

Original Research Article

Agro-economical evaluation for intercropping sugar Beet and Barley under combinations of barley cutting and Nitrogen level treatments

ABSTRACT

This study conducted to study the agro-economic effect of intercropping sugar beet and barley under combinations of barley cutting and Nitrogen levels. Field trials conducted using a split plot design with three replications at the Farm of Gemmeiza Agricultural Research Station, Egypt during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seasons. Sugar beet planted on both sides of the bed and barley plant on the top of all beds at the rate of 25% of the sole culture. Sugar beet with companion barley under three cut treatments (no cut, cut before heading (C1) and cut after heading (C2)) and three nitrogen fertilization levels (80, 100 and 120kgN/feddan (feddan=4200m²)) were studied, as well as to study competitive relationships land equivalent ratio (LER). Results revealed that cut and nitrogen treatments had significant effects on most traits of sugar beet and barley in both seasons. Significant cuts*N interaction effects were found for sugar beet and barley traits in both seasons. LER. were greater than unit (1.15 and 1.16) by intercropping sugar beet with barley under N fertilizer rate 120kg N/feddan with both no cut and C1. The effect of cuts and nitrogen interaction on LER across the two seasons increase the land usage. The highest yield advantage for RCC (89.49 and 73.54) was recorded with C1 at 120Kg N/feddan in both seasons respectively, indicating the effect of barley cuts and N fertilizer rates on yield and aggressivity (AG) values of sugar beet and barley. The highest values Total income (L.E.), Net return and economic return (L.E.) obtained from sugar beet under 120kgN rate * no cut or C1 treatments in both seasons. Agro-economically biplot graph recommended that intercropping barley with sugar beet under 120kg N rate * no cut or C1 drive the maximum values of productivity of sugar beet and competitive relationships and yield of both crops.

Keywords: *Agro-economic, net return, sucrose%, LER, RCC*

1. INTRODUCTION

Maximize the land usage to accelerate productivity gains may encourage a rapid closure of the expected food security gap. Intercropping (growing crops in the same area as a mixed stands) is the term of land use cultivation, raising crop system than growing them separately [1]. Common advantages of different forms of intercropping are exploiting more efficiently environments with limiting growth resources [2]. In addition to the better use of growth, better weed management [3], and pest control [4], assurance against failure of crop [1], reduced fertilizer requirement [5] and better soil fertility [6] than sole cropping.

The choice of the component crops in the intercropping cultivation is crucial. Under intercropping system, attention should be given to the crops that can grow together with minimal competition and maximum profit [7]. Among the important crops in the Egyptian agricultural system are the sugar crops. Increasing the sugar yield per unit area of sugar crops is, thus, a national demand and could be achieved by adopting suitable cultural practices and applying intercropping. An agronomic advantage had been demonstrated when sugar beet was intercropped with other winter barley crop [8]. These studies used the land equivalent ratio (LER) developed by [9] & [10] to determine the effectiveness of intercropping relative to sole cropping.

The most important purpose of sugar beet growers is to increase nitrogen use efficiency. In Egypt, the recommended rate of nitrogen for sugar beet varied from 60 to 120 kg per feddan, depending on the use of organic fertilizers and on a range of site-specific characteristics like soil type and climate as well as cropping systems [11], [12], [13]. Effect of nitrogen rates on sugar beet yield and its attributes was studied by [14], [15] reported high values of root characteristics of pure stand sugar beet when fertilized with 100 to 120 kg N/fed compared to other low levels of mineral nitrogen. Sugar beet is an efficient nitrogen user. [16], [17] reported that crops that do compete for a nutrient might be successfully intercropped with one another in the field in order to control environmental losses of that nutrient.

Barley can grow fast, suppress weed pressure and provide high yield in terms of dry weight. As forage, barley has higher nutritive value than oat, triticale and wheat in intercropping systems [18]. Barley forage had higher digestible dry matter (DM), lower acid detergent fiber (ADF) concentration and higher crude protein (CP)

Comment [L1]: This study was conducted to investigate

Comment [L2]: Results from this study

Comment [L3]: Include the P-value

56 [19]. Cutting barley at early growth stages (45 and 55 DAS) resulted in the production of higher forage yield
 57 with higher quality [20].

58 The use of LER, with such a model, would result in a biased estimate of yield gain towards the
 59 intercropping treatments. Therefore, alternative indices were developed to fairly determine effectiveness of
 60 intercropping compared to pure stands on an unbiased basis, such as the effective land equivalent ratio (ELER)
 61 modified by [21]. This index would provide a realistic estimate to the yield gain of the additive intercropping
 62 system compared to the sole crops.

63 The objective of this investigation was to study the effect of barley plant cuts and different nitrogen
 64 fertilizer rates on yield and its components of barley intercropped with sugar beet as well as competitive
 65 relationships and net return.

66
 67 **2. Materials & Methods**

68 The field experiments were conducted at the Experimental Farm of Gemmeiza Agriculture Research Station,
 69 Agricultural Research Center (ARC), Egypt during 2018/ 2019 and 2019/2020 growing seasons.

70
 71 **2.1. Field Experiment:**

72 The field experiment included 27 treatments which were the combination of three cut treatments of barley
 73 (no cut, cut before heading and cut after heading), three nitrogen fertilization levels (80, 100 and 120 kg N/fed),
 74 and three intercropping patterns (pure stand sugar beet, pure stand of barley and sugar beet was planted on both
 75 sides of the bed (120 cm width) and barley plant on the top of all beds distributed at the rate of 25% of the sole
 76 culture).The treatments were arranged in a split plot design with three replications, where intercropping pattern
 77 occupied the main plot, while the combination of cut treatments of barley and nitrogen fertilizer levels were
 78 distributed randomly in the sub plot. The experimental unit area was 4.8 m width × 3 m length= 14.4 m² i.e 4
 79 ridges (120 width × 3 m length).

80 Sugar beet was planted on both sides of the bed (120 cm width) 20 cm apart between hills and thinned
 81 to one plant/hill in all intercropping treatments and sugar beet pure stand, which was planted on one side of the
 82 ridges (60 cm width) spaced at 20 cm apart between hills to give 35000 plants fed⁻¹.Barley was planted in all
 83 intercropping treatments at 25% of sole culture seed rate distributed on the top of sugar beet beds. The sole
 84 culture of barley 100% was planted on broadcasting at seed rate of 60 kg fed⁻¹. Diamond cultivar of sugar beet
 85 and cultivar of barley Giza 123 were used in this study.

86 Sugar beet or barley sole and intercropping (sugar beet + barley) were evaluated under three cut
 87 treatments of barley as follows:

88 **I- Cuts treatment of barley:**

- 89 C0: no cut.
 90 C1: cut before heading (after 55 days after sowing).
 91 C2: cut after heading (after 85 days after sowing).

92 **II- Nitrogen fertilizer levels:**

93 Three levels of nitrogen fertilizer doses (80 “equal the recommended dose of sugar beet”, 100 and 120
 94 kg N fed⁻¹)were applied in the form of ammonium nitrate (33.5% N) at three equal doses distributed before first,
 95 second and third irrigations, respectively.

96 The preceding summer crop was maize in both seasons. Phosphorus fertilizer was added during land
 97 preparation in the form of calcium superphosphate (15.5% P₂O₅) at the rate of 200 kg fed⁻¹. Thinning sugar beet
 98 took place after45 days after sowing to one plant/hill at 20 cm apart. The other agricultural practices of growing
 99 barley with sugar beet were applied as recommended by The Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation.
 100 Sowing sugar beet was in 24/10/2018 and 22/10/2019 in the first and second seasons, respectively; and barley
 101 was planted after 21 days from sugar beet planted (just before the first irrigation of sugar beet).

102 This study aimed to determine the effect of intercropping barley cv. (Giza123) with sugar beet cv.
 103 Diamond under three cut treatments and three different levels of nitrogen on yield and yield components of both
 104 crops. Also, land equivalent ratio (L.E.R.) as well as competitive ratio (C.R.) and yield advantages were studied.

105
 106 **2.2. Soil Sampling and Analysis**

107 A representative soil sample of the field was taken from 0–30 cm layer and used for determining some
 108 physical and chemical properties of the studied soil during 2018 and 2019 seasons [22].The mechanical and
 109 chemical analyses of the experimental sites are recorded in Table (1).

110
 111 **Table 1. Physical and chemical properties of the experimental soil during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020**
 112 **growing season.**

Soil depth, cm	0 — 30				
Particle size distribution	2018/	2019/	Total macronutrients, %	2018/	2019/

	2019	2020		2019	2020
Coarse sand, %	5.23	5.19	N	0.144	0.138
Fine sand, %	18.46	18.38	P	0.032	0.033
Silt, %	37.24	37.11	K	0.356	0.349
Clay, %	39.07	39.32	Available N, mg kg ⁻¹	33.42	28.14
Texture class	Clay loam	Clay loam	Available P, mg kg ⁻¹	10.63	11.11
pH, 1:2.5 (susp.)	7.77	7.75	Available K, mg kg ⁻¹	315.72	102.54
EC, dSm ⁻¹	1.67	1.63	Organic matter (O.M, %)	2.50	2.52
Soluble ions, meq l⁻¹			Organic carbon (O.C, %)	1.45	1.42
Mg ²⁺	5.32	5.3	C / N ratio	10.07	9.72
Ca ²⁺	6.13	6.11	DTPA – extractable micronutrients (ppm)		
Na ⁺	7.46	7.48	Fe	3.83	3.74
K ⁺	0.23	0.25	Br	0.26	0.25
CO ₃ ²⁻	0.00	0.00	Mn	3.15	3.02
HCO ₃ ⁻	3.62	3.64	Zn	4.46	4.36
Cl ⁻	8.13	8.15	Cu	1.53	1.49
SO ₄ ²⁻	7.39	7.35			

113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152

2.3. Studied characters:

2.3.1. Barley: -

Plant height (cm), spike length (cm), number of grains/spike, number of spikes/m², 1000-grain weight (g), grains yield(kg/fed), straw yield(kg/fed) and biological yield) kg/fed) were Measured of barley for pure stand and intercropped, respectively. (Feddan (fed) = 4200m²).

2.3.2. Sugar beet: -

At harvest time, five plants were taken randomly from each subplot to estimate the data of yield components. Whereas the top and root yields were calculated from the inner two ridges (two beds) of each sub plot of sugar beet for pure stand and intercropped, respectively, as follows: total plant weight (kg), root weight/plant (kg), root length (cm), root diameter(cm) biological yield (ton/fed), root yield (ton/fed, feddan (fed)=4200m²), top yield(ton/fed), sucrose %, Sugar yield (ton/fed), Leaf area index and foliage weight (ton/fed).

2.4. Chemical quality of sugar in sugar beet root: -

Samples of 26 g fresh root weight were taken from each sub-plot to determine: Sucrose % according to the methods described by [23] and sugar yield ton /fed (SY).

2.5. Competitive relationships and yield advantages:

The following competitive relationships and yield advantages were calculated:

2.5.1. Land equivalent ratio (LER):

It was determined according to the following formula described by [24]:

$$LER = \frac{Y_{ab}}{Y_{aa}} + \frac{Y_{ba}}{Y_{bb}}$$

*Where, Y_{aa} and Y_{bb} were pure stand of crop, a (sugar beet) and b (barley), respectively. Y_{ab} is intercrop yield of a crop and Y_{ba} is intercrop yield b crop.

2.5.2. Relative crowding coefficient (RCC)

RCC, which estimates the relative dominance of one species over the other in the intercropping system [9] was calculated as follows: $K = K_a \times K_b$, $K_a = Y_{ab} \times Z_{ba} / [(Y_{aa} - Y_{ab}) \times Z_{ab}]$; $K_b = Y_{ba} \times Z_{ab} / [(Y_{bb} - Y_{ba}) \times Z_{ba}]$, Where Y_{aa} = Pure stand yield of crop a (sugar beet); Y_{bb} = Pure stand yield of crop b (barley); Y_{ab} = Intercrop yield of crop a (sugar beet); Y_{ba} = Intercrop yield of crop b (barley); Z_{ab} = The respective proportion of crop a in the intercropping system (sugar beet); Z_{ba} = The respective proportion of crop b in the intercropping system (barley).

2.5.3. Aggressivity (A)

Aggressivity represents a simple measure of how much the relative yield increase in one crop is greater than the other in an intercropping system [25] was calculated as follows: $A_{ab} = [Y_{ab} / (Y_{aa} \times Z_{ab})] - [Y_{ba} / (Y_{bb} \times Z_{ba})]$; $A_{ba} = [Y_{ba} / (Y_{bb} \times Z_{ba})] - [Y_{ab} / (Y_{aa} \times Z_{ab})]$.

2.6. Economic evaluations: -

153 The yield traits of both sugar beet and barley produced from cropping system were obtained to conduct
 154 an economic evaluation for the intercropping yields compared to the pure crops.

155 Total income and net return were calculated for each treatment in Egyptian pounds (LE) using market
 156 prices of sugar beet and barley according to Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation, Economic Affairs
 157 Sector- Price Bulletin, Egypt. The sugar beet prices were 550 and 600 LE /ton for roots and 280 LE/ ton for top-
 158 fresh. Mean while barley prices were LE 600 and 648/ardab (ardab=120kg) of grains and 1000, 1100 LE /ton of
 159 straw in 2018/19 and 2019/20, respectively. Solid costs were 12250 and 14290 LE /fed for sugar beet and 10830
 160 and 11250 LE /fed for barley in 2018/19 and 2019/20, respectively.

161 [26] used the first two principal components (PC1 and PC2) to display the two-way data in GGE-biplot
 162 graph (genotype main effect plus genotype-by-environments interaction). On the other side, [27] employed this
 163 method to display the treatment by trait two-way data to shows the genotype by trait (GGT) biplot. Accordingly,
 164 [28] showed biplot corresponds to the axes of the abscissa and the ordinate to the economic studied traits in
 165 different treatments (cuts*N fertilizer) and denoted as treatment-trait (TT).All statistical analysis and biplot
 166 graph presented in this paper were carried out with the procedures of [29].

167

168 **2.7. Statistical analysis: -**

169 The collected data were statistically analyzed according to the technique of analysis of variance
 170 (ANOVA) for the split-plot design as suggested by [30] using “GenStat” computer software package. Means of
 171 treatments were compared using LSD tests at probability 5% level.

172

173 **3. RESULTS & DISCUSSION**

174

175 **3.1. Agronomic traits mean performance: -**

176 **3.1.1. First: Sugar beet traits:**

177 **3.1.1.1 Effect of barley cut on sugar beet: -**

178 Data of the both studied seasons were in harmony in some traits, confirming the effects of studied
 179 factors. Results presented that cut treatments (no cut, cut before heading(Cut 1)and cut after heading(Cut 2)
 180 impacted significantly on the sugar beet traits as biological yield, root yield, top yield, sucrose %, sugar yield and
 181 leaf area index in both growing seasons (table 2). Meanwhile, root diameter and foliage weight traits were
 182 significantly affected by the cutting barley treatments among the intercropping in the 1st and 2nd season,
 183 respectively. The highest leaf area index (5.70 – 4.98) was belonged to the no cut of barley in both seasons,
 184 respectively. The lowest leaf area index was observed in sugar beet (3.21– 3.56) under cut after heading in both
 185 seasons, respectively. Biological yield and foliage weight traits under no cut of barley gave the highest values
 186 (39.93 – 12.16 ton/fed), respectively in 1st season and cut1 gave the best values (42.04 –12.00 ton/fed),
 187 respectively in the 2nd season. Meanwhile, it was noted that increasing root yield met reduction in foliage weight
 188 in the 1st season. Then, results showed that cut1 significantly increase in the weight of root yield (29.60 and30.04
 189 ton/fed) and sugar yield (5.19 and 5.37ton/fed) in both seasons, respectively. These results suggested that, cut
 190 before heading may be allowed improvement sugar beet yield set (root and sugar) greater than for vegetative
 191 growth by decrease the specific competition among root forming and sugar storage. [31]. [32].

192 The effect of intercropping on the root yield of sugar beet depends on the growth nature of the
 193 companion crop. The root yield of sugar beet was significant for pure stands followed by when sugar beet was
 194 intercropped with barley under cut1. The increasing in sugar beet root effect may be due to the greater exposure
 195 of the sugar beet plant to the solar radiation during root storage stage. This better effect of the solar radiation was
 196 reflected on better root growth and higher root yield. On the other hand, the reduction of sugar beet root yield in
 197 cut2 may be due to the high competition for soil nutrients which negatively affect and reduces the root yield.

198

199 **Table 2. Sugar beet agronomic traits as affected by barley cuts under cropping system during 2018/19 and**
 200 **2019/20 seasons.**

Cuts	Total plant weight (kg)	Root weight/plant (kg)	Root length (cm)	Root diameter (cm)	Biological yield (ton/fed)	Root yield (ton/fed)	Top yield (ton)	Sucrose %	Sugar yield (ton/fed)	Leaf area index	Foliage weight (ton/fed)
2018/19											
No cut	1.17	0.75	33.71	13.76	39.93	27.78	12.46	16.79	4.66	5.70	12.16
Cut1	1.23	0.81	38.19	13.88	38.17	29.60	11.31	17.52	5.19	3.96	8.57
Cut2	1.16	0.81	36.42	13.82	39.48	28.05	11.74	14.25	3.99	3.21	11.42
LSD	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.72	0.325	0.44	0.71	0.51	0.06	1.01
Sole	1.29	1.00	37.13	15.50	42.33	31.96	15.13	16.50	5.27	3.58	10.38

	2019/20										
No cut	1.12	0.74	29.53	13.88	39.14	28.22	10.77	18.45	5.22	4.98	10.93
Cut1	1.19	0.88	33.88	12.53	42.04	30.04	11.50	17.83	5.37	3.85	12.00
Cut2	1.17	0.77	30.39	13.52	39.23	28.00	12.08	15.77	4.41	3.56	11.24
LSD	NS	NS	NS	0.14	0.57	0.55	0.41	1.51	0.65	0.09	NS
Sole	1.37	1.04	35.00	15.43	44.90	31.43	16.47	19.67	6.18	4.35	13.47

201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208

3.1.1.2 Effect of nitrogen fertilizer rate on sugar beet: -

Data presented in Table (3) revealed that all studied traits of sugar beet were significantly affect by nitrogen rates in both seasons, except total plant weight in both seasons, root weight/plant, Sucrose % and sugar yield in the first season.

Table 3. Effect of nitrogen fertilization rates on studied sugar beet agronomic traits under cropping system during 2018/19 and 2019/20 seasons.

Nitrogen rates	Total plant weight (kg)	Root weight/ht/plant (kg)	Root length (cm)	Root diameter (cm)	Biological yield (ton/fed)	Root yield (ton/fed)	Top yield (ton)	Sucrose %	Sugar yield (ton/fed)	Leaf area index	foliage weight (ton/fed)
2018/19											
N1 (80kg)	1.22	0.81	32.56	13.00	36.00	26.82	9.51	16.52	4.43	4.27	9.18
N2 (100 kg)	1.11	0.75	38.36	13.80	39.89	28.28	12.03	16.04	4.55	4.53	11.61
N3 (120 kg)	1.23	0.81	37.41	14.66	41.69	30.33	13.97	15.99	4.86	4.05	11.36
LSD	NS	NS	3.51	0.59	0.62	0.15	0.85	NS	NS	0.03	0.66
2019/20											
N1 (80kg)	1.08	0.74	28.84	12.53	37.53	27.90	9.50	16.02	4.47	3.70	9.63
N2 (100 kg)	1.18	0.78	31.35	13.50	40.62	28.90	11.23	18.69	5.41	4.52	11.72
N3 (120 kg)	1.22	0.86	33.61	13.90	42.27	29.45	13.61	17.34	5.12	4.17	12.81
LSD	NS	0.09	1.46	0.50	0.45	0.28	0.56	0.97	0.36	0.07	0.42

209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233

Root yield recorded gradual increase by increasing N rate up to 120 Kg/fed in both seasons. The increase accounted to 5.44 % and 13.09 % in the 1st season and 3.58 % and 5.56 % in the 2nd season by increasing N rate from 80 to 100 and 120 Kg/fed, respectively. The root yield increasing may be due to the role of N in growth activity that stimulated the meristematic contributes and increase the cells number thus, cell enlargement. Similar findings were obtained by [15], [13] and [33].

Increasing N rates had significant effect on root quality traits. Mean values cleared that sucrose % and sugar yield ton/fed in 2nd season was significantly increased by increasing N rates. It is suggested that raising sugar yield by increasing nitrogen rate may be due to increase root yield as discussed previously in this table. Similar results were obtained by [15] and [13].

3.1.1.3. Effect of interaction between barley cuts and nitrogen rates: -

Data in Table (4) cleared that the interaction between barley cutting treatments x nitrogen rates had significant effect on sugar beet traits in both seasons. Results illustrated that the interaction effects were highly significant for biology yield, root yield/fed, Leaf area index and foliage weight in both seasons, top yield, sucrose % and sugar yield traits were significant in the 2nd season.

In general, data showed that adding 120 kg N/fed under barley cut treatment before heading (No cut) exhibited the maximum values for sugar beet biology yield and root yield/fed traits, recording (41.80-44.07 ton/fed), and (31.48- 30.82 ton/fed) in the first and second seasons, respectively compared to other treatments. This showed that nitrogen fertilizer at the rate of 120 kg N/fed and barley cut treatment before heading act dependently on biological yield and root yield of sugar beet plant. This result was in the same line with that reported by [31] and [32].

Table 4. Interaction effect of cuts x nitrogen rates on sugar beet agronomic traits under cropping system during 2018/19 and 2019/20 seasons.

Cuts	Nitrogen rates	Total plant weight (kg)	Root weight / plant (kg)	Root length (cm)	Root diameter (cm)	Biological yield (ton/fed)	Root yield (ton/fed)	Top yield (ton)	Sucrose %	Sugar yield (ton/fed)	Leaf area index	foliage weight (ton/fed)
2018/19												
No cut	N1	1.23	0.83	31.27	12.60	38.17	25.83	10.00	16.84	4.35	5.69	12.33
	N2	1.10	0.73	34.27	13.87	40.00	27.67	12.70	17.00	4.70	5.76	12.33
	N3	1.18	0.70	35.60	14.80	41.63	29.83	14.67	16.52	4.93	5.64	11.80
Cut1	N1	1.21	0.74	35.00	13.20	33.50	27.96	8.53	17.81	4.98	3.67	5.54
	N2	1.21	0.80	40.60	13.73	39.20	29.36	11.77	17.35	5.10	4.51	9.84
	N3	1.29	0.91	38.97	14.70	41.80	31.48	13.63	17.42	5.49	3.69	10.32
Cut2	N1	1.23	0.88	31.40	13.20	36.33	26.67	10.00	14.92	3.96	3.46	9.67
	N2	1.03	0.72	40.20	13.80	40.47	27.82	11.63	13.78	3.84	3.33	12.64
	N3	1.22	0.83	37.67	14.47	41.63	29.67	13.60	14.05	4.18	2.83	11.96
LSD 0.05	NS	NS	NS	NS	1.07	0.26	NS	NS	NS	NS	0.06	1.14
2019/20												
No cut	N1	1.07	0.68	27.39	13.33	37.23	27.25	9.97	16.13	4.41	4.09	9.98
	N2	1.12	0.72	29.93	14.00	39.50	28.42	10.43	19.84	5.63	5.54	11.08
	N3	1.16	0.82	31.27	14.30	40.70	28.98	11.90	19.38	5.62	5.31	11.72
Cut1	N1	1.13	0.84	31.33	11.07	39.03	28.88	8.80	15.91	4.60	3.53	10.15
	N2	1.29	0.88	33.48	13.00	43.03	30.42	11.23	19.51	5.94	4.46	12.61
	N3	1.14	0.91	36.84	13.53	44.07	30.82	14.47	18.07	5.58	3.57	13.24
Cut2	N1	1.03	0.70	27.80	13.20	36.33	27.58	9.73	16.03	4.41	3.48	8.76
	N2	1.13	0.75	30.65	13.50	39.33	27.86	12.03	16.72	4.66	3.57	11.47
	N3	1.35	0.86	32.73	13.87	42.03	28.55	14.47	14.57	4.17	3.63	13.48
LSD 0.05	NS	NS	NS	0.87	0.78	0.49	0.97	1.67	0.63	0.12	0.72	

234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254

3.1.2. Second: Barley traits: -

3.1.2.1 Effect of barley cut: -

Grain yield (kg/fed) and yield traits of barley were estimated for significance using the analysis of variance. Results demonstrate that cut treatments gave significant differences for all barley traits in both growing seasons. Data in Table (5) showed that barley produced the highest significant barley grain yield in their pure stand amounting to 1956.40 and 1982.53kg/fed of both growing seasons, respectively. In the intercropping system with sugar beet, the grain yield of barley decreased by cut treatment. Thus, the lowest grain yield was achieved in case of cut2 (after heading) that gave 231.00 and 255.47 kg/fed of both growing seasons, respectively.

This reduction in grain yield may be due to using up most soil nutrients in growing before cut, then re-vegetative growing late and decrease all yield traits (spike length, grains/spike, 1000-grain weight, biological yield and attendant decrease in grain yield). Similar trend was observed for barley grain yield by [19]. [34] revealed that, the characteristics of growth, green fodder, biological yield decreased significantly after first cutting and second.

Table 5. Impact of cuts on studied barley agronomic traits under cropping system during 2018/19 and 2019/20 seasons.

Cuts	Plant height (cm)	Spike length (cm)	No. of grains/spike	No. of spikes/m ²	1000 grain weight(g)	Biological yield (kg/fed)	Grain yield (kg/fed)	Straw yield(kg/fed)
2018/2019								
No cut	119.36	7.33	55.93	319.00	49.96	1232.22	443.33	788.89
Cut1	89.89	6.37	50.27	235.78	41.30	932.89	325.91	606.98
Cut2	67.04	5.53	45.07	193.89	38.89	662.78	231.00	431.78
LSD	2.28	0.13	0.78	8.50	1.30	15.93	7.22	13.10
Sole	123.27	7.53	57.20	355.33	53.53	5766.67	1956.40	3810.27

	2019/2020							
No cut	125.60	7.69	58.13	331.33	50.34	1275.56	452.53	823.02
Cut1	92.02	6.63	51.80	251.89	42.58	997.00	347.60	649.40
Cut2	69.39	5.91	47.47	184.22	39.98	716.89	255.47	461.42
LSD	2.57	0.20	1.21	9.78	0.96	39.39	21.18	57.90
Sole	127.20	7.70	58.20	348.00	53.03	5835.33	1982.53	3852.80

Also, grain yield varieties fell by 17% and 27% after the first cutting and 35% and 50% after the second cutting in decreased biological yield 10% and 22% after the first cutting and 21% and 39% after the second cutting for both years, respectively. [20] showed that, cutting barley at early 40-kb growth stages (45 and 55 DAS) resulted in the production of higher forage yield with higher quality. [35] recorded that, The seed and straw yield (2.48 and 9.40 t/ha) was recorded significantly higher in the no cutting for fodder and left for seed only on pooled mean basis; while, cutting at 50 DAS and left crop for seed recorded significantly higher green forage equivalent yield (79.45 t/ha).

3.1.2.2. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer rate: -

In the intercropping system with sugar beet, mean values in Table (6) established that different N rates had significant effects on grain yield and all yield traits of barley in both growing seasons. In general, it was noted that gradual increased by increasing N rate up to 120 Kg/fed for all barley yield traits in both seasons. Results revealed that the highest grain yield traits were obtained under adding N rate 120 Kg/fed, recording 353.60 and 372.04 Kg/fed for grain yield in both seasons, respectively as the gain of increasing in other yield traits. Meanwhile, the lowest grain yield was obtained under the application of 80 Kg/fed N that gave 311.93 and 329.87 Kg/fed for the two respectively seasons. These results are in accordance with those reported by [15], [13] and [33].

Table 6. Impact of nitrogen fertilization rates on studied barley agronomic traits under cropping system during 2018/19 and 2019/20 seasons.

Nitrogen rates	Plant height (cm)	Spike length (cm)	No. of grains/spike	No. of spikes/m ²	1000 grain weight(g)	Biological yield (kg/fed)	Grain yield (kg/fed)	Straw yield (kg/fed)
2018/2019								
N1 (80)	86.52	6.27	49.67	237.11	41.31	898.89	311.93	586.96
N2 (100)	91.34	6.43	50.60	243.33	43.78	941.89	334.71	607.18
N3 (120)	97.47	6.53	51.00	268.22	45.06	987.11	353.60	633.51
LSD	3.31	0.17	1.03	8.94	1.30	29.75	8.63	30.66
2019/2020								
N1 (80)	90.90	6.50	51.00	232.33	42.75	953.56	329.87	623.69
N2 (100)	96.84	6.62	51.73	255.89	43.83	973.67	353.69	619.98
N3 (120)	99.27	7.11	54.67	279.22	46.32	1062.22	372.04	690.18
LSD	3.23	0.24	1.45	7.14	0.99	48.11	13.79	41.19

3.1.2.3. Effect of the interaction between cutting and nitrogen rate: -

Means of barley cuts treatments x nitrogen rates interaction on barley traits in both growing seasons was presented in Table (7).

Table 7. Interaction effect of cuts x nitrogen rates on barley agronomic traits under cropping system during 2018/19 and 2019/20 seasons.

Cuts	Nitrogen rates	Plant height (cm)	Spike length (cm)	No. of grains/spike	No. of spikes/m ²	1000 grain weight(g)	Biological yield (kg/fed)	Grain yield (kg/fed)	Straw yield (kg/fed)
2018/19									
No cut	N1	71.67	7.20	55.20	310.33	47.78	1153.33	415.33	738.00

	N2	96.73	7.30	55.80	317.00	50.69	1233.33	450.13	783.20
	N3	124.00	7.50	56.80	329.67	51.41	1310.00	464.53	845.47
Cut1	N1	67.33	6.30	50.00	205.00	39.43	911.67	304.40	607.27
	N2	88.23	6.40	50.60	233.67	41.12	935.67	325.73	609.93
	N3	118.47	6.40	50.20	268.67	43.35	951.33	347.60	603.73
Cut2	N1	62.13	5.30	43.80	196.00	36.72	631.67	216.07	415.60
	N2	84.70	5.60	45.40	179.33	39.52	656.67	228.27	428.40
	N3	115.60	5.70	46.00	206.33	40.43	700.00	248.67	451.33
LSD 0.05		NS	NS	NS	15.49	NS	51.53	NS	NS
2019/20									
No cut	N1	121.00	7.40	56.40	311.00	48.14	1190.00	417.20	772.80
	N2	127.33	7.63	57.80	330.33	50.78	1276.67	466.80	809.87
	N3	128.47	8.03	60.20	352.67	52.10	1360.00	473.60	886.40
Cut1	N1	86.20	6.47	50.80	231.33	41.25	928.33	333.07	595.27
	N2	92.53	6.57	51.40	252.67	42.41	972.67	334.00	638.67
	N3	97.33	6.87	53.20	271.67	44.07	1090.00	375.73	714.27
Cut2	N1	65.50	5.63	45.80	154.67	38.85	742.33	239.33	503.00
	N2	70.67	5.67	46.00	184.67	38.30	671.67	260.27	411.40
	N3	72.00	6.43	50.60	213.33	42.79	736.67	266.80	469.87
LSD 0.05		5.60	NS	NS	NS	1.72	83.34	23.88	71.34

289 Results indicated significant differences for barley number of spikes/m² and biological yield/fed mean
290 value in the 1st season. Meanwhile, mean values of plant height, 1000-grain weight, grain yield/fed, biological
291 yield/fed and straw yield/fed traits had significant effect only in the 2nd season. Adding 120 kg N rate (N3)
292 without cut treatment gave the maximum values for most traits in both seasons, recording (464.53-473.60 kg/fed)
293 for grains yield, (1310.00-1360.00 kg/fed) for biological yield and (845.47-886.40 kg/fed) for straw yield in both
294 seasons, respectively. Meanwhile, 80 kg N rate (N1) under cut treatment after heading (cut2) cleared the lowest
295 values for most traits in both seasons. This interactive effect of barley cuts treatments and nitrogen rates under
296 intercropping system have been studied by [36] and [37].

297 Accordingly, adding 120 kg N/fed (N₃) under barley cut treatment before heading (cut2) revealing the
298 best values for sugar beet root yield had contrary effect on barley yield (relatively medium values) production
299 under intercropping. These results are in general agreement with those obtained by [36] and [37].
300

301

3.2. Competitive relationships

3.2.1. Land equivalent ratio (LER)

304 Competitive relationship, land equivalent ratio (LER) can be used to determine the
305 effectiveness of each intercropping sugar beet accompanied with the tested barely companion crop
306 (under three cuts and nitrogen treatments) compared to sole (pure). Calculated values of LER in Table
307 (8) were increased than one in both seasons by the interaction between barley cuts with N fertilizer
308 treatments in most cases. Obtained data showed that LER values of different intercropping treatments
309 ranged between 0.94 to 1.17 (Cut2N1) and (No cut N3), respectively and 0.99 to 1.16 for treatments of
310 (Cut2N1) and (Cut1N3), respectively in the both seasons. LER values cleared that all intercropping
311 treatments gave values higher than unit except Cut2N1 and N2 in 1st season and Cut2N1 in the 2nd
312 season. These results are in general agreement with those obtained by [38], [39], [40] and [41].

313 Adding 80 kg N (N1) under barley cut after heading (cut2) revealed the lowest LER in both
314 seasons. Meanwhile, the highest LER estimates recorded increasing by 17% and 16% in first and
315 second seasons, respectively.
316

317 **Table 8. Effect of the interaction between different barely cuts and nitrogen fertilizer levels on land**
318 **equivalent ratio (LER) across two seasons.**

Cut	N rates	Land equivalent ratio (LER)					
		2018/2019			2019/2020		
		LS	Lb	LER	LS	Lb	LER
No cut	N1 (80)	0.81	0.21	1.02	0.85	0.21	1.07
	N2 (100)	0.87	0.23	1.10	0.89	0.24	1.13
	N3 (120)	0.93	0.24	1.17	0.91	0.24	1.15

Cut1	N1 (80)	0.87	0.16	1.03	0.90	0.17	1.07
	N2 (100)	0.92	0.17	1.09	0.95	0.17	1.12
	N3 (120)	0.98	0.18	1.16	0.96	0.19	1.16
Cut2	N1 (80)	0.83	0.11	0.94	0.86	0.12	0.99
	N2 (100)	0.87	0.12	0.99	0.87	0.13	1.00
	N3 (120)	0.93	0.13	1.06	0.89	0.14	1.03

319
320 Results indicated that most treatments were positive; suggesting efficient utilization of land resource by
321 growing both crops together under these treatments, especially adding 120 kg N (N3) under barley cut before
322 heading (cut1) and no cut to obtain the most land equivalent ratio (LER) estimates.

323 3.3. Relative crowding coefficient (RCC)

324 Results in Table 9 indicate that relative crowding coefficient (RCC) were more than one and this means
325 that all treatments achieved yield advantages than solid planting of sugar beet or barely. The highest yield
326 advantage for RCC (89.49 and 73.54) was recorded with Cut1 at 120 Kg N/fed in both seasons respectively and
327 the lowest value of RCC (3.91 and 6.14) was showed by using Cut2 at 80 Kg N/fed. in both seasons respectively.
328 These results are in accordance with those observed by [39], [40] and [41]. These data reveal that canopy
329 structure of Cut1 in Barely with 120N for intercropping with sugar beet, which reflected positively on decrease
330 in the competitive pressure between them.

331
332
333
334
335
336
337 **Table 9. Effect of the interaction between different barely cuts and nitrogen fertilizer levels on Relative**
338 **Crowding Coefficient (RCC) and Aggressivity (Agg) across two seasons.**

Cut	N rates	Relative Crowding Coefficient (RCC)						Aggressivity (Ag)			
		2018/2019			2019/2020			2018/2019		2019/2020	
		Ks	Kb	K	Ks	Kb	K	Ags	Agb	Ags	Agb
No cut	N1 (80)	5.27	1.35	7.1	8.15	1.33	10.86	-0.05	+0.05	+0.31	-0.31
	N2 (100)	8.07	1.49	12.05	11.84	1.53	18.23	-0.07	+0.07	-0.05	+0.05
	N3 (120)	17.55	1.56	27.32	14.78	1.57	23.19	-0.02	+0.02	-0.04	+0.04
Cut1	N1 (80)	22.8	0.92	21	12.03	1.0	12.03	+0.31	-0.31	+0.31	-0.31
	N2 (100)	14.12	1.0	14.12	37.56	1.01	38.04	+0.32	-0.32	+0.37	-0.37
	N3 (120)	82.84	1.08	89.49	62.9	1.17	73.54	+0.34	-0.34	+0.28	-0.28
Cut2	N1 (80)	6.3	0.62	3.91	8.95	0.69	6.14	+0.49	-0.49	+0.5	-0.5
	N2 (100)	8.4	0.66	5.55	9.74	0.76	7.36	+0.51	-0.51	+0.45	-0.45
	N3 (120)	16.21	0.73	11.8	9.21	0.78	7.16	+0.52	-0.52	+0.43	-0.43

339
340 **3.4. Aggressivity (Agg)**
341 Results presented in Table 9 indicates the effect of barley plant cuts and different nitrogen fertilizer
342 rates on yield on aggressivity values of sugar beet and barely yields. It is known that an aggressivity value of
343 zero indicates that, both component crops are equally competitive. For any other situation, both crops will have
344 the same numerical value by positive for the dominant crop and negative for the dominated one. The greater the
345 numerical value, the larger the differences in competitive abilities [38], [39], [40] and [41].

346 However, the positive sign for sugar beet in cut before heading and cut after heading and the negative
347 one for Barely may be due to the ability of the shorter component to compete with the taller component for
348 available nutrients, especially N in this respect. This further, emphasizes that sugar beet is able to acquire more
349 resources than that Barely in the both seasons.

351 3.5. Monetary benefits

352 3.5.1. Sugar beet root yield

353 Impact of intercropping sugar beet with barley was assessed by measuring the crop productivity under
354 different barley cuts treatments with N rates and resultant impact on the net returns (Table 10). Sole cropping
355 sugar beet showed the highest beet root yield 31.96 and 31.43 ton/fed in both seasons. It was observed that sugar
356 beet fertilized with 120 kg N/fed gave the highest beet root yield either in sole crop or when intercropped with
357 barley under barley cut before heading recording 31.48 and 30.82 ton/fed in both seasons. Meanwhile,

358 companion barley sole gave yield 13.04 and 13.22 ard/fed. However, adding 120 kg N (N3) with no cut gave
 359 yield 3.09 and 3.16 ard/fed.
 360

361 **3.6. Economic evaluation:**

362 **3.6.1. Cost of production and total income**

363 **3.6.1.1. Net return and benefit/ cost ratio**

364 Results in (Table 10) showed economic evaluation of sugar beet intercropping with barely under cuts at
 365 different levels of nitrogen fertilizer practices. Both sole sugar beet and barley cultivation recorded the minimum
 366 cost of production. Total cost of sole sugar beet gave 12250 and 14290 LE/fed, respectively in both seasons.
 367 While, cost of sole barley was 10830 and 11250 LE/fed, respectively in the two seasons. On the other side, the
 368 highest total production cost (14300 and 15850 LE/fed) were recorded by barley fertilized with 120 kg N/fed and
 369 cutting before heading in both seasons. Total income and net return (LE/fed) for all intercropping treatments
 370 were found to be superior to solid cultures of sugar beet and barley as shown in Table (10).

371 Results cleared that the highest values of total income being 21388.7 LE/fed achieving the highest net
 372 return of 7288.7 LE/fed resulted from barley without cutting and adding 120 Kg N/fed fertilizer in the 1st season,
 373 followed by total income by cutting barley before heading and applying of 120 N kg/fed. However, total income
 374 of 23818.3 LE/fed was attained the highest net return of 7968.3 LE/fed under cutting barley before heading and
 375 adding 120 Kg N/fed in the 2nd season, followed by total income under no cut and 120 Kg N/fed treatment. On
 376 the other side, the lowest values of total income and net return were 17536 and 3736 LE/fed in the 1st season and
 377 19738.7 and 4488.7 LE/fed in the 2nd season, respectively that obtained by cutting barley plants after heading
 378 and adding 80 Kg N/fed.
 379

380 **3.7. Benefit cost ratio**

381 Results presented in Table (10) revealed that no cut+N3 and cut1+N3 treatments achieved the highest
 382 net return in the 1st and 2nd seasons, respectively. The benefit/cost ratio recorded the highest value of 0.52 by
 383 adding 120 kg N rate without cutting in the 1st season. The highest benefit/cost ratio was obtained in case of
 384 adding 120 Kg N/fed and cutting barely before heading being 0.50 in the 2nd season. Meanwhile, the lowest
 385 value of benefit/cost ratio was obtained by adding 80 kg N/fed and cutting barley after heading recording 0.27
 386 and 0.29 for the 1st and 2nd seasons, respectively.
 387

388 Economically, companion intercropping barley with sugar beet under both treatments of adding 120kg N
 389 rate without barley cutting and cutting barely before heading proved its superiority over other treatments under
 390 cropping and sole crops.
 391

392 **Table 10. Economic evaluation of sugar beet intercropped with barely under cuts and different levels of nitrogen fertilizer practices for seasons of 2018/19 and 2019/20.**

.Cuts	N rates	Barely Grain yield (L.E)	Barely straw yield (L.E)	Sugar beet Root yield (L.E)	Sugar beet FW yield (L.E)	Total income/ fed (L.E.)	Cost /fed (L.E.)	Net return/ fed (L.E.)	Benefit/ Cost ratio (B/C)
2018/2019									
No cut	N1	2076.7	738	13336.7	3453.3	19604.7	13600	6004.7	0.44
	N2	2250.7	783	13833.3	3453.3	20320.7	13850	6470.7	0.47
	N3	2322.7	845	14916.7	3304.0	21388.7	14100	7288.7	0.52
Cut1	N1	1522.0	607.2	13980.0	1551.3	17660.3	13800	3860.7	0.28
	N2	1628.6	609.9	14678.3	2756.0	19673.0	14050	5623	0.40
	N3	1738.0	603.7	15738.3	2890.3	20970.7	14300	6670.7	0.47
Cut2	N1	1080.3	415.6	13333.3	2706.7	17536.0	13800	3736.0	0.27
	N2	1141.3	426.4	13911.7	3540.0	19021.7	14050	4971.7	0.35
	N3	1243.3	451.3	14836.7	3348.7	19880.0	14300	5580.0	0.39
Sole sugar beet culture				17578	2906	17484	12250	5231	0.43
Sole Barely		9782	3810			13592	10830	2763	0.26
2019/2020									
No cut	N1	2252.7	850.0	15449.3	2790.7	21343.0	15000	6343.0	0.42
	N2	2520.7	891.0	15629.2	2921.3	21962.0	15300	6662.0	0.44
	N3	2557.7	975.3	15940.3	3332.0	22805.0	15600	7205.0	0.46
Cut1	N1	1798.7	655.0	15884.0	2464.0	20801.3	15250	5551.3	0.36
	N2	1803.7	702.7	16731.0	3145.3	22382.3	15550	6832.3	0.44
	N3	2029.0	786.0	16952.8	4050.7	23818.3	15850	7968.3	0.50
Cut2	N1	1292.3	553.3	15167.2	2725.3	19738.7	15250	4488.7	0.29

	N2	1405.3	452.3	15324.8	3369.3	20552.0	15550	5002.0	0.32
	N3	1440.7	517.0	15702.5	4050.7	21710.7	15850	5860.7	0.37
Sole sugar beet culture				18858	3771.6	20215	14290	5925	0.41
Sole Barely		10705	4237			14943	11250	3963	0.35

FW: forage weight/fed (ton) for sugar beet.

3.8. Treatment- Traits (TT) agro-economically biplot

The good tool graphical method, Treatment-Traits (TT) biplot was used to determine the effects of the measured treatments on the multiple economic traits for both sugar beet and barley yield in the same biplot graph. In TT biplot, the treatment that combines several good agro-economical traits (highest yield + total income + net return) in its composition consider as the best treatment [28]. Average data over two seasons of the 9 different treatments (cuts* N fertilizer treatments combinations) were graphically representation as illustrated in Figure (1). TT biplot summarized interrelationships among measured treatments (cuts-fertilizer treatments) toward traits, explaining amount obtained of the total variation. The first two principal components for PC1 and PC2 explained 78.94% and 12.38%, together explained that there is about 91.32% of the total variation for the both crops economic traits across treatments. Both PC's reflected more than 60% of the total variation, Then TT biplot model achieved the fit goodness [26].




Figure 1: Polygon (which won where) view of the sugar beet and barley treatment-by-trait (TT) agro-economically biplot of nine treatments for twelve economic traits, showing which treatment had the highest values for which traits.

Figure (1) showed which (cuts -fertilizer combination) treatments combination-won- where-for for the both crops economic traits under intercropping. The treatment which occupied the biplot vertex position is known as vertex treatment. The vertex treatment for each sector had the greatest values for all traits falling within that sector that could be candidates for developing growth and intercropping return yield. It was noticed that, the treatments generated a biplot with C1N3, C0N3, C0N2, C0N1, C2N1 and C1N1 at the vertex of polygon (**Fig. 1**). These vertex treatments illustrated superior performance for the economic traits allocated within each sector. Among the vertex treatments C1N3 (cut before heading + 120N supplements) revealed superior performance for the total income/fed (Income2), net return/fed (Net2), root yield price (Root1,2) and forage yield price (Forage2), indicating that these treatments could be exploited for the development these return yield in both crops economic traits. Then, C2N3 inhibit forming grains or straw to direct root and forage yield. However, C0N3 (without cut + 120N supplements) and C0N2 (without cut + 100N supplements) cleared good behavior for

423 the total income/fed (Income1) and Net return/fed (Net1) in the 1st season. Meanwhile, grain yield price (GR1,2)
424 and straw yield price (STR1,2) in both seasons, suggesting that CON3 and CON2 may had role in enhancement
425 the both barley grain and straw yield. The other cut- fertilizer treatments under intercropping C2N1(cut after
426 heading + 80N supplements),C1N1(cut before heading + 80N supplements) and C1N1 (without cut + 80N
427 supplements) treatments located in the left side of graph were not characterized for any trait. These treatments
428 were the inferior for all measured traits. These results pointed to the decrease fertilizer (80N) may inhabit the
429 yield-traits growth, suggesting that N-fertilizer was most importantly the root and grain productivity under
430 different cuts treatments.

431 These results indicate that the view of TT bi-plot polygon is good in summarizing and explaining the
432 interaction pattern between treatments and economic traits.

433

434 4. CONCLUSION

435 Based on the agro-economically biplot graph it could be recommended that planting intercropping barley
436 with sugar beet under both treatments of adding 120 kg N rate without barley cutting (Cut0N3) and cutting
437 barely before heading (Cut1N3) can be recommended to obtain the maximum values in sugar beet growth, yield,
438 and yield attributes, land usage, competitive relationships as well as total income and yield advantages of both
439 crops under the climatic conditions of Gemmeiza district, Egypt.

440

441 5. REFERENCES

442

- 443 1. **Kumar, B., U. S. Tiwana, A. Singh and H. Ram (2014).** Productivity and quality of
444 intercropping maize (*Zea mays* L.) plus cowpea [*Vigna unguiculata* (L.) Walp.] fodder as
445 influenced by nitrogen and phosphorous levels. *Range Management & Agroecology* 35(2):263-267.
- 446 2. **Trenbath, B.R. (1982).** Proc. Front. Res. Agric. Indian Statist. Inst. Golden Jubilee Int. Conf.
447 Calcutta, pp. 265-286.
- 448 3. **Rao, M.R. and Shetty, S.V.R. (1977).** Some biological aspects of intercropping systems on crop-
449 weed balance. In Weed Science Conference/Workshop in India (Proceedings), Andhra Pradesh
450 Agricultural University, Hyderabad, India, 17th-20th January.
- 451 4. **Raheja, A.K. (1977).** Pest and disease relationships within various crop mixtures. Research
452 Program 1977-78. H. Cropping Systems. Institute for Agricultural Research, Samaru, Nigeria.
- 453 5. **Gao, Y., Wu, P.T., Zhao, X.N. and Wang, Z.K. (2014).** Growth, yield, and nitrogen use in the
454 wheat/maize intercropping system in an arid region in north western China. *Field Crop Research*,
455 167, 19-30.
- 456 6. **Zhang, F.S. and Li, L. (2003).** Using competitive and facilitative interactions in intercropping
457 systems enhances crop productivity and nutrient use efficiency. *Plant and Soil*, 248, 305-312.
- 458 7. **Abdel Motagally, F. M. F. and A. K. Metwally (2014).** Maximizing Productivity by
459 Intercropping Onion on Sugar Beet. *Asian Journal of Crop Science*, 6(3): 226-235.
- 460 8. **Khedr, A.H. and Nemeat-Alla, E.A.E. (2006)** Response of barley to intercropping with sugar
461 beet under different nitrogen fertilization levels. *Journal of Agricultural Sciences. Mansoura*
462 *Univ.* 31, 4957-4968.
- 463 9. **De Wit, C.T. (1960).** Intercropping its importance and research needs. Part 1. Competition and
464 yield advantages. *Field Crop Abst.*, 32, 1-10.
- 465 10. **De Wit, C.T. and Van Den Bergh, J.P. (1965)** Competition among herbage plants. *Netherlands*
466 *Journal of Agricultural Science*, 13, 212-221.
- 467 11. **El-Sarag, E.I. (2009).** Maximizing sugar beet yield, quality and water use efficiency using some
468 agriculture practices under North Sinai conditions. *Bull. Fac. Agric., Cairo. Univ.*, 60(2): 155-
469 167.
- 470 12. **Mahmoud, E.A.; M.A. Hassanin; Eman I.R. Emara (2012).** Effect of organic and mineral
471 nitrogenous fertilizers and plant density on yield and quality of sugar beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.).
472 *Egypt. J. Agron.*, 34(1): 89-103.
- 473 13. **Masri, M.I.; B.S.B. Ramadan; A.M.A. El-Shafai and M.S. El-Kady (2015).** Effect of water
474 stress and fertilization on yield and quality of sugar beet under drip and sprinkler irrigation
475 systems in sandy soils. *Int. J. Agric. Sci.*, 5(3): 414- 425.
- 476 14. **Mahmoud, E.A. and M.I. Masri (2009).** Effect of nitrogen rates and its time of application on
477 productivity of sugar beet under sprinkler irrigation in newly reclaimed soils. *J. Agric. Sci.*
478 *Mansoura Univ.*, 34(8): 9037-9048.

- 479 15. **Abdelaal, Kh. A. A. and Sahar, F. Tawfik (2015)**. Response of sugar beet plant (*Beta vulgaris*
480 L.) to mineral nitrogen fertilization and bio-fertilizers. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci., 4(9):
481 677-688.
- 482 16. **Whitmore, A.P. and J.J. Schroder (2007)**. Intercropping reduces nitrate leaching from under
483 field crops without loss of yield: a modeling study. Europ. J. Agronomy, 27: 81–88.
- 484 17. **Stoyanov, D.; I. Atanassova and S. Stratieva (1997)**. Increase of sugar beet and sunflower
485 yields. Pochvoznanie, AgrokhimiyayEkologiya, 32(3):16-20.(C.F. computer search).
- 486 18. **Ross, S.M., J.R.King, J.T.O.Donovan and D.Spaner (2004)**. Forage potential of intercropping
487 berseem clover with barley, oat, or triticale. Agronomy J., 96(4):1013-1021.
- 488 19. **Carr, P.M., R.D.Horsley and W.W.Poland (2004)**. Barley, oat and cereal-pea mixtures as
489 dryland forages in thenorthern great plains. Agron. J. 96, 677-684.
- 490 20. **Salama, Heba S. A.(2019)**. Dual Purpose Barley Production in the Mediterranean Climate: Effect
491 of Seeding Rate and Age at Forage Cutting. International Journal of Plant Production, 13:285–
492 295.
- 493 21. **Mead, R. and R.W. Willey (1980)**. The concept of a „Land equivalent ratio“ and advantages in
494 yield from intercropping. Experimental Agriculture, 16, 217-228.
- 495 22. **Klute, A.C. (1986)**. Water retention: laboratory Methods”. In: A. koute (ed), Methods of Soil
496 Analysis, part1 2nd (ed.) AgronMonogr., ASA, Madison, W1 U.S.A, 9: 635- 660.
- 497 23. **Le-Docte, A. (1927)**. Commercial determination of sugar in the beet root using the sacks Le-
498 Docte process”. *International Sugar Journal* 29: 488-492.
- 499 24. **Willey, R. W. and M. R. Rao (1980)**. A competitive ratio for quantifying competition between
500 intercrops.Expl. Agric., 17: 257-264. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0014479700011613>.
- 501 25. **Willey, R.W. (1979)**. Intercropping — its importance and research needs. 1. Competition and
502 yield advantages. Field Crop Abst., 32: 1-10.
- 503 26. **Yan, W. and L. Hunt (2002)**.Biplot analysis of diallel data. Crop Sci. 42:21-30.
- 504 27. **Yan, W. and I. Rajcan (2002)**. Biplot analysis of test sites and trait relations of soybean in
505 Ontario. Crop Science, 42: 11–20.
- 506 28. **Akcura, M. and K. Kokten (2017)**. Variations in grain mineral concentration of Turkish wheat
507 landraces germplasm. Quality assurance and safety of Crops and Foods, 9(2):153-159.
- 508 29. GenStat software package (2017).
- 509 30. **Gomez, K. N. and A. A. Gomez (1984)**. Statistical procedures for agricultural research (2nd ed.,
510 p. 68). John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- 511 31. **Badr, A. (2016)**. Importance of nitrogen and microelements for sugar beet production in sandy
512 soils. Journal of Plant Production 7(2):283-288. DOI:10.21608/jpp.2016.45341
- 513 32. **Jacek Źarski, RenataKuśmierek- Tomaszewska and StanislawDudek (2020)**. Impact of
514 Irrigation and Fertigation on the Yield and Quality of Sugar Beet (*Beta vulgaris* L.) in a Moderate
515 Climate. Agronomy 2020, 10, 166. doi:10.3390/agronomy10020166.
- 516 33. **Sheha, A. M., A. S. Shams and M. M. Lamloom (2020)**. Effect of Wheat Plant Distribution,
517 Nitrogen and Potassium Fertilizer Levels on Wheat-sugar Beet Association. Acta Scientific
518 Agriculture, 4(10):52-74. (ISSN: 2581-365X).
- 519 34. **Hashim, E. K., M. I. Hamdan, M. A. Hamid, A. K. Mohammed (2015)**. Effect of cutting on
520 green fodder and grain yield in bread wheat cultivars. The Iraqi J. of Agric. Sci., 46(1): 95-102.
- 521 35. **Pathan, S. H., S. V. Damame and B. T. Sinare (2020)**. Effect of different cutting management
522 on growth, yield, quality and economics of dual-purpose oat, barley and wheat. Forage Res., 46
523 (2): 182-186.
- 524 36. **Ahmed, H. ALkinani, Kefaah A. Jassem and Waleed A. Jabail (2019)**. Effect of Nitrogen
525 Fertilization and Number of Cutting on Yield, Components of Barley (*Hordeumvulgare* L.).
526 MuthannaJ.o of Agric. Sci. 7 (1). DOI:10.18081/MJAS/2019-7/17-25.
- 527 37. **Pravalika, Y. and D.S. Gaikwad (2021)**. Effect of Different Levels of Nitrogen Application and
528 Cutting Management on Yield, Quality and Economics of Fodder Oats (*Avena sativa* L.).
529 Biological Forum – An International Journal 13(1): 452-457.
- 530 38. **Abd El-Zaher,Sh.R. (2009)**. Effect of intercropping barley with sugar beet under different
531 nitrogen fertilization levels on yield and yield components”. Egyptian Journal of Applied Science,
532 24(6B): 531-550.

- 533 39. **Aboukhadra, S.H., Badawy, S.A., Toaima, S.E.A. and El-Shireef, D.E.E. (2013a)** Effect of
534 intercropping system of faba bean with sugar beet on their productivity and land use. *Minufiya*
535 *Journal of Agricultural Research*, **38**,1501-1518.
- 536 40. **El-Dein, A.A.M.Z. (2015)**. Effect of intercropping some winter crops with sugar beet under
537 different nitrogen fertilizer on yield and its components. *Global J. of Agric. and Food Safety Sci.*,
538 2: 303-318.
- 539 41. **El-Ghobashi, Y.E., A.E.M. Eata (2020)**. Competitive relationships and yield advantage of
540 intercropping faba bean with sugar beet under bio-organic additives and mineral nitrogen
541 fertilizer rates. *Agric. Sci.*, 11 (1): 369-389.
- 542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549

UNDER PEER REVIEW