A COMPARATIVE STUDY ON FOLIAR AND SOIL NUTRITION IN CALCAREOUS SOILS

12

ABD - ULLA HAMMAM ABD - EL HADY

B. Sc. Agric. (Soils), University of Ain Shams, 1960



Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate Divisiou

In partial fulfilment of the requirements

for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

(Soils)

Faculty of Agriculture University of Ain Shams 1969

APPROVAL SHEET

This thesis has been approved by:

.

.

. . . *.*

Committee in Charge

Date: / / 1969.



ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author is deeply indebted to prof. Dr.

H. Hamdi, Head of Soils Department, Prof. Dr. A.H.

El-Damaty. Professor of Soils, Dr. T. El Kobbia, Assoc.

Prof. of Soils, Dr. S. El Cherif Assoc. Prof. of Soils,

Faculty of Agriculture, Ain Shams University, for their supervision, encouragement and valuable criticism throughout the course of research and writing the thesis.

Thanks are also expressed to Dr. M. R. Hemissa, Plant Nutrition Research Section, Ministry of Agriculture, for providing facilities throughout the work.

JONTHIPA

									Page
1.	Intro	duction	• •	* *	• •	• •	• •	• • e	1
	Darida	w of li	teratu	SO 1	ierti	⊥ıza∪	TOTE	on the	4
		yield a plants The eff	nd sug	ar cor	rtent	oi su	gar	••	4
		yield;	sugar 'nlant	centei S	nt and	nuoi	Tem	• •	8
	2.3.	The eff yield, tion of	ect of sugar sugar	boro convei beed	n fert nt and plant	iliza mine	ation eral	on composi-	11
		-	on yle roots	ii lan	d suga	r cor	rtent	ization of ization	12
			on mir	ieral Mants	compos	21 UL O.	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •	14
	2.4.	Nutwiel under (it cont	cents ent fo	of sup utilia	rer b zatio	eet p n con	lants ditions	15
3.	3.7.	rials and Agricul Methods 3.0.1.3.2.2.	ltural s of al Soil a	t reat nalyse analys	ments es . ses .	, .	• •	••	19 31 31 32
4.	, Resu	ilte and	D' sou	ssion	9.0	n ie	v fo	liar and	33
	4.1.	soil a conten	pplica t and lants	tions chemic	on thatal co	e yie mposi	tion	of sugar	r 33
		4,1,1,	tion	on the	э учет	a of	the	rtiliza- r beet roots	34
		4.1.2	t i on beet	filecu on mu olani	of ni triant	troge cont	en fe tents	rtiliza— of suga	10
		4.1.3.	Marc o	Tedi	o ol	csoho	orus :	fertiliz ar beet s	- 44

									Page
		4.1.4.	The effeation on and suga	. the y	ielā (of sug	ar bee	z - t	47
		4.1.5.	The integrand pota yield of sugar co	ssium Sugar	ferti: beet	lizati plant	on on	rus the	50
		4.1.6.	The effe	ct of nutrie	phospl nt c o i	horus ntents	fertil of su	iza- gar	
		4.1.7.	tion on	ct of n rie	potas nt co	ntents	of su	za- gar	54
		4.1.8.	The effe on yield content	ect of l of su	boron gar b	ferti e et an	lizati		54 62
		4.1.9.		ct of	boron of b	ferti oron,	nitrog	en,	02
	4.2.	The in:	beet pla fluence o	mts.,	c n		• •	• •	67
		soil ar	oplication ar beet post with	ns on	chemic	cal co	mposit	ion	71
		4.2.1.	Dry matt stages of fertiliz	மீ gr∈w	th, a	s infl	ferent uenced	by	74
		4.2.3.	Nitroger plants as influ	js dif∷	brant	stuge	s of g		
		4,2,2,	plants a	at dilif	erent	stage	s of		7 8
		4.2.5.	growth, applicate Potassia	ious . m	2 2	n ••	 r beet	• •	83
			plo growtn, applicat	as inf	Tuenc	stage ed by	s of fertil		87
5 •	Summ	ary .		5 6 27		• • •	• •	• •	92
ŝ.	Refe	rences	• • •	~ * *	• n	a ••	• •	• •	95
Ara	abic	Summary		*					

LIST OF TABLES

Tabl	e Title	Page
1.	The amount of nitrogen fertilizer and methods of application used in the first experiment	20
2.	Soil analyses of 'the field plots in 1965	22
3.	Date, number of sprays, amounts of urea (g/plot) and urea solution (liter/plot) sprayed during the growth period	23
4.	Amounts of phosphorus and potassium fertili- zers and their combination used in the second experiment	25
5•	Date, number of sprays, amounts of phosphorus and potassium in (g/plot) phosphorus and potassium solution (liter/plot) sprayed during the growth period	28
6.	The selected treatments for controlling nutrients uptake during growth period	29
7.	Soil analyses of the field plots for boron experiments in 1966.	3 0
8.	Date, number of sprays, amounts of boron solutions sprayed during the growth period in (liters/plots)	31
9.	The effect of nitrogen fertilization on fresh weight of sugar beet plants	3 5
10. 3	The effect of nitrogen fertilization on dry weight of sugar beet plants	<i>3</i> 6
11.	The effect of nitrogen fertilization on sucrose percentage and sugar yield of sugar beet roots	- 38
12.	The effect of nitrogen fertilization on nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium percentage and uptake by sugar beet plants	<i>y</i> 0
13.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium ferti- lization on fresh weight of sugar beet plants	45
14.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium fertilization on dry weight of sugar beet plants	46
		70

		Page
15.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium fertilization on sucrose percentage and sugar yield of sugar beet roots	4 8
16.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium fertilization on nitrogen percentage and uptake by sugar beet plants	56
17.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium fertilization on phosphorus percentage and uptake by sugar beet plants	5 8
18.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium fertilization on potassium percentage and uptake by sugar beet plants	60
19.	The effect of boron fertilization on fresh weight of sugar beet plant at different stages of growth	63
20.	The effect of boron fertilization on dry weight of sugar beet plants at different stages of growth	63
21.	The effect of boron fertilization on sucrose percentage and sugar yield of sugar beet at different stages of growth	65
22.	The effect of boron fertilization on boron concentration and uptake by sugar beet plants at different stages of growth	69
23.	The effect of boron fertilization on nitrogen phosphorus and potassium percentages and uptake by sugar beet plants at different stages	
24.	Dry matter content in gm per plant at different stages of growth, as influenced by N,P and K applications	70
25.	Sucrose percentage at different stages of growth, as influenced by N, P and K applications (calculated on the basis of dry wei-	72
26	ght)	7 5
26.	Sugar yield in gm per plant at different stages of growth, as influenced by N, P and K applications.	76

		Page
27.	Nitrogen uptake in . g. per plant at dif- ferent stages of growth, as influenced by N, P and K applications	80
28.	Nitrogen percentage in the sugar beet plants at different stages of growth, as influenced by N, P and K applications	81
29.	Phosphorus uptake in mgm per plant at different stages of growth, as influenced by N, P and K applications	84
30.	Phosphorus percentage in the sugar beet plants, at different stages of growth, as influenced by N, P and K applications	85 85
31.	Potassium uptake in mgm per plant at different stages of growth, as influenced by N, P and K applications	8 8
<i>3</i> 2.	Potassium percentage in the sugar beet plants, at different stages of growth, as influenced by N, P and K applications	89

LIST OF FIGURES

Fig.	Program (Control of the Control of t	Page
1.	The effect of nitrogen fertilization on fresh, dry and sugar yields of sugar beet roots	39
2.	The effect of nitrogen fertilization on nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium contents of sugar beet plants	43
3.	The effect of phosphorus fertilization on fresh, dry and sugar yields of sugar beet roots	49
4.	The effect of potassium fertilization on fresh, dry and sugar yields of sugar beet roots	51
5.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium ferti- lization on fresh, dry and sugar yields of sugar beet roots	53
6.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium on total nitrogen content of sugar beet plants	57
7.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium on total phosphorus content of sugar beet plants	5 9
8.	The effect of phosphorus and potassium on total potassium content of sugar beet plants	61
9.	The effect of boron fertilization on fresh, dry and sugar yields of sugar beet roots	66
10.	Dry matter content (g/plant) of sugar beet plants as influenced by fertilizon applications	73
11.	Sugar yield (g/plant) of sugar beet roots as influenced by fertilizer applications	77

		Page
12.	Nitrogen uptake (mg/plant) of sugar beet plants as influenced by fertilizer applications	82
13.	Phosphorus uptake (mg./plant) of sugar beet plants as influenced by fertilizer applications	86
14.	Potassium uptake (mg./plant) of sugar beet as influenced by fertilizer applications	90

I INTRODUCTION

In Egypt, Sugar cane is the only source of sugar industry. The average annual local sugar production amounts to 370,800 tons in 1967. Since the average local consumption of sugar is about 458,000 tons, it is apparent that there is a deficiency in local sugar production amounting to about 87,200 tons which is expected to increase as a result of greater consumption of the over increasing population. Therefore, it is necessary to search for new sugar plants, other than sugar cane, to increase the sugar production in the U.A.R.

Experiments carried out by the Ministry of Agriculture, Sugar Crops Research Section, El-Zalaki & Abo El Wafa (1966), proved that sugar beet can be successfully grown in sandy, saline and calcareous soils whereas sugar cane, under the same conditions, is practically unable to develop to its normal growth.

Furthermore, it is noteworthy to mention that the water requirements for sugar beet to produce one ton of sucrose are about 1300 cubic meters during the whole season of growth, El-Zalaki & Abo El-Wafa (1966). On the other hand, the sugar cane plant consumes about 4600 cubic meters of water to produce the same quantity

of sucrose. Moreover, the sucrose content of sugar beet is about 20% of fresh weight, while it reaches 14% of fresh weight of sugar cane. Also, the growth period of sugar beet is about half that of sugar cane. In addition, the cultivation of sugar beet in the U.A.R will not interfere with that of sugar cane. It is interesting to note also that the beet crop is in reality two crops in one. It is capable to produce 3.0 - 3.5 tons of sugar per feddan, and, in the same time, the green leaves could fulfill a great portion of the requirement for a green fodder, specially during summer season.

, g. mag

cal

all

pl

ef

en

er

Sixty thousand feddans of the highly calcareous soil at the Northern Region of El-Tahrir Province is the suggested area where sugar beet will be planted for sugar production. Therefore, it was thought of importance to evaluate the effect of fertilizers, as well as their methods of application, on sugar beet production. For this purpose, a scheme of research was planed to investigate the effect of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium on sugar beet yield, as well as sugar content of the roots. Boron fertilization was also considered since its role in sugar translocation is well known, and due to the fact that highly

2- REVIEW OF LITERATURE

For the sake of clarity, the cited literature pertaining to this subject is divided into four parts.

- 2.1. The effect of soil fertilization on the yield and sugar content of sugar beet plants.
- 2.2. The effect of foliar nutrition on the yield, sugar content and nutrient contents of plants.
- 2.3. Effect of boron fertilization on yield, sugar content and mineral composition of sugar beet plants.
- 2.4. Nutrient contents of sugar beet plants under different fertilization conditions.

2.1. The effect of soil fertilization on the yield and sugar content of sugar beet plants.

The growth and development of the sugar beet plants, as outlined, take place in an orderly fashion as long as the climate (temperature, light and moisture) is favourable, and no nutritional deficiencies, diseases, pests, or other factors are hindering plant growth. When there is a change in climate or in the nutritional status, a new equilibrium is established within the plant. Some of these changes, when occurred in the fall of the year, may induce sugar storage

or "ripening" while others, specially those inducing new growth, cause a lowering of the sucrose concentration of the beet.root.

Kolbe (1958) and Haddock et al (1956) found that the yield of sugar beet roots increased with increasing rates of nitrogenous fertilizers. However, higher rates of N increased top production, and reduced the sugar content of roots.

From two field trials, Dubourg et al (1958) noticed that higher rates of nitrogen greatly increased the percentage of amino acids in the roots particularly glutamic acid, resulting in lower sugar yield. The same result was obtained by Tolman & Johnson (1958). Roussel (1960), using two varities of sugar beet grown on different soil types, showed that 150-130 kg. N per hactar gave the highest yield of roots and sugar production.

In California, Ulrich et al (1959) found that overuse and late use of nitrogen is the major factor contributing to the decline in sucrose concentration of beets.

Dunn and Rost (1950) and Mc Queen (1960) noticed that sugar content of beet was slightly raised by phosphorus application. In field experiment on low