

## Original Research Article

### **YIELD AND QUALITY OF SOME SUGARCANE VARIETIES AS AFFECTED BY ROW AND HILL SPACING OF SEEDLINGS**

#### **ABSTRACT**

The ~~study present work~~ was conducted at Shandaweel Agricultural Research Station (latitude of 26 33° N and longitude of 31 41°E), Sohag Governorate, Egypt on a plant-cane grown in 2022/2023 and its 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon in 2023/2024 seasons. The main objective was to assess the advantage of growing some sugarcane varieties, using seedlings instead of cane cuttings, on their yield and quality. ~~A randomized complete block design in a split plot arrangement was used with three replications to lay out eighteen treatments, represented the combinations of three sugarcane varieties[(Giza 2004 27, commercially called G 4); (Giza 2003 47, G 3 and the commercial cultivar G.T.54 9, C9 as a chek], which occupied the main plots, whereas nine combinations among tow row spacing (100 and 120 cm) and three hill spacing of cane transplants (30, 40 and 50 cm) were distributed randomly in the sub plots. The experiment was conducted using a randomized complete block design (RCBD) in a split-plot arrangement with three replications (r=3). Data was analysis using.....Eighteen treatments were applied, comprising combinations of three sugarcane varieties: Giza 2004-27 (commercially known as G-4), Giza 2003-47 (G-3), and the commercial cultivar G.T.54-9 (C9, used as a check). These varieties were assigned to the main plots, while nine combinations of two row spacings (100 and 120 cm) and three hill spacings for cane transplants (30, 40, and 50 cm) were randomly allocated in the subplots.~~

Results showed that the tested sugarcane varieties varied significantly in stalk height, diameter and number of millable canes/fed, stalk weight kg/plant, cane and sugar yields (tons/fed), brix, sucrose, purity and sugar recovery percentages in both seasons. Sugarcane G.2004-27 variety exhibited the superiority in stalk weight (kg/plant) and cane yield while, sugarcane G.2003-47 showed a significant superiority in the brix, sucrose, and purity and sugar recovery percentages in both seasons.

Data show that increasing row spacing from 100 to 120 and hill space 30, 40 to 50 cm significantly on stalk height, diameter and number of millable canes/fed, stalk weight kg/plant, cane and sugar yields

: [1U] Comment

Analysis was carried out using.... : [2U] Comment  
Or data collected was analyzed using

All these should be in materials : [3U] Comment  
and methods

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

(tons/fed), brix, sucrose, purity and sugar recovery percentages in both seasons.

Under conditions of the present work, growing promising sugarcane variety G. 2004-27 in rows of 100 cm apart with 30 cm seedlings can be recommended to get the maximum cane yield/fed under Sohag Governorate.

## INTRODUCTION

Sugarcane is an important cash and industrial crop in Egypt, occupying 333 thousand feddan, production is estimated at 15.959 million tons of cane with an average yield of 46.706 ton/fed<sup>1</sup> (**Sugar Crops Council, annual report, 2023**).

In Egypt, sugarcane is grown in the traditional way, which is the method of planting with cane cuttings, which contains 3-4 buds/cane cutting, through which an amount of millable cane estimated at about 5-7 tons/fed is consumed, with a total of 350-500 thousand tons of cane is enough to plant 70.000 feddan planted during spring season. Recently, the Sugar Crops Research Institute at the Agricultural Research Center in Egypt adopted the production of seedlings for growing sugarcane with the aim of reducing the consumption of seeds this saves a few thousand tons of raw materials that can be delivered to mills for sugar extracting and also reducing irrigation water, as it is important to mention that a considerable amount of irrigation water can be saved during the period of cane seedlings production using bud chips in the nursery, compared to the field irrigation in the usual planting, as well as the possibility of growing with some other crops before planting cane. The method of planting by seedling cane is planting excised auxiliary buds of cane stalk, popularly known as bud chips. These bud chips are less bulky, easily transportable and more economical seed material. In case of using bud chips in planting about 150-200kg/fed of material will be markedly sufficient, where it results in a saving of about 97% of cane by weight **El-Soghier (2021)**.

Paying attention to different agricultural practices for sugarcane cultivation leads to achieving the highest productivity, one of these practices is row and seedling spacing. Row and seedling spacing has a direct effect on plant population. It plays a distinct role in the amount of solar radiation and hence, crop canopy development, which in turn affects photosynthesis and ultimately the dry matter produced by plant. **El-Geddawy et al. (2002) and**

<sup>1</sup>Sugar Crops Research Inst., ARC, Giza. Egypt

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

NOT INCLUDED IN THE :[4U]Comment  
REFERENCE SECTION

reference :[5U]Comment

Put reference :[6U]Comment

El-Shafai and Ismail (2006) reported that the widest row spacing resulted in the highest juice quality and stalk diameter. However, they also found that closer row spacing produced the tallest stalks, the highest number of millable canes, and increased cane and sugar yields/fed. ~~El-Geddawy, et al. (2002) and El-Shafai and Ismail (2006)~~ They found that the widest row spacing gave the highest juice quality and stalk diameter. Otherwise, They found that the distance row spacing gave the highest stalk height, number of millable canes, cane and sugar yields/fed. **Raskar and Bhoi (2003)** found that cane girth and number of millable canes were significantly higher with a 90-cm intra-row spacing compared with 30 or 60-cm intra-row spacing. However, Millable cane height was insignificantly affected by row spacing. **Abd El-Lattief (2016)** found that narrow inter-row spacing 100 cm produced higher number of millable canes, cane and sugar yields compared to the other inter-row spacing 120 and 140 cm. **Galal, et al. (2018)** indicated that planting sugarcane in rows spaced at 100 cm attained significant increases in the number of millable canes, stalk length, stalk weight, sucrose %, sugar recovery %, cane and sugar yields in the plant and 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon cane crops. **Gadallah and Abd El-Aziz-Rania (2019)** showed that planting sugarcane in rows spaced at 100 cm apart attained a significant increase in cane stalk height, number of millable canes and cane yield. While, stalk diameter, brix, sucrose and sugar recovery% as well as sugar yield were recorded surpassed the other varieties recorded at 120 cm row spacing.

In Egypt, the commercial cane variety G.T.54-9 occupies most of the area planted with sugarcane. Recently, Sugar Crops Research Institute developed a lot of promising varieties of sugarcane, among them G.2004-27, G.84-47 and G.2003-47. The newly bred varieties showed variable response to different agronomic practices. In this respect, many studies and researches carried out to evaluate sugarcane varieties for productivity and juice quality traits as well as significant variables among varieties were reported by **Ahmed, (2003); Ahmed, et al. (2008); Ismail, et al. (2008); Makhoul, et al. (2016); El-Bakry, (2018); Gadallah and Mehareb (2020); Ali, et al. (2022)** and **Hussein, et al. (2023)**.

The main objective of this study was to evaluate the method of planting by seedlings for some varieties of sugarcane when planting with different row spaces and different spaces between seedlings to obtain the highest yield of cane and sugar.

Reference is too old : [7U]Comment

Replace found with another : [8U]Comment  
word

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Select most recent references. : [9U]Comment  
Two or three references is okay

recast : [10U]Comment

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

The present work was carried out at Shandaweel Agricultural Research Station (latitude of 26 33° N and longitude of 31 41°E), Sohag Governorate, Egypt on a plant-cane (P.C.) grown in 2022/2023 and its 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon (F.R.) in 2023/2024 seasons. The main objective was to assess the advantage of growing some sugarcane varieties, using seedlings instead of cane cuttings, on their yield and quality. A randomized complete block design in a split-plot arrangement (RCBD) was used with three replications to lay out eighteen treatments, represented the combinations of three sugarcane varieties [(Giza 2004-27, commercially called G-4); (Giza 2003-47, commercially called G-3 and the commercial cultivar G.T.54-9, C9 as a check], which occupied the main plots, whereas nine combinations among two row spacing (100 and 120 cm) and three hill spacing of cane transplants (30, 40 and 50 cm) were distributed randomly in the sub plots. Healthy seedlings of 60 days age, previously produced using bud chips, was transplanted to the main field on the 1<sup>st</sup> week of May, 2022.

Bud-chip seedlings production started on the 1<sup>st</sup> week of March. Fresh harvested canes free from disease and pests were topped and bud chips were separated using bud-chipping manual tool. Stalks remained after the separation of buds was delivered to the sugar mill. Bud chips were soaked in warm water mixed in the Maxim XL 3.5% fungicide for ten minutes. The buds were sown in an upright position at 3-5 cm depth in polythene bags of 13x6 cm dimensions, filled with soil taken from the permanent field mixed with a small percentage (20%/seedling bag) of organic fertilizer as farmyard manure containing (0.35% N, 0.48% P, 1.2% K, 8% organic matter and 15% moisture). The nursery was irrigated daily. Nitrogen fertilizer was added at the rate of 5 kg ammonium nitrates (33.5% N)/1000 seedlings, which was divided into two doses: at the 30<sup>th</sup> and 40<sup>th</sup> day after planting.

Phosphorus fertilizer was added to the permanent field, at 30 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/fed as calcium super phosphate (15% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) during land preparation. Nitrogen fertilizer as urea (46% N) was applied to the plant-cane at 210 kg N/fed, which was divided into three doses: after the 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> hoeing and 30 days later *i.e.*, 45, 75 and 105 days after transplanting. In the 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon cane crop, 230 kg N/fed was applied, which was divided in two equal doses: at 15 days after ratoon initiation, *i.e.* after the 1<sup>st</sup> hand hoeing and 30 days later, *i.e.* after the 2<sup>nd</sup> hand hoeing. Potassium fertilizer was added once with the 2<sup>nd</sup> N-dose, at 24 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/fed as potassium sulfate (48% K<sub>2</sub>O) in both seasons.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

remove this from this section : [11U]Comment

what was the plot size? : [12U]Comment  
The total plot/field size used for the experiment?

statement was copied and : [13U]Comment  
pasted both in abstracts and materials and methods section

The other agronomic practices were done as recommended by the Sugar Crops Research Institute.

Mechanical and chemical properties of the upper 30 cm of the experimental soil showed that soil texture was clay loam, which contained 21.5 % sand, 29.3 % silt, 49.2 % clay; 94 mg/kg soil N, 18 mg/kg soil P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> and 117 ppm K<sub>2</sub>O with pH of 7.55.

#### **The recorded data:**

At harvest (1<sup>st</sup> week of March in the plant-cane and its 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon crop), a sample of 20 canes were randomly collected from the three middle rows of each experimental unit were cut, topped, cleaned up from trash, weighed and counted to estimate the following traits:

1. Stalk length (cm), which was measured from soil surface to the top visible dewlap.
2. Stalk diameter (cm), which was measured at the middle part of stalks.

At harvest the following traits were determined on plot basis and converted to feddan (4200 m<sup>2</sup>):

1. Number of millable canes (thousands/fed) was counted.
2. Net stalk fresh weight (kg).
3. Cane yield/fed (ton).
4. Sugar yield/fed (ton), which was estimated according to the following equation:

$$\text{Sugar yield/fed(ton)} = \text{cane yield/fed(ton)} \times \text{sugar recovery\%}$$

#### **Juice quality traits**

At harvest, a sample of 20 millable canes from each treatment was collected at random, cleaned and crushed to extract the juice, which was analyzed to determine the following quality traits:

1. Brix% (TSS: total soluble solids of juice), which was determined using "Brix Hydrometer" according to A.O.A.C. (2005).
2. Sucrose% was determined using "Sacharemeter" according to A.O.A.C.(2005).
3. Juice purity% was calculated using the following equation:

$$\text{Purity\%} = (\text{Sucrose\%}/\text{brix\%}) \times 100.$$

4. Sugar recovery% was calculated according to Yadav and Sharma (1980) as follows:  $\text{Sugar recovery\%} = [\text{sucrose\%} - 0.4 (\text{brix\%} - \text{sucrose\%}) \times 0.73]$

#### **Statistical analysis:**

prior to the establishment of the experiment, composite soil samples were randomly collected from different locations in the field using a 5mm (or the size of auger you used for your own experiment) soil auger at a depth of 0–30 cm to assess the physico-chemical properties..

the result of the physico-chemical properties of the soil for each year should be reported in a tabular form in result section

this should not be in this section.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

The collected data were statistically analyzed according to **Gomez and Gomez (1984)** using the computer "MSTAT-c" statistical analysis package described by **Freed, et al. (1989)**. The least significant differences (LSD) at 0.05 level of probability were calculated to compare the differences among means of treatments according to **Snedecor and Cochran (1981)**.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Growth characteristics and their effect of sugarcane varieties:

Results in Table (1) the tested sugarcane varieties varied significantly in stalk height, diameter and number of millable canes/fed in both seasons. The commercial G.T.54-9 variety had the highest diameter among the three varieties, followed by G.2004-27 and G.2003-47 which recorded the lowest values in these traits. While, G.2004-27 variety gave the highest stalk height and number of millable canes/fed in both seasons, however, the difference between G.T.54-9 and G.2004-27 varieties in stalk height was insignificant in both seasons. The variance among cane varieties in these traits may be due to their gene make-up. **Ismail, et al. (2008)** and **Ahmed, et al. (2008)** recorded differences among the tested cane varieties in stalk height and diameter. These results are in agreement with those reported by **Ahmed, (2003); Makhoulf, et al. (2016); El-Bakry, (2018); Gadallah and Mehareb(2020); Ali, et al. (2022)** and **Hussein, et al. (2023)**.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

Table (1): Effect of seedlings technology on growth characteristics of some sugarcane varieties in the 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons

| Varieties   | Stalk height (cm) |                 | Stalk diameter (cm) |                 | No. of millable canes/fed |                 |
|-------------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------------------|-----------------|
|             | 2022/23<br>P.C.   | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C.     | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C.           | 2023/24<br>F.R. |
| G.T.54-9    | 270.8             | 315.0           | 2.47                | 2.55            | 55.992                    | 64.026          |
| G.2004-27   | 275.2             | 315.4           | 2.39                | 2.47            | 56.668                    | 64.576          |
| G.2003-47   | 265.6             | 272.2           | 2.30                | 2.49            | 48.375                    | 55.833          |
| LSD at 0.05 | 4.99              | 5.33            | 0.04                | 0.04            | 0.381                     | 0.183           |

### Growth characteristics and their effect on row spacing and hill space:

Data in Table (2) show that increasing row spacing from 100 to 120 and hill space 30, 40 to 50cm led to a significant decrease in cane stalk height, number of millable canes/fed in the plant and 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon crops, while stalk diameter increasing in the plant and 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon crops,. This result could be due to the competition among cane plants for light in the dense planting, *i.e.* narrower row spacing. **Chang, (1974)** reported that the proportion of invisible solar radiation is so much increased than the visible solar radiation

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

due to dense sowing. The former has an elongation effect and hence accounts for the increase observed in stalk height when sugarcane was planted in close spaced rows. The same finding was reported by **El-Geddawy, et al. (2002)**; **El-Shafai and Ismail (2006)**; **Abd El-Lattief (2016)** and **Gadallah and Abd El-Aziz-Rania (2019)** who found that cane stalk height increased with decreasing row spacing .

**Table (2): Effect of seedlings technology on growth characteristics at different row and hill spacing in the 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons**

| Treatments     |                 | Stalk length (cm) |              | Stalk diameter (cm) |              | No. of millable canes/fed |              |
|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Row space (cm) | Hill space (cm) | 2022/23 P.C.      | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.        | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.              | 2023/24 F.R. |
| 100            | 30              | 288.8             | 310.4        | 2.26                | 2.46         | 56.413                    | 63.729       |
|                | 40              | 276.7             | 304.3        | 2.33                | 2.49         | 54.206                    | 62.371       |
|                | 50              | 271.6             | 299.7        | 2.40                | 2.48         | 52.973                    | 60.731       |
| 120            | 30              | 266.4             | 302.0        | 2.39                | 2.49         | 54.511                    | 62.250       |
|                | 40              | 263.1             | 299.0        | 2.44                | 2.53         | 52.676                    | 61.000       |
|                | 50              | 256.8             | 288.8        | 2.49                | 2.57         | 51.289                    | 58.788       |
| LSD at 0.05    |                 | 3.91              | 2.80         | 0.03                | 0.03         | 0.407                     | 0.213        |

### Effect of interaction between row spacing and hill space & sugarcane varieties on growth characteristics:

As for the significant interaction effects, stalk height and diameter was significantly affected by the interactions between row spacing and cane varieties in plant cane Table (3). The same interaction also showed a significant effect on the number of millable canes/fed in the plant cane and 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon. The Giza 2004-27 variety achieved the highest number of millable canes/fed with planning distance 100 cm /30cm in the plant cane and 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon which gave 59.627 and 66.587/fed in both seasons. While the highest cane stalk with planning distance 100 cm /30cm in the plant cane, on the contrary, the cane stalk thickness was obtained distance 120 cm /50cm in the plant cane.

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

**Table (3): Effect of seedlings technology on the interaction between different row and hill spacing and sugarcane varieties on growth characteristics in 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons**

| Treatments |                |                 | Stalk length (cm) |              | Stalk diameter (cm) |              | No. of millable canes/fed |              |
|------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Varieties  | Row space (cm) | Hill space (cm) | 2022/23 P.C.      | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.        | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.              | 2023/24 F.R. |
| G.T.54-9   | 100            | 30              | 294.3             | 324.0        | 2.35                | 2.48         | 58.435                    | 65.667       |
|            |                | 40              | 277.7             | 316.3        | 2.43                | 2.54         | 56.299                    | 65.033       |
|            |                | 50              | 271.0             | 315.0        | 2.48                | 2.53         | 55.063                    | 63.967       |
|            | 120            | 30              | 265.0             | 316.7        | 2.48                | 2.54         | 56.603                    | 64.507       |
|            |                | 40              | 261.0             | 312.3        | 2.53                | 2.57         | 55.467                    | 63.850       |
|            |                | 50              | 256.0             | 305.5        | 2.57                | 2.63         | 54.083                    | 61.130       |

|             |     |    |       |       |      |      |        |        |
|-------------|-----|----|-------|-------|------|------|--------|--------|
| G.2004-27   | 100 | 30 | 295.3 | 325.0 | 2.32 | 2.46 | 59.627 | 66.587 |
|             |     | 40 | 284.3 | 320.0 | 2.34 | 2.47 | 56.843 | 65.233 |
|             |     | 50 | 275.3 | 312.7 | 2.43 | 2.44 | 55.993 | 63.260 |
|             | 120 | 30 | 268.3 | 318.7 | 2.35 | 2.45 | 57.043 | 65.457 |
|             |     | 40 | 267.0 | 314.3 | 2.41 | 2.49 | 55.580 | 64.583 |
|             |     | 50 | 261.0 | 301.7 | 2.47 | 2.53 | 54.920 | 62.333 |
| G.2003-47   | 100 | 30 | 276.7 | 282.3 | 2.13 | 2.45 | 51.178 | 58.933 |
|             |     | 40 | 268.3 | 276.7 | 2.22 | 2.45 | 49.477 | 56.846 |
|             |     | 50 | 268.0 | 271.3 | 2.29 | 2.48 | 47.863 | 54.967 |
|             | 120 | 30 | 265.3 | 273.0 | 2.33 | 2.49 | 49.887 | 56.787 |
|             |     | 40 | 262.0 | 270.3 | 2.39 | 2.52 | 46.980 | 54.567 |
|             |     | 50 | 253.3 | 259.3 | 2.42 | 2.54 | 44.863 | 52.900 |
| LSD at 0.05 |     |    | 6.77  | NS    | 0.05 | NS   | 0.704  | 0.401  |

### Stalk weight kg/plant, cane yield and sugar yield (tons/fed) as affected by sugarcane varieties:

Sugarcane G.2004-27 variety exhibited the superiority in stalk weight (kg/plant) and cane yield recording significant increases amounted to 8.601 and 10.751 tons/fed higher than those produced by G.2003-47 variety, in the plant and 1<sup>st</sup>ratoon canes, respectively Table (4). Sugarcane G.T.54-9 variety exhibited the superiority in sugar yield recording significant increases amounted to 0.171 and 0.636 tons/fed higher than those produced by G.2003-47 variety, in the plant and 1<sup>st</sup>ratoon canes, respectively. These results could be attributed to higher values of stalk height and number of millable canes/fed (Table 1). These results are in agreement with those reported by **Ahmed (2003)** and **Ismail,et al. (2008)**.

Table (4): Effect of seedlings technology on stalk weight kg/plant, cane yield and sugar yield (tons/fed) of some sugarcane varieties in 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons

| Varieties   | Stalk weight (kg/plant) |                 | Cane yield (ton/fed) |                 | Sugar yield (ton/fed) |                 |
|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|-----------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
|             | 2022/23<br>P.C.         | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C.      | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C.       | 2023/24<br>F.R. |
| G.T.54-9    | 0.991                   | 1.033           | 55.486               | 66.147          | 6.250                 | 7.934           |
| G.2004-27   | 0.986                   | 1.041           | 55.879               | 67.253          | 6.117                 | 7.515           |
| G.2003-47   | 0.978                   | 1.012           | 47.277               | 56.502          | 6.079                 | 7.298           |
| LSD at 0.05 | 0.008                   | 0.002           | 0.387                | 0.288           | 0.077                 | 0.177           |

### Stalk weight kg/plant, cane yield and sugar yield (tons/fed) as affected by row spacing and hill space:

Data in Table (5) clear that stalk weight kg/plant, cane yield and sugar yield (tons/fed) were significantly and negatively influenced by increasing row spacing, where the wider the row spacing, the higher the stalk weight kg/plant and sugar yield (ton/fed) and lower cane yield(ton/fed). This result was true in both of the plant cane and 1<sup>st</sup>ratoon crops. This result can be attributed to lower values of stalk height and number of millable canes/fed (Table 2) and sugar recovery(Table 8) at the widest row spacing (120

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

cm). Planting sugarcane in rows spaced at 100-cm with 30cm apart produced 1.319 and 1.387 tons/fed of cane higher than that grown at 120-cm rows, in plant cane and 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon crops respectively. These results are in agreement with those reported by El-Geddawy, *et al.* (2002); El-Shafai and Ismail (2006) and Gadallah and Abd El-Aziz-Rania (2019).

**Table (5): Effect of row spacing and hill space on stalk weight kg/plant, cane yield and sugar yield (tons/fed) in 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons**

| Treatments     |                 | Stalk weight (kg/stalk) |              | Cane yield (ton/fed) |              | Sugar yield (ton/fed) |              |
|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Row space (cm) | Hill space (cm) | 2022/23 P.C.            | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.         | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.          | 2023/24 F.R. |
| 100            | 30              | 0.981                   | 1.030        | 55.346               | 65.716       | 6.316                 | 7.525        |
|                | 40              | 0.981                   | 1.028        | 53.242               | 64.154       | 6.173                 | 7.620        |
|                | 50              | 0.989                   | 1.017        | 52.437               | 61.808       | 6.085                 | 7.308        |
| 120            | 30              | 0.991                   | 1.032        | 54.027               | 64.329       | 6.331                 | 7.943        |
|                | 40              | 0.981                   | 1.031        | 51.733               | 62.920       | 6.042                 | 7.579        |
|                | 50              | 0.985                   | 1.035        | 50.499               | 60.878       | 5.944                 | 7.518        |
| LSD at 0.05    |                 | 0.007                   | 0.002        | 0.439                | 0.288        | 0.081                 | 0.099        |

**Effect of interaction between row spacing & hill space and sugarcane varieties on stalk weight kg/plant, cane yield and sugar yields (tons/fed):**

Stalk weight kg/plant and cane yield was significantly affected by the interaction between row spacing & hill spacing x sugarcane varieties in the plant cane and 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon crops Table (6). Insignificant variance in sugar yield was found in cane plants. However, the difference in sugar yield was found between these interactions in the 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon crops.

**Table (6): Effect of seedlings technology on the interaction between different row and hill spacing and sugarcane varieties on stalk weight kg/plant, cane yield and sugar yield (tons/fed) in 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons**

| Treatments |                |                 | Stalk weight (kg/stalk) |              | cane yield (ton/fed) |              | Sugar yield (ton/fed) |              |
|------------|----------------|-----------------|-------------------------|--------------|----------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| Varieties  | Row space (cm) | Hill space (cm) | 2022/23 P.C.            | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.         | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.          | 2023/24 F.R. |
| G.T.54-9   | 100            | 30              | 0.986                   | 1.042        | 57.600               | 68.393       | 6.420                 | 7.774        |
|            |                | 40              | 0.988                   | 1.039        | 55.647               | 67.600       | 6.219                 | 7.918        |
|            |                | 50              | 0.999                   | 1.022        | 55.028               | 65.350       | 6.149                 | 7.790        |
|            | 120            | 30              | 1.008                   | 1.039        | 57.033               | 67.030       | 6.464                 | 8.398        |
|            |                | 40              | 0.977                   | 1.025        | 54.178               | 65.470       | 6.155                 | 7.907        |
|            |                | 50              | 0.988                   | 1.031        | 53.427               | 63.040       | 6.092                 | 7.817        |
| G.2004-27  | 100            | 30              | 0.979                   | 1.041        | 58.373               | 69.300       | 6.302                 | 7.337        |
|            |                | 40              | 0.996                   | 1.036        | 56.620               | 67.583       | 6.211                 | 7.509        |
|            |                | 50              | 0.993                   | 1.025        | 55.578               | 64.837       | 6.064                 | 7.106        |
|            | 120            | 30              | 0.985                   | 1.025        | 56.200               | 68.713       | 6.184                 | 7.900        |
|            |                | 40              | 0.989                   | 1.048        | 54.987               | 67.690       | 6.034                 | 7.613        |
|            |                | 50              | 0.974                   | 1.049        | 53.517               | 65.397       | 5.906                 | 7.625        |
| G.2003-47  | 100            | 30              | 0.978                   | 1.009        | 50.063               | 59.453       | 6.226                 | 7.465        |
|            |                | 40              | 0.959                   | 1.008        | 47.459               | 57.280       | 6.088                 | 7.432        |
|            |                | 50              | 0.976                   | 1.005        | 46.705               | 55.237       | 6.042                 | 7.028        |
|            | 120            | 30              | 0.979                   | 1.008        | 48.847               | 57.243       | 6.345                 | 7.529        |

|                    |  |    |              |              |              |              |           |              |
|--------------------|--|----|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------|--------------|
|                    |  | 40 | 0.980        | 1.019        | 46.033       | 55.600       | 5.938     | 7.218        |
|                    |  | 50 | 0.993        | 1.025        | 44.553       | 54.197       | 5.834     | 7.112        |
| <b>LSD at 0.05</b> |  |    | <b>0.012</b> | <b>0.003</b> | <b>0.760</b> | <b>0.498</b> | <b>NS</b> | <b>0.114</b> |

### Quality characteristics and their impact on sugarcane varieties

Sugarcane G.2003-47 showed a significant superiority in the brix, sucrose, purity and sugar recovery (%) over that recorded by G.2004-47 and G.T.54-9, in the plant cane and the 1<sup>st</sup>ratoon Table (7). Differences among cane varieties in this trait were also found by **Ahmed, (2003); Ahmed,et al. (2008); Ismail,et al. (2008);Makhlouf, et al. (2016); El-Bakry, (2018); Gadallah and Mehareb(2020); Ali,et al. (2022) and Hussein,et al. (2023).**

Table (7): Effect of seedlings technology on juice quality of some sugarcane varieties in the 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons

| Varieties          | Brix %          |                 | Sucrose %       |                 | Purity%         |                 | Sugar recovery% |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                    | 2022/23<br>P.C. | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C. | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C. | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C. | 2023/24<br>F.R. |
| G.T.54-9           | 21.02           | 22.394          | 17.78           | 18.99           | 84.58           | 84.77           | 11.27           | 12.00           |
| G.2004-27          | 20.98           | 21.417          | 17.53           | 17.89           | 83.56           | 83.51           | 10.95           | 11.18           |
| G.2003-47          | 23.71           | 23.828          | 20.26           | 20.37           | 85.49           | 85.48           | 12.68           | 12.92           |
| <b>LSD at 0.05</b> | <b>0.26</b>     | <b>0.36</b>     | <b>0.25</b>     | <b>0.35</b>     | <b>1.36</b>     | <b>0.25</b>     | <b>0.12</b>     | <b>0.23</b>     |

### Quality characteristics and their impact on row spacing and hill space:

Data in Table (8) show that increasing row spacing from 100 to 120 and hill spacing 30, 40 and 50 cm led to a significant increase in brix, sucrose, purity and sugar recovery (%) in the plant and 1<sup>st</sup>ratoon crops. These results may be due to the great competition among plants for light and nutrients as well as mutual shading compared in case of using high rate of seeds for planting. Solar radiation has an effect on brix% and sucrose% (**Chang, 1974**). The same finding was reported by **El-Geddawy,et al. (2002);Galal,et al., (2018) and Gadallah and Abd El-Aziz-Rania (2019).**

Table (8): Effect of seedlings technology on juice quality at different row and hill spacing in the 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons

| Treatments         |                 | Brix %          |                 | Sucrose %       |                 | Purity%         |                 | Sugar recovery% |                 |
|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Row space (cm)     | Hill space (cm) | 2022/23<br>P.C. | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C. | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C. | 2023/24<br>F.R. | 2022/23<br>P.C. | 2023/24<br>F.R. |
| 100                | 30              | 21.50           | 21.507          | 18.15           | 18.19           | 84.39           | 84.52           | 11.46           | 11.50           |
|                    | 40              | 21.87           | 22.308          | 18.48           | 18.89           | 84.43           | 84.65           | 11.66           | 11.93           |
|                    | 50              | 21.98           | 22.209          | 18.58           | 18.80           | 84.49           | 84.60           | 11.67           | 11.87           |
| 120                | 30              | 21.99           | 23.222          | 18.62           | 19.67           | 84.64           | 84.69           | 11.68           | 12.39           |
|                    | 40              | 21.95           | 22.786          | 18.58           | 19.24           | 84.62           | 84.24           | 11.64           | 12.10           |
|                    | 50              | 22.09           | 23.248          | 18.72           | 19.69           | 84.69           | 84.66           | 11.84           | 12.39           |
| <b>LSD at 0.05</b> |                 | <b>0.23</b>     | <b>0.28</b>     | <b>0.22</b>     | <b>0.23</b>     | <b>NS</b>       | <b>0.14</b>     | <b>0.12</b>     | <b>0.13</b>     |

### Effect of interaction between row spacing and hill space & sugarcane varieties on juice quality:

In respect to the significant interaction effects, sucrose, purity and sugar recovery (%) was significantly affected by the interaction between row spacing and hill space & sugarcane varieties in the 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon only. Insignificant variance in brix% was found in cane plant and 1<sup>st</sup> ratoon, as well as sucrose, purity and sugar recovery (%) in the cane plant (Table 9).

Formatted: Indent: First line: 0"

**Table (9): Effect of seedlings technology on the interaction between different row and hill spacing and sugarcane varieties on juice quality in 2022/2023 and 2023/2024 growing seasons**

| Treatments  |                |                 | Brix %       |              | Sucrose %    |              | Purity%      |              | Sugar recovery% |              |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|--------------|
| Varieties   | Row space (cm) | Hill space (cm) | 2022/23 P.C. | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C. | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C. | 2023/24 F.R. | 2022/23 P.C.    | 2023/24 F.R. |
| G.T.54-9    | 100            | 30              | 20.79        | 21.24        | 17.58        | 17.96        | 84.54        | 84.54        | 11.15           | 11.37        |
|             |                | 40              | 20.97        | 21.86        | 17.69        | 18.51        | 84.33        | 84.69        | 11.18           | 11.71        |
|             |                | 50              | 20.96        | 22.20        | 17.68        | 18.83        | 84.35        | 84.84        | 11.17           | 11.92        |
|             | 120            | 30              | 21.06        | 23.35        | 17.85        | 19.84        | 84.75        | 84.97        | 11.33           | 12.53        |
|             |                | 40              | 21.08        | 22.63        | 17.88        | 19.15        | 84.80        | 84.64        | 11.36           | 12.08        |
|             |                | 50              | 21.23        | 23.08        | 17.98        | 19.61        | 84.69        | 84.97        | 11.40           | 12.40        |
| G.2004-27   | 100            | 30              | 20.60        | 20.27        | 17.22        | 16.90        | 83.58        | 83.37        | 10.80           | 10.59        |
|             |                | 40              | 20.94        | 21.25        | 17.50        | 17.76        | 83.60        | 83.56        | 10.97           | 11.11        |
|             |                | 50              | 21.23        | 20.99        | 17.72        | 17.53        | 83.47        | 83.51        | 10.91           | 10.96        |
|             | 120            | 30              | 21.02        | 22.02        | 17.57        | 18.41        | 83.59        | 83.61        | 11.00           | 11.50        |
|             |                | 40              | 20.99        | 21.66        | 17.54        | 18.05        | 83.55        | 83.33        | 10.97           | 11.25        |
|             |                | 50              | 21.08        | 22.31        | 17.62        | 18.67        | 83.59        | 83.71        | 11.04           | 11.66        |
| G.2003-47   | 100            | 30              | 23.11        | 23.01        | 19.65        | 19.70        | 85.04        | 85.64        | 12.44           | 12.56        |
|             |                | 40              | 23.71        | 23.81        | 20.24        | 20.41        | 85.36        | 85.71        | 12.83           | 12.97        |
|             |                | 50              | 23.76        | 23.44        | 20.35        | 20.03        | 85.65        | 85.47        | 12.94           | 12.73        |
|             | 120            | 30              | 23.90        | 24.29        | 20.45        | 20.77        | 85.58        | 85.48        | 12.99           | 13.15        |
|             |                | 40              | 23.76        | 24.06        | 20.32        | 20.53        | 85.52        | 85.30        | 12.90           | 12.98        |
|             |                | 50              | 23.97        | 24.35        | 20.57        | 20.77        | 85.81        | 85.30        | 13.03           | 13.12        |
| LSD at 0.05 |                |                 | NS           | NS           | NS           | 0.40         | NS           | 0.24         | NS              | 0.23         |

## WHERE IS THE CONCLUSION

## REFERANCES

**Abd El-Lattief, E.A.A. (2016).** Yield and yield attributes of sugarcane as affected by some crop management treatments. I J Res Eng Appl. Sci., 6(12): 11-19.

**A.O.A.C. (2005).** Association of Official Analytical Chemists. Official methods of analysis, 26<sup>th</sup> Ed. A.O.A.C., Int., Washington, D.C; USA.

**Ahmed, A.Z.; Osman M.S.H. and Mohamed A. (2008).** Effect of excessive nitrogen application on yield and quality of three sugarcane varieties. Intern. Conf. "IS-2008" Meeting the Challenges of Sugar Crops & Integrated Industries in Developing Countries. Held at Sinai Univ., 11-14 Sep., Al-Arish, Egypt. pp. 34-39.

What were the conclusions : [17U]Comment and recommendations drawn from the entire experiment?

REFERANCES : [18U]Comment

- Ahmed, A.Z. (2003).** Assessment of the optimum nitrogen level and seed rate for two promising sugarcane varieties. *Egypt. J. Appl. Sci.*, **18** (6B): 559-573.
- Ali, A.M.K.; A.F.I. Gadallah and O.A. Khalil (2022).** Effect of harvest age and seed rate on yield and quality of some sugarcane varieties. *Egypt. J. Agric. Res.*, 100 (4): 540-554.
- Chang, J.H. (1974).** Radiation distribution within the plant community: 36-42. *Climate and Agriculture*, Aldine Publishing Company, Chicago, Illinois, USA.
- El-Bakry, A. (2018).** Effect of row spacing on some sugarcane varieties yield and juice quality. *J. Biol. Chem. Environ. Sci.*, 13(2): 105-120.
- El-Geddawy, I.H.; D.G. Darweish; A.A. El-Sherbiny and E.E.A. El-Hady (2002).** Effect of row spacing and number of buds/seed sets on growth characters of first ratoon crops for some sugar cane varieties. *Pakistan Sugar J.*, **17** (3): 7-14.
- El-Shafai, A.M.A. and A.M.A. Ismail (2006).** Effect of row spacing on yield and quality of some promising sugarcane varieties. *Egypt. Appl. Sci.*, **21** (11): 32-46.
- El-Soghier, A.N. (2021).** Study the sugarcane planting using bud chips and conventional methods, Master of Science. Fac. Sugar and Integrated Industries Tech, Assuit Univ.
- Freed, R.S.P.; S.P. Eisensmith; S. Goetz, D. Recosky, V.W. Smail and P. Wolberg (1989).** User's Guide MSTAT-C Software program for the design management and analysis of agronomic research experiments. Michigan State Univ., USA.
- Ismail, A.M.A.; M.A. Bekheet and A.S. Abo El-Hamd. (2008).** Yield and quality of four sugarcane varieties as influenced by seed rate and nitrogen fertilization. *Egypt. J. Appl. Sci.*, **23** (1): 107-123.
- Gadallah, A.F.I. and Rania M. Abd-El-Aziz (2019).** Effect of row spacing & nitrogen fertilization on yield & quality of some sugarcane varieties. *J. Bio. Chem. Env. Sci.*, 14 (1), 215-233.
- Gadallah, A.F.I. and E.M. Mehareb (2020).** Yield and quality of some sugarcane varieties as affected by irrigation number. *SVU-International J. Agric. Sci.*, 2 (2): 144-165.
- Galal, M.O.A.; M.A.M. Osman and A.M.K. Ali (2018).** Evaluation of some promising sugarcane varieties for yield, quality and natural infection with Pokkah Boeng disease under different row spacing. *J Agri Res* 3(9):1-13.

- Gomez, K.A. and A.A. Gomez (1984).**Statistical Procedures for Agricultural Research. John Willey and Sons. Inc., New York.
- Makhlouf, B.S.I.; Dalia I.H. El-Geddawy and A.E. Mohamed (2016).**Performance evaluation of three sugarcane varieties under different levels of nitrogen fertilization and two seeding rates. Assiut J. Agric. Sci., **47** (5): 12-36.
- Hussein, O.A.Kh.; A.F.I. Gadallah and M.E.M. Ibrahim (2023).**Enhancement of production and quality of sugarcane using nitrogen and vinasses. Egyptian sugar J.(20): 3-76.
- Raskar, B.S. and P.G. Bhoi (2003).** Yield attributes of sugarcane as influenced by intra-row spacing, fertilizer levels and planting materials. Indian Sugar, **53** (5): 327-331.
- Snedecor, G.W. and W.G. Cochran (1981).**Statistical Methods. Seventh Ed. Iowa State Univ. Press, Ames, Iowa, USA.
- Yadav, R.L. and R.K. Sharma (1980).** Effect of nitrogen level and harvesting date on quality characteristics and yield of four sugar cane genotypes. Indian J Agric Sci. 50: 581-589.