



ISSN 1313 - 8820
Volume 8, Number 1
March 2016

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

2016

An International Journal Published by Faculty of Agriculture,
Trakia University, Stara Zagora, Bulgaria

Editor-in-Chief

Tsanko Yablanski
Faculty of Agriculture
Trakia University, Stara Zagora
Bulgaria

Co-Editor-in-Chief

Dimitar Panaiotov
Faculty of Agriculture
Trakia University, Stara Zagora
Bulgaria

Editors and Sections

Genetics and Breeding

Atanas Atanasov (Bulgaria)
Nikolay Tsenov (Bulgaria)
Max Rothschild (USA)
Ihsan Soysal (Turkey)
Horia Grosu (Romania)
Bojin Bojinov (Bulgaria)
Stoicho Metodiev (Bulgaria)

Nutrition and Physiology

Nikolai Todorov (Bulgaria)
Peter Surai (UK)
Zervas Georgios (Greece)
Ivan Varlyakov (Bulgaria)

Production Systems

Radoslav Slavov (Bulgaria)
Dimitar Pavlov (Bulgaria)
Bogdan Szostak (Poland)
Banko Banev (Bulgaria)
Georgy Zhelyazkov (Bulgaria)

Agriculture and Environment

Georgi Petkov (Bulgaria)
Ramesh Kanwar (USA)
Martin Banov (Bulgaria)

Product Quality and Safety

Marin Kabakchiev (Bulgaria)
Stefan Denev (Bulgaria)
Vasil Atanasov (Bulgaria)

English Editor

Yanka Ivanova (Bulgaria)

Scope and policy of the journal

Agricultural Science and Technology /AST/ – an International Scientific Journal of Agricultural and Technology Sciences is published in English in one volume of 4 issues per year, as a printed journal and in electronic form. The policy of the journal is to publish original papers, reviews and short communications covering the aspects of agriculture related with life sciences and modern technologies. It will offer opportunities to address the global needs relating to food and environment, health, exploit the technology to provide innovative products and sustainable development. Papers will be considered in aspects of both fundamental and applied science in the areas of Genetics and Breeding, Nutrition and Physiology, Production Systems, Agriculture and Environment and Product Quality and Safety. Other categories closely related to the above topics could be considered by the editors. The detailed information of the journal is available at the website. Proceedings of scientific meetings and conference reports will be considered for special issues.

Submission of Manuscripts

All manuscripts written in English should be submitted as MS-Word file attachments via e-mail to editoffice@agriscitech.eu. Manuscripts must be prepared strictly in accordance with the detailed instructions for authors at the website www.agriscitech.eu and the instructions on the last page of the journal. For each manuscript the signatures of all authors are needed confirming their consent to publish it and to nominate on author for correspondence.

They have to be presented by a submission letter signed by all authors. The form of the submission letter is available upon request from the Technical Assistance or could be downloaded from the website of the journal. Manuscripts submitted to this journal are considered if they have submitted only to it, they have not been published already, nor are they under consideration for publication in press elsewhere. All manuscripts are subject to editorial review and the editors reserve the right to improve style and return the paper

for rewriting to the authors, if necessary. The editorial board reserves rights to reject manuscripts based on priorities and space availability in the journal.

The journal is committed to respect high standards of ethics in the editing and reviewing process and malpractice statement. Commitments of authors related to authorship are also very important for a high standard of ethics and publishing. We follow closely the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE), <http://publicationethics.org/resources/guidelines>

The articles appearing in this journal are indexed and abstracted in: DOI, EBSCO Publishing Inc. and AGRIS (FAO).

The journal is accepted to be indexed with the support of a project № BG051PO001-3.3.05-0001 "Science and business" financed by Operational Programme "Human Resources Development" of EU. The title has been suggested to be included in SCOPUS (Elsevier) and Electronic Journals Submission Form (Thomson Reuters).

Address of Editorial office:

Agricultural Science and Technology
Faculty of Agriculture, Trakia University
Student's campus, 6000 Stara Zagora
Bulgaria

Telephone.: +359 42 699330
+359 42 699446

www.agriscitech.eu

Technical Assistance:

Nely Tsvetanova
Telephone.: +359 42 699446
E-mail: editoffice@agriscitech.eu

ISSN 1313 - 8820

Volume 8, Number 1
March 2016



*AGRICULTURAL
SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY*

2016

An International Journal Published by Faculty of Agriculture,
Trakia University, Stara Zagora, Bulgaria

Agriculture and Environment

Effects of irrigation and fertilization on soil microorganisms

T. Dinev^{1*}, I. Gospodinov², A. Stoyanova³, G. Beev¹, D. Dermendzhieva⁴, D. Pavlov³

¹Department of Biochemistry, Microbiology and Physics, Faculty of Agriculture, Trakia University, 6000 Stara Zagora, Bulgaria

²Agricultural Institute, 6000 Stara Zagora, Bulgaria

³Department of Plant Production, Faculty of Agriculture, Trakia University, 6000 Stara Zagora, Bulgaria

⁴Department of Applied Ecology and Animal Hygiene, Faculty of Agriculture, Trakia University, 6000 Stara Zagora, Bulgaria

(Manuscript received 8 January 2016; accepted for publication 29 February 2016)

Abstract. The purpose of this study is to determine the influence of nitrogen fertilization and irrigation on the total count of aerobic mesophilic microorganisms, moulds and yeasts in the soil. The experiment was conducted in three variants and samples were taken as follows: from irrigated and fertilized furrow; from irrigated non-fertilized furrow and from furrow without irrigation and fertilization. For determination of total number of mesophilic aerobic microorganisms, moulds and yeasts the samples were diluted and cultivated on medium sheets coated with culture medium according to the requirements of the microorganisms. Data analysis shows that fertilization has the strongest multiplication effect on the number of aerobic mesophilic microorganisms in soil (their number increases from 10.522×10^6 to 12.8×10^6 cfu/g), whereas the irrigation does not have any statistically significant impact. The multiplication of moulds and yeasts in this trial is stimulated mainly by the increased humidity. When irrigation is applied the number of moulds and yeasts increases from 1.158×10^5 to 1.407×10^5 cfu/g, while fertilization does not affect their quantity in a statistically significant way.

Keywords: aerobic mesophilic microorganisms, moulds, yeasts, fertilization, irrigation, soil

Introduction

Fertilization in modern agriculture not only maintains, but even gradually increases the yield of agricultural crops. Modern fertilization systems are not just an isolated element in crop production, but an essential link in the system of agricultural practices. The effective fertilizer provides plants with nutrients in appropriate proportions and quantities that stimulate the yield of crops with high biological and technological quality. Fertilization also gradually improves soil fertility (Li et al., 2005).

Years of research on the effects of agricultural practices clearly shows that mineral fertilizers, particularly nitrogen supplements have the strongest influence on the crop yield. The results of the research conducted by Jenkinson (1982) and Doran et al. (1996) show that mineral fertilization strongly influences a number of microorganisms and has pronounced effect on the qualitative selection of whole communities of soil microorganisms. According to many authors soil microbial biomass is closely related with soil fertility (Insam et al., 1991; Brookes, 1995; Yao et al., 2000). While soil bacteria are generally beneficial for soil fertility, because of their participation in the nutrients transformation, the fungi are very often toxigenic (Styla and Sawicka, 2010).

According to data from more than 20 years of studies submitted by Barabasz et al. (2002), high NPK fertilization rates significantly increase the number of the tested bacteria and fungi. It rose about 2-fold compared with the control. However, other studies indicate that fertilization sometimes decreases the number of many species of the selected microorganisms. High levels of nitrogen decrease the

number of bacteria, but the change in the number of fungal species is negligible. It was discovered that fertilization with high levels of nitrogen fertilizer causes a reduction of the bacteria from genera *Arthrobacter* and *Streptomyces* by 50% on average and the total destruction of the bacteria from genera *Azotobacter*, *Rhizobium* and *Bradyrhizobium*. On the other hand, there was an increase in the number of microorganisms and biomass of the genera *Eubacterium*, *Pseudomonas* and *Bacillus* and in the number of moulds of the genera *Aspergillus*, *Fusarium*, *Penicillium* and *Verticillium* (Barabasz et al., 2002). Styla and Sawicka (2010) believed that repeated mineral fertilization, especially with high doses of nitrogen, can cause strong acidification of the soils and increase the development of fungi. They reported that nitrogen fertilization increases the fungi number, but decreases the total count of aerobic microorganisms. According to Zong et al. (2010) nitrogen fertilization does not change the bacterial and fungal biomass in a statistically significant way.

The humidity is one of the most important parameters regulating the biological activity in the soil. Changes in humidity will affect soil microorganisms through complex interactions with nutrients, soil temperature, the arrangement of the soil pores and the soil atmosphere. Soil moisture and air temperature are some of the main factors regulating the activity of soil microorganisms. The study of Schnurer et al. (1986) showed that after heavy rains the number of bacteria doubles within three days, and in the subsequent dry period it decreases. The hyphae mass of the fungi also increased significantly during the experiment. Styla and Sawicka (2010) also found that after intensive irrigation the number of microorganisms

* e-mail: dinev_sz@mail.bg

increased, but the number of fungi decreased.

Because of the controversy in the literature data the purpose of the present experiment is to determine the impact of fertilization and irrigation on the development of aerobic mesophilic microorganisms, moulds and yeasts. This is one of the ways to determine the soil fertility after fertilization and irrigation as well as the possible presence of toxigenic fungi.

Material and methods

The field experiment was conducted at the experimental field of the Agricultural Institute, Stara Zagora. The predominant soil type is gleyic chromic luvisols. The humus layer has a thickness of 80 cm, the surface layer from 0 to 20 cm has loose structure, while the lower part is thick. The humus layer lies on a sandy carbonate layer. The irrigation norm is based on the established unit of field moisture capacity (FMC). For this type of soil it is found that the FMC is 27%, ie at the set depth of the active soil layer for watering to FMC watering at the amount of 95 m³ is required.

The average temperature for 2015 in July and August was higher than the norm for the period 1930 – 2015, by 2.2 and 1.9°C, respectively. At the same time in June daily average temperatures were close to normal. This year was significantly warmer from March to August.

The study was conducted with corn grain. Irrigation was done by gravity. Irrigation water was supplied through a furrow. The size of the experimental plots was 70 m² (length of the furrows 10 m, 5 irrigated and 5 non-irrigated furrows). Nitrogen fertilizer was supplied three times in equal parts –before sowing, before furrowing

and after first irrigation in total of 180 kg/ha of active ingredient. The whole fertilizer quantity was supplied during irrigation.

In the first variant samples for analysis were taken from the irrigated and fertilized furrow. In the second variant the irrigated non-fertilized furrow was sampled. In the third variant, which is a control, a sample was taken from a furrow without irrigation and fertilization. All samples were taken at the same time, 24 h after irrigation.

For determination of the total number of mesophilic aerobic microorganisms, mould and yeast samples were taken from the soil, they were decimally diluted to 10⁻⁴ for aerobic microorganisms and 10⁻³ for moulds and yeasts, and were cultivated on medium sheets coated with ready-to-use culture medium (R-Biopharm, Germany). 1 ml of the sample had been applied onto the fabric of the medium sheet. The sheets were incubated at 35°C for 24 – 48 h and the colonies were counted. The results are expressed in colony forming units per gram (cfu/g). The results were recalculated to 1 g of absolutely dry soil.

Statistical analysis of microbiological parameters was performed by a computer program "StatMost for Windows" (DataMost Co., USA, 1994), for statistical method was used Tukey's test, and the values were set as average, standard deviation and standard error.

Results and discussion

The study of the irrigation and fertilization impact on the total number of aerobic mesophilic microorganisms showed that during the period from June 3rd to August 18th, the total number of aerobic microorganisms was the lowest at irrigation without fertilization – an

Table 1. Total count of mesophilic aerobic microorganisms in different tillage practices

Irrigation and fertilization	Dates	Total aerobic count (x10 ⁶ cfu/g)*	n	SD	SE
1. Irrigation+fertilization	03.06	16.5 ^a	3	2.18	1.27
1. Irrigation+fertilization	01.07	6.45 ^b	3	2.2	1.2
1. Irrigation+fertilization	16.07	11.71 ^c	3	1.8	1.03
1. Irrigation+fertilization	20.07	15.78 ^a	3	3.2	1.84
1. Irrigation+fertilization	18.08	13.55 ^c	3	1.8	1.04
Average		12.8 ^a	3	2.24	1.28
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	03.06	8.73 ^b	3	1.82	2.43
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	01.07	8.98 ^b	3	1.9	2.1
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	16.07	7.64 ^b	3	0.9	0.51
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	20.07	12.8 ^c	3	0.8	0.46
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	18.08	13.06 ^c	3	2.89	1.61
Average		10.242 ^b	3	1.66	1.42
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	03.06	16.5 ^a	3	2.18	1.27
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	01.07	6.45 ^b	3	2.2	1.2
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	16.07	9.82 ^b	3	1.7	0.98
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	20.07	6.44 ^b	3	3.3	1.9
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	18.08	13.45 ^c	3	1.3	0.75
Average		10.522 ^b	3	2.14	1.22
Average of all groups		11.188	3	2.01	1.31

*There is statistically significant difference (P<0.05), if the letters are not the same. The values are compared between the dates and between the average values

Table 2. Moulds and yeasts in different tillage practices

Irrigation and fertilization	Dates	Moulds and yeasts (x10 ⁵ cfu/g)*	n	SD	SE
1. Irrigation+fertilization	03.06	2.18 ^a	3	0.04	0.023
1. Irrigation+fertilization	01.07	1.91 ^a	3	0.03	0.017
1. Irrigation+fertilization	16.07	0.95 ^b	3	0.03	0.017
1. Irrigation+fertilization	20.07	0.9 ^b	3	0.02	0.012
1. Irrigation+fertilization	18.08	0.75 ^b	3	0.03	0.017
Average		1.338 ^a	3	0.03	0.017
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	03.06	1.46 ^c	3	0.01	0.006
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	01.07	3.4 ^d	3	0.01	0.006
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	16.07	1.53 ^c	3	0.04	0.02
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	20.07	0.95 ^b	3	0.02	0.012
2. Irrigation+non-fertilization	18.08	0.72 ^b	3	0.02	0.012
Average		1.407 ^a	3	0.02	0.012
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	03.06	2.18 ^a	3	0.01	0.006
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	01.07	1.91 ^a	3	0.01	0.006
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	16.07	0.55 ^e	3	0.03	0.017
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	20.07	0.472 ^e	3	0.03	0.017
3. Non-irrigation+non-fertilization	18.08	0.676 ^e	3	0.05	0.029
Average		1.158 ^b	3	0.026	0.015
Average of all groups		1.301.01	3	0.0253	0.0146

*There is statistically significant difference ($P < 0.05$), if the letters are not the same. The values are compared between the dates and between the average values

average of 10.242×10^6 cfu/g (Table 1). The amount of microorganisms was the greatest when irrigation and fertilizing were applied – an average of 12.8×10^6 cfu/g. For the combination of non-fertilization with non-irrigation the number of microorganisms occupies middle position – 10.522×10^6 cfu/g. There is a statistically significant difference between the microorganisms that develop in irrigated and fertilized soils and the other two groups. On the other hand, between the microorganisms grown under irrigation+non-fertilization and non-irrigation+non-fertilization conditions there was not any statistically significant difference. This is an indication of the serious impact of fertilization on the increase of bacteria number. Such a trend of the nitrogen fertilization impact was described by Barabasz et al. (2002). On the other hand, according to the average values for different trial groups irrigation does not have serious impact on the number of aerobic mesophilic microorganisms. A possible reason for that is because soil humidity did not decrease below certain limit and in that way the multiplication of the aerobic mesophilic microorganisms was not affected. It is common belief that increasing the number of microorganisms has a favorable effect on soil fertility due to the many transformations of nutrients and synthesis of biologically active substances from the microorganisms (Kennedy and Pappendick, 1995).

According to Table 2 the number of moulds and yeasts is the greatest when irrigation without fertilization is applied – average of 1.407×10^5 cfu/g. The lowest average number is under non-irrigation+non-fertilization conditions – 1.158×10^5 cfu/g. Moulds and yeasts multiplied at moderate rate during irrigation and fertilization - their average values were 1.338×10^5 cfu/g. Between the average values during irrigation and fertilization and irrigation without fertilization there are not any statistically significant differences. These exist between the control values (without irrigation and

fertilization) and the other two groups. Analysis of the data shows that humidity has the strongest impact on mould and yeast reproduction since water content increases the growth of moulds and yeasts. On the other hand, fertilization did not affect in a statistically significant way the number of moulds and yeasts.

According to Schnurer et al. (1986) and Barabasz et al. (2002) during irrigation and fertilization there is an increase in the number of moulds and yeasts. Our data confirm the general trend in respect to humidity, whereas after fertilization it is not well defined. However, other authors found that the number of moulds and yeasts decreases during intensive irrigation (Styla and Sawicka, 2010). Those findings may be due to the decreased oxygen content in the water saturated soil and the low supply of the moulds and yeasts with oxygen. In that way the intensity of irrigation probably has the greatest effect on mould and yeast reproduction.

Conclusion

The analysis of the data shows that fertilization has the strongest influence on the increase of the total number of aerobic mesophilic microorganisms, irrigation does not change these values in a statistically significant way. Reproduction of moulds and yeasts is stimulated mainly by the increased humidity while fertilization did not affect their values in a statistically significant way. On the basis of these findings we can recommend fertilization as a way to increase the number of microorganisms and therefore soil fertility. Moreover, we have to be careful with the application of irrigation because high levels of soil humidity can increase the number of moulds and yeasts and consequently the quantity of toxigenic fungi.

References

- Barabasz W, Albinska D, Jaskowska M and Lipiec J**, 2002. Biological effects of mineral nitrogen fertilization on soil microorganisms – Review. *Polish Journal of Environmental Studies*, 11, 193-198.
- Brookes PC**, 1995. The use of microbial parameters in monitoring soil pollution by heavy metals. *Biology and Fertility of Soils*, 19, 269-279.
- Doran JW, Sarrantonio M and Liebig MA**, 1996. Soil health and sustainability. *Advances in Agronomy*, 56, 1-54.
- Jenkinson DS**, 1982. The nitrogen cycle in long-term field experiments. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series B*, 296, 563-571.
- Insam H, Mitchell CC and Dormaar JF**, 1991. Relationship of soil microbial biomass and activity with fertilization practice and crop yield of three Ultisols. *Soil Biology and Biochemistry*, 23, 459-464.
- Kennedy AC and Pappendick JR**, 1995. Microbial characteristic of soil quality. *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation*, 50, 243-248.
- Li Q, Allen HL and Wollum AG**, 2005. Effects of irrigation and fertilization on soil microbial biomass and functional diversity. *Journal of Sustainable Forestry*, 20, 17-35.
- Schnurer J, Clarholm M, Bostrom S and Rosswall T**, 1986. Effects of moisture on soil microorganisms and nematodes: a field experiment. *Microbial Ecology*, 12, 217-230.
- Styla K and Sawicka A**, 2010. Microbiological activity of soil against the background of differentiated irrigation and fertilization in apple (*Malus domestica*) orchard after replantation. *Agronomy Research*, 8, 827-836.
- Yao H, He Z, Wilson MJ and Campbell CD**, 2000. Microbial biomass and community structure in a sequence of soils with increasing fertility and changing land use. *Microbial Ecology*, 40, 223-237.
- Zong W, Gu T, Wang W, Zang B, Lin X, Huang X and Shen W**, 2010. The effects of mineral fertilizer and organic manure on soil microbial community and diversity. *Plant Soil*, 326, 511-522.

Review

- Classical and modern concepts of inbreeding and effects of inbreeding depression in animals** 3
S. Tanchev

Genetics and Breeding

- Genotype by environment interaction in mutant lines of winter barley for grain yield** 14
B. Dyulgerova, N. Dyulgerov
- Genotype-environment interaction and stability analysis for grain yield of winter barley in the conditions of North-East and South Bulgaria** 19
M. Dimitrova-Doneva, D. Valcheva, G. Mihova, B. Dyulgerova

Production Systems

- Effect of predecessors on the productivity and phytosanitary condition of hull-less oats in organic farming** 24
D. Atanasova, V. Maneva, T. Nedelcheva
- Partial factor productivity of nitrogen fertilizer on grain and grain protein yield of durum wheat cultivars** 28
G. Panayotova, S. Kostadinova
- Influence of the dimensions of lifting brushes on the losses at direct harvesting of standing vine dry bean** 37
I. Iliev, G. Milev
- Energy productivity, fertilization rate and profitability of wheat production after various predecessors** 41
II. Profitability of wheat production
Z. Uhr, E. Vasileva
- Selectivity and stability of new herbicides and herbicide combinations for the seed yields of some field crops I. Effect at coriander (*Coriandrum Sativum* L.)** 46
G. Delchev
- Determination of some macro and micro elements in grain of winter barley genotypes** 51
N. Markova Ruzdik, Lj. Mihajlov, V. Ilieva, S. Ivanovska, D. Valcheva, B. Balabanova, M. Ilievski

Agriculture and Environment

- Effects of irrigation and fertilization on soil microorganisms** 58
T. Dinev, I. Gospodinov, A. Stoyanova, G. Beev, D. Dermendzhieva, D. Pavlov

Investigation on some biotic factors in carp fish ponds D. Terziyski, H. Kalcheva, A. Ivanova, R. Kalchev	62
Investigation of some energy characteristics of pig farm P. Kostov, K. Atanasov, I. Ivanov, K. Peychev, R. Georgiev	70
Variability in the resistance to bacterial spot causal agents <i>Xanthomonas euvesicatoria</i> P and <i>Xanthomonas vesicatoria</i> PT2 among Bulgarian and introduced pepper varieties T. Vancheva, S. Masheva, D. Ganeva, N. Bogatzevska	75
Comparative analysis for macro and trace elements content in goji berries between varieties from China and R. Macedonia B. Balabanova, I. Karov, S. Mitrev	79
Product Quality and Safety	
Extraction and characterization of anthocyanin colorants from plant sources S. Dyankova, M. Doneva	85
Heavy metal content in the meat of common carp (<i>Cyprinus carpio</i> L.) and rainbow trout (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> W.), cultivated under different technologies St. Stoyanova, I. Sirakov, K. Velichkova, Y. Staykov	90

Instruction for authors

Preparation of papers

Papers shall be submitted at the editorial office typed on standard typing pages (A4, 30 lines per page, 62 characters per line). The editors recommend up to 15 pages for full research paper (including abstract references, tables, figures and other appendices)

The manuscript should be structured as follows: Title, Names of authors and affiliation address, Abstract, List of keywords, Introduction, Material and methods, Results, Discussion, Conclusion, Acknowledgements (if any), References, Tables, Figures.

The title needs to be as concise and informative about the nature of research. It should be written with small letter /bold, 14/ without any abbreviations.

Names and affiliation of authors

The names of the authors should be presented from the initials of first names followed by the family names. The complete address and name of the institution should be stated next. The affiliation of authors are designated by different signs. For the author who is going to be corresponding by the editorial board and readers, an E-mail address and telephone number should be presented as footnote on the first page. Corresponding author is indicated with *.

Abstract should be not more than 350 words. It should be clearly stated what new findings have been made in the course of research. Abbreviations and references to authors are inadmissible in the summary. It should be understandable without having read the paper and should be in one paragraph.

Keywords: Up to maximum of 5 keywords should be selected not repeating the title but giving the essence of study.

The introduction must answer the following questions: What is known and what is new on the studied issue? What necessitated the research problem, described in the paper? What is your hypothesis and goal?

Material and methods: The objects of research, organization of experiments, chemical analyses, statistical and other methods and conditions applied for the experiments should be described in detail. A criterion of sufficient information is to be possible for others to repeat the experiment in order to verify results.

Results are presented in understandable

tables and figures, accompanied by the statistical parameters needed for the evaluation. Data from tables and figures should not be repeated in the text.

Tables should be as simple and as few as possible. Each table should have its own explanatory title and to be typed on a separate page. They should be outside the main body of the text and an indication should be given where it should be inserted.

Figures should be sharp with good contrast and rendition. Graphic materials should be preferred. Photographs to be appropriate for printing. Illustrations are supplied in colour as an exception after special agreement with the editorial board and possible payment of extra costs. The figures are to be each in a single file and their location should be given within the text.

Discussion: The objective of this section is to indicate the scientific significance of the study. By comparing the results and conclusions of other scientists the contribution of the study for expanding or modifying existing knowledge is pointed out clearly and convincingly to the reader.

Conclusion: The most important consequences for the science and practice resulting from the conducted research should be summarized in a few sentences. The conclusions shouldn't be numbered and no new paragraphs be used. Contributions are the core of conclusions.

References:

In the text, references should be cited as follows: single author: Sandberg (2002); two authors: Andersson and Georges (2004); more than two authors: Andersson et al. (2003). When several references are cited simultaneously, they should be ranked by chronological order e.g.: (Sandberg, 2002; Andersson et al., 2003; Andersson and Georges, 2004).

References are arranged alphabetically by the name of the first author. If an author is cited more than once, first his individual publications are given ranked by year, then come publications with one co-author, two co-authors, etc. The names of authors, article and journal titles in the Cyrillic or alphabet different from Latin, should be transliterated into Latin and article titles should be translated into English. The original language of articles and books translated into English is indicated in parenthesis after the bibliographic reference (Bulgarian = Bg, Russian = Ru, Serbian = Sr, if in the Cyrillic, Mongolian =

Mo, Greek = Gr, Georgian = Geor., Japanese = Ja, Chinese = Ch, Arabic = Ar, etc.)

The following order in the reference list is recommended:

Journal articles: Author(s) surname and initials, year. Title. Full title of the journal, volume, pages. Example:

Simm G, Lewis RM, Grundy B and Dingwall WS, 2002. Responses to selection for lean growth in sheep. *Animal Science*, 74, 39-50

Books: Author(s) surname and initials, year. Title. Edition, name of publisher, place of publication. Example:

Oldenbroek JK, 1999. Genebanks and the conservation of farm animal genetic resources, Second edition. DLO Institute for Animal Science and Health, Netherlands.

Book chapter or conference proceedings:

Author(s) surname and initials, year. Title. In: Title of the book or of the proceedings followed by the editor(s), volume, pages. Name of publisher, place of publication. Example:

Mauff G, Pulverer G, Operkuch W, Hummel K and Hidden C, 1995. C3-variants and diverse phenotypes of unconverted and converted C3. In: Provides of the Biological Fluids (ed. H. Peters), vol. 22, 143-165, Pergamon Press. Oxford, UK.

Todorov N and Mitev J, 1995. Effect of level of feeding during dry period, and body condition score on reproductive performance in dairy cows. IXth International Conference on Production Diseases in Farm Animals, September 11-14, Berlin, Germany.

Thesis:

Hristova D, 2013. Investigation on genetic diversity in local sheep breeds using DNA markers. Thesis for PhD, Trakia University, Stara Zagora, Bulgaria, (Bg).

The Editorial Board of the Journal is not responsible for incorrect quotes of reference sources and the relevant violations of copyrights.

Animal welfare

Studies performed on experimental animals should be carried out according to internationally recognized guidelines for animal welfare. That should be clearly described in the respective section "Material and methods".

AGRICULTURAL SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

Volume 8, Number 1
March 2016



Journal web site:
www.agriscitech.eu


Publisher:
www.alfamarket.biz