J. Plant Production, Mansoura Univ., Vol. 3 (5): 715 - 727, 2012

INTEGRATION EFFECTS OF MULCHING AND BURNING WITH HOEING ON SUGAR BEET AND ASSOCIATED WEEDS.

Tagour, R. M. H. [1] **; G. M. Abd El-Hamed**[1] **; R.A. Mousa**[1] **and H. M. Sarhan**[2]

[1] Weed Res. Cent. Lab., Agric. Res. Cent., Giza, Egypt.

[2]Sugar Crops Res. Instit., Agric. Res. Cent., Giza, Egypt.

ABSTRACT

Two field experiments were carried out during 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 winter seasons to evaluate the effect of some non-traditional methods for weed control which are being (mulching by rice straw and burning has been carried after ridging and directly before sowing) on growth, yield and juice quality as well as associated weeds of sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*, L.) grown in salinity soil condition at El-Serw Research Station.

The most important results obtained could be summarized as follows:

- All weed control treatments reduced significantly fresh weight (g/m^2) of broad-leaf, grassy and total weeds growth which associated with sugar beet plants, dry weight and total of sugar beet weeds as compared to the unweeded check.
- Two hoeing with mulching was the most effective on controlling weeds (91.1-92.2%) followed by one hoeing with mulching (85.9-86.5%) and burning with two hoeing (82.8-84.2%), respectively.
- Application of two hoeing improved drastically the efficiency of the mulching and burning in controlling sugar beet weeds when compared with other treatments.
- The results show that two hoeing with mulching resulted in good control of total weeds after 120 days from sowing (DAS).
- All growth criteria i.e., plant height (cm), leaves number/plant, root/top ratio and root characters responded significantly to two hoeing with mulching followed by one hoeing with mulching and burning with two hoeing , respectively, as compared with the untreated treatment.
- Concerning the effect of weed control methods treatments on yield components of sugar beet plants, corresponding data cleared that two hoeing with mulching gave the highest values of tops, roots, biological and sugar yields.
- Application of hoeing with mulching or burning caused significant increases in values of juice quality parameters i.e., sucrose and purity % as compared with the untreated treatment.
- Generally, it can be concluded that application of two or one hoeing with mulching of rice straw and burning with two hoeing were the recommended treatments for obtaining the highest growth, yield and juice quality of sugar beet plants as well as significant reduction in total weeds under salinity lands condition at El-Serw.

This study suggest that non traditional weed control by mulching or burning can be used in compatible manner with mechanical hoeing in integrated weed strategy in sugar beet.

INTRODUCTION

Sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris*, L.) is an important crop in world sugar production, 45% of sugar production was produced from it. After introducing

this crop to Egypt and its success as to be the second source of sugar production Nowadays, Egyptian Government imports large amounts of sugar every year to face the rapid increase of population. Therefore more attention has been given to grow and develop this crop to overcome the gap between consumption and production, where this crop can grow well in saline soils. In this respect, several factors are believed to affect sugar yield such as weed control treatments. Reduction in sugar beet yield caused by weed competition is big, due to its characteristics by their slow rate of growth during the early stages, i.e. from emergence to singling during which they may be heavily infested with weeds. So, the final stand of beet plants and, hence, their yields are reduced. Leaving weeds without removal from sugar beet field caused losses in yield by about 50% El-Hattab and Shaban (1982). Weed interference in the unweeded plots reduced significantly all yield traits of sugar beet plants. Dollinger and Benz (1994) mentioned that the presence of (*Aethusa cynapium,* L.) in sugar beet field at 8 plant/ m^2 reduced yield by more than 100 dt/ha compared to weed free areas. Therefore, it could be mentioned that weed control in sugar beet fields is a must to achieve high sugar yield.

Recommended herbicides for weed control in sugar beet fields had narrow spectrum and it does not on its own internal pressure to give high efficiency on its own without finding other alternatives to control weeds such as mulching by rice straw or burning the soil before sowing. Also the herbicides prices are expensive, so to avoid these harms and increase the crops yield, an attempt was carried to develop a flame unit in a trial to kill seeds, rhizomes, bulbs and tubers of weeds which lie dormant in the soil directly. El-Nakib (1990) stated that flame was more efficient with the grass; the efficiency was 98-100%. Flame is preferable with the grass than the mechanical methods because of mechanical methods diffuse the rhizome (stock root) in the soil. Therefore, prescribed burning has primarily been used as a tool for the control of invasive annual broadleaf and grass species Ditomaso *et al.* (2006).

Mulching is a material applied to the soil surface primarily to prevent loss of water by evaporation, suppress weeds, and reduce temperature fluctuations or to promote productivity Jacks *et al.*(1955).Mulching material is usually bulky and costly to transport. Consequently, mulching is unlikely to economic, unless inexpensive material or a local waste product is available Rowe-Dutton (1957). The possibility of using rice straw as mulching for their many positive effects such as low costs and in harmony with ecosystem without harmful residual effect. In addition, soil mulching with rice straw improves growth, through releasing its mineral content to soil, leaving mineral contents as well as producing higher yield and better quality and giving good control of weeds. The benefits of these methods are controlling all types of weeds and to avoidness the chemical herbicides pollution. Most weed species were controlled by the mulching materials; the best organic mulch was rice straw and clearly related to weed control and is potential substitutes for herbicides Anzalone *et al.* (2010).

Mechanical methods such as hoeing are used to control weed plants which survived and escaped from the herbicides. Moreover, environmental

factors may limit herbicidal effect of controlling weeds as well as pollution (Abdel-Aal, 1995). Moreover, hoeing causes good aeration of the soil which encourages the growth of crop plants Fayed *et al.* (1983).

The objectives of this study were to determine the magnitude effects of some non traditional methods for weed control i.e. burning and biodegradable mulching rice straw as compared with hand hoeing on associated weeds, growth, yield and quality of sugar beet.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were carried out during at 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 winter seasons in the Experimental Station of Agriculture Research Center, El-Serw Station, Damietta Governorate, Egypt. The Experimental soil was clayey as shown in Table (1) Mechanical and chemical characters:

Table (1): Mechanical and chemical analysis of soil.

Mechanical analysis of soil							
Particle size distribution							
Type of soil	Coarse sand	Fine sand	Silt	Clay	Texture		
%	1.55	10.7	22.4	85.0	Clayey		
Chemical analysis of soil							
Characters treatment	OM %	Available N Ppm	Available P ppm	Available K ppm	PH of soil Susp 1:25	Total dissolved salts	
						%	Mmhos /cm
Burning	2.66	81.4	40.0	607.3	8.4	0.21	0.655
Without Burning	2.94	84.3	33.3	624.0	8.7	0.17	0.542

Eight treatments were used as follows:

1- Burning of the soil surface by fire unit immediately pre sowing.
2- Burning of the soil surface by fire unit immediately pre sowing followed by one hoeing at 21DAS.
3- Burning of the soil surface by fire unit immediately pre sowing followed by two hoeing at 21 and 35 DAS.
4- Mulching post emergence at 21 DAS by 15 kg/plot (5 cm in thickness) rice straw in the furrow between plants and ridges.
5- One hoeing at 21 DAS and followed immediately by rice straw mulching 15 kg/plot (5 cm in thickness) in the furrow between plants and ridges.
6- Two hoeing at 21and 35 DAS followed immediately by rice straw mulching 15 kg/plot (5 cm in thickness) in the furrow between plants and ridges.
7- Two hoeing at 21 and 35 DAS.
8- Untreated check.

Experimental design was CRBD with three replications, plot area was 15 m^2 (containing 6 rows width 50cm apart and five meters length). The sugar beet seed variety Teri at rate 4 kg/fad was planted at distance of 20 cm between hills on the 15 Nov. for the two growing seasons. Thinning was carried out for once month from planting to one plant/hill.

Burning process has been carried after ridging and directly before sowing by using a fire unit connected to cylinder gas (liquefied petroleum gas) and this process lasted after 15 minutes for each experimental plot. All the normal cultural practices of growing sugar beet recommended for the region were followed. The following data were recorded:

I-On weeds:

Weeds were hand pulled from one square meter chosen at random from each plot at 120 (DAS). Weeds were identified and classified to annual broad-leaf and grassy weeds in both seasons to determine fresh and dry weight (g/m^2) of total weeds, which recorded after drying in an oven at 70 C^o for 72 hours.

II- On sugar beet plants:

1-Growth parameters:

A sample of five plants was taken at random from each plot at 120 (DAS) to determine

(1) The morphological characters: plant height (cm), number of leaves/plant, fresh weight of plant (g), root/top ratio and also, (2) root characters: length (cm), diameter (cm), and dry weight of beet plant.

2- Yield and its components:

At harvest, plants of four guarded ridges for each treatment were uprooted and toped to determine the following parameters: top yield (t. / fad.), roots yield (t. / fad.), biological yield (ton / fad) and sugar yield (t. / fad.).

3-Chemical constituents:

At harvest, samples of ten sugar beet plants were taken randomly from the central area of each plot to study the chemical analyses of juice: Sucrose %, purity %, impurities contents, i.e. K, Na, and α-amino nitrogen milleq/100 g. beet. Determination of technological charactaristics of sugar beet: Sugar Recovery (SR) = (Pol -0.29) -0343 (K+Na) - α-N (0.0939), Sugar losses (SL) = 0.343 (K+N+ α-N (0.094) + 0.29 and Quality of sugar beet (Q) = (SR.100) / Pol where Pol = sucrose % and K = potassium .The procedures according to Silin and Silina (1977) and Sapronova et al. (1979).

Statistical analysis:

Data were statistically analyzed according to Snedecor and Cochran (1980).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

I. Effect on weeds:

The most common weed species associated with sugar beet plants in experimental fields were: sweet clover (*Melilotus indica*, L.), dentated dock (*Rumex dentatus,* L.), wild beet (*Beta vulgaris,* L.), watercress (*Coronopus squamatus*, Forssk.), and lambsquarters (*Chenopodium album*, L.) as broadleaf weeds and beard grass (*polypogon monspeliensis,* L.), canary grass (*Phalaris minor*, Retz.) as grasses.

The results in Table (2) indicated clearly weed management caused a significant effect on fresh weight (g/m^2) of broad-leaf, grassy and total weeds growth which associated with sugar beet plants. All weeded treatments

decreased fresh weight (g/m^2) of total annual weeds comparing to untreated control. Moreover, the weeded treatments differed in their efficiency in weed suppression. In this respect, two hoeing with mulching, one hoeing with mulching and burning with two hoeing came in the first order for decreasing fresh weight (g/ m^2) of total annual weeds. Mulching only came in the second rank followed by that of two hoeing only, burning with one hoeing and burning only.

Results presented in Table (2) clearly revealed that weed control treatments significantly decreased dry weight (g/m^2) of total annual weeds. Two hoeing followed by mulching, one hoeing followed by mulching, and burning with the two hoeing record the highest efficiency in decreasing dry weight of total annual weeds with no significant difference between these treatments . The above mentioned treatments reduced dry weight of total annual weeds more than control by 91.1, 85.9 and 82.8% in the first season and 92.2, 86.5 and 84.2% in the second season, respectively. This favorable effect of hoeing with mulching or burning treatments is due to elimination of weeds. Superiority of mulching or burning with hoeing in controlling weeds could be attributed to the integral control effects of frequent hoeing on annual weeds since these weeds are not capable to regrowth from the underground parts. Also, mulching delayed growth from weed seedling through preventing sunlight and considerably reduced weed infestation.

On the other side, the lowest efficiency of decreasing dry weight (g/ m^2) of total annual weeds obtained by using mulching only, two hoeing, burning with one hoeing and burning only as compared with untreated treatment by 49.9, 34.2, 29.7 and 11.4% in the first season and 51.3, 43.5, 26.4 and 16.5% in the second season, respectively. In view of these results, we find that it reduced the impact of such treatments prior to the growth of weeds due to the long period of growth in sugar beet, which extends to six months, which helps the appearance of successive generations of weeds it creates great competition and have a negative influence on the growth of sugar beet plants. The burning of the surface layer of the soil is effective in the first period of plant stage, but this effect no continues to the end of the stage of growth. Also mulching by rice straw give a positive influence in the weeds, but in the process of aeration affects soil. Teasdale *et al.* (1991); Ateh and Doll (1996) and Monks *et al.* (1997) they found that the cover crops mulch on the soil surface can greatly reduce weed density and biomass. The excellent examples of successful use of prescribed burning for the control of invasive annual broad leaf and grass species. These results were in harmony with those obtained by Ditomaso *et al.* (2006); Cisneros and Zandstra (2008) and Rask *et al.* (2011) suggested that hoeing improves aeration of the soil which may encourage germination of additional weed seeds. Similar finding for the excelsior effect of hoeing were obtained by Wevers (1995). Mulch and hoeing were the most effective for controlling of weeds. Similar finding were reported by Lee *et al.* (1992

Table (2): Effect of weed control treatments on fresh and dry weight of total annual weeds (g/m^2) at sugar beet at 120 (DAS) during at 2008/2009 and 2009/ 2010 seasons.

Characters / Treatments	Season											
	2008 /2009						2009 /2010					
	Fresh weight of weeds (g/m^2)			Dry weight of weeds (g/m^2)			Fresh weight of weeds (g/m^2)			Dry weight of weeds (g/m^2)		
	Broad	Grass	Total	Broad	Grass	Total	Broad	Grass	Total	Broad	Grass	Total
1-Burning	1354.0	135.6	1489.6	191.8	28.6	220.4	1429.6	154.0	1583.6	227.6	31.4	259.0
2- Burning + one hoeing	964.0	131.6	1095.6	147.7	27.1	174.8	1075.6	138.6	1214.2	199.0	29.1	228.2
3-Burning + two hoeing	229.0	50.0	279.0	32.8	9.8	42.6	283.6	54.0	337.6	38.7	10.9	49.0
4-Mulching	716.6	116.0	832.6	114.1	20.5	124.6	801.0	127.3	928.3	127.3	23.7	151.0
5-One hoeing + mulching	209.6	19.6	229.3	29.7	5.3	35.0	233.0	21.3	254.3	35.5	6.1	41.6
6-Two hoeing + mulching	114.6	18.6	133.3	17.5	4.5	22.0	122.6	20.0	142.6	19.0	5.1	24.1
7-Two hoeing	876.6	124.3	1001.0	137.4	26.2	163.6	936.0	133.3	1069.3	148.3	27.1	175.1
8-Untreated check	1545.6	176.3	1722.0	219.2	29.6	248.8	1910.3	217.0	2127.3	272.1	38.2	310.3
L.S.D. at 5%	522.6	88.2	553.8	97.9	15.2	98.9	408.8	51.8	428.4	63.1	7.8	66.1

II- Effect on sugar beet:

1-1 Growth parameters:

Table (3) indicated that all growth characters responded significantly to all weed control. The results showed, also, that there was a marked increase in leaves number/plant, fresh weight and root/top ratio due to of two hoeing with mulching, one hoeing with mulching and burning with two hoeing when compared with other weed control treatments. These results suggest that weed control is necessary for sugar beet plants during early and advanced growth stages. The effect of weed control treatments on height of beet plants are illustrated in Table (3). It obviously cleared that elimination of weeds increased height sugar beet plants at 120 (DAS) than unweeded plants. The tallest beet plants were achieved at 120 (DAS) by burning only, untreated control treatment, burning with one hoeing, two hoeing, mulching only, burning with two hoeing and one hoeing with mulching treatments, respectively. Plant height of these treatments was significantly greater than that of two hoeing with mulching by 20.4, 19.9, 18.2, 16.4, 15.6, 7.4 and 5.6% in the first and second season, respectively. The increase in the height of sugar beet plants are deceptive because they increase arising from increased competition with weeds this pushed the beet plants to rise and be at the expense of the rest of the growth characteristics. Number of leaves/plant, fresh weight of plant (g) and root/top ratio tended to increase by using two hoeing with mulching, one hoeing with mulching and burning with two hoeing which gave the highest number of leaves/plant, fresh weight of plant and root/top ratio at 120 (DAS) followed by mulching only, two hoeing, burning with one hoeing and burning only treatments respectively**.**

The superiority of the above mentioned treatments were significantly greater than that of unweeded check by 35.7, 25.4 and 23.5% and by 82.1,

68.4 and 67.5% at 120 (DAS) in first and second season for number of leaves/plant and by 112.1, 97,5 and 97.0 % in first season and by 61.4, 47.6 and 46.4 % in second season for fresh weight of plant and by 73.1, 40.9 and 26.8 % in first season and by 81.8, 50.0 and 41.3 % in second season for root / top ratio, respectively, while the lower value was achieved with untreated check treatment. However, the lowest efficiency decreasing of number of leaves/plant, fresh weight of plant and root/top ratio at 120 (DFS) by using mulching only, two hoeing, burning with one hoeing and burning only gave less effective than of all other treatments and as compared with untreated treatment.

Table (3): Effect of weed control treatments on growth characters of sugar beet at 120 (DAS) during 2008/2009 and 2009/2010.

Characters / Treatments	Growth Characters							
	2008/2009				2009/2010			
	Plant height (cm)	No. of leaves/ plant	Fresh weight of plant (g.)	Root/top Ratio	Plant height (cm)	No. of leaves/ plant	Fresh weight of plant (g.)	Root/top Ratio
1- Burning	46.0	21.6	691.3	1.51	47.0	21.6	801.6	1.40
2- Burning + one hoeing	45.3	22.3	861.3	1.54	46.0	22.6	817.0	1.49
3- Burning + two hoeing	40.6	23.6	1201.0	1.89	42.3	24.3	1081.0	1.95
4-Mulching	45.3	23.0	1105.6	1.86	44.0	23.6	1054.0	1.88
5-One hoeing + mulching	40.3	24.3	1204.6	2.10	41.3	24.3	1090.0	2.07
6-Two hoeing + mulching	38.6	26.3	1293.0	2.58	38.6	26.3	1192.0	2.51
7-Two hoeing	45.3	23.0	922.0	1.66	44.6	23.0	962.0	1.79
8-Untreated check	45.6	18.3	609.6	1.49	47.0	20.6	683.3	1.38
L.S.D. at 5%	5.78	4.81	387.01	1.28	6.54	6.76	404.88	1.23

The aforementioned results indicated that controlling weeds encouraged plant growth of sugar beet, this, in turn, might increased the leaves number/plant and given more chance to better use of the edaphic and aboveground environmental resources and consequently, stimulated all growth characters of beet plants. These results were true for both growing seasons. Similar results were obtained by Kudryashov and Semisal (1992) and Khalak and Kumaraswamy (1992) found that the hoeing and mulch treatments recorded the highest growth of potato plant.

1-2 Root characters:

Sugar beet root characters i.e. length (cm), diameter (cm) and dry weight (g/plant) was studied and their response to different non-traditional methods for weed control. Relevant results presented in Table (4), for 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 growing seasons. It could be concluded that all studied weed control treatments whether mechanically and their combinations succeeded to attain statistical superiority over those of the untreated control treatment which showed the lowest root dimensions of beet roots at 120 (DAS).

However, the application of one or two hoeing with mulching or burning improved significantly root length, root diameter and root dry weight of beet plants not only over the untreated check treatment but also over those of another weed control treatments.

Table (4): Effect of weed control treatments on root characters of sugar beet at 120 (DAS) during at 2008/2009 and 2009/ 2010 seasons.

Characters / Treatments	Root Characters					
	2008/2009			2009/2010		
	Length (cm)	Diameter (cm)	Dry weight (g) / plant	Length (cm)	Diameter (cm)	Dry weight (g) / plant
1- Burning	23.3	9.6	123.3	22.6	9.8	115.5
2- Burning + one hoeing	25.3	10.5	137.3	23.6	10.6	142.9
3- Burning + two hoeing	27.3	12.0	194.6	25.6	12.9	203.3
4-Mulching	26.0	11.8	176.8	24.3	12.2	189.6
5-One hoeing + mulching	27.3	12.1	203.5	26.6	13.2	233.8
6-Two hoeing + mulching	27.6	12.6	218.0	30.3	13.4	239.6
7-Two hoeing	25.3	11.0	155.5	24.0	11.7	165.7
8-Untreated check	22.6	7.0	108.0	22.0	8.5	101.6
L.S.D. at 5%	5.78	2.64	61.01	7.16	2.34	68.60

The highest values of root dimensions were obtained by two hoeing with mulching then one hoeing with mulching followed burning with two hoeing. These results may show to what extend hoeing with mulching or burning is very important not only for weed control but also to create suitable edaphically environmental condition i.e., good aeration, high biotic activity and increasing availability of some nutrients for sugar beet plant to grow well away from weed competition on the soil space and soil nutrition. These findings are in line with those obtained by El-Zouky and Maillet (1998). All non-traditional methods for weed control treatments increased significantly root dry weight of beet plant than unweeded check. Comparative results between mulching and burning with hoeing treatments indicate that using two hoeing with mulching attained the root dry weight of beet plants at 120 (DAS). It could be noticed that application two or one hoeing with mulching or burning gave and additional increment in the root dry weight of beet plant. It is also interesting to note that using two hoeing with mulching, one hoeing with mulching and burning control with two hoeing attained a superiority advantage in respect to root dry weight beet plant not only over untreated control but also over the other treatments whether used alone or in combination with hoeing treatment. This observation was fairly true in growth stage. The advantage effect of two and one hoeing with mulching and burning with two hoeing in relation to root dry weight of sugar beet plants over the other weed control treatments may be due to is effective capability on weed elimination compared with other weed control treatments (Table 4). The lower dry weight of total weeds at growth stages gave to the higher the root

dry weight. These results are in agreement with those obtained by El-Zouky and Maillet (1998).

2-Yield components:

Results in Table (5) show that the yield trails of sugar beet plants affected by non-traditional methods for weed control. Weeds interference in the unweeded plots reduced significantly all yield traits of sugar beet plants. Dollinger and Benz (1994) mentioned that the presence of (*Aethusa cynapium,* L.) in sugar beet field at 8 plant/ m^2 reduced yield by more than 100 dt/ha compared to weed free areas.

Table (5): Effect of weed control treatments on yield traits of sugar beet at harvest during 2008/2009 and 2009/ 2010 seasons.

Characters / Treatments	Yield Traits							
	2008/2009				2009/2010			
	Roots Yield (t. / fad.)	Tops Yield (t. / fad.)	Biological Yield) (t. / fad.)	Sugar Yield (t. / fad.)	Roots Yield (t. / fad.)	Tops Yield (t. / fad.)	Biological Yield (t. / fad.)	Sugar Yield (t. / fad.)
1- Burning	8.83	6.27	15.10	1.33	10.94	6.52	17.46	1.65
2- Burning + one hoeing	11.83	7.79	19.62	1.82	11.07	7.13	18.20	1.70
3- Burning + two hoeing	17.08	9.64	26.72	2.87	15.66	8.43	24.09	2.63
4-Mulching	15.05	8.17	23.22	2.44	14.16	9.92	24.08	2.28
5-One hoeing + mulching	18.71	9.92	28.63	3.19	19.03	10.78	30.82	3.25
6-Two hoeing + mulching	21.57	11.71	33.28	3.78	20.04	13.48	32.56	3.49
7-Two hoeing	14.16	7.95	22.11	2.19	12.76	8.46	21.22	1.98
8-Untreated check	8.90	5.85	14.75	1.30	9.93	6.14	16.07	1.45
L.S.D. at 5%	5.39	3.27	7.53	0.94	4.01	3.06	7.48	0.72

Elimination weeds by mulching and hoeing treatments increased significantly sugar beet tops, roots, biological and sugar yields, but significant superiority remained with two hoeing with mulching treatment which increased over the untreated check by 100.2, 142.4, 125.6 and 187.8% in the first season and 119.5, 101.8, 102.6 and 141.4% in the second season respectively. Above mentioned findings sustained that mulching, burning and hoeing treatments were not sufficient with themselves in controlling weeds in sugar beet fields. The application of supplement two or one hoeing for plots previously for weeded with mulching or burning increased markedly sugar beet yields. This applied hoeing control survival, and late emerged weed flushes and minimized weed competition to a great extent, and consequently favored growth of beet plants. Similar observations were reported by El-Zouky and Maillet (1998). The highest yield of sugar beet was obtained by controlling weeds by mulch followed by hoeing treatments. These results may be due to that hoeing and mulching treatments reduced weed density and increased yield and surface hoeing may a cerate and improve structure of some soils, especially those high in silt and very fine sand Kudryashov and

Semisal (1992); Khalak and Kumaraswamy (1992) and Eberlein *et al.* (1997). The successful use of prescribed burning for the control of invasive annual broad leaf and grass species and enhance yield. These results were in harmony with those obtained by Ditomaso *et al.* (2006); Cisneros and Zandstra (2008) and Rask *et al.* (2011).

3- Root juice quality:

Resultus presented in Table (6) showed the values of quality parameters i.e., sucrose content, purity %, impurities content i.e. potassium (K), sodium (Na) and α-amino nitrogen (AN) milleq/100 grams beet during at 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 seasons. Sucrose and purity percentage values responded significantly and a positive relationship was exhibited for these quality parameters. There was a remarkable and significant increase in these tested quality parameters with applying non-traditional methods for weed control alone or in combination. These results mean that untreated check treatment gave lowest values, while two hoeing with mulching gave the higher values.

Table (6): Effect of weed control treatments on juice quality of sugar beet Combined analysis during 2008/2009 and 2009/2010 seasons.

Characters / Treatments	Root Juice Quality				
	Quality Traits		Impurities content milleq / 100 g beet		
	Sucrose %	Purity %	K	Na	α-amino-N
1- Burning	15.1	78.5	6.42	1.87	4.47
2- Burning + one hoeing	15.4	78.3	6.39	1.87	4.33
3- Burning + two hoeing	16.8	80.2	5.49	1.75	4.00
4-Mulching	16.2	79.7	6.03	1.82	4.01
5-One hoeing + mulching	17.1	81.2	4.89	1.65	4.00
6-Two hoeing + mulching	17.4	82.7	4.46	1.55	4.00
7-Two hoeing	15.5	78.3	6.09	1.85	4.28
8-Untreated check	14.6	75.5	6.58	2.10	4.69
L.S.D. at 5%	1.06	3.47	1.25	0.29	0.37

With regard to sucrose %, the available resultus in Table (6) revealed that one hoeing with mulching and burning with two hoeing were the most effective treatments followed by hoeing process two times which induced the highest values for sucrose conent of sugar beet root. The distinct influence hoeing with mulching or burning on sucrose content may be due to the encourage effect of hoeing to root dimensions and weight and to the pronounced increase in assimilation organs (tops), consequently increasing the assimilation and storage process which, in turn, reflected on the amount of stored sugar in root tissue. These finding are in accordance with those found by El-Zouky and Maillet (1998). While, Odero *et al.* (2010) found that the root and sucrose yield loss per hectare increased as weeds density increased. This observation may be considered a good indication to the important of hand hoeing in addition to any weed control application to induce

a good soil condition for growth consequently more assimilation and, in turn, increased storage capacity for root sugar which directly increased juice purity percentage.

On the other hand, we find that there is an inverse relationship between the sucrose content and purity of the juice and the percentage of potassium, sodium, α-amino nitrogen (impurities) in the juice, we find that the more sucrose content, also increases the purity of the juice and conversely the contrary less percentage of potassium, sodium, α-amino nitrogen (impurities) in the juice.

CONCLUSION

As a conclusion from the obtained results in this study, the hand hoeing once or twice with burning or mulching by rice straw developed the best good recommendation for the non-traditional methods for weed control in sugar beet. Moreover, improving growth, and increased yield and quality, also the relationship between this and decreasing fresh and dry weight of total weeds. The possibility of using rice straw mulching and burning by cylinder gas (liquefied petroleum gas) for their many positive effects such as low coasts and harmony with ecosystem without harmful residual effect in order to environment free from pollution.

REFERENCES

Abdel-Aal, A.M. (1995). Integrated weed control in sugar beet with relation to yield and quality. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Ain Shams Univ.

Anzalone, A.; A. Cirujeda; J. Aibar; G. Pardo and C. Zaragoza (2010). Effect of biodegradable mulch materials on weed control in processing tomatoes. Weed Tech., 24(3): 369-377.

Ateh, C.M. and J. D. Doll (1996). Spring-planted winter rye as a living mulch to control weeds in soybean. Weed Tech., 10: 347-353.

Cisneros, J. J. and B. H. Zandstra (2008). Flame weeding effects on several weed species. Weed Tech., 22(2): 290-295.

Ditomaso, J.M.; M. L. Brooks; E. Allen; R. Minnich; P. M. Rice and G. Kyser (2006). Control of invasive weeds with prescribed burning. Weed Tech., 20(2): 535-548.

Dollinger, M. and W. Benz (1994). Distribution and determental effects of fool's parsley (*Aethus cynapium* L.) and its control in sugar beet with Goltix and mixtures containing Goltix. Pflanzen schutz-Nachrichten-Bayer-English-ed., 47 (3): 211-239.

Eberlein, C.V.; P.E. Patterson; M.J. Guttieri and J.C. Stark (1997). Efficacy and economics of cultivation for weed control in potato (*Solanum tuberosum*). Weed Tech., 11(2):257-264.

El-Hattab, A.H, and Sh.A. Shaban (1982). Effect of pre-sowing herbicides on weeds in sugar beet fields. J. Agronomy and Crop Science, 151:216-223.

El-Nakib, A.E. (1990). Evaluation of flame burner in grass weed-control. Misr J. Agr. Eng. 7(3):250-263.

El-Zouky, I. and J. Maillet (1998). Weed control strategies in sugar beet on the Bekaa plain. (Bibliographic citation). Comptes-redus 6 eme symposium Mediterranean EWRS, Montpellier, France.

Fayed, M.T.; M.T. Mostafa and E.E. Hassanien (1983). Increasing the efficiency of herbicides in controlling cotton weeds by one light hoeing. Proc. 1st conf. Agron., Egypt. Soc. of Crop Sci., 2: 679-688.

Jaks, G.V.; W.D. Brind and R. Smith (1955). Mulching. Commonwealth Bureau Soil Sci. Tech. Commun., 49. (C.F. HortScince, 23(3): 547-552, 1988).

Khalak, A. and A. S. Kumaraswamy (1992). Effect of irrigation Schedule and mulch on growth attributes and dry matter accumulation in potato (*Solanum tuberosum*). Indian J. of Agron., 37(3):510-513.

Kudryashov, Yu. S. and A. A. Semisal (1992). The effect of perforated film cover and soil grading on yield of early potatoes under the conditions of central Yakutia. Izuestiya Timiryazervscol Sel Skokhozyaistivennoi Akademu, No.2, 31-36. (C.F. Potato Abst., 18:No. 4).

Lee, H.C.; M. Rdrigue; J. Lopez Real and C.E. Stopes (1992). Composted manure as a surface mulch for enhanced arable crop production. Proc., 2nd Cong of the Europ. Soc. for Agron., Warwick Univ., 414-415.(C.F. Field Crop Abst., 46:2931).

Monks, C.D.; D. W. Monks; T. Basden; A. Selders; S. Poland and E. Rayburn (1997). Soil temperature, soil moisture, weed control, and tomato (*Lycopersicon esculentum*) response to mulching. Weed Tech., 11(3): 561-566.

Odero, D.C.: A.O.Mesbah: S.D.Miller and A.R.Kniss (2010). Wild buckwheat (*Polygonum convolvulus*) interference in sugar beet. Weed Tech., 24(1):59-63.

Rask, A.M.; P. Kristoffersen and C. Andreasen (2011). Controlling weeds on hard surfaces: the effect of time intervals between flame treatments. Weed Tech. In Press. Accepted September 16. 2011.

Rowe-Dutton, P. (1957). The mulching of vegetables. Commonwealth Bureau of Hort. And Plantation Crops. Tech. Commun. 24. (C.F. Hort Scince, 23(3): 547-552, 1988).

Sapronova, A., Joshman, A. and Lseava, V. (1979) . Several technology of sugar and sugar substances. Pischevaya promyshemest. pub. Moscow, 464p.

Silin, P. M. and Silina, N. P. (1977). Chemical controling sugar technology. Food Technol., Pub. USSR,Pp.120-126.

Snedecor, G. W. and W. G. Cochran (1980). Statistical Methods 7th Ed. The lowa State Univ. Press. Amer. lowa, USA.

Teasdale, J. R.; C.E. Beste and W.E. Potts (1991). Response of weeds to tillage and cover crop residue. Weed Sci. 39: 195-199.

Wevers, J. D. A. (1995). The integration of mechanical weed control into a low dose herbicide system in sugar beet. Weed Proc. of an intern. Conf., Brighton, 3: 859-863.

تأثير تكامل التغطية والحرق مع العزيق علي بنجر السكر والحشائش المصاحبة له.

رشدي محمد حسن تجور[1] – جلال محمد عبد الحميد[1] – رمضان أحمد موسي[1] – حازم محمود سرحان[2]
[1]المعمل المركزي لبحوث الحشائش – مركز البحوث الزراعية – الجيزة - مصر
[2]معهد المحاصيل السكرية - مركز البحوث الزراعية – الجيزة – مصر

تم إقامة تجربتان حقليتان خلال موسمي ٢٠٠٨/٢٠٠٩ ، ٢٠٠٩/٢٠١٠ في الأراضي الملحية بالسرو وذلك لتقييم بعض الطرق غير التقليدية لمكافحة الحشائش في بنجر السكر وأثر ذلك علي النمو والمحصول وبعض صفات الجودة للعصير وكذلك الحشائش المصاحبة

ويمكن تلخيص أهم النتائج المتحصل عليها فيما يلي :

- أظهرت معاملات مكافحة الحشائش نقصا معنويا في الوزن الغض والجاف الكلي للحشائش المصاحبة لنباتات بنجر السكر مقارنة بمعاملة الكنترول.
- وكانت أفضل المعاملات هي معاملة العزيق مرتين مع التغطية بقش الارز (٩١,١-٩٢,٢%)التي كانت أكثر فاعلية في مكافحة الحشائش يليها عزقة واحدة مع التغطية (٨٥,٩-٨٦,٥%) ثم الحرق مع عزقتين (٨٢,٨-٨٤,٢%) علي التوالي.
- وجد أن تطبيق عزقتين مع التغطية والحرق قد حسنت بقوة في فاعلية مكافحة حشائش البنجر مقارنة بالمعاملات الاخري.
- أوضحت النتائج أن عزقتين مع التغطية أظهرت مقاومة جيدة للحشائش الكلية في البنجر بعد ١٢٠ يوم من الزراعة.
- لوحظ أن جميع صفات النمو مثل طول النبات، عدد الأوراق/للنبات، نسبة الجذر/العرش وصفات الجذر قد استجابت معنويا للعزيق مرتين مع التغطية يليها عزقة واحدة مع التغطية ثم معاملة الحرق مع عزقتين علي التوالي.
- بالنسبة لتأثير معاملات مكافحة الحشائش علي مكونات محصول بنجر السكر أوضحت النتائج أن عزقتين مع التغطية أعطي أعلي القيم لمحصول العرش والجذور والمحصول البيولوجي ومحصول السكر.
- وجد أن تطبيق العزيق مع التغطية بقش الأرز اوالحرق أدي إلي زيادة معنوية في قيم الجودة للعصير وهي النسبة المئوية للسكروز والنسبة المئوية للنقاوة وذلك أذا ما قورنت بمعاملة المقارنة.
- عموما يمكن استنتاج أن تطبيق عزقتين أو عزقة واحدة مع التغطية بقش الأرز والحرق مع عزقتين تعتبر معاملات يمكن التوصية بها للحصول علي أفضل نمو ومحصول ونقاوة للعصير وكذلك أفضل مكافحة للحشائش في نباتات بنجر السكر تحت ظروف الأراضي الملحية بالسرو.

قام بتحكيم البحث

أ.د / عبد الله محمد ابو الخير محمود	**كلية الزراعة – جامعة المنصورة**
أ.د / زكريا الرفاعى يحى	**مركز البحوث الزراعية**