EFFECT OF SOME TILLAGE PRACTICES AND PLANT SPACING ON SUGAR CANE: 1. GROWTH CHARACTERISTICS

EL-GEDDAWY, I.H.¹ S.A. SHAFSHAK,² S.A.H. ALLAM ²AND G.S. EL-SAYED¹

1- SUGAR CROPS RES. INST, AGRIC. RES. CENTER, GIZA, EGYPT. 2-FAC. AGRIC., MOSHTOHOR, ZAGAZIG UNIV., EGYPT.

(Manuscript received 5 April 2004)

Abstract

This investigation was carried out at Shandaweel Research Station (Sohag Governorate) in 1997/1998 and 1998/1999 seasons to study the effect of some tillage practices (ploughing and hoeing) and row spacing on growth characteristics of the plant cane.

The results showed that increasing ploughing number from two to three and four times increased sprouting percentage at 45 days in both seasons with a significant difference in the second season , number of stalks/m after 105 and 165 days from planting and stalk diameter at 150 and 210 days in the second season. Ploughing two or three times attained the highest stalk length throughout the different growth stages compared with four ploughings.

Spacing rows at 100 cm produced higher sprouting percentage and number of stalks/m after 105 and 165 days from planting in the 2nd season compared with planting at 125 cm. Row spacing of 125 cm significantly increased stalk diameter in the 2nd season at the various growth stages. Planting sugarcane in rows of 100 cm significantly increased stalk height at the different stages in the 2nd season compared with the wider row spacing (125 cm).

Hoeing frequency had no significant effect on number of stalks/m or stalk height at 105 and 165 days from planting and stalk diameter at all growth stages.

INTRODUCTION

Soil deep loosening techniques can improve soil structure and increase the soil aeration and water permeability . It can also substantially increase crop yields. Row spacing plays an important role in the amount of solar radiation intercepted and water transpired by crop canopy which in turn affect the photosynthesis processes and

ultimately the dry matter produced and sugar extracted by sugar cane plant. Moreover, planting density may affect cane diameter, length and weight of individual plants which contribute to cane yield. Prasad at al. (1983) stated that spacing of 90 cm gave thicker canes than 70 cm. Ismail (1991) found that hand hoeing twice gave the highest stalk length, stalk diameter, at different growth stages, compared with untreated control. Researchers from the Bureau of Sugar Experiment Stations showed little or no benefit from increasing the number of cultivations in plant or ratoon cane. (Braunack, 1994). Uniform deep ploughing became a routine practice to improve productivity that needs no more confirmation (Abou- Salama, 1996). Ahmed (1995) cleared that planting sugar cane by using double drills gave the highest values of stalk height. However, there was no clear cut difference between planting systems (double and 1.5 drills) in their effect on stalk diameter. Also double drills led to a significant increase in number of sugar cane plants/m over 1.5 drill. El-Sayed (1996) revealed that planting density had no significant effect on stalk height, and planting 1.5 drill significantly increased stalk diameter compared with planting two drills. Barbieri at al. (1997) revealed that the conventional tillage gave better results than the reduced tillage. Yadav and Prasad (1997) found that closer spacing increased cane yields by 8.9% over wider spacing due to an increased number and length of millable canes. Abd- El-Latif at al.. (1998) FOUND that increasing row spacing from 80 to 120 cm significantly increased stalk height. Laila Saif at al.. (1999) found that increasing plant population in terms of number of buds/fed significantly increased stalk height, and decreased stalk diameter. The present work was conducted to study the relative importance of ploughing times , hoeing frequency and row spaces on growth characteristics of sugar cane.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field trials were conducted at Shandaweel Research Station (Sohag Governorate) in the two successive growing seasons of 1997/1998 and 1998/1999, to study the effect of some tillage practices (ploughing and hoeing) and row spacing on growth characteristics of cane plant. Each field experiment included twelve treatments representing the combination between the following studied factors:

A- Number of ploughings:

1- Two ploughings.

- 2- Three ploughings.
- 3- Four ploughings.

Ploughing was done by a (Chisel Plough) which is 7 blade- mounted type. The was distance between every 2 blades was 50 cm. It stirs the soil for a depth of 15 cm. Compacting was done after each ploughing by a wooden block.

B- Row spacing:

- 1- 100 cm.
- 2- 125 cm.

C- Hand hoeing treatments:

- 1- Hand hoeing twice, after 30 and 60 days from planting.
- 2- Hand hoeing three times, after 30, 60 and 90 days from planting.

Sugar cane variety G.T.54-9 was planted during the first week of April and harvested twelve months later. One and half drills of three-budded cane cuttings were used in sugar cane planting (37800 buds/fed in case of spacing rows at 100 cm and 30240 buds/fed in case of 125 cm rows spacing). A split split plot design with four replications was used in both seasons where, treatments of ploughing number were allocated in the main plots whereas the sub plots were assigned for row spacing treatments and hoeing frequency treatments were randomly distributed in the sub-sub plots. The experimental unit area was 70 m², 7 m in length and 10 m in width, including 10 rows (in case of spacing at 100 cm) and 8 rows (in case of spacing at 125 cm).

Data Recorded

- 1- Sprouting percentage was determined at 45 days from planting.
- 2- Number of plants per meter, was recorded twice, at 105 days from planting and 60 days later.
- 3- The following growth characteristics were periodically determined for ten labeled plants:

a- Stalk diameter (cm) at the middle part of the stalk at 150, 210, 270 and 330 days from planting.

b- Stalk height (cm) from land level till dewlap at 150, 210, 270 and 330 days from planting. The collected data were statistically analysed according the procedures outlined by Snedecor and Cochran (1981).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1- Sprouting percentage

Increasing ploughing number from two to three and four times increased sprouting percentage by 6.06 and 2.99 % in the $1^{\rm st}$ season, being 8.63 and 3.77 % in the $2^{\rm nd}$ one (Table 1). The effect of ploughing number on sprouting percentage was significant in the $2^{\rm nd}$ season only. The highest value of germination percentage (34.9% and 40.07% in the $1^{\rm st}$ and $2^{\rm nd}$ seasons, respectively) at 45 day from planting was attained by carrying out the ploughing process three times.

The results showed that using the lower row spacing (100 cm) produced higher sprouting percentage in both season compared with the wider row spacing (125 cm). The increase in germination percentage was 5.43 and 1.26 in the $1^{\rm st}$ and $2^{\rm nd}$ seasons, respectively. These increases were significant in the $2^{\rm nd}$ season only.

Data in Table (1) showed that with 2 and 3 ploughings, the wider row spacing produced higher germination percentage compared with the narrower spacing, whereas with 4 ploughings an opposite trend was observed where the narrower spacing (100 cm) produced a marked significant increase in sprouting percentage . The maximum sprouting % in 1998/1999 season was 40.87% resulting from 3 ploughing combined with 125 cm row spacing (Table 1). The increase in germination percentage resulting from 3 ploughings in both seasons of experimentation indicates that this practice in soil tillage is quite suitable for improving physical soil characters which in turn was reflected in increasing sprouting percentage. Further increase in ploughing intensity to 4 times negatively affected germination % perhaps due to negative effects on soil structure. The results obtained by Barbieri at al. (1997) revealed that the conventional tillage gave better results than the reduced tillage.

Table 1. Effect of number of ploughings and row spacing on sprouting percentage of sugar cane at (45 days from planting) (1997/98 and 1998/99 seasons)

Number of	Row spacing	1997/98 season	1998/1999 season
ploughing			
2	100 cm	32.932	30.552
	125 cm	24.785	32.338
Average		28.858	31.445
3	100 cm	35.517	39.283
	125 cm	34.325	40.868
Average		34.921	40.076
4	100 cm	35.300	39.873
	125 cm	28.365	32.735
Average		31.832	36.304
Row spacing	100 cm	34.583	36.569
x Hoeing	125 cm	29.158	35.314
Total Average		31.871	35.942
LSD at 5 % level:			

 Ploughing (P)
 NS
 *

 Row spacing (R)
 NS
 *

 P x R
 NS
 2.053

2- Number of stalks / m

Results given in Tables (2 and 3) show the effects of number of ploughings, row spacing, hoeing and their interactions on the number of stalks/m at 105 and 195 days from planting in the $1^{\rm st}$ and $2^{\rm nd}$ seasons. Regarding the effect of number of ploughings, the results showed that increasing ploughing number from two to three and four times tended to increase number of stalks/m by 14.19 % and 15.23 % after 105 days from planting, being 3.8 % and 9.05 % after 165 days from planting in the $1^{\rm st}$ season.

In 1998/99 season, the results cleared that increasing ploughing number from two to three times increased number of stalks/ m by 4.5 % and 17.61 % after 105 and 165 days from planting , respectively. However, raising ploughing number from two to four times decreased number of stalks/m by 5.77 % and 2.81 % after 105 and 165 days from planting, respectively. Ploughing sugar cane field three times attained a significant increase in the number of plant/m at 165 day in the $2^{\rm nd}$ season only, compared with 2 or 4 ploughings..

PxH

R×H P×R×H

The results indicate clearly that 3 ploughings is fair enough for producing higher number of stalks. Four ploughing negatively affected number stalks/m in both seasons. Two ploughings seemed to ensure a good seedbed for growing cane and improved soil physical, chemical and biological characters. The results obtained by Pear at al. (1992) showed no significant differences between a plot cultivated in the traditional manner and a low tillage plot.

Table 2. Effect of some tillage practices and row spacing on number of stalks /m of sugar cane at different stages of growth in 1997/98 season

Number of	Row	105	days	Augraga	165	days	Average
Ploughing	spacing	2 hoeings	3 hoeings	Average	2 hoeings	3 hoeings	Average
	100 cm	4.92	5.35	5.13	11.90	12.09	11.99
2	125 cm	7.54	7.71	7.62	13.11	13.95	13.53
Average	-	6.23	6.53	6.38	12.50	13.02	12.76
	100 cm	7.49	6.06	6.78	12.92	12.38	12.65
3	125 cm	7.81	7.78	7.79	13.64	14.06	13.85
Average		7.65	6.92	7.28	13.28	13.22	13.25
v.	100 cm	8.07	6.99	7.53	15.23	13.47	14.35
4	125 cm	6.92	7.42	7.17	13.59	13.37	13.48
Average		7.49	7.21	7.35	14.41	13.42	13.91
Row spacing	100 cm	6.83	6.13	6.48	13.35	12.64	13.00
x Hoeing	125 cm	7.42	7.64	7.53	13.44	13.79	13.62
Total Average		7.128	6.89	7.00	13.40	13.22	13.31
LSD at 5 % k	evel:						
Ploughing (P)				NS			NS
Row spacing (R)			*			NS
Hoeing (H)				NS			NS
PxR				NS	•		NS

Data given in Tables (2 and 3) cleare that row spacing had marked effect on number of stalks /m . The results indicated that 100 cm row spacing increased the number of stalks/m after 105 and 165 days from planting by 3.5 % and 21.8 % in 1998/99 season, respectively, compared with that of 125 cm. This increase reached the level of significance after 165 days. On the contrary, increasing the row distance to 125 cm in the $1^{\rm st}$ season increased the number of stalks/m after 105 and 165 days from planting by 16.19 and 4.78 % respectively, compared with planting at 100 cm. This effect reached the level of significance at 105 days.

NS

NS

NS

NS

The results of the second season are logic since narrower spaces would increased number of stems under high soil fertility. The first season results indicate that under wider spacing tillering has been encouraged compensating the lower number of buds, hence greater number of stalks were recorded at 105 as well as at 165 from planting. It is worth noting also that no marked difference is observed in the two studied spacings (100 and 125 cm) and both distances may be suitable for growing sugar cane in Sohag.

Positive results were also reported by growing sugar cane at narrower spacing (Usman, 1989 and Devi *at al.*, 1990).On the other hand, results obtained by Mali and Singh (1986), showed better effect of wider spacings on growth and yield of cane.

Table 3. Effect of some tillage practices and plant spacing on number of stalks /m of sugar cane at different stages of growth in 1998/99 season

Number of	Row	105	days	Average	165	days	Average
ploughing	spacing	2 hoeings	3 hoeings		2 hoeings	3 hoeings	
2	100 cm	7.78	7.76	7.77	14.90	15.23	15.07
	125 cm	7.50	6.71	7.10	12.23	12.23	12.23
Average		7.64	7.23	7.43	13.57	13.73	13.65
3	100 cm	8.14	8.18	8.16	17.52	18.09	17.80
	125 cm	7.71	7.04	7.38	13.76	14.85	14.30
Average		7.92	7.61	7.77	15.64	16.47	16.05
4	100 cm	6.78	6.57	6.67	13.95	14.71	14.33
	125 cm	7.23	7.45	7.34	12.61	11.80	12.21
Average		7.01	7.01	7.01	13.28	13.25	13.27
Row spacing x Hoeing	100 cm	7.56	7.50	7.53	15.45	16.01	15.73
ATIOCHIG	125 cm	7.48	7.07	7.27	12.87	12.96	12.91
Total Av	erage	7.52	7.28	7.40	14.16	14.48	14.32

LSD at 5 % level:		
Ploughing (P)	NS	1.45
Row spacing (R)	NS	*
Hoeing (H)	NS	NS
PxR	NS	NS
PxH	NS	NS
R×H	NS	NS
PxRxH	NS	NS

The effect of hoeing intensity on number of stalks /m was not significant in both seasons either at 105 or at 165 days from planting. This result indicates that no relevance has been detected between hoeing intensity and number of stalks/m.

It seems that 2 hoeings were quite effective in controlling weeds under the prevailing conditions. Similar results were also reported by Mehra *at al.* (1995) who found that hoeing twice gave the best results on growth and yield of sugar cane and positively depressed weed growth.

As for the interaction effects among the studied factors, the results obtained in Tables (2 and 3) cleare that none of the various combinations between the studied factors recorded a significant effect on the number of plant/m. These observations were true in both growing seasons. On the other hand, it could be observed that the highest values of this trait were attained by carrying out ploughing process four times + planting sugar cane at 100 cm row spacing and hoeing twice in the 1st season, and/or by ploughing sugar cane field three times + planting seed setts at 100 cm row spacing and hoeing 3 times in the second season.

The maximum numbers of stalks/m were 8.07 and 8.19 after 105 days from planting in the first and second season, respectively. At 165 days from planting, the highest stalks numbers were 15.23 and 18.09 in the first and second season, respectively.

3- Stalk diameter

Data presented in Tables (4 and 5) show that increasing ploughing number from 2 - 4 time insignificantly increased stalk diameter (cm) by 1.63, 0.55, 2.49 and 6.21% at 150, 210, 270 and 330 days from planting, respectively, in the 1st season. On the other hand, the effect of ploughing number on stalk diameter in the 2nd season was significant at 150 and 210 days from planting. The results in Table (5) indicate that increasing the intensity of ploughing from 2 - 4 time significantly increased in diameter in 1998/99 season by 15.28 and 13.84 % at 150 and 210 days, respectively. These increases were significant. At 270 and 330 days from planting no significant increases in stalk diameter was recorded in the 2nd season. It could be concluded that increasing ploughing intensity encourages sugar cane growth expressed as stalk diameter particularly at the early stages of growth. The positive effect of ploughing on sugar cane growth was also reported by Barbieri at al. (1997).On the other hand Braunack (1994) found that reducing the number of tillage operation did not after final yield of sugar cane.

Results given in Tables (4 and 5) reveal that row spacing of 125 cm significantly increased stalk diameter in the 2nd season at various growth stages. The results indicated that wider row space of 125 cm significantly increased stalk thickness by 11.19 %, 9.32 %, 7.58 % and 8.2 % at 150, 210, 270 and 330 days from planting, respectively. However, effect of row spacing on this trait was not significant at the different growth stages in the 1st season except at 150 days. These results are in agreement with those obtained by Prasad *at al.* (1983) who found that spacing of 90 cm gave thicker canes than 70 cm.m also El-Sayed (1996) revealed that planting 1.5 drill significantly increased stalk diameter compared with planting two drills.

The available results in Tables (4 and 5) point out that increasing hoeing from 2-3 time almost increased stalk diameter in both seasons at all growth stages except at 330 days in the second season. These increments were significant at 330 days in the 1st season and at 150, 210 and 270 days in the 2nd season. These increase were 0.27 and 3.39 % at 150 and 330 days from planting, respectively, in the 1st season and in the 2nd season, the corresponding increases in stalk diameter due to raising hoeing number from 2-3 were 3.44, 2.34 and 2.39 at 150, 210 and 270 days from planting, respectively in the second season.

Tables (4 and 5) show the interaction effects between number of ploughings, row spacing and hoeing on stalk diameter in both seasons. The results indicated that the only significant interactions were those between ploughing intensity and row spacing at 270 and 330 days from planting in 1998/99 season.

The results showed that the thickest stalks were those resulting from 2 ploughings + 125 cm row spacing at 270 DFP, being 2.60 cm. Whereas at 330 DFP, the thickest stalks recorded 2.98 cm resulting from 3 ploughings and 125 cm row spacing.

4- Stalk height

Regarding the effect of number of ploughing on stalk height, the results obtained showed that there was no general tendency due to the effect of ploughing number on stalk height. However, it could be noticed that ploughing two or three times attained the tallest stalk length in both seasons and throughout the different growth stages compared with four ploughings.

A general view to the results given in Tables (6 and 7) with respect to the last two growth stages i.e. when the plants aged 270 and 330 days, it could be noticed

that almost there were no significant differences between ploughing sugar cane field twice or three times with respect to their influence on stalk height. These findings were true in both seasons for the two growth stages.

However, both treatments significantly surpassed ploughing treatment 4 times. Ploughing sugar cane field twice increased stalk height at 270 days by 4.33 %and 4.84% in the 1st and 2nd seasons, respectively, compared with ploughing 4 times. Meanwhile at 330 days from planting ploughing sugar cane field twice produced a significant increase in stalk height of 5.22% and 3.35% in the 1^{st} and 2^{nd} seasons, respectively, compared with ploughing 4 times. It could be concluded that 2 ploughings were effective as far as sugar cane growth is concerned. Excessive ploughing to 4 times reduced sugar cane plant height at later stages of growth. Braunack (1994) reported that little or no benefit was obtained from increasing the number of cultivations in plant or ratoon cane. The results in Tables (6 and 7) show that using row spacing of 100 cm significantly increased stalk height by 4.46, 4.45, 2.74 and 3.35 % at 150, 210, 270 and 330 days respectively, in the 2nd season compared with the wider row spacing (125 cm). Moreover, in the 1st season, rows spacing of 100 cm increased stalk height by 1.76, 1.45, 0.85 and 0.88 % at 150, 210, 270 and 330 days, respectively, compared with 125 cm rows spacing. These increases did not reach the level of significance in the last three growth stages. results indicate that at narrower spacing sugar cane plants tended to elongate compared with plants grown at wider spacing. The elongation of cane plants is due to the increase in competition for light among growing plants at narrower spaces. Similar results were also obtained by Ahmed (1995) who found that using double drills increased stalk height compared with 1.5 drills.

The results in Tables (6 and 7) point out that practicing two or three hoeings, insignificantly affected stalk height of sugar cane plant in both seasons. There were no significant differences in stalk height throughout the growth stages in both seasons due to hoeing number. Similar results were obtained by Ismail (1991) who found that hoeing twice produced the highest stalk length.

Results given in Tables (6 and 7) indicate some significant effects of ploughing X row spacing, ploughing X hoeing, row spacing X hoeing and ploughing X row spacing X hoeing on stalk height of sugar cane at some growth stages.

REFERENCES

- Abd El-Latif, F.A.; Nour El-Hoda M.Taha and A.M.A. El-Shafai 1998. Performance of some sugar cane varieties grown under different row spacing. J. Agric.Sci., Mansoura Univ., 32 (7): 3041-3051.
- Abou- Salama, A.M. 1996. Cultural practices and their improvement for meximizing
 of sugar crops particularly in Egypt. A review article, prepared for the General
 Committee for the Promotion of Assistant Professors and Professors., Assyyout
 Univ., Agronomy Department.
- Ahmed, A.M. 1995. Evaluation of some sugar cane varieties grown in Upper Egypt. M.Sc. Thesis, Agron. Dept., Fac. Agric., Al-Azhar Univ., Cairo, Egypt.
- Barbieri, J.L.; L.R.F. Alleoni and J.L. Donzelli 1997 Agronomic and economic evaluation of soil preparation systems for sugar cane. Revista-Brasileira-de-Ciencia-do-Solo. 21 (1): 89-98.
- Braunack, M.V. 1994 The effect of soil physical properties on growth and yield of sugar cane Soil and Tillage Res. (ISSCT, XXII Congress 15 th September 1995, Cartagena, Colombia.).
- Devi, C.; K.L. Rao and D.V.M. Raju 1990 Studies on the effect of row space and nitrogen on yield and quality of early maturing sugar cane varieties. Indian Sugar, 40 (7): 541 - 544.
- El- Sayed, G.S. 1996. Plant population and nitrogen fertilizer and their effect on yield and quality for some sugar cane varieties. M.Sc. Thesis, Agron. Dept., Fac. Agric., Moshtohor, Zagazig Univ., Egypt.
- Ismail, A.M 1991. Effect of some herbicided on growth and yield of sugar cane.
 M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Al-Azhar. Univ., Cairo. Egypt.
- Laila M.Saif,; Nour El Hoda, M. Taha and Moona , M. Shehata 1999. Effect of plant denisty and nitrogen fertilizer on yield and quality of sugar cane varieties. Egypt. J. Appl. Sci; 14 (11): 77-90.
- Mali, A.L and P.P. Singh 1986. Effect of varying row spacings on the yield of select varieties of sugar cane. Indian Sugar, 36 (3): 117-121. (C.F. Hort. Abst., 1987, 57 (5): 3887).
- 11. Mehra, S.P.; L.S. Brar and K.K. Sharma 1995. Weed management in spring planted sugar cane. J. Res., Punjab Agric. Univ., 32 (1): 11-18.(C.F. Field Crop Abst, 1997, 50 (2):1362)

- Pear, E.; H. Bouza.; M.Morales.; N. Lopez.; S. Hernandez and I. Martinez 1992.
 Influence of two soil tillage technologies on the nutrient absorption, radical development and sugar cane yield. Ciencias-del-Suelo,-Riego-y-Mecanizacion. 2 (3): 25-35.
- Prasad, D.; U. K. Prasad and P. K. Bose 1983. Effect of pre-monsoon irrigation, nitrogen and spacing on the yield of sugar cane varieties. Indian J. Agron., 28 (2): 131-133. {C.F. Hort. Abst., 1985, 55 (2):1625}.
- Snedecor, G.W. and W.G. Cochran 1981. Statistical Methods. Seventh Ed. Iowa State Univ. Press, Ames, Iowa, USA.
- 15. Usman, B. 1989. Influence of AS dosage addition and amount of cane cuttings on plant growth, NPK leaf content and yield of several cane varieties. Majalah Perusahaan Gula, 25 (1): 1-12.
- Yadav, R.L.; and S.R. Prasad 1997. Maximizing sugar cane yield by increasing plant population
- 17. density, minimizing NO3-N leaching and improving soil organic matter in different crop rotations. J. Agron. Crop Sci., 178 (2): 117-123.

Table 4. Effect of some tillage practices and plant spacing on stalk diameter (cm) of sugar cane at different stages of growth in 1997/98 season.

_		1	1-	т-	Т	_	1	_	_	Т-	_		,								
	Average	2.76	2.69	2.73	2.82	2.77	2.80	2.89	2.91	2.90	2.82	2.79	2.81		NS	SN	0.0683	SN	Š	SZ	SS
lays	3 hoeinas	2,77	2.65	2.71	2.86	2.84	2.85	3.01	3.01	3.01	2.88	2.83	2.86								
330 days	2 hoeings	2.76	2.74	2.75	2.79	2.70	2.74	2.76	2.82	2.79	2.77	2.75	2.76								
	Average	2.48	2.41	2.44	2.41	2.43	2.42	2.49	2.52	2.50	2.46	2.45	2.46		NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	SN	SN
lays	3 hoeinas	2.49	2.39	2.44	2.43	2.50	2.46	2.52	2.60	2.56	2.48	2.49	2.49								
270 days	2 hoeings	2.47	2.43	2.45	2.39	2.37	2.38	2.46	2.44	2.45	2.44	2.41	2.43								
	Average	2.18	2.13	2.16	2.12	2.16	2.14	2.13	2.21	2.17	2.14	2.17	2.15		NS	*	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
lays	3 hoeings	2.21	2.12	2.16	2.13	2.20	2.16	2.13	2.21	2.17	2.15	2.17	2.16								
210 days	2 hoeings	2.15	2.15	2.15	2.11	2.12	2.11	2.13	2.21	2.17	2.13	2.16	2.14								
	Average	1.85	1.82	1.83	1.82	1.82	1.82	1.85	1.88	1.86	1.84	1.84	1.84		NS	0.0618	NS	NS	NS	SN	NS
lays	3 hoeings	1.87	1.80	1.83	1.83	1.84	1.83	1.85	1.87	1.86	1.85	1.84	1.84								
150 days	2 hoeings	1.82	1.85	1.83	1.82	1.81	1.81	1.84	1.90	1.87	1.83	1.85	1.84								
Row	spacing	100 cm	125 cm	e	100 cm	125 cm	e	100 cm	125 cm	e e	100 cm	125 cm	age	vel:		~					
Number of	Ploughing	2		Average	r)	Average	4		Average	Row spacing	X Hoeing	Total Average	LSD at 5 % level	Ploughing (P)	Row spacing (R)	Hoeing (H)	P×R	P×H	R×H	P×R×H

Table 5. Effect of some tillage practices and plant spacing on stalk diameter (cm) of sugar cane at different stages of growth in 1998/99 season.

	Average	2.75	2.93	2.84	2.70	2.97	2.83	2.73	2.94	2.83	2.72	2.95	2.84		NS	*	NS	0.0192	NS	NS	NS
ays	3 hoeings	2.76	2.96	2.86	2.67	5.96	2.82	2.68	2.97	2.83	2.70	2.96	2.83								
330 days	2 hoeings	2.73	2.91	2.82	2.72	2.98	2.85	2.78	2.91	2.84	2.74	2.93	2.84								
	Average	2.40	2.59	2.50	2.29	2.53	2.41	2.37	2.48	2.42	2.36	2.53	2.44		NS	*	0.0199	0.0466	NS	SN	NS
ays	3 hoeings	2.45	2.65	2.53	2.36	2.55	2.43	2.39	2.50	2.44	2.38	2.57	2.47								
270 days	2 hoeings	2.36	2.54	2.45	2.27	2,51	2.39	2.35	2.46	2.40	2.33	2.50	2.42								
	Average	1.82	2.02	1.92	1.99	2.23	2.11	2.12	2.24	2.18	1.98	2.16	2.07		*	*	0.0130	NS	NS	NS	NS
ays	3 hoeings	1.86	2.07	1.97	2.01	2.25	2.13	2.12	2.25	2.19	2.00	2.19	2.09								
210 days	2 hoeings	1.77	1.96	1.87	1.97	2.21	5.09	2.12	2.24	2.18	1.96	2.14	2.05								
	Average	1.58	1.79	1.68	1.73	1.98	1.86	1.88	2.00	1.94	1.73	1.92	1.83		*	*	0.0171	NS	NS	NS	NS
ays	3 hoeings	1.61	1.81	1.71	1.74	2.05	1.89	1.90	5.04	1.97	1.75	1.97	1.86								
150 days	2 hoeings	1.55	1.76	1.65	1.72	1.91	1.82	1.86	1.97	1.92	1.71	1.88	1.80								
, MOG	spacing	100 cm	125 cm	0	100 cm	125 cm	0	100 cm	125 cm	a	100 cm	125 cm	age	LSD at 5 % level	(P)	g (R)	£				I
Number of	ploughing	2		Average	3		Average	4		Average	Row spacing	X Hoeing	Total Average	LSDs	Ploughing (P)	Row spading (R)	Hoeing (H)	P×R	P×H	R×H	PxRxH

Table 6. Effect of some tillage practices and plant spacing on stalk height (cm) of sugar cane at different stages of growth in 1997/98 season.

hoelings hoelings 339.4 340.0 339.7 315.0 339.7 327.5 344.6 332.2 344.6 336.1 316.1 319.4 317.5 316.6 334.4 322.7 326.1 325.3 330.2 324.0	150 days	150 days	days			210	210 days	Average	270	270 days		330	330 days	
265.0 271.1 307.9 301.7 304.8 339.4 340.0 261.7 263.4 300.4 291.1 295.7 339.9 315.0 263.3 267.2 304.1 296.4 300.3 339.7 315.0 265.1 263.6 306.8 288.6 297.7 349.0 314.4 276.1 262.5 298.3 315.9 307.1 322.2 34.6 266.1 263.0 302.6 302.2 302.4 333.6 328.0 257.2 255.5 294.9 289.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 257.2 255.5 294.9 288.7 282.1 316.1 319.4 251.0 253.0 281.6 280.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 254.1 254.2 288.3 289.2 298.1 317.5 316.6 259.4 262.9 292.4 297.9 296.9 330.2 324.0 4 4 4	spacing 2 3 Average 2 ho	3 Average hoeings	Average		2 ho	eings	3 hoeings		2 hoeings	3 hoeings	Average	2 hoeings	3 hoeings	Average
261.7 263.4 300.4 291.1 295.7 339.9 315.0 263.3 267.2 304.1 296.4 300.3 339.7 327.5 256.1 263.6 306.8 288.6 297.7 345.0 314.4 276.1 262.5 298.3 315.9 307.1 322.2 34.6 266.1 263.0 302.6 302.2 302.4 336.0 314.4 266.1 263.0 302.6 302.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 257.2 255.5 294.9 289.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 251.0 253.0 281.6 286.7 284.1 316.1 319.4 254.1 254.2 288.3 288.3 288.1 317.5 316.6 254.1 254.2 289.2 292.9 296.9 330.2 324.0 262.9 259.6 295.6 330.2 324.0 324.0 8 8 8 8	100 cm 216.2 209.8 213.0 2	209.8 213.0	213.0			277.2	265.0	1 170	307.9	301.7	304.8	339.4	340.0	339.7
263.3 267.2 304.1 296.4 300.3 339.7 327.5 256.1 263.6 306.8 288.6 297.7 345.0 314.4 276.1 262.5 298.3 315.9 307.1 322.2 34.6 266.1 263.0 302.6 302.2 302.4 336.0 314.4 266.1 263.0 302.6 302.2 294.9 382.2 394.0 338.0 257.2 255.5 294.9 289.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 251.0 253.0 281.6 286.7 284.1 316.1 319.4 254.1 254.2 288.3 287.9 288.1 317.5 316.6 254.4 257.4 297.9 295.6 336.1 327.7 262.9 259.6 295.6 336.1 325.3 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 8 <td>125 cm 199.3 197.8 198.5</td> <td>197.8 198.5</td> <td>198.5</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>265.2</td> <td>261.7</td> <td>263.4</td> <td>300.4</td> <td>291.1</td> <td>295.7</td> <td>339.9</td> <td>315.0</td> <td>327.4</td>	125 cm 199.3 197.8 198.5	197.8 198.5	198.5			265.2	261.7	263.4	300.4	291.1	295.7	339.9	315.0	327.4
256.1 263.6 306.8 288.6 297.7 345.0 314.4 276.1 262.5 298.3 315.9 307.1 322.2 34.6 266.1 263.0 302.6 302.2 302.4 333.6 328.0 257.2 255.5 294.9 289.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 251.0 253.0 281.6 286.7 284.1 316.1 319.4 254.1 254.2 288.3 287.9 288.1 317.5 316.6 259.4 263.4 303.2 293.2 298.2 334.4 322.7 262.9 259.6 297.9 296.9 330.2 324.0 8 NS NS NS NS	Average 207.7 203.8 205.7	203.8		205.7		271.2	263.3	267.2	304.1	296.4	300.3	339.7	327.5	333.6
276.1 262.5 298.3 315.9 307.1 322.2 34.6 266.1 263.0 302.6 302.2 302.4 333.6 328.0 257.2 255.5 294.9 289.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 251.0 253.0 281.6 286.7 284.1 316.1 319.4 254.1 254.2 288.3 287.9 288.1 317.5 316.6 259.4 263.4 303.2 293.2 298.2 334.4 322.7 262.9 259.6 297.9 296.9 330.2 324.0 * * * * * NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS N	100 cm 216.5 210.8 213.6	210.8		213.6	_	271.1	256.1	263.6	306.8	288.6	297.7	345.0	314.4	329.7
266.1 263.0 302.6 302.2 302.4 333.6 328.0 257.2 255.5 294.9 289.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 251.0 253.0 281.6 286.7 284.1 316.1 319.4 254.1 254.2 288.3 287.9 288.1 317.5 316.6 259.4 263.4 303.2 293.2 298.2 334.4 322.7 262.9 259.6 297.9 296.9 330.2 324.0 * * * * * NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS	125 cm 199.6 217.2 208.4	217.2		208.4	_	248.9	276.1	262.5	298.3	315.9	307.1	322.2	344.6	331.9
257.2 255.5 294.9 289.2 292.0 318.9 313.9 251.0 253.0 281.6 286.7 284.1 316.1 319.4 254.1 254.2 288.3 287.9 288.1 317.5 316.6 259.4 263.4 303.2 293.2 298.2 334.4 322.7 262.9 259.6 297.9 296.9 336.1 325.3 261.1 261.5 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0 NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS	Average 208.0 214.0 211.0	214.0		211.0		260.0	266.1	263.0	302.6	302.2	302.4	333.6	328.0	330.8
251.0 253.0 281.6 286.7 284.1 316.1 319.4 254.1 254.2 288.3 287.9 288.1 317.5 316.6 259.4 263.4 303.2 293.2 298.2 334.4 322.7 262.9 259.6 297.9 296.9 330.2 328.3 261.1 261.5 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0 NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS	100 cm 202.2 199.6 200.9	199.6	_	200.9	-	253.9	257.2	255.5	294.9	289.2	292.0	318.9	313.9	316.4
254.1 254.2 288.3 287.9 288.1 317.5 316.6 259.4 263.4 303.2 293.2 298.2 334.4 322.7 262.9 259.6 292.4 297.9 295.6 336.1 325.3 261.1 261.5 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0 NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS NS	125 cm 205.0 214.4 209.7	214.4	-	209.7	-	255.0	251.0	253.0	281.6	286.7	284.1	316.1	319.4	317.7
259.4 263.4 303.2 293.2 298.2 334.4 322.7 262.9 256.9 292.4 297.9 295.6 326.1 325.3 262.9 262.9 296.3 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0 326.1 261.5 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0 326.1 325.3 8.8 8.8 8.8 8.8 8.8 8.8 8.8 8.8 8.8 8	Average 203.6 207.0 205.3	207.0		205.3	-	254.4	254.1	254.2	288.3	287.9	288.1	317.5	316.6	317.0
262.9 259.6 292.4 297.9 295.6 326.1 325.3 261.0 261.1 261.5 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0 261.1 261.5 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0 261.1 261.2 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0 201.1	Row spacing 100 cm 211.6 206.7 209.1	206.7		209.1	-	267.4	259.4	263.4	303.2	293.2	298.2	334.4	322.7	328.6
261.1 261.5 298.3 295.5 296.9 330.2 324.0	125 cm 201.3 209.8 205.5	209.8		205.5		256.3	262.9	529.6	292.4	297.9	295.6	326.1	325.3	325.7
* NS	Total Average 206.4 208.2 207.3	208.2	_	207.3		261.8	261.1	261.5	298.3	295.5	596.9	330.2	324.0	327.1
* NS	LSD at 5 % level :													
NS NS NS 6.603	SN	SN	NS	NS				*			*			*
NS NS NS 6.603 11.437	Row spacing (R) 2.603	2.603	2.603	2.603				NS			NS			NS
NS NS 6.603 11.437	SN	SN	SN	NS				NS			NS			NS
NS 6.603 11.437	4.508	4.508	4.508	4.508				NS			NS			NS
6.603	SN	SN	SN	NS				NS			NS			NS
11.437	5.655	5.655	5.655	5.655				NS			6.603			NS
	SN	SN	SN	NS				NS			11.437			22.155

Table 7. Effect of some tillage practices and plant spacing on stalk height (cm) of sugar cane at different stages of growth in 1998/99 season.

Number of	Row	150	150 days	Average	210 days	days	Average	270	270 days	Average	330	330 days	Average
Sill Book	Shacility	2 hooingr	3		2	e :		2	m		2	3	
		INCHAS	noemgs		noeings	noeings		hoeings	hoeings		hoeings	hoeings	
2	100 cm	188.0	194.5	191.3	224.6	231.1	227.9	287.2	293.7	290.5	329.600	338.067	333.833
	125 cm	185.5	184.3	184.9	217.8	219.2	218.5	281.1	281.6	281.3	321.100	314.167	317,633
Average	ge	186.8	189.4	188.1	221.2	225.2	223.2	284.1	287.6	285.9	325.350	326.117	325,733
. 3	100 cm	196.6	201.6	199.1	235.7	241.4	238.5	291.2	287.0	294.1	330,500	326.133	326.817
	125 cm	188.4	185.4	186.9	226.8	224.4	225.6	281.3	279.7	280.5	315.667	315.000	315,333
Average	ge	192.5	193.5	193.0	231.3	232.9	232.1	286.3	288.3	287.3	323.083	319.067	321.075
4	100 cm	201.2	201.9	201.5	231.3	227.7	229.5	281.7	266.6	274.2	311.333	313.933	312.633
	125 cm	198.2	191.4	194.8	225.4	218.9	222.1	277.2	270.6	273.9	306,667	310.767	308,717
Average	ge	199.7	196.6	198.1	228.3	223.3	225.8	279.5	268.6	274.0	309.000	312.350	310.675
Row spacing	100 cm	195.2	199.3	197.3	230.5	233.4	232.0	286.7	285.7	286.2	323.811	325.044	324,428
A noeing	125 cm	190.7	187.0	188.8	223.3	220.8	222.1	279.9	277.3	278.6	314.478	313.311	313.894
Total Average	erage	193.0	193.2	193.1	226.9	227.1	227.0	283.3	281.5	282.4	319.144	319.178	319.161
LSD at 5 % level:	evel:												
Ploughing (P)				*			*			*			*
Row spacing (R)	જ			*			*			*			*
Hoeing (H)				NS			NS			SN			Ŋ
PxR				NS			NS			5.080			ž v
P×H				NS			3.879			5.227			SI
RxH				3.148			NS			NS			SN
PxRxH				NS			NS			SN			N N
													?

تأثير بعض عمليات الخدمة والكثافة النباتية على قصب السكر 1 - صفات النمو

ابراهيم حنفى الجداوى ، صلاح الدين شفشق ، صلاح علام ، جمال سعد السيد ا

١- معهد بحوث المحاصيل السكرية - مركز البحوث الزراعية - وزارة الزراعة
 ٢- كلية الزراعة بشتهر - جامعة الزقازيق

أجريست هذه الدراسة بمحطة بحوث شندويل (محافظة سوهاج) في موسمى ٩٨/١٩٩٧ و المريست هذه الدراسة تأثير بعض عمليات الخدمة (الحرث والعزيق) ومسافات التخطيط على صفات نمو محصول قصب السكر. أوضحت النتائج أن زيادة عدد مرات الحرث من إثنين إلى ثلاث و أربع مرات أدى آلي زيادة نسبة الانبات بعد ٤٥ يوما في كلا الموسمين مع اختلافات معنوية في الموسم الثاني فقط.

كما ان زيادة عدد مرات الحرث من مرتين إلى ثلاث وأربع مرات أدت إلى زيادة عدد النباتات/م بعد ١٠٥ و ١٦٥ يوما من الزراعة. كما ان زيادة عدد مرات الحرث إلى أربعة مرات أدى إلى زياده معنويه في سمك ساق القصب في عمر ١٥٠ و ٢١٠ يوما من الزراعة في الموسم المثاني. كما أعطت معاملة الحرث مرتين و ثلاث مرات أعلى زياده في طول ساق قصب السكر وذلك في مراحل النمو المختلفة بالمقارنة بالحرث اربع مرات.

حققت مسافة ۱۰۰ سم بين الخطوط أعلى نسبة إنبات للقصب بالمقارنه بمسافة ١٠٠ سم و كانست الزياده معنويه فقط في الموسم الثاني ولقد أدت مسافة التخطيط ۱۰۰ سم إلى زياده عدد النباتات/م بعد ١٠٥ و ١٦٥ يوما من الزراعه في الموسم الثاني بالمقارنه بمسافة ١٠٥ سم. ولقد أدت مسافة التخط يط ١٢٥ سم أدى إلى زياده سمك ساق القصب معنويا في الموسم الثاني في مراحل النمو المختلفه. زراعة قصب السكر في خطوط على بعد ١٠٠ سم بين الخطوط الى زياده معنويه في طول ساق قصب السكر في مراحل النمو المختلفه في الموسم الثاني بالمقارنه بمسافة

لم يكن هناك تأثير إ معنويا لعدد مرات العزيق على عدد نباتات القصب/م بعد عمر ١٠٥ و ١٦٥ يوميا من الرواعه في كلا الموسمين، كما ادت زيادة عدد مرات العزيق الى ثلاث مرات السي زيادة سمك الساق في كلا الموسمين في مراحل النمو المختلفه. ولم تؤثر معاملات العزيق معنويا على طول الساق في مراحل النمر المختلفه في كلا الموسمين.