



*Minia J. of Agric. Res. & Develop.*  
*Vol. (30) No. 3 pp 363 -376 ,*  
*2010*

FACULTY OF AGRICULTURE

## **EFFECT OF PLANTING DENSITIES ON PRODUCTIVITY AND QUALITY OF SUGAR BEET (*Beta vulgaris* L.) UNDER MIDDLE EGYPT CONDITIONS**

**H. Ferweez, ; Maha. M. El.Zeny and A.M. Elwan**  
Sugar Tech. and Agro., Res. Dept., Sugar Crops Res. Inst., Agric. Res.  
Centre, Giza, Egypt.

Received 10 Dec. 2010

Accepted 26 Dec. 2010

### **ABSTRACT**

Recently, there is a great need to find out the proper technical recommendations for improving the productivity and quality of sugar beet under Middle Egypt conditions. Therefore, this study was conducted at Mallawi Agric. Res., Station, Minia Governorate, Egypt, during 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 seasons to examine the effect of nine planting densities, i.e. 28.000 (1.0<sup>r</sup>) plants/fed at ridges, rows and beds, 30.000 (1.0<sup>r</sup>) at ridges, rows and beds and 36.667 (1.0<sup>r</sup>) plants/fed. at ridges, rows and beds, on productivity traits and quality characteristics of sugar beet. A randomized complete block design (RCBD) with four replications was used.

The obtained results indicated that plant density 36.667 (1.0<sup>r</sup>)/fed at beds of sugar beet produced the highest values of roots number/fed. at harvest (30.87 (1.0<sup>r</sup>) roots/fed.) and root length (44.80 cm), as well as the lowest value of root diameter (1.47 cm). The lowest values of roots number /fed. at harvest (23.03 (1.0<sup>r</sup>) roots/fed) and root length (29.20 cm) were scored for plant density of 28.000 (1.0<sup>r</sup>)/fed at rows.

High plant density at beds (36.667 (1.0<sup>r</sup>) plants/fed) achieved the highest values in both of pol% (17.02%), sugar recovery % (10.02%) and quality index (88.27%) and lowest values in K, Na

### H. Ferweez *et al.*

and  $\alpha$ -N contents (3.20, 1.28 and 1.83 meq/100 gm). Low plant density at rows (28.00 (10<sup>3</sup>) plants/fed.) recorded the lowest values in both of pol% and sugar recovery% (13.10 and 10.44%) and highest values in K, Na and  $\alpha$ -N contents being 4.09, 1.00 and 2.40 meq/100 gm, respectively.

Under the Middle Egypt conditions, high plant density at beds (46.67 (10<sup>3</sup>) plants/fed.) was recommended because it achieved the highest values of root and recoverable sugar yields (30.46 and 0.33 ton/fed, respectively). Therefore, increasing income value of grower and sugar production for the factory as well as increase the efficiency of water use. This also will help in reducing the vast gap between sugar consumption and production on the national level.

### INTRODUCTION

Sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*, L.) is a new cultivated crop in Upper and Middle Egypt started in 1997 season at El.Minia Governorate and in 2001 season at El.Fayum Governorate). It is a crop of short duration and requires less water Egyptian Government imports large amounts of sugar, i.e. about 1.10 million ton, every year to face the rapid demand due to the increase of population. Sugar beet plays a prominent role for sugar production, about 37.08% of locally sugar production which reached 1.61 million ton in 2009 season. Recently, more attention has been given to grow and development sugar beet crop to overcome the gap between sugar consumption and production. (El. Geddawy *et al.* 2001; Abd El. All, 2002; Gaweesh, 2003 and CCSC, 2010).

However, many studies are required to find out proper technical recommendations for improving productivity and quality of sugar beet under Middle Egypt conditions. Recent study by El- Sheref (2007) found that sugar beet grown in ridges or beds gave the highest values of root length and diameter, root weight, pol %, quality index, root and recoverable sugar yields (ton/fed). While, the highest values of impurities (K, Na and  $\alpha$ -amino N contents) were scored using rows. On the other hand, other studies revealed that increasing the plant density up to 42000 plants/fed significantly increased root and sugar yields/fed, after which the increase in plant density was accompanied

## Importing productivity and quality of sugar beet

with a reduction in root and sugar yields/fed. Also, pol% and sugar recovery % of beet roots were significantly increased with the increase in plant density. This might be attributed to that the increase in plant density reduced root size and consequently provided higher pol%. and decreased impurities (K, Na and  $\alpha$ -amino N contents) (Taha, 1980; Kamal, *et al* 1989; El.Khatib, 1991; Lauer 1990 and Ramadan, 1999).

The present study was designed to examine the effect of different plant densities on productivity and quality traits of sugar beet, and find out the optimal plant density which achieve best productivity and quality of sugar beet under Middle Egypt conditions.

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This work was conducted at Mallawi Agric. Res. Station El .Minia Governorate, Egypt, during 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 seasons to study the effect of nine plant densities, of sugar beet cultivar namely Kawamera 28.00(1.5)/fed, 30.00(1.5)/fed, and 36.67(1.5)/fed, at ridges, rows and beds. A Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with four replicates was used. Plots area were 30.0 m<sup>2</sup> (each plot consisting of 6.0 cm wide for ten ridges, while 10.0 cm wide for six beds, each of 0.5 meters long) and were distributed as given in Table (1). The soil of experimental site has a silty clay loam texture with pH of 8.10, 1.30 organic matter, 26.20 ppm available N, 9.20 ppm available P and 210 ppm K. Other traditional cultural practices were used as usually followed in sugar beet fields under the Middle Egypt conditions during the two seasons.

#### Data recorded:

A- **Vegetative traits:** At harvest (190 days from sowing), samples of 10 plants from each plot were taken at random to record:

- 1- Number of extractable roots /fed.
- 2- root length (cm).
- 3- root diameter (cm).

B- **Quality characteristics:**

A samples of twenty roots were taken at random, cleaned with running tap water, dried, each sample was ground separately with

**H. Ferweez *et al.***

grater into cossettes and mixed thoroughly to determine the quality characteristics as described in Cooke and Scott, (1993).

## Importing productivity and quality of sugar beet

**Table 1: Plant densities in ridges, rows and beds .**

Plant density	Area / Plant	Ridge spacing (cm)	Hill spacing (cm)	Plant distribution
28.00 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	1000 cm <sup>2</sup>	60	20	One side
28.00 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows		60	20	One side
28.00 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds		100	30	Two sides
30.00 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	1200 cm <sup>2</sup>	60	20	One side
30.00 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows		60	20	One side
30.00 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds		100	24	Two sides
46.67 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	900 cm <sup>2</sup>	60	10	One side
46.67 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows		60	10	One side
46.67 (1.0 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds		100	18	Two sides

\*Feddan area = 4200 m<sup>2</sup>

- 1- Pol % was estimated in fresh samples of sugar beet roots, using saccharometer according to the method described in AOAC, (2000).
- 2- Alpha amino nitrogen, sodium and potassium contents were estimated according to the procedure of sugar company by Auto analyzer as describe in AOAC, (2000), The results were expressed as milliequivalent / 100 gm beet.
- 3- Sugar recovery % was calculated using the equation reported by Cooke and Scott (1993):  

$$\text{Sugar recovery \%} = \text{Pol, \%} - [0.29 + 0.343 (K + Na) + \alpha - N (0.094)],$$
 Where, K, Na and  $\alpha - N$  determined as milliequivalent/100 g beet.
- 4- Quality index was calculated as in Cooke and Scott (1993) using the following formula: Quality index, % = Sugar recovery % X 100 ÷ Pol %

### C- Productivity traits :

1. Roots yield ( ton /fed): were determined as roots yield ton /fed on fresh weight basis at harvest (at 190 days from sowing) .
2. Recoverable sugar yield (ton/fed) was calculated from the following equation : Recoverable sugar yield (ton/fed)= Roots yield (ton/fed) X Sugar recovery % .

## H. Ferweez *et al.*

Data collected were subjected to the proper analysis of variance (ANOVA). The proper statistical of all data was carried out according to lined by Gomez and Gomez (1984). Differences among treatments were evaluated by the least significant difference test (LSD) at 5 per cent level .

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Vegetative traits :

Results in Table 2 reveal that plant density had a highly significant effect on vegetative traits of sugar beet, i.e. number of extractable roots/fed.at harvest in the 1<sup>st</sup> season, root length (cm) in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season and root diameter (cm) in the two growing seasons. It could be noticed from combined analysis that increasing plant density of sugar beet from 28 up to 30 and 46.67 (1.5) roots/fed. led to an increase in the number of extractable roots/fed.at harvest by 20.82 and 42.36% and root length (cm) by 10.97 and 31.16%, while, root diameter (cm) was decreased by 13.81 and 22.13 % respectively. These results might be due to the increase in plant density of sugar beet may led to competition for growth elements. The present findings are in line with those reported by Kamel *et al.*(1989) and Ramadan (1999) who found that increasing plant density from 33600 to 56000 plants /fed decreased number of roots at harvest. The also added that plant population loss at harvest was more at higher density .

Table 2 also shows that beds planting of sugar beet recorded the highest values of extractable roots number/fed. at harvest 30.21 (1.5 roots/fed.) and root length (39.43cm), while, the highest value of root diameter (12.37cm) were scored for ridges planting. These results might be due to different shares of utilized nutrients, water and other factors growth.Hilal (2000) and El.Sheref(2007) reported the same results.They pointed out that planting systems had a significant effect on vegetative traits of sugar beet .

## Importing productivity and quality of sugar beet

**Table 2: Effect of plant density on the number of extractable beet roots (t<sup>r</sup>) at harvest, root length and diameter (cm).**

Plant density	Number of extractable beet roots (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at harvest			Root length (cm)			Root diameter (cm)		
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	combined	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	combined	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	combined
28.00 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	23.10	23.80	23.50	31.57	32.10	31.80	13.80	13.87	13.80
28.00 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows	22.80	23.27	23.03	29.20	29.30	29.20	13.20	13.50	13.30
28.00 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds	24.30	20.67	24.98	33.73	34.60	34.18	12.30	12.03	12.42
Mean	23.40	24.24	23.82	31.57	32.00	31.74	13.10	13.27	13.19
30.00 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	28.50	29.00	28.70	36.33	37.00	36.68	12.10	12.57	12.28
30.00 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows	27.53	28.30	27.87	34.20	34.80	34.50	11.00	11.80	11.67
30.00 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds	29.33	30.23	29.78	38.30	40.20	39.20	10.60	11.00	10.83
Mean	28.39	29.18	28.78	36.28	37.34	36.81	11.40	11.76	11.59
47.67 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	33.20	34.00	33.60	41.37	42.30	41.80	10.80	11.07	10.97
47.67 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows	31.97	32.03	32.20	38.63	38.60	38.62	10.90	11.10	11.02
47.67 (t <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds	30.00	36.23	30.87	44.00	40.70	44.80	10.20	10.60	10.42
Mean	33.06	34.26	33.91	41.33	42.20	41.77	10.60	10.92	10.80
Average of ridges	28.23	28.93	28.58	36.39	37.10	36.78	12.20	12.57	12.37
Average of rows	27.50	28.03	27.72	34.01	34.20	34.12	11.80	12.10	11.99
Average of beds	29.71	30.71	30.21	38.68	40.10	39.43	11.00	11.38	11.22
Overall mean	28.50	29.23	28.84	36.36	37.10	36.78	11.70	11.98	11.86

### H. Ferweez *et al.*

F value	**	Ns	**	Ns	*	**	**	**	**
LSD 0.05	0.31	-	0.58	-	0.81	0.56	0.22	0.24	0.16

Combined analysis show that plant density (46.67 (10<sup>3</sup>)/fed at beds) of sugar beet contained the highest values of extractable actual roots number /fed. at harvest (30.87 (10<sup>3</sup>) roots/fed.) and root length (44.80 cm) as well as the lowest value of root diameter (10.47 cm). While, the lowest values of extractable actual roots number /fed. at harvest (23.02 (10<sup>3</sup>) roots/fed) and root length (29.20 cm) were scored for plant density (28.00 (10<sup>3</sup>)/fed at rows). These results might be due to different shares of utilized nutrients, water and other factors growth. Plant density 28000 plants/fed at ridges achieved the maximal value of root diameter (13.80 cm). Similar results were reported by Ramadan (1999) Hilal (2000) and El.Sheref (2007) who pointed out that planting density had a significant effect on vegetative traits of sugar beet.

#### Quality characteristics :

Data in Tables, 3 and 4 reveal significant differences among plant densities in quality traits of sugar beet, i.e. pol and  $\alpha$ -N content in the two growing seasons and in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season for K content and in the 1<sup>st</sup> season for sugar recovery % of sugar beet. Combined analysis show that increasing plant density of sugar beet from 28 up to 30 and 46.67 (10<sup>3</sup>) roots/fed. increased pol % by 10.11 and 23.04%, sugar recovery% by 20.60 and 32.30% and quality index by 4.82 and 7.08%, while decreased Na content of beet root by 7.97 and 13.74%, K content of beet root by 10.47 and 26.98% and  $\alpha$ -N content of beet root by 8.03 and 18.60%, respectively. The present findings are in line with those reported by Kamel *et al.* (1989) and Ramadan (1999) who revealed that pol%, sugar recovery% and quality index significantly increased with the increase in plant density of sugar beet in both seasons.

Combined analysis show that beds planting increased pol % by 2.18 and 0.61%, sugar recovery % by 3.01 and 8.42% and quality index by 1.31 and 2.69%, while decreased Na content by 2.96 and



### Importing productivity and quality of sugar beet

۷.۴۱% , K content by ۰.۰۱ and ۱۱.۰۲% , α- N content by ۶.۰۷ and ۱۲.۱۲% compared with ridges and rows planting ,respectively . Similar trend was obtained by Hilal (۲۰۰۰) and El.Sheref (۲۰۰۷) who revealed significant differences among quality traits of beet roots between planting patterns , i.e. ridges , rows and platforms.

**Table ۳ : Effect of plant density on pol%, Na and K contents (meq/۱۰۰ gm) of beet roots.**

Plant density	pol%			Na content (meq/۱۰۰ gm)			K content (meq/۱۰۰ gm)		
	۱ <sup>st</sup>	۲ <sup>nd</sup>	combined	۱ <sup>st</sup>	۲ <sup>nd</sup>	combined	۱ <sup>st</sup>	۲ <sup>nd</sup>	combined
۲۸.۰۰ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at ridges	۱۳.۲ .	۱۳.۰ .	۱۳.۳ ۰	۱.۰۰	۱.۴۸	۱.۴۹	۴.۴۰	۴.۱۰	۴.۳۰
۲۸.۰۰ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at rows	۱۳.۱ .	۱۳.۱ .	۱۳.۱ .	۱.۰۸	۱.۰۲	۱.۰۰	۴.۶۰	۴.۰۳	۴.۰۹
۲۸.۰۰ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at beds	۱۳.۰ .	۱۳.۸ .	۱۳.۶ ۰	۱.۴۰	۱.۴۳	۱.۴۴	۴.۲۰	۴.۰۰	۴.۱۰
<b>Mean</b>	۱۳.۲ ۷	۱۳.۴ ۷	۱۳.۳ ۷	۱.۰۱	۱.۴۷	۱.۴۹	۴.۴۳	۴.۲۳	۴.۳۳
۳۰.۰۰ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at ridges	۱۰.۴ .	۱۰.۷ ۷	۱۰.۰ ۸	۱.۳۸	۱.۳۷	۱.۳۸	۳.۸۰	۳.۷۰	۳.۷۰
۳۰.۰۰ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at rows	۱۴.۸ .	۱۰.۰ .	۱۴.۹ .	۱.۴۷	۱.۴۳	۱.۴۰	۴.۰۰	۳.۸۰	۳.۹۳
۳۰.۰۰ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at beds	۱۰.۶ .	۱۰.۷ ۷	۱۰.۶ ۸	۱.۳۳	۱.۳۲	۱.۳۳	۳.۶۲	۳.۰۰	۳.۰۸
<b>Mean</b>	۱۰.۲ ۷	۱۰.۰ ۱	۱۰.۳ ۹	۱.۳۹	۱.۳۷	۱.۳۸	۳.۸۱	۳.۷۰	۳.۷۰
۴۶.۶۷ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at ridges	۱۶.۲ ۷	۱۶.۶ .	۱۶.۴ ۳	۱.۳۲	۱.۲۸	۱.۳۰	۳.۰۰	۳.۴۰	۳.۴۰
۴۶.۶۷ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at rows	۱۰.۸ .	۱۶.۰ .	۱۰.۹ .	۱.۳۸	۱.۳۳	۱.۳۶	۳.۶۳	۳.۰۳	۳.۰۸
۴۶.۶۷ (۱۰ <sup>۳</sup> )/fed at beds	۱۶.۸ ۳	۱۷.۲ .	۱۷.۰ ۲	۱.۲۸	۱.۲۷	۱.۲۸	۳.۲۳	۳.۱۷	۳.۲۰
<b>Mean</b>	۱۶.۳ .	۱۶.۶ .	۱۶.۴ ۰	۱.۳۳	۱.۲۹	۱.۳۱	۳.۴۶	۳.۳۷	۳.۴۱
<b>Average of ridges</b>	۱۴.۹ ۶	۱۰.۲ ۹	۱۰.۱ ۲	۱.۴۰	۱.۳۸	۱.۳۹	۳.۹۲	۳.۷۰	۳.۸۳

H. Ferweez *et al.*

Average of rows	١٤.٥ ٧	١٤.٧ ٠	١٤.٦ ٣	١.٤٨	١.٤٣	١.٤٥	٤.٠٩	٣.٩٧	٤.٠٣
Average of beds	١٥.٣ ١	١٥.٥ ٩	١٥.٤ ٥	١.٣٦	١.٣٤	١.٣٥	٣.٦٨	٣.٥٧	٣.٦٣
Overallmean	١٤.٩ ٤	١٥.١ ٩	١٥.٠ ٧	١.٤١	١.٣٨	١.٤٠	٣.٩٠	٣.٧٧	٣.٨٣
F value	**	**	**	Ns	Ns	Ns	Ns	**	*
LSD ٠.٠٥	٠.١٣	٠.٢٠	٠.١٤	-	-	-	-	٠.٠٩	٠.٠٨

Combined analysis showed that plant density at beds (٤٦.٦٧ (١٠<sup>٣</sup>) plants/fed) achieved the highest values in both of pol% (١٧.٠٢%), sugar recovery % (١٥.٠٢%) and quality index (٨٨.٢٧%) as well as the lowest values in both of K, Na and α-N contents (٣.٢٠, ١.٢٨ and ١.٨٣ meq/١٠٠ gm), while, low plant density at rows (٢٨.٠٠ (١٠<sup>٣</sup>) plants/fed.) contained the lowest values in both of pol% and sugar recovery% (١٣.١٠ and ١٠.٤٤%) and the highest values in both of K, Na and α-N contents (٤.٥٩, ١.٥٥ and ٢.٤٥ meq/١٠٠ gm), respectively. Ramadan (١٩٩٩) Hilal (٢٠٠٠) and El.Sherif (٢٠٠٧) reported similar effects.

**Table ٤: Effect of plant density on sugar recovery%, quality index and α- N content (meq/١٠٠ gm) of beet roots.**

Plant density	Sugar recovery %			quality index			α- N content (meq/١٠٠ gm)		
	١ <sup>st</sup>	٢ <sup>nd</sup>	combined	١ <sup>st</sup>	٢ <sup>nd</sup>	combined	١ <sup>st</sup>	٢ <sup>nd</sup>	combined
٢٨.٠٠ (١٠ <sup>٣</sup> )/fed at ridges	١٠.٤٥	١١.٠٩	١٠.٨٧	٨٠.٦٨	٨٢.١٥	٨١.٤٢	٢.٣٣	٢.٢٣	٢.٢٨
٢٨.٠٠ (١٠ <sup>٣</sup> )/fed at rows	١٠.٣٨	١٠.٥٠	١٠.٤٤	٧٩.٢١	٨٠.١٥	٧٩.٦٨	٢.٤٢	٢.٤٨	٢.٤٥
٢٨.٠٠ (١٠ <sup>٣</sup> )/fed at beds	١١.٠١	١١.٤٥	١١.٢٣	٨١.٥٣	٨٢.٩٤	٨٢.٢٤	٢.١٧	٢.١٠	٢.١٣
Mean	١٠.٦٨	١١.٠١	١٠.٨٥	٨٠.٤٧	٨١.٧٥	٨١.١١	٢.٣١	٢.٢٧	٢.٢٩
٣٥.٠٠ (١٠ <sup>٣</sup> )/fed at ridges	١٣.١٣	١٣.٣٠	١٣.٢١	٨٥.٢٤	٨٤.٣٤	٨٤.٧٩	٢.١٧	٢.١٢	٢.١٤
٣٥.٠٠ (١٠ <sup>٣</sup> )/fed at rows	١٢.٣٥	١٢.٧٠	١٢.٥٢	٨٣.٤٣	٨٤.٦٤	٨٤.٠٤	٢.٢٣	٢.١٨	٢.٢١

### Importing productivity and quality of sugar beet

30.00(1.5)/fed at beds	13.42	13.62	13.52	16.00	16.40	16.23	2.00	1.90	1.98
Mean	12.97	13.21	13.09	14.90	15.13	15.02	2.13	2.08	2.11
46.67(1.5)/fed at ridges	14.14	14.52	14.33	15.24	17.49	17.22	1.90	1.90	1.90
46.67(1.5)/fed at rows	13.59	13.80	13.72	13.43	16.58	16.30	2.03	1.98	2.01
46.67(1.5)/fed at beds	14.82	15.22	15.02	16.00	18.47	18.27	1.80	1.82	1.83
Mean	14.19	14.53	14.36	14.90	17.01	17.26	1.94	1.92	1.93
Average of ridges	12.64	12.97	12.81	14.29	14.66	14.47	2.10	2.10	2.11
Average of rows	12.10	12.30	12.23	12.88	13.79	13.34	2.23	2.22	2.22
Average of beds	13.08	13.43	13.26	15.21	15.94	15.58	2.01	1.96	1.98
Overallmean	12.61	12.92	12.76	14.13	14.80	14.46	2.13	2.09	2.11
F value	**	Ns	**	Ns	Ns	Ns	**	**	**
LSD 0.05	0.12	-	0.18	-	-	-	0.04	0.08	0.05

#### Productivity traits :

Results in Table 6 show highly significant differences among plant densities with regard to root yield of sugar beet in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season. It could be noticed from combined analysis that increasing plant density of sugar beet from 28 up to 30 and 46.67 (1.5) roots/fed. led to an increase in root yield (ton/fed) by 4.10 and 2.00%, and sugar yield by 24.17 and 37.00% ,respectively. The results could be due to the increase in number of roots/ fed at harvest and pol% of sugar beet with increasing the plant density (Tables 2 and 3). These findings are in harmony with the findings of Lauer (1990) and Ramadan (1999) .

It could be noted from combined analysis (Table 6) that beds and ridges recorded the highest values of root yield(ton/fed) of sugar beet by 12.10 and 12.10 % and recoverable sugar yield(ton/fed) by 19.90 and 17.10 % compared with rows, respectively . This is possibility due to the increase in number of roots / fed. and pol % under beds and ridges planting . These findings are in agreement with those obtained by Hilal (2000) and El.Sheraf (2007) who revealed that planting systems ( ridges, rows and beds ) had significant effect on root and recoverable sugar yield of sugar beet.

### **H. Ferweez *et al.***

It could be noticed from combined that high plant density at beds (46.67 (1.7)roots/fed) achieved the highest values of root and recoverable sugar yields (30.46 and 0.33 tons/fed, respectively), while low plant density at rows (28.00 (1.7)roots/fed) scored the lowest values of of root and recoverable sugar yields (29.94 and 3.13 tons/fed, respectively). Such data are in agreement with those reported by Ramadan (1999) Hilal (2000) and El.Sheref (2007).

The present study recommended the use of high plant density at beds (46.67 (1.7)roots/fed at beds) Middle Egypt conditions. These will results in because the highest values of root and recoverable sugar yields ( 30.46 and 0.33 ton/fed, respectively) , increasing income value of grower and sugar production for the factory, and increase the efficiency of water use. Also, reducing the vast gap between sugar consumption and production on the national level .

## Importing productivity and quality of sugar beet

**Table 5: Effect of plant density on root and recoverable sugar yields(ton/fed) of beet roots.**

Plant density	Root yield(ton/fed)			Sugar yield(ton/fed)		
	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	combined	1 <sup>st</sup>	2 <sup>nd</sup>	combined
28.00 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	34.60	30.06	34.86	3.67	3.89	3.78
28.00 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows	29.41	30.48	29.94	3.00	3.20	3.13
28.00 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds	33.40	36.02	34.73	3.68	4.13	3.91
<b>Mean</b>	32.50	33.80	33.17	3.47	3.74	3.60
30.00 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	30.40	30.48	30.44	4.60	4.72	4.68
30.00 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows	31.64	33.24	32.44	3.91	4.22	4.07
30.00 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds	34.91	36.49	35.70	4.30	4.97	4.66
<b>Mean</b>	32.98	33.07	32.87	4.27	4.64	4.46
46.67 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at ridges	30.97	30.20	30.61	0.09	0.12	0.10
46.67 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at rows	31.22	32.97	32.10	4.24	4.07	4.15
46.67 (1.5 <sup>r</sup> )/fed at beds	34.32	36.00	35.16	0.09	0.07	0.08
<b>Mean</b>	32.84	33.06	32.89	4.81	0.09	4.90
<b>Average of ridges</b>	30.34	30.26	30.30	4.47	4.08	4.27
<b>Average of rows</b>	30.76	32.23	31.49	3.73	4.00	3.86
<b>Average of beds</b>	34.22	36.37	35.30	4.37	4.89	4.63
<b>Overallmean</b>	33.44	34.62	34.03	4.19	4.49	4.34
<b>Value</b>	Ns	*	*	Ns	Ns	Ns
<b>P &lt; 0.05</b>	-	1.20	0.91	-	-	-

### REFERENCES

- Abd El. All ,A.M. (2002) :** Weed control treatments for different intercropped systems of sugar beet and faba bean . J. of Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 27 (12) : 8092 - 8092.
- A.O.A.C. (2000):** Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Official methods of analysis, 17<sup>th</sup> Ed. ,AOAC International ,Washington, D.C., USA.
- CCSC (2010):** Central Council for Sugar Crops. Annual Report, Ministry of Agriculture , Egypt. ( In Arabic).
- Cooke, D.A. and , R.K. Scott (1993):** The Sugar Beet Crop. Scientient Practice published by Chapman & Hall, London .
- El.Geddawy, I.H. ; Saif, L. M. and Abd El. Latief , F.A. ( 2001) :** Hoeing and nitrogen fertilization with respect to quality , yield and yield components of some sugar beet varieties

**H. Ferweez et al.**

grown in upper Egypt .J. of Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ.,  
٢٦(٨):٤٦٤٧ - ٤٦٦١.

- El.Khatib, H.S.Y.(١٩٩١):** Effect of plant population and distribution and N,K fertilization on growth , yield and quality of sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* , L.). M. Sc. Thesis , Fac. of Agric. Mansoura Univ., Egypt.
- El. Sheref ,E.E. M. (٢٠٠٧):** Effect of irrigation system and planting pattern on yield and quality of sugar beet under North Delta conditions . J. Agric. Mansoura Univ., ٣٢(٥):٣٢٦٩-٣٢٨٧.
- Gaweesh, S.S.W. (٢٠٠٣) :** Evaluation of some chemical and Mechanical weed control methods on associated weeds , growth , yield and quality of some sugar beet under newly reclaimed sandy soil at Nubariya. J. of Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., ٢٨ (١) : ٧٩ - ٩٣.
- Gomez,K.A. and A.A. Gomez (١٩٨٤):** Statistical procedures for agricultural Research, Second Edition. John Willey and Sons , New York, pp.٦٨٠.
- Hilal , S.M.M. (٢٠٠٠) :**Effect of some cultural treatments on yield and quality of sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* L. ) . M.Sc. Thesis , Fac. of Agric.Kafr El.Sehikh , Tanta Univ.
- Kamel ,M.S.; Mahmoud,E.A.; Abdel-Hafez,A.A.; Abustait , E.O. and Hassanein ,B.S. (١٩٨٩):** Effect of plant density,thinning time and nitrogen fertilization on growth, yield and quality of sugar beet. Assiut J. Agric. Sci., ٢٠(٢):٢٢٥-٢٣٨ .
- Lauer , J.C.(١٩٩٥):**Plant density and nitrogen rate effects on sugar beet yield and quality early in harvest. Agron.J. ٨٧:٤٦٩-٤٧٥.
- Ramadan, B.S.H.(١٩٩٩):**Differential response of some sugar beet varieties to plant density and harvesting dates . J.Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ. , ٢٤(٢): ٤١٣-٤٢٣
- Taha,E.M.(١٩٨٥):**Effect of different rates of nitrogen and plant spacing on on growth , yield and quality of sugar beet . Minia J. Agric.Res.Rev.,٧(٣):١٠١٧-١٠٣٠.

## Importing productivity and quality of sugar beet

### تأثير اختلاف الكثافة النباتية على إنتاجية وجودة بنجر السكر تحت ظروف مصر الوسطي

حسين فرويز محمد حسن - مها محمد الزيني - على محمد علوان

قسمي بحوث تكنولوجيا السكر والمعاملات ، معهد بحوث المحاصيل السكرية ، مركز

البحوث الزراعية ، جمهورية مصر العربية

لا يزال هناك حاجة لإجراء العديد من الدراسات لإيجاد التوصيات الفنية لتحسين إنتاجية وجودة بنجر السكر تحت ظروف مصر الوسطي . لهذا الشأن أقيمت تجربتين حقليتين بمحطة البحوث الزراعية بملوي ، محافظة المنيا ، مصر خلال موسمي ٢٠٠٧ / ٢٠٠٨ ، ٢٠٠٨ / ٢٠٠٩ ، لدراسة تأثير تسع كثافات نباتية مختلفة هي ٢٨ ، ٣٥ ، و ٤٦.٦٧ ألف نبات / ف على الخطوط ، الصفوف و المصاطب في تصميم قطع كاملة العشوائية لعدد أربع مكررات على الصفات الخضرية وكذلك صفات الجودة و المحصول لجذور بنجر السكر .

#### أوضحت النتائج المتحصل عليها الآتي :

- ١- حققت الكثافة النباتية ٤٦.٦٧ ألف نبات / فدان على المصاطب أعلى القيم لعدد الجذور / ف عند الحصاد (٣٥.٨ ألف نبات / ف) وطول الجذر (٤٤.٨٥ سم) ، في المقابل سجل القيم الأقل لعدد الجذور/ف عند الحصاد ( ٢٣.٠٣ ألف نبات/ ف) وطول الجذر (٢٩.٢٥ سم) للكثافة النباتية ٢٨ ألف نبات /ف على صفوف .
- ٢- حققت الكثافة النباتية ٤٦.٦٧ ألف نبات / فدان على المصاطب أعلى القيم لنسبة الحلاوة في جذور البنجر (١٧.٠٢ % ) ، نسبة استخراج السكر (١٥.٠٢ %) و معامل الجودة (٨٨.٢٧ %) وكذلك القيم الأقل لكميات ألفا أمينو نتروجين ، البوتاسيوم و الصوديوم ( ١.٨٣ ، ٣.٢٠ و ١.٢٨ ملليمكافئ / ١٠٠ جم بنجر على التوالي) ، في المقابل حققت الكثافة النباتية ٢٨ ألف نبات /ف على صفوف اقل القيم لنسبة الحلاوة في جذور البنجر (١٣.١٠ %) و نسبة استخراج السكر (١٠.٤٢ %) وكذلك

**H. Ferweez et al.**

القيم الأعلى لكميات ألفا أمنيو نتروجين ، البوتاسيوم و الصوديوم ( ٢.٤٥ ، ٤.٥٩ و ٢.٤٥ ملليمكافئ / ١٠٠ جم بنجر على التوالي) .

٣- بناء على تقدم فإن الكثافة النباتية المناسبة لبنجر السكر تحت ظروف مصر الوسطي هي ٤٦.٦٧ ألف نبات/ف على مصاطب ويمكن التوصية بها حيث حققت أعلى القيم لنواتج الجذور النظيفة والسكر القابل للاستخراج ( ٣٥.٤٦ و ٥.٣٣ طن/ ف على التوالي ) وتحقق زيادة دخل المزارع و إنتاج السكر للمصنع ، وهذا بالإضافة يساعد في خفض الفجوة الضخمة بين إنتاج و استهلاك السكر على مستوى الوطن.