Agricultural Science*: (2) 47 438-451.
- Abd El-Samad, H.M.; Shaddad, M.A.K. and Barakat, N. (2011). Improvement of plants salt tolerance by exogenous application of amino acids. *J. Med. Plants Res.* 5(24): 5692-5699.
- Abdel Hamid, E. and Lina, A. (2011). Effect of Plant Density and Nitrogen Fertilization on Some Indicators of Growth of Yellow Maize (Bacillus Hybrid 2) and its Productivity, 27(1): 65- 81.
- Adris, M.H. (2009). Plant physiology. Encyclopedia of Plant-Suzan Mubarak Scientific Exploration Center in Cairo, Egypt.
- Ahmed, S.A.H. and Bakr, R.H. (2009). Response of two sorghum bicolor L. sorbents to water stress under field conditions. *Iraqi Agriculture Journal.* 14 (2): 82-71.
- Alalousi, A.A. and Elsahookie, M.M. (2006). Hybrid-inbred response of Maiza under sufficient and insufficient nitrogen: II. Genetic-Morphologic yield compon ents. *Iraqi. J. Agric. Sci.*, 37(3): 67-74.
- AL-Alousi, A.M.A. (2005). Response of strains and hybrids of maize under nitrogen and water deficiencies and adequacy. Ph.D. thesis. faculty of Agriculture. Baghdad University.
- AL-Asadi, the limitations of snake Joseph (2015). Genomic structures of maize L. (*zea mays* L.) are subjected to water stress caused by proline. Doctoral thesis - Faculty of Education, Karbala University.
- Al-Delaimy, A.O.A. and Al-Mamoori, A.H. (2018). Effect of Mineral Acids ( $H_3PO_4$ ) on Rooting Response of Aging Mung Bean (*Phaseolusaureus*Roxb.) Cuttings via Indole Acetic Acid Level. *Journal of Global Pharma Technology*, 00(00):000-000
- Alhilali, A.M. (2005). Plant Physiology under the Drought and Salt. Academic Publishing and Press King Saud Uni., Saudi Arabia. 246-247.

- Ali, Q.; Anwar, F.; Ashraf, M.; Saari, N. and Perveen, R. (2013). Ameliorating effects of exogenously applied proline on seed composition, seed oil quality and oil antioxidant activity of maize (*Zea mays* L.) under drought stress. *Int. J. Mol. Sci.*, 14: 818-835.
- Ali, Q.; Ashraf, M. and Athar, H.U. (2007). Exogenously applied proline at different growth stages enhances growth of two maize cultivars grown under water deficit conditions. *Pak. J. Bot.*, 39(4): 1133-1144.
- AL-Maeini, Ayad Hussein Ali (2004). Water requirements for four varieties of bread wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.). Under the influence of water tension and potassium fertilizer. Ph.D. thesis Faculty of Agriculture University of Baghdad.
- AL-Maeini, Ayad Hussein Ali (2010). Response of yellow maize to nitrogen fertilizer and different irrigation periods. *Iraqi Agriculture Journal*. 15 (1): 10-1.
- AL-Sahooki, M.M. and the peasant Ayoub Obeid and AL-Mohammed Ali Fadam (2009). Crop Management, Soil and Drought Education. *Iraqi Agricultural Science Series*. (2): 1-28.
- AL-Sahooki, M.M. (1990). Maize production and improvement, Baghdad University, Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research.
- Al-shaheen, M.; Soh, R. and Seof, A. (2014). Corn (*Zea mays* L.) topoline and gibberellic acid spray under different irrigation levels. *Inter J. Bot.*, 4(6): 7-16.
- AL-Zuhairi, A.A.G. (2017). The role of proline and arginine in the growth and yield of yellow maize. Master Thesis - College of Education for Pure Sciences / Life Sciences - Diyala University.
- Anjum, S.A.; Xie, X.Y.; Wang, L.C.; Saleem, M.F.; Man, C. and Lei, W. (2011). Morphological, physiological and biochemical responses of plants to drought stress. *Afr J Agric Res* 6: 2026-2032.
- Araus, J.L.; Serret, M.D. and Edmeades, G.O. (2012). Phenotyping maize for adaptation to drought. *Frontiers in Physio.*, 3: 305.
- Ashraf, M. and Foolad, M.R. (2007). Roles of glycine betaine and proline in improving plant abiotic stress resistance. *Environ Exp Bot.*, 59: 206-216.
- Babakhaani, S.; Nasri, M. and Oveysi, M. (2013). Effect of cytokine hormone spray and water stress on the yield and yield components of corn (*Zea mays* var. *saccharata*). *Ann. Biol. Res.*, 4 (4):130-133.
- Carpici, E.B. (2009). Evaluation of the effects of plant densities and nitrogen rates on stress physiology traits in silage corn (*Zea mays* L.) production. Ph.D. thesis, Field Crops, Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sciences. Uludag University, Bursa, Turkey.
- Daryanto, S.; Wang, L. and Jacinthe, P.A. (2016). Global Synthesis of Drought Effects on Maize and Wheat Production. *PLoS ONE* 11(5): e0156362.
- Dawood, M.G. (2016). Influence of osmoregulators on plant tolerance to water stress. *Sci. Agri.*, 13(1): 42-58.
- Dmello, J.P.F. (2015). Amino acids in higher plants. CPT Group (UK) Ltd. Croydon. CROYY.
- EL-Sahookie, M.M. (1985). A shortcut method for estimating plant leaf area in maize. *J. Agron. And Crop Sci.* 15(4): 157-160.
- Farhad, M.G.; Kibria, M.H.; Mian, Y. Murata and Hoque, M.A. (2015). Mitigating water stress in wheat by foliar application of proline. *Int. J. Expt. Agric.* 5(3): 8-14.
- Fereres, E. and Soriano, M. (2007). Deficit irrigation for reducing agricultural water use. Special issue on 'Integrated approaches to sustain and improve plant production under drought stress" *J. Exp. Bot.* 58: 147-159.
- Freeling, M. and Walbot, V. (1994). The Maize Handbook. Springer verlag, New York, Inc., 42-44.
- Hayat, S.; Hayat, Q.; Alyemini, M.N.; Wani, A.S.; Pichtel, J. and Ahmad, A. (2012). Role of proline under changing environments. *Plant Signaling and Behavior* 7: 1456-1466.
- Hussein, H.J.; Shaheed, A.I. and Yasser, O.M. (2011). Effect of Accelerated Aging Conditions on Viability of Sunflower (*Helianthus annus* L.) Seeds, *Euphrates Journal of Agriculture Science*, 3 (3): 1-9.
- Hussein, H.J.; Shaheed, A.I. and Yasser, O.M. (2012a). Effect of Accelerated Aging on Vigor of Local Maize Seeds in Term of Electrical Conductivity and Relative Growth Rate (RGR), *Iraqi Journal of Science*, (53) 2: 285-291.
- Hussein, H.J.; Yasser, O.M.; Shaheed, A.I. and Abidi, A.B. (2012c). Effect of Accelerated Ageing Conditions on Physiological and Biochemical Changes of Sunflower (*Helianthus annus* L.) Seeds, *Advances in Life Sciences*, 1(1): 20-24.
- Hussein, H.J.; Yasser, O.M.; Shaheed, A.I.; Abidi, A.B. and Tiwari, B.K. (2012 b). Physiological and Biochemical Changes Induced by Accelerated Ageing of Maize Seeds (*Zea mays* L.), *Indian Journal of Agricultural Biochemistry*, 25 (2): 116-120.
- Kaya, C.; Tuna, A.L. and Alfredo, A.A. (2006). "Gibberellic acid improves water deficit

- tolerance in maize plants." *Acta physiologiae plantarum* 28(4): 331-337.
- Kebede, H.; Sui, R.X.; Fisher, D.K.; Reddy, K.N.; Bellaloui, N. and Molin, W.T. (2014). Corn Yield Response to Reduced Water Use at Different Growth Stages. *Agri. Sci.*, 5: 1305-1315.
- Kishor, K.; Polavarapu, B. and Sreenivasulu, N. (2014). "Is proline accumulation per se correlated with stress tolerance or is proline homeostasis a more critical issue?" *Plant, cell & environment* 37(2): 300-311.
- Mohammed, Hussein Aziz. Effect of proline acid and Abscisic acid in raising the water efficiency of maize L. (*Zea mays* L.). Tikrit University Journal of Agricultural Sciences 14 (2): 73-84.
- Okay, D. (2006). Determination of corn plant water-yield relationships with CERES-maize model in Bursa conditions. PhD thesis, Irrigation and Agricultural Structures, Graduate School of Natural and Applied Sci., Uludag. Uni, Bursa, Turkey.
- Pandey, K.; Maranville, W.A. and Admou, K. (2000). Deficit irrigation and nitrogen effects on maize in a Sahelian environment I. Grain yield and yield components". *Agric. Water Manage.*, 46: 1-13.
- Saddon, N. and Zuraini, Z. (2016). Effect of gibberellic acid and proline on vegetative characteristics of (*Zea mays* L.) cultivar (fajir-1) *International Journal of Current Research*, 8(01): 24939-2494.
- Sahib, M.M. and Hussein, H.J. (2014). Relative Growth Rate (RGR) and Electrical Conductivity changes in snake cucumber (*Cucumismelovar. flexuosus* Naud.) seeds under Accelerated Ageing conditions, *Journal of Kerbala University*, (12)4: 13-20.
- Schachtman, D.P. and Goodger, J.Q.D. (2008). Chemical root to shoot signaling under drought. *Trends plant Sci.*, 13: 281-287.
- Shahid, M.A.; Balal, R.M.; Pervez, M.A.; Abbas, T.; Aqeel, M.A.; Javaid, M.M. and Garcia-Sanchez, F. (2014). Exogenous proline and proline-enriched *Lolium perenne* leaf extract protects against phytotoxic effects of nickel and salinity in *Pisum sativum* by altering polyamine metabolism in leaves. *Turk J Bot* 38: 914-926.
- Stewart, C.R. (1983). Proline Accumulation: Biochemistry Aspects. In: *Physiology and Biochemistry of Drought Resistance in Plants*. Paleg, L. G. and Aspinall, D. (Eds.), Acad. Press. Aust.
- Sun, Y.L. and Hong, S.K. (2010). Exogenous proline mitigates the detrimental effects of saline and alkaline stress in *Leymus chinensis* (Trin.). *Journal of Plant Biotechnology* 37: 529-538.
- Szabados, L. and Saviouré, A. (2010). Proline: a multifunctional amino acid. *Trends in Plant Science*, 15(2): 89-97.
- Taie, H.A.; Abdelhamid, M.T.; Dawood, M.G. and Nassar, R. (2013). "Pre-sowing Seed Treatment with Proline Improves some Physiological, Biochemical and Anatomical Attributes of Faba Bean Plants under Sea Water Stress." *J. of Applied Sci, Res*, 9(4): 81-88.
- Turgut, I.; Duman, A.; Bilgili, U. and Açikgoz, E. (2005). Alternate row spacing and plant density effects on forage and dry matter yield of corn hybrids (*Zea mays* L.) J, of *Agron, and Crop Sci*, 191:146-151.
- Vasconcelos, A.C.F.; Zheng, X.Z.; Ervin, E. and Kiehl, J.D. (2009). Enzymatic antioxidant responses to bio stimulants in Maize and soy bean subjected to drought. *Sci. Agricol.* 66 (3): 395-402.
- Zadehbagheri, M.; Azarpanah, A. and Javanmardi, S. (2014). Proline Metabolite Transport an Efficient Approach in Corn Yield Improvement as Response to Drought Conditions. *Am-Euras. J. Agric. Environ. Sci.*, 14(5): 476-485.