

The effect of changing from a monoclonal to a multi-clone farming system (mixing sugarcane varieties at planting)

2016 update

GLEN PARK, SRA Limited, Ingham

Aim: A series of four replicated experiments were conducted to determine the effect on sugar yield and profitability from establishing crops with more than one sugarcane variety.

Experiment 1: Sugarcane varieties Q190[Ⓛ] and Q241[Ⓛ] were planted in pure and mixed plots on 1.8m dual rows. The mixed plots were established by either planting alternate rows with a different variety or by planting the two varieties side by side within the one dual row using a whole-stalk dual-row double-disc cane planter.

Experiment 2: Sugarcane varieties Q200[Ⓛ] and Q208[Ⓛ] were planted in pure and mixed plots on 1.5m rows. The mixed plots were established by planting alternate rows with a different variety.

Experiment 3: Sugarcane varieties Q200[Ⓛ], Q208[Ⓛ] and KQ228[Ⓛ] were planted in pure and mixed plots on 1.6m rows. The mixed plots were established by planting alternate rows with a different variety.

Experiment 4: This is a repeat planting of Experiment 1 established in a different cane field. Sugarcane varieties Q190[Ⓛ] and Q241[Ⓛ] were planted in pure and mixed plots on 1.8m dual rows. The mixed plots were established by either planting alternate rows with a different variety or by planting the two varieties side by side within the one dual row using a whole-stalk dual-row double-disc cane planter.

Results : For all but the second ratoon in experiment four there was no significant differences between pure and mixed treatments for yield components (only sugar yield has been presented) and net revenue.

Planting alternate rows of Q190[Ⓛ] and Q241[Ⓛ] produced a significantly higher yield and net revenue than a pure stand of Q241[Ⓛ] in the 2nd ratoon of experiment four. Planting Q190[Ⓛ] and Q241[Ⓛ] together in dual rows also produced a significantly higher net revenue than a pure stand of Q241[Ⓛ] in the 2nd ratoon of experiment four.

Discussion: A monoclonal farming system can leave the sugar industry exposed to significant yield and financial losses whenever a new pest or disease problem occurs. Changing from a monoclonal to a multi-clone farming system might be a useful strategy to reduce the speed of spread and the overall yield losses associated with new disease outbreaks. The outbreak of Orange Rust caused major losses to the Australian sugar industry when it affected Q124. If prior to the outbreak of Orange Rust growers had adopted a planting system where they only planted Q124 in every second row on their farms the losses may not have been as severe. The same could have applied to the outbreak of Smut.

By adopting a multi-clone farming system on wide rows it would be relatively easy to follow only every alternate row if a new pest or disease affected one variety. The remaining row would benefit from the 'skip row' effect and the overall reduction in farm yield should not be as significant as is the case in the current monoclonal system.

The variety Q241[Ⓛ] has caused significant milling problems due to unusual levels of long fibres. It may be the case that if Q241[Ⓛ] was planted in a multi-clone farming system milling problems with this variety could be overcome.

Conclusions: Although limited, the data collected from these four experiments indicates that changing from a monoclonal farming system to a multi-clone system has no apparent negative affect on yield or profit. If a new pest or disease outbreak occurs, this system may bring significant benefits to the sugar industry. More research into this topic could reveal other benefits. This work builds on earlier research reported by Spaul et al, 2006; Cadet et el, 2006; Raman Kapur et el, 1989; Nazir et el, 1997 and Simpson et el, 2013.

Copyright © 2015 Sugar Research Australia Ltd. All rights reserved. No part of this information sheet may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior permission of SRA. Disclaimer: In this disclaimer a reference to 'we', 'us' or 'our' means SRA and our directors, officers, agents and employees. Although we do our best to present information that is correct and accurate, we make no warranties, guarantees or representations about the suitability, reliability, currency or accuracy of the information we present in this information sheet, for any purposes. Subject to any terms implied by law and which cannot be excluded, we accept no responsibility for any loss, damage, cost or expense incurred by you as a result of the use of, or reliance on, any materials and information appearing in this information sheet. You, the user, accept sole responsibility and risk associated with the use and results of the information appearing in this information sheet, and you agree that we will not be liable for any loss or damage whatsoever (including through negligence) arising out of, or in connection with the use of this information sheet. We recommend that you contact our staff before acting on any information provided in this information sheet. Warning: Our tests, inspections and recommendations should not be relied on without further, independent inquiries. They may not be accurate, complete or applicable for your particular needs for many reasons, including (for example) SRA being unaware of other matters relevant to individual crops, the analysis of unrepresentative samples or the influence of environmental, managerial or other factors on production.

Table 1. Plant and first-ratoon sugar yields and net revenue for experiment 1.

| Treatment | Plant | | 1 st Ratoon | |
|--|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) |
| Q190 [Ⓛ] | 9.9 ^A | 1493 ^A | 13.4 ^A | 2870 ^A |
| Q190 [Ⓛ] and Q241 [Ⓛ] mixed every second row | 9.9 ^A | 1523 ^A | 12.3 ^A | 2560 ^A |
| Q190 [Ⓛ] and Q241 [Ⓛ] mixed within each dual row | 9.7 ^A | 1499 ^A | 12.5 ^A | 2614 ^A |
| Q241 [Ⓛ] | 9.2 ^A | 1433 ^A | 12.0 ^A | 2515 ^A |

Means in columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different. Revenue base on a sugar price of \$400 per tonne.

Table 2. Plant crop sugar yields and net revenue for experiment 2.

| Treatment | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|
| Q200 [Ⓛ] | 14.2 ^A | 3001 ^A |
| Q200 [Ⓛ] and Q208 [Ⓛ] mixed every second row | 15.6 ^A | 3416 ^A |
| Q208 [Ⓛ] | 17.6 ^A | 3768 ^A |

Means in columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different. Sugar price \$400.

Table 3. Plant, 1st, 2nd and 3rd ratoon sugar yields and net revenue for experiment 3.

| Treatment | Plant | | 1 st Ratoon | | 2 nd Ratoon | | 3 rd Ratoon | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) |
| Q200 [Ⓛ] | 16.2 ^A | 3711 ^A | 13.1 ^{AB} | 2954 ^{AB} | 11.8 ^A | 2549 ^A | 7.9 ^B | 1568 ^B |
| Q200 [Ⓛ] and Q208 [Ⓛ] mixed every second row | 16.9 ^A | 3802 ^A | 14.0 ^A | 3131 ^A | 13.0 ^A | 2727 ^A | 9.9 ^{AB} | 1972 ^{AB} |
| Q200 [Ⓛ] and KQ228 [Ⓛ] mixed every second row | 15.6 ^A | 3598 ^A | 11.9 ^{AB} | 2603 ^{AB} | 10.7 ^A | 2285 ^A | 9.3 ^{AB} | 1940 ^{AB} |
| Q208 [Ⓛ] | 16.2 ^A | 3686 ^A | 14.3 ^A | 3154 ^A | 14.2 ^A | 3066 ^A | 12.4 ^A | 2716 ^A |
| Q200 [Ⓛ] , Q208 [Ⓛ] and KQ228 [Ⓛ] mixed every third row | 14.1 ^A | 3250 ^A | 12.3 ^{AB} | 2740 ^{AB} | 12.0 ^A | 2629 ^A | 9.3 ^{AB} | 1942 ^{AB} |
| Q208 [Ⓛ] and KQ228 [Ⓛ] mixed every second row | 14.8 ^A | 3359 ^A | 11.4 ^{AB} | 2530 ^{AB} | 12.2 ^A | 2650 ^A | 10.8 ^{AB} | 2329 ^{AB} |
| KQ228 [Ⓛ] | 13.8 ^A | 3065 ^A | 10.8 ^B | 2407 ^B | 12.3 ^A | 2666 ^A | 9.3 ^{AB} | 2037 ^{AB} |

Means in columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different. Sugar price \$400.

Table 4. Plant, 1st and 2nd Ratoon sugar yields and net revenue for experiment 4.

| Treatment | Plant | | 1 st Ratoon | | 2 nd Ratoon | |
|--|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|
| | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) | Sugar (t/ha) | Net Revenue (\$/ha) |
| Q190 [Ⓛ] | 14.0 ^A | 2744 ^A | 12.1 ^A | 2349 ^A | 12.1 ^{AB} | 2606 ^{AB} |
| Q190 [Ⓛ] and Q241 [Ⓛ] mixed every second row | 14.7 ^A | 2851 ^A | 14.6 ^A | 2731 ^A | 13.5 ^A | 2856 ^A |
| Q190 [Ⓛ] and Q241 [Ⓛ] mixed within each dual row | 13.2 ^A | 2627 ^A | 12.6 ^A | 2300 ^A | 12.9 ^{AB} | 2778 ^A |
| Q241 [Ⓛ] | 13.4 ^A | 2547 ^A | 15.3 ^A | 2793 ^A | 10.4 ^B | 2199 ^B |

Means in columns followed by the same letter are not significantly different. Sugar price \$400.

