

## **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=4200m<sup>2</sup>)) 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)

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 m<sup>2</sup> 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<sup>-1</sup>.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<sup>-1</sup>. 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<sup>-1</sup>) 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% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) at the rate of 200 kg fed<sup>-1</sup>. Thinning sugar beet  
 98 took place after 45 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/

**Comment [I1]:** If I understand correctly, % of barley in intercropping treatments is 25% of sole culture seed rate. In this regard, what is % sugar beet rate in intercropping cultivation compared to the sole culture?

**Comment [I2]:** What are the irrigation rates? How they are calculated?

	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 <sup>-1</sup>	33.42	28.14
Texture class	Clay loam	Clay loam	Available P, mg kg <sup>-1</sup>	10.63	11.11
pH, 1:2.5 (susp.)	7.77	7.75	Available K, mg kg <sup>-1</sup>	315.72	102.54
EC, dSm <sup>-1</sup>	1.67	1.63	Organic matter (O.M, %)	2.50	2.52
<b>Soluble ions, meq l<sup>-1</sup></b>			Organic carbon (O.C, %)	1.45	1.42
Mg <sup>2+</sup>	5.32	5.3	C / N ratio	10.07	9.72
Ca <sup>2+</sup>	6.13	6.11	<b>DTPA – extractable micronutrients (ppm)</b>		
Na <sup>+</sup>	7.46	7.48	Fe	3.83	3.74
K <sup>+</sup>	0.23	0.25	Br	0.26	0.25
CO <sub>3</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	0.00	0.00	Mn	3.15	3.02
HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup>	3.62	3.64	Zn	4.46	4.36
Cl <sup>-</sup>	8.13	8.15	Cu	1.53	1.49
SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>2-</sup>	7.39	7.35			

113  
114

### 2.3. Studied characters:

115

#### 2.3.1. Barley: -

116

Plant height (cm), spike length (cm), number of grains/spike, number of spikes/m<sup>2</sup>, 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) = 4200m<sup>2</sup>).

117

118

119

120

#### 2.3.2. Sugar beet: -

121

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)=4200m<sup>2</sup>), top yield(ton/fed), sucrose %, Sugar yield (ton/fed), Leaf area index and foliage weight (ton/fed).

122

123

124

125

126

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

127

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).

128

129

130

### 2.5. Competitive relationships and yield advantages:

131

The following competitive relationships and yield advantages were calculated:

132

#### 2.5.1. Land equivalent ratio (LER):

133

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

134

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

135

\*Where, Y<sub>aa</sub> and Y<sub>bb</sub> were pure stand of crop, a (sugar beet) and b (barley), respectively. Y<sub>ab</sub> is intercrop yield of a crop and Y<sub>ba</sub> is intercrop yield b crop.

136

137

138

#### 2.5.2. Relative crowding coefficient (RCC)

139

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<sub>aa</sub> = Pure stand yield of crop a (sugar beet); Y<sub>bb</sub> = Pure stand yield of crop b (barley); Y<sub>ab</sub> = Intercrop yield of crop a (sugar beet); Y<sub>ba</sub> = Intercrop yield of crop b (barley); Z<sub>ab</sub> = The respective proportion of crop a in the intercropping system (sugar beet); Z<sub>ba</sub> = The respective proportion of crop b in the intercropping system (barley).

140

141

142

143

144

145

146

#### 2.5.3. Aggressivity (A)

147

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:  $A_{ab} = [Y_{ab} / (Y_{aa} \times Z_{ab})] - [Y_{ba} / (Y_{bb} \times Z_{ba})]$ ;  $A_{ba} = [Y_{ba} / (Y_{bb} \times Z_{ba})] - [Y_{ab} / (Y_{aa} \times Z_{ab})]$ .

148

149

150

151

### 2.6. Economic evaluations: -

152

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 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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.**

**Comment [I3]:** Replace with "x" everywhere.

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 <sup>2</sup>	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

255  
256 Also, grain yield varieties fell by 17% and 27% after the first cutting and 35% and 50% after the second  
257 cutting in decreased biological yield 10% and 22% after the first cutting and 21% and 39% after the second  
258 cutting for both years, respectively. [20] showed that, cutting barley at early 40-~~kb~~ growth stages (45 and 55  
259 DAS) resulted in the production of higher forage yield with higher quality. [35] recorded that, The seed and  
260 straw yield (2.48 and 9.40 t/ha) was recorded significantly higher in the no cutting for fodder and left for seed  
261 only on pooled mean basis; while, cutting at 50 DAS and left crop for seed recorded significantly higher green  
262 forage equivalent yield (79.45 t/ha).

Comment [14]: ??

### 263 3.1.2.2. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer rate: -

264 In the intercropping system with sugar beet, mean values in Table (6) established that different N rates  
265 had significant effects on grain yield and all yield traits of barley in both growing seasons. In general, it was  
266 noted that gradual increased by increasing N rate up to 120 Kg/fed for all barley yield traits in both seasons.  
267 Results revealed that the highest grain yield traits were obtained under adding N rate 120 Kg/fed, recording  
268 353.60 and 372.04 Kg/fed for grain yield in both seasons, respectively as the gain of increasing in other yield  
269 traits. Meanwhile, the lowest grain yield was obtained under the application of 80 Kg/fed N that gave 311.93 and  
270 329.87 Kg/fed for the two respectively seasons. These results are in accordance with those reported by [15], [13]  
271 and [33].  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279

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

Nitrogen rates	Plant height (cm)	Spike length (cm)	No. of grains/spike	No. of spikes/m <sup>2</sup>	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

### 282 3.1.2.3. Effect of the interaction between cutting and nitrogen rate: -

283 Means of barley cuts treatments x nitrogen rates interaction on barley traits in both growing seasons was  
284 presented in Table (7).  
285  
286

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

Cuts	Nitrogen rates	Plant height (cm)	Spike length (cm)	No. of grains/spike	No. of spikes/m <sup>2</sup>	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/m<sup>2</sup> and biological yield/fed mean  
290 value in the 1<sup>st</sup> 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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 (N<sub>3</sub>) 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].

Comment [15]: Before heading is cut1.

### 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 1<sup>st</sup> season and Cut2N1 in the 2<sup>nd</sup>  
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 **Table 8. Effect of the interaction between different barely cuts and nitrogen fertilizer levels on land**  
317 **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 Results indicated that most treatments were positive; suggesting efficient utilization of land resource by  
320 growing both crops together under these treatments, especially adding 120 kg N (N3) under barley cut before  
321 heading (cut1) and no cut to obtain the most land equivalent ratio (LER) estimates.  
322

### 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 barley 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

347 However, the positive sign for sugar beet in cut before heading and cut after heading and the negative  
348 one for Barely may be due to the ability of the shorter component to compete with the taller component for  
349 available nutrients, especially N in this respect. This further, emphasizes that sugar beet is able to acquire more  
350 resources than that Barely in the both seasons.  
351

### 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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, 17<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> 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, Agrokhimiyay Ekologiya, 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 the northern 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 2<sup>nd</sup> (ed.) Agron Monogr., ASA, Madison, WI 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 (2<sup>nd</sup> 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, Renata Kuśmierk- Tomaszewska and Stanisław Dudek (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 Scientifica  
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, Kefaa A. Jassem and Waleed A. Jabail (2019)**. Effect of Nitrogen  
525 Fertilization and Number of Cutting on Yield, Components of Barley (*Hordeum vulgare* L.).  
526 Muthanna J. 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