Original Research Article

Effect of deficit irrigation at different growth periods on yield and quality of sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum l.*) first ratoon.

ABSTRACT

Aims: was to evaluate the effect of deficit irrigation at different growth periods on yield and quality of sugarcane (*Saccharum spp.*) first ratoon.
Study design: The study was carried out in Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD), with three replications.
Place and Duration of Study: A field experiment was conducted during two seasons, 2020/21 and 2021/22 at Guneid Sugarcane Research Center Farm, Sudan.
Methodology: Irrigation deficit treatments were applied when available soil moisture content (ASMC) reached 25 % in the root zone at eight different growth periods viz; DT_1: first day to day 50^{th} , DT_2: day (51^{th} - 100^{th}), DT_3: day(101^{th} -150^{th}), DT_4: day (151^{th} - 200^{th}), DT_5: day (201^{th} - 250^{th}), DT_6: day (251^{th} - 300^{th}), DT_7: day (301^{th} - 350^{th}) and DT_8: day 351^{th} to day 400^{th} after ratoon establishment. These were compared with optimum irrigation (DT_0) which was irrigated at 60% ASMC at the root zone.
Results: showed that all deficit irrigation treatments (DT_1 to DT_8) recorded significantly cane and sugar yield reduction than the control (DT_0) in the two growing seasons. In this sense, $DT_{3,}$ DT_4 and DT_5 treatments have recorded the highest cane and sugar yield reduction. Moreover irrigation deficit affected negatively on the sugarcane ratoon yield parameters with low cane water productivity in DT_4 and DT_5 treatments. Therefore, sugarcane first ratoon must be avoided to deficit irrigation at age of 3.3 month to age 10.0 month.
Conclusion: According to the results sugarcane first ratoon (Varity Co 6806) establishing in December under Central Sudan agro-climatic zone (Gunied conditions) must be avoided to deficit irrigation at ratoon age of 3.3^{th} month to age 10.0^{th} month (at ratoon age 100 day to 300 day), because of high reduction on cane yield, sugar yield and low in water productivity.

Keywords: Sugarcane; first ratoon; deficit irrigation; growth periods; yield and quality

1. INTRODUCTION

Sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum* L.) is one of the major cash crops in many countries around the world[1]. It represents about 79% of the global sugar production [2]. Sugarcane is grown as an irrigation and strategic crop in the central clay plain of the Sudan. Recently in 2021, sugar cane production in Sudan was 5.33 million tonnes. Though Sudan sugar cane production fluctuated substantially in recent years, it tended to decrease through 2012 - 2021 period ending at 5.33 million tonnes in 2021. Ratooning is a practice of growing full crop of sugarcane from sprouts of underground stubbles left in the field after harvest of the plant crop.[3] reported that ratooning in sugarcane saves the cost of seedbed preparation, seed material and planting operations and ratoon keeping is 25-30 % economical than plant crop and get ready for harvest before plant crop with supplementary advantage of better juice quality and sugar recovery. Scarcity of water mostly affected growth and yield-related parameters of various crops [4].Therefore, water deficit condition showing negative response towards biochemical and physiological processes [5 and 6].The effect of water deficit on sugarcane at different stages of its development is not well defined in literature, affecting estimates of crop behavior when soil moisture below optimum values [7]. Moreover, all development phases presented deficiency, according to [8 and7]. So that, the water deficit causes a significant reduction in production in the four development phases of sugarcane [9]. All the physiological and yield-related aspects of a crop were severely affected by drought from the very early stage of seedling to harvesting [10]. Kharif planted crop suffers due to water stress in its grand growth stage. Germination and tillering are the two important and sensitive phases are exposed to soil moisture stress, ultimately it effects cane and sugar yield [11]. Thus, plants having different growth patterns result in different cane yields [12]. However the low level of sugarcane productivity prevailed in some areas of irrigated schemes is attributed to many agronomic factors of which the low level of irrigation water management [13]**.** The objective of the study was to evaluate the effect of deficit irrigation at different growth periods on yield and quality of sugarcane **(***Saccharum spp.*) first ratoon.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1. Experimental site: A field experiment was conducted at the Sugarcane Research Center at Guneid farm, Sudan (Latitude 14° 48' and 15° N, Longitude 33° 16' and 33° 22' E and altitude of 386 m above mean sea level), in a heavy clay soil, during 2020/21 and 2021/22 growing seasons. The objective was to evaluate the effect of deficit irrigation at different growth periods on yield, quality of sugarcane **(***Saccharum spp.*) first ratoon, under Central Sudan Agro-climatic zone (CSAZ). The test crop was sugarcane Co 6806 variety, which is occupying around 90% of cultivated areas. CSAZ is classified as semi-arid, the maximum air temperature ranges 31.6- 43.7 ^{0}C, minimum air temperature ranges 12.8- 25.7^{0}C, Relative humidity ranges between 22 % to 83 % (Table.1), also annual rainfall were 191 mm and 236 mm at two growing seasons respectively [14].The field experiment soil have been described as Remaitab series (subclass S2v) which is Smectitic alluvium, clay Vertisols with moderate chemical fertility (O.C.% 0.4), low infiltration rate, bulk density was 1.5, quite uniform, and alkaline in reaction (pH paste 8.1).

2.2. Experimental design: The experimental design was Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). The field experimental unit was 112.5 m^2 (15m x 7.5m) consisted of five ridges. Sugarcane first ratoon was established in December and harvested in January at the age of 13 months. The recommended package of cane ratoon practices was followed. Furrow irrigation was used for experiment and parshal flume installed and small pump to measure the quantity of water entering the field plot.

2.3. Deficit irrigation treatments: The treatments comprised of two levels of water supply. The first was optimal irrigation (DT_0) with full Irrigation water applied when the available soil moisture in the root zone reached 60 % of the total available soil moisture (40% depletion). The second treatment was applied when available soil moisture content (ASMC) reached 25 % in the root zone (75% depletion). These deficit irrigation treatments were; DT_1: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age one day to day 50, DT_2: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age 51 day to day 100, DT_3: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age 101 day to day 150 day, DT_4: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 151 to day 200, DT_5: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 201 to day 250, DT_6: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 251 to day 300, DT_7: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 301 to day 350 and DT_8: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 351 to ratoon age 400 day after ratoon establishment.

2.4. Crop water requirement: The reference evapotranspiration (ET_0) for Guneid area was computed using the FAO-Penman-Monteith approach [15] and CROPWAT software. Seasonal actual evapotranspiration (ET_a) and the irrigation required throughout the growing season were calculated according to the method described by [16]. The seasonal amount of water requirement (CWR) for sugarcane ratoon was determined as function of the local climate, ratoon age and soil data according to Dooreenbos and Kassam (1979) as:

$CWR = ET_0 \times kc$,

where CWR is ratoon water requirement (mm day^{-1}), *ET*o is evapotranspiration of a reference plant under specified conditions, calculated by the class A pan evaporation method (mm day^{-1}), and *K*c is the ratoon water requirement coefficient for sugarcane.

Soil samples were augured from each plot at the depth 30 cm to determine the soil properties. Then soil moisture content determination by gravimetric method [17] at 20 cm to 60 cm depth using an auger and Tensiometer. Sampling was made at one day before irrigation and three day after irrigation throughout the growing seasons.

2.5. Agronomic parameters: First Sugarcane ratoon yield and quality parameters were recorded at harvesting date.

2.5.1. Cane yield (TC/ha) : cane yield and yield components viz; cane yield (tc ha^{-1}), stalk population(000ha^{-1}), stalk height(cm), stalk diameter (cm), number of nodes per stalk, intermodal length(cm) and stalk weight (kg)were recorded.

2.5.2. Cane quality: random samples of ten millable stalks were collected from each plot from juice analysis. The juice quality parameters including total soluble solids cane (brix %cane), sucrose percent (pol % cane), purity%, estimated recoverable sugar percent (ERS%), and fiber % were determined from juice analyzed according to [18] methods of analysis.

2.6. Water productivity (WP): Water productivity is one way of irrigation performance indicators. It defined as the ratio of crop yield to seasonal irrigation water applied including rain fall [19], it was calculated by using the following equation: WP=Y/SI, whereas WP is water productivity (kg $ha^{-1}m^{-3}$), Y is the yield (kg) and SI is the seasonal irrigation water applied including rain fall (m^3).

2.7. Statistical analysis:

Data collected were analyzed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) technique to evaluate the differences among treatments. Means were separated using the least significant difference (LSD) at the 5% level of significance [20].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Crop water requirements (CWR): Table (1) shows the climatic data of experimental area for the years 2019 to 2021. Results indicated that CSAZ climate is semi-arid, the maximum air temperature mean was 38 ^{0}C, minimum air temperature mean was 20^{0}C, and relative humidity mean was 53 %. Also annual rainfall were 191 mm and 236 mm at two growing seasons respectively. Table (2) shows the water requirements of sugarcane as ratoon cane during the irrigation seasons. Results indicated that the highest ratoon water needs were 9.91, 9.32, 7.84 and 8.91 mm/day in the month of March, April, May and June respectively. This is Grand growth stage in which sugarcane ratoon needs large amount of water, when the lowest ratoon water needs in initial and tillering stages ranged with 2.9 mm/day to 4.2 mm/day and late season stage with a value of 4.0 mm/day to 4.8 mm/day water requirements, respectively. The effective rainfall (Re) was recorded in the months of July to September. In December before sugarcane first ratoon has been harvested, crop water requirements was zero, because this month in this study was dry off period of sugarcane first ratoon to improve sugarcane quality. [21] found that sugarcane needs supplemental irrigation of 508.8 mm/season to cane plant and 486.5 mm/season to ratoon cane with higher frequency of irrigation in the development phase II.

3.2. Effect of deficit irrigation on cane yield parameters at different growth periods of sugarcane first ratoon: in Tables (3) and Table (4), it was clear that deficit irrigation displayed negative effect on cane yield of first ratoon. Cane yield parameters which were arranged and analyzed were; stalk height, stalk diameter, intermodal length and stalk population on the two growing seasons. Analysis of variance showed that deficit irrigation treatments at different growth period of sugarcane ratoon significantly reduced stalk height, stalk diameter in sugarcane ratoon due to water stress restricted photosynthesis, elongation and lateral enlargement. Data which was shown in Table (3), the finding were in agree with [22]. Also stalk height, stalk diameter and intermodal length were reduced when water deficit irrigation applied at all eight growth periods compared to the optimum irrigation treatment. Moreover deficit irrigation during grand growth periods of sugarcane ratoon reduced rates of stalk elongation and internodes length (DT_4 and DT_5). Similar results found when [23] applied water stress, he observed reduction rates of plant elongation and node increment and there is a close relationship between plant height and stem diameter .In this sense the intermodal length significantly influence the yield of sugarcane. Optimal irrigation practice (DT_0) which gave 10.5 cm intermodal length during first and second seasons, compared to 8.7 and 8.5 when deficit irrigation treatments DT_4 and DT5 were applied. Insipid of plant density is a major constituent of sugarcane yield, the effect of deficit irrigation application on stalk population during 2020/021 and 2021/022 was not significant (Table 4). Tillering which provides the plants with the optimum number of stalks needed for a good yield is known to be affected by the availability of the irrigation water. Water deficit treatments considerable decreased sugarcane ratoon population compared with optimum irrigation treatment which produced intensive plant population. The reduction of plant population when water deficit applied to sugarcane first ratoon was probably due to reduction in number of tillers per stool. Various research studies reported that water influence on sugarcane production due to its effect on yield parameters[24]. In relationship to improvement of water use efficiency, optimum irrigations are necessary to gain maximum cane length, cane diameter, plant height and ultimately more fresh cane yield [25, 26 and 27] reported positive correlation amid variables and productivity that increased with irrigation quantity which causes direct rise in cane yield. [23] who reported that water deficit reduced the number of tiller per plant. Most growth of the stalk occurs during the grand growth phase, lack of moisture results in lower nutrient uptake as nutrients are taken up in solution. This affects the elongation of internodes negatively resulting in reduced growth of stalk height and circumference, leaves responsible for photosynthesis, the production of sugar storage tissues and ultimately stalks weight which all significantly restrict sugarcane yield [28]. Therefore, stalk height and circumference determine the yield of sugarcane ignificantly and they are greatly influenced by water [29]. [30] found that irrigation regimes significantly affected cane length and diameter. Under water stress conditions the height and yield of sugarcane are negatively affected hence yield also reduces [28]. Moreover, [30], they found that the number of millable cane had direct correlation with irrigation regime level. Also [31] had reported that deficit irrigation with low level of water stress at tillering increase sugarcane plant numbers. The number of millable canes obtained with optimum irrigation was significantly the highest compared to rest of the treatments. The reduced competition of sugarcane for nutrient, moisture and light might have helped in profuse tiller production and low shoot mortality resulting in realizing higher number of millable canes [32]. [21], were reported that water stress restricted photosynthesis, elongation and lateral enlargement. [33], were observed that furrow method, when irrigation was applied at longer intervals. With the result, the internodes' length and plant height was reduced. [23] they had found that water stress reduced the number of tiller per plant, reduced rates of plant elongation and node increment and there is a close relationship between plant height and stem diameter. [32], confirmed that due to increased in competition of plant cane for nutrient, moisture and sunlight. [34 and 35], were in line of that continuous availability of nutrients as per crop requirement and favorable soil moisture throughout the growth period of sugarcane increase cane high.

3.3. Effect of deficit irrigation on yield quality parameters at different growth periods of sugarcane first ratoon: yield quality parameters viz; Total soluble solid (Brix% cane), sucrose content in cane (pol% cane), Purity % in juice, Fiber% and estimated sugar recovery percentage (ERS%) were affected by deficit irrigation applied at different growth period of sugarcane first ratoon. Although water deficit influenced negatively on sugarcane quality parameters, quality parameters such as brix and pol were not affected by cultural practices; Juice quality mainly depends on genetic nature of the variety [36].

Insipid of the total soluble solid (brix %) is determining the total sugar production, deficit irrigation application method was failed to affect brix % significantly in sugarcane first ratoon (Table 5). However, deficit irrigation treatments brix % ranged from 15.4 to 15.9 % during the first season and from 15.7 to 17.2% during the second season. In case DT_5, DT_2 and DT_8 deficit irrigation treatments, showed high value of brix % in comparison to the other deficit irrigation treatments. These results are in agreement with those of [37] who reported that quality of sugarcane did not vary.

Sucrose content in cane (pol %) is totally controlled by genetic makeup of a variety and climatic condition. Data on pol % is influenced by different deficit irrigation treatments are presented in Table (5). Thus, deficit irrigation application treatments did not exhibit any influence on the pol %. In case DT_4, DT_5 and DT_8 deficit irrigation treatments, showed high value of sucrose content in comparison to the other deficit irrigation treatments. Moreover DT_8, deficit irrigation treatment which was applied during maturity stage gave highest pol percent in mean of two growing seasons (11.7%), because weather factors prevailed during maturity stage play a major role on quality parameters of sugarcane. Pol percent ranged from 10.50 to 11.50 % and from 11.20 to 11.9 % in the first and second season, respectively. These results are in line with those of [38] who reported that juice quality parameters such as sucrose was not affected by deficit irrigation treatments. In table (5), the result on estimated sugar recovery percentage (ERS %) clearly indicated that ERS % was improved consistently during both the years of the study with the same trend of pol %. So that deficit irrigation treatments namely $\mathbf{DT_4}$, $\mathbf{DT_5}$ and $\mathbf{DT_8}$ have high value of ERS % compared to the other treatments, but the difference was low significant. The early development of millable canes with uniform maturity at harvest under deficit irrigation might have resulted in higher sugar recovery value. The differences between treatments didn't reach the significance level. However, all deficit irrigation practiced involved in the present investigation improved the percentage of cane juice recovery. Pure sugar is the ultimate goal of cane crop production and is mainly controlled by genetic makeup of the variety. Thus, water deficit factor have little effect on sugar recovery during each season of investigation.

The data pertaining to cane juice purity as influenced by different deficit irrigation treatments are presented in Table (6). The results revealed that the purity of cane juice was affected no significantly by deficit irrigation application. Under different deficit irrigation treatments, cane juice purity % ranged from 81.0 to 84.3 and 81.2 to 85.2 during 2020-021 and 2021-022. The results showed that DT_1, DT_2 and DT_4 treatment obtained the highest purity% value 83.7, 84.0 and 84.4 as mean of two growing seasons. While DT_3, DT_5, and DT_8 recorded the lowest purity% values of 82.5, 82.8 and 82.8 respectively. So this mean that there was no significant association between cane yield and traits for juice parameters like purity % in sugarcane ratoon. Genetically Fiber % is a controlled feature of the sugarcane crop. The fact that fiber per cent was mainly controlled by varietal genetic makeup was proved and thus fiber was not affected significantly during each year of study. Table (6) showed there was no significant difference between different water deficit treatments on fiber% cane in the second season clearly. DT_0, DT_3, and DT_8 treatments were recorded the lowest fiber% cane values in mean of two growing seasons were 17.9 %, 17.7 %, and17.7 %, while DT_4, DT_5, DT_6, and DT_7 achieved the highest fiber% values of cane 18.7, 18.8, 18.5, and 18.5 respectively. Adoption of full irrigation resulted in improvement cane juice quality which reflected from the reduced cane fiber per cent in comparison to deficit irrigation treatments.

3.4. Effect of deficit irrigation on cane yield at different growth periods of first ratoon: Table (4) showed that the effects of deficit irrigation on one cane stalk weight and total cane yield, the result was shown that weight of one cane and cane yield are positively correlated which was agree with [39]. Moreover there were significant differences of deficit irrigation treatments on cane yield (Table 4). So that optimum irrigation treatment(DT_0) recorded the highest mean cane yield was 88.7 tc ha^{-1}, compared to DT_4, and DT_5 treatments which were recorded the lowest mean values of cane yield of 74.4 tc ha^{-1} and 74.5 tc ha^{-1}, for the reason that high biomass crop requires large quantities of water for maximum production[40]. Deficit irrigation treatment reduced cane yield of sugarcane ratoon which is clear shown in figure (1). Moreover [41] were reported that water stress reduced cane yield and dry weight of sugarcane. On the other hand deficit irrigation treatments recorded high values of cane yield in the second season compare to the first one, the reduction of ratoon cane yield in the first growing season was probably due to reduction in total rainfall and the others climatic factors change.

3.5. Effect of deficit irrigation on sugar yield at different growth periods of first ratoon: Perusal of data on sugar yield as influenced by deficit irrigation treatments revealed significant differences between the treatments (Table 6) and (Fig 2). Sugar formation is dependent on climatic parameter and associated with adequate water supply. The sugar yield is a function of cane yield and hence trend was similar as in cane yield. The sugar yields in various treatments followed the same trend as that of cane yield. Markedly the highest sugar yield was recorded in DT_0, DT_1, DT_2 and DT_8

which were gave significantly higher sugar yield 7.2 ts ha^{-1}, 6.6 ts ha^{-1}, 6.3 ts ha^{-1} and 6.8 ts ha^{-1} respectively in mean of both two growing seasons, this attribute to the fact that deficit irrigation with low level of water stress at tillering (DT_1, and DT_2, treatments) increase sugarcane plant numbers [31] and deficit irrigation at late season (DT_8) improve sugar cane quality and the crop is well ripened before harvest[42]. Furthermore $DT_{0,}$ DT_5 and DT_8 were recorded high in Brix %, pol% cane and ERS% cane. However, deficit irrigation treatment DT_4 has significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) increased purity percent in juice when compared to other treatments, while water deficit during the mid-season stage DT_4, and DT_5 were applied after fall significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) decreased cane and sugar yield compared to other treatments. This could mainly be due to the fact that the mid-season stage is most sensitive to water stress [39]. But deficit irrigation before dry off period after rainy season have significantly ($P \leq 0.05$) decreased cane and sugar yield (DT_6 and $DT_{7)}$, climatic data in Table (2) showed that in last October and November was applied have high relative humidity % and high in evaporation (mm) that lead to high reduction in sugar yield.

3.6. Effect of water deficit on number of irrigations applied and water saved of First ratoon: the effect of water deficit on number of irrigations applied and water saved at different growth Periods of sugarcane first ratoon under CSAZ was shown in Table (7) . Results have shown that huge amount of water have been saved when deficit irrigation treatments $DT_{2,}$ DT_3 and DT_5 were applied at the growth periods of ratoon and water saved were 6100M^3 ha^{-1},5500M^3 ha^{-1}, and 5200M^3 ha^{-1} respectively. All deficit irrigation treatments were saved water through the growing season which were ranged from 6100 M^3 ha^{-1} to 3800 M^3 ha^{-1}. Number of irrigations applied in sugarcane first ratoon which was established in December and harvested in January under Gunied conditions, Sudan was thirty in optimum irrigation treatment and was twenty seven when deficit irrigation treatments were applied. Deficit irrigation is not only effect in number of irrigation but also in amount of water which was used during the irrigation season.

3.7. Effect of water deficit at different growth periods on water productivity of sugarcane first ratoon: Table (8) shown the effect of deficit irrigation on cane water productivity of sugarcane first ratoon. High values of water productivity were recorded when deficit irrigation treatments DT $_{1,}$ DT $_{2,}$ DT $_{3,}$ and DT $_6$ were applied followed by $DT_{7,}$ $DT_{8,}$ $DT_{0,}$ $DT_{4,}$ and DT5 respectively. Moreover cane yield reduction was not significant when compared to the benefits of saved water. This result was agreed with [43], who was reported that deficit irrigation saved significant irrigation water without significant yield losses.



Fig. (1): Effect of deficit irrigation on cane yield reduction % of first ratoon, seasons 2020/021-2021/022.



Fig. (2): Effect of deficit irrigation on sugar yield reduction % of first ratoon, seasons 2020/021-2021/022.

Table (1). Climatic data of the experimental area for the study years (2019-2021)

Years	Climatic data	Months											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
2019	Max. Temperature (°C)	36.1	36.1	37.5	41.7	43.1	38.46	37.4	32.7	34.9	35.0	37.2	33.9
	Min. Temperature (°C)	17.2	19.1	18.8	22.5	25.7	24.4	23.5	22.8	23.0	22.1	18.8	15.1
	R. humidity (%)	41.7	32.2	23.1	19.7	30.7	60.2	68.6	80.6	76.6	70.2	42.6	41.6
	Wind speed (m s^{-1})	1.9	2.1	1.9	1.7	2.4	4.0	4.0	2.5	2.8	1.0	1.1	1.5
	Evaporation (mm)	14.4	16.8	18.1	22.8	22.0	20.9	16.9	6.7	6.4	6.4	12.0	12.1
	Rainfall (mm)	-	-	-	-	-	15.6	43.4	129.7	69.7	8.4	-	-
2020	Max. Temperature (°C)	31.6	33.5	37.9	41.4	42.6	41.5	37.1	33.2	34.3	38.5	36.6	35.6
	Min. Temperature (°C)	12.8	14.4	24.8	22.0	25.6	24.9	22.2	20.1	22.7	24.7	18.3	16.4
	R. humidity (%)	37.2	32.7	24.1	22.0	31.3	47.4	67.4	83.1	76.9	62.3	41.3	44.1
	Wind speed (m s^{-1})	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.8	3.7	4.5	2.6	3.8	1.4	1.4	1.4
	Evaporation (mm)	13.2	14.7	23.9	18.9	17.9	18.2	18.2	6.3	7.2	11.2	14.4	12.8
	Rainfall (mm)	-	-	-	-	-	-	33.5	142.1	15.4	-	-	-
2021	Max. Temperature (°C)	33.3	34.1	40.2	39.2	40.0	40.5	35.9	34.9	35.5	39.0	38.2	32.5
	Min. Temperature (°C)	15.6	16.3	22.6	21.8	24.3	25.6	22.0	20.1	22.2	22.7	22.5	14.5
	R. humidity (%)	45.8	39.0	33.3	27.5	41.8	51.3	73.5	72.9	78.3	53.4	26.0	33.0

Wind speed (m s^{-1})	6.82	1.90	2.27	1.97	2.21	2.77	4.3	2.4	2.3	0.8	0.9	1.5
Evaporation (mm)	13.3	15.5	19.0	21.3	16.2	17.7	11.6	9.4	7.0	10.5	17.5	16.5
Rainfall (mm)	-	-	-	-	10.3	40.0	58.7	79.6	47.4	-	-	-

Table (2): Sugarcane first ratoon water requirements of the experimental area for two growing season (2020/021-2021/022).

Month		ET_0 (mm/day)			k_c	CWR (mm/day)			Rainfall((mm/day)		
1st Season	2nd Season	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean		1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean
Dec 2019	Dec 2020	4.81	4.94	4.88	0.6	2.90	2.96	2.93	-	-	-
Jan 2020	Jan 2021	5.32	5.02	5.17	0.8	4.26	4.02	4.14	-	-	-
Feb	Feb	6.10	5.96	6.03	1.1	6.71	6.56	6.64	-	-	-
Mar	Mar	7.31	7.93	7.62	1.3	9.50	10.31	9.91	-	-	-
April	April	7.73	7.80	7.77	1.2	9.28	9.36	9.32	-	-	-
May	May	7.93	7.74	7.84	1.0	7.93	7.74	7.84	-	10.3	5.0
June	June	9.74	8.08	8.91	1.0	9.74	8.08	8.91	-	40.0	20.0
July	July	7.25	6.30	6.78	1.0	7.25	6.30	6.78	33.5	58.7	46.0
Aug	Aug	4.90	5.74	5.32	1.0	4.90	5.74	5.32	142.0	79.6	111.0
Sept	Sept	5.70	5.36	5.53	1.0	5.70	5.36	5.53	15.5	47.4	32.0
Oct	Oct	6.00	5.30	5.65	0.9	5.40	4.77	5.09	-	-	
Nov	Nov	5.40	5.02	5.21	0.8	4.00	4.02	4.01	-	-	
Dec 2020	Dec 2021	Dry Off	Dry off	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Annual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	191.0	236	214.0

CWR is crop water requirement (mm day^{-1}), *ET*o is evapotranspiration (mm day^{-1}), and *K*c is crop water requirement coefficient for sugarcane.

Table (3): Effect of deficit irrigation on stalk height, stalk diameter and internodal length at different growth periods of sugarcane first ratoon.

Treat.	Stalk height (cm)			Stalk diameter (cm)			Internodal length (cm)		
	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean
DT_0	216.0 ^{a}	227.5 ^{a}	222.0	2.25 ^{a}	1.92 ^{a}	2.1	10.5 ^{a}	10.5 ^{a}	10.5
DT_1	197.3 ^{b}	205.9 ^{ab}	202.0	2.25 ^{a}	1.88 ^{ab}	2.1	10.1 ^{a}	9.5 ^{bc}	9.8
DT_2	186.7 ^{d}	189.3 ^{bcd}	188.0	2.16 ^{ab}	1.83 ^{abc}	2.0	9.0 ^{ab}	9.4 ^{bc}	9.2
DT_3	189.0 ^{cd}	202.2 ^{abc}	196.0	2.22 ^{ab}	1.84 ^{abc}	2.0	9.8 ^{ab}	8.8 ^{cde}	9.3
DT_4	164.7 ^{f}	176.7 ^{cd}	171.0	2.10 ^{ab}	1.78 ^{c}	1.9	8.9 ^{b}	8.5 ^{de}	8.7
DT_5	160.0 ^{g}	163.0 ^{d}	162.0	2.06 ^{b}	1.76 ^{c}	1.9	9.2 ^{ab}	7.8 ^{e}	8.5

DT_6	177.3^{e}	186.2^{bcd}	182.0	2.16^{ab}	1.82^{bc}	2.0	9.4^{ab}	8.5^{de}	9.0
DT_7	189.3^{cd}	188.2^{bcd}	189.0	2.23^{a}	1.83^{ab}	2.0	10.0^{a}	9.3^{bcd}	9.7
DT_8	194.0^{bc}	198.2^{bc}	196.0	2.24^{a}	1.84^{abc}	2.0	10.1^{a}	10.4^{a}	10.3
Mean	183.7	193.0	188.0	2.18	1.83	2.0	9.7	9.2	9.5
CV%	1.77	8.7	-	4.40	3.07	-	8.99	6.1	-
LSD ($p\leq0.05$)	5.64	29.1	-	0.17	0.097	-	1.51	0.96	-

Means sharing same letters do not differ significantly at the 5 % level of significance**.**

DT_0: Optimum irrigation, which was irrigated at 60 % available soil moisture content at the root zone. **DT_1 to DT_8**: Deficit irrigation were applied at first growth period to deficit irrigation at eighth growth period (from day one to day fifty after ratoon establishment and from day 350 to day 400 at the eight period). All these treatments were irrigated at 25 % available soil moisture content at the root zone.

Table (4). Effect of deficit irrigation on stalk population, stalk weight and cane yield at different growth periods of sugarcane first ratoon .

Treat.	Stalk population(000ha^{-1})			Stalk Weight (kg)			Cane yield (Ton ha^{-1})		
	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean
DT_0	131.0^{a}	135.0^{a}	133.0	0.94^{a}	0.80^{a}	0.9	83.3^{a}	94.0^{a}	88.7
DT	131.0^{a}	132.0^{a}	132.0	0.81^{b}	0.71^{ab}	0.8	76.1^{b}	85.9^{a}	81.0
DT_2	128.0^{a}	128.0^{a}	128.0	0.66^{e}	0.69^{abc}	0.7	71.7^{d}	77.0^{ab}	74.4
DT_3	130.0^{a}	129.0^{a}	130.0	0.72^{cd}	0.65^{bc}	0.7	72.0^{d}	77.0^{ab}	74.5
DT_4	126.0^{ab}	124.0^{a}	125.0	0.64^{e}	0.60^{c}	0.6	60.1^{e}	67.4^{b}	63.8
DT_5	114.0^{b}	118.0^{a}	116.0	0.56^{f}	0.59^{c}	0.6	59.0^{f}	65.9^{b}	62.5
DT_6	127.0^{a}	128.0^{a}	128.0	0.68^{de}	0.62^{bc}	0.7	74.0^{c}	77.0^{ab}	75.5
DT_7	129.0^{a}	129.0^{a}	129.0	0.73^{c}	0.65^{bc}	0.7	74.3^{c}	77.7^{ab}	76.0
DT_8	129.0^{a}	131.0^{a}	130.0	0.77^{bc}	0.67^{bc}	0.7	73.6^{c}	82.9^{ab}	78.3
Mean	127.0	128.0	128.0	0.72	0.67	0.7	71.6	78.3	75.0
CV%	6.03	9.2	-	4.02	9.33	-	0.77	12.75	-
LSD ($p\leq0.05$)	13.3	20.3	-	0.94^{a}	0.80^{a}	-	0.96	17.28	-

Means sharing same letters do not differ significantly at the 5 % level of significance**.**

DT_0: Optimum irrigation, which was irrigated at 60 % available soil moisture content at the root zone. **DT_1 to DT_8**: Deficit irrigation were applied at first growth period to deficit irrigation at eighth growth period (from day one to day fifty after ratoon establishment and from day 350 to day 400 at the eight period). All these treatments were irrigated at 25 % available soil moisture content at the root zone.

T Table (5). Effect of deficit irrigation on cane Brix %, cane Pol % and ERS % at different ggrowth periods of sugarcane first ratoon.

Treat.	Brix % cane			Pol % cane			ERS %		
	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean
DT_0	15.9 ^{a}	16.5 ^{abc}	16.2	11.0 ^{a}	11.5 ^{ab}	11.3	8.0 ^{a}	8.5^{ab}	8.3
DT_1	15.1 ^{b}	16.5 ^{abc}	15.8	10.5 ^{a}	11.7 ^{ab}	11.1	7.5 ^{a}	8.7 ^{ab}	8.1
DT_2	15.4 ^{ab}	17.0 ^{ab}	16.2	11.0 ^{a}	11.8 ^{ab}	11.4	8.0 ^{a}	8.8^{ab}	8.4
DT_3	15.5 ^{ab}	16.7^{abc}	16.1	10.8 ^{a}	11.3 ^{b}	11.1	7.9 ^{a}	8.3 ^{b}	8.1
DT_4	15.4 ^{ab}	16.7^{abc}	16.1	11.0 ^{a}	11.9 ^{a}	11.5	7.8 ^{a}	8.9 ^{a}	8.4
DT_5	15.5 ^{ab}	17.2 ^{a}	16.4	10.9 ^{a}	11.6 ^{ab}	11.3	8.0 ^{a}	8.6^{ab}	8.3
DT_6	15.4 ^{ab}	15.7 ^{d}	15.6	10.5 ^{a}	11.2 ^{b}	10.9	7.5 ^{a}	8.2 ^{b}	7.9
DT_7	15.4 ^{ab}	16.2 ^{cd}	15.8	10.6 ^{a}	11.7 ^{ab}	11.2	7.6 ^{a}	8.7 ^{ab}	8.2
DT_8	15.5 ^{ab}	16.3 ^{bcd}	15.9	11.5 ^{a}	11.9 ^{a}	11.7	7.5 ^{a}	8.9 ^{a}	8.2
Mean	15.5	16.5	16.0	10.8	11.61	11.2	7.8	8.61	8.2
CV%	2.36	2.63	-	5.03	3.25	-	7.02	4.38	-
LSD ($p\leq0.05$)	0.63	0.75	-	0.937	0.65	-	0.94	0.65	-

Means sharing same letters do not differ significantly at the 5 % level of significance**.**

DT_0: Optimum irrigation, which was irrigated at 60 % available soil moisture content at the root zone. **DT_1 to DT_8**: Deficit irrigation were applied at first growth period to deficit irrigation at eighth growth period (from day one to day fifty after ratoon establishment and from day 350 to day 400 at the eight period). All these treatments were irrigated at 25 % available soil moisture content at the root zone.

Brix: total soluble solid, **Pol**: sucrose content in cane and **ERS**: estimated sugar recovery.

Table (6): Effect of water deficit at different growth periods on Purity % in Juice, Fiber% in cane and Sugar yield.

Treat.	Purity % in Juice			Fiber % in cane			Sugar yield (Ton ha^{-1})		
	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean	1st Season	2nd Season	Mean
DT_0	83.0 ^{a}	85.19 a	84.1	17.9 ^{abc}	17.83 ^{a}	17.9	6.66 ^{a}	7.78 ^{a}	7.2
DT_1	82.5 ^{a}	84.90 a	83.7	18.0 ^{abc}	17.93 ^{a}	18.0	5.71 ^{b}	7.46 ^{ab}	6.6
DT_2	85.5 ^{a}	82.56 a	84.0	18.2 ^{abc}	18.30 ^{a}	18.3	5.74^{b}	6.76 ^{abc}	6.3
DT_3	84.3 ^{a}	80.72 a	82.5	17.3 ^{c}	18.07 ^{a}	17.7	5.62 ^{b}	6.36 ^{bc}	6.0
DT_4	83.9 ^{a}	84.94 a	84.4	19.1 ^{a}	18.27 ^{a}	18.7	4.81^{c}	6.01 ^{bc}	5.4
DT_5	84.3 ^{a}	81.23 a	82.8	18.8 ^{ab}	18.83 ^{a}	18.8	4.66^{c}	5.65^{c}	5.2
DT_6	81.0 ^{a}	85.84 a	83.4	18.5 ^{a}	18.43 ^{a}	18.5	5.55 ^{b}	6.31 ^{bc}	5.9
DT_7	82.9 ^{a}	84.79 a	83.8	18.2 ^{abc}	18.73 ^{a}	18.5	5.65 ^{b}	6.75 ^{abc}	6.2
DT_8	81.0 ^{a}	84.54 a	82.8	17.8 ^{bc}	17.50 ^{a}	17.7	6.26 ^{a}	7.41 ^{ab}	6.8
Mean	83.2	83.86	83.5	18.21	18.10	18.2	5.63	6.72	6.2
CV%	3.5	4.47	-	4.04	4.44	-	7.35	12.93	-
LSD ($p\leq0.05$)	5.03	6.49	-	1.2740	1.39	-	0.71	1.63	-

Means sharing same letters do not differ significantly at the 5 % level of significance**.**

DT_0: Optimum irrigation, which was irrigated at 60 % available soil moisture content at the root zone.**DT_1 to DT_8**: Deficit irrigation were applied at first growth period to deficit irrigation at eighth growth period (from day one to day fifty after ratoon establishment and from day 350 to day 400 at the eight period). All these treatments were irrigated at 25 % available soil moisture content at the root zone.

Table (7): Effect deficit irrigation on water saved at different growth periods of Sugarcane ratoon

Treatments	No. of irrigations applied	No. of Irrigations Saved	CWR M^3(000) ha $^{-1}$ /season	Water saved M^3(000) ha $^{-1}$ /season
DT_{0} (control)	30	0	20.9	0
DT_{1}	27	3	17.1	3.8
DT_{2}	27	3	14.8	6.1
DT_{3}	27	3	15.4	5.5
DT_{4}	27	3	16.2	4.7
DT_{5}	27	3	15.7	5.2
DT_{6}	27	3	16.2	4.7
DT_{7}	27	3	16.9	4.0
DT_{8}	27	3	17.5	3.4

Table (8): Effect deficit irrigation on water productivity at different growth periods of Sugarcane ratoon

Treatments	CWR M^3(000) ha^{-1}			Total sugarcane Kg(000)) ha^{-1}			Water productivity (WP) Kg (000) ha $^{-1}$m^{-3}		
	1st season	2nd season	Mean	1st season	2nd season	Mean	1st season	2nd season	Mean
DT_{0} (control)	21.5	20.3	20.9	83.3^{a}	94.0^{a}	88.65	3.90	4.60	4.25
DT_{1}	17.2	17.0	17.1	76.1^{b}	85.9^{a}	81.00	4.43	5.05	4.74
DT_{2}	14.7	14.8	14.8	71.7^{d}	77.0^{ab}	74.35	4.89	5.19	5.05
DT_{3}	15.2	15.5	15.3	72.0^{d}	77.0^{ab}	74.5	4.76	4.97	4.87
DT_{4}	15.9	16.5	16.2	60.1^{e}	67.4^{b}	63.75	3.78	4.09	3.94
DT_{5}	15.3	16.2	15.7	59.0^{f}	65.9^{b}	62.45	3.87	4.07	3.97
DT_{6}	15.9	16.5	16.2	74.0^{c}	77.0^{ab}	75.5	4.66	4.67	4.67
DT_{7}	16.5	17.3	16.9	74.3^{c}	77.7^{ab}	76.0	4.5	4.5	4.50
DT_{8}	16.9	18.2	17.5	73.6^{c}	82.9^{a}	78.25	4.35	4.57	4.46
Mean	16.3	16.9	16.6	71.56	78.3	74.93	4.39	4.64	4.52
C.V %				0.77	12.8	6.79	-	-	-
LSD (P ≤0.05)				0.96	17.28	9.12	-	-	-

Means sharing same letters do not differ significantly at the 5 % level of significance.

CWR: Crop water requirement.

4. CONCLUSION

Deficit irrigation treatments ($DT_1$to DT_8) recorded significantly effect on cane and sugar yield reduction than the control (DT_0) in the two season (2020/21 and 20 21/22) under Gunied conditions, central Sudan Agro- climatic zone. DT_2 DT_3, DT_4 and DT_5 treatments recorded significant the highest cane yield reduction were; 16.04 %, 15.84 %, 28.11 % and 29.56%. While DT_3, DT_4, DT_5 and DT_5 treatments recorded significant the highest sugar yield reduction were; 17.04 %, 25.07%, 28.53% and 17.87% respectively compared to DT_0 with full Irrigation. High Sugarcane water productivity recorded at deficit irrigation treatments DT_1, DT_2, DT_3 and DT_6 respectively compared to optimum irrigation (DT_0) as first ratoon.

REFERENCES

1.Anonymous. *Agri. Situation in India, agristat.* 2005. http//www.des.kar.nic.in.

2.Czarnikow. In Deficit?www.czarnikow.com/news/16-06-15/2015-16-deficit.

3. Shukla, S.K., Singh, K.K., Pathak, A.D., Jaiswal, V.P and Solomon, S.. Crop diversification options involving pulses and sugarcane for improving crop productivity, nutritional security and sustainability in India. *Sugar Technology*. 2017;19 (1): 1-10.

4. Tawfik R.S., and El-Mouhamady A.B.A. Molecular genetic studies on abiotic stress resistance in sorghum entries through using half diallel analysis and intersimple sequence repeat (ISSR) markers. Bull Natl Res Cent. 2019;43:117

5.Kaushal, M. Potraying rhizobacterial mechanisms in drought tolernace: a way forward toward sustainable agriculture. PGPR Amelioration Sustain. Agric., (2019),195–216.

6.Garcia, F.H.S., Mendonca, A.M.D.C., Rodrigues, M., Matias, F.I., Filho, .P.D.S., Santos, H.R.B., Taffner, J., Barbosa, J.P.R.A.D. Water deficit tolerance in sugarcane isdependent on the accumulation of sugar in the leaf. Ann. Appl. Biol. 2020; 176, 65–74.

7. Silva MDA, JL Jifon, CMD Santos, CJ Jadoski, JAGD Silva. Photosynthetic capacity and water use efficiency in sugarcane genotypes subject to water deficit during early growth phase. *Braz Arch Biol Technol*. 2013; 56:735–748.

8.M 8-Machado R., Ribeiro R., Marchiori P., Machado D., Machado E., Landell M. Biometric and physiological responses to water defici in sugarcane at different phenological stages. Pesqui. Agropecu. Bras. (2009),44, 1575–1582.

9.Sulistiono, W.; Taryono; Yudono, P.; Irham.(Growth analysis of transplanted sugarcane bud chips seedling in the dry land. *Int. J. Sci. Technol. Res.* (2017), 6; 87–93.

10. Chaves M.M., and Oliveira M.M.. Mechanisms underlying plant resilience to water deficits: prospects for water-saving agriculture. J Exp Bot. 2004; 55:365–384 .

11.Rao, M., P.S. Rao, M. Vijayakumar and M. Bharathalakshmi.Drought Management in Sugarcane at Formative Stage during Pre-monsoon Period Ch. Biological Forum – An International Journal. 2021;13(3): 241-244.

12.Abu-Ellail, F.F.B.; Gadallah, A.F.I.; El-Gamal, I.S.H. Genetic variance and performance of five sugarcane varieties for physiological, yield and quality traits influenced by various harvest age. *J. Plant Prod. Mansoura Univ*. 2020; 11, 429–438.

13.kolln, O.T., Glauber José de Castro Gava , Heitor Cantarella , Sérgio Ricardo Silva, Paulo Ce sar Ocheuze Trivelin. Sugarcane yield loss due to water and nitrogen deficiencies evaluated by carbon isotopic discrimination method. Emirates Journal of Food and Agriculture. 2021; 33(9): 751-763 doi: 10.9755/ejfa.2021.v33.i9.2756.

14. GMA. Guneid Meteorological Authority (2021).

15.Smith, M., R. G. Allen, J. L. Monleith, A. Pereira and A. Segeren. Report of the Expert Consultation on Procedures for Revision of FAO Guidelines for Prediction of Crop Water Requirements. 1991; UN-FAO, Rome, Italy, 54 p.

16.Dooreenbos, J and kassam. *Guidelines for predicting crop water* Irrigation and drainage paper, 1979; No.*24, 156, p.FAO, Rome, Italy*.

17.Farbrother, H. G. Cop water requirements of crop in the Gezira. Annual Report of the Gezira Research Station. Wad Medani, Sudan, 1973.

18. ICUMSA. ICUMSA Method Book. C/o British Sugar Technical Centre. Colney, Norwich NR7UB, England.1994.

19.Howell, T. Irrigation engineering, evapo-transpiration. In: C. J. Arntezem, and E. M Ritter (eds.). V Encycl. Opedia. of Agricultural Science. 1994.

2 20.Gomez KA, Gomez AA. Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research, 2nd edition, A Wily Inter. Sci. publication.
J John Wiley an dSon, New York, 1984.

21. Gurski, B. C., J. L. Moretti de Souza, E. Gerstemberger, R. A. de Oliveira. Water requirements and restrictions to sugarcane in cane plants and ratoon cane cycles in Southern Brazil. Acta Agronómica. 2020; 69 (2); 136-144

22.Silva, A. L.C., and Costa, W.A.J.M. Varietal variation in growth, physiology and yield of sugarcane under two contrasting water regimes. Top. Agric. Res. 2004; 16, 1-12.

23.Zhao, D., Glaz, B., Comstock, J.C. Sugarcane response to water-deficit stress during early growth on organic and sand soils. *Am, J. Biol. Sci.*, 2010; 5:403-414.

24.Singh I, RP Verma, TK Srivastava. Growth, yield, irrigation wateruse efficiency, juice quality and economics of sugarcan in pusa hydrogel application under different irrigation scheduling. *Sugar Technol*. 2018; 20:29–35

25. Singh P.N, SK Shukla, VK Bhatnagar. Optimizing soil moisture regime to increase water use efficiency of sugarcane (*Saccharum* spp. hybrid complex) in subtropical India. *Agric Water Manage* 2007; 90:95–100

26. Olivier FC, A Singels. Increasing water use efficiency of irrigated sugarcane production in South Africa through better agronomic practices. *Field Crops Res.* 2015; 176:87–98

27. Silva M.A., Jifon J.L., da Silva J.A.G., Sharma V. Use of physiological parameters as fast tools to screen for drought tolerance in sugarcane. Plant Physiology 2007;19, 193-201.

28. Ethan S., Gana A, Wada C, Baba J. Effect of irrigation intervals on the yield of three released sugarcane varieties in Nigeria. Journal of Agriculture Technology, 2016; 9(7), pp. 1731-1738.

29.Bhingardeve S. D, Pawar D, Hasure. D, Dingre S. D. Yield and Yield Attributes of Sugarcane under Deficit Irrigated Subsurface Drip Irrigation, International Journal of Agriculture Innovations Research, 2017; Volume 5, Issue 6.

30. Bekheet MA. Effect of irrigation and potassium fertilization on yield and quality of two sugarcane varieties. *Assiut J Agric Sci*. 2006; 37:1–1

31.Abdel-Wahab, D.M. Effect of irrigation interval on yield and yield components of two Sugarcane cultivars grown at Kenana Sugar Scheme. *University of Gezirah J. Agric. Sci*. 2005; 3(1)32-43

32 Kumari, R and Kaushal, A. Drip fertigation in sweet pepper: A Review. *International Journal of Engineering Research and Applications*. 2014; 4 (8): 144-149.

33. Singandhupe, R.B., ankar, M.C., Anand, P.S.B and Patil, N.G. Management of drip irrigated sugarcane in western India. *Archives of Agronomy and Soil Science*. 2008; 54 (6): 629-649.

34.Pawar, D.D., Dingre, S.K and Surve, U.S. Growth, yield and water use in sugarcane (*Saccharum officinarum*) under drip fertigation. *Indian Journal of Agronomy*. 2013; 58 (3): 396-401.

35. Veeraputhiran, R., Balasubramanian, R., Pandian, B.J., Chelladurai, M., Tamilselvi, R and Renganathan, V.G. Effect of subsurface drip fertigation on cane yield, water use efficiency and economics of sugarcane. *Madras Agricultural Journal*. 2012; 99 (4-6): 255-258.

36. Yanam, I., Emtryd, O., Dinguing, L and Grip, H. Effect of organic manure and nitrate leaching in an enmerthicanthrosols profile. *Nutrient Cycling Agro-Ecosystems*. 1997; 48: 225-229.

37.Jain,P., Pal, R., Kadian, S.P and Saini, M.L. Character relationship among quality and agronomical traits in sugarcane. *Indian sugar*.2002; (9): 723-726.

38.Eltayeb, G. E. Sugarcane responses to different irrigation regimes, ph.D. Thesis, Sudan University of Science and technology. Khartoum, Sudan. drainage paper 2011; No.*24, 156, p.FAO, Rome, Italy*.

39. Srivastava, T.K., Chauhan, R.S and Menhi Lal. Weed dynamics and their management in sugarcane under different preceding crops and tillage systems. *Indian Journal of Agricultural Sciences*. 2005; 75 (5): 256-260.

40.Wiedenfed, N. Effect of irrigation water salinity and electrostatic water treatment for sugarcane production. Agricultural Water Management. 2008; 95, 86-8.

41.Basnayake, Jackson, P. A., Inman-Bamber, N. G., Lakshmanan, P. Sugarcane for water-limited environments. Genetic variation in cane yield and sugar content in response to water stress. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 2012. *doi:10.1093/jxb/ers.*

42.Eltahir, E. E. Sugarcane harvesting techniques. Paper presented at the National Training Center for Sugar, Sennar, Sudan. 2002.

43.Ayana M. Deficit irrigation practices as an alternative means of improving water use efficiencies in irrigated case study of maize crop at Arab Minch Ethiopia. *Afr. J. Agric. Res*. 2011; 6(3):226-235.