

Fayoum Journal of Agricultural Research and Development ISSN:1110-7790



### Effect of nitrogen sources, rates and boron on the absorbance of N, K, Na and B on the quality and productivity of sugar beet.

<sup>1</sup>Darwish Sam, <sup>2</sup>Mohamed Saber, <sup>2</sup>Eman E. Belel and <sup>1</sup>Mohamed Abd E-Moneim
 <sup>1</sup>Soils, Water and Environment, Research Institute, ARC, Giza, Egypt
 <sup>2</sup>Soils and Water Depart., Fac. of Agric., El Fayoum University, Egypt
 Corresponding author: <u>Tahawy96@gmail.com</u>

### ABSTRACT

To investigate the effect of nitrogen sources and nitrogen rate, and boron or without it on sugar beet yield and quality, two field experiments were carried out at the Experimental Farm of the Agriculture Research Centre, Tamia Research Station, Fayoum Governorate. Egypt, during the two successive seasons of 2016/2017 and 2017/2018. A split-split plot design was used in both growing seasons. Two nitrogen sources (anhydrous ammonia 82% and urea 46%) arranged in main plots, Three nitrogen rates (60, 75, and 90 kg N/fad) were devoted in sub-plots, whereas, sub-sub plots were allocated of boron applications at two rates of (without addition and addition 1 g/L of boron). The main results could be summarized as follows:

1-Nitrogen fertilization activated plant growth and increased its yield.

- 2- Nitrogen source as anhydrous ammonia showed the greatest growth (N, K, Na, and B) and yield while the lowest effective source was urea in 120 and 200days from planting,
- 3- By increasing the nitrogen rate from 60 to 90 kg /fed, led to an increase in the content of shoot and roots from N, K, Na, B and also increased the shoot and root dry and fresh weight and the yield of sugar was increased at the age of 120 days from planting as well as at the harvest, while this led to a decrease in the proportion of sucrose in the roots at harvest,
- 4- The addition of boron was superior to not adding it in all the studied traits such as root length and size and absorbed elements such as N, K, Na, and B, as well as the percentage of sugar and sugar yield per Fadden and the weight of roots and leaves in both seasons.

### **KEYWORDS**

Sugar beet, Anhydrous Ammonia, Urea, Rates of nitrogen, Boron, Quality, productivity, uptake of nitrogen, potassium, Sodium, boron.

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author: Mohamed Abd El-Moneim ⊠ tahawy96@gmail.com

Received: 14/ 6/2021

Accepted: 4 /7 / 2021

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

Sugar beet is the second crop in terms of sugar production in the world, as it follows the Amaranthaceae family, the percentage of sugar ranges between 14-20%, while sugar cane ranges between 10-13%, as well as in terms of water consumption as the Fadden of sugar cane it needs about 13100 m<sup>3</sup> of water, while sugar beet needs about 2950 m<sup>3</sup> of water, as well as where it resides in the ground, as sugar cane lasts 10-12 months, while sugar beet lasts 5-6 months. Nitrogen is a vital element for sugar beet growth, in many cases, nitrogen is a limiting factor because few soils contain sufficient nitrogen in an available form as nitrate or ammonium to provide for maximum growth at each stage of the crop. where the element is in short supply, fertilizer has a remarkable effect on the appearance of the crop, most noticeably by improving the colour and vigour of the leaf canopy, it has led to a widespread over-use of nitrogen. In many cases, this over-use decreases both sugar percentage and sugar extractability. (Draycott, 2006)

Boron in sugar beet is playing an important role which it was involved in hemicellulose, lignin structural, cell elongation and division. tissue differentiation and metabolism of carbohydrates, protein, auxin, and phenol, and in the end control of membrane permeability.

Boron (B) is the most important of the trace elements needed in sugar beet because, without adequate supply, the yield and quality of roots are very depressed (**Cooke and Scott, 1993**). Boron is a unique non-metal micronutrient required for the normal growth and development of plants and is essential for the cell structure of plants, and the possible roles of B include sugar transport cell wall synthesis, lignification, cell wall integrity, carbohydrate structure metabolism, ribose nucleic acid (RNA) metabolism, phenol metabolism, and as of the cell membranes. Boron is absorbed by roots as undissociated boric acid (H<sub>3</sub>Bo<sub>3</sub>) and it is the only element that is taken up by plants not as an ion but as an uncharged molecule, and the factor affecting B uptake include soil type (texture, alkalinity/calcareousness, pH, organic matter content). B concentration, moisture, and plant species, and Boron is relatively immobile in the plant and thus its availability is essential at all stages of growth. especially during fruit/seed development (Ahmad et al, 2012).

Abashady et al (2011) observed that application of ammonia gas compared with urea as a source of nitrogen the ammonia gas was significantly increased alpha-amino N, Na, K root, sugar vield, and sucrose %. Siam, Hanan et al (2012) observed that used the ammonia gas with rates of 100,120 and 140 kg N/fed in corn plant the result showed that the ammonia gas with the high rate improved the all character N uptake, phosphorus uptake, and potassium uptake were increased over the control. Ghazy (2013) found that nitrogen sources had a significant effect on root length, crop growth rate, and net assimilation rate, and root fresh weight of sugar beet.

Abdelaal and Tawfik (2015) recorded that application of four nitrogen rates (

0,35,70 and 105 kg N/fed) to sugar beet plants, the highest values lead to higher values of root length and diameter, foliage and root fresh weights, and root yield/fed in the two seasons. However, the highest means of sucrose % and apparent purity % have resulted from the control treatment (0 kg N/fed) in the two growing seasons. Abd El-Megeed (2017) concluded that anhydrous ammonia (82%N) has increased significantly the rice plant and its components, dry matter, plant height, No.of tiller, and No.of panicle compared with urea (46 % N). Attia and Khalifa (2015) observed that the growth parameters and quality of sugar beet grown in newly soil to different nitrogen sources (ammonium sulfate %, ammonium nitrate, and urea 46%) and they found a significant effect of N-sources on the N, K, and Na% whether in the top or root in most cases at the growth stage. Uptake on N, K, Na, and B, sucrose was improved as a grown season progressive in both seasons. Abbas et al (2018) found that the decreased nitrogen rate from 100% to 75 % of recommended rate as 120kg N/fed in sandy soils as ammonium nitrate landed to significantly increased the sucrose % in two seasons respectively, on the decreasing other hand nitrogen rate significantly decreased the top yield and also root vield in the two-season respectively. Moursi and Darwesh (2014) observed that increasing the nitrogen rate from 30 to 90 kg N/fed to sugar beet plants led to an increase in root yield (ton/fed), top vield (ton/fed), root length (cm), root diameter (cm), sugar yield (ton/fed), N in tops % and N content in root % while sucrose % was decreased by increasing the nitrogen rate from 30 to 90 kg N/fed all parameter in the first and respectively. Abd second season; El-Motagally (2016) reported that the nitrogen fertilizer with rate 60.90 and 120 Kg N/fed and he conducted that applying the N application of 90 kg /fed was the best treatment which increasing the sugar yield by improving the root quality and found that no significant differences in K accumulation in sugar beet roots in both seasons, the highest mean values of a amino-N content in roots were consistently found in the plants grown in the highest N treat soil at 90 days after planting and similarly the accumulation of Na in sugar beet roots. Lamani and Halikatti (2019) showed that application of 180 kg N/ha increased yield and the quality parameter such as α-amino-N, K, P, and sucrose % were increased significantly while the root to shoot ratio and harvest index did not differ significantly. Mostafa. Shafika and Darwish (2001) studied the effect of four N levels, 45, 75, and 105kg/fed. On sugar beet. They found that top and root yield was significantly increased with increasing N fertilizer up to 75kg N/fed. Mostafa,Shafika and Darwish (2001) studied the effect of nitrogen fertilizer levels 0, 45, 75, and 105kg N/fed. on sugar beet quality. They found that sucrose and purity % of sugar beet were decreased with increasing N-rate up to 105kg N/fed. (Abd Elhady, 2018) pointed that adding boron to sugar beet as a foliar spray and control treatment without boron under new reclaimed soil conditions, Sugar beet plants treated with Boron treatment gave the highest values of effective root length, root diameter, root fresh weight, leaves fresh weight and root/leaves ratio, On the other hand, the lowest values of the previous traits were recorded with the control treatment (without boron application). The highest values of root yield (34.63 ton/fad), top yield (7.773 ton/fad), sugar yield (6.00 ton/fad), sucrose percentage (18.86%), and extractable sugar percentage (17.33%), while the lowest values were recorded with control treatment (without boron application).

### 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

Two field experiments were carried out during the winter seasons of and 2017/2018 2016/2017 at the Experimental Station Farm of the Agriculture Research Centre, Tamia Research Station, Fayoum Governorate, Egypt, to evaluate the effect of different nitrogen sources (anhydrous ammonia 82% and urea 46% ), nitrogen rates (60,

75 and 90 kg N/fad) and without and with boron their interaction on yield and components and chemical constituents of sugar beet (c.v *Gloria*). A representative soil sample (0-30 cm) was taken before planting to determine some physical, chemical, and nutritional properties (Table 1).

Proper	ty	2016-2017	2017-2018	Property	20	016-2017	2017-2018
	Particle s	ize distribution		Ec in soil pa	aste	4.67	4.61
Coarse sa	and	14.45	15.50		Soluble ions	(mmole L <sup>-1</sup> )	)
Fine sa	nd	23.56	22.37	Na <sup>+</sup>		18.63	17.20
Silt %	,	21.25	19.40	$\mathbf{K}^{+}$		4.13	3.52
Clay %	6	40.74	42.73	Ca <sup>++</sup>		12.48	12.70
Texture C	Class	Clay Loam	Clay Loam	Mg <sup>++</sup>		11.46	12.68
pH in soil	paste	8.92	8.67	Cl		16.88	18.63
O.M %	6	0.50	0.58	Hco3		4.86	4.99
CaCo <sub>3</sub>	%	5.80	4.89	$So_4$		24.96	22.40
		Available	e macro and mic	ronutrients (mg	kg <sup>-1</sup> )		
	Ν	Р	K	Fe I	Mn Cu	ı Zn	В
2016-2017	38.54	54 5.20 435		4.89 1	.89 0.5	0 0.92	0.32
2017-2018	52.70	6.28	455	4.22 2	2.06 0.5	6 1.1	0.30

 Table 1. Some physical and chemical analyses of the studied soil

Nitrogen application sources were as follows: (anhydrous ammonia 82% and urea 46%), rate of them (60, 75, 90 KG N/fed) and (control and foliar application with Boron with rate 1 g /L). were added in three equal doses, Anhydrous ammonia fertilizer (82% N) was injected directly into the soil, at 15 cm depth with 30 cm spacing between the points of injection one week before planting, in soil containing 15% moisture content. Meanwhile, the solid N source (urea) was applied in three equal doses during the season 2016/2017 growing and 2017/2018. The first one was applied at planting, the second was applied before the first irrigation, where the last dose was applied before the second irrigation.

Potassium was applied as potassium sulphate 48% K<sub>2</sub>O and phosphorus as calcium superphosphate 15.5% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub> at rates of 100 and 50 kg fed-1, respectively before sowing for all plots of the experimental soil.

The experiment was designed as a split-split-plot arrangement of treatments with three replications. Nitrogen application sources in the main plot; nitrogen fertilization levels were distributed randomly in the subplot and (without boron and boron) were located in the sub-sub plots with three replication. The experimental unit area was 10.5m2 (1/400 fed) (one Fadden =  $4200 \text{m}^2$ ). Seeds were sown on September 15 and 20 in the 2016 and 2017 seasons, respectively. The preceding summer crop was maize in both seasons.

soils analyzed The were for mechanical and some chemical properties according to The mechanical analysis was done according to Piper (1950). Total calcium carbonate was determined according to (Jackson, 1981). Soil organic matter was determined according to the modified method of Walkley and Black, as described by Jackson, (1973). pH Soil was measured in 1:2.5 soil water suspension according to (Jackson, 1981)

and ECe was measured in saturated soil according (Jackson, 1981) paste to Soluble cations (Mg<sup>+2</sup>, Ca<sup>+2</sup>, Na<sup>+</sup>, K<sup>+</sup>) and soluble anions (HCO<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup>, CO<sub>3</sub><sup>-2</sup>, SO<sub>4</sub><sup>-2</sup>, Cl<sup>-</sup>) were determined in soil paste extract as described by Page et al.,(1982). Available nitrogen content in soil (mg /kg) was determined by the method described by Jackson (1973). Available phosphorus was extracted according to Olsen et al. (1954). and measured colourimetrically according to Jackson (1967). Available potassium and sodium were determined bv flame photometrically as according to Page et al. (1982). Boron content in the soil was extracted using Hot Water according to Berger and Truog (1939) and determined by the Azmothine-H method according to Bingham (1982). Available zinc was determined by the method described by Soltanpour and Workman (1979).

#### 2-1-Yield and yield component characters:

At 120 days, as well as 200 days of sugar beet cultivation, samples of five plants were randomly taken from the shoot as well as from the roots to estimate the content of both of them from N. K. Na, and B as well as to estimate the dry and fresh weight. At harvest (200 days after sowing) five plants were randomly chosen from the outer ridges of each subsub plot to estimate yield components characters as follows: 1 - Root length (cm).2 - Root diameter (cm). 3- shoot fresh weight (g /plant). 4- Root fresh weight (g/ plant). 5- shoot dry weight (g/plant).6- root dry weight (g/plant). Sucrose percentage (pol %) was polarimetically determined on a lead acetate extract of fresh macerated root according to the method of Le- Docte (1927).

At harvest, plants of all ridges from each sub-sub plot were harvested, cleaned, topped and weighed in addition to the weight of the five-plant sample.

### **2.2-Preparation of plant samples for analysis:**

The plant part (leaves and roots) weighed immediatelv after was separation. Plant materials were cut into small portions, dried at 70° C for 24 hours in an aerated oven. After plant samples had become crisp, they were allowed to attain equilibrium with air for a few hours to establish reasonably stable moisture content before being weighed after being weighted. The crude dry materials were ground to pass a 60 mesh sieve in an agate ball-mill, and then thoroughly mixed, and a representative sample was stored in tightly stopper glass containers.

#### 2.3-Plant analysis:

Representative portions of 0.5 g of the derived plant material were digested with the mixture of concentrated sulphuric and perchloric acids as described by **Page** *et al.* (1982). Then, the extraction was diluted with distilled water to the volume of 50 ml in a calibration flask; this extraction was subjected to total N, K, Na, B and analysis as follow:

**<u>1- Total Nitrogen:</u>** Total nitrogen was determined Kjeldahl technique, **Jackson** (1973).

**2-Total potassium and sodium:** was determined flame photometer as described by **Page** *et al.* (1982).

**<u>3-Total Boron:</u>** Total Boron was Determined by wet digestion and determined by the **Azmothine-H** method according to **Bingham (1982).** 

Uptake of N, K, Na and B were calculated by using multiplying the dry

weight with the respective percentage of N, K, Na and B nutrient uptake = nutrient concentration in the root or top X root or top dry weight

#### **2.4-Statistical Analysis:**

Results were statistically analyzed using COSTATC software. The ANOVA test was used to determine the significance  $(p \le 0.05)$  treatment effect and the L.S.D Multiple Range Test was used to determine significantly the difference between individual means **Gomez and Gomez (1984)**.

#### **3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Average root fresh and dry weight (g), shoot fresh and dry weight (g), nitrogen uptake, potassium uptake. sodium uptake, and boron uptake in root and shoot of sugar beet at 120 days from sowing as affected by nitrogen sources, nitrogen rates and addition of boron and the effects of their interactions in 2016/2017 and 2017 /2018 seasons are shown in Tables 2-7. Results recorded in Tables 2 to 7 show clearly that all measured characters were significantly affected by nitrogen sources in both seasons. Sugar beet plants that received anhydrous ammonia gave the highest values of shoot fresh and dry weight 366.3 and 391.7 g, for fresh and 38.5,40.9 for dry respectively, root fresh and dry weight 480.3 and 523.1 for fresh and 99.4,102.8 g for dry. Nitrogen uptake by shoot and root 1450 and 1577 for the shoot, and 1995 and 2190 (mg/plant) for root, potassium uptake by shoot and root 1602,1595 for the shoot and 1575, 1553 (mg/plant) for root, sodium uptake by shoot and root 2243,2730 for the shoot and 1412,1417

(mg/plant) for root and boron uptake by shoot and root 1.98, 2.26 for the shoot and 1.45, 1.47 (mg/plant) for root .respectively. Meaning that the superiority of ammonia gaseous was achieved comparing with the other sources of nitrogen. The superiority of gaseous ammonia may be due to its noticed reduction in soil pH, which increased the availability of the nutrients and improved their efficiency uptake; therefore, the amount of dry matter was increased. This finding may be due to the great efficiency of gaseous ammonia as a source of nitrogen to fulfil the nitrogen needs of the plant. Similar results were obtained by Ragab and Ibrahim (2009) and Seham (2012).

Results presented in Tables 2 to 7 show clearly that the effect of nitrogen rates was significant on all studied characters in both seasons. Sugar beet plants fertilized with a nitrogen fertilizer at the rate of 90 kg N/fed, gave the highest values of shoot fresh and dry weight 368.6,408.8 for fresh and 40.4,42.3 g for dry, respectively. root fresh and dry 482.6.540.5 for fresh weight and 98.9,102.0 g for dry, nitrogen uptake by shoot and root 1701,1726 for the shoot and 2255, 2228 (mg/plant) for root, potassium uptake by shoot and root 1767,1652 for the shoot and 1775, 1906 (mg/plant) for root, sodium uptake by shoot and root 2527, 2940 for the shoot and 1462, 1318 (mg/plant) for root and boron uptake by shoot and root 2.42, 2.48 for the shoot and 1.49,1.49 (mg/plant) for root, respectively. The increment of root fresh weight owing to raising nitrogen rate might be attributed to the active effect of nitrogen in increasing photosynthesis and net assimilation rate translocated and stored in roots which led to increasing root length resulted in increasing root fresh weight. On the other hand, the increase in purity% caused by the lowest nitrogen rate may be due to the reduction in root length and root fresh weight resulted from smaller roots which have the lowest wetted, therefore Results tableted in Tables 2 to 7 show clearly that the effect of boron fertilization compared without boron was significant on all studied characters in both seasons. Sugar beet plants fertilized with boron gave the highest values of shoot fresh and dry weight 351.5, 364.8 for fresh and 36.6,38.1 g for dry, respectively. root fresh and dry weight 507.9.530.4 for fresh and 103.5,10.00 g for dry, nitrogen uptake by shoot and root 1489, 1518 for the shoot and 1862, 2064 (mg/plant) for root, potassium uptake by shoot and root 1499, 1403 for the shoot and 1454, 1494 (mg/plant) for root, sodium uptake by shoot and root 2320, 2559 for the shoot and 1664, 1595 (mg/plant) for root and boron uptake by shoot and root 2.10, 2.02 for the shoot and 1.52, 1.51 (mg/plant) for root, respectively. these results were in harmony with those obtained bv (Drycoot,2006) found that boron in sugar beet is played an important role which it was involved in hemicellulose, lignin structural, cell elongation and division, tissue differentiation and metabolism of carbohydrate, protein, auxin, and phenol and in the end control of membrane permeability.

The obtained in the table from (2-7) showed that the interaction effect between nitrogen sources and nitrogen rates was significant on all studied characters except root fresh and dry weight (g) in the second season, shoot fresh weight (g) for the second season, nitrogen uptake for root in the first season, potassium uptake by root in the second season, sodium uptake by root in the first seasons did not significant. Results tabulated in Tables 2 to 7 exhibited that the interaction effect among nitrogen sources and micronutrients, nitrogen rates and micronutrients and nitrogen sources, nitrogen rates and micronutrients are not significant in both seasons.

Average root fresh and dry weight (g), shoot fresh and dry weight (g), nitrogen uptake, potassium uptake, sodium uptake, and boron uptake in root and shoot of sugar beet at harvest date as affected by nitrogen sources, nitrogen rates and addition of boron and their interactions in 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 seasons are shown in Tables 8-15. Results recorded in Tables 8 to 15 show clearly that all measured characters were significantly affected by nitrogen sources in both seasons. Sugar beet plants received anhydrous ammonia over urea by a percentage20.18 and 16.62 % of root fresh weight 22.14 and 18.03 %, for dry weight respectively, sucrose % 5.88 and 58.77 %, the yield of the sugar 24.39 and 23.06 % shoot fresh and dry weight (ton /fed) 28.02 and 29.59 % for shoot fresh weight and shoot dry weight (kg/fed) 26.37 and 30.36%, root length (cm) and volume  $(\text{cm}^3)$  16.56 and 17.31% for root length and 22.99, 32.06% for root volume, ( nitrogen uptake by shoot and root 16.98,13.54 % for nitrogen uptake by shoot and 15.32,16.30 % for nitrogen uptake by roots, potassium uptake by shoot and root 33.85,37.71% for the shoot and 22.46,18.35% for root, sodium uptake by shoot and root 32.74, 27.54% for the shoot and 22.51,18.52 for root and boron uptake by shoot and root 29.99,53.76% for the shoot and 26.21, 45.27 for the root, first for the and second season,

respectively. increased sucrose concentration thus increased purity%. These results are in agreement with those of, Telep, *et al.* (2008), Abd EL-Motagally and Attia (2009), Manderscheid *et al.* (2010), and Gobarah Mirvat *et al.* (2011), who found that increasing N supply increased juice impurities such as Na content.

 Table 2. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on sugar beet shoot and root fresh weights (g/plant) after 120 days from sowing during 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

Treat	ments				eight (g	/plant)			Root fr	esh wei	ght (g/pl	lant)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	on 2016	/2017	Seaso	n 2017/	2018	Sease	on 2016/2	2017	Seaso	on 2017/	2018
source (S)	rate (R) (kg/fed.)	withou t	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	withou t	boron	Mean
Anhydrou	60	291.0	332.9	311.9	314.2	342.9	328.6	401.9	506.2	454.0	432.7	514.1	473.4
s	75	340.5	392.4	366.5	378.8	410.9	394.8	410.1	519.8	465.0	479.4	547.0	513.2
Ammonia	90	384.1	456.9	420.5	429.6	473.5	451.6	438.0	605.7	521.8	534.3	631.0	582.6
M	ean	338.5	394.1	366.3	374.2	409.1	391.7	416.7	543.9	480.3	482.1	564.0	523.1
	60	228.6	290.0	259.3	245.1	297.1	271.1	292.0	428.6	360.3	340.5	466.8	403.7
Urea	75	272.5	302.7	287.6	273.4	320.2	296.8	337.5	458.4	398.0	378.6	491.7	435.2
olea	90	299.3	333.9	316.6	314.7	344.0	329.3	358.1	528.6	443.4	464.9	531.7	498.3
M	ean	266.8	308.8	287.8	277.7	320.4	299.1	329.2	471.9	400.5	394.7	496.7	445.7
Means of	60	259.8	311.4	285.6	279.7	320.0	299.8	346.9	467.4	407.2	386.6	490.4	438.6
nitrogen	75	306.5	347.5	327.0	326.1	365.5	345.8	373.8	489.1	431.5	429.0	519.4	474.2
rates	90	341.7	395.4	368.6	372.1	408.8	390.5	398.1	567.1	482.6	499.6	581.4	540.5
Grand	Mean	302.7	351.5	327.1	326.0	364.8	345.4	373.0	507.9	440.4	438.4	530.4	484.4
LSD 0.05													
Nitrogen se	ource (S)		18.65			36.55			43.44			17.96	
Nitrogen ra	ate (R)		17.17			26.11			20.33			4.40	
Micronutri	ents (M)		13.44			19.65			37.62			19.16	
S*R			24.28			N.S			N.S			6.23	
S*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
S*R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	

Table 3. Effect of nitro	gen sources, rates	, the addition o	f boron and th	neir interaction on
sugar beet sl	noot and root dry	weights (g/pla	nt) after 120	days from sowing
during 2016/	2017 and 2017/201	8 seasons.		

during 2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.         Treatments       Shoot dry weight (g/plant)       Root dry weight (g/plant)													
Treatr	nents		Shoot	dry we	ight (g/p	lant)				•	veight (g/pl	ant)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	n 2016/	2017	Seaso	n 2017/	2018	Seas	on 2016/	2017	Seas	son 2017/2	2018
source (S)		without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
A 1	60	29.40	33.60	31.50	31.10	33.90	32.50	84.60	103.90	94.25	88.40	106.80	97.60
Anhydrous	/ <b>^</b>	34.70	40.00	37.35	39.80	43.10	41.45	90.70	108.90	99.80	92.70	114.10	103.40
Ammonia	90	42.60	50.70	46.65	46.40	51.10	48.75	92.90	115.20	104.05	96.10	118.60	107.35
Me	an	35.57	41.43	38.50	39.10	42.70	40.90	89.40	109.33	99.37	92.40	113.17	102.78
	60	22.40	28.40	25.40	24.50	29.70	27.10	77.90	96.80	87.35	80.50	99.10	89.80
Linco	75	27.70	30.90	29.30	28.40	33.30	30.85	86.00	98.30	92.15	86.70	102.50	94.60
Urea	90	32.30	36.10	34.20	34.30	37.50	35.90	89.80	97.80	93.80	92.20	100.90	96.55
Me	an	27.47	31.80	29.63	29.07	33.50	31.28	84.57	97.63	91.10	86.47	100.83	93.65
Means of	60	25.90	31.00	28.45	27.80	31.80	29.80	81.25	100.35	90.80	84.45	102.95	93.70
nitrogen	75	31.20	35.45	33.33	34.10	38.20	36.15	88.35	103.60	95.98	89.70	108.30	99.00
rates	90	37.45	43.40	40.43	40.35	44.30	42.33	91.35	106.50	98.93	94.15	109.75	101.95
Grand	Mean	31.52	36.62	34.07	34.08	38.10	36.09	86.98	103.48	95.23	89.43	107.00	98.22
LSD	0.05												
Nitrogen se	ource (S)		2.02			3.92			4.42			3.37	
Nitrogen ra	ate (R)		1.79			2.76			3.95			0.91	
Micronutri	ents (M)		1.45			2.07			6.94			3.88	
S*R			2.53			3.91			N.S			1.28	
S*M	N.S		N.S			N.S			N.S				
R*M		N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S		
S*R*M				N.S			N.S			N.S			

Table 4. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on Nuptake (mg/plant) sugar beet shoot and root after 120 days from sowing during 2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

	2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.         Treatments       N- uptake by shoot (mg/plant)         N- uptake by root (mg/plant)												
Trea	tments	l	N- uptal	ke by sl	hoot (mg	/plant)			N- upta	ike by :	root (mg	/plant)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Seaso	n 2017/2	2018	Seaso	n 2016/	2017	Seaso	n 2017/	2018
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
	(kg/fed.)												
A 1	60	888	1255	1072	991	1319	1155	1860	1673	1766	1783	1808	1796
Anhydrous	75	1190	1539	1364	1314	1728	1521	2275	1800	2038	2222	2408	2315
Ammonia	90	1626	2215	1921	1783	2325	2054	2423	1942	2182	2405	2511	2458
Me	an	1229.6	1230	1670	1450	1363	1791	1577	2186	1805	1995	2137	2242
	60	642	936	789	654	996	825	1809	1936	1872	1828	1895	1861
Urea	75	878	1353	1116	966	1231	1098	2243	1756	2000	2226	2084	2155
Ulea	90	1327	1635	1481	1288	1506	1397	2588	2068	2328	2318	1678	1998
Me	an	949.0	949	1308	1128	969	1244	1107	2213	1920	2067	2124	1886
Means of	60	765	1095	930	823	1158	990	1834	1804	1819	1805	1851	1828
nitrogen	75	1034	1446	1240	1140	1479	1310	2259	1778	2019	2224	2246	2235
rates	90	1477	1925	1701	1536	1916	1726	2506	2005	2255	2362	2095	2228
Grand	Mean	1089.3	1089	1489	1289	1166	1518	1342	2200	1862	2031	2130	2064
LSD 0.05													
Nitrogen s	ource (S)		227.24			266.43			56.38			65.15	
Nitrogen ra	ate (R)		134.94			178.50			22.40			24.11	
Micronutri	ents (M)		88.06			152.05			83.37			N.S	
S*R			190.84			N.S			N.S			34.10	
S*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			120.56	
R*M	R*M N.S			N.S			N.S			147.66			
S*R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	

#### Table 5. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on Kuptake (mg/plant) of sugar beet shoot and root dry weights after 120 days from sowing during 2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

	50 11 11	s uur m	5 2010	-017	unu 20		o beab	ons.					
Treatn	Treatments K- uptake by shoot (mg Nitrogen Season 2016/2017 Seas								K- upta	ake by ro	oot (mg/p	olant)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Seaso	n 2017/2	2018	Seaso	on 2016/	2017	Seaso	n 2017	/2018
source (S)	rate (R) (kg/fed.)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
A 1	60	1035	1326	1181	955	1210	1083	1498	1141	1319	1467	1212	1340
Anhydrous	75	1335	1700	1517	1445	1708	1577	1761	1492	1626	1695	1426	1560
Ammonia	90	196	2246	2108	1903	2348	2125	1881	1677	1779	1848	1671	1759
Mea	an	1446	1757	1602	1434	1755	1595	1713	1437	1575	1670	1436	1553
	60	548	853	700	608	806	707	1513	1366	1439	1560	1319	1439
Urea	75	862	1228	1045	829	1002	915	1781	1418	1599	1669	1449	1559
Ulea	90	1209	1643	1426	1017	1343	1180	1911	1630	1771	2217	1890	2053
Mea	an	873	1241	1057	818	1050	934	1735	1471	1603	1815	1553	1684
Means of	60	792	1090	941	781	1008	895	1506	1253	1379	1514	1266	1389
nitrogen	75	1098	1464	1281	1137	1355	1246	1771	1455	1613	1682	1437	160
rates	90	1589	1944	1767	1460	1845	1652	1896	1654	1775	2033	1780	1906
Grand	Mean	1160	1499.2	1329	1126	1403	1264	1724	1454	1589	1743	1494	1619
LSD 0.05													
Nitrogen so	urce (S)		160.60			296.31			39.90			36.89	
Nitrogen ra	te (R )		105.37			162.06			19.61			18.64	
Micronutrie	ents (M)		122.17			89.19			67.18			65.40	
S*R			149.01			229.19			27.74			N.S	
S*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
S*R*M			N.S N.S				N.S				N.S		

# Table 6. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on Na-uptake (mg/plant) of sugar beet shoot and root dry weights after 120 days from sowing during 2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

Trea	tments		Na- upt	ake by	shoot (r	ng/plant	;)		Na- u	ptake by	root (mg/p	olant)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	n 2016/	2017	Sease	on 2017.	/2018	Seas	on 2016/	2017	Seaso	on 2017/	2018
source (S)	rate (R)	without	Boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
	(kg/fed.)												
Anhydrous	60	1338	2197	1767	1571	2032	1802	899	1646	1273	918	1698	1308
Ammonia	75	1831	2298	2064	2956	2652	2804	1044	1768	1406	1028	1803	1415
Ammonia	90	2484	3312	2898	3421	3744	3583	1179	1937	1558	1122	1932	1527
Mea	an	1884	2602	2243	2650	2810	2730	1041	1784	1412	1023	1811	1417
	60	1049	1411	1230	1641	1894	1768	619	1337	978	671	1355	1013
Urea	75	1105	2126	1615	1943	2466	2204	751	1560	1155	635	1412	1023
Ulea	90	1736	2576	2156	2032	2564	2298	997	1737	1367	850	1370	1110
Mea	an	1297	2038	1667	1872	2308	2090	789	1544	1167	719	1379	1049
Means of	60	1194	1804	1499	1606	1963	1785	759	1492	1125	795	1526	1161
nitrogen	75	1468	2212	1840	2450	2559	250	898	1664	1281	831	1607	1219
rates	90	2110	2944	2527	2727	3154	2940	1088	1837	1462	986	1651	1318
Grand 1	Mean	1590	2320	1955	2261	2559	2410	915	1664	1289	871	1595	1233
LSD 0.05	5												
Nitrogen	source		339.97			317.97			140.93			370.89	
(S)													
Nitrogen	rate (R)		158.29			346.40			157.41			144.84	
Micronut	rients		216.41			190.79			160.44			176.40	
(M)													
S*R			223.85			489.88			N.S			N.S	
S*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
S*R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	

Table 7. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on B-
uptake (mg/plant) of sugar beet shoot and root dry weights after 120 days from
sowing during 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

	sowing	auring .	2010/	201/3	anu 201	1/201	o seas	sons.					
Tre	atments		B- upta	ke by sl	hoot (mg/	plant)			B- upt	take by	root(mg/	plant)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Season	n 2016/	2017	Seaso	n 2017/	2018	Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Seaso	n 2017/	2018
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
	(kg/fed.)												
Anhudrous	60	1.16	1.66	1.41	1.36	1.69	1.53	1.27	1.45	1.36	1.26	1.60	1.38
Anhydrous	75	1.55	2.09	1.82	1.80	2.28	2.04	1.34	1.60	1.47	1.33	1.59	1.46
Ammonia	90	2.02	3.42	2.72	2.91	3.50	3.20	1.42	1.64	1.53	1.37	1.75	1.56
Me	an	1.58	2.39	1.98	2.02	2.49	2.26	1.34	1.56	1.45	1.32	1.61	1.47
	60	0.94	1.32	1.13	0.81	1.11	0.96	1.04	1.48	1.26	1.15	1.39	1.27
Linco	75	1.26	1.70	1.48	1.07	1.66	1.36	1.17	1.36	1.26	1.27	1.39	1.33
Urea	90	1.86	2.38	2.12	1.65	1.87	1.76	1.29	1.61	1.45	1.38	1.46	1.42
Me	an	1.35	1.80	1.58	1.19	1.55	1.36	1.17	1.48	1.32	1.27	1.41	1.34
Means of	60	1.05	1.49	1.27	1.08	1.40	1.24	1.15	1.47	1.31	1.21	1.44	1.33
nitrogen	75	1.41	1.89	1.65	1.43	1.97	1.70	1.25	1.48	1.37	1.30	1.49	1.39
rates	90	1.94	2.90	2.42	2.28	2.68	2.48	1.36	1.62	1.49	1.37	1.60	1.49
Grand	Mean	1.47	2.10	1.78	1.60	2.02	1.81	1.25	1.52	1.39	1.29	1.51	1.40
LSD 0.05													
Nitrogen se	ource (S)		0.14			0.22			0.05			0.04	
Nitrogen ra	ate (R)		0.11			0.17			0.01			0.01	
Micronutri	ents (M)		0.08			0.16			0.06			0.06	
S*R			0.16			0.24			1.84			1.88	
S*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			0.07	
R*M			N.S			N.S			0.10			N.S	
S*R*M			N.S			N.S			0.14			N.S	

Results tableted in Tables 2 to 7 show clearly that the effect of boron fertilization compared without boron was significant on all studied characters in both seasons. Sugar beet plants fertilized with boron gave the highest values of shoot fresh and dry weight 351.5, 364.8 for fresh and 36.6.38.1 g for dry, respectively, root fresh and dry weight 507.9,530.4 for fresh and 103.5,100.0 g for dry, nitrogen uptake by shoot and root 1489, 1518 for the shoot and 1862, 2064 (mg/plant) for root, potassium uptake by shoot and root 1499, 1403 for the shoot and 1454, 1494 (mg/plant) for root, sodium uptake by shoot and root 2320, 2559 for the shoot and 1664, 1595 (mg/plant) for root and boron uptake by shoot and root 2.10, 2.02 for the shoot and 1.52, 1.51 (mg/plant) for root, respectively, these results were in harmony with those obtained by (Drycoot,2006) found that boron in sugar beet is played an important role which it was involved in hemicellulose, lignin structural, cell elongation and division, tissue differentiation and metabolism of carbohydrate, protein, auxin, and phenol and in the end control of membrane permeability.

The obtained in the table from (2-7) showed that the interaction effect between nitrogen sources and nitrogen rates was significant on all studied characters except root fresh and dry weight (g) in the second season, shoot fresh weight (g) for the second season, nitrogen uptake for root in the first season, potassium uptake by root in the second season, sodium uptake by root in the first seasons did not significant.

Results tabulated in Tables 2 to 7 exhibited that the interaction effect among nitrogen sources and micronutrients, nitrogen rates and micronutrients and nitrogen sources, nitrogen rates and micronutrients are not significant in both seasons.

Average root fresh and dry weight (g), shoot fresh and dry weight (g), uptake, potassium nitrogen uptake. sodium uptake, and boron uptake in root and shoot of sugar beet at harvest date as affected by nitrogen sources, nitrogen rates and addition of boron and their interactions in 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 seasons are shown in Tables 8-15. Results recorded in Tables 8 to 15 show clearly characters that all measured were significantly affected by nitrogen sources in both seasons. Sugar beet plants received anhydrous ammonia over urea by a percentage20.18 and 16.62 % of root fresh weight 22.14 and 18.03 %, for dry weight respectively, sucrose % 5.88 and 58.77 %, the yield of the sugar 24.39 and 23.06 % shoot fresh and dry weight (ton /fed) 28.02 and 29.59 % for shoot fresh weight and shoot dry weight (kg/fed) 26.37 and 30.36%, root length (cm) and volume  $(cm^3)$  16.56 and 17.31% for root length and 22.99, 32.06% for root volume, (nitrogen uptake by shoot and root 16.98,13.54 % for nitrogen uptake by shoot and 15.32,16.30 % for nitrogen uptake by roots, potassium uptake by shoot and root 33.85,37.71% for the shoot and 22.46.18.35% for root, sodium uptake by shoot and root 32.74, 27.54% for the shoot and 22.51,18.52 % for root and shoot and boron uptake by root 29.99.53.76% for the shoot and 26.21, 45.27 for the root, for the first and second season, respectively. and These results may be due to that nitrogen has a vital role in building up metabolites, activating enzymes and carbohydrates accumulation which transferred from leaves to developing roots which in turn enhanced root length, diameter, and the fresh weight finally roots yield per unit area. Similar findings were reported by Ramadan *et al.* (2003) and ElHassanin *et al.* (2016) and Abbas *et al* (2018).

Results presented in Tables 8 to 15 show clearly that the effect of nitrogen rates was significant on all studied characters in both seasons. Adding 60 kg N/fed as nitrogen rate gave the lowest values from 75 and 90 kg N/fed for all characters such as root fresh and dry weight 10.95,19.91% and 9.34.18.91% for fresh root and 9.09,19.56 and 9.06,20.21 for dry root first and second season, respectively. yield of the sugar 2.54,5.71% and 1.50,4.79% first and second season, respectively, shoot fresh and dry weight (ton /fed) 12.43,21.99 and 6.26,18.26 % for shoot fresh weight and for shoot dry weight (kg/fed) 7.66,19.30 and 11.49,21.10% first and second season, respectively, root (cm) and volume  $(cm^3)$ length 10.30,28.37 and 15.88,23.99 % for root length and 18.61,43.20 and 25.96,45.86 % for root volume first and second season, respectively, ( nitrogen uptake by shoot and root 14.31,30.36 and 12.37,26.62 % for nitrogen uptake by shoot and 12.37,37.60 and 11.37,33.76 for % nitrogen uptake by roots, potassium uptake by shoot and root 10.63,24.67 and 14.31,31.74% for the shoot and 9.68,21.11 and 9.53,21.08% for root, sodium uptake by shoot and root 2.73.5.38 and 3.19,6.30 % for the shoot and 9.97,21.85 and 9.83,21.57% for root and boron uptake by shoot and root 35.78,66.06 and 39.79,116.52% for the shoot and 32.44,58.26 and 30.06,103.80 for the root, for the first and second season, respectively. this is maybe attributed by the increment of growth attributes gained by increasing nitrogen fertilizer level may be due to the role of nitrogen in developing root dimensions by increasing division or elongation of cells and also enhancing leaf initiation and increment chlorophyll concentration in leaves and photosynthesis process. This was associated with the accumulation of carbohydrates translocated from leaves to develop roots, consequently increasing root size The aforementioned findings are in agreement with those of Attia *et al.* (2004) NemeatAlla(2005), Gomaa *et al.* (2005) and Awad-Allah *et al.* (2007).

And sucrose % was increased from 90 kg N/fed to 60 kg N/fed and the 2.33,5.95 and 3.31,7.59 for the first and second season, respectively. Weeden (2000) explained that with an increase of nitrogen in the soil, the amino acid in root increases that it causes sugar crystallization and so decreasing of extractable sugar. And These results may be due to that nitrogen has a vital role in metabolites, building up activating enzymes and carbohydrates accumulation transferred from leaves which to developing roots which in turn enhanced root length, diameter, and the fresh weight finally roots yield per unit area. Similar findings were reported by Ramadan et al. (2003) and ElHassanin et al. (2016) and Abbas et al (2018).

Results tableted in Tables 8 to 15 show clearly that the effect of boron fertilization compared without boron was significant on all studied characters in both seasons. Sugar beet plants fertilized with boron gave the highest values of root fresh and dry weight 13.44, 13.29% for fresh compared by without boron 15.12, 15.47. for the first and second season, respectively, sucrose % and the yield of the sugar (ton/fed) 8.77, 11.02 % and the vield of the sugar (ton/fed) 20.50 ,23.06 % first and for the second season. respectively, shoot fresh and dry weight 30.77 .22.54 % for fresh and 22.77 . 17.95 % for dry for the first and second season, respectively, root length (cm) and root volume( $cm^3$ ) 20.25 ,19.11% for the root length and 40.58, 33.69% for the root volume for the first and second season, respectively, nitrogen uptake by shoot and root 19.20,19.54 % for the shoot and 14.60, 14.56 % for root for the first and second season, respectively, potassium uptake by shoot and root 22.97, 23.76 % for the shoot and 15.56 16.01 % for root first and second for the season. respectively, sodium uptake by shoot and root 5.44, 4.92 % for the shoot and 15.88 ,16.32% for root for the first and second season, respectively, and boron uptake by shoot and root 49.10, 32.36 %% for the shoot and 42.40, 30.61% for the root for the first and second season, respectively This is due to the role of boron in translocation of be contain some essential micronutrients which the carbohydrate assimilated in the leaves, thus enhance stimulate the plant growth and production. Similar sugar accumulation in the roots. Knany et al (2009). and Mekdad and Shaabab (2020) concluded that, the application of boron which may be attributed to decrease uptake of impurities such as Na, K and alpha-amino-N in root juice, and Seham et al (2015). and These are may attribute the increase in uptake might be due to transpiration loss which was more from leaves and resulted in more movement of applied boron with water in the xylem to the leaves but due to phloem immobility of boron, there was more accumulation of boron in the leaves. This was in confirmation with the results of Zhao and Oosterhuuis (2003) and Nadian *et al* (2010). Al-Mohmmad and Al- Geddawi (2001) showed that boron consumption in sugar beet significantly increased the sugar yield due to increased glucose levels in root and phloem sap.

The obtained in the table from (8-15) showed that the interaction effect between nitrogen sources and nitrogen rates were not significant on all studied characters except sucrose % in the first season, the yield of the sugar second season, dry weight of shoot dry weight for first and second seasons, root volume for the first season, nitrogen uptake for the shoot in both seasons and nitrogen uptake root in the first season, potassium uptake by a shoot in both seasons, sodium uptake by a shoot in the first seasons and boron uptake by shoot and root in both seasons were significant.

Results tabulated in Tables 8 to 15 exhibited that the interaction effect among nitrogen sources and micronutrients were not significant in studied characters except root volume in the first season, nitrogen uptake by a shoot in the first seasons, boron uptake by shoots in both seasons and boron uptake by root in the second season were significant.

Results tabulated in Tables 8 to 15 exhibited that the interaction effect among nitrogen rates and micronutrients were not significant in studied characters except root length in the first season, nitrogen uptake by a shoot in both seasons and nitrogen uptake by root in the first season, potassium uptake by a shoot in the first season and boron uptake by a shoot in the first season and boron uptake by root in both season were significant.

Results tabulated in Tables 8 to 15 exhibited that the interaction effect among nitrogen sources, nitrogen rates and micronutrients are not significant in all studied characters except the weight of fresh root the second season, root volume in the first seasons, nitrogen uptake by a shoot in the first season, potassium uptake by a shoot in the second season and boron uptake by shoot and root in both seasons.

# Table 8. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on sugar beet fresh roots fresh and dry roots weights (ton/fed) at harvest time during 2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

Trea	atments		Weight	of fresl	h root (to	n/fed)			Weight	t of dry	roots (to	n/fed)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Seaso	n 2017/2	2018	Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Seaso	n 2017/2	2018
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
	(kg/fed.)												
Anhudnous	60	21.41	24.48	22.95	22.51	24.82	23.67	3.88	4.40	4.14	4.02	4.58	4.30
Anhydrous	75	23.89	26.82	25.36	24.03	26.96	25.50	4.08	4.69	4.39	4.22	4.84	4.53
Ammonia	90	26.69	28.61	27.65	26.11	30.45	28.28	4.63	5.13	4.88	4.66	5.62	5.14
Me	an	24.00	26.64	25.32	24.22	27.41	25.81	4.20	4.74	4.47	4.30	5.01	4.66
	60	16.23	20.45	18.34	17.38	21.79	19.59	2.82	3.40	3.11	3.10	3.74	3.42
Urea	75	18.62	22.25	20.44	19.95	23.65	21.80	3.18	3.89	3.54	3.51	4.25	3.88
Ulea	90	19.88	23.81	21.85	21.88	24.44	23.16	3.33	4.28	3.81	3.78	4.51	4.15
Me	an	18.24	22.17	20.21	19.74	23.29	21.52	3.11	3.86	3.48	3.46	4.17	3.82
Means of	60	18.82	22.47	20.64	19.95	23.31	21.63	3.35	3.90	3.63	3.56	4.16	3.86
nitrogen	75	21.26	24.54	22.90	21.99	25.31	23.65	3.63	4.29	3.96	3.87	4.55	4.21
rates	90	23.29	26.21	24.75	24.00	27.45	25.72	3.98	4.71	4.34	4.22	5.07	4.64
Grand	Mean	21.12	24.40	22.76	21.98	25.35	23.66	3.65	4.30	3.98	3.88	4.59	4.24
LSD	0.05												
Nitrogen s	ource (S)		2.07			0.82			0.40			0.20	
Nitrogen	rate (R)		1.41			1.05			0.24			0.28	
Micronutr	ients (M)		0.89			0.57			0.19			0.16	
S*	R		N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
S*]	М		N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
R*	М		N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
S*R	*M		N.S			1.41			N.S			N.S	

# Table 9. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction onSucrose % and yield of sugar (ton/fed) sugar beetroot at harvest time during2016/2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

Treatm	ents			Sucr	ose %				the yi	eld of s	ugar (tor	n/fed)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	on 2016/	2017	Seaso	on 2017/	2018	Seaso	on 2016		-	n 2017/	2018
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
	(kg/fed.)												
Anhydrou	60	17.20	18.70	17.95	17.43	19.10	18.27	3.27	3.94	3.61	3.33	4.11	3.72
Anhydrou	<sup>8</sup> 75	16.53	17.87	17.20	16.90	18.60	17.75	3.28	4.09	3.69	3.39	4.29	3.84
Ammonia	90	15.63	17.13	16.38	16.23	17.73	16.98	3.42	4.13	3.78	3.49	4.55	4.02
Mean		16.45	17.90	17.18	16.85	18.48	17.67	3.32	4.05	3.69	3.40	4.32	3.86
	60	15.20	17.50	16.35	15.60	18.00	16.80	2.37	3.03	2.70	2.60	3.33	2.97
Unao	75	15.73	16.87	16.30	15.00	17.30	16.15	2.43	3.11	2.77	2.45	3.44	2.95
Urea	90	15.17	16.57	15.87	14.27	16.57	15.42	2.45	3.33	2.89	2.54	3.43	2.99
Mean		15.37	16.98	16.17	14.96	17.29	16.12	2.42	3.16	2.79	2.53	3.40	2.97
Means of	60	16.20	18.10	17.15	16.52	18.55	17.53	2.82	3.49	3.15	2.97	3.72	3.34
nitrogen	75	16.13	17.37	16.75	15.95	17.95	16.95	2.86	3.60	3.23	2.92	3.87	3.39
rates	90	15.40	16.85	16.13	15.25	17.15	16.20	2.94	3.73	3.33	3.02	3.99	3.50
Grand Mea	an	15.91	17.44	16.68	15.91	17.88	16.89	2.87	3.61	3.24	2.97	3.86	3.41
LSD 0.05													
Nitrogen s	ource (S)		0.56			0.60			0.09			0.15	
Nitrogen r	ate (R)		0.13			0.13			0.10			0.05	
Micronutri	ients (M)		0.65			0.66			0.09			0.06	
S*R			0.19			N.S			N.S			0.07	
S*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			0.11	
S*R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	

# Table 10. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on sugar beet shoot and root dry weights (Kg/plant) at harvest time days from sowing during 2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

Treat	nents		Shoot	fresh w	eight (tor	ı/fed)			Shoot	dry we	eight (kg/	fed)	
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Seaso	n 2017/.	2018	Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Seaso	n 2017/2	2018
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
	(kg/fed.)												
A h d	60	5.16	7.11	6.14	6.07	6.93	6.50	534.94	645.35	590.15	550.25	647.33	598.79
Anhydrous Ammonia	75	5.64	8.05	6.85	6.48	8.21	7.35	557.31	733.29	645.30	623.98	779.61	701.80
Ammonia	90	6.24	8.45	7.35	7.46	8.67	8.07	627.95	812.36	720.16	727.96	825.35	776.66
Me	an	5.68	7.87	6.78	6.67	7.94	7.30	573.40	730.33	651.87	634.06	750.76	692.41
	60	3.28	5.37	4.33	4.01	5.99	5.00	388.86	507.79	448.33	404.83	516.59	460.71
Urea	75	3.90	5.91	4.91	4.19	5.57	4.88	407.49	537.96	472.73	422.37	536.59	479.48
Ulea	90	4.39	6.42	5.41	4.39	6.69	5.54	442.61	594.92	518.77	446.99	565.91	506.45
Me	an	3.86	5.90	4.88	4.20	6.08	5.14	412.99	546.89	479.94	424.73	539.70	482.21
Means of	60	4.22	6.24	5.23	5.04	6.46	5.75	461.90	576.57	519.24	477.54	581.96	529.75
nitrogen	75	4.77	6.98	5.88	5.34	6.89	6.11	482.40	635.63	559.01	523.18	658.10	590.64
rates	90	5.32	7.44	6.38	5.93	7.68	6.80	535.28	703.64	619.46	587.48	695.63	641.55
Grand	Mean	4.77	6.89	5.83	5.43	7.01	6.22	493.19	638.61	565.90	529.40	645.23	587.31
LSD	0.05												
Nitrogen s	ource (S)		0.69			0.54			25.23			28.07	
Nitrogen	rate (R)		0.55			0.69			6.27			5.98	
Micronutr	ients (M)		0.38			0.56			22.60			23.83	
S*	R		N.S			N.S			8.87			8.46	
S*]	М		N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
R*.	M		N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	
S*R	*M		N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S	

## Table 11. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on<br/>root length (cm) and root volume (cm<sup>3</sup>) of sugar beet at harvest time during<br/>2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

Treatr	nents		R	oot len	gth (cm)	1		Root volume (cm3)						
Nitrogen	Nitrogen	Seaso	n 2016/	6/2017 Season 20			2018	Seas	Season 2016/2017			Season 2017/2018		
source (S)	rate (R) (kg/fed.)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	
Anhydrous	60	22.86	26.84	24.85	22.13	28.90	25.52	716.00	1045.00	880.50	764.00	1345.00	1054.50	
Ammonia	75	24.14	30.17	27.16	26.57	32.97	29.77	780.00	1301.00	1040.50	1047.00	1616.00	1331.50	
Ammonia	90	27.98	34.35	31.17	28.75	35.03	31.89	967.00	1507.00	1237.00	1436.00	1767.00	1601.50	
Me	an	24.99	30.45	27.72	25.82	32.30	29.06	821.00	1284.33	1052.67	1082.33	1576.00	1329.17	
	60	17.99	22.40	20.20	18.47	24.23	21.35	496.00	833.00	664.50	548.00	945.00	746.50	
Urea	75	20.49	24.57	22.53	22.37	26.67	24.52	581.00	1003.00	792.00	732.00	1142.00	937.00	
Ulea	90	21.90	31.41	26.66	24.15	28.28	26.22	627.00	1324.00	975.50	813.00	1238.00	1025.50	
Me	an	20.13	26.13	23.13	21.66	26.39	24.03	568.00	1053.33	810.67	697.67	1108.33	903.00	
Means of	60	20.43	24.62	22.52	20.30	26.57	23.43	606.00	939.00	772.50	656.00	1145.00	900.50	
nitrogen	75	22.32	27.37	24.84	24.47	29.82	27.15	680.50	1152.00	916.25	889.50	1379.00	1134.25	
rates	90	24.94	32.88	28.91	26.45	31.66	29.05	797.00	1415.50	1106.25	1124.50	1502.50	1313.50	
Grand	Mean	22.56	28.29	25.43	23.74	29.35	26.54	694.50	1168.83	931.67	890.00	1342.17	1116.08	
LSD	0.05													
Nitrogen	source (S)		0.73			3.09			44.17			304.47		
Nitrogen	rate (R)		1.51			1.60			15.25			144.42		
Micronut	rients (M)		0.82			1.37			37.45			124.34		
S*R			N.S			N.S			21.57			N.S		
S*M			N.S			N.S			52.96			N.S		
R*M			1.42			N.S			N.S			N.S		
S*R*M			N.S			N.S			91.73			N.S		

Table 12. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on
sugar beet N- uptake by shoot and roots (kg/fed) at harvest time during 2016/
2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

	2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.												
Treatr	nents		N- upt	ake by	shoot (kg	g/fed)	N- uptake by root (kg/fed)						
Nitrogen Nitrogen		Season 2016/2017			Season 2017/2018			Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Season 2017/2018		
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean
	(kg/fed.)												
A h d	60	6.71	7.89	7.30	6.86	7.96	7.41	23.22	24.10	23.66	23.99	25.19	24.59
Anhydrous	75	7.73	9.58	8.66	7.64	9.13	8.39	25.12	29.15	27.14	26.03	29.88	27.96
Ammonia	90	8.82	10.87	9.85	8.19	10.75	9.47	31.58	37.57	34.58	31.81	38.27	35.04
Me	an	7.75	9.45	8.60	7.56	9.28	8.42	26.64	30.27	28.46	27.28	31.11	29.20
	60	5.80	6.98	6.39	5.94	7.02	6.48	20.17	22.69	21.43	20.97	23.10	22.04
Umaa	75	6.03	7.98	7.01	6.33	8.13	7.23	21.18	25.91	23.55	21.57	26.35	23.96
Urea	90	7.10	8.92	8.01	7.06	9.20	8.13	23.96	30.69	27.33	23.90	30.74	27.32
Me	an	6.31	7.96	7.14	6.44	8.12	7.28	21.77	26.43	24.10	22.15	26.73	24.44
Means of	60	6.26	7.44	6.85	6.40	7.49	6.95	21.70	23.40	22.55	22.48	24.15	23.31
nitrogen	75	6.88	8.78	7.83	6.99	8.63	7.81	23.15	27.53	25.34	23.80	28.12	25.96
rates	90	7.96	9.90	8.93	7.63	9.98	8.80	27.77	34.13	30.95	27.86	34.51	31.18
Grand	Mean	7.03	8.70	7.87	7.00	8.70	7.85	24.21	28.35	26.28	24.71	28.92	26.82
LSD 0.05													
Nitrogen s	ource (S)		0.20			0.28			1.00			1.22	
Nitrogen r	ate (R)		0.09			0.08			0.27			2.69	
Micronutrients (M)			0.31			0.31			1.07			2.92	
S*R			0.13			0.11			0.39			N.S	
S*M			0.44			N.S			N.S			N.S	
R*M			0.54			0.53			1.85			N.S	
S*R*M			0.76			N.S			N.S			N.S	

Table 13. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on<br/>K-uptake (kg/fed) of sugar beet shoot and root dry weights at harvest time<br/>during 2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

during 2016/ 2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.															
Treatn	nents	K- uptake by shoot (kg/fed)							K- uptake by root (kg/fed)						
Nitrogen Nitrogen		Seaso	Season 2016/2017			Season 2017/2018			n 2016/2	2017	Season 2017/2018				
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean		
	(kg/fed.)														
A In I	60	7.82	10.35	9.09	8.53	11.54	10.03	52.00	59.27	55.64	54.63	62.57	58.60		
Anhydrous	75	9.30	10.92	10.11	10.20	12.78	11.49	55.15	63.49	59.32	57.47	66.63	62.05		
Ammonia	90	10.24	12.90	11.57	11.94	13.58	12.76	62.83	70.25	66.54	63.56	77.29	70.43		
Me	an	9.12	11.39	10.25	10.22	12.63	11.43	56.66	64.34	60.50	58.55	68.83	63.69		
	60	5.38	6.91	6.15	4.92	6.90	5.91	37.77	45.92	41.84	41.95	50.80	46.38		
Linco	75	5.85	7.66	6.75	6.09	8.32	7.21	42.62	52.57	47.60	47.63	58.22	52.93		
Urea	90	5.89	8.97	7.43	6.46	10.02	8.24	44.89	58.15	51.52	51.62	61.78	56.70		
Me	an	5.71	7.85	6.78	5.82	8.41	7.12	41.76	52.21	46.99	47.07	56.93	52.00		
Means of	60	6.60	8.63	7.62	6.72	9.22	7.97	44.88	52.59	48.74	48.29	56.69	52.49		
nitrogen	75	7.57	9.29	8.43	8.14	10.55	9.35	48.89	58.03	53.46	52.55	62.42	57.49		
rates	90	8.06	10.93	9.50	9.20	11.80	10.50	53.86	64.20	59.03	57.59	69.54	63.56		
Grand	Mean	7.41	9.62	8.51	8.02	10.52	9.27	49.21	58.28	53.74	52.81	62.88	57.85		
LSD 0.05															
Nitrogen s	ource (S)		0.41			0.50			5.77			2.98			
Nitrogen r	ate (R)		0.09			0.10			3.24			4.17			
Micronutrients (M)			0.34			0.38			2.68			2.30			
S*R			0.48			0.13			N.S			N.S			
S*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S			
R*M			0.59			N.S			N.S			N.S			
S*R*M			N.S			0.93			N.S			N.S			

#### 328

# Table 14. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on sugar beet Na- uptake by shoot and roots (kg/fed) at harvest time during 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

Treatments			Na- up	take bv	shoot (k	g/fed)	Na- uptake by root (kg/fed)							
Nitrogen Nitrogen		Season 2016/2017			Season 2017/2018			Seaso	n 2016/2	•	Season 2017/2018			
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	
	(kg/fed.)													
A 1 1	60	12.90	13.55	13.23	12.60	12.85	12.73	32.99	37.73	35.36	34.93	40.10	37.52	
Anhydrous	75	13.17	13.81	13.49	12.86	13.39	13.13	35.17	40.51	37.84	36.77	42.90	39.84	
Ammonia	90	13.34	14.05	13.70	13.04	13.90	13.47	40.13	45.10	42.62	40.72	49.77	45.25	
Me	an	13.14	13.80	13.47	12.83	13.38	13.11	36.10	41.11	38.61	37.47	44.26	40.87	
	60	8.56	8.85	8.71	8.94	9.45	9.20	23.98	29.23	26.61	26.74	32.50	29.62	
	75	8.80	9.28	9.04	9.20	9.77	9.49	27.04	33.54	30.29	30.45	37.37	33.91	
Urea	90	8.95	9.91	9.43	9.47	10.18	9.83	28.56	37.19	32.88	33.10	39.66	36.38	
Me	an	8.77	9.35	9.06	9.20	9.80	9.50	26.53	33.32	29.92	30.10	36.51	33.30	
Means of	60	10.73	11.20	10.97	10.77	11.15	10.96	28.49	33.48	30.98	30.84	36.30	33.57	
nitrogen	75	10.99	11.55	11.27	11.03	11.58	11.31	31.11	37.03	34.07	33.61	40.14	36.87	
rates	90	11.15	11.98	11.56	11.26	12.04	11.65	34.35	41.15	37.75	36.91	44.72	40.81	
Grand	Mean	10.95	11.58	11.26	11.02	11.59	11.30	31.31	37.22	34.26	33.79	40.38	37.08	
LSD 0.05														
Nitrogen s	ource (S)		0.52			0.49			3.85			1.99		
Nitrogen r	ate (R)		0.10			0.09			2.10			2.78		
Micronutr	ients (M)		0.45			0.45			1.75			1.52		
S*R			0.14		N.S			N.S			N.S			
S*M			N.S		N.S			N.S				N.S		
R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S		
S*R*M			N.S			N.S			N.S			N.S		

# Table 15. Effect of nitrogen sources, rates, the addition of boron and their interaction on sugar beet B- uptake by shoot and roots (g/fed) at harvest time during 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 seasons.

Treatments			B-upt	ake by	shoot (g/	fed)	B- uptake by root (g/fed)							
Nitrogen Nitrogen		Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Season 2017/2018			Seaso	n 2016/2	2017	Season 2017/2018			
source (S)	rate (R)	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	without	boron	Mean	
	(kg/fed.)													
Anhydroug	60	11.56	18.89	15.23	13.08	19.16	16.12	48.73	64.58	56.66	53.26	68.32	60.79	
Anhydrous Ammonia	75	13.72	23.78	18.75	15.84	25.34	20.59	50.44	75.53	62.99	53.38	79.46	66.42	
Ammonia	90	17.30	38.41	27.86	31.04	39.85	35.45	63.48	121.68	92.58	99.14	135.92	117.53	
Me	an	14.19	27.03	20.61	19.99	28.12	24.05	54.22	87.26	70.74	68.59	94.57	81.58	
	60	8.53	13.35	10.94	5.36	8.65	7.01	30.79	44.68	37.74	20.10	32.88	26.49	
Lines	75	10.38	23.14	16.76	7.42	16.04	11.73	40.56	83.52	62.04	30.93	63.26	47.10	
Urea	90	9.45	21.72	15.59	12.37	16.85	14.61	35.57	78.08	56.83	53.43	67.27	60.35	
Me	an	9.45	19.40	14.43	8.38	13.85	11.12	35.64	68.76	52.20	34.82	54.47	44.65	
Means of	60	10.05	16.12	13.08	9.22	13.91	11.56	39.76	54.63	47.20	36.68	50.60	43.64	
nitrogen	75	12.05	23.46	17.76	11.63	20.69	16.16	45.50	79.53	62.51	42.16	71.36	56.76	
rates	90	13.38	30.07	21.72	21.71	28.35	25.03	49.53	99.88	74.70	76.29	101.60	88.94	
Grand	Mean	11.82	23.22	17.52	14.19	20.98	17.58	44.93	78.01	61.47	51.71	74.52	63.11	
LSD 0.05														
Nitrogen s	ource (S)		0.74			0.73			3.32			3.49		
Nitrogen r	ate (R)		0.39			0.18			7.24			1.12		
Micronutrients (M)			0.71		0.63			3.31			2.68			
S*R		0.55			0.26			10.24			1.58			
S*M			1.00			0.90			N.S			3.80		
R*M			1.23		N.S			5.74			4.65			
S*R*M			1.73			1.55			8.11			6.57		

### **4. REFERENCES**

Abashady, K. A., Zalat, S. S., and Ibraheim, M. F. 2011. Influence of use nitrogen fertilizer levels and sources for late sowing date on yield and quality of sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) in north Nile delta. Journal of Plant Production, 2(3), 425-436.

doi:10.21608/jpp.2011.85577

- Abbas, M. S., Soliman, A. S., Moustafa,
  Z. R and Abd El-Reheem, K. M.
  2018. Effect of some soil amendments on yield and quality traits of sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) under water stress in sandy soil. Egyptian Journal of Agronomy, 40(1), 75-88. doi:10.21608/agro.2018.2660.1091
- Abd El-Hady, M. A. 2018. Response of sugar beet growth, productivity and quality to foliar application of different forms of boron microelement and number of sprays under new reclaimed soil conditions. Egyptian Journal of Agronomy, 39 (3), 401 - 410. Doi : 10 . 21608 / agro. 2017.1948.1082
- **Abd El-Megeed, T. 2017.** Effect of urea and anhydrous ammonia fertilizer on yield and yield component of rice plants. J. of Plant Production, 8(3), 425-434.

doi:10.21608/jpp.2017.39999

Abd El-Motagally, F. F. 2016. Effect concentration and spraying time of boron on yield and quality traits of sugar beet grown in newly reclaimed soil conditions. Assiut. J. of Agric. Sci, 46(6), 15-26. doi:10.21608/ajas.2016.516

- Abd El-Motagally, F. M., and Attia, K. K. 2009. Response of sugar beet plants to nitrogen and potassium fertilization in sandy calcareous soil. Inter. J. of. Agric and Biology, 11(6), 695-700.
- Abdelaal, K. A. and Tawfik, S. F. 2015. Response of Sugar Beet Plant (Beta vulgaris L.) to Mineral Nitrogen Fertilization and Bio-Fertilizers. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci, 4(9), 677-688.
- Abo-Steet, Seham Y., El-Edfawy, Y.M and Niazy, M.M 2015. Mutual effect among compost and foliar spraying with zinc and boron on sugar beet (Beta vulgaris l.) grown on saline sandy loam soil. J.Soil Sci. and Agric. Eng., Mansoura Univ., 6 (9): 1091– 1105
- Ahmad, W., H., M., Niaz S., S.,, A., and Saifullah. 2012. Boron deficiency in soils and CROPS: A review. Crop Plant. doi:10.5772/36702
- Al-Mohmmad, H and Al-Geddawy, S. 2001 Effect of boron on heart rot and on yield of sugarbeet. Arab J Pl Protection 19: 45-48.
- Attia, A.N., Kandil A.A., Sultan, M.S., Badawi, M.A. and Seadh, S.E 2004 Effect of planting dates, bio fertilization and NK combination levels on II- Yield and quality of sugar beet. The 4th Scientific Conference of Agricultural Sciences, Assuit, December 2004.
- Attia, K. K. and Khalifa, A. M. M 2015. Response of sugar beet grown in newly reclaimed soil to different nitrogen sources at different growth

stages. Middle East Journal of Agriculture Research. Vol.04 (3) :467-474.

- Awad-Allah, M.A., Abd El Lattief, E.A., Ahmed, M.S.H. 2007 Influence of nitrogen fertilizer and elemental sulphur levels on productivity and technological characteristics of sugar beet under middle Egypt conditions. Assiut J. Agric. Sci., 38(3): 1–16.
- Bingham, F. T. 1982 Boron. In Methods of Soil Analysis, eds. A. L Page, 431– 447. Madison, Wisconsin, U.S.A.: ASA.
- Berger, K. C and Truog, E. 1939 Boron determination in soils and plants. Industrial Engineering. Chemistry (Analytical Edition) Journal 11: 540-545.
- Cooke, D.A. and Scott, R.K. 1993" The Sugar Beet Crop". Chapman and Hall London, pp. 262-265.
- Drycott, A.P. 2006.Sugar Beet. Blackwell Publishing, united kingdom.<u>http://base.dnsgb.com.ua/fil</u> es/book/Agriculture/Cultures/Sugar-<u>Beet.pdf</u>
- El-Hassanin, S.M.R., Moustafa, N.S., Khalifa, A.M and Ibrahim, N.I. 2016 Effect of foliar application with the humic acid substance under nitrogen fertilization levels on quality and yields of sugar beet plant. Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci. 5(11), 668-680.
- Ghazy, E.A.E. 2013. Effect of nitrogen fertilizer on sugar beet. M. Sc. Thesis, Fac. of Agric., Al-Azhar Univ.
- Gobarah Mirvat, E., Mohamed, Magda H., Mohamed, Manal F and Tawfik, M.M. 2011. Potential of bio fertilization for sustainable production of sugar (Beta vulgaris,

L.) in newly reclaimed sandy soil. Int. J. Acad. Res., 3(6): 120–125.

- Gomaa, A.M., H.Ferweez and Abo El-Wafa, A.M. 2005. Maximizing yield quality and profitability of sugar beet using nitrogen fertilizer at different sowing dates under middle Egypt conditions. Assuit J. Agric. Sci. 36 (3): 39-56.
- Gomez, K. A and Gomez, A. A. 1984. Statistical procedures for agriculture research. 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. John Wiley and Sons. New York, USA. 680pp.
- Jackson, M. L. 1967. Soil Chemical Analysis. Prentice – Hall, beet. The 4th Scientific Conference of Agricultural Inc, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA.
- Jackson, M.I. 1973. Soil Chemical Analysis. Prentice- Hall of Indian, Private Limited, New Delhi.
- Jackson, M.L 1981. Soil Chemical Analysis. Prentic Hall Inc., New Jersey, USA.
- Knany, R.E., El-Saady, A.S.M., Atia, R.H. and Awad, N.M. 2009. Comparative study between potassium fertilizer sources in the presence of boron on sugar beet yield and juice quality. Alexandria science exchange journal, vol.30, (4).445-452.
- Lamani,K.D and Halikatti,S.I. 2019. Effect of Nitrogen, Phosphorous and Potash on Yield Attributes and Quality of Sugar Beet (Beta vulgaris). International Journal of Plant and Soil Science, 26(3), 1–8.
- Le-Docte, A. 1927. Commercial determinations of sugar in the beet root using the sacks. Le-Docte process. Int. Sugar. J. 29: 488-492.
- Manderscheid, R., Pacholski, A and Weigel, H. 2010. Effect of free air

carbon dioxide enrichment combined with two nitrogen levels on growth, yield and yield quality of sugar beet: Evidence for a sink limitation of beet growth under elevated CO2. Europ. J. Agron., 32: 228–239.

- Mekdad, A A. A. and Shaban, A. 2020. Integrative applications of nitrogen, zinc, and boron to nutrients-deficient soil improves sugar beet productivity and technological sugar contents under semi-arid conditions. Journal of Plant Nutrition, 43:13, 1935-1950.
- Mostafa, Shafika . N. and Darwish, S.D. 2001. Biochemical studies on the efficiency use of some nitrogen fertilizers for sugar beet production. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 26 (4): 2421-2439.
- Moursi, E.A. and Darwesh, R.Kh. 2014. Effect of Irrigation and Nitrogen Fertilization on Sugar Beet Yield, Quality and Some Water Relations in Heavy Clay Soils. Alexandria science exchange journal, vol.(35) No (3).
- Nadian, H., Najarzadegan, R., Saeid, K. A., Gharineh, M. H and Siadat, A 2010 Effects of boron and sulfur application on yield and yield components of Brassica napus L. in a calcareous soil. J World App Sci 11: 89-95.
- Nemeat Alla, E.A.E. 2005. Yield and quality of sugar beet as affected by different nitrogen and sulphur rates under clay soils. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 30(12): 7255-7264.
- Olsen, S.R., Cole, C.V., watanabe, F.S. and Dean, L.A. 1954. Estimation of available phosphorus in soils by extraction with sodium bicarbamate. US. Dept. Agric., Cric .939.onions morphological properties.

International Jour. of Farming and Allied Sci. ISSN 2322-4134.

- Page, A.L., Miller, R.H and Keeney, D.R. 1982. Methods of Soil Analysis. Part 2 Chemical and Microbiological Properties. American Society of Agronomy, No. 9. Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- **Piper, C.S. 1950.**" Soil and Plant Analyses". A monograph from the wait, Agric., Research Institute, Univ. of Adelaide, Australia.49.
- Ragab, A.Y. and Ibrahim M.H. 2009. Effect of nitrogen, Phosphorus and biofertilizers on Maize: 11.Yield and its components.J.Agric. Sci. Mansoura Univ., 34(7): 8043-8054.
- Ramadan, B.S.H., Hassan, H.R. and Abdou, F.A. 2003 Effect of mineral and biofertilizers on photosynthetic pigments, root quality, yield components and anatomical structure of sugar beet (Beta vulgaris L.) plants grown under reclaimed soils. J. Agric. Sci. Mansoura, Univ. 28(7), 5139-5160.
- Seham Y.M 2012. Evaluation of fertilization efficiency with gaseous ammonia of corn and sunflower crops in different soil types. Ph.D. Thesis, Fac. Agric., Ain Shams Univ., Egypt.
- Siam, Hanan. S., Abd El-Kader, Mona G and Abd El-Fattah M.S 2012. Effect of Ammonia Gas and Some Micronutrients on Maiz Plants (Zea Mays) I-Plant Growth and Mineral Uptake. Australian Journal of Basic and Applied Sciences, 6(3): 462-473.
- Soltanpour, P.N and Workman, S., 1979. Modification of the NH4 HCO3-DTPA soil test to omit carbon black. Communications in Soil Science and Plant Analysis 10(1): 1411-1420.

- Telep, A.M., Lashin, A.U., Ismail, S.A and El- Seref, G.F.H. 2008. Response of sugar beet to N, K and Na application in newly reclaimed soils of Minia governorate. Minia J. Agric. Res. Develop., 28(3): 495– 518.
- Weeden, B.R. 2000. Potential of sugar beet on the Atherton Tableland. A Report for the Rural Industries Research and Development Corporation. December 2000, RIRDC Publication No 00/167. RIRDC Project No DAQ-211A.
- Zhao, D and Oosterhuis, D. M 2003 Cotton growth and physiology responses to boron deficiency. J Pl Nutr 26: 856-67.

#### الملخص العربي

تم إجراء تجربتين حقليتين بالمزرعة التجريبية التابعة لمركز البحوث الزراعية بمحطة بحوث طامية بمحافظة الفيوم. جمهورية مصر العربية خلال موسم الشتاء لعامين هما ٢٠١٧/٢٠١٦ و٢٠١٨/٢٠١٧. وذلك لدراسة التأثير المتبادل لإضافة مصدرين من النيتروجين (الأمونيا الغازية ٨٢٪ واليوريا ٤٦٪) في قطع التجربة الرئيسية، وتم استخدام ثلاثة معدلات نيتروجين (٥٦، ٧٥ ، ٩٠ كجم نتروجين / فدان) في قطع الأراضي التحت رئيسية، في حين تم استخدام مستويين من البورون (صفر، ١ جم/لتر) في القطع تحت تحت فرعية في تصميم قطع عشوائية منشقة مرتين وتأثير ذلك على جودة وبعض الصفات المحصولية والإنتاجية ومحتوى النبات من النيتروجين والبوتاسيوم والصوديوم والبورون عند عمر ١٢٠ يوم وكذلك عند عمر الحصاد على نبات بنجر السكر صنف (Gloria). و يمكن تلخيص النتائج الرئيسية على النحو التالي.

- التسميد بالنيتر وجين ينشط نمو النبات ويزيد من محصوله.
- ٢- أظهر مصدر النيتروجين مثل الأمونيا الغازية أعلى نمو وأعلى امتصاص من (N، K، N) بينما أقل مصدر فعال كان اليوريا خلال ١٢٠ يوم وعند الحصاد.
- ٣- عن طريق زيادة معدل النيتروجين من ٦٠ إلى ٩٠ كجم / فدان أدى ذلك إلى زيادة محتوى الفروع والجذور من B و لم و B و كذلك زيادة عدد الاغصان و زيادة الوزن الطازج والجاف للجذور. تمت زيادة محصول السكر عند عمر ١٢٠ يوم من الزراعة وكذلك عند الحصاد، بينما أدى ذلك إلى انخفاض نسبة السكروز في الجذور عند الحصاد.
- ٤- تفوق إضافة البورون على عدم إضافته في جميع الصفات المدروسة مثل طول الجذر وحجمه والعناصر الممتصة مثل N و K و N وB وكذلك نسبة السكر ومحصول السكر لكل فدان ووزن الجذور والأوراق في كلا الموسمين.
- الكلمات الدلالية: بنجر السكر، الامونيا اللامائية، اليوريا، معدلات التسميد النيتروجيني، البورون، الجودة، الإنتاجية، الممتص من النيتروجين والبوتاسيوم والصوديوم والبورون.