Growth, Fruit Yield and Quality of Three Strawberry Cultivars as Affected by Mulch Type and Low Tunnel

Mohamed A. Soliman¹, Hala A. Abd El-Aal², Ramadan, A. Mohmed¹ and Nabil N. Elhefnawy²

ABSTRACT

Two field experiments were carried out to study the effects of three mulch treatments (black polyethylene, clear polyethylene in addition to a non-mulched control) under low tunnel system (with and without tunnel), on plant growth, flowering traits, fruit yield and quality of three strawberry cultivars (Fragaria & ananassa Duch); Festival, Sweet Charlie and Gaviota, grown in sandy soil under a drip irrigation system. The results indicated that the three tested strawberry cultivars which were mulched with clear or black polyethylene and tunneled exhibited significant increases in number of leaves, number of crown, leaf area, dry mass/plant, number of flower trusses / plant and it flowered earlier than the non-mulched and non- tunneled ones. Moreover, most yield potential characters i.e. early yield, total yield, yield/plant, marketable yield, culls yield and average fruit weight; were positively and significantly increased by the application of mulch (clear and black polyethylene mulch) and tunneled compared to non-mulched and non-tunneled ones. Furthermore, these treatments, significantly, enhanced most fruit quality characteristics; total soluble solids, total titratable acidity, ascorbic acid, and reducing, non-reducing and total sugars compared to the control. Both Festival and Sweet Charlie cultivars were exceeded Gaviota one, in this respect.

Key words: Strawberry Cultivars, Polyethylene Plastic Mulch, Low Tunnels

INTRODUCTION

Strawberry (Fragaria & ananassa Duch) is one of the most popular vegetable crops. In Egypt, it occupies an important position among the non-traditional vegetable crops due to its multifarious use for local fresh consumption, exportation and food processing. Potentially, it is one of the most profitable horticultural Egyptian exports to Europe (El-Shall et al 2003). In recent years, there have been interests to study bioactive compounds of strawberries with an impact on human health such as ascorbic and ellagic acids (Wang et al 2002). Strawberries are rich in total antioxidents and are thus important for human health (Halvorsen et al 2002). However, the quality and quantity of these compounds are affected by genetic, environmental and agricultural factors (Kallio et al 2000; Anttonen and Karjalianen, 2005).

Mulch is any material used to cover the surface of the garden soil. There are many types of mulching

materials, but they can be divided into two general categories; natural and synthetic. Synthetic-mulches are plastic and papers. The crops vary in their response to polyethylene mulch covers depending on cultivar, materials used, color and environmental conditions (Salman et al 1991; Pan et al 1999). Many researchers pointed that mulching had clear effects on microclimate around the plants by modifying the radiation budget of the surface and give significant increased on vegetative growth of many vegetable (Aguyoh and taber, 1999; Osiru and Hahn, 1994). Growing day-neutral strawberry using plastic mulch stimulate growth of young plants, increase soil temperature, weed control, reduces evapotranspiration, maximize water use efficiency and restrains heat loss during cold nights (Lieten, 1991; Gimenez et al 2002). Furthermore, it improves the protability by increasing the productivity and/or early fruit production as well as enhancing fruit quality (Orzolek and Murphy, 1993). Positive significant effects of organic and synthetic mulches on vegetative growth, flowering traits and yield and its components of strawberry plants have been reported by several investigators (Kher et al 2010; Hasanein et al 2011; Medina et al 2011; Li-fan et al 2012; Abou Elyazied and Mady, 2012; Muhammad Haroon et al 2014). Plants mulched with straw or white-on-black polyethylene flowered and yielded more than plants mulched with clear or white polyethylene. Conversely, more crown and root dry weight (DW) were associated with straw or clear-on-black polyethylene, (Fear and Nonnecke, 1989). Black polyethylene provides higher soil temperature in spring than hairy vetch mulch (Teasdale and Abdul-Baki, 1995; Teasdale and Abdul-Baki, 1997). Abou Elyazied and Mady, (2012) found that plastic mulch, significantly, increased NPK content and reduced the number of days to first flower, number flower/cluster and increase the final yield of strawberry plants than control.

Fruit quality of strawberry plants was affected by many factors including cultivar, mulching system, fertilization, irrigation and temperature (Khanizadeh, 1994; Kivijarvi *et al.*, 2002; Anttonen *et al.*, 2006). Nestby *et al.*, (1985) demonstrated that the use of color polyethylene mulch had increased the percentage total soluble solids (Brix), vitamin C content, phenolic, total

¹Horticulture Research Institute - Agricultural Research Center.

² Environmental studies and Research Institute – University of Sadat City Received October 18, 2015, Accepted December 28, 2015

anthocyanin and ellagic acid of strawberry plants compared with the control.

High and low tunnels are very common in the Mediterranean regions and Asia (Faspi *et al.*, 2006) as they prolong the harvesting period and improve fruit quality. A high tunnel fruit growing system provides a competitive edge in the market, compared with a field growing system (Kadir *et al.*, 2006). Significant, effects of high tunnels on vegetative growth, flowering traits, yield and fruit quality of strawberry plants were reported by Qureshi *et al.*, (2012).

The objective of the present study was to compare the effects of two types of mulch (black polyethylene, clear polyethylene in addition to a non-mulched control) under low tunnel system (with and without) for three strawberry cultivars; Sweet Charlie, Gaviota, Festival on vegetative growth, flowering traits, fruit yield and quality and chemical composition.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Strawberry cultivars

Three cultivars of strawberry widely cultivated in Egypt were chosen. These cultivars represent the most sugary with excellent flavor; c.v Sweet Charlie and the universally grown, high yielding and good quality; c.vs, Gaviota and festival. Frigo transplants of the tested strawberry cultivars were obtained from Strawberry and Non-Traditional Crops Research Station Nobaria, El-Buhiera Governorate, Egypt. The transplanting date into the field were on September 1 and 25, in the first and second growing seasons, respectively.

Experimental procedure

Two field experiments were conducted during the growing seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 at the Experimental Station Farm Horticultural Research Institute (South Tahrir), El-Buhiera Governorate, under drip irrigation system. Some physical and chemical properties of the two experimental sites were determined according to methods described by Black, (1965) and presented in Table (1). The experimental layout was a split-split plot system in a randomized complete blocks design with four replications. Strawberry cultivars were arranged as the main plots and the plastic mulches treatments were considered as

the sub – plots; while, the low tunnels systems were placed in the sub-sub-plots. Each sub-sub-plot was two rows of 2.40 m width and 3 m length having an area 7.2 m².A drip irrigation network was designed for this study. The drip irrigation network consisted of lateral's GR of 16 mm in diameter, with emitters at 0.5 m distance, with allocating two laterals for each ridge. The emitters had a discharge rate $4 \ l \ h^{-1}$.

All Agricultural practices such as fertigation and disease and pest control were carried out whenever it was necessary according to the recommendations of the commercial production of strawberry commercial production as outlined by Ministry of Agriculture. During the entire growing season, nitrogen, potassium and phosphor fertilizers were also added through the drip irrigation system four times per week, at the rates of 200kg N /fed, in the form of ammonium nitrate (20.5% N), 120 kg K₂O / fed. as soluble potassium sulphate (48% k₂O) and 80kg P₂O₅ /fed as soluble phosphoric acid.

Data Recorded

1- Vegetative growth traits

At full blooming stage, Five representative plant sample were randomly chosen from each sub-sub plot to measurement the number of crowns/ plant, the number of leaves/ plant, plant leaf area (cm²) and plant dry mass (g) were recorded.

2- Yield potential

Early fruit yield was calculated in ton/ fed. as the fresh weight of harvested fruits from the first four pickings. Total yield was calculated in ton /fed. as the fresh weight of all harvested fruits throughout the growing season. Yield /plant (g) was calculated in a random sample of ten plants per sub-sub plot at each picking.

3-Yield components

Average fruit weight (g), was calculated in a random sample of ten plants per sub-sub plot at each harvest. Non-marketable yield (ton/fed), including splitter, malformed, green shouldered, white tip, damaged and rotted fruits was determined at each picking. Marketable yield (ton/fed) was calculated at each picking.

 Table 1. Some physical and chemical analyses of the experimental sites of the 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 growing season

\mathbf{v}	Physical	Chemical characteristics									
Season	Sand%	Silt%	Clay%	EC PH _		Soluble cations mg/l		Soluble anions mg/l		Total N	
				us/m		Ca	mg	K	HCO ₃	So ₄	_
2012/2013	93	5	2	0.16	8.9	0.72	0.54	0.23	0.59	0.54	0.007
2013/2014	94	4	2	0.21	8.8	0.69	0.55	0.20	0.56	0.55	0.009

4- Fruit quality

Random samples of ten fruits were taken from each sub-sub plot at monthly intervals starting from the first harvest, to determine fruit characteristics. Moisture content (%): was determined on fresh weight basis by calculating the difference between fruit fresh weight and oven dried (70 °c until a constant weight) fruits/fruit fresh weight \times 100. Total soluble solids (TSS %): was determined using a carlzeiss hand refractometer.

Reducing and total sugars: were determined according to Nelson's method as illustrated by Mailk and Singh, (1980). Means while the non-reducing sugars were calculated by the difference between total and reducing sugars.

Statistical analysis:

The obtained data were statically analyzed using Statistical Analysis System (SAS), version 6(SAS INSTITUTE INC, Cary, USA).Differences between means were compared by Revised the Least Significant Difference test (LSD) at 0.05 levels.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1- Vegetative growth traits:

Results in Table (2) indicated that Festival cultivar recorded the highest mean values for most vegetative growth parameters i.e. number of leaves and crowns, dry mass and leaf area compared with those of Sweet Charlie and Gavuta, in both seasons. The obtained results seemed to complement with those reported by Shiow et al (1998). The results presented in Table (2), generally, clarified the presence of some significant increments on all studied vegetative growth characters of strawberry plant as a result of application of mulches type and tunnels compared with control (non-mulched / non-tunneled), in both seasons. The black polyethylene mulch recorded the highest mean values for all studied growth characters, in both seasons. The lowest mean values of vegetative growth characters were obtained by no soil cover (non-mulched control) treatment. The detected pronounced positive effect of mulches type on the vegetative parameters might be due to the reduced soil erosion; weed emergence; water loss; increased nitrogen; recycling of nutrients and addition of organic matter to the soil. These results, generally, are matched with those reported by Himelrick, (1982); Blatt, (1984); Nestby, (1985) and Fear Nonneck, (1989). Executing the low tunnel resulted in higher vegetative growth than the non-tunneled control. The benefits of plastic tunnels lead to maximum water use efficiency by the plant and reduce weeds which positively reflect on vegetative growth characters (Gimenez et al 2002).

The results in Table (3) illustrated the interaction effect between (cultivars \times mulch types) on vegetative growth characters of strawberry plants. In both season, significant difference were detected in all vegetative growth traits as a result of the combination between the different mulches and cultivars. The best treatment combination for most vegetative growth characters was obtained when the strawberry plants cv Festival were mulched by black polyethylene, in both seasons.

The interaction effect between tunnel and cultivar on vegetative growth traits are presented in Table(4). Strawberry cv. Festival or Sweet Charlie under low tunnel was responsible for the significant increments for all studied vegetative growth traits, in both seasons. Similar results were reported by Qureshi *et al.*, (2012).

The obtained results presented in Table (5) reflected the significant interaction effects between (mulches type \times tunnel) on vegetative growth characters of strawberry plants. Application of mulch treatments either black or clear under the low tunnel, significantly, produced more vegetative growth traits, in both seasons. Black mulch exhibited higher mean values for all vegetative growth traits in tunnels, in both seasons. The obtained results seemed to complement with those reported by Medin *et al.*, (2011) and Levent and Sozer, (2001).

2- Flowering traits:

The obtained results tabulated in Table (6) reported that strawberry cvs. Festival and Sweet Charlie were earlier and produced higher number of flower trusses/ plant than Gaviota one. The effect of various mulch types and tunnels on flowering time (earliness) and number of flower trusses / plant were found significant, in both seasons (Table 6). The strawberry plants which were mulched and tunneled flowered earlier and produced more flower trusses than the control (nonmulched and non-tunneled). The observed enhancement effect on flowering parameters due to type of mulches might be attributed to the benefits of organic and synthetic mulches which led to decrease water loss and soil temperature during the hot summer months, reduced soil erosion and action as a slow-release fertilizer (Teasdele and Abdul-backi, 1993). Also, it leads to promote vegetative growth which positively reflects on flowering traits. The low tunnels increased temperature 1-2 °C and enables the plant growing during critical development period, which reflect on flowering traits (Sevgican, 1984). These results seemed to be in general agreements with those reported by Sevgican (1984); Fear and Nonnecke, (1989) and Levent and Sozer, (2001), who reported that plants mulched with black mulches and tunnels flowered and yielded earlier than control one.

Treatment		Number of leaves		Number of crown		Total dry weight (g m)		Leaf area (cm ²)	
		Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2
Cultivar	Gafuta	19.98 b	15.13 b	3.38 a	2.84 b	6.76 c	6.43 b	237.51 c	222.95 b
	Festival	25.76 a	21.65 a	3.50 a	3.51 a	18.30 a	15.28 a	640.63a	621.72 a
Swe	et Charlie	22.31 ab	20.20 a	3.98 a	3.33 a	12.44 b	13.97 a	430.91 b	511.65 a
Mulch	Control	19.48 b	17.12 b	2.73 b	2.33 b	9.15 b	8.21 b	343.75c	345.23b
	Clear	23.48 a	19.42 a	3.86 a	3.91 a	12.67 a	12.86 a	426.77 b	518.37 a
_	Black	25.09 a	20.43 a	4.27 a	3.44 a	15.63 a	14.63 a	538.50 a	492.72 a
Tunnel	Non	21.77 a	17.24 b	3.54 a	2.55 b	11.62 a	11.39 a	418.99 b	440.66a
	Tunnel	23.59 a	20.75 a	3.70 a	3.91 a	13.34 a	12.40 a	453.69 a	463.55 a

Table 2. The Main effects of cultivar, mulch and tunnel on vegetative growth characters of strawberry plant, during the seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

Values followed by the same letter(s), within a comparable group of means of any main effect, do not significantly differ, using revised L.S.D test at 0.05% level

Table 3. The Interaction effect between cultivar and mulch on vegetative growth characters of strawberry plants, during the seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

Cultivar	Mulch	Number of leaves		Number of crown		Total dry weight (g m)		Leaf area (cm²)	
	Mulch	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season
		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
Gafuta	Un- mulched	18.91 c	10.03 c	2.92 d	1.75 d	5.78 d	5.49 d	219.18 c	201.64 b
	clear mulch	22.38 bc	17.94 b	3.52 cd	3.97a	8.19 d	7.81 d	288.78 bc	267.95 b
	Black mulch	18.66 c	17.42 b	3.71 bcd	2.80 bc	6.303 d	6.01 d	204.53 c	199.25 b
Festival	Un -mulched	21.17 c	22.66 a	1.89 e	2.72 bc	14.22 bc	12.52 c	604.49 a	554.34 a
	clear mulch	27.62 ab	20.11ab	3.95 abc	4.27 a	19.51 ab	18.01 b	622.41 a	685.57 a
	Black mulch	28.49a	22.16 a	4.65 a	3.50 ab	21.04 a	15.32 bc	694.98 a	625.24 a
Sweet Charlie	Un -mulched	18.38 c	18.67 b	3.39 cd	2.51 cd	7.46 d	6.55 d	207.58 c	279.71 b
	clear mulch	20.43 c	20.21 ab	4.11 abc	3.45 ab	10.32 cd	12.78 c	369.12 b	601.61 a
	Black mulch	28.14 a	21.72 a	4.44 ab	4.02 a	19.51 ab	22.57 a	715.99 a	653.66 a

Values followed by the same letter(s), within a comparable group of means of any main effect, do not significantly differ, using revised L.S.D test at 0.05% level.

Table 4. The Interaction effect between	cultivar and	l tunnel	on vegetati	ve growth	characters
of strawberry plants, during the seasons	of 2012/2013	3 and 20	013/2014.		

Cultivar	Tunnel	Number of leaves		Number of crown		Total dry weight (g m)		Leaf area (cm²)	
	I unner	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2
Gafuta	Non	18.52 b	13.80 b	3.63 ab	2.02 c	7.04 d	6.71 b	238.60 d	525.23 c
Galuta	Tunnel	21.44 a	16.45 b	3.138 b	3.66 ab	6.48 d	6.17 b	236.39 d	220.66 d
Eastival	Non	25.19 a	19.99 b	3.29 b	2.83 bc	19.35 a	14.42 a	575.42 b	595.40 b
Festival	Tunnel	26.33 a	23.61 a	3.71ab	4.16 a	17.17 ab	16.14 a	705.83 a	648.03 a
Sweet Charlie	Non	21.62 a	18.22 b	3.70 ab	2.78 bc	13.65 bc	13.04a	418.84 c	501.35 c
	Tunnel	23.01 a	22.19 a	4.26 a	3.87 a	11.23 cd	14.89 a	442.95 c	521.96c

Values followed by the same letter(s), within a comparable group of means of any main effect, do not significantly differ, using revised L.S.D test at 0.05 % level.

Mulch	Tunnol	Number of leaves		Number of crown		Total dry weight (g m)		Leaf area (cm²)	
withen	Mulch Tunnel		Season 2	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2	Season 1	Season 2
	Non	18.21 b	15.35 c	2.41 c	2.14 b	10.34 bc	8.00 c	332.11 d	308.67 d
Un mulch	Tunnel	20.77b	18.89 b	3.05 bc	2.52 b	7.96 c	8.37 c	355.39 d	381.79 c
Clear mulch	Non	20.54 b	17.47 b	3.54 b	2.98 b	10.37 bc	11.45 bc	425.07 c	461.57 b
Clear mulch	Tunnel	23.41 a	21.36 a	4.17 ab	4.81 a	14.98 ab	14.28ab	428.47 c	475.17 b
Black mulch	Non	23.58 a	18.88 b	4.04 ab	2.52 b	14.71 ab	11.88 b	499.80 b	451.73 b
	Tunnel	26.61 a	21.98 a	4.51 a	4.36 a	16.54 a	17.37 a	577.20 a	533.70a

Table 5. The Interaction effect between mulch and tunnel on the vegetative growth characters of strawberry plants, during the seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

Values followed by the same letter(s), within a comparable group of means of any main effect, do not significantly differ, using revised L.S.D test at 0.05% level.

Table 6. Main effect of cultivars, mulch and tunnels on flowering traits of strawberry plants,
during the seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

		Earliness of fl	owering (days)	Number of flower Trusses/ plant			
Tre	atment —	Season1	Season2	Season1	Season2		
Cultivar	Gafuta	127.85 a	128.12 a	20.54 a	18.83 b		
	Festival	128.23 a	127.33 a	21.02 a	20.77 b		
S	weet Charlie	123.30 b	170.59 a	19.83 a	21.490 a		
Mulch	Control	128.34 a	174.82 a	16.01 b	17.21 c		
	Clear	126.47 b	126.57a	23.17 a	20.77b		
	Black	124.57 c	124.56 a	22.23a	23.12 a		
Tunnel	Non	128.82 a	128.62a	20.22 a	18.84 b		
	Tunnel	124.11 b	125.40 a	20.72 a	21.89 a		

Values followed by the same letter(s), within a comparable group of means of any main effect, do not significantly differ, using revised L.S.D test at 0.05% level.

The interaction effect between type of mulch and cultivar on flowering traits; i.e. earliness of flowering and number of trusses/plant; are presented in Table (7). Strawberry plants cv Sweet Charlie which mulched with black mulches was responsible for causing the earliness of flowering and had positive and significant effect on number of flower trusses/plant⁻¹, in both seasons. Similar results were reported by Shiow *et al* (1998).

Results in Table (8) illustrated the significant interaction effect between the tunnel treatments and the three studied cultivars, on flowering traits, in both seasons. The strawberry plants c.vs Festival and Sweet Charlie which tunneled, generally, flowered earlier and produced higher number of flower trusses/plant, in both seasons. However, Festival without tunnel recorded the highest mean values of days from transplanting to floral initiation, indicating that this cultivar requires the tunnel cover to flower earlier. Similar results were recorded by Sevgican (1984) and Levent and Sozer (2001).

The interaction effect between the mulch type and tunnel treatment on earliness and number of flower trusses are shown in Table (9). The results indicated that were significant differences on the studied flowering traits due to mulch type and tunnel treatments, in both seasons. The highest mean value of both characters, were obtained from strawberry plants mulched with black polyethylene mulch and tunneled, in both seasons. The obtained results are in general accordance with those reported by Levent and Sozer (2001) and Medina et al., (2011).

3- Fruit yield and its components:

The results presented in Table (10), exhibited significant difference among the three studied strawberry cultivars in terms of yield parameters, in both seasons. Sweet Charlie and Festival cultivars were superior to Gaviota with respect to all yield potential characters. These results, also, indicated that there were significant increase in all studied yield parameters, i.e. early yield, yield/plant, total yield, marketable yield, culls and average fruit yield due to the application of mulch compared to the non-mulched control, in both seasons. Early yield, yield/plant, total yield, and average fruit yield were positively and significantly increased a result of application the two types of mulch compared to the non-mulched control. The only exception was noticed with marketable yield, culls; where the differences among the mulch treatments were insignificant, in both seasons.

Black mulch is better than clear one, in respect to yield /plant, marketable yield and total yield. Such positive responses of strawberry yield potential to mulch and tunnel treatments may be due to proper balance of microclimate (moisture and temperature) for strawberry plants, which creates favorable conditions for nutrients uptake, photosynthesis and metabolites translocation. Other possibility was increasing available water and nutrients uptake which ultimately accelerated the rate of vegetative growth and yield. These findings appeared to be in general accordance with those reported by several investigators (Baltt, 1984; Nestby, 1985; Hayness, 1987; Lareau and Lamorre, 1990; Shiow *et al.*, 1998; Ali and Radwan, 2008; Medina *et al.*, 2011 and Qureshi *et al.*, 2012).

Results in Table (11) illustrated the interaction effect between the various types of mulches and the three studied strawberry cultivars on yield and its components which were found significant, in both seasons.

Table7. Interaction effect between cultivar and mulch on flowering traits of strawberry plants, during the seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.

Cultivar	Mulch	Earliness of flo	owering(days)	Number of flower Trusses/plant		
Cultival	winch	Season1	Season2	Season1	Season2	
	Un- mulched	130.49 a	130.39 b	17.72 b	17.24 d	
Gafuta	Clear mulch	126.79 c	126.60 f	23.32 ab	20.98 bc	
	Black mulch	126.29 d	127.36 e	20.58 ab	18.28 cd	
	Un- mulched	129.29 b	128.21 d	16.64 b	18.26 cd	
Festival	Clear mulch	129.22 b	128.64 c	22.21 ab	19.99 cd	
	Black mulch	126.17 d	125.15 g	24.24 a	24.07 ab	
	Un- mulched	125.26 e	133.87 a	13.66 b	16.13 d	
Sweet Charlie	Clear mulch	123.39 f	124.46 h	24.00 a	21.348 bc	
	Black mulch	121.24 g	121.44 i	21.88 ab	26.99 a	

Values followed by the same letter(s), within a comparable group of means of any main effect, do not significantly differ, using revised L.S.D test at 0.05% level.

Table 8. Interaction effects between cultivar and tunnel on flowering traits of s	trawberry
plants, during the seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.	

Cultivar	Tunnels –	Earliness of flo	owering(days)	Number of flower Trusses/plant		
Cultival	I uniters	Season1	Season2	Season1	Season2	
Gafuta	Non	129.89 b	130.02 a	21.11 ab	17.29c	
Galuta	Tunnel	125.82 c	126.22 a	19.96 ab	20.38 ab	
Festival	Non	130.82 a	130.00 a	18.71 b	18.96 bc	
restivat	Tunnel	125.64 d	124.67 a	23.34a	22.59 a	
Sweet Charlie	Non	125.76 c	125.85 a	18.86 b	19.28 b	
Sweet Charlie	Tunnel	120.83 e	115.33 a	20.83ab	22.71a	

Values followed by the same letter(s), within a comparable group of means of any main effect, do not significantly differ, using revised L.S.D test at 0.05% level.

Table 9. Interaction between mulch and tunnel on fl	lowering traits of strawberry plants,
during the seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.	

Mulch	Tunnels -	Earliness of flo	owering (days)	Number of flow	er Trusses/plant
Mulch	I unners –	Season1	Season2	Season1	Season2
Un mulched	Non	130.33 a	129.35 b	14.13 b	15.69 c
Un mulched	Tunnel	126.36 d	130.30 a	17.88 b	18.73 b
Clear mulch	Non	128.88 b	129.37 b	20.20 b	20.21 b
Clear mulch	Tunnel	124.06 e	123.77d	25.14 a	22.336 a
Black mulch	Non	127.26 c	127.15 c	20.38 b	20.637 b
DIACK INUICH	Tunnel	121.88 f	122.15e	23.08 a	25.61 a

Values followed by the same letter(s), within a comparable group of means of any main effect, do not significantly differ, using revised L.S.D test at 0.05% level.

CIGAL	Black	[unnel Non	Tunnel	Table 11. Interaction effect between cultivar and mulch on strawberry fruit yield and its components, durin	and 2015/2014.				Th mulch	Un mulch	Un mulch Gavuta Clear mulch		
2.20 8	2.26 a	1.96 b	2.29 a	reffect k	Earl	(To	Season	1 00 4	2122	2.12 e		2.27 c	2.27 c
2.24 8	2.24 a	1.95 b	2.31 a	etween o	Early yield	Ton/ fed)	Season	2	1 8 1 J	1.81 d	1.81 d 2.16 bc	1.81 d 2.16 bc 2.22 b	1.81 d 2.16 bc 2.22 b 2.04 c
17.04 8	20.20 a	18.31 b	20.01 a	ultivar a	Avera	weigh		Season	Season 1 12 DO A	Season 1 13.20 d	Season 1 13.20 d 12.38 d	Season 1 13.20 d 12.38 d 16.74 c	Season 1 13.20 d 12.38 d 16.74 c 19.58 bc
20.17 8	20.81 ab	21.37 a	22.67 a	nd mulch	Average fruit		weight (gm)	ht (gm) Season	ht (gm) Season 2	ht (gm) Season 2 15.01 b	ht (gm) Season 2 15.01 b 13.88 b	ht (gm) Season 2 15.01 b 13.88 b 14.137 b	ht (gm) Season 2 15.01 b 13.88 b 14.137 b 19.21 ab
373.170	652.72 a	583.11 a	600.75 a	on strawbe		Yield	Yield (ع	Yield Season	Yield Season 1 A35 33 a	Yield Season 1 435.33 e	Yield Season 1 435.33 e 454.02 e	Yield Season 1 435.33 e 454.02 e 443.82 e	Yield (g Season 1 435.33 e 435.402 e 454.02 e 453.50 bc
JJ4.74 U	639.82 a	568.84 a	591.89 a	to not signinear	erry fruit y	erry fruit y // plant	awberry fruit y Yield / plant (gm)	erry fruit y //plant gm) Season	erry fruit y // plant gm) Season 2 466 60 4	erry fruit y gm) Season 2 466.60 d	erry fruit y m Season 2 466.60 d 448.92 d	erry fruit y m Season 2 466.60 d 448.92 d 465.73 d	erry fruit y [m] Season 2 465.00 d 448.92 d 465.73 d 615.29 bc
11.23 8	11.95 a	9.26 b	11.41 a		utly differ, usn yield and i	yield and j Market	rity differ, usn vield and i Market (Ton	ntly differ, usin yield and i Market (Ton Season	vijeld and j vield and j Market (Ton Season 1 700 ^	yield and j Marketz (Ton Season 1 7.99 c	ntly differ, usin yield and j Market: (Ton Season 7.99 c 8.23 c	ntly differ, usi Market: (Ton Season 1 7.99 c 8.23 c 7.94 c	ndy differ, usi yield and i Market (Ton Season 1 7.99 c 8.23 c 7.94 c 7.94 c 12.01 b
10.72 8	11.65 a	8.73 b	11.35a		ng revised L.S its compo	ng revised L.S its compor able yield	liffer, using revised L.S d and its compor Marketable yield (Ton / fed)	its compor able yield n / fed) Season	ing revised L.S its compor able yield n / fed) Season 2 2 8 524	ing revised L.S its compor able yield a / fed) Season 2 8.52d	ing revised L.S ifs compor able yield n / fed) 2 8.52d 7.76 d	its compor able yield n / fed) Season 2 8.52 7.76 d 8.42 d	ng revised L.S its compor able yield <u>n / fed)</u> Season 2 8.52d 7.76 d 8.42 d 8.42 d 10.99 c
0.79.0	0.79 Ь	0.95 a	0.85 b	J +	D test at 0.059 nents, duri	D test at 0.059).D test at 0.03% lev nents, during t Culls yield (Ton / fed)	D test at 0.05 nents, duri Culls (Ton Season	D test at 0.05 hents, duri Culls (Ton Season 1 1	nents, duri Culls (Ton Season 1 0.823 d	i.D test at 0.05 nents, duri Culls (Ton Season 1 0.823 d 0.853 cd	5. D test af 0.05% nents, duri Culls (Ton Season 1 0.823 d 0.823 cd 0.823 rd 0.823 rd	nents, duri Culls (Ton Season 1 0.853 cd 0.937 ab 0.984 a
0.90 0	0.80 Ъ	1.41 a	0.001	d CK10	<u>0.95 b</u> % level. ing the se	0.93 b % level. ing the se	% level. % level. ing the se yield / fed)	% level. % level. ing the se yield / fed) Season	<u>0.95 b</u> % level. ing the se yield / fed) / fed) 2 0.813 b	0.93 b % level. yield / fed) Season 2 0.813 b	0.93 b % level. ing the se yield yield Season 2 0.813 b 0.847b	0.93 b % level. ing the se vield / fed) Season 2 0.813 b 0.847b 0.783b	0.935 b % level. ing the se vield / fed) Season 2 0.813 b 0.847b 0.847b 0.847b 0.847b 0.847b 0.847b
12.02 8	12.74 a	10.21h	FOR FO	12.24 a	0956 12.24 a 12.31 a level. Ig the seasons of 2012/2013	asons of	12.24 a 17 asons of 2012 Total yield (Ton / fed)	12.24 a asons of : Total (Ton Season	asons of Total (Total Season 1 2 24 a Total (Ton Season	12.24 a 12.24 a Total (Ton Season 8.81 d	12.24 a asons of 7 Total (Ton Season 1 8.81 d 9.08 d	12.24 a 12.24 a Total (Ton Season 9.08 d 8.89 d	12.24 a 12.24 a Total (Ton Season 5.881 d 9.08 d 8.89 d 8.89 d 8.89 d 13.10 bc
11.6.3 8	12.45 a	10.13 b		12.31 a	12.31 a 2012/2013	12.31 a 2012/201: yield	24 a 12.31 a 5 of 2012/2013 Fotal yield (Ton / fed)	12.31 a 2012/201: yield / fed) Season	12.31 a 2012/201; 2012/201; yield yield Season 2 0 33 4	12.31 a 2012/201: 2012/201: yield / fed) 9.33 d	12.31 a 2012/201: 2012/201: yield / fed) / fed) 2 9.33 d 8.98 d	12.31 a 2012/201; 2012/201; yield / fed) / fed) / season 2 9.33 d 8.98 d 8.98 d 9.31 d	12.31 a 2012/2013 yield / fed) Season 2 2 9.33 d 8.98 d 8.98 d 8.98 d 8.98 d 8.98 d

	2013/2014.	Table 10. Main effect of cultivar, mulch and tunnel on strawberry fruit yield and its components, during the s
Early wink		of cultivar, m
Automatic finnit underht		ulch and tunn
		el on strawbe
Viold / mlant		rry fruit yield
Markatakla viald		and its components,
Culle stald		
Total winks		easons of 2012/2013 and

		Early (Ton	/ yield / fed)	Avera	Average fruit weight (gm)	Yield (g	(gm) (gm)	Market (Tor	Marketable yield (Ton / fed)	Culls ; (Ton /	yield fed)	Total (Ton	Total yield (Ton / fed)
Culuyar	TATRICIT	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season
		-	2	-	2	-	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
	Un mulch	1.80 h	1.81 d	13.20 d	15.01 b	435.33 e	466.60 d	7.99 c	8.52d	0.823 d	0.813 b	8.81 d	9.33 d
Gavuta	Clear mulch	2.12 e	2.16 bc	12.38 d	1 3 .88 b	454 02 e	448.92 d	8.23 c	7.76 d	0.853 cd	0.847b	9.08 d	b 86.8
	Black mulch	2.27 c	2.22 b	16.74 c	14.137 b	443.82 e	465.73 d	7.94 c	8.42 d	0.937 ab	0.78 3 b	8.89 d	9.31 d
	Un mulch	1.95 g	2.04 c	19.58 bc	19.21 ab	635.50 bc	615.29 bc	12.01 b	10.99 c	0.984 a	1.075 a	13.10 bc	12.42 b
Festival	Clear mulch	2.23 d	2.19 b	23.25 a	24.52 ab	656.99 b	627.52 b	13.10ab	12.95 ab	0.858 cd	1.012 a	13.14 b	12.55 b
	Black mulch	2.07 f	2.12 bc	21.81 a	23.96 ab	775.15 a	726.21 a	13.51 ab	12.32 abc	0.878 bc	0.942 в	14.41 a	13.40 a
Current	Un mulch	1.75 I	1.85 d	20.16 b	23.01 ab	578 82 d	563.19 c	12.42b	12.16 bc	0.921 ab	1.084 a	11.94 c	11.97
Charlis	Clear mulch	2.49 a	2.36 a	23.28 a	24.33 ab	608.56 cd	582.31 bc	12.46 Ь	12.07 bc	0.955 ab		13.18 b	13.36 a
	Black mulch	2.43 b	2.37 a	22.05 a	29.11 a	739.19 a	727.54 a	14.41 a	14.21 a	0.882 c	0.838 b	14.17 a	13.86 a

ALEXANDRIA SCIENCE EXCHANGE JOURNAL, VOL.36, No.4 OCTOBR- DECEMBER 2015

		Earl	Early yield	Average	Average fruit weight	Yiek	Yield / plant	Mark	Marketable yield		Culls yield		Total yield	vield
Cultivar	Tunnel	01)	Lon/ Ted)		(gm)		(gm)	2			n/T		(10n / 1ed)	Tea)
		Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	n Season	on Season		on	Season	Season
		-	2	-	2	-	2	1	2		2	2	1	2
0-6	Non	1.89 f	1.91 c	13.85 d	12.85 d	443.11 c	484.62 b	7.99 c	7.94c	c 0.923 ab		0.784 c	8.91 Ъ	8.72 d
Oatuta	Tunnel	2.24 b	2.22 b	14.36 d	15.8 3c d	445.68 c	436.22 b	8.04 c	8.86c	c 0.819 b		0.844 c	8.86 b	9.77 c
	Non	1.96 e	1.94 c	20.14 bc	21.13 bcd	626.28 b	651.81 a	11.75 b	b 11.52 b	b 0.949 ab		1.004 a 1	12.72 Ь	12.53 b
r esuvai	Tunnel	2.24 b	2.30a	22.95 a	23.99 bc	701.06 a	660.89 a	12.83 ab	b 12.74 a	la 0.864 b		0.919Ъ	13.69a	13.66 a
	Non	2.02 d	1.99 c	20.95 b	25.17 ab	658.10 ab	630.17 a	11.89 b	b 11.40 b	b 0.971 а		1.028 a 1	l2.85 b	12.43 b
Sweet Charme	Tunnel	2	>		20102	11000	610 52 0	2000						12 07
Table 13. Interaction effects between mulch and tunnel on strawberry fruit yield and its components, during	oy nic sume	2.42 a letter(s), wit	2.40 a hin a compa	22.70 ab rable group of	$\frac{1 \text{ turnet}}{2.42 \text{ a}} = \frac{2.40 \text{ a}}{2.40 \text{ a}} = \frac{22.40 \text{ ab}}{22.40 \text{ ab}} = \frac{5.72 \text{ a}}{5.73 \text{ a}} = \frac{15.50 \text{ a}}{15.50 \text{ a}} = \frac{12.52 \text{ a}}{15.50 \text{ a}} = 12.5$	077.37a nain effect, do	not significant	13.30 a ly differ, usin	a 12.92a ng revised L.S	2a 0.866 b , S.D test at 0.05	6 b 0.944 b 0.05% level.	44 D	4.17 a	13.07
111 2010/20	nteraction 14.	2.42 a letter(s), wit	<u>2.40 a</u> hin a compa between	22.70 ab rable group of mulch and	33.12 a means of any i	nain effect, do	not significant ry fruit yi	y differ, us eld and i	ng revised 1	S.D test at	<u>6 b 0.9</u> 0.05% level. uring the	seasoi	0.944 b 14.17 a 13.87 a , level g the seasons of 2012/2013	13.°/
	nteraction 114.	1 effects (Tor (Tor	2 a 2.40 a), within a compa cts between Early yield (Ton/ fed)	222.70 ab rable group of mulch and Average	e group of means of any 1 alch and tunnel of Average fruit weight (gm)	nain effect, do 1 strawber Yield (g	eet, do not significant wherry fruit yi Wield / plant	y differ, us d and j d and j Marketa (Ton	differ, using revised1 d and its comp d arketable yield (Ton / fed)	, S.D test at ynents, d (T	at 0.05% level during the Culls yield (Ton / fed)	seasol	14.17 a 13 ns of 2012 Total yield (Ton / fed))12/2(/ield fed)
Mulch	nteraction 114. Tunnel	1 effects Eart (Tor Season	, within a compa , within a compa cts between cts between Early yield Early yield on Season	222.70 ab mable group of mulch and Average Season	fmeans of any i d tunnel of fruit weight (gm) Season	nain effect, do 1 strawber <u>Yield</u> Season	io not significant srry fruit yi srry fruit yi (<u>gm)</u> Scason	y differ, us bld and i Marketa (Ton Season	3.30 a 12.9 sr, using revised1 nd its comp rketable yield (I'on / fed) on Season	S.D test at 1 ynen(s, di Cu Scason	at 0.05% level at 0.05% level during the s Culls yield Culls yield on Season	seasoi	14.17 a 13 ns of 2012, Total yield (Ton / fed) eason See)12/20)12/20 field fea) Seaso
Mulch	nteraction 114. Tunnel	$\frac{2.42.8}{\text{letter(s), with}}$ 1 effects $\frac{\text{Eart}}{(\text{Lor})}$ 1	2.40 a hin a compa between between y yield y fed) Season 2	22.70 ab mble group of mulch and Average (Season 1	means of any i means of any i fruit weight gen Season 2	nain effeet, do 1 strawber <u>Yield</u> Season 1	not significant rry fruit yi / plant <u>m)</u> 2	y differ, us bld and i Markett (Ton Season 1	ng revised ng revised ts comp ts comp	2a 0.80 S.D test at onents, d Cu (T Scasor 1	5 b 0.9 0.05% level uring the uring the llls yield on / fed) Seaso 2	seasoi	14.17a ons of 2(Totaly (Ton / Season 1	13.07)12/20)12/20 field field fed) 2
Mulch	nteraction 114. Tunnel	$1 \text{ effects} $ $\frac{\text{Eart}}{(\text{Tor}(s), \text{ with } s)}$ $\frac{\text{Eart}}{(\text{Tor}(s), \text{ for } s)}$ $\frac{1}{1.62 \text{ f}}$	2.40 a hin a compa between y yield y fed 2 1.65 c	22.70 ab rable group of mulch and Average Season 16.76 c	means of any i means of any i I tunnel of I tunnel of	1 strawber Season 540.51 cd	not significant ry fruit yi / plant <u>y</u> Scason 2 558.44 cd	y differ, us bld and j bld arkett (Ton Season 1 9.45 b	ng revised1 ng revised1 ts composite ts composite the transformation of the transformation of transformation of the transformation of the transform	23 0.80 S.D test at onents, d Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct	6 b 0.9. 0.05% level uring the Ills yield Senso 2 1.007	a seasor	4.17 a is of 2(Totaly (Ton/ cason 1 1 0.34 b	13.87 112/20 112/20 field fed) Season 2 10.171
Mulch Un mulch	Iteraction 114. Tunnel Non Tunnel	$1 \text{ effects} = \frac{2.42 \text{ B}}{\text{letter(s), with}}$	2.40 a hin a compa between y yield y fed) 2 1.65 c 2.16 b	22.70 ab mable group of Average Season 18.54 bc	means of any 1.2 a means of any 1.7 I tunnel or I tunnel or I tunnel or Season Season 22.24 ab	nnain efficet, do 1 strawber <u>Yield</u> <u>Scason</u> <u>1</u> <u>519,86 d</u>	not significant rry fruit yi / plant <u>Beason</u> 558 44 cd 538 28 d	y differ, us bld and j bld and j <u>Market</u> (Ton Season 9,45 b 11.16a	ng revised ng revised ts compo- the yield / fed) 2 9.16 b 2 9.16 b 11.95 a	23 0.80 S.D test at onents, d Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct Ct	0.05% level 0.05% level uring the : uring the : 1.05% level 0.876 level 0.876 level 0.876 level	b 11	14.17a Dons of 20 Totaly (Ton / Season 10.34 b 12.05 a	113.07 112/20 110.171 10.171 12.53
Mulch Un mulch	114. 114. Tunnel Non Tunnel Non	2.42.8 letter(s), will Eart (Tor Season 1.62.f 1.62.f 2.04.e 2.18.c	hin a compa between y yield y fed) Season 2.16 b 2.07 b	22.70 ab mable group of Average i Season 1 16.76 18.54 bc 18.96 b	means of any 1 I tunnel of I tunnel of I tunnel of Season Season 22.24 ab 22.11 b	00/1.3/8 nain effect, do Yield Season 519.86 d 579.91 bc	not significant rry fruit yi /plant mseason 2 558.24 cd 538.28 d 505.68 f	y differ, us gld and j gld and j <u>Markett</u> (Ton Season 1.156 1.1.166 9.99 b	a 12.9 ng revised ts comp ts comp ts comp ts comp / fed / fed 9.16 b 9.16 b 11.95 a 10.57 b	22 0.80 S.D test at onent(s, d Ct (T Season 1 0.932 a 0.812 c	0.05% level 0.05% level uring the 0.0 / fed) 5 / 1.007 0.876 1.007	a 10 5 44 b 5 a 10 5 10 10	14.17 a DINS OF 20 Total y (Ton / Season Season 10.34 b 12.05 a 10.81 b	13.001 112/20 112/20 Fed) Seasor 2 10.171 12.53a 11.571
Mulch Un mulch Whit mulch	Iteraction 114. Tunnel Non Tunnel Non	2.42 8 letter(s), wi Eart (Tor Season 1.62 f 2.04 e 2.37 b	hin a compa between v fed) 2.165 c 2.165 c 2.165 c 2.164 2.241 a	222.70 ab mable group of Average Season 18.54 be 18.54 be 18.56 c 18.56 c 18.56 c 18.56 c	means of any 1/2 a means of any 1/2 a fruit weight gm) Season 22.24 ab 22.24 ab 22.25 ab	nnain effect, do Yield Yield Season 1 540,51 ed 579,91 be 605,88 b	not significant rry fruit yi /plant <u>Season</u> 2 505.68 f4 505.68 f 505.68 f	y differ, us d and j d ankett (Ton Season 9.45 b 11.16a 9.99 b 11.46 a	a 12.9 ng revised ble yield / fed) / fedb 9.16 b 11.95 a 10.57 b 12.28 a	23 0.80 S.D test at pnent(s, d Ct (T Scasor 1 0.932 a 0.8865 b	0.05% level 0.05% level 0.05% level 0.05% level 0.05% level 0.785 b 0.785 b 0.785 b	b 110	4.17a Is of 2(Total y (Ton/ (Ton/ 0.34 b 0.35 a 2.35 a	113.07 a 112/201)12/201 (fed) Season 10.17 b 11.57 b 11.57 b

March		Earl (To	Early yield (Ton/ fed)	Average fruit (gm)	fruit weight (gm)	Yield / plant (gm)	n)	Market (Ton	Marketable yield (Ton / fed)	Culls yiel (Ton / fed	yield / fed)	Total ; (Ton /	yield / fed)
INTRICT		Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season
		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
T Tar and a L	Non	1.62 f	1.65 c	16.76 c	18.04 Ь	540.51 cd	558.44 cd	9.45 b	9.16 в	0.932 a	1.007 a	10.34 b	10.1
	Tunnel	2.04 e	2.16 b	18.54 bc	22.24 ab	519.86 d	538.28 d		11.95 a	0.886 b	0.876 b	12.05 a	12.5
Whit much	Non	2.18 c	2.07 Ь	18.96 Ь	20.11 Ь	579.91 bc	505.68 f	9.99 Ь	10.57 Ь	0.812 c	1.008 a	10.81 b	11.5
AA TITE THATCH	Tunnel	2.37 b	2.41 a	20.32 ab	22.65ab	605.88 b	600.16bc	11.46 a	12.28 a	0.865 b	0.785 b	12.33 a	13.0
Dlash mulah	Non	2.06 d	2.12 b	19.22b	19.37 b	616.47 b	617.08 b	9.17 b	10.68 Ъ	0.992 a	0.940 a	10.02 Ъ	11.62 b
DISCN HILLOH	Tunnel	2.45 a	2.36 a	21.17 a	29.68 a	688.97 a	662.57 a	12.33 a	12.62a	0.846 b	0.872 Ь	13.18 a	13.4

(%) Season Season	Total sugars (gm acidic acid/100 gm (%) juice) Season Season Season Season	Total sugars total unatarity Actury (%) (gm acidic acid/100 gm (%) juice) Season Season Season	Total sugars Iotal futratable Acidity , (%) (gm acidic acid/100 gm (%) juice) Season Season Season	Total sugars fount intraturie Actuity Total soluble solid (%) (gm acidic acid/100 gm (%) Juice) (%) Season Season Season Season
Season Season S 1 2 1	season 2	Season Season Season	2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1	2 1 2 1 2 1 2 1
14.81 b 0.379 a 0 15.51 a 0.361 b 0 15.19 b 0.364 ab 0 14.97 a 0.356 c 0		0.379 a 0.361 b 0.364 ab 0.356 c	0.379 a 0.374 a 0.361 b 0.361 b 0.364 ab 0.375 a 0.356 c 0.363 a	0.379 a 0.374 a 10.27 b 9.55 b 0.361 b 0.361 b 11.35 a 10.84 a 0.364 ab 0.375 a 11.46 a 10.93 a 0.356 c 0.363 a 10.01 b 9.36 b
		0.361 b 0.375 a 0.363 a 0.374 a 0.737 a 0.737 a	0.361 b 11.35 a 0.375 a 11.46 a 0.363 a 10.01 b 0.374 a 11.98 a 0.737 a 11.11 ab	0.361 b 11.35 a 10.84 a 0.375 a 11.46 a 10.93 a 0.363 a 10.01 b 9.36 b 0.374 a 11.98 a 10.64 a 0.737 a 11.11 ab 11.32 a 0.737 a 11.11 ab 11.32 a
	2 3 74 a 361 b 375 a 363 a 374 a 737 a		I I a 10.27 b b 11.35 a a 11.46 a a 11.98 a a 11.11 ab	I Scasol Scasol 1 2 2 a 10.27 b 9.55 b b 11.35 a 10.84 a a 11.46 a 10.93 a a 11.16 a 10.64 b a 11.98 a 10.64 a a 11.11 ab 11.32 a a 11.11 ab 11.32 a

5	T_{a}
5	ıble
SUga	Ĩ
	-
ġ,	Iai
4	ne
W	ffec
ber	0
igars of strawberry fruits.	fcı
Ī	ltij
s	var
	B
j	шc
Ì	ha
ese	nd
asc	
ns	nel
0f.7	01
Ě	l Vİ
22	tam
013	Ē.
â	ũ
. during the seasons of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.	tota
Ξ	l se
20	Ĭul
4	ple
	soli
	ds,
	titr
	ata
	ble
	aci
	ldit
	Table 14. Main effect of cultivar, mulch and tunnel on vitamin C, total soluble solids, titratable acidity, redu
	edu
	icin
	nia 20
	nd
	non
	l-re
	duc
	jing
	, an
	d

Cultivars	Tunnels	Non red	Non reducing sugars (%)		Reducing sugars (%)	Total (Total sugars (%)	Total titratable Acidity (gm acidic acid/100 gm iuice)	ratable m acidic m iuice)	Total soluble (%)	oluble solid (%)	Vita (mg/100	Vitamin C (mg/100gm f. w.)
Cultivars	Tunnels		(10)		1.00		1.00	acid/100 gm juice)	em juice)			(
		Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season	Season
		-	2	1	2	-	2	1	2	1	2	1	2
2	Non	2.86 c	2.72 c	11.45 b	11.62 bc	14.30 d	14.34 c	0.381 a	0.368a	9.06 c	8.81 b	26.45 b	25.61 b
Ganna	Tunnel	3.30 b	3.38 b	11.74 a	11.88 ab	15.05 b	15.25 b	0.376 a	0.381 a	11.48 ab	10.28 a	24.64 c	24.53 b
: -	Non	3.52 b	2.93 bc	11.51 a	11.47 c	15.17 b	14.69 c	0.365 a	0.365 a	10.55 bc	10.70 a	20.33 d	21.32 c
restival	Tunnel	4.37 a	4.17 a	11.81 a	12.14 a	16.19 a	16.31 a	0.3563 a	0.357 a	12.16 a	10.97 a	29.99 a	29.21 a
2	Non	3.07 c	3.11 bc	11.56 a	11.44 c	14.63 c	14.54 c	0.357 a	0.364 a	11.01ab	10.41 a	25.19 bc	25.55 b
Sweet Chamle	Tunnel	3.69 b	4.03 a	11 77 2	11 81ahc	12 16 21	158/3	N 271 A	e 985 U	4° UO 11			
Table 17. Interaction effects o between mulch and tunnel on vitamin C, total soluble solids, titratable acidity, reducing and non- reducing and total sugars of strawberry fruits, during the season of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.	nteraction nd total sug	effects ars of st	in a comparat o between rawberry	1 mulch fruits, d	and turn uring the	main effect, lel on vit season of	do not signii tamin C, f 2012/20	Table 17. Interaction effects o between mulch and tunnel on vitamin C, total soluble solids, titratable acidit, reducing and total sugars of strawberry fruits, during the season of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.	ble solids	, titratab	11.45 a).05% level. (e acidity,	reducing	29.12
able 17. I educing an Mulch	nteraction nd total sup Tunnels	effects gars of st Non redu	r(s), within a comparal effects o between rs of strawberry Non reducing sugar (%)	1 mulch fruits, d Reduc	nup of means of any ulch and tunn its, during the Reducing sugars (%)	nain effect, nel on vi season of Tota	Fiel, do not signi rect, do not signi vitannin C, n of 2012/20 Total sugars (%)	icantly differ, u total solu 13 and 201 Total titrat (gm acidic ju	ntly differ, using revised otal soluble solids and 2013/2014. Total titratable Acidity (gm acidic acid/100 gm Julce)	, titratabl	test at 0.05% level. atable acidity , atable acidity , Total soluble solid (%)	29.30 a reducing Vita (mg/10	2.50 a 29.12 a ucing and noi Vitamin C (mg/100gm f.w)
able 17. I educin <u>g an</u> Mukh	nteraction Id total su; Tunnels	effects ars of st Non reduced	in a comparal o hetweel rawberry %) Season	1 mulch fruits, d Reduc	and tunn uring the (%) Season	nain effect, main effect, season of Tota Season	do not signi tarnin C, <u>F2012/20</u> I sugars (%) Season	icantly differ, u total solu 13 and 201 Total titrat (gm acidic Season	sing revised ble solids 3/2014. able Acidity acid/100 gm lce) Season	L.S.D test at (, titratab) Total s Season	11.45 a .05% level. e acidity, e acidity, oluble solid (%) Season	reducing Vita (mg/10	29.12 and no min C Season
able 17. I educing an Mulch	oy me same p nteraction Id total sup Tunnels	effects arrs of st Non redu Season	in a comparal o between rawberry rang sugar %) Season 2	1 mulch fruits, d Reduc Season 1	means of any and tunn uring the (%) Season 2	nain effect, main effect, season of Season 1	do not signi tannin C, f 2012/20 f d sugars (%) Season 2	icantly differ, u total solu [3 and 201 Total titrat (gm acidic Season 1	ble solids 3/2014. able Acidity acid/100 gm lce) 2	, titratabl Total s Season 1	11.45 a ,05% level. (e acidity, oluble solid (%) Season 2	reducing Vita (mg/10 Season	29.12 min C 00gm f.w) 2
able 17. I educing an Mulch	nteraction nd total su; Tunnels	effects arrs of st Non reduction Season 1 2.96 c	in a comparal o between rawberry %) % Season 2.77 b	n mulch fruits, d Reduc Season 11.37 b	means of any and tunn uring the (%) Season 2 11.34 b	main effect, nel on vii season of Season 14.33 c	do not signi tannin C, f 2012/20 f 2012/20 d sugars (%) Season 2 14.10 c	icantly differ, u total solu [3 and 201 Total titrat (gm acidic gm acidic Season 1 0.361 a	ble solids 3/2014. able Acidity acid/100 gm lce) 5eason 2 0.370 a	L.S.D test at (, titratabl Total s Season 10.14 b	11.45 a ,05% level. (e acidity, oluble solid (%) Season 2 9.16 c	reducing Vita (mg/10 24.71 c	29.12 and no min C Mgm f.w) Season 24.05 cc
rable 17. I reducing an Mulch	nteraction nd total su: Tunnels Non Tunnel	effects ars of st Non redu Season 1 2.96 c 3.17 c	in a comparal o between rawberry ceing sugar %) Season 2.77 b 3.74 a	n mulch fruits, d Reduc Season 11.37 b 11.92 a	means of any and tunn uring the (%) Season 2 11.34 b 12.09 a	nain effect, season of Season Season 14.33 c 15.11ab	do not signi tannin C, f 2012/20 f 2012/20 (%) Season 2 14.10 c 15.83 a	icantly differ, u total solu [3 and 201 Total titrat (gm acidic Season 0.361 a 0.352 a	ble solids 3/2014. 3/2014. able Acidity acid100 gm ice) Season 2 0.370 a 0.357 a	L.S.D test at (, titratabl Total s Season 10.14 b 9.88 b	11.45 a ,05% level. e acidity, oluble solid (%) Season 2 9.16 c 9.55 b	reducing Vita (mg/10 Season 21.96 d	29.12 and no min C 90gm f.w) Season 24.05 cc 21.58 c
Mulch Un mulch	nteraction nd total su: Tunnels Non Non	effects gars of st Non redu Season 1 2.96 c 3.17 c	in a comparal o between rawberry %) % Season 2.77 b 3.74 a 2.99 b	ble group of fruits, d Reduc Season 11.37 b 11.92 a 10.72 c	means of any and tunn uring the (%) Season 2 11.34 b 12.09 a 11.82a	nmain effect, season of Season Season 14.33 c 14.21 c	do not signi tannin C, f 2012/20 f 1 sugars (%) Season 2 14.10 c 15.83 a 14.81 b	icantly differ, u total solu [3 and 201] Total titrat (gm acidic Season 1 0.361 a 0.361 a	sing revised ble solids 3/2014. 3/2014. aable Acidity acid/100 gm ice) 0.370 a 0.357 a 0.363 a	L.S.D test at (L.S.D test at (Total s Season 10.14 b 9.88 b 10.59 b	11.45 a ,05% level. e acidity, oluble solid (%) Season 2 9.16 c 9.55 b 10.35 b	29.30 a Vita (mg/10 21.96 d 25.17 c	29.12 and no min C 0gm f.w) Season 24.05 cc 21.58 c 25.99 c
Clear mulch	nteraction nd total su: Tunnels Non Non Tunnel Non	effects gars of st Non redu Season 1 2.96 c 3.17 c 3.47 bc 4.22 a	in a comparal o hetweel rawberry rawberry Season 2 2.77 b 3.74 a 2.99 b 3.86 a	ble group of fruits, d Reduc Season 11.37 b 11.92 a 10.72 c 11.54 b	means of any means of any ming sugars (%) Season 2 11.34 b 12.09 a 11.82a 11.82a	nmain effect, season of Season Season 14.33 c 15.11ab 14.21 c 15.76 a	do not signi f 2012/20 f 2012/20 f 2012/20 season 2 14.10 c 15.83 a 14.81 b 15.69 a	icantly differ, u total solu [3 and 201 Total titrat (gm acidic Season 0.361 a 0.361 a 0.374 a	ble solids 3/2014. 3/2014. able Acidity acid/100 gm ice) 0.370 a 0.357 a 0.363 a	L.S.D test at (L.S.D test at (Total s Season 10.14 b 9.88 b 10.59 b 13.36 a	11.45 a ,05% level. e acidity, oluble solid (%) Season 2 9.16 c 9.55 b 10.35 b 10.92 ab	reducing Vita (mg/10 21.96 d 29.26 b	29.12 min C 00gm f.w) 24.05 cc 21.58 c 25.99 c 28.98 b
Clear mulch	nteraction nd total suy Tunnels Non Tunnel Non Non	effects ars of st Non redu 2.96 c 3.17 c 3.47 bc 4.22 a 3.16 c	in a comparal o hetweel rawherry % Season 2.77 b 3.74 a 2.99 b 2.99 b	1 mulch fruits, d Reduc 11.37b 11.37b 11.52 a 11.54b 11.42 b	means of any and tunn uring the (%) Season 11.34b 12.09 a 11.82a 11.83 a	main effect, main effect, season of Season 14.33 c 15.11ab 14.21 c 15.76 a 14.38	do not signi tannin C, f 2012/20 f 2012/20 d sugars (%) Season 2 14.10 c 15.83 a 14.81 b 15.69 a 14.36b	icantly differ, u total solu 13 and 201 Total titrat (gm acidic gm acidic 0.361 a 0.361 a 0.361 a 0.371 a	ble solids 3/2014. 3/2014. able Acidity acid/100 gm (ce) Season 2 0.370 a 0.357 a 0.363 a 0.363 a	L.S.D test at (L.S.D test at (Total s Season 1 10.14 b 9.88 b 10.59 b 13.36 a 9.89 b	11.45 a ,05% level. (%) Season 2 9.16 c 9.55 b 10.35 b 10.35 b 10.92 ab	reducing Vita (mg/10 21.96 d 22.65 d 22.09 d	29.12 a mnin C 00gm f.w) 24.05 cd 21.58 e 25.99 c 22.95 cd 22.45 d

nd to	able
ă	16.
nd total sugars of strawberry fruits, during the season of 2012/2013 and 2013/2014.	able 16. Interaction effects of cultivars and tunnels on vitamin C, total soluble solids, titratable acidity, reduc
rawberry	n effects of
fruits, dw	f cultivars
ring	anc
the season	tunnels (
2,) n v
2012/20	itamin
1 3 a	<u>,</u>
ind 2	otal
013/201	soluble
4	solids,
	titratable
	acidity,
	reducing
	and
	non-reducing

The Sweet Charlie c.v which mulched with black polyethylene and tunneled, generally, produced the highest significant mean values for fruit yield and its components, in both seasons. The obtained results are in general accordance with those reported by (Albregts *et al.*, 1993; Shiow *et al.*, 1998; Ali and Radwan, 2008 and Qureshi *et al.*, 2012).

The difference between tunnel and cultivar were found significant for yield characters and its components (Table 12). The highest mean values for most fruit yield parameters were obtained when strawberry c.vs Festival or Sweet Charlie grown under tunnel than the un-tunneled control one, in both seasons. Similar results were reported by Shiow *et al.*, (1998); Levent and Sozer, (2001) and Qureshi *et al.* (2012).

The highest mean values of fruit yield parameters (i.e. early yield, yield/plant, total yield, marketable yield, culls yield and average fruit weight) were resulted from the interaction between the mulched and tunneled found significant for yield fruit parameter, Table (13). The strawberry plants were mulched and tunneled gave, in both seasons. Similar results were reported by (Levent and Sozer, 2001).

Fruit quality traits:

The results in Table (14), generally showed the presence of some significant differences on vitamin C, total soluble solids, titratable acidity, reducing and nonreducing and total sugars, as a result of mulch types and tunnels, in both growing season. Mulch types and tunnels, significantly, improved all fruit quality character, in both seasons. The obtained results, generally, showed significant differences among strawberry plants cv. Festival, Sweet Charlie and Gaviota, in both season. It was observed that, Festival or Sweet Charlie cultivars contained more total soluble solids, V.C and reducing and non-reducing and total sugars than Gaviota one, in both season. However, gaviota fruits had more total titratable acidity than Festival and Sweet Charlie ones. Generally the obtained results compatible with those reported by (Lareau and Lamarre, 1990; Shiow et al., 1998 and Qureshi et al., 2012).

The interaction effects among the cultivar and mulch types on V.C, TSS, Reducing and non-reducing and total sugars are shown in Table (15). The comparisons among the means of the various treatment combinations showed the presence of some significant interaction effects on the V.C, TSS, reducing and non-reducing and total sugars, in both seasons. The highest mean values of these characters were obtained from strawberry plant cv. Festival which mulched with black polyethylene. However, no significant difference in total titratable acidity was detected, in both seasons. The obtained results are in general accordance with those reported by (Shiow *et al* 1998). The results presented in Table (16), illustrated the interaction effects between cultivars and tunnels of strawberry plant on the total soluble solids, vitamin c, reducing and non-reducing and total sugars were found to be significant, in both season. The best results for these characters were obtained from strawberry cv. Sweet Charlie which grown under tunnel, in both season. However, total titratable acidity were not significantly, affected by these interaction. Similar results were recorded by (Levent and Sozer, 2001; Medina *et al.*, 2011 and Qureshi *et al.*, 2012).

The interaction effects between mulch types and tunnels on V.C, TSS, TTA, reducing and non-reducing and total sugars are presented in Table (17), in both seasons, the strawberry plants which were mulched and tunneled gave the highest mean values for total sugars,

vitamin C, reducing and non-reducing and total sugars compared than control treatment. However, total titrable acidity were not significantly affected. Similar results were recorded by Levent and Sozer, (2001).

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the results from this study, application of plastic mulch and low tunnel for production strawberry plants caused significant increments in vegetative growth characters, fruit yield and its components and improved fruit quality. Fistival cultivar exhibited the superiority, in this respect.

REFERENCES

- Abu El-Yazied, A and M. A. Mady., (2012). Plastic color and potassium foliar application affect growth and productivity of strawberry (*fragaria*×*annanassa* Dush). Juarnal of applied Science Research. 8(2): 1227-1239.
- Aguyoh J; Taber H.G and Lawson V., (1999). Maturity of fresh market sweet corn with directseeded plants, transplants, clear plastic mulch and rowcover combinations. Hort Technology. 9 (3): 420-425.
- Al Bregts, E. E and C. k. Chandler., (1993). Effect of polyethylene mulch color on fruit response of strawberry. proc. Soil Crop Sci. Florida. 52: 40-43.
- Ali, R.A.M. and E.A. Radwan., (2008). Effect of organic and synthetic mulches of some fresh strawberry cultivers, J. Agric. Env. Sci. Alex. Univ., Egypt.
- Anttonen, M. J, Hoppula, K. L; Nestby, R; Verheul, M. J and Karjalainen, R. O., (2006). Influence of fertilization, mulch color, early forcing, fruit order, planting date, shading, growing environment and genotype on the contents of selected phenolics in strawberry production. Journal of plant Nutrition 29: 103-112.

- Black, C. A., (1965). Methods of soil analysis Amer. Soc. of Agron. Madison, Wisconsin, USA.
- Blatt, C. A., (1984). Irrigation, mulch and double row planting related to fruit size and yield of Bounty strawberry. Hort. Sci. 19 (6): 826-827.
- Bultin of the Agricultural Statistics Winter Crop Part (1) Ministry of Agriculture 1992.
- El- Shall, M. A; S. M. El-Araby, I. M. Ghoneim and H. Anter., (2003). Effect of biofertilization under varying NPK levels on growth yield and fruit quality of strawberry plants. J. Agric. Env. Sci. Alex. Univ., Egypt, 2: 106-129.
- Faspi, F; Salmeron, A; Fontecha , A; Gareta, Y and Real, A., (2006). Plastic film for agricultural applications. J. Plastic Film ≠ Sheeting 22: 85-101.
- Fear, C. D and G. R. Nonnecke., (1989). Soil mulches influence reproductive and vegetative growth of Fern and Tristar day natural strawberries. HortScience. 19 (6): 826-827.
- Gimenez. C; R. F. Otto and N. Castilla., (2002). Productivity of leaf and root vegetable crops under direct cover. Sci. Hort. 94: 1-11.
- Halvorsen; B. L, K. Holte; M. C. W. Myhestad; J. Bayikmo; E. Hvatium; S. F. Remberg; A. B. Wold; K. Haffner; H. Buugered; L. F. Andersen; J. G. Moskauy; D. R. Jacobs; JR and R. Biomhoff., (2002). Asystematic screening of total antioxidents in dietary plants. J. Nutr. 132, 461-471.
- Hasanein, N. M; Manal, M. H. Gad El-Mola and Mona, A. M. Aly., (2011). Influence of different color of shade on growth and Yield of strawberries and different color of plastic Mulch under low tunnels conditions. Res. J. Agric S Biot. Sci. 7 (6): 483-490.
- Haynes, R., (1987). The use of polyethylene mulches to change soil microclimate as revealed by enzyme activity and biomass nitrogen, sulphar and phosphorus. Biology and Fertility of soils. 5 (3): 235-240.
- Himelrick. D. G., (1982). Effect of polyethylene mulch color on soil temperature and strawberry plant response. Adv. Strawberry Prod. 1: 15-16.
- Kadir, S; Carey, E and Ennaahli, S., (2006). Influence of high tunnel and field conditions on strawberry growth and development. Hort. Sci. 41: 4581-4589.
- Kallio; H. M. Hakela; A. M. Pelkkikangas and A. Lapveleianen., (2000). Sugars and acids of strawberry varieties. Europ. Food Res. Tech. 212. 81-85.
- Khanizadeh, S., (1994). Breeding strawberries for Eastern central Canada. Euphytica 77:45-49.
- Kher R; Baba J. A and Bakshi P., (2010). Influence of planting time and mulching material on (4): 441-444.
- Kivijarvi, P; Parikka, P and Tuovinen, T., (2002). The effect mulches on yield, fruit quality and strawberry mite in organically grown strawberry organic production of fruit and berries. The Danish Inst. of Agric. Sci. Dep. of Hort. Arslev, Denmark.

- Lareau, M. J and Lamarra., (1990) .Effects of row cover and mulching in the producti on of day neutral strawberry cultivers . In the strawberry into the 21 st century. Proc. of the third North Amer. strawberry conf. Houston. c. a. Hort. Abst. 63(5). 1993).
- Levent Arin and Sozer Ankara., (2001). Effect of low-tunnel, mulch pruning on the yield and earliness of tomato in unheated glasshouse. J. Appl. Hort., 3(1): 23-27.
- Li Fan; Valentine Roux, Claudine Dube; Denis Charlebois; Shutiantao, and Shahrokh Khanizadeh., (2012). Effect of mulching systems on fruit quality and phytochemical composition of newly developed strawberry lines. Agric. and Food Sci. 21: 132-140.
- Lieten, F and Beats., (1991). Research on strawberries. No Future for coloured film. Onderzock. Qardbet Geen toekomst voor gek-leurde folies. Groenteno fruit. vollegronds groenten. 1 (29): 10-11. (c. a. Hort. Abst. Vol. 62, No. 8. 1992).
- Medina, Y; A. Gosselins; R. Harnois; L. Gauthier; S. Khanizadeh (2011). Effect of plastic mulching on yield and fruit quality of strawberry plants grown under high tunnels. Acta. Hort. 893.
- Muhammad Haroon; Mohammed saeed; Ijaz Ahmed; Rahamdad Khan; Shahida Bibi; Saeedullah Khattak and Hidayatullah., (2014). Weed density and strawberry yield as affected by herbicides and mulching techniques. Pak. J. Weed Sci. Res., 20(1): 67-75.
- Nestby, R., (1985). Mulching of strawberries with clear polyethylene and control of weeds under the mulch. Jorddekking medklar plasti Jodbear, og ugraskontrall under plasten. forskning og forsake landbruket. 36 (3): 103-107.
- Orzolek, M. D. and Murphy, J. H., (1993). The effect colored polyethylene mulch on the yield of squash and pepper. Proc. Nat. Agri. Plastics Cong. 24: 157-161.
- Osiru, T. and Hahn J., (1994). Effects of mulching on the growth yield and quality of yams. J. Plant Physiology. 64 (8): 201-205.
- Pan, H.Y. K.J. Fisher and M.A. Nichols., (1999). The effect of mulch and row covers on yield of process tomatoes. Acta. Hort. 487: 145-150.
- Qureshi; S. Chughtai; A. Saleom, (2012). Impact of cultivation system on growth and yield of strawberry (Fragaria × ananassa) c.v. chandler. Pakistan. J. Agric. Res. vol 25 No. 2-2012.
- Salman, S.R., A.E. Abou-Hadid., A.S. El-Beltagy and T.T. Ellabban, (1991). The interaction between plastic mulch and irrigation. Egy. J. of Hort. Pupl. 18(1): 77-86.
- Sevgican, A. (1984). Alack plastik tuneller. Egc. Univ. Zir. Fak. Dergest, 21 (1): 101-104.
- Shiow, Y. W., G. T. Galletta and M. J. Comp, (1998). Mulches types effect fruit quality and composition of tow strawberry genotypes. Hort. Sci. 33 (4): 636 - 640.

Teasdale, J. K and A. A. Abdul-Baki., (1995). Soil temperature and tomato growth associated with black polyethylene and hairy vetch mulches. J. A. Soc. Hort. Sci. 120: 848-853.

.(

.

- Teasdale, J. K and A. A. Abdul-Baki, (1997). Growth analysis of tomato in black polyethylene and hairy vetch production system. Hort. Sci. 32 (4): 659-663
- Wang, S. Y; Zheng, W and Galleta, G. J, (2002). Cultural system affects fruit quality and antioxidant capacity in strawberries. J. Agri. Food Chem. 50: 6534-6542.

(

)

)

)

(

(



)