

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

## ABSTRACT

**Aims:** This study aimed to evaluate the effect of deficit irrigation at different growth periods on the 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 (mention names).

**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<sub>1</sub>: first day to day 50<sup>th</sup>, DT<sub>2</sub>: day (51<sup>th</sup> - 100<sup>th</sup>), DT<sub>3</sub>: day (101<sup>th</sup> - 150<sup>th</sup>), DT<sub>4</sub>: day (151<sup>th</sup> - 200<sup>th</sup>), DT<sub>5</sub>: day (201<sup>th</sup> - 250<sup>th</sup>), DT<sub>6</sub>: day (251<sup>th</sup> - 300<sup>th</sup>), DT<sub>7</sub>: day (301<sup>th</sup> - 350<sup>th</sup>) and DT<sub>8</sub>: day 351<sup>th</sup> to day 400<sup>th</sup> after ratoon establishment. These were compared with optimum irrigation (DT<sub>0</sub>) which was irrigated at 60% ASMC at the root zone.

**Results:** The results showed that all deficit irrigation treatments (DT<sub>1</sub> to DT<sub>8</sub>) recorded significantly cane and sugar yield reduction to than the control (DT<sub>0</sub>) in the two growing seasons. In this sense, DT<sub>2</sub>, DT<sub>4</sub> and DT<sub>5</sub> 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<sub>4</sub> and DT<sub>5</sub> treatments. Therefore, sugarcane first ratoon must be avoided to deficit irrigation at age of 3.3 months to age 10.0 months.

**Conclusion:** According to the results sugarcane first ratoon (Variety Varsity Co 6806) established in December under the Central Sudan Agro-climatic zone (Gunned conditions) must be avoided to deficit irrigation at ratoon age of 3.3<sup>th</sup> month to age 10.0<sup>th</sup> month (at ratoon age 100 days to 300 days), because of high reduction on cane yield and 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 15% 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's sugar cane production has increased substantially in recent years, it tended to decrease through the 2012-2021 period ending at 5.33 million tonnes in 2021. Ratoon crop practice of growing a full crop of sugarcane from sprouts of underground stubbles left in the field after the harvest of the plant crop is reported that ratooning in sugarcane saves the cost of seedbed preparation, seed material and planting operations and ratoon crop is 25-30% more economical than plant crop and gets ready for harvest before plant crop with the supplementary advantage of better juice quality and sugar recovery. The scarcity of water mostly affected the growth and yield-related parameters of various crops [4]. Therefore, water deficit conditions showing a 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 the literature, affecting estimates of crop behavior when soil moisture is below optimum values [7]. Moreover, all development phases presented deficiency, according to

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, 10 pt

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0"

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman

[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~~ ~~their~~ grand growth stage. Germination and tillering are the two important and sensitive phases that 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~~ ~~However~~, the low level of sugarcane productivity that 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 the yield and quality of sugarcane (*Saccharum spp.*) first ratoon.

Formatted: Font: (Default) Times New Roman, Not Bold

## 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 the yield, and quality of sugarcane (*Saccharum spp.*) first ratoon, under the Central Sudan Agro-climatic zone (CSAZ). The test crop was the sugarcane Co 6806 variety, which is occupying around 90% of cultivated areas. CSAZ is classified as semi-arid, with ~~at~~ the maximum air temperature range ~~ranges~~ of 31.6- 43.7 °C, minimum air temperature range ~~ranges~~ of 12.8-25.7 °C, Relative humidity ranges between 22% to 83% (Table-1), also annual rainfall ~~rainfall~~ were 191 mm and 236 mm at two growing seasons respectively [14]. The field experiment soil ~~has~~ ~~have~~ been described as Remaitabseries (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 a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD). The field experimental unit was 112.5 m<sup>2</sup> (15m x 7.5m) and consisted of five ridges. ~~Sugarcane's~~ ~~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 the experiment and ~~a~~ ~~parshall~~ ~~Parshall~~ flume was installed and a 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<sub>0</sub>) 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<sub>1</sub>: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age one day to day 50, DT<sub>2</sub>: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age 51 day to day 100, DT<sub>3</sub>: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age 101 day to day 150 day, DT<sub>4</sub>: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 151 to day 200, DT<sub>5</sub>: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 201 to day 250, DT<sub>6</sub>: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 251 to day 300, DT<sub>7</sub>: at which deficit irrigation was applied at ratoon age day 301 to day 350 and DT<sub>8</sub>: 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<sub>0</sub>) for the Guneid area was computed using the FAO-Penman-Monteith approach [15] and CROPWAT software. Seasonal actual evapotranspiration (ET<sub>a</sub>) 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 a function of the local climate, ratoon age and soil data according to Doorenbos and Kassam (1979) ~~as~~:

$$CWR = ET_0 \times K_c \dots \dots \dots \text{Eq. 1}$$

Formatted: Centered, Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

where CWR is ratoon water requirement (mm day<sup>-1</sup>), ET<sub>0</sub> is evapotranspiration of a reference plant under specified conditions, calculated by the class A pan evaporation method (mm day<sup>-1</sup>), and K<sub>c</sub> is the ratoon water requirement coefficient for sugarcane.

Soil samples were augured from each plot at the depth of 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~~ ~~days~~ after irrigation throughout the growing seasons.

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

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

Formatted: Not Raised by / Lowered by

**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.

Formatted: Font: Bold

**2.6. Water productivity (WP):** Water productivity is one way of irrigation performance indicators. It is defined as the ratio of crop yield to seasonal irrigation water applied including rainfall ~~rain fall~~ [19], it was calculated by using the following equation:

Formatted: Font: Bold

$$WP = Y/SI \dots \dots \dots \text{Eq. 2}$$

Formatted: Centered, Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

whereas WP is water productivity ( $\text{kg ha}^{-1}\text{m}^{-3}$ ), Y is the yield (kg) and SI is the seasonal irrigation water applied including rainfall (mm).

### 2.7. Statistical analysis:

Data collected were analyzed using the 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].

## 3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

**3.1. Crop water requirements (CWR):** Table (1) shows the climatic data of the experimental area for the years 2019 to 2021. Results indicated that the CSAZ climate is semi-arid, the maximum air mean temperature was  $38^{\circ}\text{C}$ , the minimum air temperature mean was  $20^{\circ}\text{C}$ , and the relative humidity mean was 53%. Also, annual rainfall was 191 mm and 236 mm in the 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 the Grand growth stage in which sugarcane ratoon needs a large amount of water, when the lowest ratoon water needs in the initial and tillering stages ranged from 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 from the months of July to September. In December before the sugarcane first ratoon has been harvested, crop water requirements were zero, because this month in this study was a dry-off period of the 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 a 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 a negative effect on the cane yield of the first ratoon. Cane yield parameters which were arranged and analyzed were; stalk height, stalk diameter, intermodal length and stalk population during the two growing seasons. Analysis of variance showed that deficit irrigation treatments at different growth periods of sugarcane ratoon significantly reduced stalk height, and stalk diameter in sugarcane ratoon due to water stress-restricted photosynthesis, elongation and lateral enlargement. Data which was shown in Table (3) and the finding were in accordance with [22]. Also, stalk height, stalk diameter and intermodal length were reduced when water deficit irrigation was 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 internode length ( $\text{DT}_4$  and  $\text{DT}_5$ ). Similar results were 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 influences the yield of sugarcane. Optimal irrigation practice ( $\text{DT}_0$ ) which gave 10.5 cm intermodal length during the first and second seasons, compared to 8.7 and 8.5 when deficit irrigation treatments  $\text{DT}_4$  and  $\text{DT}_5$  were applied. In spite of plant density is a major constituent of sugarcane yield, the effect of deficit irrigation application on stalk population during 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 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 considerably decreased the sugarcane ratoon population compared with optimum irrigation treatment which produced an intensive plant population. The reduction of plant population when water deficit was applied to sugarcane first ratoon was probably due to a reduction in the 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 the 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 a direct rise in cane yield. [23] who reported that the water deficit reduced the number of tillers 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 stalk weight which all significantly restrict sugarcane yield [28]. Therefore, stalk height and circumference determine the yield of sugarcane 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 canes had a direct correlation with the irrigation regime level. Also [31] had reported that deficit irrigation with a low level of water stress at tillering increases sugarcane plant numbers. The number of millable canes obtained with optimum irrigation was significantly the highest compared to the rest of the treatments.

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0.44", Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

The reduced competition of sugarcane for ~~nutrients~~nutrient, moisture and light might have helped in profuse tiller production and low shoot mortality resulting in realizing a higher number of millable canes [32]. [21], ~~were~~ reported that water stress restricted photosynthesis, elongation and lateral enlargement. [33], were observed that ~~the~~ furrow method, when irrigation was applied at longer intervals. ~~As~~With the result, the internodes' length and plant height ~~was~~were reduced. [23] ~~they had~~ found that water stress reduced the number of ~~tiller~~tillers 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 ~~the increased~~increase in competition of plant cane for ~~nutrients~~nutrient, moisture and sunlight. [34 and 35], ~~were in line of~~revealed that continuous availability of nutrients as per crop requirement and favorable soil moisture throughout the growth period of sugarcane increase cane ~~high~~yield.

**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 ~~the~~genetic nature of the variety [36].

~~In~~spid of the total soluble solid (brix %) is determining the total sugar production, ~~the~~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 ~~the~~ case of DT<sub>5</sub>, DT<sub>2</sub> and DT<sub>8</sub> deficit irrigation treatments, showed a high value of brix % in comparison to the other deficit irrigation treatments. These results are in agreement with those of [37] who reported that ~~the~~ quality of sugarcane did not vary.

Sucrose content in cane (pol %) is ~~totally~~controlled by ~~the~~ genetic makeup of a variety and climatic ~~condition~~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<sub>4</sub>, DT<sub>5</sub> and DT<sub>8</sub> deficit irrigation treatments, showed a high value of sucrose content in comparison to the other deficit irrigation treatments. Moreover, DT<sub>8</sub> deficit irrigation treatment which was applied during ~~the~~ maturity stage gave ~~the~~ highest pol ~~per cent~~percent in ~~the~~ mean of two growing seasons (11.7%), because weather factors prevailed during ~~the~~ maturity stage ~~and~~ play a major role ~~in~~on the 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~~season, respectively. These results are in line with those of [38] who reported that juice quality parameters such as sucrose ~~were~~was not affected by deficit irrigation treatments. In table (5), the result ~~of~~the 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 DT<sub>4</sub>, DT<sub>5</sub> and DT<sub>8</sub> have a 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 ~~practices~~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 ~~the~~ genetic makeup of the variety. Thus, ~~the~~ water deficit factor ~~have~~has little effect on sugar recovery during each season of investigation.

The data ~~about~~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 ~~not~~ 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-~~21~~ and 2021-~~22~~. The results showed that DT<sub>1</sub>, DT<sub>2</sub> and DT<sub>4</sub> treatment obtained the highest purity% ~~values~~value of 83.7, 84.0 and 84.4 as a mean of two growing seasons. While DT<sub>3</sub>, DT<sub>5</sub> and DT<sub>8</sub> recorded the lowest purity% values of 82.5, 82.8 and 82.8 respectively. ~~So~~So, this ~~means~~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<sub>0</sub>, DT<sub>3</sub>, and DT<sub>8</sub> treatments ~~were~~ recorded the lowest fiber% cane values in a mean of two growing seasons were 17.9%, 17.7%, and 17.7%, while DT<sub>4</sub>, DT<sub>5</sub>, DT<sub>6</sub>, and DT<sub>7</sub> achieved the highest fiber% values of cane 18.7, 18.8, 18.5, and 18.5 respectively. ~~The~~ adoption of full irrigation resulted in an improvement in cane juice quality which ~~was~~ reflected ~~in~~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 ~~the~~ weight of one cane and cane yield ~~is~~are positively correlated which ~~was agreed~~was agree with [39]. ~~Moreover~~Moreover, there were significant differences ~~in~~of deficit irrigation treatments on cane yield (Table 4). ~~So~~So, ~~the~~that optimum irrigation treatment (DT<sub>0</sub>) recorded the highest mean cane yield was 88.7 tc ha<sup>-1</sup>, compared to DT<sub>4</sub> and DT<sub>5</sub> treatments which ~~were~~ recorded the lowest mean values of cane yield of 74.4 tc ha<sup>-1</sup> and 74.5 tc ha<sup>-1</sup>, for the reason that high biomass crop requires large quantities of water for maximum production [40]. Deficit irrigation

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0.5",  
Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", Line spacing:  
Multiple 1.15 li

treatment reduced the cane yield of sugarcane ratoon which is clearly 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 compared to the first one, the reduction of ratoon cane yield in the first growing season was probably due to a reduction in total rainfall and the other climatic factors change.

**3.5. Effect of deficit irrigation on sugar yield at different growth periods of the 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 parameters and associated with an 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<sub>0</sub>, DT<sub>1</sub>, DT<sub>2</sub> and DT<sub>8</sub> which gave significantly higher sugar yields of 7.2 ts ha<sup>-1</sup>, 6.6 ts ha<sup>-1</sup>, 6.3 ts ha<sup>-1</sup> and 6.8 ts ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively. The mean of both two growing seasons, this attributed to the fact that deficit irrigation with a low level of water stress at tillering (DT<sub>1</sub>, and DT<sub>2</sub>, treatments) increase sugarcane plant numbers [31] and deficit irrigation at late season (DT<sub>8</sub>) improve sugar cane quality and the crop is well ripened before harvest [42]. Furthermore DT<sub>0</sub>, DT<sub>5</sub> and DT<sub>8</sub> were recorded high in Brix%, pol% cane and ERS% cane. However, deficit irrigation treatment DT<sub>4</sub> has significantly ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) increased purity per cent in juice when compared to other treatments, while water deficit during the mid-season stage DT<sub>4</sub>, and DT<sub>5</sub> 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 the rainy season has significantly ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) decreased cane and sugar yield (DT<sub>6</sub> and DT<sub>7</sub>). climatic data in Table (2) showed that in last October and November was applied to have high relative humidity % and high in evaporation (mm) that lead to a high reduction in sugar yield.

**3.6. Effect of water deficit on the number of irrigations applied and water saved of First ratoon:** The effect of water deficit on the 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 a huge amount of water has been saved when deficit irrigation treatments DT<sub>2</sub>, DT<sub>3</sub> and DT<sub>5</sub> were applied at the growth periods of ratoon and the water saved were 6100M<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>, 5500M<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>, and 5200M<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> respectively. All deficit irrigation treatments were saved water through the growing season which were ranged from 6100 M<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup> to 3800 M<sup>3</sup> ha<sup>-1</sup>. Several Number of irrigations were applied in the sugarcane first ratoon which was established in December and harvested in January under Gumed conditions, Sudan was thirty in optimum irrigation treatment and was twenty seven when deficit irrigation treatments were applied. Deficit irrigation is not only effective in number of irrigation but also in the 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) shows 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<sub>1</sub>, DT<sub>2</sub>, DT<sub>3</sub>, and DT<sub>4</sub> were applied followed by DT<sub>7</sub>, DT<sub>8</sub>, DT<sub>0</sub>, DT<sub>4</sub>, and DT<sub>5</sub> respectively. Moreover, cane yield reduction was not significant when compared to the benefits of the saved water. These results were agreed with [43], who was reported that deficit irrigation saved significant irrigation water without significant yield losses.

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript




Fig. (1). Effect of deficit irrigation on cane yield reduction % of first ratoon, seasons 2020-21 and -2021-22.




Fig. (2). Effect of deficit irrigation on sugar yield reduction % of first ratoon, seasons 2020-21 and -2021-22.

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

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered

Formatted: Centered, Line spacing: Multiple  
1.15 li

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 <sup>-1</sup> )	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 <sup>-1</sup> )	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 <sup>-1</sup> )	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	-	-	-

Formatted Table  
Formatted: Centered  
Formatted: Centered  
Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Formatted Table

Table (2): Sugarcane first ratoon water requirements of the experimental area for two growing seasons (2020/21-2021/22).

Month	E T <sub>0</sub> (mm/day)					CWR (mm/day)			Rainfall (mm/day)			
	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	K <sub>c</sub>	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> 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	Dry off	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Annual	Annual	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	191.0	236	214.0

CWR is crop water requirement (mm day<sup>-1</sup>), E T<sub>0</sub> is evapotranspiration (mm day<sup>-1</sup>), and K<sub>c</sub> is crop water requirement coefficient for sugarcane.

Formatted: Centered  
Formatted Table  
Formatted: Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Don't keep with next  
Formatted: Centered  
Formatted: Centered  
Formatted: Centered  
Formatted: Centered  
Formatted: Centered  
Formatted: Centered  
Formatted: Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Don't keep with next  
Formatted: Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Don't keep with next  
Formatted: Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Don't keep with next  
Formatted: Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Don't keep with next  
Formatted: Centered, None, Space Before: 0 pt, After: 0 pt, Don't keep with next

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)
--------	-------------------	---------------------	------------------------

Formatted Table  
Formatted: Centered

	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean
DT <sub>0</sub>	216.0 <sup>a</sup>	227.5 <sup>a</sup>	222.0	2.25 <sup>a</sup>	1.92 <sup>a</sup>	2.1	10.5 <sup>a</sup>	10.5 <sup>a</sup>	10.5
DT <sub>1</sub>	197.3 <sup>b</sup>	205.9 <sup>ab</sup>	202.0	2.25 <sup>a</sup>	1.88 <sup>ab</sup>	2.1	10.1 <sup>a</sup>	9.5 <sup>bc</sup>	9.8
DT <sub>2</sub>	186.7 <sup>d</sup>	189.3 <sup>bcd</sup>	188.0	2.16 <sup>ab</sup>	1.83 <sup>abc</sup>	2.0	9.0 <sup>ab</sup>	9.4 <sup>bc</sup>	9.2
DT <sub>3</sub>	189.0 <sup>cd</sup>	202.2 <sup>abc</sup>	196.0	2.22 <sup>ab</sup>	1.84 <sup>abc</sup>	2.0	9.8 <sup>ab</sup>	8.8 <sup>cde</sup>	9.3
DT <sub>4</sub>	164.7 <sup>f</sup>	176.7 <sup>cd</sup>	171.0	2.10 <sup>ab</sup>	1.78 <sup>c</sup>	1.9	8.9 <sup>b</sup>	8.5 <sup>de</sup>	8.7
DT <sub>5</sub>	160.0 <sup>g</sup>	163.0 <sup>d</sup>	162.0	2.06 <sup>b</sup>	1.76 <sup>c</sup>	1.9	9.2 <sup>ab</sup>	7.8 <sup>e</sup>	8.5
DT <sub>6</sub>	177.3 <sup>e</sup>	186.2 <sup>bcd</sup>	182.0	2.16 <sup>ab</sup>	1.82 <sup>bc</sup>	2.0	9.4 <sup>ab</sup>	8.5 <sup>de</sup>	9.0
DT <sub>7</sub>	189.3 <sup>cd</sup>	188.2 <sup>bcd</sup>	189.0	2.23 <sup>a</sup>	1.83 <sup>ab</sup>	2.0	10.0 <sup>a</sup>	9.3 <sup>bcd</sup>	9.7
DT <sub>8</sub>	194.0 <sup>bc</sup>	198.2 <sup>bc</sup>	196.0	2.24 <sup>a</sup>	1.84 <sup>abc</sup>	2.0	10.1 <sup>a</sup>	10.4 <sup>a</sup>	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<0.05)	5.64	29.1	-	0.17	0.097	-	1.51	0.96	-

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

DT<sub>0</sub>: Optimum irrigation, which was irrigated at 60% available soil moisture content at the root zone. DT<sub>1</sub> to DT<sub>8</sub>: Deficit irrigation was applied at the first growth period to deficit irrigation at the eighth growth period (from day one to day fifty after ratoon establishment and from day 350 to day 400 at the eighth 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 <sup>-1</sup> )			Stalk Weight (kg)			Cane yield (Ton ha <sup>-1</sup> )		
	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean
DT <sub>0</sub>	131.0 <sup>a</sup>	135.0 <sup>a</sup>	133.0	0.94 <sup>a</sup>	0.80 <sup>a</sup>	0.9	83.3 <sup>a</sup>	94.0 <sup>a</sup>	88.7
DT	131.0 <sup>a</sup>	132.0 <sup>a</sup>	132.0	0.81 <sup>b</sup>	0.71 <sup>ab</sup>	0.8	76.1 <sup>b</sup>	85.9 <sup>a</sup>	81.0
DT <sub>2</sub>	128.0 <sup>a</sup>	128.0 <sup>a</sup>	128.0	0.66 <sup>e</sup>	0.69 <sup>abc</sup>	0.7	71.7 <sup>d</sup>	77.0 <sup>ab</sup>	74.4
DT <sub>3</sub>	130.0 <sup>a</sup>	129.0 <sup>a</sup>	130.0	0.72 <sup>cd</sup>	0.65 <sup>bc</sup>	0.7	72.0 <sup>d</sup>	77.0 <sup>ab</sup>	74.5
DT <sub>4</sub>	126.0 <sup>ab</sup>	124.0 <sup>a</sup>	125.0	0.64 <sup>e</sup>	0.60 <sup>c</sup>	0.6	60.1 <sup>e</sup>	67.4 <sup>b</sup>	63.8
DT <sub>5</sub>	114.0 <sup>b</sup>	118.0 <sup>a</sup>	116.0	0.56 <sup>f</sup>	0.59 <sup>c</sup>	0.6	59.0 <sup>f</sup>	65.9 <sup>b</sup>	62.5
DT <sub>6</sub>	127.0 <sup>a</sup>	128.0 <sup>a</sup>	128.0	0.68 <sup>de</sup>	0.62 <sup>bc</sup>	0.7	74.0 <sup>c</sup>	77.0 <sup>ab</sup>	75.5
DT <sub>7</sub>	129.0 <sup>a</sup>	129.0 <sup>a</sup>	129.0	0.73 <sup>c</sup>	0.65 <sup>bc</sup>	0.7	74.3 <sup>c</sup>	77.7 <sup>ab</sup>	76.0
DT <sub>8</sub>	129.0 <sup>a</sup>	131.0 <sup>a</sup>	130.0	0.77 <sup>bc</sup>	0.67 <sup>bc</sup>	0.7	73.6 <sup>c</sup>	82.9 <sup>ab</sup>	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<0.05)	13.3	20.3	-	0.94 <sup>a</sup>	0.80 <sup>a</sup>	-	0.96	17.28	-

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

DT<sub>0</sub>: Optimum irrigation, which was irrigated at 60% available soil moisture content at the root zone. DT<sub>1</sub> to DT<sub>8</sub>: Deficit irrigation was applied at the first growth period to deficit irrigation at the eighth growth period (from day one to day fifty after ratoon establishment and from day 350 to day 400 at the eighth period). All these treatments were irrigated at 25% available soil moisture content at the root zone.

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

Formatted Table

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Font color: Text 1

Treat.	Brix % cane			Pol % cane			ERS %		
	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean
DT <sub>0</sub>	15.9 <sup>a</sup>	16.5 <sup>abc</sup>	16.2	11.0 <sup>a</sup>	11.5 <sup>ab</sup>	11.3	8.0 <sup>a</sup>	8.5 <sup>ab</sup>	8.3
DT <sub>1</sub>	15.1 <sup>b</sup>	16.5 <sup>abc</sup>	15.8	10.5 <sup>a</sup>	11.7 <sup>ab</sup>	11.1	7.5 <sup>a</sup>	8.7 <sup>ab</sup>	8.1
DT <sub>2</sub>	15.4 <sup>ab</sup>	17.0 <sup>ab</sup>	16.2	11.0 <sup>a</sup>	11.8 <sup>ab</sup>	11.4	8.0 <sup>a</sup>	8.8 <sup>ab</sup>	8.4
DT <sub>3</sub>	15.5 <sup>ab</sup>	16.7 <sup>abc</sup>	16.1	10.8 <sup>a</sup>	11.3 <sup>b</sup>	11.1	7.9 <sup>a</sup>	8.3 <sup>b</sup>	8.1
DT <sub>4</sub>	15.4 <sup>ab</sup>	16.7 <sup>abc</sup>	16.1	11.0 <sup>a</sup>	11.9 <sup>a</sup>	11.5	7.8 <sup>a</sup>	8.9 <sup>a</sup>	8.4
DT <sub>5</sub>	15.5 <sup>ab</sup>	17.2 <sup>a</sup>	16.4	10.9 <sup>a</sup>	11.6 <sup>ab</sup>	11.3	8.0 <sup>a</sup>	8.6 <sup>ab</sup>	8.3
DT <sub>6</sub>	15.4 <sup>ab</sup>	15.7 <sup>d</sup>	15.6	10.5 <sup>a</sup>	11.2 <sup>b</sup>	10.9	7.5 <sup>a</sup>	8.2 <sup>b</sup>	7.9
DT <sub>7</sub>	15.4 <sup>ab</sup>	16.2 <sup>cd</sup>	15.8	10.6 <sup>a</sup>	11.7 <sup>ab</sup>	11.2	7.6 <sup>a</sup>	8.7 <sup>ab</sup>	8.2
DT <sub>8</sub>	15.5 <sup>ab</sup>	16.3 <sup>bcd</sup>	15.9	11.5 <sup>a</sup>	11.9 <sup>a</sup>	11.7	7.5 <sup>a</sup>	8.9 <sup>a</sup>	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<0.05)	0.63	0.75	-	0.937	0.65	-	0.94	0.65	-

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

**DT<sub>0</sub>**: Optimum irrigation, which was irrigated at 60% available soil moisture content at the root zone. **DT<sub>1</sub> to DT<sub>8</sub>**: Deficit irrigation was/were applied at the first growth period to deficit irrigation at the eighth growth period (from day one to day fifty after ratoon establishment and from day 350 to day 400 at the eighth 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 <sup>-1</sup> )		
	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	Mean
DT <sub>0</sub>	83.0 <sup>a</sup>	85.19 <sup>a</sup>	84.1	17.9 <sup>abc</sup>	17.83 <sup>a</sup>	17.9	6.66 <sup>a</sup>	7.78 <sup>a</sup>	7.2
DT <sub>1</sub>	82.5 <sup>a</sup>	84.90 <sup>a</sup>	83.7	18.0 <sup>abc</sup>	17.93 <sup>a</sup>	18.0	5.71 <sup>b</sup>	7.46 <sup>ab</sup>	6.6
DT <sub>2</sub>	85.5 <sup>a</sup>	82.56 <sup>a</sup>	84.0	18.2 <sup>abc</sup>	18.30 <sup>a</sup>	18.3	5.74 <sup>b</sup>	6.76 <sup>abc</sup>	6.3
DT <sub>3</sub>	84.3 <sup>a</sup>	80.72 <sup>a</sup>	82.5	17.3 <sup>c</sup>	18.07 <sup>a</sup>	17.7	5.62 <sup>b</sup>	6.36 <sup>bc</sup>	6.0
DT <sub>4</sub>	83.9 <sup>a</sup>	84.94 <sup>a</sup>	84.4	19.1 <sup>a</sup>	18.27 <sup>a</sup>	18.7	4.81 <sup>c</sup>	6.01 <sup>bc</sup>	5.4
DT <sub>5</sub>	84.3 <sup>a</sup>	81.23 <sup>a</sup>	82.8	18.8 <sup>ab</sup>	18.83 <sup>a</sup>	18.8	4.66 <sup>c</sup>	5.65 <sup>c</sup>	5.2
DT <sub>6</sub>	81.0 <sup>a</sup>	85.84 <sup>a</sup>	83.4	18.5 <sup>a</sup>	18.43 <sup>a</sup>	18.5	5.55 <sup>b</sup>	6.31 <sup>bc</sup>	5.9
DT <sub>7</sub>	82.9 <sup>a</sup>	84.79 <sup>a</sup>	83.8	18.2 <sup>abc</sup>	18.73 <sup>a</sup>	18.5	5.65 <sup>b</sup>	6.75 <sup>abc</sup>	6.2
DT <sub>8</sub>	81.0 <sup>a</sup>	84.54 <sup>a</sup>	82.8	17.8 <sup>bc</sup>	17.50 <sup>a</sup>	17.7	6.26 <sup>a</sup>	7.41 <sup>ab</sup>	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<0.05)	5.03	6.49	-	1.2740	1.39	-	0.71	1.63	-

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

**DT<sub>0</sub>**: Optimum irrigation, which was irrigated at 60% available soil moisture content at the root zone. **DT<sub>1</sub> to DT<sub>8</sub>**: Deficit irrigation were/was applied at the first growth period to deficit irrigation at the eighth growth period (from day one to day fifty after ratoon establishment and from day 350 to day 400 at the eighth period). All these treatments were irrigated at 25% available soil moisture content at the root zone.

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

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

Formatted Table

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

Treatments	CWR M <sup>3</sup> (000) ha <sup>-1</sup>			Total sugarcane Kg(000) ha <sup>-1</sup>			Water productivity (WP) Kg (000) ha <sup>-1</sup> m <sup>-3</sup>		
	1 <sup>st</sup> season	2 <sup>nd</sup> season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> season	2 <sup>nd</sup> season	Mean	1 <sup>st</sup> season	2 <sup>nd</sup> season	Mean
DT <sub>0</sub> (control)	21.5	20.3	20.9	83.3 <sup>a</sup>	94.0 <sup>a</sup>	88.65	3.90	4.60	4.25
DT <sub>1</sub>	17.2	17.0	17.1	76.1 <sup>b</sup>	85.9 <sup>a</sup>	81.00	4.43	5.05	4.74
DT <sub>2</sub>	14.7	14.8	14.8	71.7 <sup>d</sup>	77.0 <sup>ab</sup>	74.35	4.89	5.19	5.05
DT <sub>3</sub>	15.2	15.5	15.3	72.0 <sup>d</sup>	77.0 <sup>ab</sup>	74.5	4.76	4.97	4.87
DT <sub>4</sub>	15.9	16.5	16.2	60.1 <sup>e</sup>	67.4 <sup>b</sup>	63.75	3.78	4.09	3.94
DT <sub>5</sub>	15.3	16.2	15.7	59.0 <sup>f</sup>	65.9 <sup>b</sup>	62.45	3.87	4.07	3.97
DT <sub>6</sub>	15.9	16.5	16.2	74.0 <sup>c</sup>	77.0 <sup>ab</sup>	75.5	4.66	4.67	4.67
DT <sub>7</sub>	16.5	17.3	16.9	74.3 <sup>c</sup>	77.7 <sup>ab</sup>	76.0	4.5	4.5	4.50
DT <sub>8</sub>	16.9	18.2	17.5	73.6 <sup>c</sup>	82.9 <sup>a</sup>	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	-	-	-

Formatted Table

Means sharing the same letters does not differ significantly at the 5% level of significance.  
CWR: Crop water requirement.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Deficit irrigation treatments (DT<sub>1</sub> to DT<sub>8</sub>) recorded a significant effect on cane and sugar yield reduction than the control (DT<sub>0</sub>) in the two seasons (2020-21 and 2021-22) under Gunied conditions, central Sudan Agro-climatic zone. DT<sub>2</sub>, T<sub>3</sub>, DT<sub>4</sub> and DT<sub>5</sub> treatments recorded the highest cane yield reduction were 16.04%, 15.84%, 28.11% and 29.56%. While DT<sub>2</sub>, DT<sub>4</sub>, DT<sub>6</sub> and DT<sub>8</sub> treatments recorded significant the highest sugar yield reduction were 17.04%, 25.07%, 28.53% and 17.87% respectively compared to DT<sub>0</sub> with full Irrigation. High Sugarcane water productivity was recorded at deficit irrigation treatments DT<sub>1</sub>, DT<sub>2</sub>, DT<sub>3</sub> and DT<sub>6</sub> respectively compared to optimum irrigation (DT<sub>0</sub>) as the first ratoon.

#### REFERENCES

1. Anonymous. Agricultural Situation in India, Agri Stat. 2005. <http://www.des.kar.nic.in>.
2. Czarnikow. 2016. 2015/16-In Deficit? [www.czarnikow.com/news/16-06-15/2015-16-deficit](http://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 tolerance: 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 is dependent on the accumulation of sugar in the leaf. Ann. Appl. Biol. 2020; 176: 65-74.

Formatted: Not Superscript/ Subscript

Formatted: Subscript

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 10 pt, Not Bold, Subscript, Not All caps

Formatted: Font: 11 pt

Formatted: Line spacing: Multiple 1.15 li

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. *BrazArch Biol Technol.* 2013; 56:735-748.
8. Machado R., Ribeiro R., Marchiori P., Machado D., Machado E., Landell M. Biometric and physiological responses to water deficit 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 Cesar 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.
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: 54. UN-FAO, Rome, Italy.
16. Doorenbos, J and Kassam. Guidelines for predicting crop water Irrigation and drainage paper, 1979; 24: 156. FAO, Rome, Italy.
17. Farbrother, H. G. Crop 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. 1994. Colney, Norwich NR7UB, England.
19. Howell, T. Irrigation engineering, evapo-transpiration. In: C. J. Arntzen, and E. M Ritter (eds.). *V Encycl. Opedia. of Agricultural Science.* 1994.
20. Gomez KA, Gomez AA. *Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research*, 2nd edition, A Wiley Inter. Sci. publication. John Wiley and Son, 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 sandy soils. *Am. J. Biol. Sci.*, 2010; 5:403-414.
24. Singh I, RP Verma, TK Srivastava. Growth, yield, irrigation water use efficiency, juice quality and economics of sugarcane 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): 1731-1738.
29. Bhingarde 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 Gezira 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. Yanan, T., Emteryd, O., Dianqing, L., & Grip, H. (1997). Effect of organic manure and chemical fertilizer on nitrogen uptake and nitrate leaching in a Eum-orthic anthrosols profile. *Nutrient cycling in Agroecosystems*, 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; 24: 156. 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 P., Sugarcane for water-limited environments. Genetic variation in cane yield and sugar content in response to water stress. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 2012.
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.