RESEARCH

Open Access

Improving Water Use Efficiency of Lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.) Using Phosphorous Fertilizers

Asad M F AlKhader^{1*} and Azmi M Abu Rayyan²

Abstract

A greenhouse pot experiment was conducted to evaluate the effect of phosphorous (P) fertilizers application to an alkaline calcareous soil on the water use efficiency (WUE) of lettuce cultivar "robinson" of iceberg type. Head fresh and dry weights, total water applied and WUE were affected significantly by the P fertilizer type and rate. P fertilizers addition induced a significant enhancement in the WUE and fresh and dry weights of the crop. A local phosphate rock (PR) applied directly was found to be inferior to the other types of P fertilizers (Mono ammonium phosphate (MAP), Single superphosphate (SSP), and Di ammonium phosphate ((DAP)). MAP fertilizer at 375 and 500 kg P_2O_5 /ha application rates recorded the highest significant values of head fresh weight and WUE, respectively.

Keywords: Lettuce; *Lactuca sativa* L; Phosphorous; Fresh and dry weights; Water use efficiency; Phosphate rock; Alkaline; Calcareous soil

Introduction

Globally, the paucity of water resources limits agricultural production. The increasing demand for food and water necessitates a more efficient water use of water in agriculture. Jordan is considered one of the ten poorest countries in water resources in the world (Al-Qerem, et al. 2012). Irrigation accounts for 62 % of the total water use in the country in the year 2005, and the allocated water for irrigation in the year 2003 was 511 million cubic meters (Ministry of Water and Irrigation 2004). Improved water use efficiency (WUE) represents a key factor in increasing crop productivity under such water scarcity conditions. Therefore, scientific research in this context to save irrigation water and improve its productivity in Jordan is extremely needed.

Phosphorus (P), in a balanced nutrient management program, can improve WUE and helps crops achieve optimal performance under limited moisture conditions (Briggs and Shantz 1913; Power et al. 1961). It was indicated that increasing P supply had a positive effect of on crop production and WUE (Pyne et al. 1992). Water use efficiency can be expressed as units of yield per unit of water used. Researchers (Ogata et al. 1960) had reported that the considerable enhancement in the water use and WUE by the crop could be attributed to the increase in root growth with high P supply.

Phosphorus is highly needed to establish and maintain crops especially in calcareous soils where the availability of P is very low (Siam et al. 2008). P-deficient plants are known to have lower photosynthetic rates, and decreased growth (Jacob and Lawlor 1991). However, adequately fertilized soils promote rapid leaf area expansion, thus increasing transpiration, and more rapid ground cover, which in turn reduces evaporation and increases WUE. Such increases have been largely attributed to a larger ratio of transpiration to evapotranspiration as a result of greater leaf area (Schmidhalter and Studer 1998).

Phosphate rock (PR) has been used directly in the world, especially in acid soils, as a supplemental P source at different levels but much less than other water-soluble P fertilizers (Khasawneh and Doll 1978). As P is an essential element for its growth and development, lettuce P demand is very high (Lana et al. 2004; Hasaneen et al. 2009). Therefore, lettuce can be used as a test plant.

The objective of this study was to investigate the performance of the lettuce head plant under varying types and rates of P fertilizers application in terms of fresh weight and WUE.

* Correspondence: asad_fathi@yahoo.com

¹Horticulture and Field Crops, National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE), PO Box (639), Baga' 19381, Jordan

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



© 2013 AlKhader and Abu Rayyan; licensee Springer. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Materials and methods

Experimental site

A greenhouse pot experiment was conducted during the growing season 2009/2010 in The Jubeiha Agricultural Research Station of the University of Jordan in the University Campus which is located at 32° 40" North and 35° 52" East, and 980 m above sea level and has a mean annual rainfall of about 414 mm.

Plant material

Seedlings of lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L.) cultivar "robinson" of iceberg type of 35 days after sowing (DAS) were obtained from a commercial nursery.

Experimental design and treatments

The experimental design used was a split-plot arrangement in a completely randomized design (CRD) (Figure 1). Where four fertilizers types (Single super phosphate (SSP), Di ammonium phosphate (DAP), Mono ammonium phosphate (MAP) and a local phosphate rock (PR) in a finely ground form (powder)) were assigned to the main plots, while five fertilizers rates (R1 = 0, R2 = 125, R3 = 250, R4 = 375, and R5 = 500 kg P₂O₅/ha) were assigned to the subplots, replicated five times.

Cultural practices

Plastic pots of 7 liter size, 25 cm top diameter, and 26 cm height were used. Air dry clay texture soil (clay

47.7%, silt 36.8% and sand 15.5%) of 7 Kg weight was put in each pot after being mixed, and fumigated with methyl bromide. P fertilizers and urea (46% N) at a rate of 200 Kg N/ha were thoroughly mixed with the soil of each pot. Supplemental N was applied to make sure that each treatment receives the same level of N. Lettuce seedlings were planted on 2nd February 2010 with one transplant per pot. Soil moisture was maintained close to field capacity during the growing season. Daily air temperature (Figure 2) and relative humidity (RH) (Figure 3) inside the greenhouse were monitored using a thermohigrograph (Thies, CLIMA, Germany) where the chart was replaced weekly. Photosynthetic active radiation (PAR), also, was measured using Mini station (WatchDog, Spectrum Technologies, Inc.), as shown in Figure 4. Harvesting was carried out on 4th April 2010 (61 days after transplanting, (DAT)). Figure 5 shows the greenhouse pot experiment 36 DAT and the seedlings used in the transplantation.

Chemical and physical analysis

Soil

Soil samples were air dried, crushed and passed through a 2 mm sieve for some chemical and physical analysis. Soil pH and salinity as paste extract, cation exchange capacity (CEC), texture (hydrometer method), organic matter, calcium carbonate (calcimeter method), total N (Kjeldhal method), available P (using spectrophotometer), available K (using flame photometer) were determined





according to the previous procedures, respectively (Bower and Wilcox 1965; Chapman 1965; Day 1965; Allison 1965; Allison and Moodie 1965; Bremner 1965; Olsen and Dean 1965; Pratt 1965). The results of the analysis are presented in Table 1.

Plant

Head fresh weight The head fresh weight was determined using an electronic balance $(\pm 0.1 \text{ g})$.

Irrigation water

Chemical analysis for the irrigation water used in the experiment was conducted to determine pH, electrical conductivity (EC), and major cations and anions according to the previous described work (Chapman and Pratt 1982). Table 2 shows the results of the analysis of the irrigation water. **Dry matter** Plant samples (leaves and stems) were dried in the oven at 65°C for 72 hrs and the dry matter was determined (\pm 0.1 g).

Statistical analysis

Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and mean separation according to least significant difference (LSD) at the 5% level of significance were conducted for the results using SAS version 9.0 (SAS Institute Inc. 2002).





Results and discussion

Fresh and dry weights

The results indicated that fresh and dry weights of the lettuce head plant were significantly affected by the P fertilizer type, rate and their interaction (Table 3).



Figure 5 The greenhouse pot experiment 36 days after transplanting (DAT) which carried out on 2/2/2010 (top), and the seedlings of the lettuce cultivar "robinson" of iceberg type (35 days after sowing (DAS)) used in the transplantation (bottom).

Plants fertilized with MAP produced the highest fresh and dry weights/head (353.4 and 14.13 g/head, respectively), whereas the lowest weights were related to PR-fertilized plants (20.2 and 0.81 g/head, respectively) (Figure 6). MAP, SSP and DAP induced significant differences in plant fresh and dry weights/ head as follows: MAP > SSP > DAP > PR. On the other hand, the effect of the P rate on the head fresh and dry weights was in the following descending order: $500 < 375 < 250 < 125 < 0 \text{ kg P}_2O_5/ha \text{ kg P}_2O_5/ha$. The highest fresh and dry weights/head were linked to the rate of 500 kg P $_2O_5/ha$ (366.7 and 4.66 g/head, respectively), whereas the control treatment (zero P) recorded the lowest weights (14.8 and 0.58 g/head, respectively) (Figure 7).

Generally, the highest weights were recorded for the higher application rates of DAP, SSP and MAP, whereas the control treatments and different rates of PR recorded the lowest results (Table 4). There was no significant differences in plant fresh and dry weights among the rates of 500 and 375 kg P_2O_5 /ha of MAP and 500 kg P_2O_5 /ha of SSP. However, the maximum fresh and dry weights (531.4 and 21.26 g/head, respectively) were induced at 375 P₂O₅/ha fertilization rate of MAP. Meanwhile, the minimum values were reported for the control treatment of PR (13.0 and 0.52 g/head, respectively). No significant increases in the fresh and dry weights were detected as higher P rates had been applied. Thus, the 375 P_2O_5/ha rate of MAP can be recommended under similar environments. This would reduce the costs of P application and conserve the natural reserves of phosphate. Positive environmental consequences through minimizing pollution of the environment (Boutraa 2009), also, should be expected.

The superiority of MAP, SSP and DAP over PR could be attributed to their higher solubility and, thus, higher P availability to the plant as they are fast-release

Texture	CEC	Ava	lable	O. M.	Total N	CaCO ₃	Salinity EC	pН
		Р	К				dS/m	
	meq/100 g	р	om		%		Paste extr	act
Clay	43.4	6.1	313	1.58	0.08	8.2	0.96	7.75

Table 1 Results of some chemical and physical properties of the soil used in the pot experiment

Table 2 Results of chemical analysis for the irrigation water used in the pot experiment

NO ₃	SO ₄ ²⁻	HCO₃	Cl	K ⁺	Na ⁺	Mg ²⁺	Ca ²⁺	EC	pН
ppm				meq/l				dS/m	
3.74	3.55	0.9	5.5	0.15	4.26	2.6	2.94	1.03	7.8

fertilizers (Miretzky and Fernandez 2008; Siam et al. 2008). The results, also, agree with the findings of many researchers (Chien and Menon 1995; Prochnow et al. 2006; Miretzky and Fernandez 2008) which indicated that PRs are of low solubility and, hence, low agronomic efficiency in high pH calcareous soils. Besides their higher solubility, ammonium phosphate fertilizers, like MAP and DAP, are superior to calcium phosphate fertilizers (like PRs) due to the presence of ammonium ion that has a positive effect on plant growth (Beaton and Nielsen 1959).

On the other hand, the relatively high agronomic performance for MAP compared with the other P fertilizers sources can be attributed to the higher production of $H_2PO_4^-$ which is more readily available to the plants than the other P forms (Fixen 1990).

The enhancement effect of P application on plant growth could be related to the vital role of inorganic P, in the ATP form, which provides energy for CO_2 assimilation in the Calvin Cycle in plant photosynthesis and the synthesis of starch, fatty acids and amino acids (Mikulska et al. 1998; Luo et al. 2009). However, the reduction of fresh and dry weights of the lettuce plant under lower P application rates and control treatments could be related to the role of the abscisic acid in growth inhibition as its

Table 5 Effect of F fertilizer of fettuce plant growth, total water applied and water use efficient	Table 3 Ef	ffect of F	? fertilizer o	on lettuce	plant g	growth, t	total water	applied	and wate	er use	efficier
---	------------	-------------------	----------------	------------	---------	-----------	-------------	---------	----------	--------	----------

Fertilizer type	Fresh weight	Dry weight	Total applied water	Water use efficiency	
	g/he	ad	mm	g/mm	
DAP	275.9 с	11.03 c	160.1 b	1.61 b	
SSP	321.0 b	12.83 b	172.5 ab	1.75 ab	
MAP	353.4 a	14.13 a	178.7 a	1.87 a	
PR	20.2 d	0.81 d	115.7 c	0.17 c	
Mean	242.6	9.70	156.7	1.35	
LSD 0.05	22.7	0.91	14.6	0.16	
Fertilizer rate (kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha)					
0	14.8 e	0.58 e	112.0 c	0.13 c	
125	207.0 d	8.28 d	145.1 b	1.35 b	
250	286.3 c	11.45 c	155.3 b	1.73 a	
375	338.3 b	13.53 b	178.6 a	1.70 a	
500	366.7 a	14.66 a	192.8 a	1.85 a	
Mean	242.6	9.7	156.7	1.35	
LSD 0.05	25.4	1.01	16.3	0.18	
Significance level					
Fertilizer type	***	***	***	***	
Fertilizer rate	***	***	***	***	
Fertilizer type × rate	***	***	**	***	

Means followed by different letter(s) in a column differ significantly according to LSD test at 0.05 probability.

**: Highly Significant at $P \le 0.01$.

***: Highly Significant at $P \le 0.001$.



content in plant leaves increases under such suboptimal growth conditions (Mikulska et al. 1998).

Water applied

P fertilizer type, rate and their interaction affected the total amount of water applied to the head lettuce plant significantly (Table 3). As shown in Figure 8, plants fertilized with MAP gained the highest amount of water applied (178.67 mm), meanwhile the lowest amount of



water applied was recorded for plants fertilized with PR (115.69 mm). While the application rate of 500 kg P_2O_5 / ha induced the highest total water applied (192.755 mm), the control treatment caused the lowest amount (112.0 mm), as presented in Figure 9. Actually, the total water applied of the control treatment was significantly lower than those of the other P application rates. However, there were no significant differences between the total water applied at 500 and 375 kg P_2O_5 /ha rates.

Fertilizer type	Fertilizer rate	Fresh weight Dry weight g/head		Total water applied	Water use efficiency g/mm	
	(kg P ₂ O ₅ /ha)			mm		
	0	14.1 h	0.56 h	109.8 h	0.13 f	
	125	233.7 g	9.35 g	142.5 fg	1.66 e	
DAP	250	336.4 ed	13.45 ed	161.5 ef	2.10 bcd	
	375	367.9 cd	14.72 cd	183.4 bcde	2.02 6cd	
	500	427.0 b	17.08 b	203.2 bc	2.12 bcd	
	0	16.8 h	0.67 h	115.1 gh	0.14 f	
	125	266.0 fg	10.64 fg	165.3 ef	1.62 e	
SSP	250	399.3 bc	15.97 bc	169.0 def	2.38 abc	
	375	427.3 b	17.09 b	201.3 bcd	2.21 bcd	
	500	495.0 a	19.80 a	212.1 ab	2.42 ab	
	0	14.4 h	0.58 h	115.5 gh	0.13 f	
	125	306.3 ef	12.25 ef	161.0 ef	1.91 de	
MAP	250	388.0 bc	15.52 bc	173.0 cdef	2.26 bcd	
	375	531.4 a	21.26 a	205.0 bc	2.34 bc	
	500	526.5 a	21.06 a	239.0 a	2.70 a	
	0	13.0 h	0.52 h	107.8 h	0.12 f	
	125	22.1 h	0.89 h	111.7 gh	0.20 f	
PR	250	21.3 h	0.85 h	117.8 gh	0.18 f	
	375	26.4 h	1.06 h	124.6 gh	0.21 f	
	500	17.8 h	0.71 h	116.7 gh	0.15 f	
LSD		50.7	2.03	32.7	0.36	

Table 4 Interaction effect of P fertilizer on lettuce plant growth, water applied and water use efficiency

Means followed by different letter(s) in a column differ significantly according to LSD test at 0.05 probability.



Higher application rates of different fertilizers, except PR, resulted in higher values of water applied (Table 4). This was supported by many investigators (Xu et al. 2004) who indicated that the rate of water uptake was higher at the high P application rate treatment than that at the low one, and this was attributed to the greater size of the plants at the high P level. On the other hand, plants fertilized with MAP at the application rate of 500 kg P_2O_5 /ha recorded the highest significant value of total water applied (239.03 mm), and the lowest value was obtained at the control treatment of PR (107.77 mm). No significant differences in the total water applied were observed between that recorded at the 500 kg P_2O_5 /ha rate of each of MAP and SSP fertilizers.

Water use efficiency

The effects of the fertilizer type, rate and their interaction on the WUE of the lettuce head plant were highly significant (Table 3). While, plants fertilized with MAP presented the highest W.U.E. (1.87 g/mm), the lowest value was reported for plants fertilized with PR (0.17 g/mm).





However, there was no significant difference in W.U.E. induced by SSP and MAP fertilizers (Figure 10). On the other hand, the application rates of 250, 375 and 500 kg P₂O₅/ha caused no significant differences in the W.U.E. of the plant (1.85, 1.70 and 1.73 g/mm, respectively), as displayed in Figure 11. The control treatment, however, marked the lowest WUE (0.13 g/mm). Table 4 indicates that plants fertilized with MAP at 500 kg P₂O₅/ha exhibited the highest W.U.E. (2.70 g/mm), whereas the lowest value of W.U.E. was recorded for plants related to the control treatment of PR (0.12 g/mm). However, the difference in the WUE produced by MAP and SSP fertilizers at 500 kg P₂O₅/ha application rate was not significant. The substantial improvement in the WUE by the plant could be ascribed to the increase in the plant root growth with increasing P supply (Ogata et al. 1960).

Conclusions and recommendations

The investigated P fertilizers, except PR, enhanced the performance of lettuce head plant grown in an alkaline calcareous soil through improving its WUE and increasing its fresh weight and, subsequently, the yield. MAP



and SSP fertilizers were found to be superior to the other P fertilizers, and can be used successfully to improve the crop WUE and increase its yield. Direct application of PR to the alkaline calcareous soil was of low agronomic value. MAP fertilizer at the application rate of 375 kg P_2O_5 /ha can be recommended in terms of both plant fresh weight and WUE, as this treatment of fertilizer can induce both relatively high crop yield and improve irrigation water productivity.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

AA conducted the greenhouse experiment, analyzed the data and prepared the manuscript. AR designed the experiment and revised the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgments

Authors would like to thank Deanship of Academic Research, University of Jordan, for the financial support, while the technical support from National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE) is highly appreciated.

Author details

¹Horticulture and Field Crops, National Center for Agricultural Research and Extension (NCARE), PO Box (639), Baqa' 19381, Jordan. ²Faculty of Agriculture, University of Jordan (UOJ), Amman, Jordan.

Received: 20 July 2013 Accepted: 14 October 2013 Published: 25 October 2013

References

- Allison LE (1965) Organic carbon. In: Balck C (ed) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Agronomy 9. Amer Soc. of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp 1376–1378
- Allison LE, Moodie CD (1965) Carbonates. In: Balck C (ed) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Agronomy 9. Amer. Soc. of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp 1379–1396
- Al-Qerem RA, Suleiman AA, Shatanawi MR (2012) Assessing tomato yield and water saving under deficit irrigation in Jordan Valley, Jordan. J Agr Sci 8(2):209–222
- Beaton JD, Nielsen KF (1959) The availability to alfalfa of phosphorous from twelve different carriers. Can J Soil Sci 39:54–63
- Boutraa T (2009) Growth and carbon partitioning of two genotypes of bean (*Phaseolus vulgaris*) grown with low phosphorous availability. EurAsia J BioSci 3:17–24
- Bower CA, Wilcox LV (1965) Soluble salts. In: Balck C (ed) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Agronomy 9. Amer Soc. of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp 933–951
- Bremner IM (1965) Total nitrogen. In: Balck C (ed) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Agronomy 9. Amer Soc. of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp 1149–1178
- Briggs ⊔, Shantz HL (1913) The water requirement of plants: II. A review of the literature. USDA Bureau Plant Industry Bulletin 285
- Chapman HD (1965) Cation-exchange capacity. In: Balck C (ed) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Agronomy 9. Amer Soc. of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp 891–900
- Chapman HD, Pratt PF (1982) Methods of analysis for soils, plants and waters, University of California
- Chien SH, Menon RG (1995) Factors affecting the agronomic effectiveness of phosphate rock for direct application. Fertilizer Research 41:227–234
- Day TR (1965) Particle size analysis. In: Balck C (ed) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Agronomy 9. Amer Soc. of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp 562–566
- Fixen PE (1990) Agronomic evaluations of MAP and DAP, Illinois Fertilizer Conference Proceedings, January 23–24
- Hasaneen MNA, Younis ME, Tourky SMN (2009) Plant growth, metabolism and adaptation in relation to stress conditions XXIII. Salinity-biofertility interactive

- Jacob J, Lawlor DW (1991) Stomatal and mesophyll limitations of photosynthesis in phosphate deficient sunflower, maize and wheat plants. J Exp Bot 42:1003–1011
- Khasawneh FE, Doll EC (1978) The use of phosphate rock for direct application to soils. Adv Agron 30:159–204
- Lana RMQ, Junior LAZ, Luz JMQ, da Silva JC (2004) Lettuce yield under different phosphorus sources use in the Cerrado soil. Hortic Bras 22(3):525–528
- Luo HY, Lee SK, He J (2009) Integrated effects of root-zone temperatures and phosphorous levels on aeroponically-grown lettuce (*Lactuca sativa* L) in the tropics. The Open Horticulture Journal 2:6–12
- Mikulska M, Bomsel JL, Rychter M (1998) The influence of phosphate deficiency on photosynthesis, respiration and adenine nucleotide pool in bean leaves. Photosynthetica 35(1):79–88
- Ministry of Water and Irrigation (2004) National water master plan, water uses and demands, Amman, Jordan
- Miretzky P, Fernandez CA (2008) Phosphates for Pb immobilization in soils: a review. Environ Chem Lett 6:121–133
- Ogata G, Richards LA, Gardner WR (1960) Transpiration of alfalfa determined from water content changes. Soil Sci 89:179–182
- Olsen SR, Dean LA (1965) Phosphorus. In: Balck C (ed) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Agronomy 9. Amer Soc. of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp 1035–1048
- Power JF, Grunes DL, Reichmann GA (1961) The influence of phosphorous fertilization and moisture on growth and nutrient absorption by spring wheat: I. Plant growth, N uptake, and moisture use. Soil Sci Soc Am Proc 25:207–210
- Pratt PF (1965) Potassium. In: Balck C (ed) Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2. Chemical and Microbiological Properties. Agronomy 9. Amer Soc. of Agronomy, Madison, Wisconsin, USA, pp 1022–1030
- Prochnow LI, Chein SH, Carmona G, Austin ER, Corrente JE, Alleoni LRF (2006) Agronomic effectiveness of cationic phosphate impurities present in superphosphate fertilizers as affected by soil pH. Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal 37:2057–2967
- Pyne WA, Drew MC, Hossner LR, Lascano RJ, Onken AB, Wendt CW (1992) Soil phosphorous availability and pearl millet water-use efficiency. Crop Sci 32:1010–1015
- SAS Institute Inc (2002) SAS, Cary, North Carolina, USA
- Schmidhalter U, Studer C (1998) Water-use efficiency as influenced by plant mineral nutrition, 1st Sino-German Workshop "Impact of plant nutrition on sustainable agricultural production". Kiel, 22–23 October 1998
- Siam HS, Abd El-moez MR, El-ashry SM (2008) Response of lettuce followed by sorghum to application of different types of phosphorus, compost and sulfur. Aust J Basic Appl Sci 2(3):447–457
- Xu G, Levkovitch I, Soriano S, Wallach R, Silber A (2004) Integrated effect of irrigation frequency and phosphorous level on lettuce: P uptake, root growth and yield. Plant Soil 263:297–309

doi:10.1186/2193-1801-2-563

Cite this article as: AlKhader and Abu Rayyan: **Improving Water Use Efficiency of Lettuce (***Lactuca sativa* **L.) Using Phosphorous Fertilizers.** *SpringerPlus* 2013 **2**:563.

Submit your manuscript to a SpringerOpen[™] journal and benefit from:

- Convenient online submission
- ► Rigorous peer review
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Open access: articles freely available online
- ► High visibility within the field
- Retaining the copyright to your article

Submit your next manuscript at > springeropen.com