# EFFECT OF SOWING DATES AND PHOSPHORUS FERTILIZER ON ROOT ROT AND QUALITY OF SOME SUGAR BEET VARIETIES

El-Mansoub, M. M. A. and Hanan Y. Mohamed Sugar Crops Res. Inst., Agric. Res. Center, Giza, Egypt.

#### **ABSTRACT**

The present investigation was carried out at the experimental farm of Malawi Agricultural Research Station, El-Minia Governorate, Egypt during 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 seasons to investigate the effect of sowing dates (15<sup>th</sup> October, 30<sup>th</sup> October and 15<sup>th</sup> November) and phosphorus fertilizer (0, 15 and 30) kg  $P_2O_5$  /fed on root rot disease incidence, yield and its quality of three sugar beet varieties *i.e.* Farida, Kawemira and Montibianco. A split-split plot design with three replications was used, sowing dates were allocated in the main plots, phosphorus fertilizer was assigned in the sub plots while, sugar beet varieties were distributed in the sub- sub plots.

The results revealed that sowing date 15<sup>th</sup> October significantly reduced root rot disease incidence and increased all quality parameters, i.e. sucrose ,sex, Na, K, alpha amino N,SLM and extractability percentages except purity % as well as productivity traits (top and root yields) in the two growing seasons. The above varieties of sugar beet significantly differed in all studies traits in the two growing seasons. Phosphorus fertilizer significantly effected on all studies traits in both seasons, except sugar yield and (root yield and root fresh weight) in the first season only. Planting Kawemira sugar beet variety when received 30 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> / fed in 15<sup>th</sup> October significantly increased yields of root and top (ton/fed) in the second season.

#### INTRODUCTION

Planting date is considered among the most important for all field crops generally, and sugar beet specially. It has an active role for growth, yield and root quality of sugar beet plants. The suitable date for sugar beet planting mainly depends on many factors such as the previous crop, weathering conditions, controlling conditions with sugar factories and cultivated cultivar. Under the environmental conditions of Egypt , there is a general agreement that early planting of sugar beet ( September - October) produced the highest sucrose percentage as well as root and sugar yields per unit area (Helal, Samia et. al., 2008, Yousef and Abdel-Mottaleb, 2009, El-Hosary et. a.l, 2010 and Enan et al., 2011). Other study found that the planting in September gave the highest root diameter, root length, and weight and also technological characters TSS %, sucrose %, purity %, Na, sugar extractable and extractability percentages Naghizadeh et. al., 2013. Banding phosphorus fertilizer results in more efficient uptake of this essential nutrient as a result, it is sometimes recommended that phosphorus application rate be decreased by 30 to 50 percent compared to broadcast rates when fertilizer is banded, Mesbah et. al., 2012. On the other hand, under study, El-Essawy (1996) showed that root, top and sugar yields and quality of sugar beet plants increased with the combination of 30 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> + 24 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed. Ibrahim, 1998 applied 0 and 15 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed and 0, 24 and 48 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed. He found that 15

kg  $P_2O_5$  + 48 kg  $K_2O$ /fed gave significantly the maximum values of root length, diameter, fresh weight/plant, root and sugar yields while sucrose and purity percentages were significantly decreased. Jaszczolt, 1998 showed that phosphorus fertilizer amounts (400-640 kg/ha) did not significantly affect the crop yield, sugar yield or sugar content of beet. Kurakov *et al.* 1998 found that doubling or tribling the PK rate only increased root yield by 5-15% and did not increase sugar yield.

The technological quality of the roots was best with the lowest PK rate or with increased P or K rates. Root sugar content was highest with increased K and sugar output was greatest (15. 63-15. 69%) with increased P or K. Odrekhovskii *et al.* (1998) reported that increasing  $P_2O_5 + K_2O$  fertilizer rates from 50 up to 200 kg /fed gave root yield 39. 4 tons/fed. Sugar yield was highest with 100 kg  $P_2O_5 + 100$  kg  $K_2O$ /ha. Higher fertilizer rates reduced the technological quality of the roots. Applying P fertilizer in addition to the 3 gal A-1 10-34-0 as either broadcast P fertilizer or additional amounts of 10-34-0 has never increased sugarbeet root yields above those achieved with 3 gals A-1 10-34-0 alone.

Under Egyptian conditions, sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.) is susceptible to several foliar and soil borne diseases which are responsible for a considerable losses in the root yield and sugar content (Abada, 1994 and El-Mansoub *etal* 2010) Among the most important diseases affecting sugarbeet production are damping off and root rot caused by several pathogens *i.e.* Rhizoctonia solani, Macrophomina phaseolina, Sclerotioum rolfsii and Fusarium spp. (El-Kholi, 2000 and Husseien, Manal 2005). Yields can be reduced up to 10 tons per acre and sugar beet quality can be greatly affected (Abada, 1994). Root rot causal pathogens is a difficult disease to manage since the fungal propagules in soil and crop residues can survive for several years on the infected plants that considered as the secondary source of inoculum (Khalifa *et al.*, 2007).

Agricultural practices *i.e.* phosphorus fertilization and sowing dates may be useful in controlling root rot disease. Also, sugar-beet varieties with good resistance to the disease should be considered one of the applicable methods in controlling root rot disease in the fields with a chronic history of the disease inoculum (El-Fiki *et al.*, 2004 and Poindexter, 2012). Resistant sugar beet cultivars have been introduced to reduce disease occurrence Sugar beet seeds sown in Egypt are imported and hence beet varieties should be evaluated under the Egyptian conditions to select the best varieties in respect to yield and quality traits. Aly (2006) found that Marathon variety had almost the best values of root length, diameter and root fresh weight, as well as root and sugar yields/fed.

On the other hand, Kawimera variety was the highest one in sucrose%, extractable sugar and extractability percentages. Mohamed, Hanan (2008), El-Sheikh *et al.*, (2009) and Enan et al (2009) found that sugar beet varieties differed significantly in all studied traits except TSS% in both seasons. Sugar yield in the 1<sup>st</sup> season Farida variety gave a significant increase for sugar yield, juice quality (TSS, sucrose and purity%). While it recorded the lowest values of impurities (Na, K and N%). Abd El-Aal *et al.*, (2010) revealed that significant variation in yield productivity and root quality

among sugar beet varieties. Kawemira and Gloria varieties gave the highest sugar yield followed by Nejma, on the other hand Lola exhibited the lowest sugar yield. Oscar poly, Carola, Raspoly, Kawemera and Mont Bianko were more response to added nitrogen fertilizer. Mohamed *et al.* (2012) cleared that The differences between sugar beet varieties were significantly in root dimension, root, and sugar yields/fed sucrose% and  $\alpha$ -amino N.

The present investigation aimed to find out the relative effect of three sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizer on root rot disease incidence, yield and its quality of three sugar beet varieties.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were conducted the experimental farm of Malawi Agricultural Research Station, El-Minia. Governorate, Egypt during 2009/2010 and 2010/2011 seasons to study the performance of three sugar beet varieties (Farida, Kawemira and Montibianco) to phosphorus fertilizer application (0,15 and 30kg/fed) under three sowing dates (15<sup>th</sup> October, 30<sup>th</sup> October and 15<sup>th</sup> November). The field soil was naturally heavily infested with root rot causal pathogens. A split-split plot design with three replications in the two seasons. Whereas sowing dates were allocated in the main plots, phosphorus fertilizer was assigned in the sub plots and sugar beet varieties were allocated in the sub-sub plot. Plot area was 12 m<sup>2</sup> including five rows of 60-cm width and 4-m long. Thinning was done after 45 days from planting to obtain one plant/hill (35000 plans/fed.). Phosphorus fertilizer was added during seed bed preparation, in the form of calcium superphosphate (15.5% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>), while potassium fertilization was applied at the rate of 48 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed, as potassium sulphate (48% K<sub>2</sub>O) in the two equal doses the first at seed bed preparation and the second after thinning. Nitrogen fertilizer was applied in the form of ammonium sulphate (20.5% N) in four equal doses, the first was applied after thinning and the others were applied at 2-weeks interval. Sugar beet was planted at distance of 20 cm in both seasons .Other agricultural practices were applied as recommended for growing sugar beet.

Physical and chemical properties of the experimental soil site are presented in Table (1) that carried out according to Page (1982).

At harvest, the three guarded central rows of each plot were harvested to estimate the following traits from random five plants:

#### 1- Growth traits:

- 1.1. Root length (cm).
- 1.2. Root fresh weight (g/plant)

#### 2- Sugar beet yields (ton/ fed):

The above mentioned was calculated by using a bulk sample which included all sugar beet plants of the three central rows of each plot (7.2 m<sup>2</sup>) 2.1. Root yield (ton/fed).

- 2.2. Sugar yield (ton/fed) was calculated using the following equation: Sugar yield (ton/fed) = Root yield X sugar extraction %.
- 2.3. Top yield (ton/fed)

#### 3- Quality traits:

Juice quality and some technological parameters were determined using an automatic French system (HYCEL).

- 3.1.Sucrose percentage (Pol. %) was polarimetrically determined on a lead acetate extract of fresh macerated root according to the method of Le-Docte (1927).
- 3.2. Impurities (K, Na and  $\alpha$ -amino nitrogen) were determined in the digested extract of root dry matter as follows:
- 3.2.1 Sodium and Potassium percentages were determined using the Flame photometer according to A.O.A.C (2005).
- 3.2.2.  $\alpha$ -amino nitrogen was determined (Hydrindnation method) according to Carruthers *et al* (1962).

Table 1: Physical and chemical properties of the experimental soil site

rable 1: Physical and chemica	i properties of the ex	perimental son site
Properties	2009/2010	2010/2011
Texture analysis:		
Clay %	44.20	47.40
Silt %	32.20	28.60
Sand %	23.60	24.00
Texture grade:	Clay	Clay
pH (1:1 suspention)	7.50	7.50
Ec m.mohs (1:1)	1.32	1.15
Organic matter %	1.18	1.24
Soluble cations:		
Ca <sup>++</sup> + Mg <sup>++</sup> meq/100g soil	0.96	0.84
Na <sup>†</sup> meq/100g soil	0.37	0.44
K <sup>†</sup> meq/100g soil	0.09	0.11
Soluble anions:		
CO <sub>3</sub> + HCO <sub>3</sub> meq/100g soil	0.33	0.36
Cl meq/100g soil	0.84	0.91
Available N mg / kg soil	21.1	19.35
Available P (ppm)	8.50	7.85
Available K mg kg soil	175	180

<sup>\*</sup> Each value represents the mean of 5 samples

#### 3.3. Purity percentage.

Purity, sugar lost in molasses and extractable sugar (rendement or recovery) percentages were calculated according to the following formulas:

- -Purity % = 99.36 14.27 (V1 + V2 + V3)/ V4 (Devillers, 1988).
- -Sugar lost in molasses (SLM%) = 0.14 (V1 + V2) + 0.25 (V3) + 0.50 (Devillers, 1988).
- -Sugar extraction % = pol% SLM% 0.6 (Dexter, et al., 1967).
- -Extractability % = Sugar extraction/ pol%

Where:  $V_1$  = Sodium,  $V_2$  = Potassium,  $V_3$  =  $\alpha$ -amino nitrogen,  $V_4$  =Pol % Root rot infection and its severity using the scale devised by Engelkes and Windels,1996 was estimated after harvest according to the 0-7 grades as follows:

0= no visible lesions.

1= arrested lesions at point of inoculation.

2= less than 5% shallow, dry rot canker.

3= 5 to 24% deep, dry rot canker.

4= 25 to 49% extensive rot.

5= 50 to 89% rot extensive into interior root.

6= 90 to less than 100%, most dead foliage.

7= 100% dead plants

The collected data were statistically analyzed according to Snedecor and Cochran (1981). treatment means were compared using L.S.D at 5% level of probability.

#### RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### A- Growth characters and root rot disease control:

The tabulated results in Tables (2 & 3) indicated that sowing date had a significant effect on root length (cm) in both growing seasons 2009/2010 and 2010/2011, respectively, and root fresh weight in the second season only. It could be noticed that, Planting sugar beet plants in 15<sup>th</sup> October scored the least percentage of root rot disease incidence and highest values of root dimensions, root length and root fresh weight in the two seasons (8.24%, 37.07 cm and 763.6 gm/plant) and (9.15%, 34.95 cm and 787.0 gm) respectively. The increment of growth attributes gained by early sowing date may be due to developing dimensions by increasing division or elongation of cells and also photosynthesis process (Naghizadeh et. al. 2013) he reported that root dimensions of sugar beet increased gradually as the early sowing date (September). Also, planting sugar beet plants in 15<sup>th</sup> October recorded the least percentage of root rot disease incidence. Sowing date play an important role for decreasing soil borne diseases. These results are in agreement with Khalifa, 1997. Phosphorus fertilizer levels (15 and 30kg/fed) had significant effect reducing the incidence of root rot disease and on root length (cm) in both growing seasons as well as root fresh weight only in the second season. High level of phosphorus fertilizer (30 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) significantly decreased root rot incidence and increased root length and root fresh weight in both seasons analysis, these results are in harmony with that obtained by El-Essawy (1996). Improvement in sugar beet root rot disease control was affected by 15 and 30kg/fed of phosphorus fertilizer especially at the high level (30 kg P2O5). Phosphorus is one of the vital elements required for crop growth and controlling several soil borne diseases (Khalifa et. al., 2010). These results are in agreement with Khalifa, 1997, Mahmoud, et. al., 2008 and Khalifa et. al., 2010. Concerning the evaluated sugar beet varieties, data in Tables (2 & 3) indicated that varieties of sugar beet had a significant effect on decreasing root rot incidence root length and fresh weight of sugar beet varieties in the two growing seasons 2009/2010 and 2010/2011, respectively. It could be noticed that Kawimera variety was the best one in this regard in the two growing seasons. This result might be due to the action of gene make-up, which plays an important role in plant structure and morphology. These findings are in the same line with that reported by Mohamed, Hanan (2008). The resistance to root rot infection might be chemical in nature, this opinion was supported with El-Fiki et. al. (2004).

#### **B- Productivity traits:**

Data in Tables (4 & 5) clarified that sowing date of sugar beet had a significant effect on top, root and sugar yields of sugar beet in the two growing seasons 2009/2010 and 2010/2011, respectively. It could be noticed from two seasons early sowing date (15th October) of sugar beet increased top and root yields by (10.38 and 31.18 ton, respectively) in the first season, meanwhile, the latest sowing date (15<sup>th</sup>November) recorded the highest sugar yield in the first season only 3.115 ton/fed. On the other hand, early sowing date (15<sup>th</sup> October) increased all parameters i.e. top, root and sugar yields of sugar beet (10.21, 29.78 and 2.613 ton/fed, respectively) in the second one. This results might be due to the increase in root dimension as well as quality parameters of sugar beet with the early sowing date. Similar results were obtained by El-Hosary et. al 2010 , Enan et. al. 2011 and Naghizadeh et. al. 2013. Concerning the evaluated phosphorus fertilizer, data presented in Tables (4 & 5) revealed the phosphorus fertilizer had a significant effect on top, and root yields in the second season and top yield only in the first one however soil application of 30 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> /fed gave the highest value of top and root yields of sugar beet by (10.51 and 31.06 ton/fed, respectively) at the first season. However, gave the highest value of top, root and sugar (10.34, 30.21 and 2.608 ton/fed, respectively) compared to the check with no P fertilizer application. There was no difference in sugar yield among treatments with 0-15- 30 applied at various rates at the two tested seasons. These results are in harmony with those obtained by. Sims 2004 and Mesbah et. al., 2012. Regard for the evaluated sugar beet varieties, data in Tables (4 & 5) indicated that the studied varieties of sugar beet revealed differed significantly effect on top, root and sugar yields in the two tested seasons. Kawemira variety scored the highest value (9.98, 29.66 ton/fed) of top and root yields in the first season as well as (9.81 and 28.33 ton/fed) in the second one, while the difference between Kawemira and Montbianco varieties was insignificant for sugar yield in the first season and the difference in this trait among the examined varieties was insignificant in the second season. Similar results were obtained by Mohamed, Hanan (2008). A significant interaction was found between sowing date and phosphorus fertilizer (AB) with regard to top yield in both seasons in addition to root yield in the second one only (Tables 4 & 5). The highest value (10.48 and 10.30 tons/fed) of top yield in the first and second season respectively were obtained by sowing date at 15<sup>th</sup> October and soil application of 15 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed. Also a significant interaction between sowing date and sugar beet varieties (AC) of top, root and sugar yields in both seasons with some exception. In general, it can be concluded from the results that Montbianco variety with early sowing date (15<sup>th</sup> October) scored the highest value of top, root and sugar yields, could be recommended for maximizing sugar beet productivity.

#### C- Quality parameters.

Results in Tables (6-11) indicated that sowing date of sugar beet had a significant effect on Na %, K% and alpha amino N %, as well as sucrose %, sex % ( sugar extraction %) and purity % in addition to SLM % and extractability % in the two growing seasons except extractability % only in the second season. It could be noticed from two seasons analysis that planting sugar beet in 15<sup>th</sup> October increased all quality traits except purity % was increased by planting sugar beet in 15<sup>th</sup> November. These findings are in agreement with that reported by Naghizadeh et. al. 2013, P fertilizer levels had significant effect on all juice quality traits in both seasons, except extractability % in the second season. High level of phosphorus fertilizer (30kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) Significantly increased all juice quality traits in both seasons analysis, except purity % was decreased by 6.22 % and 6.47 % in first and second seasons respectively compared with control (0 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> /fed) these results are in harmony with that obtained by El-Essawy, 1996. Sugar beet varieties had significant effect on all juice quality traits in both seasons. except extractability % in the second season. Kawemira variety scored the highest value of all juice quality traits in both seasons, except purity %, while the difference between Kawemira and Farida sugar beet varieties was insignificant for sugar extraction % in the second season.

A significant interaction was found between sowing date and phosphorus fertilizer (AB) with regard to all quality traits in both seasons except k %, sex %, SLM % and extractability % in the second season only, (Tables 6 - 11 ). It could be noticed from two seasons analysis that planting sugar beet in 15<sup>th</sup> November and soil application of 30 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed increased all quality traits except impurities , SLM, sucrose and sex percentage were increased by planting sugar beet in 15<sup>th</sup> october. Also a significant interaction between sowing date and sugar beet varieties (AC) of all quality traits in both seasons with some exception i.e K and SLM percentage only in the second season, it can be noticed from two seasons analysis that Montbianco variety with early sowing date (15<sup>th</sup> October) scored the highest value of juice quality traits except purity % ,these results are in harmony with that obtained by Enan et. al. 2011. Asignificant interaction between phosphorus fertilizer and sugar beet varieties (BC) as well as interaction between sowing dates phosphorus fertilizer and sugar beet varieties (ABC) of all quality traits in both seasons with some exception only in the second season.

#### REFERENCES

- Abada, K. A. (1994). Fungi causing damping–off and root rot on sugar-beet and their biological control with *Trichodrema harazinum*. Agric., Ecosystems and Environ., 51: 333-337.
- Abd El-Aal, A. M.; A. I. Nafie and Ranya M. Abdel Aziz (2010). Response of some sugar beet genotypes to nitrogen fertilization under newly reclaimed land conditions. Egypt. J. Appl. Sci., 25 (6B) 194-208.
- Aly, E. F. (2006). Effect of environmental conditions on productivity and quality of some sugar beet varieties. Ph. D. Thesis. Fac. of Agric. Benha Univ. Egypt.
- A.O.A.C. (2005). Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Official Methods of analysis, 16<sup>th</sup> Ed. International Washington, D.C. USA.
- Carruthers, A.,J.F.T. Oldfield and H.J. Teague (1962). Assessment of beet quality. The 15<sup>th</sup> Annual Technical Conference, British Sugar Corporation LTD.36PP.
- Devillers, P. (1988). Prevsion du sucre melasse. Scurries francases 129, 190-200. (C.F. the sugar beet book).
- Dexter, S.T., M. Frankes and F. W. Snyder (1967). A rapid of determining extractable white sugar as may be applied to the evaluation of agronomic practices and grower deliveries in the sugar beet industry. J. Am., Soc., Sugar Beet Technol. 14: 433 454
- El-Essawy, I.I. (1996): Effect of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium fertilizers on yield and quality of sugar beet, J. Agric. Res., Tanta Univ., 22(2): 270-278
- El-Fiki, A.I.I.; El-Deeb, A.A.; Mohamed, F.G. and M.M.A. Khalifa (2004):Controlling sesame charcoal rot incited by Macrophomina phaseolina under field condition by using the resistant cultivars and some seed and soil treatments. Egypt.J.Phytopathol.,32 (1-2):103-118
- El–Hosary, A.A., M.I. Salwau, A.M.M. Saad, I.H. El Geddawy and B.S. Ibrahim (2010). Sugar beet yield and its components as affected by sowing date, mineral nitrogen and bio fertilizers. Egypt. J. of Appl. Sci., 25 (8A): 349 366.
- El-Kholi, M. M. (2000). Sugar beet diseases in Egypt. The Ninth Congress of Phytopathology, Egypt. Phytopathol. Soci., Giza. Egypt. May 2000.
- El-Mansoub, M.M.A., Manal Y. Hussein and M.M.A.Khalifa (2010). Effect of some intercropping systems of faba bean and garlic with sugar beet on severity of sugar beet cercospora leaf spot and rust diseases and its yield and quality. Egypt .J. of Appl. Sci., 25 (9): 421-436.
- El- Sheikh, S. R. E.; K. A. M. Khaled and S. A. A. M. Enan (2009). Evaluation of some sugar beet varieties under three harvesting dates. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 34 (3): 1559-1567.
- Enan, S.A.A.M; A.M. Abd El-Aal and N.M.E. Shalaby (2011). Yield and quality of some sugar beet varieties as affected by sowing date and harvest age. Fayoum. J. Agric. Res. & Dev., 25 (2): 51-65

- Enan, S. A. A. M.; S. R. E. El Sheikh and K. A. M. Khaled (2009). Evaluation of some sugar beet varieties under different levels of N and Mo fertilization. J. Biol. Chem. Environ. Sci., 4 (1): 345-362.
- Engelkes, A. and C.E. Windels (1996). Susceptibility of sugar beet and beans to *Rhizoctonia sol*ani AG -2-2 III B and AG -2-2 IV. Pl. Dis. 80: 1413-1417.
- Hilal, M.M. Samia ,EI E.M. EL-Sheref and S.M.E. Mostafa (2008) Effect of sowing dates and nitrogen fertilizer levels on yield and quality of sugar beet ( Beta vulgaris L.) . J.Agric. Res. Kafr EI Sheikh Univ., 34 (4) :979 992
- Husseien, Manal, Y. (2005). Evaluation of some plant extracts in controlling damping-off and root rot of sugar beet. Minufiya J. Agric. Res., 30 (3): 867-876.
- Ibrahim, M.F.M. (1998): The effect of some fertilization elements on the yield and quality of sugar beet. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Moshtohor, Zagazig Univ., Egypt.
- Jaszczolt, E. (1998): Sugar beet fertilization with phosphorus in relation to the richness of soil in available phosphorus. Gazeta Cukrownicza., 106 (4): 72-73.
- Khalifa, M. M. A. (1997). Studies of root-rot and wilt diseases of sesame plants. M. Sc. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Moshtohor, Zagazig Univ. Benha Branch, pp.158.
- Khalifa, M. M. A.; Draz (Eetmad), E. I. and M. M. Ibrahim (2007). Charcoal rot of sunflower in Egypt: Performance of some various control measures on disease incidence and seed yield production. Egypt .J. of Appl. Sci., 22 (8B): 315-330
- Khalifa M. M. A., El-Sayeda-El-Badawy H.M., Abol-Ela M.F. and Ahmed M.Gomaa (2010). Influence of some bio-fertilizers and different sources of mineral phosphorus on controlling pod rot diseases and aflatoxin contamination in seeds of peanut. Annals of Agric. Sci. Moshtohor, 48 (1), 37-48.
- Kurakov, V.I.; V.V. Sitnikova; L.V. Aleksandrova and O.A. Minakova (1998): How to ensure yield of ecologically pure produce. Sakharnaya-Svekla.
- Le Docte, A. (1927). Commercial determination of sugar in beet root using the Sacks. Le Docte process. Int. Sugar J., 29: pp 488-492. (C.F. Sugar Beet Nutrition April 1972 Appl. Sci. Pub. LTD, London, A.P. Draycott).
- Mahmoud, E.Y ,El-Sayeda H. M. El- Badawyand., Khalifa M. M. A. (2008): Effect Of Inoculation With Rhizobium And Va-Mycorrhizae On Peanut Root Rot Diseases Under Different Sources Of Phosphorus Fertilizer.Annals Of Agric.Sc., Moshtohor. 46 (4): 51-61.
- Mesbah, A., B. Stevens and M. Killen (2012). Phosphorus fertility in sugar beets. Field Days Bulletin: 133 134
- Mohamed, Y. Hanan (2008).Influence of some biochemical fertilization regimes and organic fertilizer on yield and quality of some sugar beet varieties. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Zagazig Univ., Egypt.

- Mohamed,Kh.El-Sh., Hanan, Y. Mohamed and E.M. Abdel Fatah (2012).Effect of nitrogen sources fertilization and boron foliar application on growth, quality and productivity of some sugar beet varieties.J. Biol. Chem. Environ. Sci., 7(4): 177-192.
- Naghizadeh, M., A. A. Askari and A. Fadaie (2013). Study of effects of sowing and harvest date onsugar beet quantity and quality traits. Intl. J. Agron. Plant. Prod. Vol., 4 (12):3392-3395
- Odrekhovskii, A.F.; E.T. Petrova; V.N. Yakimenko and I.S. Zhkarednyi (1998): How much fertilizer does beet need?. Sakharnaya Svekla., 9: 13-15.
- Page, A. L. (1982). "Methods of soil analysis". Chemical and Microbiological Properties. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed., Agron. 9, Am. Soc. Agron. Inc. Publ. Madison, Wis, USA.
- Poindexter, S. (2012) Protect sugarbeets from Rhizoctonia root rot . Michigan State University Extension.
- Sims, A. (2004). Supplying phosphorus for sugar beet production with 10 34 0 banded with the seed Marshal Country. Farm Cropping Trails Northwest and West Central Minnesota U of MN Extention Service. Page 19.
- Snedecor, G. W. and W. G. Cochran (1981). Statistical methods 6<sup>th</sup> Ed. Iowa State Univ. Press. Ames. Iowa. USA.
- Yousef, M.S.H. and H.M. Abdel Mottaleb (2009). Effect of sowing and harvesting dates on productivity of some sugar beet varieties under Sinai conditions. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 34 (9): 9543-9556.

# تأثير مواعيد الزراعة والسماد الفوسفاتى على عفن الجذور وجودة بعض اصناف بنجر السكر ممد عبد العاطى المنسوب و حنان يوسف محمد معهد بحوث المحاصيل السكرية – مركز البحوث الزراعية – الجيزة – مصر

اقيمت تجربتان حقليتان بالمزرعة التجريبية لمحطة بحوث ملوى بمحافظة المنيا خلال موسمى الزراعة (0.1) بر (0.1) بدراسة تاثير مواعيد الزراعة (0.1) بدرا (0.1) بدراسة تاثير مواعيد الزراعة (0.1) بدون اضافة (0.1) بدون اضافة (0.1) بدون اضافة (0.1) بدون الجودة لثلاث المنافقة مرتين في القطع المنافقة مورزع السماد الفوسفاتي والاصناف عشوائيا في القطع الشعية وتحت الشقية .

اوضحت النتائج زيادة معنوية لصفات الجودة مثل السكروز ، نسبة السكر المستخلص ، الصوديوم، البوتاسيوم ، الالفا امينو نيتروجين ، السكر المفقود في المولاس ونسبة الاستخلاص وكذلك صفات الانتاجية من محصولي السكر والجذور مع خفض نسبة الاصابة بعفن الجذور عند الزراعه في ١٥ اكتوبر لكلا موسمي الزراعة. استجابت الاصناف تحت الدراسة معنويا لجميع الصفات في كلا موسمي الدراسة، كما اثرت اضافة السماد الفوسفاتي معنويا على جميع الصفات تحت الدراسة عدا محصول السكر والجذر والوزن الغض للجذر في الموسم الاول فقط. ولذلك ادى زراعة الصنف كواميرا في الميعاد ١٥ اكتوبر مع اضافة ٣٠ كجم فو١٠ الى زيادة معنوية في محصولي الجذور والعروش (طن/فدان) في كلا موسمي الزراعة.

Table 2: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on root rot disease%, root length (cm) and root fresh weight (g/plant) of three sugar beet varieties in 2009/2010 season.

Treatm	ents	Root	t rot dise	ase%	Mean	Roo	t length (	(cm)	Mean	Root fresh weight (g/plant)		Mean	
Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus		rieties ( C	C )*		Varieties ( C )		Wieaii	Va	rieties (	C)	Wieaii	
Sowing dates (A)	fertilizer (B)	V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3	
	Zero	8.79	8.36	7.77	8.30	34.63	37.15	39.41	37.07	679.0	556.1	871.3	702.1
15 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	8.28	7.79	7.29	7.79	34.91	37.44	39.62	37.33	690.3	841.0	890.7	807.3
	30kg/fed	8.87	8.72	8.35	8.65	34.41	36.91	39.16	36.83	671.3	821.3	851.7	781.4
Mea	an	8.64	8.29	7.80	8.24	34.65	37.17	39.40	37.07	680.2	739.5	871.2	763.6
	Zero	10.14	9.71	8.77	9.54	33.63	35.41	37.16	35.40	651.0	769.3	801.0	740.4
30 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	9.64	9.19	8.64	9.16	33.91	35.64	37.41	35.66	662.7	782.3	810.0	751.7
	30kg/fed	10.84	10.30	9.58	10.24	33.41	34.49	36.90	34.94	641.7	758.7	790.7	730.3
Mea	an	10.21	9.73	9.00	9.65	33.65	35.18	37.16	35.33	651.8	770.1	800.6	740.8
	Zero	10.72	10.25	9.34	10.10	31.16	33.64	35.41	33.41	621.3	710.7	741.7	691.1
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	10.44	9.84	9.41	9.90	31.40	33.91	35.64	33.65	632.7	721.3	751.7	701.9
	30kg/fed	11.18	10.63	10.20	10.67	30.90	33.41	35.41	33.25	612.0	701.3	732.3	681.9
Mea	an	10.78	10.24	9.65	10.22	31.16	33.66	35.49	33.44	621.9	711.1	741.9	691.6
Mean of	Zero	9.88	9.46	10.30	9.88	33.14	33.41	32.91	33.15	650.3	661.9	641.7	651.3
phosphorus	15kg/fed	9.44	8.94	9.89	9.42	35.40	35.67	34.94	35.34	678.7	781.6	760.4	740.2
fertilizer	30kg/fed	8.63	8.45	9.37	8.82	37.33	37.56	37.16	37.35	804.7	817.4	791.6	804.6
Mea	an	9.32	8.95	9.85	9.37	35.29	35.55	35.00	35.28	711.2	753.6	731.2	732.0

\* Varieties i.e. V1, V2 and V3 were Farida, Kawemira and Montibianco, respectively.

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties (C)	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC Interaction
Root rot disease%	0.15	0.09	0.09	0.16	0.16	0.16	NS
Root length	0.17	0.13	0.13	NS	0.21	NS	NS
Root fresh weight	NS	NS	87.1	NS	NS	NS	NS

Table 3: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on root rot disease%, root length (cm) and root fresh weight (g/plant) of three sugar beet varieties in 2010/2011 season.

	giit (g/pidiit)				2010/201								
Treatm	ents	Root	rot dise	ase%	Mean	Roo	ot length	(cm)	Mean		t fresh we (kg/plant)	•	Mean
Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus	Va	rieties (	C )	Weari	Va	arieties (	C)	Weali	Va	rieties ( (	C)	Wieari
Sowing dates (A)	fertilizer (B)	V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3	
	Zero	9.57	9.14	8.62	9.11	2.17	35.01	37.26	34.93	673.0	825.0	8637	787.2
15 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	9.21	8.70	8.24	8.72	2.28	35.43	37.51	35.23	684.0	832.7	884.7	800.4
	30kg/fed	10.13	9.56	9.21	9.63	2.23	34.75	37.01	34.68	663.0	814.0	842.3	773.1
Mea	ın	9.64	9.13	8.69	9.15	2.23	35.06	37.26	34.95	673.3	823.9	863.6	787.0
	Zero	11.20	10.56	10.22	10.66	2.10	33.26	35.01	33.27	643.7	765.0	792.7	733.8
30 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	10.63	10.19	9.65	10.16	2.13	33.51	35.26	33.51	653.3	774.7	803.7	743.9
	30kg/fed	11.70	11.13	10.56	11.13	2.07	33.02	34.75	33.01	633.7	754.7	785.0	724.4
Mea	ın	11.18	10.63	10.14	10.65	2.10	33.27	35.01	33.26	643.6	764.8	793.8	734.4
	Zero	11.66	11.14	10.61	11.14	1.91	31.52	33.25	31.26	615.0	704.3	734.3	684.6
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	11.18	10.74	10.41	10.78	1.96	31.75	33.51	31.50	625.0	716.0	745.0	695.3
	30kg/fed	12.09	11.60	11.24	11.64	1.88	31.26	33.34	31.12	606.0	694.7	722.3	674.3
Mea	ın	11.64	11.16	10.75	11.19	1.92	31.51	33.37	31.30	615.3	705.0	733.9	684.5
Mean of	Zero	10.81	10.34	11.31	10.82	1.72	31.25	30.76	31.01	643.9	654.1	634.2	644.1
phosphorus	15kg/fed	10.28	9.88	10.77	10.31	2.20	33.56	33.01	33.28	764.8	774.4	754.4	764.6
fertilizer	30kg/fed	9.81	9.43	10.34	9.86	2.32	35.43	35.03	35.21	796.9	811.1	783.2	797.7
Mea	ın	10.30	9.88	10.80	10.33	2.08	33.42	32.93	33.17	735.2	746.6	724.0	735.4

\* Varieties i.e. V1, V2 and V3 were Farida, Kawemira and Montibianco, respectively.

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties ( C )	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC Interaction
Root rot disease%	0.08	0.06	0.05	NS	NS	NS	NS
Root length	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.10
Root fresh weight	0.80	0.60	0.80	1.10	1.40	1.40	2.50

Table 4: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on top, roots and sugar yields (ton/fed) of three sugar beet varieties in 2009/2010 season.

					2009/201	0 season.							
Treatme	ents	Top	yield (tor	/fed)		Root	yield (tor	n/fed)		Sugai	yield (to	n/fed)	
Cowing dates (A)	Phosphorus	Va	rieties (	C)	Mean	Va	rieties ( (	C)	Mean	Va	rieties (	C)	Mean
Sowing dates (A)	fertilizer (B)	V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3	
	Zero	9.22	10.82	11.10	10.38	28.23	32.02	33.25	31.17	3.282	2.968	2.954	3.068
15 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	9.31	10.91	11.21	10.48	28.52	32.24	33.54	31.44	3.309	2.946	2.942	3.066
	30kg/fed	9.12	10.71	11.00	10.28	28.02	31.71	33.06	30.93	3.278	2.977	2.980	3.078
Mea	n	9.22	10.82	11.11	10.38	28.26	31.99	33.29	31.18	3.289	2.964	2.959	3.071
	Zero	8.91	10.20	10.51	9.88	27.11	29.59	27.96	28.22	3.192	2.999	2.709	2.967
30 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	9.02	10.32	10.60	9.98	27.27	29.71	31.54	29.51	3.196	2.965	3.008	3.056
	30kg/fed	8.81	10.11	10.41	9.78	26.82	29.25	31.13	29.07	3.156	2.984	3.054	3.065
Mea	n	8.92	10.21	10.51	9.88	27.07	29.52	30.21	28.93	3.181	2.982	2.924	3.029
	Zero	8.62	9.61	9.92	9.39	26.23	27.19	29.42	27.55	3.102	3.050	3.140	3.097
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	8.71	9.71	10.02	9.48	26.09	27.54	30.46	28.03	3.088	3.044	3.190	3.107
	30kg/fed	8.51	9.52	9.81	9.28	26.00	27.03	29.16	27.40	3.121	3.151	3.151	3.140
Mea	n	8.61	9.62	9.92	9.38	26.04	27.26	29.68	27.66	3.104	3.081	3.159	3.115
Mean of	Zero	8.92	9.01	8.82	8.91	27.12	27.30	26.95	27.12	3.192	3.198	3.185	3.191
phosphorus	15kg/fed	10.22	10.32	10.12	10.22	29.60	29.83	29.33	29.59	3.005	2.985	3.034	3.009
fertilizer	30kg/fed	10.51	10.61	10.41	10.51	30.21	31.85	31.12	31.06	2.934	3.047	3.061	3.014
Mea	n	9.88	9.98	9.78	9.88	28.98	29.66	29.13	29.26	3.044	3.076	3.094	3.071

\*Varieties i.e. V1, V2 and V3 were Farida, Kawemira and Montibianco, respectively.

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties ( C )	AXB	AXC	ВХС	ABC Interaction
Top yield (ton/fed)	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	NS
Root yield (ton/fed)	0.89	NS	0.61	NS	1.06	NS	NS
Sugar yield (ton/fed)	NS	NS	0.058	NS	0.058	NS	NS

Table 5: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on top, roots and sugar yields (ton/fed) of three sugar beet varieties in 2010/2011 season.

					2010/201	1 season.							
Treatm	ents	Top	yield (ton	/fed)		Root	yield (tor	n/fed)		Sugar yi	eld (ton/f	ed)	
Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus	Va	rieties (	C)	Mean	Va	rieties ( C	3)	Mean	Va	rieties (	C)	Mean
Sowing dates (A)	fertilizer (B)	V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3	
	Zero	9.13	10.63	10.63	10.23	26.21	31.05	32.28	29.85	2.607	2.571	2.577	2.585
15 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	9.13	10.73	10.73	10.30	26.86	31.26	32.76	30.20	2.896	2.555	2.586	2.679
	30kg/fed	8.93	10.53	10.53	10.09	26.07	29.73	32.07	29.29	2.642	2.486	2.596	2.575
Mea	n	9.06	10.63	10.63	10.21	26.29	30.68	32.37	29.78	2.715	2.537	2.586	2.613
	Zero	8.72	10.03	10.03	9.69	25.06	28.53	30.03	27.87	2.564	2.559	2.584	2.569
30 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	8.83	10.14	10.14	9.80	25.27	28.75	30.43	28.15	2.569	2.537	2.587	2.564
	30kg/fed	8.61	9.94	9.94	9.60	24.74	28.26	29.73	27.58	2.525	2.541	2.602	2.556
Mea	n	8.72	10.03	10.03	9.70	25.02	28.51	30.06	27.87	2.553	2.546	2.591	2.563
	Zero	8.43	9.43	9.43	9.23	23.72	27.10	28.28	26.37	2.445	2.657	2.658	2.587
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	8.53	9.62	9.62	9.33	24.08	27.31	28.54	26.64	2.468	2.645	2.642	2.585
	30kg/fed	8.34	9.34	9.34	9.10	23.52	26.74	27.76	26.01	2.441	2.713	2.637	2.597
Mea	n	8.43	9.47	9.47	9.22	23.78	27.05	28.19	26.34	2.451	2.672	2.646	2.590
Mean of	Zero	8.76	8.83	8.83	8.74	25.00	25.31	24.78	25.03	2.539	2.645	2.536	2.573
phosphorus	15kg/fed	10.03	10.16	10.16	10.04	28.89	29.11	28.24	28.75	2.596	2.579	2.580	2.585
fertilizer	30kg/fed	10.36	10.43	10.43	10.34	30.20	30.57	29.86	30.21	2.606	2.605	2.612	2.608
Mea	n	9.72	9.81	9.81	9.71	28.03	28.33	27.63	28.00	2.580	2.610	2.576	2.589

\*Varieties i.e. V1, V2 and V3 were Farida, Kawemira and Montibianco, respectively.

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties ( C )	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC Interaction
Top yield (ton/fed)	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
Root yield (ton/fed)	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.06	0.07	0.07	0.12
Sugar yield (ton/fed)	NS	NS	0.071	NS	NS	NS	NS

Table 6: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on juice impurities (Na, K and α-aminoN%) of three sugar beet varieties in 2009/2010 season.

					2009/201	0 season.							
Treatme	nts		*Na%				K%			(	α-amino N)%	6	
Cowing dates (A)	Phosphorus	١	/arieties ( C	)	Mean	\	/arieties ( C	)	Mean	١	/arieties ( C	)	Mean
Sowing dates (A)	fertilizer (B)	V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3	
	Zero	1.350	1.913	1.980	1.748	3.540	4.350	4.450	4.113	2.270	2.800	2.900	2.658
15 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	1.380	1.940	1.990	1.770	3.617	4.387	4.470	4.158	2.290	2.820	2.950	2.691
	30kg/fed	1.320	1.870	1.950	1.713	3.510	4.307	4.420	4.078	2.240	2.770	2.890	2.637
Mear	1	1.350	1.908	1.973	1.744	3.556	4.348	4.447	4.117	2.269	2.800	2.917	2.662
	Zero	1.263	1.620	1.770	1.551	3.407	4.157	4.263	3.942	2.160	2.630	2.750	2.516
30 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	1.280	1.670	1.860	1.603	3.450	4.177	4.263	3.963	2.180	2.670	2.760	2.542
	30kg/fed	1.220	1.610	1.710	1.513	3.313	4.033	4.203	3.850	2.110	2.610	2.710	2.478
Mear		1.254	1.633	1.780	1.556	3.390	4.122	4.243	3.919	2.153	2.639	2.743	2.512
	Zero	1.170	1.420	1.540	1.377	3.237	3.800	4.080	3.708	2.050	2.400	2.520	2.339
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	1.220	1.463	1.547	1.410	3.267	3.857	4.107	3.743	2.830	2.420	1.857	2.369
	30kg/fed	1.180	1.433	1.510	1.374	3.210	3.747	4.007	3.654	2.020	2.350	2.490	2.291
Mear		1.190	1.439	1.532	1.387	3.238	3.801	4.067	3.702	2.056	2.393	2.540	2.330
Manager	Zero	1.261	1.293	1.240	1.265	3.394	3.444	3.344	3.394	2.163	2.187	2.128	2.159
Mean of phosphorus - fertilizer -	15kg/fed	1.651	1.691	1.638	1.660	4.102	4.140	4.029	4.090	2.612	2.641	2.579	2.611
iei uiiZei	30kg/fed	1.763	1.780	1.723	1.762	4.267	4.280	4.210	4.252	2.727	2.774	2.699	2.733
Mear		1.559	1.594	1.534	1.562	3.921	3.955	3.861	3.912	2.501	2.534	2.469	2.501

Sodium (Na), Potassium (K) and Nitrogen (N)

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC
LSD 0.05 IOI.	Sowing dates (A)	Priospriorus ierunzer (b)	(C)	AAD	AXC	BAC	Interaction
Na%	0.005	0.004	0.007	0.006	0.012	0.012	0.020
K%	0.008	0.007	0.008	0.012	0.014	0.014	0.024
α-amino N)%	0.004	0.003	0.004	0.005	0.006	0.006	0.011

Table 7: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on juice impurities (Na, K and  $\alpha$ -amino N%) of three sugar beet varieties in 2010/2011 season.

	. Boot various				2010/201	1 season.							
Treatm	ents		Na				K			α	amino N	%	
Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus	Va	rieties ( (	(C) Mean Va		Va	rieties (	C)	Mean	Va	rieties (	C )	Mean
	fertilizer (B)	V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3		V1	V2	V3	
	Zero	0.980	1.520	1.613	1.371	2.257	3.147	3.247	2.883	1.607	2.407	2.490	2.168
15 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	1.010	1.550	1.627	1.396	3.067	3.180	3.287	3.178	1.887	2.410	2.537	2.278
	30kg/fed	0.930	1.303	1.637	1.290	2.303	3.103	3.203	2.870	1.833	2.357	2.503	2.231
Mea	n	0.973	1.458	1.626	1.352	2.542	3.143	3.246	2.977	1.776	2.391	2.510	2.226
	Zero	0.880	1.250	1.400	1.177	2.203	2.933	3.017	2.718	1.747	2.227	2.333	2.102
30 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	0.900	1.307	1.470	1.226	2.250	2.950	3.057	2.752	1.770	2.267	2.357	2.131
	30kg/fed	0.857	1.220	1.337	1.138	2.107	2.787	3.013	2.636	1.700	2.200	2.307	2.069
Mea	n	0.879	1.259	1.402	1.180	2.187	2.890	3.029	2.702	1.739	2.231	2.332	2.101
	Zero	0.800	0.930	1.160	0.963	2.020	2.603	2.877	2.500	1.643	1.980	2.117	1.913
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	0.827	1.100	1.200	1.042	2.057	2.643	2.900	2.533	1.683	2.013	2.180	1.959
	30kg/fed	0.800	1.077	1.130	1.002	2.007	2.537	2.807	2.450	1.613	1.947	2.087	1.882
Mea	n	0.809	1.036	1.163	1.003	2.028	2.594	2.861	2.494	1.647	1.980	2.128	1.918
Mean of	Zero	0.887	0.912	0.862	0.887	2.160	2.458	2.139	2.252	1.666	1.780	1.716	1.720
phosphorus	15kg/fed	1.233	1.319	1.200	1.251	2.894	2.924	2.809	2.876	2.204	2.230	2.168	2.201
fertilizer	30kg/fed	1.391	1.432	1.368	1.397	3.047	3.081	3.008	3.045	2.313	2.358	2.299	2.323
Mea	n	1.170	1.221	1.143	1.178	2.700	2.821	2.652	2.724	2.061	2.123	2.061	2.081

Sodium (Na), Potassium (K) and Nitrogen (N)

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties ( C )	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC Interaction
Na%	0.003	0.003	0.005	0.004	0.008	0.008	0.015
K%	0.165	0.165	0.123	NS	NS	NS	NS
α-amino N)%	0.003	0.005	0.004	0.007	0.007	0.007	0.012

# J. Plant Production, Mansoura Univ., Vol. 5 (5), May, 2014

Table 8: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on SLM%, sex% and purity% of three sugar beet varieties in 2009/2010 season.

varieties iii 2009/2010 Season.													
					2009/201	0 season.							
Treatm	Treatments		Sucrose %			Suga	r extract	ion%		Pur	ity%		
0	Phosphorus	Vai	rieties ( C	)	Maan	Va	rieties (	C )	Maan	Varieties ( C )			Maan
Sowing dates (A)	fertilizer (B)	V1	V2	V3	Mean	V1	V2	V3	Mean	V1	V2	V3	Mean
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Zero	14.00	17.21	17.80	16.34	8.60	10.79	11.25	10.22	83.80	76.57	75.72	78.70
	15kg/fed	14.10	17.41	17.99	16.50	8.62	10.94	11.40	10.32	83.45	76.23	75.60	78.42
	30kg/fed	13.90	17.01	17.61	16.18	8.55	10.65	11.09	10.10	84.20	77.15	76.12	79.15
Mea	n	14.00	17.21	17.80	16.34	8.59	10.80	11.25	10.21	83.81	76.65	75.81	78.76
30 <sup>th</sup> October	Zero	13.72	16.01	16.61	15.45	8.50	9.87	10.31	9.56	84.90	80.56	78.53	81.33
	15kg/fed	13.81	16.20	16.80	15.60	8.53	10.02	10.49	9.68	84.70	79.87	77.25	80.61
	30kg/fed	13.61	15.81	16.41	15.28	8.50	9.81	10.19	9.50	85.42	80.58	79.33	81.78
Mea	n	13.71	16.09	16.61	15.44	8.51	9.90	10.33	9.58	85.01	80.34	78.37	81.24
	Zero	13.40	14.61	15.40	14.48	8.39	8.92	9.37	8.89	86.05	83.06	81.64	83.58
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	13.51	14.81	15.62	14.65	8.45	9.05	9.55	9.02	85.37	82.50	81.56	83.14
	30kg/fed	13.31	14.21	15.20	14.24	8.33	8.58	9.26	8.73	85.88	82.82	81.98	83.56
Mea	n	13.41	14.55	15.41	14.46	8.39	8.85	9.40	8.88	85.77	82.79	81.73	83.43
Mean of	Zero	13.71	13.81	13.61	13.71	8.50	8.54	8.46	8.50	84.92	84.51	85.17	84.86
phosphorus fertilizer	15kg/fed	15.95	16.14	15.68	15.92	9.86	10.01	9.68	9.85	80.07	79.53	80.18	79.93
	30kg/fed	16.61	16.81	16.41	16.61	10.31	10.48	10.18	10.33	78.63	78.14	79.14	78.64
Mea	n	15.42	15.59	15.23	15.41	9.56	9.67	9.44	9.56	81.20	80.72	81.50	81.14

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties ( C )	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC Interaction
Sucrose%	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02
Sex%	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.02	0.03
Purity%	0.07	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.17	0.17	0.30

### El-Mansoub, M. M. A. and Hanan Y. Mohamed

Table 9: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on SLM%, sex% and purity% of three sugar beet varieties in 2010/2011 season.

70.150	103 111 20 10/20				2010/201	1 season.							
Treatm	onte	9	ucrose %		2010/201		ar extract	ion%			Purity%		
	Phosphorus		rieties ( C			_	rieties (			Varieties ( C )			
Sowing dates (A)	fertilizer (B)	V1	V2	, V3	Mean	V1	V2	V3	Mean	V1	V2	, V3	Mean
15 <sup>th</sup> October	Zero	13.95	17.14	17.72	16.27	10.05	12.08	12.53	11.55	87.75	80.96	79.73	82.81
	15kg/fed	14.06	17.34	17.92	16.44	9.28	12.24	12.67	11.40	88.15	80.56	79.58	82.76
	30kg/fed	13.86	16.93	17.51	16.10	9.87	11.96	12.36	11.39	88.53	84.00	79.35	83.96
Mea	n	13.96	17.14	17.72	16.27	9.73	12.09	12.52	11.45	88.14	81.84	79.55	83.18
30 <sup>th</sup> October	Zero	13.64	15.91	16.52	15.36	9.77	11.15	11.62	10.85	89.13	84.60	82.54	85.42
	15kg/fed	13.75	16.13	16.71	15.53	9.84	11.33	11.76	10.98	88.90	83.80	81.58	84.76
	30kg/fed	13.55	15.73	16.30	15.19	9.80	11.12	11.43	10.78	89.37	84.88	83.44	85.90
Mea	n	13.65	15.93	16.51	15.36	9.80	11.20	11.60	10.87	89.13	84.43	82.52	85.36
	Zero	13.35	14.53	15.31	14.39	9.70	10.20	10.64	10.18	90.09	88.83	85.82	88.25
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	13.45	14.72	15.51	14.56	9.76	10.32	10.80	10.29	89.75	86.44	85.28	87.16
	30kg/fed	13.26	14.13	15.11	14.17	9.64	9.86	10.53	10.01	90.07	86.67	86.18	87.64
Mea	n	13.35	14.46	15.31	14.37	9.70	10.13	10.66	10.16	89.97	87.31	85.76	87.68
Mean of	Zero	13.64	13.75	13.56	13.65	9.84	9.62	9.77	9.75	88.99	88.93	89.32	89.08
phosphorus	15kg/fed	15.86	16.06	15.60	15.84	11.14	11.30	10.98	11.14	84.79	83.60	85.18	84.53
fertilizer	30kg/fed	16.52	16.71	16.31	16.51	11.60	11.74	11.44	11.59	82.70	82.14	82.99	82.61
Mea	n	15.34	15.51	15.15	15.34	10.86	10.89	10.73	10.83	85.49	84.89	85.83	85.41

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties ( C )	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC Interaction
Sucrose%	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01
Sugar extraction%	0.16	0.13	0.12	NS	0.21	0.21	NS
Purity%	0.18	0.13	0.13	0.23	0.23	0.23	0.39

## J. Plant Production, Mansoura Univ., Vol. 5 (5), May, 2014

Table 10: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on sugar lost to molasses % ( SLM %) and extractability % (Ex%) of three sugar beet varieties in 2009/2010 season.

			2009/201	10 season.					
Treatn	nents		SLM %						
Cowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer	Varieties ( C )			Maan	\	Maan		
Sowing dates (A)	(B)	V1	V2	V3	Mean	V1	V2	V3	Mean
	Zero	4.796	5.819	5.952	5.522	61.45	62.70	63.20	62.45
15 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	4.882	5.865	5.988	5.578	61.13	62.87	63.38	62.46
	30kg/fed	4.756	5.761	5.916	5.478	61.48	62.61	63.00	62.36
Me	an	4.812	5.815	5.952	5.526	61.35	62.73	63.19	62.42
30 <sup>th</sup> October	Zero	4.624	5.541	5.699	5.288	61.92	61.64	62.08	61.88
	15kg/fed	4.676	5.580	5.715	5.323	61.80	61.85	62.42	62.02
	30kg/fed	4.512	5.411	5.621	5.181	62.44	61.99	62.10	62.18
Me	an	4.604	5.511	5.678	5.26	62.05	61.83	62.20	62.03
	Zero	4.410	5.100	5.434	4.983	62.59	61.01	60.84	61.48
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	4.458	5.167	5.474	5.033	62.56	61.08	61.12	61.59
	30kg/fed	4.382	5.037	5.341	4.920	62.58	60.35	60.93	61.29
Me	an	4.418	5.101	5.416	4.98	62.58	60.81	60.96	61.45
M	Zero	4.612	4.672	4.550	4.611	61.99	61.83	62.17	61.99
Mean of phosphorus fertilizer	15kg/fed	5.486	5.537	5.403	5.475	61.78	61.93	61.65	61.79
	30kg/fed	5.695	5.725	5.626	5.682	62.04	62.31	62.01	62.12
Me	an	5.264	5.312	5.193	5.256	61.94	62.02	61.94	61.97

Sugar Lost to Molasses%(SLM%)- Extractability%(EX%)

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties ( C )	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC Interaction
SLM %	0.009	0.008	0.008	0.013	0.014	0.014	0.024
Extractability % (Ex%)	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.08	0.08	0.150

Table 11: Effect of sowing dates and phosphorus fertilizers on sugar lost to molasses % ( SLM %) and extractability % (Ex%) of three sugar beet varieties in 2010/2011 season.

	20mty 70 (=2070) 01 ti			1 season.					
Treatr	ments		*SLM %						
Cowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer	Varieties ( C )			Mean	V	Maan		
Sowing dates (A)	(B)	V1	V2	V3	wean	V1	V2	V3	Mean
	Zero	3.296	4.461	4.595	4.117	72.08	70.47	70.68	71.08
15 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	4.180	4.499	4.649	4.443	66.01	70.59	70.71	69.10
	30kg/fed	3.392	4.375	4.558	4.108	71.19	70.62	70.55	70.79
Me	ean	3.622	4.445	4.601	4.223	69.76	70.56	70.65	70.32
	Zero	3.263	4.165	4.296	3.908	71.67	70.06	70.36	70.70
30 <sup>th</sup> October	15kg/fed	3.318	4.200	4.352	3.957	71.51	70.25	70.37	70.71
	30kg/fed	3.152	4.007	4.277	3.812	72.31	70.71	70.09	71.04
Me	ean	3.244	4.124	4.308	3.892	71.83	70.34	70.27	70.81
	Zero	3.043	3.729	4.068	3.613	72.71	70.20	69.50	70.80
15 <sup>th</sup> November	15kg/fed	3.093	3.801	4.113	3.669	72.54	70.11	69.62	70.76
	30kg/fed	3.022	3.674	3.987	3.561	72.69	69.75	69.65	70.70
Me	ean	3.053	3.734	4.056	3.614	72.64	70.02	69.59	70.75
Maan of phaanhamia	Zero	3.201	3.530	3.188	3.306	72.15	70.02	72.06	71.41
Mean of phosphorus fertilizer	15kg/fed	4.118	4.167	4.019	4.101	70.24	70.32	70.36	70.31
ierulizer	30kg/fed	4.320	4.371	4.274	4.322	70.18	70.23	70.10	70.17
Me	ean	3.879	4.023	3.827	3.910	70.86	70.19	70.84	70.63

Sugar Lost to Molasses%(SLM%)- Extractability%(EX%).

LSD 0.05 for:	Sowing dates (A)	Phosphorus fertilizer (B)	Varieties ( C )	AXB	AXC	вхс	ABC Interaction
SLM %	0.165	0.130	0.123	NS	NS	NS	NS
Extractability % (Ex%)	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.150	NS	NS

J. Plant Production, Mansoura Univ., Vol. 5 (5), May, 2014