

ANNUAL REPORT 2013-14

Discipline of Crop Production

All India Coordinated Research Project on Sugarcane

Indian Institute of Sugarcane Research, Lucknow

AS 42: Agronomic evaluation of promising genotypes of sugarcane

An experiment was conducted to evaluate three sugarcane genotypes (CoH 06265, CoS 06247 and CoH 06266) under three NPK levels (112.5, 45, 45; 150, 60, 60 and 187.5, 75, 75 kg/ha) with a view to identifying suitable genotype under various fertilizer schedules in spring season. Initial soil chemical analysis indicated that soil was low in organic carbon (0.46%) and available nitrogen (262 kg/ha); medium in phosphorus (39.5 kg P₂O₅/ha) and potassium (284 kg K₂O /ha) contents. Sugarcane planting was done in the month of February 2013.

Sugarcane genotype, CoH 06265 produced the highest number of millable cane (102350/ha) followed by CoS 06247 (90840/ha) and CoH 06266 (76830/ha -Table 1). The highest cane length (213.9 cm) was recorded with genotype CoS 06247 but thicker canes (2.477 cm diameter) were harvested with the genotype CoH 06265. Thus both the genotypes could not yield significant difference in individual cane weight. Genotype, CoH 06266 recorded the lowest mean cane weight (924 g). There were no significant differences in sucrose content of different genotypes. The highest cane and sugar yields (88.5 and 11.1 t/ha, respectively) was observed with genotype CoH 06265. It was followed by CoS 06247 (79.4 and 9.96 tonnes cane and sugar yields/ha, respectively).

Mean number of millable canes, cane length, diameter, weight and cane and sugar yields significantly increased up to application of 150, 60, 60 kg NPK/ha. Recommended level of NPK i.e., 150, 60 and 60 kg /ha fetched significantly higher cane (80.12 t/ha) and sugar yields (9.99 t/ha) which was at par with 125% NPK levels. Different fertility levels could not influence the juice quality parameters significantly. The interaction between genotypes and fertility levels were not significant.

Table 1: Influence of different treatments on growth, quality and yield of sugarcane crop

| Treatment | NMC (000/ha) | Cane length (cm) | Cane diameter (cm) | Cane weight (g) | °Brix | Pol % Juice | Purity % | Cane yield (t/ha) | Sugar yield (t/ha) |
|------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------|-------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| Genotypes | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| CoH 06265 | 102.35 | 203.4 | 2.477 | 1059 | 20.59 | 18.15 | 87.99 | 88.5 | 11.10 |
| CoS 06247 | 90.84 | 213.9 | 2.339 | 1186 | 20.46 | 18.12 | 88.15 | 79.4 | 9.96 |
| CoH 06266 | 76.83 | 197.06 | 2.291 | 924 | 20.52 | 17.95 | 87.50 | 63.6 | 7.86 |
| SE m± | 2.84 | 4.22 | 0.048 | 43.20 | 0.058 | 0.067 | 0.19 | 3.50 | 0.26 |
| <i>CD</i> (<i>P=0.05</i>) | 8.51 | 12.65 | 0.14 | 129.50 | NS | NS | NS | 10.49 | 0.81 |
| Fertility levels (NPK kg/ha) | | | | | | | | | |
| 112.5,45,4 5 | 79.80 | 198.3 | 2.187 | 963 | 20.52 | 18.06 | 87.71 | 69.82 | 8.70 |
| 150,60,60 | 93.49 | 211.3 | 2.406 | 1118 | 20.53 | 18.07 | 87.97 | 80.12 | 9.99 |
| 187.5,75,7 5 | 96.74 | 204.8 | 2.514 | 1088 | 20.52 | 18.10 | 87.96 | 81.46 | 10.19 |
| SE m± | 4.84 | 6.22 | 0.048 | 0.073 | 0.058 | 0.067 | 0.19 | 8.03 | 0.26 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 8.51 | 12.65 | 0.14 | 129.50 | NS | NS | NS | 10.49 | 0.81 |

AS 63: Plant Geometry in relation to mechanization in sugarcane

Field experiment was conducted to workout optimum plant geometry of different varieties for use of farm machinery. The experiment consisted of 12 treatment combinations with 3 planting geometries viz., 120, 150 and 30x120 cm row spacings and 4 varieties viz., CoS 96275, CoSe 92423, CoS 94257 and CoLk 94184. The experiment was laid out in split plot design allocating plant geometry in main plot and varieties in sub plots. The treatments were replicated thrice in the experiment.

The data on ratoon sugarcane growth, yield attributes and yield indicate that significant highest shoot population (166.71 thousands/ha), number of millable canes (141.44 thousand/ha) and cane yield (73.56 t/ha) was observed at 30x120 cm row spacing (Table 1). Variety CoSe 92423 recorded significantly highest yield (66.59 t/ha) to CoS 96275 and CoS 94257, however it was found similar to CoLk 94184 (63.59 t/ha). The quality parameters were not affected by plant geometry but significantly highest sugar yield was obtained at

30x120 cm spacing. Different genotypes showed significant variation for different quality observations. Significantly highest brix (22.11), pol % (19.84) with purity of 89.71% and CCS % (13.82) was harnessed by CoLk 94184. This genotype also fetched significantly highest sugar yield (8.79 t/ha), which was closely followed by CoSe 92423.

Table 1: Ratoon cane growth, yield attributes and yield under different planting geometries and genotypic variations

| Treatment | Shoot count 180 DAP | NMC (000/ha) | Cane length (cm) | Cane girth (cm) | Av. Cane weight (g) | Cane yield (t/ha) |
|---------------|------------------------|-----------------|---------------------|--------------------|------------------------|----------------------|
| Row spacing | | | | | | |
| 120 cm | 138.72 | 107.32 | 181.98 | 2.35 | 0.79 | 61.58 |
| 150 cm | 116.33 | 90.14 | 179.36 | 2.48 | 0.93 | 52.68 |
| 30x120 | 166.71 | 141.44 | 182.28 | 2.39 | 0.82 | 73.56 |
| CD (P = 0.05) | 17.60 | 14.35 | NS | NS | NS | 8.65 |
| Genotypes | | | | | | |
| CoS 96275 | 132.67 | 104.89 | 173.03 | 2.30 | 0.71 | 59.48 |
| CoSe 92423 | 144.47 | 119.56 | 185.73 | 2.61 | 0.92 | 66.59 |
| CoS 94257 | 144.76 | 104.16 | 178.23 | 2.54 | 0.92 | 60.77 |
| CoLk 94184 | 140.43 | 123.25 | 187.81 | 2.58 | 0.83 | 63.59 |
| CD (P = 0.05) | 6.73 | 8.73 | 6.27 | 0.16 | 0.18 | 4.59 |

Table 2: Effect of planting geometries and genotypes on quality attributes and sugar yield

| Treatment | ⁰ Brix | Pol (%) | Purity (%) | CCS (%) | CCS (t/ha) |
|----------------------------|-------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------------|
| Planting Geometries | | | | | |
| Row spacing | | | | | |
| 120 cm | 20.45 | 17.98 | 87.85 | 12.40 | 7.63 |
| 150 cm | 20.55 | 18.10 | 87.92 | 12.49 | 6.59 |
| 30x120 | 20.59 | 18.00 | 87.33 | 12.38 | 9.09 |
| CD (P = 0.05) | NS | NS | NS | NS | 0.97 |
| Genotypes | | | | | |
| CoS 96275 | 21.15 | 18.69 | 88.33 | 12.93 | 7.64 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| CoSe 92423 | 19.17 | 16.51 | 86.12 | 11.28 | 7.55 |
| CoS 94257 | 19.68 | 17.05 | 86.58 | 11.68 | 7.10 |
| CoLk 94184 | 22.11 | 19.84 | 89.71 | 13.82 | 8.79 |
| CD (P = 0.05) | 1.23 | 1.33 | 1.10 | 1.16 | 0.79 |

AS 64: Response of sugarcane crop to different plant nutrients in varied agro- ecological situations

A field experiment was initiated during first week of April, 2013, to study the response of sugarcane to different nutrients. Twelve nutrient treatments in RBD having three replications with sugarcane (Cv. CoSe 92423) was planted. The recommended fertilizer dose was 150 kg N, 60 kg P₂O₅ and 60 kg K₂O ha⁻¹. The other nutrient 40 kg S, 25 kg ZnSO₄, 10 kg FeSO₄ and 5 kg MnSO₄ ha⁻¹ were applied as per the treatment. Twelve nutrient treatments in RBD having three replications with sugarcane (Cv. CoSe 92423) was studied for response of sugarcane to different nutrients.

Initially soil was low in organic carbon (0.31%), available nitrogen (208.5 kg ha⁻¹), phosphorus (11.88 kg P₂O₅ ha⁻¹) and medium in potassium (202.87 kg K₂O ha⁻¹) contents. Growth parameter on tiller population at 90 and 120 days after planting, NMC, yield attributes, cane yield and cane juice quality were recorded.

Cane yield (t/ha) was influenced by various nutrient management treatments, however they were non-significant. Higher cane yield (57.06 t/ha) was recorded with treatment T9 (NPK + S + Zn) followed by the treatment T11 (NPK+S+Zn+Fe+Mn) with cane yield (51.31 t/ha) and T6 (NPK+Zn), cane yield (50.49 t/ha) as compared to other treatments. Lowest cane yield was recorded with control plot (41.96 t/ha) (Table 1). The initial lower soil organic carbon content and available nitrogen, phosphorus and medium potassium nutrients affected cane yield in treatments, where nutrient were applied alone (N or NP or NPK) as compared to in combination of NPK with other nutrient like S, Zn, Fe and Mn. Cane quality parameters were not affected by any of the nutrient applied. Application of recommended dose of NPK (150:60:60 kg/ha) with S (40 kg/ha) and Zn (25 kg ZnSO₄/ha) produced higher cane yield (57.06 t/ha).

Table 1. Growth, yield and juice quality parameters of sugarcane to different nutrients

| Treatment | Shoot count (‘000/ha) | NMC | Cane yield | Juice quality parameters at harvest (%) |
|------------------|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|--|
|------------------|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|--|

| | 90 DAP | 120 DAP | (‘000/ha) | (t/ha) | Brix | Sucrose | Purity |
|----------------|-------------------|--------------------|------------------|---------------|-------------|----------------|---------------|
| T1 Control | 114.5 | 125.9 | 99.53 | 41.96 | 19.22 | 16.61 | 86.43 |
| T2 N | 117.2 | 128.9 | 101.95 | 45.65 | 18.91 | 16.29 | 86.17 |
| T3 NP | 106.8 | 117.6 | 92.93 | 46.25 | 18.69 | 16.09 | 86.06 |
| T4 NPK | 80.3 | 88.3 | 69.83 | 47.90 | 18.77 | 16.03 | 85.39 |
| T5 NPKS | 101.9 | 112.1 | 88.62 | 45.86 | 18.71 | 16.02 | 85.57 |
| T6 NPKZn | 98.9 | 108.9 | 86.06 | 50.49 | 18.94 | 16.12 | 85.15 |
| T7 NPKFe | 106.7 | 117.4 | 92.79 | 44.11 | 18.61 | 15.92 | 85.62 |
| T8 NPKMn | 78.9 | 86.9 | 68.68 | 43.59 | 19.17 | 16.58 | 86.47 |
| T9 NPKSZn | 114.8 | 126.2 | 99.80 | 57.06 | 19.19 | 16.67 | 86.93 |
| T10 NPKSZnFe | 101.9 | 112.1 | 88.62 | 49.93 | 19.01 | 16.31 | 85.80 |
| T11 NPKSZnFeMn | 117.2 | 128.9 | 101.95 | 51.31 | 19.05 | 16.36 | 85.90 |
| 12 FYM 20 t/ha | 110.6 | 121.6 | 96.16 | 48.29 | 18.35 | 15.64 | 85.23 |
| CD (5%) | 21.0 | 23.1 | 18.26 | NS | NS | NS | NS |

DAP: Days after planting

AS 65: Enhancing Sugarcane Productivity and Profitability under Wheat – Sugarcane Cropping System

The field experiment was conducted during 2012-14 to enhance the productivity of sugarcane under wheat – sugarcane cropping system. The experiment comprising 9 treatments viz.; T₁: Autumn planted sugarcane, T₂ : T₁+ wheat (1:2), T₃: T₁+ wheat (1:3), T₄: wheat sown on 15th November – late sugarcane, T₅: wheat sown on 15th December – late sugarcane, T₆: wheat sown (three rows) on 15th November under FIRB + sugarcane in furrows at 75 cm in 3rd week of February, T₇: wheat sown (three rows) on 15th November under FIRB + sugarcane in furrows at 75 cm in 3rd week of March, T₈: T₆ with sowing of wheat on 15th December and T₉: T₇ with sowing of wheat on 15th December was laid out in Randomized Block Design with three replications. The findings reveals that wheat grain yield was the highest (46.6 q/ha) in November sown wheat in the treatment T₄. Wheat yielded almost the same in flat as well as FIRB method. However, wheat sown in the month of November yielded higher than wheat sown in December due to higher number of ear heads per running meters, number of grains per ear head and test weight. Wheat (Nov.) + sugarcane (Feb/March) under FIRB method produced higher wheat yield (44.1 q/ha) over

wheat (Nov) + sugarcane (Oct) in 3:1 row ratio (40.2 q/ha) as well as 2:1 row ratio (33.5 q/ha).

Tiller population recorded at different stages indicated that tiller count in autumn planted sole sugarcane and sugarcane planted with wheat in 3rd week of February under FIRB system was higher compared with sugarcane planted with wheat in 3rd week of March under FIRB. The lowest tiller population was observed in sugarcane planted with wheat (1:3) under flat method followed by wheat – sugarcane system. The highest tiller count (231.8 thousands/ha) was recorded in the month of July in sugarcane planted in 3rd week of February with wheat under FIRB system and the lowest (86.4 thousands/ha) in sugarcane + wheat (1:3). The highest plant height (247 cm) was observed in autumn planted sole sugarcane followed by sugarcane + wheat (1:2) and wheat + sugarcane under FIRB system. The cane yield was the highest (89.0 tonnes/ha) in autumn planted sole sugarcane. Sugarcane planted in 3rd week of February in standing wheat under FIRB method (82.5 tonnes/ha) was significantly higher than sugarcane planted in 3rd week of March in wheat under FIRB and sugarcane + wheat (1:2) due to higher NMC, cane length, cane weight and number of internodes. The lowest cane yield was recorded in wheat – sugarcane system (59.3 tonnes/ha) and sugarcane + wheat in 1:3 row ratio (60.3 tonnes/ha).

AS-66: Priming cane node for accelerating germination

Results of an experiment planted with the objective of assessing suitable cane node priming technique for accelerating germination indicated that the priming of cane nodes with hot water (50°C)+ 3% urea solution for 2 hrs (T₃) or cattle dung, cattle urine and water in 1:2:5 ratio and planted directly in the field (T₄) or after incubation (4 days) (T₆) exhibited significantly higher germination of cane buds (78.21%) at 10, 20, 30 and 40 days after planting (DAP) as compared to un-primed cane nodes (T₁) (19.03, 28.64, 39.84 and 54.60%) or treating them with hot water at 50°C for 2 hrs. only (T₂) (14.58, 30.24, 37.15 and 44.33%). Conventionally planted crop with 3-bud setts produced the lowest germination at all the dates, and it was 38.68% at 40 days after planting. Number of tillers and millable canes and yield of cane also exhibited the same trend as the germination of cane buds obtained in different treatments except in the conventional planting (T₅) where number of tillers and millable canes were almost the same with that of T₃, T₄ and T₆ treatments, which was by virtue of three times more number of cane buds planting. Accordingly, cane yields obtained under T₃, T₄, T₅ and T₆ treatments being statistically at par among themselves were significantly higher to the tune of 12.65 and 11.29% than that of T₁ and T₂ treatments (un-

primed cane nodes or treated with hot water only). Conventional planting with 3-bud setts although produced cane yield at par with primed cane node treatments but with the use of huge seed cane (72 q/ha) whereas only 17.52 q/ha seed cane was used in cane node planting method. CCS% cane did not differ significantly due to different treatments in the test (Table 1).

Table 1: Effect of cane node priming techniques on the growth, yield and quality of sugarcane

| Treatment | Germination % of cane buds | | | | No. of tillers (000/ha) | No. of millable canes (000/ha) | Cane yield (t/ha) | CCS% cane |
|--|----------------------------|--------|--------|--------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|
| | 10 DAP | 20 DAP | 30 DAP | 40 DAP | | | | |
| T ₁ : Un-primed cane node | 19.03 | 28.64 | 39.84 | 54.60 | 168 | 103 | 67.48 | 11.34 |
| T ₂ : Treating cane node in hot water at 50°C for 2 hours | 14.58 | 30.24 | 37.15 | 44.33 | 163 | 105 | 68.53 | 11.03 |
| T ₃ : Treating cane node in hot water (50°C) and 3% urea solution for 2 hours. | 24.33 | 52.35 | 60.76 | 75.68 | 182 | 112 | 75.50 | 11.20 |
| T ₄ : Priming cane node with cattle dung, cattle urine and water in 1:2:5 ratio | 30.38 | 40.77 | 65.47 | 75.24 | 206 | 117 | 77.53 | 11.13 |
| T ₅ : Conventional 3-bud setts planting | 7.03 | 15.33 | 28.33 | 38.68 | 215 | 120 | 78.42 | 11.31 |
| Primed and sprouted cane node (incubated for 4 days after priming) | 20.35 | 49.33 | 67.81 | 74.38 | 209 | 117 | 77.54 | 11.09 |
| CD (P=0.05) | 7.08 | 15.80 | 4.51 | 5.47 | 9.01 | 5.91 | 4.56 | NS |

AS67: Optimization of fertigation schedule for sugarcane through micro-irrigation technique under different agro-climatic conditions

Sugarcane ratoon crop was initiated during first week of April, 2013 and the crop was harvested in the last week of March, 2014. It was observed that irrigation treatments significantly influenced shoot count at 60 and 120 days of ratooning. However, nitrogen doses did not influence the shoot count. Irrigation X nitrogen interaction was non-significant at 60 days of ratooning but it was significant at 120 days of ratooning (Tables 1 and 2). Length of sugarcane plant leaf was also significantly influenced by irrigation treatments but leaf width remained unaffected with irrigation and nitrogen treatments both (Table 3 and 4). Irrigation treatments significantly affected number of millable canes (Table 5). However, the effect of nitrogen and interaction of Nitrogen X Irrigation was non-significant on number of millable canes. Cane stalk length and diameter were also significantly influenced by irrigation treatments (Table 6 and 7). Irrigation X nitrogen interaction effect was also observed on cane stalk length. Highest sugarcane yield of 94.10 t/ha was observed when sugarcane was drip fertigated with recommended dose of nitrogen and water equivalent to 125 % pan evaporation (Table 8). However, irrigation water use efficiency (IWUE) was the highest at 2946.88 kg/ha-cm when fertigation was done and the amount of irrigation water was kept as 75 per cent of pan evaporation (Table 9). The sugarcane yield and IWUE was not influenced significantly by doses of nitrogen in fertigation treatments. With surface irrigation, the mean sugarcane yield and IWUE were 76.43 t/ha and 955.32 kg/ha-cm respectively. Sugarcane juice quality generally remained unaffected with irrigation and nitrogen treatments. However lower dose of nitrogen resulted in higher sucrose, brix and purity (Table 10, 11 and 12).

Table 1. Shoot count after 60 days of ratooning

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 261111 | 263333 | 250000 | 258148 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 280556 | 272778 | 259444 | 270926 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 261667 | 239444 | 266111 | 255741 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 233889 | 237222 | 255556 | 242222 |
| Average | 259306 | 253194 | 257778 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 8532 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | 27139 |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 7389 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 8532 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

Table 2. Shoot count after 120 days of ratooning

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 163333 | 171111 | 176111 | 170185 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 167778 | 176667 | 172778 | 172407 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 181111 | 183333 | 171111 | 178519 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 169444 | 165556 | 173889 | 169630 |
| Average | 170417 | 174167 | 173472 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 1977 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | 6290 |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 1712 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 1977 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | 4838 |

Table 3. Length of leaf soon before onset of monsoon

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 115.9 | 115.7 | 110.5 | 114.0 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 114.1 | 108.6 | 111.0 | 111.2 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 118.6 | 118.1 | 115.5 | 117.4 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 99.3 | 102.0 | 98.1 | 99.8 |
| Average | 112.0 | 111.1 | 108.8 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 2.2 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | 7.0 |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 1.9 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 2.2 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

Table 4. Width of leaf soon before onset of monsoon

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 3.50 | 3.30 | 3.07 | 3.29 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 3.37 | 3.13 | 3.20 | 3.23 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 3.07 | 3.43 | 3.17 | 3.22 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 3.03 | 3.13 | 3.27 | 3.14 |
| Average | 3.24 | 3.25 | 3.18 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 0.13 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | NS |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 0.11 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 0.13 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

Table 5. Number of millable canes

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 124222 | 119278 | 117944 | 120481 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 124111 | 124389 | 121556 | 123352 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 121944 | 128944 | 122278 | 124389 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 115222 | 120000 | 113944 | 116389 |
| Average | 121375 | 123153 | 118931 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 2800 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | 8908 |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 2425 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 2800 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

Table 6. Cane stalk length at harvest (cm)

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 234.9 | 241.0 | 247.7 | 241.2 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 240.1 | 249.1 | 242.9 | 244.0 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 286.3 | 248.1 | 254.0 | 262.8 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 241.2 | 237.3 | 238.5 | 239.0 |
| Average | 250.6 | 243.9 | 245.8 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 4.67 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | 14.86 |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 4.05 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 4.67 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | 11.43 |

Table 7. Cane stalk diameter (cm)

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 1.86 | 1.95 | 2.07 | 1.96 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 1.94 | 2.00 | 2.03 | 1.99 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 2.31 | 2.06 | 2.09 | 2.15 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 1.99 | 1.95 | 1.92 | 1.95 |
| Average | 2.03 | 1.99 | 2.03 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 0.07 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | 0.23 |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 0.06 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 0.07 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

Table 8. Sugarcane yield (t/ha)

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 82.39 | 80.89 | 83.99 | 82.42 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 84.03 | 83.35 | 83.40 | 83.59 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 94.10 | 91.00 | 89.31 | 91.47 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 79.54 | 76.42 | 73.32 | 76.43 |
| Average | 85.01 | 82.91 | 82.50 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 1.41 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | 4.50 |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 1.22 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 1.41 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

Table 9. Irrigation water use efficiency (kg/ha-cm)

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Irrigation water applied (ha- cm) | Nitrogen application rate | | | Average |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 28.5 | 2890.84 | 2838.21 | 2946.88 | 2891.98 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 38 | 2211.26 | 2193.35 | 2194.81 | 2199.81 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 47.5 | 1980.99 | 1915.79 | 1880.12 | 1925.63 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 80 | 994.27 | 955.21 | 916.49 | 955.32 |
| Average | | 2019.34 | 1975.64 | 1984.58 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | | 36.89 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | | 117.35 |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | | 31.95 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | | 36.89 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | | NS |

Table 10 Corrected brix at harvest

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 19.68 | 19.04 | 20.90 | 19.87 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 19.89 | 20.20 | 20.29 | 20.13 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 19.25 | 20.22 | 20.23 | 19.90 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 19.72 | 20.55 | 20.17 | 20.15 |
| Average | 19.63 | 20.00 | 20.40 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 0.31 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | NS |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 0.27 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | 1.15 |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 0.31 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

Table 11. Sucrose % juice

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 17.19 | 16.48 | 18.20 | 17.29 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 17.18 | 17.59 | 17.71 | 17.50 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 16.53 | 17.63 | 17.60 | 17.25 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 17.18 | 18.15 | 17.71 | 17.68 |
| Average | 17.02 | 17.46 | 17.81 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 0.33 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | NS |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 0.28 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | 1.22 |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 0.33 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

Table 12. Purity percentage

| Nitrogen Irrigation | Nitrogen application rate | | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|---------|
| | N1 = 100% recommended dose of N | N2 = 75% recommended dose of N | N3 = 50% recommended dose of N | Average |
| I1= Sub Surface Drip at 75% PE | 87.32 | 86.48 | 87.06 | 86.95 |
| I2 = Sub Surface Drip at 100% PE | 86.33 | 87.11 | 87.29 | 86.91 |
| I3 = Sub Surface Drip at 125% PE | 85.93 | 87.13 | 87.01 | 86.69 |
| I4=Farmers practice surface irrigation | 87.15 | 88.30 | 87.74 | 87.73 |
| Average | 86.68 | 87.25 | 87.27 | |
| SE (Irrigation) | | | | 0.40 |
| CD (Irrigation) | | | | NS |
| SE (Nitrogen) | | | | 0.34 |
| CD (Nitrogen) | | | | NS |
| SE (IxN) | | | | 0.40 |
| CD(IxN) | | | | NS |

