

551 Annals Agric. Sci., Ain Shams Univ., Cairo, 52(2), 551-562, 2007

INFLUENCE OF PHOSPHATIC AND POTASSIC FERTILIZERS ON LEAF-N, P AND K OF TWO SUGARCANE VARIETIES GROWN ON THREE SOIL SERIES IN SUDAN

[44]

El-Tilib^{1,a}, M.A.; E.A. Elamin¹; M.H. Elnasikh¹ and H.I. Suleiman¹

 Department of Soil and Environment Sciences- Faculty of Agriculture-Shambat-PC 13314, Khartoum North - Sudan,

a: E-mail: elamin elamin@yahoo.com

Keywords: Triple superphosphate, Potassium chloride, Leaf-N, Leaf-P, Leaf-K.

ABSTRACT

A field trial was carried out for two consecutive seasons (1998 and 1999) at Sennar Sugarcane Company (latitude 13° 33'N and longitude 33° 37'E). The study was meant to examine the impact of phosphatic and potassium fertilization on plant cane and its ratoon contents of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium. The treatments comprised of three levels of potassium (0, 72 and 144 kgK/ha applied as potassium chloride; three levels of phosphorus (0, 29 and 58 kgP/ha) applied as triple super phosphate (TSP); two sugar cane varieties (Co 6806 and Co 527) grown on three soil series (Hago, Nasr and Dinder). The treatments were arranged in a randomized complete block design and replicated thrice. Plant samples for analysis were taken at intervals of two months starting four months from planting up to ten months. The results showed that the mineral composition of cane plants was significantly affected by treatments. Leaf-N was high early in the season (3.23%) and started to decrease as the growing season proceeded (1.8%). The leaf-N values were low to high according to the standard concentrations. The leaf-N levels were higher in plant cane than those of the ratoon. Nasr soil series gave the highest values followed by Dinder and Hago series. Variety Co 6806 was better than Co 527. Leaf-P content was low according the standard levels ranging from 0.055 to 0.116%. Variety Co 6806 surpassed Co 527 in absorption of phosphorus. Leaf-P and leaf-K in ratoon were higher than those in the plant cane which indicated the residual effect of phosphorus and potassium fertilization. Leaf-K was in the insufficient range (1.33 – 2.04%). However, the data showed a significant rise in leaf-N, and leaf-K of plant cane and ratoon by 5-9% and 13-14%, respectively.

INTRODUCTION

Sugarcane production and industry expanded considerably in Sudan in the last four decades. However, the yield per unit area is well below the potential yield obtained abroad. This was thought to be due to the lack of nutrient supply mainly N, P, and K. Sugarcane is a heavy feeder crop that depletes the soil of these essential nutrients, therefore, adequate nutrient supply is essential.

Soils of Sudan are inherently deficient in nitrogen and are of very low phosphorus contents. Generally, the most important agricultural soils in Sudan suffer from nitrogen and phosphorus deficiency (Gobara et al 1993). Because of this, yield of most crops in Sudan is very low compared with that in many areas worldwide.

Fertilization of sugarcane at Northwest Sennar Scheme in Sudan was mostly limited to nitrogen, and small areas of the scheme received phosphorus, but very little was assigned to the response of cane to potassium fertilization (El-Tilib et al 2004). Therefore, this investigation was conducted to estimate the influence of soil type, sugarcane variety, phosphorus and potassium fertilization on the uptake of nitrogen, phosphorus and potassium by plant cane and its ratoon.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A two-year field experiment was conducted in the seasons of 1998 and 1999 at Sennar Sugar Company in the Blue Nile State (latitude 13° 33' N and longitude 33° 37' E). The experimental site was disc ploughed, finely harrowed, leveled and ridged at 1.5 meter. The area was divided into plots 37.5 m² and 1.5 meter apart with 5 rows.

The experiment was carried out on three soil types using two sugarcane varieties and three levels of phosphatic and potassium fertilizers and their combinations. The soil types include: Dinder series classified as, very fine montmorillonite, isohyperthermic, Typic Chromusterts (Dinder clay); Hagu series classified as, fine kaolinitic,

isohyperthermic, Ultic Haplustalfs (Hagu sandy clay) and Nasr series (Nasr sandy clay) occupying intermediate position between Dinder and Hagu series classified as fine, montmorillonite, isohyperthermic, Vertic Ustorthents (El-Fadil, 1971). Properties of the three soil types are presented in Table (1).

The cane varieties used were the most commonly grown in the scheme, namely, Co 6806 and Co527. Triple superphosphate fertilizer (TSP) was applied at three levels (0, 64.5 and 129 kg P_2O_5 /ha) designated as P0, P1 and P2, respectively. The TSP was added in bands along the furrow at the time of planting. The rates of the added potassium were 0, 86 and 172 kg K_2O / ha designated as K0, K1 and K2, respectively. The recommended basal dressing of nitrogen was applied at the rate of 219 kgN/ha as urea. Both potassium and nitrogen fertilizers were mixed thoroughly and broadcasted by hand in continuous band in the furrow, buried and irrigated immediately two months after planting.

Table 1. Physical and chemical properties of examined soil series.

in and the contract of	THE RESIDENCE OF THE PARTY OF	Pa	article size distri	bution (%)		
Soil series	Depth (cm)	Coarse sand	Fine sand	Silt	Clay	Bulk Density
Dinder	0-30	17	6	25	52	1.66
	30-50	17	5	24	54	1.78
Nasr	0-30	29	6	17	48	1.89
	30-50	28	7	17	49	1.87
Hagu	0-30	41	8	14	37	1.88
	30-50	39	6	16	39	1.86

Soil series	Depth (cm)	pH (paste)	ECe (dS/m)	CEC (mmol/kg soil)	CaCO ₃ (%)	O.C. (%)	TotalN (%)	Avial P (ug/g)
Dinder	0-30	8.00	0.40	640	0.80	0.91	0.05	2.2
	30-50	8.10	0.43	650	0.80	0.62	0.04	2.6
Nasr	0-30	7.44	0.34	540	2.2	0.94	0.04	1.8
	30-50	7.50	0.50	580	2.4	0.58	0.05	3.8
Hagu	0-30	7.05	0.56	460	1.4	0.94	0.04	3.6
of Insidi	30-50	7.08	0.55	430	1.7	0.55	0.03	3.0

and solic	นายเลลีย (ค.ศ. นายเลลีย (ค.ศ.	Sc	oluble catio	ons and ani	ons (mmo	l _c /l)	Ex	changeable (mmol/kg	
Soil series	Depth (cm)	Na	Ca	Mg	CI	HCO ₃	Exch.Na	Exch. K	Mobile K reserve
Dinder	0-30	3.20	1.00	0.20	2.40	3.00	0.92	0.58	1.28
	30-50	3.50	1.20	0.40	2.40	4.50	1.87	0.44	1.11
Nasr	0-30	1.25	2.10	1.00	2.80	5.00	0.34	0.66	1.38
	30-50	1.40	3.50	1.00	2.60	3.50	0.48	0.50	0.87
Hagu	0-30	1.30	4.00	2.00	2.70	4.70	0.30	0.54	1.65
s शक्तिपुरका	30-50	1.20	3.20	1.70	2.50	5.10	0.70	0.41	1.42

Four months after planting, the ridges were split to cover the base of the growing stools (hilling up). Weeding was performed through the use of Gezapax and Gezaprim herbicides prior to the second irrigation. Thereafter, hand weeding was practiced when necessary. Five stalks were selected randomly from the three inner rows in each plot and marked.

The parameters were measured at intervals of two months starting from the 4th month after planting and continued to the 10th month. The leaf sample was prepared from four most recently mature leaves (leaf number 3, 4, 5 and 6 from the top counting the rolled up spindle leaf as number 1) and pooled to constitute one sample. The leaves were cut into small pieces and dried in an oven at 70°C for 48 hours. The dried samples were ground separately by a grinder mill and kept for the chemical analysis.

The ratoon was considered as the second season of the crop. Therefore, after cane harvest, the ratoon was cut to ground level, plots were cleaned, irrigated and ridges were raised. The ratoon received similar doses of nitrogen, potassium and phosphorus fertilizers as the plant cane. Hand weeding was performed when necessary but no herbicides were added. All measurements, sampling and analysis were carried out following the field and laboratory methods employed for cane plant in the first year of the study.

Chemical Analysis

Micro-Kjeldahl method was used for plant nitrogen determinations. Leaf phosphorus was detected using vanado-molybdate colorimetric method described by AOAC (1970). Leaf-calcium, magnesium, sodium and potassium were determined using atomic absorption spectrophotometer, model 2380, Perkin Elmer. The treatments were arranged in a randomized complete block design and replicated thrice. Statistical analysis was performed and the means were separated using Duncan Multiple Range Test.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Nitrogen

The uptake of nitrogen by cane early in the season increased significantly as a result of phosphorus application but later it became low. According to Wolf et al (1985), the level of leaf nitrogen was sufficient up to the 6th month but, thereafter, it was reduced to the lower limit. A

positive correlation between phosphorus and nitrogen concentrations of plant shoot was established (Bar Yousef et al 1995 and Azcon, et al 1996). The results showed that the influence of potassium fertilizer on nitrogen uptake by plant cane was generally negative during the first 8 months after planting (Table 2). This could be explained by the possible antagonism between nitrogen and potassium because potassium modifies ammonium (NH4+) ion fixation in soils to restrict nitrogen availability. This was attributed to the contraction of clay lattices as a result of potassium application, hence blocking the release of the fixed ammonium (Somorowska, 1987 and Daliparthy, et al 1994). On the other hand, application of potassium fertilizer to ratoon increased the nitrogen uptake throughout the growth of the plant cane (Table 3). This was almost due to the efficient root system of the ration which enabled the search of nutrients in larger soil volume (Yavda and Singh, 1992). However, the levels of leaf nitrogen, phosphorous and potassium were relatively high early in the season and tended to decline towards the end of the season (Mengel & Kirkby 1978). It was concluded that plant cane attained its maximum requirement of nutrients at the age of 6 months when full development of leaves occurred and the requirement of plant for these nutrients decreases thereafter.

Phosphorous

Leaf phosphorous content in plant cane showed an insignificant increase in response to phosphorous fertilization (Table 4). These insignificant responses to the added phosphorous could be attributed to the ability of most soils to immobilize the added phosphorous (Barvalle, et al 1995) and Tsadilas, et al 1996). The level of leaf phosphorous in ratoon was significantly increased early in the season when fertilizer phosphorous was added (Table 5). However, the level of phosphorus in both plant cane and ratoon is in the lower range (Wolf, et al 1985). This may be due to the phosphorus retention by hydrous iron oxides or adsorption by clay particles (Elmahi and Mustafa, 1980). It is worth mentioning that the ratoon leaf phosphorous content was higher than that of plant cane. This may suggest that in the ratoon there would be less fixation of the added phosphorous and the residual effect of phosphorous applied in the first season will be in favour of the ratoon (Korndorfer and Alcarde, 1992). Addition of potassium fertilizer did not affect the level of leaf phosphorous in plant cane

El-Tilib; Elamin; Elnasikh and Suleiman

Table 2. Mean leaf nitrogen content (%) of plant cane as affected by treatments

0 2			4	months fr	om plantir	ng	115	6 months fro	om planting	g		8 months fr	om plantin	g	10	0 months fi	rom plantir	ng
Variety	Fertili	zer rate		Soil series	3	MVE	L BL.	Soil series		MVi		Soil series		MVE		Soil series		MVE
	K	P	Dinder	Nasr	Hagu	E E	Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu	
4	18.0	PO	2.45	3.10	1.52		2.40	3.20	2.00		2.13	2.39	1.51		1.50	1.95	1.60	
	K0	Pl	2.40	2.80	1.89		2.10	3.41	2.22		2.02	2.46	1.57		1.41	1.95	1.56	
		P2	2.44	3.40	1.71		2.33	3.50	1.90		2.17	2.20	1.36		1.45	1.79	1.38	
		PO	2.50	2.98	1.60		2.22	3.70	1.95		2.22	2.18	1.49		1.33	1.96	1.60	
co 6806	K1	Pl	2.62	2.67	1.65	2.39b	2.72	3.80	1.91	2.54a	2.10	2.30	1.45	1.93a	1.38	1.93	1.52	1.616
		P2	2.49	3.10	1.68		2.48	3.06	2.07		2.03	1.81	1.49		1.44	1.88	1.54	
		P0	2.50	2.76	1.59		2.23	3.42	2.08		2.20	1.78	1.48		1.45	1.84	1.60	
	K2	P1	2.72	3.05	1.65		2.23	3.13	1.95		2.18	2.19	1.36		1.30	1.92	1.58	
		P2	2.54	2.88	1.80		2.25	3.24	2.16		2.00	1.74	1.39		1.32	1.75	1.55	
		PO	2.70	3.48	1.56		2.10	2.60	1.83		2.00	2.03	1.17		1.35	1.82	1.50	
	KO	Pl	2.61	3.95	1.60		2.19	3.00	2.00		1.96	2.13	1.29		1.30	1.67	1.63	
		P2	2.53	3.43	1.67		2.10	3.17	1.80		2.00	2.02	1.30		1.30	1.69	1.31	
		P0	2.58	3.20	1.50		2.10	3.05	1.89		1.80	2.00	1.42		1.46	1.60	1.60	
Co 527	K1	P1	2.71	3.98	1.63	2.56a	2.13	3.38	1.99	2.36b	2.02	1.98	1.40	1.77b	1.40	1.76	1.76	1.76
		P2	2.80	2.90	1.42		2.12	2.53	2.00		1.95	2.09	1.33		1.40	1.82	1.66	
		P0	2.56	3.80	1.52		2.20	3.56	1.94		1.80	2.10	1.39		1.30	1.71	1.59	
	K2	PI	2.69	3.43	1.56		2.16	3.45	1.86		2.08	2.06	1.31		1.45	1.70	1.70	
		P2	2.68	3.19	1.50		1.96	2.55	2.12		1.90	2.00	1.36		1.45	1.85	1.69	
MSE			2.58b	3.23a	1.61c		2.22b	3.21a	1.98c		2.04b	2.08a	1.39c		1.34c	1.81a	1.58b	
			Main K ef	fect			Main K ef	fect			Main K ef	fect			Main K eff	ect		
			K0	K1	K2		K0	KI	K2		K0	KI	K2		K0	K1	K2	
			2.51a	2.45b	2.47b		2.44b	2.51a	2.42b		1.87a	1.84b	1.81c		1.56b	1.61a	1.60a	
			Main P eff	fect			Main P eff	ect			Main P eff	fect			Main P effe	ect		
			P0	P1	P.2		P0	Pl	P2		P0	Pi	P2		P0	P1	P2	
			2.44b	2.53a	2.45b		2.42ь	2.54a	2.41b		1.84b	1.88a	1.78c		1.60a	1.61a	1.57b	
			Variety SE	$E = \pm 0.01$			Variety SE	$\xi = \pm 0.009$			Variety SE = ± 0.009				Variety SE = ±0.004			
			Soil, K and	oil, K and P SE = ±0.014			Soil, K and	$dPSE = \pm 0.0$	11		Soil, K and P SF = ± 0.011			Soil, K and P SE = ± 0.005				
	-		CV = 4.04	%			CV = 3.13	%			CV = 4.32	20/0			$CV = 2.08^{\circ}$	%		

Symbols used in this table and the following tables are explained as follows: P0 = No phosphorus; P1 = 64.5 kg P_2O_3 /ha: $P_2 = 129$ kg P

Means followed by the same letter do not differ significantly using Duncan's Multiple Range Test at 1 and 5%

Table 3. Mean leaf nitrogen content (%) of ration as affected by treatments

		ued 10-11	4 n	nonths fro	om planti	ng	6	months t	rom planti	ng	8	months f	rom planti	ng	10	months f	rom plant	ing
Variety	Fertil	lizer rate	CA A 10 2	Soil series	10011	MVE	208 X	Soil serie	S	MVE	242	Soil serie	s	MVE	A. A 1	Soil serie	s	MVE
	K	P	Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu	
		P0	1.60	1.63	1.79		1.97	1.78	1.54		1.49	1.69	1.47		1.54	1.49	1.65	
	K0	P1	1.87	1.79	1.99		2.15	1.86	1.83		1.72	1.98	1.55		1.83	1.64	1.89	
		P2	1.99	1.87	2.04		2.20	1.93	1.85		1.68	2.02	1.49		1.77	1.67	1.88	
		PO	1.66	2.01	2.02		2.22	2.10	1.86		1.74	1.83	1.63		1.80	1.43	1.93	
Co	K1	P1	2.10	1.72	2.18	1.92a	2.40	2.40	2.04	1.98a	1.91	1.87	1.54	1.69a	1.94	1.54	2.00	1.75a
6806		P2	2.10	1.82	1:92		2.09	1.85	1.84		1.68	1.92	1.52		1.80	1.52	1.82	
		P0	1.76	2.00	2.11		2.16	2.08	1.87		1.75	1.86	1.52		1.88	1.60	1.89	
	K2	P1	2.00	1.80	1.79	4	2.05	1.84	1.74		1.70	1.81	1.43		1.80	1.62	1.74	
		P2	1.70	1.66	1.80		2.16	1.92	1.70		1.70	1.78	1.53		1.75	1.61	1.85	
		P0	1.52	1.77	1.52		2.00	1.72	1.59		1.50	1.57	1.35		1.58	1.48	1.52	
J. C. 17.	K0	P1	1.90	1.98	1.99		2.24	1.89	1.78		1.60	1.77	1.62		1.62	1.80	1.65	
		P2	1.96	1.89	2.00		2.21	1.85	1.73		1.65	1.67	1.45		1.68	1.70	1.65	
		P0	1.72	1.95	1.75		2.12	1.93	1.77		1.62	1.86	1.52		1.73	1.76	1.75	
Co 527	K1	P1	2.05	2.15	2.10	1.86b	2.31	2.19	1.93	1.95b	1.65	1.93	1.76	1.65b	1.79	1.81	1.78	1.71b
	r.	P2	2.05	1.90	1.98		2.30	1.91	1.73		1.74	1.82	1.59		1.76	1.61	1.83	
		P0	1.74	1.99	1.91		2.33	1.93	1.80		1.73	1.84	1.51		1.88	1.87	1.65	
	K2	P1	2.00	2.00	2.01		2.16	1.97	1.77		1.56	1.72	1.43		1.68	1.77	1.82	
1		P2	1.79	1.91	1.93		2.00	1.91	1.71		1.70	1.73	1.53		1.78	1.77	1.85	
MSE	*	70.0	1.86b	1.886	1.94a		2.17a	1.95b	1.78c		1.67b	1.82a	1.52c		1.76a	1.65b	1.79a	
			Main K	effect			Main K	effect			Main K	effect			Main K	effect		
			K0	K1	K2		K0	K1	K2		K0	K1	K2		K0	K1	K2	
			1.84c	1.95a	1.88b		1.90c	2.06a	1.95b		1.63c	1.73a	1.66c		1.67b	1.76a	1.77a	
			Main P	effect	a reco		Main P				Main P	effect			Main P	effect		
			P0	P1	P2 .		P0	P1	P2		P0	Pl	P2		P0	P1	P2	
			1.80c	1.97a	1.91b		1.93b	2.03a	1.94b		1.64b	1.70a	1.68a		1.69b	1.76a	1.74a	
		Variety SE = ± 0.013		Variety	$SE = \pm 0.0$	009		Variety SE = ± 0.009				Variety						
			Soil, K	and P SE	$=\pm0.015$	i	Soil, K	and P SE	$= \pm 0.011$		Soil, K and P SE = ± 0.011				Soil, K and P SE = ± 0.013			
			CV = 5.				CV = 3				CV = 4				CV = 5			

Symbols as defined in Table (2).

Table 4. Mean leaf phosphorus content (%) of plant cane as affected by treatments

			4	months fr	om plant	ing	6	months fr	om planti	ng	8	months fr	om plantii	ng	10	months fr	om planti	ing
Variety		ilizer		Soil series	3	MVE	4.7 -3 N	Soil series	3	MVE	\bar{r}	Soil series		MVE	(§)	Soil series		MVE
	ra	ate																
	K	P	Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu	
		P0	0.057	0.099	0.094		0.124	0.120	0.083		0.081	0.110	0.081		D .083	0.089	0.073	
	K0	PI	0.055	0.091	0.116		0.108	0.128	0.092		0.076	0.113	0.084		0.076	0.090	0.070	
		P2	0.056	0.105	0.079		0.120	0.129	0.075		0.082	0.108	0.070		0.083	0.080	0.064	
		P0	0.056	0.091	0.096		0.113	0.136	0.080		0.082	0.110	0.079	9	0.075	0.092	0.072	
Co	K1	PI	0.058	0.083	0.090	0.080a	0.137	0.141	0.077	0.109a	0.075	0.109	0.076	0.087a	0.080	0.086	0.069	0.079a
6806		P2	0.058	0.090	0.091		0.136	0.111	0.083		0.078	0.103	0.078		0.080	0.088	0.071	
		PO	0.057	0.083	0.088		0.114	0.125	0.085		0.082	0.100	0.078		0.080	0.085	0.073	
	K2	P1	0.061	0.095	0.089		0.113	0.117	0.078		0.080	0.103	0.071		0.076	0.086	0.069	
		P2	0.052	0.083	0.097		0.122	0.116	0.086		0.070	0.105	0.072		0.076	0.083	0.071	
		PO	0.055	0.097	0.066		0.111	0.091	0.064		0.066	0.090	0.060		0.076	0.093	0.060	
	KO	PI	0.052	0.108	0.072		0.091	0.103	0.070		0.064	0.094	0.066		0.073	0.085	0.065	
		P2	0.050	0.088	0.091		0.083	0.094	0.074		0.065	0.086	0.063		0.074	0.084	0.050	
		PO	0.052	0.083	0.077		0.124	0.091	0.071		0.059	0.086	0.070		0.083	0.080	0.062	
Co 527	K1	Pl	0.052	0.101	0.083	0.077b	0.134	0.097	0.071	0.093b	0.063	0.083	0.070	0.073b	0.083	0.087	0.070	0.076b
		P2	0.069	0.086	0.095		0.124	0.091	0.072	0.000	0.065	0.100	0.069		0.076	0.094	0.069	
		PO	0.050	0.099	0.095		0.113	0.110	0.070		0.058	0.091	0.069		0.073	0.086	0.063	
	K2	P1	0.052	0.091	0.083		0.102	0.108	0.078		0.065	0.090	0.064		0.083	0.086	0.065	
		P2	0.052	0.091	0.099		0.113	0.091	0.076		0.060	0.090	0.070		0.088	0.095	0.068	
MSE			0.055c	0.092a	0.089b		0.116a	0.110b	0.077c		0.071b	0.098a	0.072b		0.079b	0.087a	0.067c	
1	K)	20.1	Main K e	effect	7 14	71.96	Main K	effect			Main K	effect			Main K	effect		
			K0	K1	K2		K0	KI	K2		K0	K1	K2		K0	K1	K2	
			0.080a	0.078a	0.079a		0.098b	0.105a	0.101b		0.081a	0.081a	0.079a		0.076a	0.077a	0.078a	
			Main P e		0.3		Main P e		. 20		Main P e		1272		Main P e			
			P0	PI	P2		P0	Pl	P2		P0	P1	P2		P0	P1	P2	
			0.078a	0.080a	0.080a		0.101a	0.103a	0.100a		0.081a	0.080a	0.080a		0.078a	0.078a	0.077a	
				$E = \pm 0.000$				$SE = \pm 0.001$				$SE = \pm 0.001$			-	$SE = \pm 0.000$		
			CV = 10	nd P SE = ±	EU.UU11		SOII, K a CV = 9.4	nd P SE = :	10.0012		Soil, K and P SE = ± 0.0012 CV = 11.50%				Soil, K and P SE = ±0.0011 CV = 11.01%			18.

Symbols as defined in Table (2).

Table 5. Mean leaf phosphorus content (%) of ratoon as affected by treatments

-lane			4	months fr	om plantir	ng	C/4 = 36	months fr	om plantir	ng	8	months fro	om plantir	ng	10	months fr	om planti	ng
Variety	Fert	ilizer		Soil series	E = 10.01	MVE		Soil series	,+41.U1.T	MVE		Soil series	e ·	MVE	5 TO 12 S	Soil series	110	MVE
	ra	ate	r de o	25	1,52			1.958				Mari						
	K	P	Dinder	Ness			ы								Asil s			
			Polici I	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu	
	***	PO	0.078	0.100	0.095		0.106	0.110	0.096		0.097	0.090	0.084		0.067	0.085	0.070	
	K0	P1	0.096	0.111	0.105		0.115	0.115	0.114		0.099	0.106	0.088		0.078	0.094	0.080	
		P2	0.104	0.114	0.105		0.120	0.118	0.112		0.099	0.107	0.081		0.078	0.094	0.075	
MSI		P0	0.085	0.121	0.106		0.115	0.120	0.115		0.096	0.096	0.092		0.075	0.080	0.080	
Co	K1	Pl	0.106	0.096	0.114	0.101a	0.126	0.133	0.126	0.113a	0.103	0.097	0.086	0.094a	0.079	0.086	0.082	0.092a
6806	- 40	P2	0.108	0.102	0.100		0.112	0.105	0.113		0.097	0.100	0.084		0.078	0.085	0.074	
		P0	0.089	0.121	0.111		0.114	0.120	0.116		0.095	0.098	0.086		0.078	0.090	0.079	
	K2	P1	0.101	0.110	0.093		0.108	0.113	0.106		0.092	0.096	0.079		0.074	0.092	0.070	
Co 327		P2	0.083	0.091	0.093	111	0.110	0.105	0.103		0.090	0.092	0.084		0.071	0.089	0.074	
	-	PO	0.073	0.099	0.080		0.092	0.104	0.101		0.085	0.090	0.080		0.076	0.082	0.071	
	K0	P1	0.090	0.109	0.104		0.100	0.111	0.113		0.088	0.099	0.095		0.076	0.095	0.077	
	S K	P2	0.091	0.102	0.100		0.098	0.107	0.104		0.090	0.092	0.083		0.078	0.086	0.074	
		P0	0.082	0.108	0.091		0.096	0.114	0.112		0.091	0.105	0.089		0.083	0.097	0.080	
Co 527	K1	P1	0.090	0.118	0.109	0.098b	0.100	0.128	0.122	0.108b	0.079	0.107	0.103	0.091b	0.075	0.092	0.081	0.080a
		P2	0.099	0.106	0.105		0.111	0.115	0.112		0.099	0.103	0.095		0.091	0.089	0.087	
	***	P0	0.080	0.105	0.099		0.103	0.111	0.109		0.093	0.101	0.087		0.087	0.094	0.075	
6806	K2	Pl	0.088	0.109	. 0.101		0.094	0.115	0.107		0.075	0.095	0.082		0.072	0.090	0.082	
Co	n 10	P2	0.080	0.105	0.102		0.088	0.112	0.109		0.086	0.096	0.091		0.080	0.091	0.087	
MSE			0.090c	0.107a	0.101b		0.106c	0.114a	0.111b		0.091b	0.098a	0.087c		0.091a	0.090a	0.077a	
			Main K		10		Main K		1,00		Main K		1,60		Main K			
			K0	K1	K2		K0	K1	K2		K0	K1	K2		K0	KI	K2	
			0.098b	0.103a	0.098b		0.108b	0.115a	0.108b		0.091b	0.096a	0.090b		0.080a	0.097a	0.082a	
			Main P		o - 1195		Main P		Hazan		Main P				Main P			
			P0	Pl	P2		P0	P1 ·	P2		PO	P1	P2		PO	P1	P2	9981
			0.096c	0.103a	0.099b		0.109b	0.114a	0.109b		0.091a	0.093a	0.093a	X 2 10 5	0.080a	0.096a		
			Variety	$SE = \pm 0.0$	800			$SE = \pm 0.0$				$SE = \pm 0.0$				$SE = \pm 0.0$		ELEST COMMON REPORTER
			Soil, Ka	and P SE =	±0.001	REFORES				CHARLE	Carlo							1.
process and		CV = 7.53%						Soil, K and P SE = ± 0.0009 CV = 7.55%			Soil, K and P SE = ± 0.008 CV = 6.99%							

El-Tilib; Elamin; Elnasikh and Suleiman

Table 6. Mean leaf potassium content (%) of plant cane as affected by treatments

		201	4 r	nonths fr	om planti	ng	ATTICK 6	months f	rom planti	ng	. 8	months fr	om planti	ng	10	months f	rom plant	ing
Variety	Fertiliz			Soil serie	sodi	MVE		Soil serie	:S	MVE		Soil serie	S	MVE	,	Soil series	5	MVE
	K	P	Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu	
		PO	1.30	1.40	1.40		1.95	1.88	1.76		1.92	2.17	1.69		1.57	1.68	1.54	
	K0	P1	1.29	1.25	1.78		1.74	1.99	2.00		1.87	2.21	1.80		1.60	1.66	1.56	
		P2	1.30	1.70	2.00		1.92	2.10	2.03		1.98	2.25	1.75		1.59	1.62	1.70	
		P0	1.35	1.71	1.52		1.88	2.23	1.78		2.09	2.30	1.73		1.61	1.90	1.63	
Co	K1	P1	1.46	1.28	1.71	1.54a	2.35	2.27	1.83	2.01a	2.03	2.20	1.74	1.98a	1.78	1.70	1.65	1.69
6806		P2	1.31	1.81	1.78		2.12	2.12	2.05		1.81	2.26	1.81		1.48	1.91	1.71	
		PO	1.35	1.60	1.55		1.87	2.23	1.95		2.04	2.15	1.76		1.70	1.82	1.66	
	K2	P1	1.48	1.45	1.80		1.92	1.85	1.97		2.07	2.06	1.67		1.64	1.66	1.80	
	KY bi	P2	1.43	1.69	2.02		1.96	2.41	2.24		1.95	2.33	1.74		1.79	1.82	1.86	
		P0	1.26	1.40	1.48		1.52	1.78	1.55		1.62	1.77	1.33		1.52	1.83	1.35	
	K0	PI	1.25	1.60	1.55		1.62	2.04	1.70		1.60	1.88	1.49		1.53	1.70	1.47	
		P2	1.27	1.53	1.80		1.58	1.96	1.98		1.65	1.88	1.66		1.56	1.83	1.30	
		P0	1.23	1.42	1.56		1.53	1.89	1.75		1.46	1.83	1.71		1.70	1.67	1.50	
Co 527	K1 5.7	P1	1.40	1.83	1.64	1.45b	1.89	2.10	1.74	1.79b	1.73	1.92	1.64	1.67b	1.92	1.93	1.59	1.64
		P2	1.30	1.11	1.30		1.47	1.72	1.66		1.56	1.77	1.48		1.45	1.80	1.45	
	14	P0	1.29	1.67	1.55		1.70	2.21	1.72		1.49	1.90	1.64		1.57	1.77	1.45	
	K2	P1	1.38	1.50	1.65		1.87	2.15	2.01		1.77	1.83	1.59		1.90	1.75	1.66	
69		P2	1.36	1.25	1.49		1.67	1.75	1.77		1.60	1.73	1.54		1.80	1.85	1.50	
MSE) 0	1.33c	1.51b	1.64a		1.81c	2.6 %	1.86b		1.79b	2.02a	1.65c		1.65b	1.77a	1.58c	
			Main K				Main K		222		Main K		10000		Main K		478.42	
		1 0	K0	K1	K2		K0	K1	K2		K0	K1	K2		K0 .	K1	K2	
			1.48b	1.48b	1.53a		1.84c	1.91b	1.96a		! 8 0b	1.84a	1.82a		1.59c	1.68b	1.72a	
			Main P		-		Main P				vain P				Main P			
			P0	P1	P2		P0	P1	P2		P .	PI	P2		P0	PI	P2	
		•	1.45b	1.52a	1.52a		1.84b	1.95a	1.92a		1 80p	1.84a	1.82a		1.63b	1.69a	1.67a	
	Variety SE = ± 0.01					the second of th				$SE = \pm 0.009$				Variety SE = ± 0.01				
				and P SE	$=\pm0.012$	2					$5 \cdot 1$. K and P SE = ± 0.011				Soil. K and P SE = ± 0.012			
	CV = 5.40%						CV = 5.	36%			CV = 4.62%					CV = 5.27%		

Annals Agric. Sci., 52(2), 2007

Table 7. Mean leaf potassium content (%) of ration as affected by treatments

7.8	10	1 7 7		onths fro					rom planti				rom planti				rom plant	
Variety	Fertil	izer rate	S	oil series	, <u>8.8</u>	MVE		Soil serie	S	MVE	;	Soil serie	s	MVE		Soil serie	S	MVE
	K	P	Dinder	Nasr	Hagu	F 1	Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu		Dinder	Nasr	Hagu	
10.1	y - £	PO	1.64	1.44	1.38	E =	1.48	1.54	1.38		1.30	1.64	1.45		1.23	1.41	1.50	
	KO	Pl	2.12	1.50	1.59		1.65	1.60	1.64		1.53	1.90	1.55		1.48	1.54	1.73	
Things		P2	2.15	1.70	1.74		1.64	1.75	1.80	100	1.43	2.04	1.60		1.40	1.65	1.84	
8.7		P0	1.90	1.88	1.64		1.72	1.93	1.72		1.58	1.88	1.66		1.47	1.48	1.80	
Co	K1	P1	2.50	1.75	1.80	1.79a	1.90	2.43	1.90	1.74a	1.80	1.96	1.58	1.65a	1.63	1.65	1.88	1.59a
6806		P2	2.35	1.82	1.60		1.58	1.85	1.75		1.48	2.00	1.58		1.45	1.61	1.73	
		PO	2.03	1.85	1.70		1.68	1.90	1.70		1.60	1.89	1.53		1.55	1.60	1.75	
	K2	P1	2.35	1.60	1.50		1.61	1.63	1.66		1.58	1.79	1.50		1.50	1.57	1.66	
		P2	2.06	1.70	1.52		1.75	2.00	1.65		1.68	1.90	1.62		1.48	1.75	1.78	
		PO	1.50	1.52	1.15		1.37	1.56	1.48		1.20	1.45	1.30		1.29	1.23	1.45	
	K0	P1	2.00	1.75	1.51		1.61	1.76	1.67		1.33	1.70	1.58		1.38	1.53	1.60	
	型 图	P2	2.10	1.75	1.58		1.60	1.80	1.74		1.38	1.66	1.50		1.44	1.50	1.70	
		PO	1.75	1.71	1.34		1.48	1.78	1.70		1.30	1.77	1.50		1.45	1.48	1.71	
Co 527	K1	Pl	2.40	1.95	1.62	1.74b	1.73	2.10	1.86	1.68b	1.50	1.89	1.76	1.56b	1.65	1.57	1.76	1.56b
		P2	2.00	1.65	1.45		1.56	1.75	1.53		1.38	1.71	1.51		1.43	1.35	1.72	
		P0	1.88	1.85	1.49		1.70	1.90	1.75		1.40	1.87	1.54		1.63	1.68	1.65	
	K2	P1	2.30	1.82	1.58		1.61	1.90	1.75		1.40	1.70	1.47		1.50	1.55	1.85	
		P2	1.98	1.70	1.44		1.48	1.81	1.52		1.48	1.67	1.47		1.57	1.52	1.76	
MSE			2.04a	1.72b	1.53c		1.62c	1.83a	1.68b	45	1.47c	1.80a	1.54b		1.47c	1.54b	1.72a	
			Main K	effect	2.5		Main K	effect			Main K	effect			Main K	effect		
			K0	KI	K2		K0	K1	K2		$\mathbf{K}0$	K1 -	K2		K0	K1	K2	
			1.67b	1.82a	1.80a		1.62c	1.79a	1.72b		1.53b	1.65a	1.62a		1.49c	1.60b	1.63a	
			Main P	effect			Main P	effect			Main P	effect			Main P	effect		
			P0	P1	P2		P 0	P1	P2		P 0	Pi	P2		P0	P1	P2	
		10	1.65c	1.87a	1.77b		1.65c	1.78a	1.70b		1.56b	1.64a	1.62a		1.52b	1.61a	1.59a	
										Variety SE = ± 0.012				Variety SE = ± 0.009				
	Soil, K and P SE = ± 0.019					9	•				Soil. K and P SE = ± 0.014				Soil, K and P SE = ± 0.011			
	CV = 8.10%									CV = 6.51%				CV = 5.02%				

Symbols as defined in Table (2).

significantly except when the plant was 6 months old. The addition of potassium to ration reflected a significant increase in leaf phosphorous content relative to the control. This was true when potassium fertilizer was applied at 86-kg K₂O/ha (Kl), whereas application of potassium fertilizer at the rate of 172 kgK₂O/ha (K2) did not show any effect on the level of leaf phosphorous. These resultswere in agreement with those of Randall, et al (1997). The level of leaf phosphorous obtained in this study ranged from 0.05-0.14, 0.08-0.14 and 0.05-0.12% for Dinder, Nasr and Hagu soil respectively. These ranges were considered low with reference to the standard concentration 0.15% (Wolf, et al 1985). Hagu soil recorded the least leaf phosphorous content occause it has the capacity to fix more phospho ous compared with other soil series (El-Fadil, 1971).

Potassium

Addition of potassium fertilizer manifested a significant effect on leaf potassium content in both plant cane and ratoon (Tables 6 and 7). A positive effect on leaf-K was observed for potassium phosphorous interaction in both plant cane and ratoon experiments. This may be attributed to the synergetic interaction between potassium and phosphorous and/or to the improved root system due to the added phosphorous which means more soil volume for the plant to exploit for potassium (El-Essawi et al 1995 and Elmahi et al 2002). The soil types showed significant differences in leaf potassium level that could be attributed to the differences in potassium fixing capacity of these soils. According to El-Fadil (1971), the clay mineral was abundantly montmorillonite in Dinder and Nasr whereas Hagu soil was mostly Kaolinitic. Therefore, the expected fixation pattern should be in the order of Dinder > Nasr > Hagu. The measured values of leaf potassium of plant grown on Dinder, Nasr and Hagu soil ranged between 1.23-2.35, 1.11-2.41 and 1.3-2.24%, respectively. These values can be considered medium to high for the three soil series (Wolf, et al 1985).

Conclusions and recommendations

In conclusion, leaf-N, P and K of sugarcane and its ration were significantly improved by phosphorus and potassium fertilizers and it was evident that Nasr series surpassed Dinder and Hagu series in leaf-P content. The present study

revealed that higher rates of potassium should be recommended on Co 6806.

REFERENCES

AOAC (1970). Official Methods of Analysis of the Association of Official Analytical Chemists, 11th Ed. Washington, DC.

Azcon, R.; M. Gomez and R. Tobar (1996). Physiological and nutritional responses by *Lactuca sativa* L. to nitrogen sources and mycrrohizal fungi under drought conditions. Biology and Fertility of Soil 22(1/2):156-161.

Bar Yousef, B.; P. Imas; A.P. Hidding; J.A. Kipp; C. Sonneveld and C. Kreij (1995). Phosphorus fertilization and growth substrate effect on dry matter production and nutrient content in green house tomatoes. International Symposium on Growing media and Plant Nutrition in Horticulture Naold Wigk Netherlands. Acta Horticulture 401:337-346.

Barvalle, R.; R. Rosell; A. Miglierina and P. Maiza (1995). Soil fixation and availability of phosphate fertilizer. Comm. Soil Sci. Plant Analysis. 26(13/14):2157-2165.

Daliparthy, J.; A.V. Barker and S.S. Mondal (1994). Potassium fractions with other nutrients at crops: a review of focusing on the tropics. J. Plant Nutr. 17(11): 1859-1886.

El-Essawi, T.M.; S.A. Mashali and R. Kanay (1995). Effect of balanced manuring on sorghum growth and increasing utilization of nutrients. Egypt. J. of Soil Sci. 35(3):252-264.

El-Fadil, K. (1971). North west Sennar Soil Survey Report. Soil Survey Department, Ministry of Sariculture and Forestry, Wad-Medani, Sudan.

El-Mahi, Y. E. and M. A. Mustafa (1980). The effects of electrolyte concentration and sodium adsorption ration on phosphorus retention by soils. J. Soil Sci. 130(6): 321-325.

El-Mahi, Y.E.; A.M.A. Sokrab; E.A. Elamin and I. S. Ibrahim (2002). Phosphorus and potassium fertilizers effect on growth and yield of irrigated forage sorghum (Sorghum bicolor (L.) Moench) grown on a saline-sodic soil. Crop Res. 23(2): 235-242.

El-Tilib, A.M.; M.H. Elnasikh and E.A. Elamin (2004). Phosphorus and potassium fertilization effects on growth attributes and yield of two sugarcane varieties grown on three soil series. J. of Plant Nutr., 27(4):663-699.

Gobara, L.A.M.; A.A. Mahdi; A.M. Eltilib and H.M. Abdelmagid (1993). Response of haricot

bean to inoculation, nitrogen and phosphorus fertilization in Sudan. E. Afric. Agric. For. J. 59(1):41-51.

Korndorfer, G.H. and J.C. Alcarde (1992). Accumulation and content of phosphorus in sugarcane leaves. Field Crops Abstracts. 45(7):1993. Abs No. 4617.

Mengel, K. and E.A. Kirkby (1978). Principles of Plant Nutrition. 2nd Ed. pp. 103-109. International Potash Institute, Bern. Switzerland.

Randall, G.W.; S.D. Evans and T.K. Iragavarapu (1997). Long-term P and K applications: II-Effect on corn and soybean yields and plant P and K concentrations. J. Prod. Agric. 10(4):572-580. Somorowska, K. (1987). Influence of fertilization

with high potassium chloride rates and irrigation on some quality characters of potato tubers. Biule-tyn-Instytutus-Ziemnaka (Poland) 35:61-72.

Tsadilas, C.D.; V. Samaras and D. Dimoyiannis (1996). Phosphate sorption by red Mediterranean soils from Greece. Comm. Soil Sci. Plant Analysis. 29(9/10):2279-2293.

Wolf, B.; J. Fleming and J. Batchelor (1985). Fluid Fertilizer Manual Vol. I. Meeting the Nutrient requirements of plants. National Fertilizer Solution Association 88823, Peoria, Illinois.

Yadava, M.D. and K.D.N. Singh (1992). Transformations of applied nitrogen in relation to its availability to sugarcane in a calcareous soil. J. Indian Soc, Soil Sci. 39 (2): 292-297.



حولیات العلوم الزراعیة جامعة عین شمس، القاهرة مجلد(۲۰)، عدد (۲)، ۵۱۱–۲۰۰۰، ۲۰۰۷

تأثير السماد الفوسفوري والبوتاسي على محتوى أوراق عينتين من قصب السكر المزروع في ثلثة أنواع من الترب في السودان

[£ £]

عبد المنعم محمد أحمد التلب' - الأمين عبد الماجد الأمين' - ماريا حسن الناسخ' - حسن إبراهيم سليمان المنعم محمد أحمد التربة والبيئة - كلية الزراعة - جامعة الخرطوم - شمبات - رمز بريدي ١٣٣١٤ - السودان

للهكتار). أستعمل كلوريد البوتاسيوم كمصدر للهسفور. للبوتاسيوم والسوبرفوسفات الثلاثي كمصدر للفسفور. أجريت هذه التجربة على عينتين من فصب السكر (Co 6806 & Co 527) مزروعة في ثلاثة أنماط من التربة (هجو وناصر ودندر). أتبع في تنفيذ التجربة التصميم العشوائي الكامل في ثلاثة مكررات.

بدأ جمع عينات النبات للتحليل بعد أربعة شهور من الزراعة واستمر جمع عينات النبات كل شهرين أجريت تجربة حقلية لموسمين متتالين (١٩٩٨ - ١٩٩٨) بموقع شركة سكر سنار (خط عرض ١٩٩٨) بموقع شرك سخ ٣٣٠ شرق)، لدراسة تأثير التسميد البوتاسي والفوسفوري على محتوي نبات فصب السكر وخلفته من النيتروجين والبوتاسيوم والفوسفور. المعاملات تشمل ثلاثة مستويات من البوتاسيوم (صفر و ٢٧ و ١٩٣٨ كجم للهكتار). وثلاث مستويات من الفوسفور (صفر و ٢٩ و ٥٨ و ٥٨ حجم

بدأ جمع عينات النبات للتحليل بعد أربعة شهور من الزراعة واستمر جمع عينات النبات كل شهرين حتى الشهر العاشر من الزراعة. أوضحت النتائج أن التركيب المعدني للنبات قد تأثر معنويا بالمعاملات. وقد كان محتوى ورق النبات من النيتروجين مرتفعا في العينات الأولى ٣,٢٣% وبدأت تنخفض بتقدم موسم النمو ٨,١%، هذا المستوى مسن النيتروجين يعتبر مرتفعا إلى منخفض قياسا بالمستويات المثلى، وكان محتوى عينات قصب السكر مسن النيتروجين أعلى منه في الخلفة. نمط التربة ناصر أعطى أعلى محتوى من النيتروجين في الورقة يليها نمط تربة الدندر وأدناه هجو.

المحتوى النيتروجيني في عينة قصب السسكر Co 6806 كان أكبر منه في العينة 527 Co. و يعتبر

محتوى أوراق النبات من الفوسفور منخفضا نسسبيا قياسا بالمستويات المثالية حيث يتراوح بين ٥٠,٥٠ وتحتوي العينة Co 6806 علي كمية فوسفور أكثر من العينة 527 Co. وكان محتوى الورقة من الفوسفور والبوتاسيوم في الخلفة أعلى منه في قصب السكر مما يدل على الأثر المتبقى للسماد الفوسفوري والبوتاسي. وكان محتوى الأوراق من البوتاسيوم في مستوى غير كافي (١,٣٣ - ٤٠,٠٠).

وقد أوضحت الدراسة أن هناك ارتفاع مقددر في محتوى أوراق النبات من النيتروجين، والفوسفور والبوتاسيوم في قصصب السكر والخلفه.

77 910 mall edge 47 770 mec) we worked

andrew is the many former of the Remo

تحكيم: ١.د عادل السيد اللبودي