(Original Article)



Response of Cassava Tubers Yield and its Components to Different Agricultural Treatments

Dalia M.T. Nassef*; Aiman K. Metwaly and Ameen S. Mahdy

Department of Vegetable Crops, Faculty of Agriculture, Assiut University, Assiut 71526, Egypt.

* Correspondence: daliatantawey@agr.aun.edu.eg DOI: 10.21608/AJAS.2024.277501.1347 © Faculty of Agriculture, Assiut University

Abstract

Two field experiments were conducted at the Experimental Farm of Vegetable Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Assiut University, Egypt, to observe the effect of harvest time and planting method under two different planting dates on cassava yield and its components (c.v. Indonisi). Planting dates were on the 1st and 15th of April in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023 seasons, respectively which were laid in two separate experiments. Each experiment is laid out in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) using a split-plot arrangement with three replications. Where harvesting times (8, 9 and 10 months from planting) were arranged in the main plots while planting methods (direct and stored stakes for 15 days underground) were localized in the subplots. The acquired results exhibited that all the first and second interactions had significant or highly significant effects on tubers yield /fed in both seasons except the interaction between planting date \times planting method in the second season. Hence, the highest average values of tuber yield /fed (8.483 and 7.963 tons in the two respective seasons) were obtained from cassava plants which were planted using direct stakes on April 1 and harvested after 9 months from planting. So, to achieve the highest yield from cassava, it will be recommended to cultivate cassava with direct stakes at the beginning of April and harvest after 9 months under Assiut conditions.

Keywords: Cassava, Planting method, Harvest time, Planting Time, Tubers yield

Introduction

Cassava (*Manihot esculenta* Crantz) is a perennial plant belonging to the family *Euphorbiaceae*. It is mostly grown in tropical and subtropical areas (Alves, 2002; Li *et al.*, 2016 and Wang *et al.*, 2018). Cassava is reasonably drought tolerant and is expected to be highly adaptable to future climate change, making it an important crop for food security (Jarvis *et al.*, 2012; Duque and Setter, 2019). Cassava is Africa's fourth largest source of calories (FAO, 2020). Cassava is an important food source for more than 800 million people worldwide (McCallum *et al.*, 2017). The cassava plant is a perennial woody shrub that can grow up to three meters tall in tropical regions. The plant is thought to have originated in Latin America, where local Indians discovered it 4,000 years ago (Akinpelu, *et al.* 2011). However, cassava has been less studied compared to other crops although its

Nassef *et al.*, 2024

importance as a food in many developing countries (Varshney et al., 2010 and Leal et al., 2014) and its commercial use for starch in the tropics and subtropics (Nweke, 2005; Karlstrom et al., 2016). The main factor of the cassava plant's economic value is its tuberous roots; differences in production are caused by the interaction between the roots and the physicochemical properties of the soil (Oliveira, et al. 2001). In addition to the use of cassava roots, its leaves can be used as a calcium and vitamin foundation, as well as a protein-rich food, responsible for the removal of cyanogenic compounds (cooking and drying) (Lancaster and Brooks 1983). Planting time is the core factor related to the production of tuberous roots, regardless of the cultivar or any other cultural practice that may be approved, and it depends on the region it is produced. The best planting times for cassava are also related to the availability of mature branches and climatic conditions favoring sprouting and root formation (Takahashi and Gonçalo 2005). Accordingly, farmers need to understand how cassava varieties reply to different planting dates and crop ages at harvest to revenue advantage of flexible planting and harvest dates increasing prices, and dry matter. Thus, this study was conducted to identify the best time to both cultivate the stakes and harvest the tubers and the best method to cultivate stakes on root yield and quality in Assiut Governorate, over two seasons.

Material and Methods

Two field experiments were conducted at the Experimental Farm of Vegetable Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Assiut University, Egypt (longitude:31.25 E, latitude:27.25N, deviation: 45m/148ft), to survey the effect of harvest time and planting method under two different dates of planting on cassava yield and its components (c.v. Indonisi). Planting dates (D) were on the 1st and 15th of April in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023, respectively which were laid in two separate experiments. Each experiment is laid out in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) using a split-plot arrangement with three replications. Where harvesting times, T (8, 9, and 10 months from planting) were arranged in the main plots while planting methods, M (direct and stored stakes for 15 days underground) were localized in the subplots.

Each experiment contained 18 experimental units (3 harvest times \times 2 planting methods \times 3 replicates) each of them was 30 m². Each plot consists of three terraces of 5 m in length and 1m in width, spacing 50 cm between terraces and 1 m between plants.

The experimental soil site was clay with the assets as presented in Table 1 (Page *et al.*, 1982).

Characteristic	Values	Characteristic	Values	
рН (1:2.5)	8.01		52.22	
EC1:1 dSm ⁻¹	1.35	- Clay %	53.23	
ECe dSm ⁻¹	2.01	S:14 0/	20.25	
Organic matter (OM) %	1.10	– Silt %	28.35	
Soluble cations, (meq/kg soil)		Sand 9/	10.42	
Ca ²⁺	10.00	– Sand %	18.42	
Mg ²⁺	4.00	S - 11 4 4	Class	
Na ⁺	4.70	– Soil texture	Clay	
K ⁺	1.30	D U- do	1 (2	
Soluble anions, (meq/100 g soil)		- Bulk density, (g/cm ³)	1.63	
Cl	5.70		45 70	
HCO ₃ ⁻ +CO ₃ ²⁻	4.30	- Field capacity, (F.C) %	45.70	
SO ₄ ²⁻	10.00	\mathbf{W}	21.20	
Total nitrogen (ppm)	13.00	– Wilting Point (W.P) %	21.30	
Available phosphorus (ppm)	10.20	W. S. dama dia m. O/	(7.20	
Available potassium (ppm)	312.00	-W. Saturation %	67.30	

Table 1. The physical and chemical properties of the experimental farm soil.

All the other agricultural practices that were recommended for cassava plants were done in the two growing seasons.

At harvested times after 8,9,10 months in both experiments, the following characteristics were determined:

1-Tubers' number/plant: As a mean of five plants randomly chosen from each experimental unit

2-Tuber diameter (cm): As a mean of ten tubers randomly chosen from each experimental unit, measured of the middle part using the pachymeter

3-Tuber length (cm): As a means of ten tubers randomly chosen from each experimental unit, measure the distance between the base and the apex of the root using a graduated ruler.

4-Tuber weight (g): As a means of ten tubers randomly chosen from each experimental unit.

5-Tubers' weight /plant (kg): As mean weight of tubers of five plants randomly chosen from each experimental unit.

6-Tubers yield (ton/fed): Weight of tubers of all plants in each experimental unit then transfer to ton per feddan.

Statistical analysis

Each experiment was analyzed separately and Bartlett's test for homogeneity of error variances was examined by analyzing covariance between the studied planting dates to reveal the effect of the planting factor and its interactions with the other tested factors. Collected data were analyzed using the SAS Statistical Software Package and means were compared using the LSD at $P \le 0.05$ according to Gomez and Gomez (1984).

Results and Discussion

1-Tubers' number /plant

Exhibited data in Table 2 clearly show that the tested planting dates had a highly significant influence on the number of tubers per plant in the two growing seasons. Cassava plants that were planted on the first of April gave the highest number of tubers per plant (9.569 and 9.941 in the first and the second seasons, respectively) as compared to the 15th of April in both seasons. This may be due to the suitable environmental conditions prevailing at the first planting date which were more encourage the growth of stakes buds than 15th April.

Furthermore, illustrated data in Table 2 reveal that the testing harvest time had a highly significant effect on the cassava tubers number per plant in both seasons. Thus, the collecting of cassava tubers after 9 months surpassed the other harvest time and produced the maximum average values (9.525 and 9.425 tubers per plant in the two respective seasons). These results may be attributed to the harvest time, 9 months after planting, was later than the other harvest date (8 months). This may be due to the increase in synthesis products as a result of the increase in age from 8 to 9 months, which led to the formation of new tubers and consequently increased the number of tubers per plant as the age exceeded 9 months, especially with the prevention of irrigation, which led to Some tubers were lost, which led to a decrease in number after that (at 10 months). These results agree with Lilian *et al* (2019) and Samidjo (2020).

and 2022/2	1023, seasons							
Sea	Seasons			2	2022/2023			
II	Dlandin a mathada	Planting	date (D)		Planting date (D)			
Harvesting time (T)	Planting methods	\mathbf{D}_1	D_2	Mean	\mathbf{D}_1	D_2	Mean	
	(M)	1 st April	15 th April	l	1 st April 15 th Apri		l	
T_1	Direct stakes	9.100	8.167	8.634	9.233	6.933	8.083	
8 Months	Storage stakes	9.000	7.833	8.417	8.500	6.500	7.500	
Μ	lean	9.050	8.000	8.525	8.867	6.717	7.792	
T ₂	Direct stakes	10.267	8.967	9.617	11.643	7.923	9.783	
9 Months	Storage stakes	10.067	8.800	9.434	10.533	7.600	9.067	
Μ	Mean		8.883	9.525	11.088	7.762	9.425	
Т3	Direct stakes	9.633	8.467	9.050	10.000	7.400	8.700	
10 Months	Storage stakes	9.267	8.400	8.834	9.667	7.200	8.434	
Μ	lean	9.450	8.433	8.942	9.833	7.300	8.567	
$\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{M}$	Direct stakes	9.667	8.533	9.100	10.292	7.419	8.856	
1 × M	Storage stakes	9.444	8.344	8.894	9.567	7.100	8.334	
Gener	al Mean	9.569	8.440	9.005	9.941	7.254	8.598	
F test and	d LSD 0.05	F test		LSD 0.05	5 F test		LSD 0.05	
(D) Plai	nting date	**		-	**		-	
(M) Planti	ing methods	*	**	-	**		-	
(T) Harvesting time		**		0.278	**		0.280	
$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{M}$		n.s		-	**		0.391	
$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{T}$		**		0.393	**		0.396	
Μ	×T	n.s		_ **		:*	0.396	
D×	$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{M}$		**		0.556 *		0.561	

Table 2. Means of tubers number/plant as affected by planting date (D), harvesting time (T) and planting methods (M) as well as their interactions in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023. seasons

Where ns., * and ** were non-significant and significant at 5 and 1% levels of probability, respectively.

Also, the data presented in the same previous table show that the plants which were cultivated with direct and storage stakes for 15 days varied highly significantly in both seasons. The cultivation with direct stakes provided the highest number of tubers per plant (9.100 and 8.856 in the first and second seasons respectively). This may be caused by the direct stakes being ready to grow rather than storage stakes which help the farmers to save the costs of storage of the stakes and consequently enhance the net return. Concerning the interactions involved in this respect, data presented in Table 2 focus that all first and second interactions had a significant or highly significant effect on tubers number per plant in both seasons except the interaction between planting date D × planting method M and planting method M × harvesting time T in the first season. Thus, the highest average values of tubers number per plant (10.267 and 11.643 in the two respective seasons) were obtained from cassava plants which were cultivated using direct stakes on 1st of April and harvested after 9 months from planting.

2-Average tuber diameter (cm)

The illustrated data in Table 3 show that the tested planting dates had a significant effect on the tuber diameter of cassava in the two growing seasons. Cassava plants that were planted on April 1st gave the highest tuber diameter (3.909 and 3.887 cm in the first and second seasons, respectively). This may be due to the appropriate environmental conditions prevailing at the first planting date, which were more encouraging the cell deviation and the fullness of the tubers which reflected on the tuber's diameter compared to April 15.

Here too, the data shown in Table 3 reveal that the tested harvest time had a highly significant effect on the diameter of cassava tubers in both seasons. Thus, cassava tuber diameters after 9 months exceeded the other harvest time and produced maximum mean values (3.871 and 3.883 cm in the two seasons, respectively). These results may be because the harvest date, 9 months after planting, was later than the other harvest date (8 months). This may be due to the increase in synthetic products as a result of increasing the age from 8 to 9 months, which led to the tubers storing nutrients and thus increasing the diameter of the tubers in the plant, as the age exceeded 9 months, especially with the prevention of irrigation, which led to some tubers losing their moisture, which led to a decrease in their number after that (at 10 months). Similar findings were detected by Lilian *et al* (2019) and Samidjo (2020).

Also, the data presented in the same previous table shows that the tuber diameter trait varied significantly between cassava plants grown by direct stakes and stored for 15 days in both seasons. Direct stakes cultivation gave the highest diameter of tuber (3.783 and 3.723 cm in the first and second seasons, respectively) as compared with indirect planting (stored for 15 days before planting). This may be because direct stakes were ready for growth instead of storage stakes, which helps farmers save on the costs of storing stakes and thus enhances the net yield.

Regarding the interactions involved in this respect, the illustrated data in Table 3 indicated that all of the first and second interactions had a significant or

highly significant effect on the diameter of the cassava tubers in both seasons, except the interaction between planting date $D \times$ planting method M and Planting method M \times harvest time T in the second season. Thus, the highest average values of tuber diameter per plant (4.087 and 4.213 in the two seasons, respectively) were obtained from cassava plants that were planted using direct stakes s on April 1st and harvested after 9 months after planting.

and 2022/2	2023, seasons						
Sea	2021/2022			2022/2023			
		Planting	g date (D)		Planting		
Harvesting time (T)	Planting methods (M)	D ₁ 1 st	D ₂ 15 th	Mean	D1 1 st April	D ₂ 15 th	Mean
		April	April			April	
T_1	Direct stakes	3.810	3.530	3.670	3.712	3.340	3.526
8 Months	Storage stakes	3.763	3.423	3.593	3.683	3.193	3.438
Mean		3.787	3.477	3.632	3.697	3.266	3.482
T 2	Direct stakes	4.087	3.727	3.907	4.213	3.662	3.937
9 Months	Storage stakes	4.000	3.670	3.835	4.051	3.606	3.828
Mean	~~~~~	4.043	3.698	3.871	4.132	3.634	3.883
Т3	Direct stakes	3.920	3.627	3.773	3.884	3.529	3.707
10 Months	Storage stakes	3.873	3.617	3.745	3.777	3.458	3.618
Mean		3.897	3.622	3.759	3.831	3.493	3.662
T M	Direct stakes	3.939	3.628	3.783	3.936	3.510	3.723
$\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{M}$	Storage stakes	3.879	3.570	3.724	3.837	3.419	3.628
Gener	al Mean	3.909	3.599	3.754	3.887	3.464	3.676
F test and	d LSD 0.05	E tost LSD		LSD 0.05	F test		LSD 0.05
(D) Plar	nting date	** _		-	**		-
	ing methods	** _		-	**		-
(T) Harvesting time		**		0.019	**		0.041
$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{M}$			*	0.031	n.	s	-
	×T			0.027	**		0.059
Μ	× T	**		0.027	n.s		_
	T×M			0.071	**		0.083
2							

Table 3. Means of tuber diameter (cm) as affected by planting date (D), harvesting time (T) and planting methods (M) as well as their interactions in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023, seasons

Where n.s., * and ** were non-significant and significant at 5 and 1% level of probability, respectively.

3-Average tubers length (cm)

Data in Table 4 cleared that, the tested planting dates had a highly significant (P \leq 0.01) effect on the tuber length in both seasons. Cassava plants that were planted on the first of April gave the highest length of tuber (39.45 and 40.47 cm in the first and the second seasons respectively) as compared to the 15th of April in both seasons. This may be due to the suitable environmental conditions prevailing at the first planting date which were more encourage the cell elongation of cassava tubers as compared with the late one.

Furthermore, illustrated data in Table 4 reveal that, the testing harvest time had a highly significant effect on the cassava tuber length in both seasons thus, cassava tuber length in plants that were harvested after 9 months from planting exceeded the other tested harvesting time and produced maximum mean values (38.82 and 39.95cm in the two respective seasons). These results may be because the harvest date, 9 months after planting, was later than the other harvest date (8

months) and gave a chance for cassava plants to store and transfer the photosynthesis products to tuber and enhancement cell elongation and division which led to an increase in tuber length than other tested harvesting time. These results are in harmony with those obtained by Lilian *et al* (2019) and Samidjo (2020).

Table 4. Means of tuber length (cm) as affected by planting date (D), harvesting time (T) and planting methods (M) as well as their interactions in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023, seasons

Seasons		2021/2022			2022/2023			
		Planting date (D)			Planting			
Harvesting time (T)	Planting methods (M)	D ₁ 1 st	D ₂ 15 th	Mean	D ₁ 1 st	D ₂ 15 th	Mean	
		April	April		April	April		
T_1	Direct stakes	38.41	34.00	36.21	39.05	35.10	37.08	
8 Months	Storage stakes	37.27	33.18	35.23	38.27	34.04	36.16	
Mean		37.84	33.59	35.72	38.66	34.57	36.62	
T ₂	Direct stakes	42.03	36.62	39.33	43.69	37.47	40.58	
9 Months	Storage stakes	40.48	36.13	38.31	41.77	36.87	39.32	
Mean		41.26	36.38	38.82	42.73	37.17	39.95	
Тз	Direct stakes	39.58	35.79	37.69	40.18	36.13	38.16	
10 Months	Storage stakes	38.76	34.98	36.87	39.45	35.72	37.59	
Mean		39.17	35.39	37.28	39.82	35.93	37.88	
$\mathbf{T} \mathbf{v} \mathbf{M}$	Direct stakes	40.01	35.47	37.74	40.98	36.23	38.61	
$\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{M}$	Storage stakes	38.84	34.77	36.81	39.83	35.54	37.69	
Gener	al Mean	39.45	35.09	37.27	40.47	35.88	38.18	
F test and	d LSD 0.05	F test LSD 0.05		LSD 0.05	F test		LSD 0.05	
(D) Plai	nting date	*	**	-	**		-	
(M) Plant	ing methods	** _		-	*	*	-	
· · · ·	(T) Harvesting time		**		**		1.272	
D	$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{M}$		*	0.962	n	l.S	-	
$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{T}$		ł	**	1.530	×	**	1.799	
Μ	×T	n.s		-	n.s		-	
D×	$\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{M}$	n.s		-	*		2.123	

Also, the presented data in the same previous table show that the plants that were cultivated with direct and storage stakes for 15 days varied highly significantly in tuber length trait in both seasons. The cultivation with direct stakes gave the highest length of tubers (37.74 and 38.61 cm in the first and second seasons respectively). This may be due to the direct stakes being ready to grow rather than storage stakes which led to an increase in the elongation and division of cassava cells and consequently encouraged tuber length.

Regarding the interactions involved in this respect, the presented data in Table 4 focuses that all the first and second interactions had a significant or highly significant effect on the length of tubers in both seasons except the interaction between planting date $D \times$ planting method M in the second season, planting method M \times harvest time T in both seasons and the second order interaction in the first season. Whatever, the highest average values for the tuber length trait (42.03 and 43.69 cm in the two seasons, respectively) were obtained from cassava plants that were planted using direct stakes on April 1st and harvested 9 months after planting.

4-Average tuber weight (g)

Illustrated data in Table 5 reveal that the average tuber weight was affected significantly by the tested planting dates in both seasons. Cassava plants which were planted on the first of April gave the highest weight per tuber (404.7 and 383.1g in the two respective seasons) compared to April 15 in both seasons. This is to be expected since the same trend was observed regarding tuber diameter and tuber length traits (Tables 3 and 4).

Furthermore, the data shown in Table 5 reveal that the harvest time test had a highly significant effect on average tuber weight in both seasons. Thus, the average tuber weight that was harvested after 9 months from planting exceeded the other studied harvesting time and produced the maximum average values in this respect (400.3 and 375.9 g in the two respective seasons). This is to be logical since the same obtained were detected from the same harvesting time about tuber diameter and length (Tables 3 and 4). These findings are in harmony with those obtained by Lilian *et al* (2019) and Samidjo (2020).

Fable 5. Means of tuber weight (g) as affected by planting date (D), harvesting time
(T) and planting methods (M) as well as their interactions in 2021/2022 and
2022/2023, seasons.

2022/2023,	50450115.							
Seasons			2021/2022	2	2022/2023			
	Planting date (D)			Planting				
Harvesting time	Planting methods	\mathbf{D}_1	D ₂	Mean	\mathbf{D}_1	D ₂	Mean	
(T)	(M)	1 st	15 th	wiean	1 st	15 th	Mean	
		April	April		April	April		
T_1	Direct stakes	377.5	322.4	350.0	367.0	297.5	332.3	
8 Months	Storage stakes	360.0	315.2	337.6	356.8	255.9	306.4	
Μ	ean	368.7	318.8	343.8	361.9	276.7	319.3	
Τ2	Direct stakes	455.9	354.4	405.2	415.4	350.3	382.9	
9 Months	Storage stakes	442.1	348.5	395.3	394.6	343.0	368.8	
Μ	Mean		351.5	400.3	405.0	346.7	375.9	
Т3	Direct stakes	396.9	337.5	367.2	386.8	330.0	358.4	
10 Months	Storage stakes	387.4	332.0	359.7	377.7	315.8	346.8	
Mean		392.2	334.8	363.5	382.2	322.9	352.6	
$\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{M}$	Direct stakes	410.1	338.1	374.1	389.7	325.9	357.8	
1 ^ IVI	Storage stakes	396.5	331.9	364.2	376.3	304.9	340.6	
Gener	al Mean	404.7	335.0	369.9	383.1	314.5	348.8	
F test and	d LSD 0.05	F test LSD 0.05		LSD 0.05	F test		LSD 0.05	
(D) Plaı	nting date	*	**	-	**		-	
	(M) Planting methods		** _		**		-	
(T) Harvesting time		**		10.38	**		12.67	
$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{M}$		n.s		-	**		14.25	
D	×T	*	**	14.69	**		17.92	
М	× T	**		14.69	**		17.92	
$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{M}$		n.s		-	**		25.34	
			_					

Where n.s., * and ** were non-significant and significant at 5 and 1% level of probability, respectively.

Here too, the presented data in the same previous table also showed that the plants grown by direct stakes and stored for 15 days differed significantly in both seasons. Direct stakes cultivation gave the highest weight of single tuber (374.1 and 357.8 g in the first and second seasons, respectively). This is to be expected

since the same trend was obtained about tuber diameter and length (Tables 3 and 4) which are considered the main contributors in weight.

Concerning the interactions involved in this respect, the illustrated data in Table 5 indicated that all interactions had a significant or highly significant effect on the average tuber weight in both seasons, except the interaction between planting date $D \times$ planting method M, and the second order interaction in the first season ($D \times M \times T$). Thus, the highest average values for average tuber weight (455.9 and 415.4 g in the two seasons, respectively) were obtained from cassava plants that were planted using direct stakes on April 1st and harvested after 9 months.

5-Tubers' weight/plant (kg)

It's clear from the illustrated data in Table 6 that the studied planting dates had a significant effect on the weight of tubers per plant in the two growing seasons. Cassava plants which were planted on April 1st gave the highest weight of tubers per plant (3.558 and 2.704 kg in the two respective seasons) as compared to the April 15 planting date. This is to be logical since the same planting time produced the maximum average values of the number of tubers /plant and average tuber weight (Tables 2 and 5) as mentioned before which the main consist of tubers weight /plant.

anu 2022/2023, se	asons						
isons		2021/2022		2022/2023			
	Planting date (D)			Planting			
Planting methods (M)	\mathbf{D}_1 \mathbf{D}_2		Maan	\mathbf{D}_1	D ₂	Маан	
	1 st	15 th	wiean	1 st	15 th	Mean	
	April April			April	April		
Direct stakes	3.391	2.635	3.013	2.544	2.158	2.351	
Storage stakes	3.342	2.480	2.911	2.387	2.053	2.220	
ean	3.367	2.558	2.963	2.465	2.106	2.286	
Direct stakes	3.887	3.302	3.595	3.127	2.327	2.727	
Storage stakes	3.719	3.221	3.470	2.798	2.306	2.552	
Mean		3.262	3.533	2.963	2.317	2.640	
Direct stakes	3.507	3.192	3.350	2.721	2.255	2.488	
Storage stakes	3.449	3.140	3.295	2.629	2.211	2.420	
ean	3.478	3.166	3.322	2.675	2.233	2.454	
Direct stakes	3.595	3.043	3.319	2.797	2.247	2.522	
Storage stakes	3.503	2.947	3.225	2.605	2.190	2.398	
al Mean	3.558	2.974	3.266	2.704	2.217	2.461	
1 LSD 0.05	H tost		LSD 0.05	F test		LSD 0.05	
nting date	*	**	-	**		-	
	**		-	**		-	
(T) Harvesting time		**		**		0.113	
$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{M}$		n.s		**		0.283	
$\mathbf{D} \times \mathbf{T}$		**		**		0.159	
× T	*		0.086	**		0.159	
Γ×Μ	**		0.121	**		0.227	
	Planting methods (M) Direct stakes Storage stakes ean Direct stakes Storage stakes ean Direct stakes Storage stakes ean Direct stakes Storage stakes al Mean d LSD 0.05 nting date ng methods esting time × M × T × T	Planting methods Planting methods D1 1st April Direct stakes 3.391 Storage stakes 3.342 ean 3.367 Direct stakes 3.887 Storage stakes 3.719 ean 3.803 Direct stakes 3.507 Storage stakes 3.449 ean 3.478 Direct stakes 3.595 Storage stakes 3.503 al Mean 3.558 d LSD 0.05 F to nting date * esting time * × M m × T * × T *	Isons 2021/2022 Planting methods (M) Planting date (D) D1 D2 1st 15th April April Direct stakes 3.391 2.635 Storage stakes Storage stakes 3.342 2.480 ean 3.367 2.558 Direct stakes 3.803 Storage stakes 3.719 3.803 3.262 Direct stakes 3.507 Storage stakes 3.449 3.140 ean 3.478 3.166 Direct stakes 3.503 Storage stakes 3.503 Storage stakes 3.503 Storage stakes 3.503 Al LSD 0.05 F test ning methods *** esting time *** × M n.s × T **	Isons 2021/2022 Planting methods (M) D1 1 st D2 1 st Mean Direct stakes 3.391 2.635 3.013 Storage stakes 3.342 2.480 2.911 ean 3.367 2.558 2.963 Direct stakes 3.87 3.302 3.595 Storage stakes 3.719 3.221 3.470 ean 3.803 3.262 3.533 Direct stakes 3.507 3.192 3.350 Storage stakes 3.449 3.140 3.295 ean 3.478 3.166 3.322 Direct stakes 3.595 3.043 3.319 Storage stakes 3.503 2.947 3.225 al Mean 3.558 2.974 3.266 d LSD 0.05 F test 0.05 0.05 nting date ** - - ng methods ** - - × M n.s - × T **	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	

Table 6. Means of tubers weight /plant (kg) as affected by planting date (D), harvesting time (T) and planting methods (M) as well as their interactions in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023, seasons

Where n.s., * and ** were non-significant and significant at 5 and 1% level of probability, respectively.

Furthermore, illustrated data in Table 6 reveal that the testing harvest time had a highly significant effect on the cassava tubers weight per plant in both seasons. Thus, the collecting cassava tuber's weight after 9 months surpassed the other harvest time and produced the maximum average values (3.533 and 2.640 kg in both respective seasons). These results are predictable since the same planting time produced the maximum average values of the number of tubers /plant and average tuber weight (Tables 2 and 5) as mentioned before which the main consist of tubers weight /plant. These results are in good line with those obtained by Lilian *et al* (2019) and Enesi *et al*. (2022).

The data existing in the same previous table also show that the cassava plants grown by direct stakes and stored for 15 days differed significantly in both seasons. Direct stakes cultivation gave the highest weight of tubers per plant (3.319 and 2.522 kg in the first and second seasons, respectively). These results are likely since the same planting type (direct) produced the maximum average values of the number of tubers /plant-and single tuber weight traits (Tables 2 and 5) as mentioned before which the main consist of tubers weight /plant.

Concerning the interactions involved in this respect, data presented in Table 6 focus that all first and second interactions had a significant or highly significant effect on tubers number per plant in both seasons except the interaction between planting date $D \times planting$ method M ($D \times M$) in the first season. Hence, the highest average values of tubers weight/plant (3.887 and 3.127 kg in the two respective seasons) were achieved from cassava plants which were cultivated using direct stakes on the 1st of April and harvested after 9 months from planting.

6-Tubers yield (ton/ feddan)

Illustrated data in Table 7 show that the tested planting dates had a significant impact on the tuber yield in tons in the two growing seasons. Cassava plants which were planted on April 1st gave the highest tubers yield (7.796 and 7.117 tons / fed. in the first and second seasons, respectively) compared to April 15 in both seasons. This is logical since the same planting date produced the maximum mean values of tubers weight /plant which is considered the chief consist of tuber yield /fed.

Moreover, the data shown in Table 7 show that the testing harvest time had a highly significant impact on tuber yield /fed in both seasons. Thus, the tuber yield of cassava after 9 months surpassed the other studied harvest time and produced the maximum average values in this respect (7.683 and 7.026 tons /fed in the two respective seasons. This is to be expected since the same harvest time produced the maximum mean values of tubers weight /plant which painstakingly the main consists of tuber yield /fed. A similar trend was obtained by Ngeve (2003) and Lilian *et al* (2019).

Also, the presented data in the same previous table show that the plants grown by direct stakes and stored for 15 days differed significantly in this respect in both seasons. Direct stakes cultivation gave the highest amount of total tuber yield /fed (7.216 and 6.718 tons in the first and second seasons, respectively). This is to be logical since the same planting method produced the maximum mean

values of tubers weight /plant which is considered the main consist of tuber yield /fed.

	2025, seasons						
Seas		2021/20	2022/2023				
		Planting	date (D)		Planting	g date (D)	
Harvesting time (T)	Planting methods (M)	D ₁ 1 st	D ₂ 15 th	Mean	D ₁ 1 st	D ₂	Mean
		April	April		April	15 th April	
T ₁	Direct stakes	7.317	5.887	6.602	6.760	5.983	6.372
8 Months	Storage stakes	7.233	4.700	5.967	6.573	5.503	6.038
Mean		7.275	5.293	6.284	6.667	5.743	6.205
Τ2	Direct stakes	8.483	7.117	7.800	7.963	6.410	7.187
9 Months	Storage stakes	8.167	6.963	7.565	7.360	6.370	6.865
Mean		8.325	7.040	7.683	7.662	6.390	7.026
Т3	Direct stakes	7.907	6.587	7.247	7.050	6.140	6.595
10 Months	Storage stakes	7.663	6.210	6.937	6.903	6.057	6.480
Mean		7.785	6.398	7.092	6.977	6.098	6.538
$\mathbf{T} \times \mathbf{M}$	Direct stakes	7.902	6.530	7.216	7.258	6.178	6.718
1 ^ NI	Storage stakes	7.688	5.958	6.823	6.946	5.977	6.462
Genera	l Mean	7.796	6.225	7.011	7.117	6.075	6.596
F test and	LSD 0.05	Ft	test	LSD 0.05		test	LSD 0.05
(D) Plan	ting date	*	*	-	;	**	-
(M) Plantin	ng methods	*	*	-	**		-
	(T)Harvesting time		*	0.138	;	**	0.152
D ×	M	*	*	0.143	n.s		-
D >	< T	*	*	0.195	**		0.214
M	× T	*	*	0.195		*	0.214
D×T	· × M	*	*	0.275	;	**	0.303

Table 7. Means of tubers yield (ton/fed) as affected by planting date (D), harvesting time (T) and planting methods (M) as well as their interactions in 2021/2022 and 2022/2023, seasons

Where n.s., * and ** were non-significant and significant at 5 and 1% level of probability, respectively. Conclusion

Concerning the interactions involved in this trait, the illustrated data in Table 7 indicated that all of the first and second interactions had a significant or highly significant effect on the tuber yield /fed in both seasons, except the interaction between planting date × planting method ($D \times M$) in the second season. Thus, the highest average values of tuber yield /fed (8.483 and 7.963 tons in the two seasons, respectively) were obtained from cassava plants that were planted using direct stakes on April 1st and harvested after 9 months from planting.

Conclusion

From this study it is clear that, Cassava crops can be cultivated under Assiut conditions easily and get a high yield by planting it with direct stakes on the first of April and harvesting the tubers after 9 months.

References

- Akinpelu A., Amamgbo L., Olojede A. and Oyekale A. (2011). Health implications of cassava production and consumption. J Agric Soc Res (JASR). 11(1):118-125.
- Alves, A.A.C. (2002). Cassava botany and physiology. In Hillocks R J, Thresh JM, Belotti A, editors. Cassava: biology, production and utilization. Wallingford: CABI; 67–90.

- Duque, L.O. and Setter T.L. (2019). Partitioning index and non-structural carbohydrate dynamics among contrasting cassava genotypes under early terminal water stress. Environ. Exp. Bot. 163, 24–35. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2019.03.023.
- Enesi, R.O., Hauser, S., Pypers, P., Kreye, C., Tariku, M., and Six, J. (2022). Understanding changes in cassava root dry matter yield by different planting dates, crop ages at harvest, fertilizer application and varieties. European Journal of Agronomy, 133: 126448.
- FAO (2020). FAOSTAT Statistical Databases [WWW Document]. Food Agric. Organ, United Nations. http://www.fao.org/faostat/en/#data/FBS.
- Gomez, K.A. and Gomez, A.A. (1984). Statistical procedures for agricultural research. 4th Ed. John Wiley & Sons Inc. New York, USA.
- Jarvis, A., Ramirez-Villegas J., Campo B.V.H. and, Navarro-Racines C. (2012). Is cassava the answer to African climate change adaptation? Trop. Plant Biol. 5, 9– 29. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12042-012-9096-7
- Karlstrom, A., Calle, F., Salazar, S., Morante, N., Dufour, D. and Ceballos, H. (2016). Biological implications in cassava for the production of amylose-free starch: impact on root yield and related traits. Front. Plant Sci. 7, 1–8. https://doi.org/10.3389/ fpls.2016.00604.
- Lancaster, P.A. and Brooks, J.E. (1983). Cassava Leaves as Human Food. Economic Botany 37(3):331-348.
- Leal, L.G., Lopez, C. and Lopez-Kleine, 'L. (2014). Construction and comparison of gene co-expression networks based on immunity microarray data from Arabidopsis, rice, soybean, tomato and cassava. In: Castillo, L.F., Cristancho, M., Isaza, G., Pinzon, 'A., Rodríguez, J.M.C. (Eds.), Advances in Computational Biology. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 13–19.
- Li, Y.Z., Zhao J.Y., Wu S.M., Fan X.W., Luo X.L. and Chen B.S. (2016). Characters related to higher starch accumulation in cassava storage roots. Sci. Rep. 6, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep19823
- Lilian A. M., Spinosa, W.A., Destro T.M. Junior H. de S, and Nascimento V. d. (2019). Influence of harvest time and agricultural year in yield components of table cassava cultivars. Agronomy Science and Biotechnology, Volume 5, Issue 2, Pages 77-88.
- McCallum, E.J., Anjanappa, R.B. and Gruissem, W. (2017). Tackling agriculturally relevant diseases in the staple crop cassava (Manihotesculenta). Curr. Opin. Plant Biol. 38(8):50-58.
- Ngeve, J. M. (2003). Cassava root yields and culinary qualities as affected by harvest age and test environment. Journal of the Science of Food and Agriculture, 83(4): 249-257
- Nweke, F.I. (2005). The cassava transformation in Africa. In: A Review of Cassava in Africa with Country Case Studies on Nigeria, Ghana, the United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda and Benin. In: FAO (Ed.), Proceedings of the Validation Forum on the Global Cassava Development Strategy, Vol. 2, pp. 15–61.
- Oliveira, J.O.A.P., VidigalFilho P.S., Tormena C.A., Pequeno M.G., Scapim C.A., Muniz, A.S., and Sagrilo, E., (2001). Influence of soil tillage systems on cassava

(Manihotesculenta, Crantz) yield. RevistaBrasileira de Ciência do Solo, 25, 443-450.

- Page, A.L., Miller, R.H. and Keeney, D.R. (1982). Methods of Soil Analysis, Parts 1 and 2. ASA Inc. and SSS A Inc., Madison, WI, USA.
- Samidjo, G.S. (2020). Effect of planting and harvesting time on cassava (ManihotesculentaCrantz) Var. Gambyong. In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (Vol. 458, No. 1, p. 012036). IOP Publishing.
- Takahashi, M. and Gonçalo, S. (2005). A cultura da mandioca. 2. ed. Olímpica, Paranavaí, 116p.
- Varshney, R., Glaszmann, J.C., Leung, H., and Ribaut, J.M. (2010). More genomic resources for less-studied crops. Trends in Biotechnology, 28, 452-460. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tibtech.2010.06.007
- Wang, W., Hostettler, C.E., Damberger, F.F., Kossmann, J., Lloyd, J.R., Zeeman, S.C., (2018). Modification of cassava root starch phosphorylation enhances starch functional properties. Front. Plant Sci. 9: 1–16. https://doi.org/10.3389/ fpls.2018.01562.

Nassef et al., 2024

استجابة محصول درنات الكسافا ومكوناته لمعاملات زراعية مختلفة

داليا محمود طنطاوي ناصف*، ايمن قطب متولى، امين سلامة مهدى

قسم الخضر، كلية الزراعة، جامعة اسيوط، اسيوط، مصر.

الملخص

أجريت هذه الدراسة في مزرعة قسم الخضر البحثية بكلية الزراعة- جامعة أسيوط - مصر. وكانت مواعيد الزراعة فى1 و15 إبريل خلال الموسم الصيفي في الاعوام 2021/2022 و2023/2022 على التوالي حيث يمثل كل موعد زراعة تجربة منفصلة. ونفذت التجربة البحثية بتصميم القطاعات كاملة العشوائية (RCBD) باستخدام ترتيب القطع المنشقة مرة واحدة في ثلاث مكررات. حيث وضع موعد الحصاد (8، 9، 10 أشهر من الزراعة) في القطع الرئيسية وطريقة الزراعة (الزراعة بالعقل مباشرة او العقل المخزنة لمدة 15 يوم تحت الارض) في القطع الشقية. وعلى النتائج المتحصل عليها أن جميع التفاعلات من الدرجة الأولى والثانية كان لها تأثير معنوي أظهرت النتائج المتحصل عليها أن جميع التفاعلات من الدرجة الأولى والثانية كان لها تأثير معنوي أو عالي المعنوية على إنتاجية الفدان من الدرنات في كلا موسمي الدراسة، باستثناء التداخل بين موعد الزراعة وطريقة الزراعة في الموسم الثاني فقط. وهكذا، وقد تم الحصول على أعلى قيم لمتوسط إنتاج الدرنات للفدان (8.480 و 7.965 طن في الموسمي الدراسة، باستثناء التداخل بين موعد الزراعة وطريقة الزراعة في الموسم الثاني فقط. وهكذا، وقد تم الحصول على أعلى قيم لمتوسط إنتاج الدرنات للفدان من الدرنات في كلا موسمي الدراسة، باستثناء التداخل بين موعد الزراعة وطريقة الزراعة في الموسم الثاني فقط. وهكذا، وقد تم الحصول على أعلى قيم لمتوسط إنتاج الدرنات للفدان (8.480 و 7.965 طن في الموسمين الأول والثاني على التوالي) من المتراعة تحت ظروف أسيوط.