# EFFECT OF POTASSIUM AND MAGNESIUM ON YIELD AND OUALITY OF TWO SUGAR BEET VARIETIES

M.S.H. OSMAN,

Sugar Crops Res. Inst., Agric. Res. Center, Giza, Egypt

(Manuscript received 20 April 2004)

#### **Abstract**

Two field trials in a split plot design with four replications were carried out at Sakha Research Station (Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate) during 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 seasons to study the influence of potassium and magnesium fertilization on yield and quality of two sugar beet varieties. Each experiment consisted of 18-treatments repesent two varieties (Pleno and Toro), and three potassium sulfate (48% K<sub>2</sub>O) levels zero, 24 and 48 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed and three magnesium sulfate (24% MgO) levels zero, 5 and 10 kg MgO/fed. Varieties were assigned in main plots whereas the combinations betewen fertilizer treatments were destributed in subplot.

The results showed that sugar beet variety Toro significantly surpassed variety Pleno in root diameter, root fresh weight, top and root yields (tons/fed) in the  $2^{nd}$  one.

Potassium fertilizer attained a significant difference in root length, root diameter, root fresh weight, sucrose%, purity% and top yield (tons/fed) in both seasons.

Morover, magnesium fertilizer produed a significant effect on root length, diameter, root fresh weight, top and root yield in the  $1^{\rm st}$  season.

The highest values of root (45.54 tons/fed) and sugar (8.34 tons/fed) yields resulted from the interaction between Toro variety, fertilized by 5 kg MgO/fed and 24 kg  $K_2$ O/fed in the 1st season and (43.55 tons roots/fed) and (7.9 tons sugar/fed) resulted from the interaction between Toro variety, fertilized with 5 kg MgO/fed and 48 kg  $K_2$ O/fed in the 2nd season., respectively.

## INTRODUCTION

Sugar beet crop was introduced to Egypt as a complementary sugar crop to bridge the gap of sugar production amounted to 0.6 million t/year. Potassium fertilizer plays an important role in physiological processes in beet plants, where it improves juice quality and sugar yield. Magnesium fertilizer is used in different levels of fertilization to obtain the maximum yield and quality. Many investigations proved that sugar beet yield and quality differed greatly by the applied levels of potassium and

magnesium fertilizers. Bizik (1993) reported that a liquid fertilizer spray containing Mg nitrate dumag, Ca, Mg nitrate or Mg nitrate + CaCl applied to sugar beet plants in early july at 80 l/ha increased sugar contents. Denesova and Andres (1995) studied the effects of K - Mg fertilizer Kamex granules, 200 kg K2O/ha and 30 kg MgO/ha and Mg fertilizer Bittersalz, 2 applications of 2.6 kg MgO/ha on sugar beet plants. Results showed that sugar beet plants were good affected regarding sugar yield. The economic returns of Bittersalz fertilizer were higher than those resulted from Kamex granules fertilizer application. Domska (1996) found that application of 60 kg MgO/ha as soil application and foliar 2 kg MgO/ha to sugar beet plants gave the highest sugar yield and sugar contents of sugar beet plants. El-Taweel (1999) In Egypt, found that sugar beet varieties Top, Kawemira and Pleno did not differ significantly in dry weight of leaves as well as top and sugar yields/fed, sucrose%, TSS% and purity%. The variety Pleno was the highest one in this respect followed by Kawemira and Top in a descending order. Also, she found that K application from 0 to 24 and 48 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed and Mg application from 0 to 9 and 18 kg MgO/fed., significantly increased leaf area index, root length, root diameter, fresh weight of sugar beet root, total soluble solids, sucrose, purity percentages, root, top and sugar yield of sugar beet plants. Saif, Laila (2000) tested four sugar beet varieties viz. Marcopoly, M 9680, M 9681 and Mito. She found significant differences among varieties in root fresh weight, sucrose, purity and root yield. Osman (2001) found that foliar spray sugar beet plants cv. Sultan with 50 and 250 ppm of K and Mg at 45, 75 and 105 days from sowing significantly improved top, root and sugar yield (tons/fed) and total soluble solids, sucrose and purity percentages of sugar beet plants. Ismail et al. (2002) found that sugar beet variety Kawemira recorded the highest values of root fresh weight/plant and root yield t/fed. Potassium affected significantly root fresh weight/plant, purity%, root and sugar yields in both seasons, while sucrose% significantly responded only in the 1st season, while the highest top yield was recorded by application of 24 kg K2O/fed. Osman et al. (2003) found that sugar beet variety Toro surpassed the other two varieties in root length and total soluble solids percentage. This work was intiated to investigate the response of yield and quality of two sugar beet cvs to different level of K and Mg.

### **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

Two field trials in a split plot design with four replications were carried out at Sakha Research Station (Kafr El-Sheikh Governorate) during 2001/2002 and

2002/2003 seasons to study the influence of potassium and magnesium fertilization on yield and quality of two sugar beet varieties. Each experiment consisted of 18-treatments repesent two varieties (Pleno and Toro), and three potassium sulfate (48%  $K_2O$ ) levels zero, 24 and 48 kg  $K_2O$ /fed and three magnesium sulfate (24% MgO) levels zero, 5 and 10 kg MgO/fed. Varieties were assigned in main plots whereas the combinations between fertilizer treatments were destributed in subplot.

Nitrogen fertilizer was applied in the form of Urea 46% nitrogen whereas potassium and magnesium fertilizer were added in the form of potassium and magnesium sulfate in two equal doses, the 1st application after thinning (45 days from sowing) and the 2nd dose was applied two weeks later. A fixed dose of phosphours (15 kg  $P_2O_5$ /fed) in the form of calcium superphosphate 15%  $P_2O_5$  at the rate of 30 kg  $P_2O_5$ /fed was added at seed bed preparation. Sowing took place during the 1st week of November while harvest was done 7 months later in both seasons. Plot size was 14 m² (4 rows of 50 cm apart and 7 m in length). Distance between hills was 20 cm. The examined sugar beet varieties were allocated in the main plots, meanwhile, the combination between K and Mg levels were randomly distributed in the sub plots. The previous crop was Rice in both seasons. Other agricultural practices were done as recommended by Sugar Crops Research Institute. The physical and chemical analysis of the upper 30 cm of soil of the experimental site showed that the soil was clay loam containing 28.8 ppm available N, 16.38 ppm P and 420 ppm K $^+$ . The field was kept free of weeds by pre-emergence herbicide (Pyrador 3 kg/fed).

## Data recorded

At harvest, a sample of ten plants were taken at random to determine the following characters:

## I- Root traits

- 1. Root length (cm).
- 2. Root diameter (cm).
- 3. Root fresh weight (gm).

## II. Juice quality

1. Sucrose% was determined according to Le Decote (1927).

2. Purity% was calculated according to Carruthers et al. (1962).

Apparent purity % = Sucrose % x 100/TSS %.

- **III. Yield and yield components:** At harvest plants of each plot for various treatments were uprooted and topped to estimate:
- 1. Top yield (tons/fed).
- 2. Root yield (tons/fed).
- 3. Sugar yield (tons/fed) was calculated according to the following equation:

Sugar yield (tons/fed) = Root yield x sucrose %.

The collected data were statistically analyzed according to Snedecor and Cochran (1981).

#### **RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS**

#### I- Root traits

#### 1. Root length (cm)

Results in Table (1) show that Toro variety produced higher root length (cm) compared with Pleno with insignificant differences in both seasons.

This result is in line with those reported by El- Taweel (1999) and Osman  $\it et al.$  (2003).

Results given in Table (1) reveale that root length (cm) was significantly affected by Mg-fertilizer in the 1<sup>st</sup> season. Adding 10 kg MgO/fed surpassed zero and 5 kg MgO/fed by 1.91 cm, 0.63 cm in the 1<sup>st</sup> season and 1.27 cm, 0.36 cm in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season., respectively. This result concides with that reported by El- Taweel (1999).

Regarding the effect of potassium ( $K_2O$ ) fertilizer levels, results showed that applying 48 kg  $K_2O$ /fed increased the root length in both seasons compared with check treatment and 24 kg  $K_2O$ /fed this increase amounted to 6.10 cm, 2.95 cm in the  $1^{st}$  season and 6.23 cm, 2.93 cm in the  $2^{nd}$  season., respectively. This increment was significant in both seasons. This result is in line with that reported by El-Taweel (1999).

Table 1. Effect of varieties, magnesium and potassium fertilizer on root length and root diameter (cm) of some sugar beet varieties at harvest in 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 seasons.

Magnesium   Magnesium	20				1							1000	1			
Varieties         Kg Mg/fed         zer           Pleno         5         20           Average         20         20           Toro         5         20           Average         0         20           Average         0         20           Average         0         20           Average         0         20           Total average         20         20	2	2001/2002		Mean	2	2002/2003		Mean	2	2001/2002	7	Mean	2	2002/2003		Mean
Varieties         Kg Mg/fed         zer           Pleno         5         20           Average         2         20           Toro         5         20           Toro         5         20           Average         20         20           Average         20         20           Mg x K         5         20           Total average         20         20	8 8	Potassium (Kn K-O/fed)			д Ş	Potassium (Kn K-O/fed)	<u> </u>		<u>а</u> 8	Potassium (Ko KoO/fed)	- =		- ×	Potassium (Ko K-O/fed)	-	
Pleno   0   19.	zero	24	48		zero	24	48		zero	24	48		zero	24	48	
Pleno   5   20.	-	22.14	24.10	22.01	20.95	23.31	26.24	23.50	9.80	13.14	14.10	12.34	9.65	11.98	13.57	11.72
Average 20.  Toro 5 20.  Average 20.  Average 20.  Mg x K 5 20.  Total average 20.	20.70	23.53	26.03	23.42	21.19	23.94	25.87	23.67	11.04	13.87	13.36	12.76	11.19	13.94	13.20	12.78
Average 20.  Toro 5 20.  Average 0 20.  Average 0 20.  Mg × K 5 0 20.  Total average 20.  Total average 20.  Total average 20.  Total average 20.	20.44	24.33	27.98	24.25	21.10	24.26	27.89	24.41	11.44	13.66	13.98	13.03	12.43	13.59	13.22	13.08
Toro   0   20	20.31	23.33	26.03	23.23	21.08	23.83	26.66	23.86	10.76	13.56	13.81	12.71	11.08	13.17	13.33	12.53
Total average   20.	20.20	23.04	26.00	23.08	20.26	23.40	25.77	23.14	10.20	12.37	12.67	11.75	10.26	14.06	13.10	12.47
10   21.	20.98	24.35	27.38	24.24	21.46	24.92	28.02	24.80	11.98	14.68	13.72	13.46	11.80	13.58	14.02	13.13
Average   20.	21.07	24.68	28.27	24.67	20.27	25.20	28.85	24.77	11.73	12.68	13.60	12.67	10.94	13.54	13.18	12.55
Mg × K 5 20.  Total average 20.  Total average 20.  S.D. at 5% level of significant	20.75	24.02	27.22	24.00	20.66	24.51	27.54	24.24	11.31	13.24	13.33	12.63	11.00	13.73	13.43	12.72
Mg × K 5 20.  10 20.  Total average 20.  S.D. a 5% level of significant facilities (A).	20.00	22.59	25.05	22.55	20.60	23.35	26.00	23.32	10.00	12.76	13,38	12.05	9.94	13.02	13.34	12.10
10 20.  Total average 20.  .S.D. at 5% level of significant derivation (A).	20.84	23.94	26.71	23.83	21.33	24.43	26.94	24.23	11.51	14.27	13.54	13.11	11.49	13.76	13.61	12.95
.S.D. at 5% level of significant	20.76	24.51	28.12	24.46	20.68	24.73	28.37	24.59	11.59	13.17	13.79	12.85	11.68	13.56	13.20	12.82
S.D. at 5% level of significant	20.53	23.68	26.63	23.61	20.87	24.17	27.10	24.05	11.03	13.40	13.57	12.67	11.04	13.45	13.38	12.62
(A) pariation (A)			500 / 1000 1000 1000		207		Section 1									
Validated (A)				N.S				N.S				N.S				S
Magnesium (B)				1.53				N.S				0.482				N.S
Potassium (C)				0.435				0.541				0.623				0.790
4×B				N.S				N.S				0.682				N.S
A×C				N.S				992.0				N.S				N.S
B×C				0.754				0.938				N.S				N.S
AXBXC				N.S				N.S				N.S				N.S

The interaction effect in the  $2^{nd}$  season appeared that the maximum root length was 27.54 cm resulted from the interaction between variety Toro x 48 kg  $K_2O/fed$  in the  $2^{nd}$  season and MgO x  $K_2O$  in both seasons was 28.12 cm and 28.37 cm recorded from 10 kg MgO/fed and 48 kg  $K_2O/fed$ .

#### 2. Root diameter (cm)

Results in Table (1) show that the differences between the studied varieties was insignificant with respect to root diameter (cm) in the  $1^{st}$  season, however, Toro variety significantly produced higher root diameter compared with Pleno in the  $2^{nd}$  season. This result is in line with that reported by El-Taweel (1999).

Concerning magnesium fertilizer effect on root diameter, results given show that root diameter cm, was affected by the applied doses of Mg-significantly in the 1<sup>st</sup> season amounted by adding 5 kg MgO/fed surpassed the other treatments by 13.11 and 12.95 cm., respectively. This result concides with that reported by El- Taweel (1999).

Application of 48 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed produced thicker root diameter in the 1<sup>st</sup> season, and 24 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season. The significant increase in root diameter amounted to 13.57 cm in the 1<sup>st</sup> season and 13.45 cm in the 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons., respectively. This result is in agreement with those reported by El-Taweel (1999).

The interaction effect appeared that the maximum root diameter (13.46 cm) was resulted from the interaction between variety Toro x 5 kg MgO/fed in the 1<sup>st</sup> season.

#### 3. Root fresh weight (g)

Results given in Table (2) indicate that Toro variety surpassed pleno in relation to root fresh weight. The increase in root fresh weight was significantly in the 2nd season only. This result is in line with those reported by El- Taweel (1999), Saif (2000) and Ismail *et al.* (2002).

Table 2. Effect of varieties, magnesium and potassium fertilizer on root fresh weight (g) and top yield (tons/fed) of some sugar beet varieties at harvest in 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 seasons.

Kg Mg/fed   Potassium   Potassium   Potassium   Potassium   Potassium   Potassium   Potassium   Rg Mg/fed   Potassium   Rg Mg/fed   Potassium   Rg Mg/fed   Potassium   Rg Mg/fed   Rg M			100	NOOL ILESII WEIGHT (9)	1		100			_	Top yield (tons/fed)	(tons/fed	_		
Kg Mg/Ted		2002	Mean	2	002/2003		Mean	2	2001/2002		Mean		2002/2003		Mean
Decision   Control   Con		Sium (Fed)		<u>-</u> γ	otassium	-		π ξ	Potassium	_ {			Potassium	_ :	
10		0,	,		20/102	-1		5	9 N20/16	_1		2	Ng N2O/red	0	
1029-7   1364-0   -459-7   1284-4   1011.7   1347-7   1497.0   1222.1   12.36     1029-7   1365-1   1365-1   1365-1   1365-1   1367-1   13.89     10	1	48	_		24	48		zero	24	48		zero	24	48	
10   1194.3   1436.7   1386.3   1325.6   1169.0   1443.7   1370.3   1377.7   13.84	1029.7 136-	4.0 1459.7	1284.4	1011.7	1247.7	1407.0	1222.1		16.37	17.52	15.41	12.14	14.97	16.88	14.67
10   1194-3   1416.0   1447.7   1352.7   1233.0   1409.0   1372.0   1453.0   1453.0   1453.0   1452.7   1405.6   1452.7   1405.6   1452.7   1436.8   1383.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.6   135.1   1302.7   1408.3   1452.7   1408.3   1452.7   1302.7   1408.3   1452.7   1302.7   1408.3   1452.7   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1408.3   1302.7   1308.3   1302.7   1308.3   1302.7   1308.3   1302.7   1308.3   1302.7   1308.3   1302.7   1308.3   1302.7   1	1153.7 1436	6.7 1386.3	1325.6	1169.0	1443.7	1370.3	1327.7		17.24	16.64	_	14.03	17.32	16.44	15.93
Werege         1125-9         1405-6         1431.2         1320.9         1157-9         1366.8         1383.1         1302.6         135.1           0         1070.3         1287.0         1316.7         1367.7         1363.3         1360.9         137.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         136.3         14.68         136.3         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.68         14.78         14.69         14.78         14.69         13.68         14.78         14.69         14.78         14.69         14.78         14.69         14.78         14.69         14.78         14.69	1194.3 1416	6.0 1447.7	1352.7	1293.0	1409.0	1372.0	1358.0	14.33	16.99	17.37	16.23	15.52	16.91	16.46	16.30
10   1070.3   1287.0   1316.7   1224.7   1075.7   1456.3   1360.0   1297.3   12.84     10   1223.3   1318.3   1410.3   1317.3   1437.7   1437.7   1437.7   1387.2   1387.2   1387.2   14.88     10   1223.3   1318.3   1410.3   1410.7   1442.8   1383.2   13.14.6     1180.7   1325.5   1312.7   1442.7   1322.0   1312.1   14.68     120   1050.0   1325.5   1388.2   1324.6   1043.7   1352.0   1383.2   1321.9     10   1208.8   1367.2   1492.0   1313.7   1496.3   1370.0   1341.6     120   1333.3   1390.0   1407.1   1316.8   1153.8   1394.8   1388.2   1312.2   13.84     120   1208.8   1367.2   1404.0   1368.8   1153.8   1394.8   1388.2   1312.2   13.84     120   1208.8   1367.2   1407.3   1406.3   1370.0   1311.2   13.84     120   1208.8   1367.2   1407.3   1407.3   1406.3   1370.0   1311.2   13.84     120   1208.8   1387.2   1312.8   1384.2   1312.2   13.84     120   1208.8   1308.8   1308.8   1304.8   1388.2   1312.2   13.84     120   1208.8   1208.8   1308.8   1304.8   1308.8     120   1208.8   1308.8   1308.8   1308.8     120   1208.8   1308.8   1308.8     120   1208.8   1308.8     120   1208.8   1308.8     120   1208.8   1308.8     120   1308.8     1308.8	1125.9 140	5.6 1431.2	1320.9	1157.9	1366.8	1383.1	1302.6	13.51	16.87	17.18	15.85	13.90	16.40	16.60	15.63
12.48;3   1518.0   1421.7   1396.0   1229.7   1408.3   1451.7   1363.2   14.98     10   1222.3   1318.3   1410.3   1317.3   143.7   1402.7   1368.0   1305.1   14.68     1180.7   1325.5   1318.2   1312.7   1497.7   1492.7   1322.8   1392.1   1311.9     10   1050.0   1225.5   1388.2   1224.6   1049.7   1322.0   1332.0   1321.9   14.17     10   1208.0   1377.3   1404.0   1356.0   1319.3   1426.0   1411.0   1345.4   14.41     10   1208.0   1367.2   1492.0   1353.0   1218.3   1406.3   1370.0   1311.6   14.51     10   1208.0   1333.1   1390.0   1407.1   1316.8   1153.8   1394.8   1388.2   1312.2   13.84     1183.3   1390.0   1407.1   1316.8   1153.8   1394.8   1388.2   1312.2   13.84     A × B	1070.3 1287	7.0 1316.7	1224.7	1075.7	1456.3	1360.0	1297.3	12.84	15.44	15.80	14.70	12.91	17.48	16.32	15.57
10   1223.3   1318.3   1410.3   1317.3   1143.7   1403.7   1386.0   1305.1   14.68   141.7   1422.8   1382.0   1305.1   14.68   1382.0   1317.7   1422.8   1382.0   1317.9   14.17   1422.8   1382.0   1317.9   14.17   1422.8   1382.0   1317.9   12.60   1200.0   1477.3   1404.0   1360.8   1195.3   1426.0   1417.3   1404.0   1360.8   1195.3   1426.0   1417.3   1426.0   1313.0   1313.3   1390.0   1313.0   13	1248.3 1518	8.0 1421.7	1396.0	1229.7	1408.3	1451.7	1363.2	14.98	18.22	17.06	16.75	14.76	16.90	17.42	16.36
Verege         1180.7         1374.4         1382.9         1312.7         1149.7         1422.8         1393.2         1321.9         14.17           0         1090.0         1285.5         1388.2         1254.6         1043.7         1383.5         1250.7         1250.7         1250.7         1250.7         1250.7         1250.7         1250.7         1250.7         1350.7	1223.3 1318	8.3 1410.3	1317.3	1143.7	1403.7	1368,0	1305.1		15.82	16.92	15.81	13.72	16.84	16.42	15.66
1050.0 1325.5 1388.2 1254.6 1043.7 1352.0 1383.5 1259.7 12.60  1201.0 1477.3 1404.0 1350.8 1199.3 1426.0 1411.0 1345.4 14.41  11233.3 1390.0 1407.1 1316.8 1153.8 1394.8 1388.2 1312.2 13.84  selum (B)	1180.7 1374	4.4 1382.9	1312.7	1149.7	1422.8	1393.2	1321.9	14.17	16.49	16.60	15.75	13.80	17.07	_	15.86
5   1201.0   1477.3   1404.0   1360.8   1199.3   1426.0   1411.0   1345.4   144.1   10   1108.8   1387.2   1425.0   1385.0   1208.8   1387.2   1425.0   1383.0   1313.3   1390.0   1315.8   1315.8   1315.8   1315.8   1315.2   1315.2   1315.8   14.5   1315.8   1315	1050.0 1325	5.5 1388.2	1254.6	1043.7	1352.0	1383.5	1259.7		15.91	16.66	15.06	12.52	16.22	16.60	15.12
0 1208.8 1367.2 1429.0 1335.0 1218.3 1406.3 1370.0 1331.6 14.51  wel of significant N.S ssium (B) 48.25 N.S Sobassium (C) 68.24 N.S	1201.0 1477	7.3 1404.0	1360.8	1199.3	1426.0	1411.0	1345.4	14.41	17.73	16.85	16.23	14.39	17.11	16.93	16.15
evel of significant N.S S. 1394.8   1388.2   1312.2   13.84    N.S S. A.S. Salum (B) 62.32   0.5.32   0.5.32   0.5.33	1208.8 1367	7.2 1429.0	1335.0	1218.3	1406.3	1370.0	1331.6	14.51	16.41	17.15	16.02	14.62	16.88	16.44	15.98
N.S 48.25 62.32 68.24 N.S N.S	1153.3 1390	0.0 1407.1	1316.8	1153.8	1394.8	1388.2	1312.2	13.84	16,68	16.89	15.80	13.85	16.74	16.66	15.75
N.S Nesium (B) 48.25 Potassium (C) 68.24 N.S N.S	I of significant														
esium (B) 48.25 Potassium (C) 62.32 68.24 N.S			N.S				S				Z				U
otassium (C) 62.32 68.24 N.S N.S	m (B)		48.75				V				0 570				2
8.24 8.24 8.05 8.05	Ssium (C)		62.33				200				0770				2.5
12.00 N. N. N			70.09				10.0				0.740				, y
S.S.			17.00				N.V				0.819				S
UZ			S.S				N.S				S.S				Z
2			S.S				N.S				Z				Z
5.N			S				U Z				2				2

Oncemore, the results obtained in Table (2) show that in the root fresh weight was significantly affected by magnesium fertilizer in the  $1^{\rm st}$  season. However, application of 5 kg MgO/fed produced the highest value of root fresh weihght in both seasons. This result concides with that reported by El-Taweel (1999).

In regard to the influence of  $K_2O$  fertilizer treatments on root fresh weight, data showed that root fresh weight was significantly affected by application of 48 kg  $K_2O$ /fed and 24 kg  $K_2O$ /fed attained the highest value of root fresh weight being 1407.1 g and 1394.8 g/plant in the  $1^{st}$  and  $2^{nd}$  season., respectively. This result concide with that reported by El-Taweel (1999) and Ismail *et al.* (2002).

Also, variety x magnesium interaction significantly affected root fresh weight in the  $1^{st}$  season. The results showed that the highest root fresh weight 1396 g was recorded by Toro and 5 kg MgO/fed in the  $1^{st}$  season.

## III. Yield and yield components

#### 4. Top yield (tons/fed)

Results in Table (2) show that Toro variety produced heavier top yield (tons/fed) compared with Pleno with a significant differences in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season. The increase in top yield recorded by Toro over Pleno was 1.47% in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season. This result is in line with that reported by Ismail *et al.* (2002).

Oncemore, the results obtained in Table (2) show that top yield was significantly affected by magnesium fertilizer in the 1<sup>st</sup> season, applying 5 kg MgO/fed. produced the highest values of top yield in both seasons. This result concide with that reported by Osman (2001).

Data in Table (2) show that  $K_2O$ -fertilizer level gave significant effect on top yield in both seasons. Application of 48 kg  $K_2O$ /fed recorded the highest values of top yield (16.89) in the 1<sup>st</sup> season, meanwhile, 24 kg  $K_2O$ /fed attained the highest values of top yield (16.74) in the 2<sup>nd</sup> one., respectively. This result are in agreement with that obtained by Osman (2001) and Ismail *et al.* (2002).

Results indicated that top yield was significantly affected by the interaction between variety  $\times$  MgO in the  $1^{st}$  season. The heavier top yield being 16.75 tons/fed was recorded with Toro variety and 5 kg MgO/fed in the  $1^{st}$  season.

#### II. Juice quality

#### 5. Sucrose %

The results in Table (3) indicate that there were insignificant influence on sucrose% due to both of varieties and/or Mg fertilizer. This result is in line with that reported by Saif, Laila (2000) (varietal effect) and Bizik (1993), Domska (1996), El-Taweel (1999) and Osman (2001) by applying Mg fertilizer.

Concerning, the effect of  $K_2O$  fertilizer levels data revealed that sucrose% was significantly affected by the applied doses of  $K_2O$  in both seasons. Application of 48 kg  $K_2O$ /fed produced the highest value of sucrose% (17.65 in the  $1^{st}$  season) whereas, application of 24 kg  $K_2O$ /fed was enough to attain the highest value of sucrose (17.58% in the  $2^{nd}$  season), respectively. This result concide with that reported by El-Taweel (1999), Osman (2001) and Ismail *et al.* (2002).

All interactions between the studies factors did not affect significantly the sucrose% in both seasons.

#### 6. Purity %

Data given in Table (3) show that neither sugar beet varieties not Mg fertilizer insignificantly affected purity% in both seasons. This result concides with those reported by Saif, Laila (2000) and Ismail *et al* (2002) (varietal effect) and Bizik (1993), Domska (1996), El-Taweel (1999) and Osman (2001) (Mg applying).

Results in Table (3) show that  $K_2O$  fertilization significantly affected purity% in both seasons. Application of, 48 kg  $K_2O$ /fed produced higher purity% compared with check treatment and 24 kg  $K_2O$ /fed. Adding of 48 kg K/fed increased values of purity% 7.73 and 1.11% in the 1st season and 7.99 and 0.19% in the 2nd season., respectively. This result is in agreement with that reported by El- Taweel (1999), Osman (2001) and Ismail *et al.* (2002).

All interaction between the studied factors did not affect significantly the purity% in both seasons.

### III. Yield and yield components

#### 7. Root yield (tons/fed)

Data given in Table (4) cleare that Toro variety statistically surpassed Pleno variety with respect to root yield (tons/fed) in the 2<sup>nd</sup> one,however, this influence was

Table 3. Effect of varieties, magnesium and potassium fertilizer on sucrose and purity% of some sugar beet varieties at harvest in 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 seasons.

Varieties         Kg Mg/fed         zero (Kg Ko)fed)         Zero	2002/2003 Potassium (Kg K <sub>2</sub> O/fed) 24 48 216.80 18.18	Wean 12 87	50	2001/2002	Mean	20	20002/2003	003	Mean
(Kg K <sub>2</sub> O/red)  2.71	24 24 16.80	-	2	Potassium		<u></u>	Potassium	Ę	
cero         24         48         zero           2.71         17.09         18.24         16.01         11.55           3.91         16.55         17.19         15.88         14.38         14.38           4.69         17.46         17.60         16.58         15.63         14.19         15.88         16.61         14.19         15.88         16.63         14.19         17.83         16.31         14.19         17.83         16.31         14.19         14.13         14.15         14.15         17.25         16.48         14.15         17.25         16.48         14.15         17.15         16.46         14.15         17.15         17.15         16.46         14.15         17.15         17.15         17.15         17.15         17.15         17.15         17.15         17.15         17.15 <td< td=""><td>16.80</td><td>-</td><td>(Kg</td><td>(Kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed)</td><td></td><td>10</td><td>(Kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed)</td><td>(paj</td><td></td></td<>	16.80	-	(Kg	(Kg K <sub>2</sub> O/fed)		10	(Kg K <sub>2</sub> O/fed)	(paj	
2.7. 17.09 18.24 16.01 12.55 3.7. 17.09 18.24 16.01 12.55 3.7. 17.03 17.68 16.16 14.19 3.80 17.46 17.68 16.16 14.19 4.81 18.28 17.51 16.87 14.75 4.71 15.74 17.53 16.37 14.13 4.44 17.49 17.63 16.52 14.10 3.26 17.28 18.04 16.19 12.99 4.70 17.10 17.57 16.46 14.88 4.11 17.26 17.65 16.38 14.57 N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.	16.80	H	zero	24 4	48	zero	0 24	48	
3.91 16.55 17.19 15.88 14.38 44.89 44.89 17.66 17.60 16.58 15.63 15.63 15.63 17.81 16.16 14.19 17.81 16.16 13.49 14.15 16.24 17.81 16.27 14.75 16.27 14.10 17.28 18.04 16.19 12.99 43.6 17.41 17.35 16.38 14.57 47.0 17.10 17.57 16.46 14.88 44.11 17.26 17.65 16.34 14.15 17.51 16.34 14.15 17.51 16.34 14.15 17.51 16.34 14.15 17.51 16.34 14.15 17.55 16.34 14.15 17.55 16.34 14.15 17.56 17.65 16.34 14.15 17.56 17.65 16.34 14.15 17.56 17.65 16.34 14.15 17.56 17.65 17.55 16.34 14.15 17.56 17.65 17.55 16.34 14.15 17.56 17.65 17.55 17.	17.85		71.48	80.89 82	82.39 78	78.25 71.28	28 84.16	84.42	79.95
4.66 17.46 17.60 16.58 15.63 13.73 17.03 17.68 16.16 14.19 14.19 15.81 16.87 14.19 16.87 14.10 16.87 14.13 16.87 14.13 16.87 14.13 16.87 14.13 16.14 17.29 17.63 16.23 14.13 14.13 16.14 17.25 16.14 1	20:12	16.55	73.02	75.64 80	80.42 76	76.36 74.89	39 81.36	82.05	79.43
3.77 17.03 17.68 16.16 14.19 4.81 18.28 16.36 13.43 4.81 18.67 17.83 16.33 14.13 4.44 17.49 17.63 16.52 14.10 3.26 17.28 18.04 16.19 12.99 4.36 17.30 17.57 16.46 14.88 4.11 17.26 17.55 16.36 14.85 4.11 17.26 17.55 16.46 14.88 4.11 17.26 17.55 16.46 14.88 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.46 4.15 17.57 18.46 4.16 17.58 18.47 4.70 17.10 17.57 18.46 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48 4.11 17.26 17.57 18.48	3 17.89 17.24	16.92	75.59	80.50 80	80.14 78	78.74 76.50	50 82.88	81.23	80.20
380 17.46 17.83 16.36 13.43 47.1 16.74 17.53 16.37 14.13 44.4 17.49 17.63 16.52 14.10 3.26 17.28 18.04 16.19 12.99 47.0 17.10 17.55 16.46 14.87 47.0 17.10 17.55 16.46 14.88 41.1 17.26 17.65 16.34 14.15 N.S.	17.51 17.61	16.44	73.36	79.01 80	80.98	77.79 74.22	22 82.80	82.56	98'62
4.81 18.28 17.51 16.87 14.75 4.71 16.74 17.53 16.33 14.13 4.72 17.28 18.04 16.19 12.99 4.36 17.41 17.35 16.38 14.57 4.70 17.10 17.57 16.46 14.88 4.11 17.26 17.65 16.34 14.15 N.S N.S N.S	3 18.06 17.41	16.30	75.85	85.72 86	86.23 82	82.60 73.57	57 81.82	82.49	79.29
4.71 16.74 17.53 16.33 4.44 17.49 17.63 16.52 3.36 17.28 18.04 16.19 4.70 17.10 17.57 16.46 4.11 17.26 17.65 16.34 4.11 17.26 17.65 16.34 8.12 17.65 17.65 18.34	5 17.27 17.68	3 16.57	74.08	80.58 80	80.55 78	78.40 74.39	39 80.04	80.31	78.25
4.44 17.49 17.63 16.52 3.26 17.28 18.04 16.19 4.70 17.10 17.57 16.46 4.11 17.26 17.65 16.38 N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S. N.S.	3 17.62 17.51	16.42	74.52	80.96 81	81.16 78	78.88 74.64	54 81.83	82.73	79.73
3.26 17.28 18.04 16.19 4.36 17.41 17.35 16.38 4.70 17.10 17.57 16.46 4.11 17.26 17.65 16.34 N.S N.S N.S	0 17.65 17.53	3 16.43	74.82	82.42 82	82.65 79	79.96 74.20	20 81.23	81.84	79.09
4.36 17.41 17.35 16.38 4.70 17.10 17.57 16.46 4.11 17.26 17.65 16.34 N.S N.S N.S	9 17.43 17.80	16.07	73.67	83.30 84	84.31 80	80.43 72.43	13 82.99	83.45	79.62
4.70 17.10 17.57 16.46 4.11 17.26 17.65 16.34 N.S N.S N.S N.S	7 17.56 17.55	5 16.56	73.55	78.11 80	80.49 77	77.38 74.64	54 80.70	81.18	78.84
4.11   17.26   17.65   16.34   N.S N.S N.S N.S 0.73 0.73	3 17.75 17.38	3 16.67	75.05	80.73 80	80.65 78	78.81 75.58	58 82.35	81.98	79.97
	5 17.58 17.57	7 16.43	74.09	80.71 81	81.82 78	78.87 74.21	21 82.01	82.20	79.48
N.S. N.S. 0.73									
N.S 0.73 N.S		N.S			Z	S			S
0.73 N.S		N.S			Z	N.S			N.S
<i>S</i> 2		0.689			2	14			1.66
);		N.S			Z	S			N.S
N.S		N.S			Z	Ŋ			S
N.S		N.S			Z	S			S
N.S		N.S			Z	S			N.S

insignificantly in the  $1^{st}$  season. This result is in line with those reported by Saif, Laila (2000) and Ismail *et al.* (2002).

The effect of magnesium fertilizer on root yield appared a significant influence in the  $\mathbf{1}^{st}$  season on root yield. This result concides with that reported by Osman (2001).

Regarding the effect of potassium fertilizer on root yield, it could be noted a significantly increase in this trait in both seasons, application of 48 kg  $K_2O/fed$  attained the highest value of root yield 42.21 in the  $1^{st}$  season whereas application of 24 kg  $K_2O/fed$  attained the highest value of root yield 41.84 in the  $2^{nd}$  season., respectively. This result is in line with that reported by El-Taweel (1999) and Osman (2001).

Results indicated that root yield was significantly affected by the interaction between variety x MgO in the  $1^{\rm st}$  season. The highest root yield was (41.88 tons/fed) was recorded with Toro variety and 5 kg MgO/fed in the  $1^{\rm st}$  season.

#### 8. Sugar yield (tons/fed)

Neither sugar beet varieties nor magnesium fertilizer levels attained a significant effect on sugar yield/fed. However, it could be noticed that application of 5 kg MgO/fed attained a negligible increase in sugar yield compared with check treatment and/or 10 kg MgO/fed. This result is in line with that reported by Ismail *et al.* (2002) (varietal effect) and Denesova and Andres (1995), Domska (1996) and El-Taweel (1999) and Osman (2001) (Mg applying).

Results given in Table (4) show that sugar yield was significantly affected by the applied of  $K_2O$  in both seasons. Application of 48 kg  $K_2O$ /fed produced the highest value of sugar yield 7.47 tons/fed in the 1<sup>st</sup> season whereas, application of 24 kg  $K_2O$ /fed produced the highest value of sugar yield 7.39 tons/fed in the 2<sup>nd</sup> season. This result concides with that reported by El- Taweel (1999), Osman (2001) and Ismail *et al.* (2002).

The various interactions between the studied factors did not affect significantly the sugar yield in both seasons.

Table 4. Effect of varieties, magnesium and potassium fertilizer on root yield and sugar yield (tons/fed) of some sugar beet varieties at harvest in 2001/2002 and 2002/2003 seasons.

Agmesium 69 Mg/fed 2010 89 Mg/fed 2010 89 Mg/fed 2010 89 Mg/fed 2011 10 80 Mg/fed 2010 80 Mg/fed	0 - 0	Mean Mean 38.53 39.77 40.58 39.63	20 (K <sub>K</sub> zero 30.35	2002/2003 Potassium (Kg K <sub>2</sub> O/fed) 24	6	Mean	2	2001/2002		Mean	0	5002/2003		
G Mg/fed zero 0 30.89 10 35.83 e 0 32.11 5 37.45 10 36.70 10 36.27 10 36.23 10 36.29 10 36.29 10 36.29 10 36.29	R <sub>2</sub> O/fed) 24 48 24 48 40.92 43.79 43.10 41.59 42.48 43.43 42.17 42.94 38.61 39.50	38.53	(K, zero 30.35	otassium 3 K <sub>2</sub> O/fec 24	=			-		3	1	1		Mean
G Mg/fed 20.89 5 34.61 10 35.83 6 0 32.11 5 37.45 10 36.73 10 36.73 10 36.23 10 36.23 1	24 48 40.92 43.79 43.10 41.59 42.48 43.43 42.17 42.94 38.61 39.50	38.53 39.77 40.58 39.63	zero 30.35	24			۵ ۶	Potassium	4	F)(	т 5	Potassium	5	
10 33.78 10 33.83 10 33.78 10 32.11 10 35.70 10 35.	<del></del>	39.77 40.58 39.63	30.35	1.7	48		2010	24/10	40	-	N OTOL	24/15	90	
5 34.61 10 35.83 e 33.78 0 33.78 10 36.70 e 35.42 0 31.50 0 31.50 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 36.03		39.63	2000	37 43	42.21	36.66	3 03	6 90	8 03	632	3.81	6.20	7 69	5 03
10 35.83 e 33.78 0 32.11 5 37.45 10 36.70 e 35.42 0 31.50 0 31.50 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 36.03 e of significant	$\rightarrow$	39.63	35.07	43.31	41.11	39.83	4.83	7.14	7.16	6.38	5.06	7.76	7.18	6.67
e 33.78 0 32.11 10 35.45 10 35.42 e 35.42 0 31.50 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 36.03 10 96.03	$\vdash$	39.63	38.79	42.27	41.16	40.74	5.26	7.46	7.66	6.79	60.9	7.59	7.13	6.94
0 32.11 5 37.45 10 35.70 e 35.70 0 31.50 5 36.03 10 36.27 10 36.03 10 36.27	$\vdash$	NC 36	34.74	41.00	41.49	39.08	4.67	7.20	7.62	6.50	4.99	7.21	7.33	6.51
5 37.45 10 36.70 e 35.42 5 31.50 5 36.03 10 36.27 rage 34.60	Ļ	17:00	32.27	43.69	40.80	38.92	4.43	6.75	7.08	80.9	4.34	7.90	7.14	6.46
e 35.70 e 35.42 0 31.50 5 36.03 10 36.27 rage 34.60	45.54 42.65	41.88	36.89	42.25	43.55	40.90	5.57	8.34	7.49	7.13	5.47	7.32	7.71	6.83
e 35.42 0 31.50 5 36.03 10 36.27 rage 34.60 el of significant	39.55 42.31	39.52	34,31	42.11	41.04	39.15	5.40	6.63	7.42	6.47	4.85	7.48	7.20	6.51
0 31.50 5 36.03 10 36.27 rage 34.60 el of significant	41.23 41.49	39.38	34.49	42.68	41.80	39.66	5.13	7.24	7.33	6.57	4.89	7.56	7.35	6.60
5 36.03 10 36.27 rage 34.60 el of significant	39.77 41.65	37.64	31.31	40.56	41.51	37.79	4.18	6.87	7.56	6.20	4.07	7.09	7.42	6.19
10 36.27 rage 34.60 lel of significant	44.32 42.12	40.82	35.98	42.78	42.33	40.36	5.20	7.74	7.33	6.76	5.27	7.54	7.45	6.75
rage 34.60	41.02 42.87	40.05	36.55	42.19	41.10	39.95	5.33	7.04	7.54	6.64	5.47	7.53	7.17	6.72
D. at 5% level of significant	41.70 42.21	39.50	34.61	41.84	41.65	39.37	4.90	7.22	7.47	6.53	4.94	7.39	7.34	6.56
eties (A)		N.S				s				N.S				N.S
Magnesium (B)		1.45				N.S				N.S				N.S
Potassium (C)		1.87				2.37				0.592				0.671
A×B		2.05				N.S				N.S				N.S
A×C		N.S				N.S				N.S				N.S
U		N.S				N.S				N.S				N.S
4×B×C		N.S				N.S				SZ				S

#### REFERENCES

- Bizik, J. 1993. The content and ratios of cations in sugar beet plants as an indicator of sugar content. Rostl. Vyro. 39 (12): 1103-1109. (C.F. Field Crop Abst., 48 (8): 6070, 1995).
- Carruthers, A. J.F.T. Oldfield and H.J. Teague 1962. Assessment of beet quality.
   Paper presented to the 15 th Annual Technical Conference, Biritish Sugar Corporation Ltd. 28 pp.
- Denesova, O. and E. Aandres 1995. New results with potassium and magnesium fertilizer application to sugar beet. Agroch 35 (9/10): 159, 161-162. (c.f. Field Crop Abst 50 (6): 4160, 1997).
- Domska, D. 1996. Yield and quality of sugar beet after foliar feeding with nitrogen, magnesium, boron and copper. Polish J. of Food and Nutri Sci. 5 (20): 23-31.
   (C.F. Field Crop Abst 50 (4): 2488, 1997).
- El-Taweel, Fayza. M.A. 1999. Response of some sugar beet varieties to potassium and magnesium fertilizers. Ph.D. Thesis. Fac. Agric. Moshtohor. Zagazig. Univ.
- Ismail, A.M.A. Kh. A. Aboushady and S.M. Allam 2002. Response of some sugar beet varieties to methods of potassium application. Egypt. J. Appl. Sci., 17 (2): 86-101.
- Le Docte, A. 1927. Commercial determination of sugar in beet root using the Sacks Le Docte Int. Sugar J., 29: 488-492.
- Osman, A.M.H. 2001. Effect of nutrition and pacoloburazol (PGR) on sugar beet yield and quality (*Beta vulgaris* L). Ph.D. Thesis. Fac. Agric. Moshtohor. Zagazig Univ.
- Osman, A.M.H. G.S. El-Sayed M.S.H. Osman and K.S. El-Sogheir 2003. Soil
  application of some micro-elements with relation to yield and quality of sugar
  beet varieties. (*Beta vulgaris* L.). Annals of Agric. Sc., Moshtohor. 41 (3): 11351152.
- Saif, Laila M.A. 2000. The relative importance of potassium fertilizer for sugar beet under Upper Egypt conditions. Minufiya J. Agric. Res., 25 (5): 1215-1227.
- 11. Snedecor, G.W. and W.G. Cochran 1981. Statistical Methods. Seventh Ed., Iowa State Univ. Press, Ames., Iowa, USA.

# تأثير التسميد بالبوتاسيوم والماغنسيوم على محصول وجودة

## صنفين من بنجر السكر

#### محمود سيد حسن عثمان

معهد بحوث المحاصيل السكريه- مركز البحوث الزراعيه - الجيزه - مصر

أقيمت تجربتان حقليتان بمحطه البحوث الزراعيه بسخا بمحافظه كفر الشيخ لدراسه تأثير الاضافة الارضية التسميد بالماغنسيوم والبوتاسيوم على محصول وجوده بنجر السكر خلال موسمى الزراعه 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 و 1.00 و منفين من التسميد الماغنسيوم صفر و مينو و بلينو وثلاثة معدلات من التسميد الماغنسيوم صفر و و و 1.00 و 1.00 كجم اكسيد ماغنسيوم مغ ألفدان وثلاثة مستويات من التسميد بعنصر البوتاسيوم صفر و 1.00 كجم بوتاسيوم بوم أللغدان ووزعت المعاملات في تصميم قطع منشقه مره و احده في أربع مكررات حيث وضعت الاصناف في القطع الرئيسيه والتفاعل بين مستويات التسميد في القطع الشقية.

أوضحت النتائج المتحصل عليها:

- ١- تغوق الصنف تورو على الصنف بلينو معنويا في الصفات التالية: قطر الجذر ووزن
   الجذر الطازج ومحصولي العرش والجذر في الموسم الثاني فقط.
- ٢- أوضحت النتائج تفوق معاملات التسميد بعنصر الماغنسيوم مغ أ معنويا في الصفات التالية: طول الجنر وقطر الجذر ووزن الجذر الطازج ومحصولي العرش والجنر في الموسم الاول فقط.
- ٣- أوضحت النتائج تفوق معاملات التسميد بعنصر البوتاسيوم بو ١ معنويا في كلا الموسمين في الصفات التالية: طول الجذر و قطر الجذر ووزن الجذر الطازج والسكروز والنقاوة ومحصول العرش.
- 3 اوضحت النتائج ان احسن محصول من الجذور ( £0,03 طن الفدان) نتج من التفاعل بين الصنف تورو مع اضافة المعدل 0 كجم اكسيد ماغنسيوم مغ أ للفدان و 2 كجم اكسيد بوتاسيوم بو1 للفدان في الموسم الاول بينما كان في الموسم الثاني (2,00 طن الفدان نتج من التفاعل بين الصنف تورو و 2 كجم اكسيد ماغنسيوم مغ أ الفدان و 2 كجم اكسيد بوتاسيوم بو1.
- $\circ$  اوضحت النتائج ان احسن محصول من السكر ( $\wedge$  4,7% طن الفدان) نتج من التقاعل بين الصنف تورو مع اضافة المعدل  $\circ$  كجم اكسيد ماغنسيوم مغ أ المفدان و  $\wedge$  4 كجسم اكسيد بوتاسيوم بو  $\wedge$  1 للفدان في الموسم الأول بينما كان في الموسم الثاني ( $\wedge$  4,9% طن المفدان) نتج من التفاعل بين الصنف تورو ومعاملة الكونترول للماغنيسيوم مغ أو  $\wedge$  5 كجم بوتاسيوم بو $\wedge$  1 للفدان.