Studies on Advancing Berries Maturation and Promoting Grapes Quality of Some Grapevine Cultivars Grown Under Minia Region Conditions

Faissal F. Ahmed ¹; Ahmed, H. Abdelaal²; Ahmed A.E.M. Seleem ³ and Mohamed H.M. Atta ³

¹Hort. Dept. Fac. of Agric. Minia Univ. Egypt ² Hort. Dept. Fac. of Agric. Al- Azhar Univ. Sadat branch ³ Hort. Dept. Fac. of Agric. Al- Azhar Univ. Assiut branch Faissalfadel@yahoo.com

Abstract: Maturation date, yield / vine, berries colouration % berries, shattering %, cluster weight, total anthocyanins and both physical and chemical characteristics of grapevine cv., Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless grown under Minia region conditions in response to treating the clusters with protone (10% ABA) at 250 to 1000 ppm, ethrel at 250 ppm and amino acids at 1 % either applied alone or in different combinations were investigated during 2017 and 2018 seasons. Single and combined applications of protone at 250 to 1000 ppm, ethrel at 250 ppm and amino acids at 1% once to veraison stage when approximately 10% of the berries on 50% of the clusters had softened resulted in measurable advancement in maturation date and promotion on berries colouration and berries quality compared to the control. In ascending order the best materials in this respect were amino acids, protone and Ethrel. Combined application were favourable than using each material alone in hastening fruit maturation and improving berries quality. Yield as well as weights of cluster and berries were unaffected by the present treatments. The most early in maturation date grape cvs could be arranged as follows in descending order Flame Red Globe and Crimson. The best results with regard to berries quality parameters were recorded on grapevine cvs crimson seedless, Flame seedless and Red Globe, in descending order. For solving the problem of uneven colouration of the berries in the clusters of Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless grapevines grown under Upper Egypt region conditions, it is suggested to subject the clusters once at veraison stage when approximately 10% of the berries on 50% of the clusters on each vine had softened with a mixture of ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1%.

[Faissal F. Ahmed; Ahmed, H. Abdelaal; Ahmed A.E.M. Seleem and Mohamed H.M. Atta. **Studies on Advancing Berries Maturation and Promoting Grapes Quality of Some Grapevine Cultivars Grown Under Minia Region Conditions.** N Y Sci J 2019;12(1):30-39]. ISSN 1554-0200 (print); ISSN 2375-723X (online). http://www.sciencepub.net/newyork. 4. doi:10.7537/marsnys120119.04.

Keywords: Ethrel, protone; ABA, Amino acids, Flame seedless, Red Globe, crimson, berries maturation and colouration berries quality, anthocyanins.

1. Introduction

Many efforst were done for solving the problems of irregular colouraiton of coloured grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless under hot climates Nowadays, several trials were conducted to use amino acids as replacement of Ethrel and protone for advancing maturation date and promoting berries colouration grapevine cvs (**Davies, 1980**). The occurrence of this problem had negative effects on marketing of the fruits to local and foreign markets (**Orth** *et al.*, **1993**; **Taiz and Zeiger, 2002. Zhang** *et al.*, **2009 and Dal** *et al.*, **2010**).

Previous studies showed that using amino acids (Ahmed *et al.*, 2012; Abdelaal, 2012; Abdelaal *et al.*, 2013; El- Khawaga, 2014; Mohamed, 2014; Abdel aziz et al., 2017 and Mohamed, 2017); ethrel (Liu *et al.*, 2002, Omar and Girgis, 2005, El- Halaby, 2006; El- Sayed, 2007; Kassem, *et al.*, 2011; Aly, 2017 and Ibrahiem, 2018) and ABA (Geny et al., 2005; Koyama, 2010; Giribadi *et al.*, 2010; Strydom, 2014, Ferrara *et al.*, 2015, Yamamoto *et al.*, 2015 Lichter *et al.*, 2015, Casterllarin *et al.*, 2016, Aly, 2017 and Ibrahiem, 2018) were very effective in advancing maturation date, berries colouration and grapes quality in different grape cvs.

The merit of this study was examining the effect of single and combined applications of amino acids, ethrel and protone as a source of ABA on maturation date, berries colouration and quality of berries in grapevines cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless grown under Minia region conditions.

2. Material and Methods

This study was carried out during the two consecutive seasons of 2017 and 2018 on ninety uniform in vigour own rooted 11 years old of grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless and grown in a private vineyard, namely El Karam, Talla village, Minia district, Minia Governorate where the texture of the soil is clay.

The selected vines are planted at 1.5×3 meters apart. The chosen vines were trained by spur pruning system leaving 72 eyes/ vine (12 fruiting spurs x 5 eyes plus six replacement spurs x two eyes) using Gable supporting method. Winter pruning was conducted on the first week of Jan. during both seasons. Surface irrigation system was followed using Nile water containing 50 ppm salinity.

The selected vines (90 vines) received the same horticultural practiced that were already applied in the vineyard except application of Ethrel, proton and amino acid. These practices including the application of 10 tons FYM, (0.3% N), 240 kg ammonium nitrate, 150 kg calcium superphosphate $(15.5 \% P_2O_5)$ and 200 kg potassium sulphate (48 % K₂O) per one fedddan annually. F.Y.M was added once at the middle of Jan. Nitrogen fertilizer was added at three unequal batches as 37.5 % just after growth start, 37.5 % just after berry setting and 25% just after harvesting. Phosphate fertilizer was added once at the middle of Jan. Potassium fertilizers was applied twice at growth start (middle of Feb.) and again just after berry settin^g (middle of April) during both seasons. Another horticultural practices such as twice hoeings, irrigation, pinching and pest management were carried out as usual.

 Table (1): Mechanical, physical and chemical analysis of the tested orchard soil:

| Parameters | Values |
|--|--------|
| Particle size distribution | |
| Sand % | 10.0 |
| Silt % | 15.0 |
| Clay % | 75.0 |
| Texture garde | Clay |
| pH (1: 2.5 extract) | 7.59 |
| E.C. (1: 2.5 extract) (mmhos/ 1cm 25° C) | 0.81 |
| O.M. % | 2.11 |
| CaCO ₃ % | 2.4 |
| Macronutrients values | |
| Total N % | 0.09 |
| P (Olsen method, ppm) | 4.11 |
| K (ammonium acetate, ppm) | 419 |
| Mg (ppm) | 6.12 |
| S (ppm) | 2.20 |
| EDTA extractable micronutrients (ppm): | |
| Zn | 0.79 |
| Fe | 1.11 |
| Mn | 1.9 |
| Cu | 0.72 |

Soil is classified as clay in texture with water table depth not less than two meters deep. The results of orchard soil analysis according to Wilde *et al.*, (1985) are given in Table (1).

This experiment included thirty treatments from two factors (A & B). The first factor (A) comprised from three grapevine cvs namely a_1) Flame seedless, a_2) Red Globe and a_3) Crimson seedless. The second factor (B) contained the following ten treatments from single and combined applications of Ehrel at 250 ppm, proton at 250 to 1000 ppm and amino acids at 1%:

b₁- Control.

 b_2 - Spraying protone at 250 ppm (2.5 ml / L)

b₃- Spraying protone at 500 ppm (5.0 ml/L)

 $b_{4}\text{-}$ Spraying protone at 1000 ppm ($10\ \text{ml/L})$

b₅- Spraying ethrel at 250 ppm (0.52 ml/L)

b₆- Spraying amino acids at 1% ppm (10 ml/L)

b₇- Spraying protone at 500 ppm+ ethrel at 250

 b_8 - Spraying protone at 500 ppm + amino acids

b₉- Spraying ethrel at 250 ppm + amino acids

 b_{10} - Spraying ethrel at 250 ppm + protone at 500 ppm + amino acids at 1%

Each treatment was replicated three times, one vine per each. Ethrel (48%) and Proton (10% ABA) were sprayed once at veraison stage when approximately 10% of the berries per cluster on 50% of the number of vine clusters had softened.

Triton B as a wetting agent was added at 0.05%. Spraying was done till clusters runoff.

Randomized complete block design (RCBD) was followed where the three grapevine cvs and the ten ethrel, protone and amino acid treatments occupied the whole and suplot, respectively. Each treatment was replicated three times, one vine per each.

For realizing the objectives of this study, the following parameters were recorded in response to application of Ethrel, Proton and amino acid.

1-Maturation time

It was calculated when T.S.S./acid reached 25:1 2-Yield per vine

The yield of each vine was recorded in terms of weight (in kg.), then the average weight of cluster (g.) was recorded. Five clusters per each vine were taken at random for determinations of the following physical and chemical characteristics of the berries:

1– Percentage of berries colouration by dividing number of red coloured berries by total number of berries per cluster and multiplying the product by 100.

2- Percentage of berries shattering by counting the number of dropped berries by the total number of berries per cluster and multiple the product by 100.

3- Average berry weight (g.) and dimensions (longitudinal and equatorial, cm).

4- Percentage of total soluble solids in the juice by using handy refractometer.

5- Percentage of total acidity (as gram tartaric acid / 100 ml juice) by titration against 0.1 N NaOH using phenolphthalein as indicator (A.O.A.C, 2000).

6- The ratio between T.S.S. and acid.

7- Percentage of reducing sugars in the juice by using Lane and Eynon (1965) volumetric method as described in A.O.A.C. (2000).

8- Total phenols (A.O.A.C., 2000) and total anthocyanins in the berries by using ethyl alcohol and HCL method (mg /100 g F.W.) (Fulcki and

Francis, 1968).

The proper statistical analysis was done. Treatment means were compared using new L.S.D. test at 5% (according to **Mead** *et al.*, **1993**.

3. Results and Discussion

1- Maturation time

Data in Table (2) show the effect of single and combined application of protone, ethrel and amino acids on maturation date of grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

Table (2): Effect of single and combined applications of protone, Ethrel and amino acids on maturation time and yield / vine of grapevines cvs Flame seedless Red Globe and C0rimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

| | Maturatio | on time | | | | | | | Yield/ vine (kg.) | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| Protone, ethrel and amino | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | |
| acid treatments (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a2 Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a2 Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | |
| b1 control | 30/6 | 25/7 | 26/8 | | 2/7 | 30/7 | 31/8 | | 10 | 16 | 12 | 12.7 | 9.5 | 17.1 | 12.9 | 13.2 | |
| b2 Proton at 250 ppm | 22/6 | 17/7 | 18/8 | | 24/6 | 22/7 | 23/8 | | 10 | 16 | 12 | 12.7 | 9.4 | 17.0 | 12.9 | 13.1 | |
| b3 Protone at 500 ppm | 19/6 | 14/7 | 15/8 | | 21/6 | 19/7 | 20/8 | | 9.9 | 16 | 12 | 12.7 | 9.4 | 17.0 | 12.8 | 13.1 | |
| b4 Protone 1000 ppm | 16/6 | 11/7 | 12/8 | | 18/6 | 16/7 | 16/8 | | 9.8 | 16 | 12 | 12.7 | 9.4 | 17.0 | 12.8 | 13.1 | |
| b5 Ethrel at 250 ppm | 9/6 | 4/7 | 5/8 | | 11/6 | 9/7 | 21/8 | | 9.8 | 16 | 11.9 | 12.6 | 9.4 | 17.0 | 12.8 | 13.1 | |
| b6 Amino acids at 1% | 27/6 | 20/7 | 23/8 | | 30/6 | 27/7 | 27/8 | | 10.0 | 16 | 11.9 | 12.7 | 9.5 | 16.9 | 12.8 | 13.0 | |
| b7 Protone at 500 ppm + Ethrel | 2/6 | 27/6 | 28/7 | | 4/6 | 2/7 | 3/8 | | 9.7 | 16 | 11.9 | 12.5 | 9.4 | 16.9 | 12.8 | 13.0 | |
| b ₈ Protone at 500 ppm + amino acid | 7/6 | 2/7 | 3/8 | | 9/6 | 7/7 | 8/8 | | 9.8 | 15.8 | 11.8 | 12.5 | 9.4 | 16.9 | 12.8 | 13.0 | |
| b ₉ Ethrel + amino acids | 5/6 | 30/6 | 1/8 | | 7/6 | 6/7 | 5/8 | | 9.8 | 15.8 | 11.8 | 12.5 | 9.5 | 16.9 | 12.8 | 13.0 | |
| B10 Ethrel + 500 ppm proton + amino\ | 29/5 | 25/6 | 25/7 | | 31/5 | 28/6 | 1/8 | | 9.8 | 15.8 | 11.8 | 12.5 | 9.5 | 16.9 | 12.8 | 13.0 | |
| Mean (A) | 8/6 | 26/6 | - | | | | | | 9.9 | 15.9 | 11.9 | | 9.4 | 17.0 | 12.8 | 13.0 | |
| New L.S.D. at 5% | А | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | A | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | |
| INCW L.S.D. at 5% | | | | | | | | | 2.1 | Ns | Ns | | 2.3 | NS | NS | | |

It is clear from the obtained data that maturation time was greatly varied among the three grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless. It was advanced in grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless in descending order. The early in maturation time grapevine was Flame seedless and the late one was Crimson seedless. Grapevine cvs Red Glove was in between. These results were true during both seasons.

Maturation time was materially hastened with using protone at 250 to 1000 ppm, ethrel at 250 ppm and amino acid at 1% either applied alone or in combination compared to the control treatment. Maturation date was measurably advanced gradually with increasing concentrations of protone from 250 to 1000 ppm. Using amino acids at 1%, protone at 250 to 1000 ppm and ethrel at 250 ppm, in ascending maturation date. Combined applications of protone, ethrel and amino acids was materially advanced maturation time than using each material alone. Combined application using two materials together gave an outstanding promotion on maturation time than using each material alone. The best double application treatment was the application of protone at 500 ppm plus ethrel at 250 ppm. Using protone at 500 ppm, ethrel at 250 ppm and amino acid at 1% gave a great advancement on maturation date. These results were true during both seasons.

Maturation date was highly affected by the interaction between protone, ethrel, amino acids and different grapevine cvs. The great advancement on maturation date was recorded on grapevine cv Flame seedless treated with protone at 500 ppm, ethrel at 250 ppm and amino acid at 1% together. Under such promised treatment, maturation date was 29 and 31 May during both seasons, respectively. The untreated Crimson seedless grapevines matured on 26 and 31 August during both seasons, respectively. Similar trend was noticed during both seasons.

2- The yield / vine

Data in Table (2) show the effect of single and combined applications of protone, ethrel and amino acids on the yield/ vine of grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

Yield/ vine was significantly affected among the three grapevine cvs. It was significantly maximized in grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Crimson seedless and Red Globe, in ascending order. The grapevine cv Red Globe recorded the higher yield relative to the other grapevine cvs Flame seedless and Crimson seedless. The grapevine cv Crimson seedless ranked the second position in this respect. The grapevine cv. Flame seedless occupied the last position in this connection. Similar trend was noticed during both seasons.

Single and combined applications of protone at 250 to 1000 ppm, ethrel at 250 ppm amino acids at 1% caused unsignificant promotion on the yield / vine relative to the control treatment. These results were true during both seasons.

The interaction between proline, ethrel and amino acids from one side and the grapevine cvs

from the other side had significant effect on the yield. The maximum yield (16.0 & 17.0 kg) was recorded on the untreated vine cv. Red Globe during 2017 and 2018 seasons, respectively. These results were true during both seasons.

3- The percentage of berries colouration

Data in Table (3) show the effect of single and combined application of protone, ethrel and amino acids on berries colouraiton % of grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

Table (3): Effect of single and combined applications of protone, Ethrel and amino acids on the percentage of berries colouration and shattering of grapevines cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

| | Berries c | olourati | on % | | | | | | Berries shattering % | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| Protone, ethrel and amino | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | 2017 | | | 2018 | | | | | |
| acid treatments (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a2 Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | |
| b1 control | 70.5 | 50.5 | 40.5 | 53.8 | 71.2 | 51.2 | 41.4 | 54.6 | 6.5 | 2.9 | 8.9 | 5.8 | 7.0 | 3.1 | 9.2 | 6.4 | |
| b2 Proton at 250 ppm | 75.0 | 54.9 | 45.0 | 58.3 | 75.8 | 55.9 | 45.9 | 59.2 | 6.7 | 3.1 | 9.1 | 6.3 | 7.3 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 6.7 | |
| b3 Protone at 500 ppm | 77.1 | 57.0 | 47.0 | 60.4 | 78.0 | 58.0 | 47.8 | 61.3 | 6.8 | 3.1 | 9.2 | 6.4 | 7.4 | 3.3 | 9.5 | 6.7 | |
| b ₄ Protone 1000 ppm | 80.0 | 59.0 | 55.1 | 64.7 | 80.9 | 60.0 | 55.9 | 65.6 | 6.9 | 3.2 | 9.3 | 6.5 | 7.5 | 3.4 | 9.6 | 6.8 | |
| b5 Ethrel at 250 ppm | 82.9 | 61.6 | 51.6 | 65.4 | 84.0 | 62.6 | 52.5 | 66.4 | 7.0 | 3.3 | 9.4 | 6.6 | 7.5 | 3.4 | 9.6 | 6.8 | |
| b6 Amino acids at 1% | 72.6 | 52.6 | 42.9 | 56.0 | 73.6 | 53.7 | 44.0 | 57.1 | 6.6 | 3.0 | 9.0 | 6.2 | 7.2 | 3.2 | 9.3 | 6.6 | |
| b7 Protone at 500 ppm + Ethrel | 90.0 | 70.0 | 64.5 | 74.8 | 90.9 | 70.9 | 65.9 | 75.9 | 7.3 | 3.6 | 9.0 | 6.6 | 7.7 | 3.5 | 9.7 | 7.0 | |
| b ₈ Protone at 500 ppm + amino acid | 85.0 | 64.0 | 55.0 | 68.0 | 86.0 | 65.0 | 56.0 | 69.0 | 7.1 | 3.4 | 9.5 | 6.7 | 7.6 | 3.5 | 9.6 | 6.9 | |
| b9 Ethrel + amino acids | 87.0 | 66.0 | 57.0 | 70.0 | 87.9 | 67.0 | 57.8 | 70.9 | 7.2 | 3.5 | 9.5 | 6.7 | 7.7 | 3.5 | 9.7 | 7.0 | |
| B10 Ethrel + 500 ppm proton + amino\ | 92.1 | 71.9 | 66.0 | 76.7 | 93.0 | 74.9 | 69.9 | 78.3 | 7.4 | 3.4 | 9.5 | 6.8 | 7.7 | 3.6 | 9.7 | 7.0 | |
| Mean (A) | 81.2 | 60.4 | 51.9 | | 82.1 | 62.4 | 53.7 | | 7.0 | 3.3 | 9.2 | | 7.5 | 3.4 | 9.5 | | |
| New L.S.D. at 5% | А | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | A | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | |
| INCW L.S.D. at 570 | 1.1 | 1.7 | 2.9 | | 1.5 | 1.9 | 3.3 | | 1.9 | NS | NS | | 2.1 | NS | NS | | |

Percentage of berries colouration was significantly varied among the three grapevine cvs namely Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless. Grapevine cv Flame seedless recorded the highest values of berries colouration % among the other grapevines. The lowest values were recorded on the grapevine cv. Crimson seedless. These results were true during both seasons.

Single and combined applications of protone at 250 to 1000 ppm, ethrel at 250 ppm and amino acids at 1% significantly was followed by enhancing berries colouration compared to the check treatment. Increasing concentrations of protone from 250 to 1000 ppm significantly caused a gradual promotion on berries colouration % in the three grapevine cvs. Treating the clusters of the three grapevine cvs with ethrel, protone and amino acids, in descending was significantly responsible for advancing berries colouration %. Combined applications of the previous three materials were significantly favourable in enhancing berries colouration than application of each material alone. Using the three

materials namely ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1% gave the maximum values of berries colouration %. The untreated vines produced the lowest values. These results were true during both seasons.

Percentage of berries colouration was significantly enhanced due to the investigated interaction. The maximum values of berries colourations (92.1 & 93.0%) were recorded on the grapevine cv. Flame seedless treated with ethrel at 250 ppm + protone at 500 ppm + amino acids at 1% during both seasons, respectively. The untreated Crimson seedless grapevine recorded the lowest values (40.5 & 41.4%) during 2017 and 2018 seasons, respectively. Similar trend was noticed during both seasons.

4- The percentage of berries shattering

Data in Table (4) show the effect of single and combined application of protone, ethrel and amino acids on the percentage of berries shattering of grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

Berries shattering % was significantly varied among the three grapevine cvs. It was maximized in grapevine cv Crimson seedless grapevines and minimized in grapevine cv Red Globe. These results were true during both seasons.

Varying ethrel, protone and amino acid treatments had no significant effect on the percentage of berry shattering. These results were true during both seasons.

The investigated interaction had significant effect on the percentage of berries shattering during both seasons. The maximum values of berries shattering % were observed in grapevine cv Crimson seedless regardless the application of ethrel, proton and amino acid treatment. The lowest values were recorded on grapevines cv. Red Globe regardless the application of the studied materials. These results was nearly the same during both seasons.

5- The average cluster weight

Data in Table (5) show the effect of single and combined application of protone, ethrel and amino acids on the average cluster weight of grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

Varying grapevine cvs had significant effect on the average cluster weight. The maximum values were recorded on grapevine cv. Red Globe grapevine cv. Flame seedless grape cv gave the minimum values. These results were true during both seasons.

Average cluster weight was significantly unaffected by varying ethrel, protone and amino acid treatment during both seasons.

The studied interaction had significant effect on the average cluster weight. Using any treatments with Red Globe grapevine cvs gave he maximum values. The grapevine cv Flame seedless grapevines treated with any treatment gave the lowest values. Similar trend was noticed during both seasons.

6- Physical and chemical characteristics of the berries

Data in Tables (5 & 6) show the effect of single and combined application of protone, ethrel and amino acids on the TSS, reducing sugars %, T.S.S/ acid Titratable acidity %, Total phenols, Total anthocyanins in the juice and cluster of berry weight and dimensions of grapevine cvs Flame, Red Globe and Crimson during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

6-1 Berry weight and dimensions

Averages berries weight and dimensions (equatorial and longitudinal) were significantly varied among the three grapevines cvs. The maximum values were recorded on grapevine cv Red Globe. Similar trend was noticed during both seasons.

Average berry weight and dimensions were significantly unaffected by ethrel, protone and amino acid treatments during both seasons.

Significant effect on berry weight and dimensions was attributed to the investigated interaction. The maximum values were recorded on grapevine cv Red Globe regardless the application of ethrel, protone and amino acid treatments. The grapevine cvs Flame seedless sand Crimson seedless regardless the studied treatment recorded the lowest values. These results were true during both seasons.

6-2 Total soluble solids, reducing sugars % and T.S.S/ acid

Varying grapevine cvs had significant effect on T.S.S. %, reducing sugars % and T.S.S. /acid in the grapes. The maximum values were recorded on grapevine cv. Crimson seedless, Grapevine cv Red Globe achieved the lowest values. Grapevine cv. Flame seedless occupied the second position in this respect. These results were true during both seasons.

Single and combined applications of ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 250 to 1000 ppm and amino acids at 1% significantly enhanced T.S.S. %, reducing sugars and T.S.S./ acid relative to control. The promotion on these chemical traits was significantly in proportional to the increase in protone concentrations from 250 to 1000 ppm. Using ethrel, protone and amino acids, in descending order was significantly very effective in enhancing these chemical characteristics. These results were true during both seasons.

Total soluble solids %, reducing sugars % and T.S.S./ acid were significantly affected by the interaction between grapevines, cvs and material treatments. The maximum values were recorded on the grapevine cv. Crimson seedless subjected to ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1%. The lowest values were recorded on untreated grapevine cv Red Globe. These results were true during both seasons.

6-3 Titratable acidity %

Tritratable acidity was significantly varied among the three grapevine cvs. It was maximized in grapevine cv Red Globe and minimized in grapevine cv. Flame seedless in the first season and Crimson seedless in the second one. Similar trend was noticed during both seasons.

It was significantly reduced with single and combined applications of ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 250 to 1000 ppm and amino acids at 1% relative to the control. There was a gradual reduction on such chemical characteristic with increasing protone concentrations from 250 to 1000 ppm. Using ethrel at 250 ppm was significantly favourable than the other two material in reducing titratable acidity protone significantly ranked the second position and amino acids occupied the last position in this respect. Combined application were significantly favourable than using each material alone in this connection. The lowest values were recorded on the vines treated with ethrel at 250 ppm, proton at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1%.

It is worth to mention that the lowest values of titratable acidity were recorded on grapevine cv. Flame seedless treated with ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1%. The highest values were recorded on untreated Red Globe grapevines. These results were true during both seasons.

6-3 Total phenols

Total phenols in the juice was significantly varied among the three grapevine cvs. It was maximized in grapevine cv Red Globe and minimized in grapevine cv Crimson seedless. These results were true during both seasons.

Total phenols was significant declined with using ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 250 to 1000 ppm and amino acids at % either application alone or in combination. Using ethrel was significantly favourable than application of protone or amino acids in reducing total phenols. The lowest values were recorded on the vine that received ethrel at 250 ppm, potone at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1%. The untreated vines produced the maximum values.

The studied combination had significant effect on the juice total phenols. The lowest values of total phenols were recorded on grapevine cv Crimson seedless treated with ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1%. The untreated Red Globe grapevines produced the highest values. Similar trend were detected during both seasons.

6-4 Total anthocyanins in the juice

Varying grapevine cvs had significant effect on total anthocyanins in the juice. The highest content was observed in grapevine cv. Flame seedless. Grapevine cv. Crimson seedless gave the lowest values. In between effect was appeared in grapevine cv. Red Globe grape cv. Similar trend was noticed during both seasons.

It is evident from the obtained data that subjecting the vines of the tree grapevine cvs once with ethrel at 250 ppm, prone at 250 to 1000 ppm and amino acids at 1% either singly or in combinations significantly was very effective in enhancing the total anthocyanins relative to the control. The promotion was significantly associated with using amino acids, protone and ethrel, in ascending order. Combined applications were preferable than using each material alone in enhancing total anthocyanins,. The maximum values were detected on the vines that treated with ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1%. The untreated vines produced the lowest values.

The highest values of total anthocyanins were recorded on grapevine cv. Flame seedless treated with ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 500 ppm and amino acids at 1%. The untreated Crimson seedless grapevine gave the lowest values. Similar trend was noticed during both seasons.

Table (4): Effect of single and combined applications of protone, Ethrel and amino acids on average cluster weight and berry weight of grapevines cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

| | Average | cluster w | eight | | | | | | Average berry weight | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| Protone, ethrel and amino | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | |
| acid treatments (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | |
| b1 control | 450.0 | 994.0 | 600.0 | 681.3 | 471.0 | 998.0 | 611.3 | 693.3 | 5.91 | 11.21 | 4.22 | 7.11 | 5.94 | 11.31 | 4.50 | 7.25 | |
| b2 Proton at 250 ppm | 450.0 | 994.0 | 600.0 | 681.3 | 471.0 | 998 | 611.3 | 693.4 | 5.91 | 11.21 | 4.22 | 7.11 | 5.93 | 11.30 | 4.45 | 7.24 | |
| b ₃ Protone at 500 ppm | 449.0 | 993.0 | 599.0 | 680.3 | 470.0 | 997 | 611.3 | 692.8 | 5.90 | 11.20 | 4.21 | 7.10 | 5.93 | 11.30 | 4.48 | 7.24 | |
| b ₄ Protone 1000 ppm | 449.0 | 993.0 | 599.0 | 680.3 | 470.0 | 997 | 611.0 | 692.7 | 5.89 | 11.19 | 4.20 | 7.09 | 5.92 | 11.29 | 4.47 | 7.23 | |
| b5 Ethrel at 250 ppm | 449.0 | 993.0 | 598.0 | 680.3 | 469.0 | 996 | 610.0 | 691.7 | 5.89 | 11.19 | 4.20 | 7.09 | 5.92 | 11.29 | 4.47 | 7.23 | |
| b ₆ Amino acids at 1% | 450 | 994 | 600 | 681.3 | 471 | 998 | 611.3 | 693.4 | 5.91 | 11.21 | 4.22 | 7.11 | 5.94 | 11.31 | 4.50 | 7.25 | |
| b ₇ Protone at 500 ppm + Ethrel | 448.0 | 992.0 | 597.0 | 679.0 | 467.0 | 994 | 608 | 689.7 | 5.87 | 11.17 | 4.17 | 7.07 | 5.90 | 11.27 | 4.45 | 7.21 | |
| b ₈ Protone at 500 ppm + amino acid | 448.0 | 992.0 | 597.0 | 679.0 | 468.0 | 995 | 609 | 690.7 | 5.88 | 11.18 | 4.19 | 7.08 | 5.91 | 11.28 | 4.46 | 7.22 | |
| b9 Ethrel + amino acids | 448.0 | 992.0 | 597.0 | 679.0 | 468.0 | 995 | 609 | 690.7 | 5.88 | 11.18 | 4.18 | 7.09 | 5.91 | 11.28 | 4.46 | 7.22 | |
| B10 Ethrel + 500 ppm proton + amino\ | 446.0 | 990.0 | 546.0 | 677.3 | 465 | 993 | 608 | 688.7 | 5.85 | 11.16 | 4.15 | 7.05 | 5.88 | 11.25 | 4.43 | 7.19 | |
| Mean (A) | 449.7 | 992.7 | 598.3 | | 469.0 | 996.1 | 610.0 | | 5.89 | 11.19 | 4.20 | | 5.92 | 11.92 | 4.47 | | |
| New L.S.D. at 5% | Α | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | Α | В | AB | | |
| INCW L.S.D. at 370 | 9.1 | NS | 13.1 | | 8.9 | NS | 12.8 | | 1.11 | NS | 1.81 | | 1.01 | NS | 1.41 | | |

| Table (5): Effect of single and combined applications of protone, Ethrel and amino acids on a | verage |
|---|---------|
| longitudinal and equatorial of berry of grapevines cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson se | eedless |
| during 2017 and 2018 seasons. | |

| | Average | berry lo | ngitudinal (cr | n) | | | | | Average berry equatorial (cm) | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| Protone, ethrel and amino | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | |
| acid treatments (B) | A ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | |
| b1 control | 2.11 | 2.51 | 2.1 | 2.24 | 2.11 | 2.49 | 2.13 | 2.24 | 1.79 | 2.49 | 1.71 | 2.00 | 1.81 | 2.51 | 1.72 | 2.01 | |
| b2 Proton at 250 ppm | 2.10 | 2.50 | 2.10 | 2.23 | 2.10 | 2.49 | 2.13 | 2.24 | 1.79 | 2.49 | 1.72 | 2.00 | 1.82 | 2.52 | 1.73 | 2.02 | |
| b3 Protone at 500 ppm | 2.10 | 2.50 | 2.10 | 2.23 | 2.10 | 2.49 | 2.13 | 2.24 | 1.79 | 2.48 | 1.71 | 1.99 | 1.81 | 2.51 | 1.72 | 2.01 | |
| b ₄ Protone 1000 ppm | 2.09 | 2.49 | 2.09 | 2.22 | 2.10 | 2.44 | 2.13 | 2.22 | 1.79 | 2.48 | 1.71 | 1.99 | 1.81 | 2.31 | 1.72 | 1.95 | |
| b ₅ Ethrel at 250 ppm | 2.09 | 2.49 | 2.09 | 2.22 | 2.09 | 2.43 | 2.12 | 2.21 | 1.78 | 2.47 | 1.70 | 1.98 | 1.80 | 2.30 | 1.71 | 1.94 | |
| b6 Amino acids at 1% | 2.11 | 2.51 | 2.11 | 2.24 | 2.11 | 2.50 | 2.14 | 2.25 | 1.80 | 2.50 | 1.72 | 2.01 | 1.82 | 2.52 | 1.73 | 2.02 | |
| b ₇ Protone at 500 ppm + Ethrel | 2.07 | 2.47 | 2.06 | 2.20 | 2.09 | 2.42 | 2.11 | 2.21 | 1.77 | 2.46 | 1.65 | 1.97 | 1.79 | 2.29 | 1.69 | 1.92 | |
| b ₈ Protone at 500 ppm + amino acid | 2.08 | 2.48 | 2.08 | 2.21 | 2.09 | 2.42 | 2.11 | 2.21 | 1.78 | 2.47 | 1.70 | 1.98 | 1.79 | 2.29 | 1.70 | 1.93 | |
| b9 Ethrel + amino acids | 2.10 | 2.50 | 2.07 | 2.22 | 2.09 | 2.42 | 2.11 | 2.21 | 1.77 | 2.47 | 1.69 | 1.98 | 1.79 | 2.29 | 1.70 | 1.93 | |
| B10 Ethrel + 500 ppm proton + amino\ | 2.06 | 2.46 | 2.09 | 2.19 | 2.07 | 2.40 | 2.10 | 2.19 | 1.77 | 2.46 | 1.68 | 1.97 | 1.78 | 2.28 | 1.68 | 1.91 | |
| Mean (A) | 2.09 | 2.49 | 2.09 | | 2.10 | 2.45 | 2.12 | | 1.78 | 2.48 | 1.70 | | 1.80 | 2.38 | 1.71 | | |
| New L.S.D. at 5% | А | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | A | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | |
| 110W L.S.D. at 570 | 0.27 | NS | 0.31 | | 0.22 | NS | 0.25 | | 0.41 | NS | 0.61 | | 0.30 | NS | 0.59 | | |

Table (6): Effect of single and combined applications of protone, Ethrel and amino acids on the percentage of total soluble solids and reducing sugars in the grapes of grapevines cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

| | T.S.S. % | | | | | | | | Reducing sugars % | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | | |
| acid treatments (B) | A ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | |
| b1 control | 16.0 | 14.1 | 19.1 | 16.4 | 16.3 | 14.5 | 19.5 | 16.8 | 14.4 | 12.7 | 17.2 | 14.8 | 14.7 | 13.1 | 17.6 | 15.1 | |
| b2 Proton at 250 ppm | 16.8 | 14.9 | 19.9 | 17.2 | 17.1 | 15.3 | 20.3 | 17.6 | 15.1 | 13.4 | 17.9 | 15.5 | 15.4 | 13.8 | 18.3 | 15.8 | |
| b3 Protone at 500 ppm | 17.2 | 15.3 | 20.3 | 17.6 | 17.5 | 15.7 | 20.7 | 18.0 | 15.5 | 13.8 | 18.3 | 15.9 | 15.8 | 14.1 | 18.6 | 16.2 | |
| b ₄ Protone 1000 ppm | 17.5 | 15.6 | 20.6 | 17.9 | 17.9 | 16.1 | 21.1 | 18.4 | 15.8 | 14.0 | 18.5 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 14.5 | 19.0 | 16.5 | |
| b5 Ethrel at 250 ppm | 18.0 | 16.1 | 21.1 | 18.4 | 18.3 | 16.5 | 21.5 | 18.8 | 16.2 | 14.5 | 19.0 | 16.6 | 16.5 | 14.9 | 19.4 | 16.9 | |
| b6 Amino acids at 1% | 16.3 | 14.4 | 19.4 | 16.7 | 16.6 | 14.8 | 19.8 | 17.1 | 14.7 | 13.0 | 17.5 | 15.1 | 14.9 | 13.3 | 17.8 | 15.3 | |
| b7 Protone at 500 ppm + Ethrel | 19.1 | 17.2 | 22.2 | 19.5 | 19.4 | 17.6 | 22.6 | 19.9 | 17.2 | 15.5 | 20.0 | 17.6 | 17.5 | 15.8 | 20.3 | 17.9 | |
| b ₈ Protone at 500 ppm + amino acid | 18.5 | 16.6 | 21.6 | 18.9 | 18.8 | 17.0 | 22.0 | 19.3 | 16.7 | 14.9 | 19.4 | 17.0 | 16.9 | 15.3 | 19.8 | 17.3 | |
| b9 Ethrel + amino acids | 18.8 | 16.9 | 21.9 | 19.2 | 19.1 | 17.3 | 22.3 | 19.6 | 16.9 | 15.2 | 19.7 | 17.3 | 17.2 | 15.6 | 20.1 | 17.6 | |
| B10 Ethrel + 500 ppm proton + amino\ | 19.5 | 17.6 | 22.6 | 19.9 | 19.8 | 18.0 | 23.0 | 20.3 | 17.6 | 15.8 | 20.6 | 18.0 | 17.8 | 16.2 | 20.7 | 18.2 | |
| Mean (A) | 17.9 | 15.9 | 20.3 | | 18.1 | 16.3 | 21.3 | | 16.0 | 14.3 | 18.8 | | 16.3 | 14.7 | 19.2 | | |
| New L.S.D. at 5% | А | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | A | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | |
| New 1.5.D. at 570 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Table (7): Effect of single and combined applications of protone, Ethrel and amino acids on titratable acidity % and T.S.S. /acid of in the grapes of grapevines cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

| | Maturity | time | | | | | | | Yield/ vine (kg.) | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| Protone, ethrel and amino | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | |
| acid treatments (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a2 Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a2 Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | |
| b1 control | 0.640 | 0.738 | 0.569 | 0.649 | 0.657 | 0.755 | 0.589 | 0.667 | 25.0 | 19.1 | 33.6 | 25.9 | 24.8 | 19.2 | 33.1 | 25.7 | |
| b2 Proton at 250 ppm | 0.600 | 0.698 | 0.529 | 0.609 | 0.620 | 0.718 | 0.564 | 0.634 | 28.0 | 21.4 | 37.6 | 29.1 | 27.6 | 21.3 | 27.7 | 28.9 | |
| b ₃ Protone at 500 ppm | 0.580 | 0.678 | 0.509 | 0.589 | 0.600 | 0.698 | 0.544 | 0.614 | 29.7 | 22.6 | 39.9 | 30.7 | 39.2 | 22.5 | 38.1 | 32.2 | |
| b4 Protone 1000 ppm | 0.561 | 0.659 | 0.489 | 0.570 | 0.580 | 0.678 | 0.524 | 0.598 | 31.2 | 23.7 | 42.1 | 32.3 | 30.9 | 23.8 | 40.3 | 31.7 | |
| b5 Ethrel at 250 ppm | 0.541 | 0.639 | 0.469 | 0.550 | 0.560 | 0.658 | 0.504 | 0.574 | 33.3 | 25.2 | 45.0 | 34.5 | 32.7 | 25.1 | 42.7 | 33.4 | |
| b6 Amino acids at 1% | 0.620 | 0.700 | 0.549 | 0.623 | 0.640 | 0.738 | 0.584 | 0.654 | 30.8 | 20.6 | 35.3 | 28.9 | 36.0 | 20.1 | 34.0 | 26.7 | |
| b ₇ Protone at 500 ppm + Ethrel | 0.471 | 0.651 | 0.499 | 0.540 | 0.500 | 0.600 | 0.444 | 0.515 | 40.6 | 26.4 | 44.5 | 37.2 | 38.8 | 29.3 | 51.0 | 39.7 | |
| b ₈ Protone at 500 ppm + amino acid | 0.510 | 0.691 | 0.532 | 0.578 | 0.540 | 0.638 | 0.484 | 0.554 | 36.3 | 24.0 | 40.6 | 26.3 | 36.2 | 26.7 | 45.5 | 36.1 | |
| b ₉ Ethrel + amino acids | 0.490 | 0.671 | 0.512 | 0.558 | 0.520 | 0.618 | 0.464 | 0.534 | 35.4 | 25.2 | 42.8 | 35.5 | 36.7 | 28.0 | 48.1 | 37.6 | |
| B10 Ethrel + 500 ppm proton + amino\ | 0.451 | 0.630 | 0.472 | 0.518 | 0.480 | 0.582 | 0.424 | 0.495 | 43.2 | 27.9 | 47.0 | 39.4 | 41.3 | 31.0 | 54.3 | 42.2 | |
| Mean (A) | 0.546 | 0.697 | 0.562 | | 0.570 | 0.668 | 0.513 | | 33.3 | 23.6 | 40.8 | | 36.4 | 27.4 | 41.5 | | |
| New L.S.D. at 5% | А | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | A | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | |
| New 1.5.D. at 570 | 0.041 | 0.018 | 0.031 | | 0.039 | 0.017 | 0.030 | | 1.9 | 1.2 | 2.1 | | 2.0 | 1.0 | 1.7 | | |

| | Total phe | enols (n | ng/ g F.W.) | | | | | | Total anthocyanins (mg/gF.W.) | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------|-------------|--|
| Protone, ethrel and amino | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | 2017 | | | | 2018 | | | | |
| acid treatments (B) | A ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | a ₁ Flame | a ₂ Red | a ₃ Crimson | Mean (B) | |
| b1 control | 4.71 | 5.11 | 4.11 | 4.64 | 4.60 | 5.00 | 3.99 | 4.53 | 15.29 | 12.11 | 9.22 | 12.21 | 16.00 | 12.81 | 10.09 | 12.97 | |
| b2 Proton at 250 ppm | 4.20 | 4.60 | 3.60 | 4.14 | 4.18 | 4.58 | 3.57 | 4.11 | 18.50 | 15.32 | 12.43 | 15.42 | 20.10 | 16.91 | 14.19 | 17.07 | |
| b3 Protone at 500 ppm | 4.00 | 4.40 | 3.40 | 5.93 | 4.00 | 4.40 | 3.39 | 3.93 | 19.80 | 16.62 | 13.73 | 16.72 | 22.11 | 18.92 | 16.20 | 19.08 | |
| b ₄ Protone 1000 ppm | 3.00 | 4.20 | 3.20 | 3.73 | 3.71 | 4.11 | 3.10 | 3.64 | 21.81 | 17.91 | 15.02 | 18.01 | 25.00 | 21.81 | 19.09 | 22.00 | |
| b ₅ Ethrel at 250 ppm | 3.51 | 3.91 | 2.91 | 3.44 | 3.41 | 3.81 | 2.80 | 3.34 | 22.99 | 19.81 | 16.92 | 19.91 | 28.11 | 24.92 | 22.28 | 25.08 | |
| b6 Amino acids at 1% | 4.50 | 4.90 | 3.90 | 4.43 | 4.41 | 4.81 | 3.80 | 3.34 | 17.0 | 13.82 | 10.93 | 13.92 | 18.09 | 14.90 | 12.18 | 15.06 | |
| b ₇ Protone at 500 ppm + Ethrel | 2.88 | 3.28 | 2.28 | 2.81 | 2.71 | 3.11 | 2.10 | 2.64 | 28.31 | 25.1 | 22.21 | 25.21 | 35.1 | 31.91 | 29.14 | 32.07 | |
| b ₈ Protone at 500 ppm + amino acid | 3.30 | 3.70 | 2.70 | 3.23 | 3.20 | 3.60 | 2.59 | 3.13 | 25.00 | 21.82 | 18.93 | 21.92 | 29.96 | 26.77 | 24.05 | 26.84 | |
| b ₉ Ethrel + amino acids | 3.10 | 3.50 | 2.50 | 3.03 | 3.00 | 3.40 | 2.39 | 2.93 | 26.22 | 23.0 | 20.11 | 23.11 | 32.11 | 28.92 | 16.2 | 29.08 | |
| B10 Ethrel + 500 ppm proton + amino\ | 2.11 | 2.51 | 1.51 | 2.04 | 3.09 | 2.49 | 1.48 | 2.02 | 31.96 | 28.78 | 25.89 | 28.88 | 26.28 | 33.11 | 30.39 | 33.27 | |
| Mean (A) | 3.61 | 4.01 | 3.01 | | 3.53 | 3.93 | 2.92 | | 22.61 | 19.43 | 16.54 | | | 23.10 | 20.38 | | |
| New L.S.D. at 5% | А | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | A | В | AB | | А | В | AB | | |
| New 1.5.1. dt 570 | 0.14 | 0.16 | 0.28 | | 0.18 | 0.14 | 0.24 | | 0.22 | 1.00 | 1.73 | | 1.33 | 1.11 | 1.92 | | |

Table (8): Effect of single and combined applications of protone, Ethrel and amino acids on total phenols and total anthocyanins in the juice of grapevines cvs Flame seedless, red Globe and Crimson seedless during 2017 and 2018 seasons.

4. Discussion

1- Effect of protone and Ethrel:

The acceleration on maturation of Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless grapes due to application of Ehrel could be attributed to the break down of Ethrel to ethylene which results in activation the hydrolytic and oxidative enzymes involved in maturation, increasing the degradation of chlorophylls and promoting the biosynthesis of plant pigments namely anthocyanins and carotenoids and hastening the compartmentation. In addition, ethrel is effective in increasing mitochondrial oxidation of malic acid (**Dal et al., 2010**).

The effect of ABA in enhancing maturation of the berries might be attributed to its effect as main signal triggering the onset of the secondary metabolism in grape skine as well as enhancing the enzymes especially UPP- Glucose – Flavonic 3-O Glucose –T (**Zhang** *et al.*, **2009**). The beneficial effects of ABA in reaching the plant tissues to senescence could give another explanation (**Taiz and Zeiger**, **2002**).

These results regarding the effect of ethrel are in concordance with Liu *et al.*, (2002), on Cabernet Sauvignon grapes; Strydom (2014), on Flame seedless grapes, Ibrahiem (2018) on Crimson seedless grapes. The results of Ferrara *et al.*, (2015) on Crimson seedless grapes, Lichter *et al.*, (2015) on Flame seedless grapes and Castellarin *et al.*, (20156) on Thompson seedless grapes supported the present results.

2- Effect of amino acids:

Amino acids as organic nitrogenous compounds are the building blocks in the synthesis of proteins, which are formed by as process in which ribosomes catalyze the polymerization of amino acids (**Davies**, **1982**). Several hypothesis have been proposed the explain for the role of amino acids in plant. Available evidence suggests several alternative routes of IAA and ethylene synthesis in plants, starting from amino acid (**Davies**, 1982). In this respect, (**Taiz and Zeiger**, 2002) suggested that the regulatory effect of certain amino acids like phenylalanine and ornithine in plant development appeared through their influence on the biosynthesis of gibberellins, tryptophane and methionine in building of IAA and ethtlene respectively.

The results regarding the promoting effect of amino acids on maturation date, berries colouration, total athocyanins and fruit quality are in agreement with those obtained by Ahmed *et al.*, (2012); Abdelaal (2012), Abdelaal *et al.*, (2013) on Thompson seedless grapes, El- Khawaga (2014) and Mohamed (2014) on Superior grapes and Abdel- Aziz *et al.*, (2017) and Mohamed (2017) on Flame seedless grapes.

Conclusion

For overcoming irregular colouration of clusters, advancing berries maturation and improving berries quality of the three grapevine cvs Flame seedless, Red Globe and Crimson seedless grown under Minia region conditions, it is preferable for treating clusters with ethrel at 250 ppm, protone at 500 ppm and amino acids (tryptophane + methionene + cysteine) at 1% when approximately 10% of the berries on 50% of the clusters had softened (Veraison stage).

References

1. Abd El-aal, E.E.H.A. (2012): The synergistic effects of using some nutrients as well as antioxidant substances on growth, nutritional status and productivity of Thompson seedless grapevines grown under Sohag region. Ph. D. Thesis Fac. of Agric. Sohag Univ., Egypt.

- Abdelaal, A.M.K; Ahmed, F.F. and AbdElaal, E.E.H. (2013): The stimulative effects of using some nutrients and antioxidants on growth, nutritional status and yield of Thompson seedless grapes. Hort. Sci. J. of Suez Canal Univ. Vol. 1: 322-329.
- Abdelaal, A.M.K.; Abada, M.A.M. and Ibrhiem, H.A.E. (2017): Trials for solving the problem of poor berries colouration and improving yield of Crimson seedless grapevines. New York, Sci. J. 10(12): 91-103.
- 4. Abdel-Aziz F.H.; Uwakiem, M.Kh. and Ebrahiem M.M.M. (2017): Promoting berries colouration, yield and quality of Flame seedless grapevines by using amino acids enriched with different nutrients. Assiut J. Agric. Sci. (98) No.13; 145-157.
- Ahmed, F.F., Abdelaal, A.M. K. and Abd EIaal, E.E. H.A. (2012): Promoting productivity of Thompson seedless grapevines by application of some antioxidants and nutrients. Minia J. of Agric. Res. & Develop. Vol. (32) No. 3 pp. 527-542.
- Aly, Kh, A. M. (2017): Attempts for relating problem for cluster colouration of Flame seedless grapevines grown under Upper Egypt climatic conditions. M. Sc. Thesis Fac. of Agric. Minia Univ. Egypt.
- Association of Official Agricultural Chemists (A.O.A.C.) (2000): Official Methods of Analysis (A.O.A.C.) 12th Ed., Benjamin Franklin Station Washington D.C., U.S.A. pp. 490-510.
- Castellarin, S.D., Gambetta, G.A., Wada, H., Krasnow, M.N., Cramer, G.R., Peterlunger, E., Shackel, K.A. and Matthews, M.A., (2015): Characterization of major ripening events during softening in grape: turgor, sugar accumulation, abscisic acid metabolism, colour development, and their relationship with growth. Journal of experimental Botany, P. 483.
- Dal, R\. A., Pilati, S., Velasco, R., Moser, C., Costa, G. and Boschetti, A. (2010): Ethylene production during grape berry development and expression of genes involved in ethylene biosynthesis and response. Acta Hortic. 884, 73-80.
- Davies, D.D. (1982): Physiological aspects of protein tumour Encycl. Plant physiol. New series (nucleic acids and proteins, structure, biochemistry and physiology of proteins). Springer Veria, Berlin, New York, pp. 190-228.
- 11. El Halaby, E. H. S. (2006): Trials for producing early with high quality "Superior

grapes". M.Sc. Thesis Fac. of Agric. Minia Univ. Egypt.

- El- Khawaga, A. Sh. (2014): Impact of vitamins B and C, glutamic acid and silicon on fruiting of Superior grapevines. World. Rural Observations. 6(4): 57-62.
- 13. El-Sayed- A.A.M.S. (2007): Response of Flame seedless grapes to some improving treatments under Assuit Environments. M. Sc. Thesis Fac. of Agric. Assiut Univ. Egypt.
- 14. Ferrara, G., Mazzeo, A., Matarrese, A.M.S., Pacucci, C., Punzi, R., Faccia, M., Trani, A. and Gambacorta, G., (2015): Application of abscisic acid (S-ABA) and sucrose to improve colour, anthocyanin content and antioxidant activity of cv. Crimson Seedless grape berries. Australian Journal of Grape and Wine Research, 27(1), pp. 18-29.
- 15. Fulcki, T. and Francis, F.J. (1968): Quantitative methods for anthocyanins 1- Extraction and determination for total anthocyanin. J. Food Sci. 33: 72-77.
- Geny L, Deytieux C, Done'che B. (2005): Importance of hormonal profile on the onset of ripening in grape berries of *Vitis vinifera L*. Ada Horticulturae 682, 99-105.
- 17. Giribaldi, M., Geny, L., Delrot, S. and Schubert, A. (2010): Proteomic analysis of the effects of ABA treatments on ripening *Vitis vinifera* berries. Journal of Experimental Botany, 61(9), pp.2447-2458.
- Ibrahiem, H.A.M. (2018): Trials for overcoming uneven colouration problems of clusters in grape cv. Crimson seedless M. Sc. Thesis Fac. of Agric. Minia Univ. Egypt.
- Kassem, H, A, Al- Obeed, R.S. and Soliman, S.S. (2011): Improving yield, quality and profitability of Flame seedless grapevine grown under arid environmental by growth regulators pro- harvest applications. Middle-East J. of Sci. Res. 8(1); 165-172.
- 20. Koyama, K., Sadamatsu, K., and Gotoyamamoto, N. (2010): Abscisic acid stimulated ripening and gene expression in berry skins of the Cabernet Sauvignon grape. *Functional & Integrative Genomics*, 70(3), 367-381.
- 21. Lane J. H. and Eynon, L. (1965): Determination of reducing sugars by means of Fehlings solution with methylene blue as indicator.A.O.A.C Washington D.C., U.S.A.
- Lichter, A., Kaplunov, T., Zutahy, Y., Daus, A., Beno, D., Lurie, S., Sarig, P. and Stromza, A. (2015): Using auto fluorescence to follow the effect of abcisic acid and leaf removal on color development of 'flame seedless' grapes. ActaHort. (ISHS) 1091:183-186.

- 23. Liu, Z.; Chen, H.; Han, X. Gong, Q.; Cai, G. and Zhang, X. (2002): Early high production techniques for Huiminmitao Peach variety. China Fruits p. 1: 37-38.
- 24. Mead, R.; Ciirrnow, R. N. and Harted, A. M. (1993): Statistical Methods in Agricultural and Experimental Biology. 2nd Ed. Chapman and Hall, London pp. 10- 44.
- 25. Mohamed, W.B.M.F. (2014): Effect of some ammo acid, nutrient and salicylic acid treatments on Superior grapevine cv. M. Sc. Thesis Fac. of Agric. Assiut Azhar Univ. Egypt.
- 26. Mohamed, M. M. E. (2017): Promoting the yield quantitively and qualitatively of Flame seedless grapevines by using some amino acid enriched with different nutrients. M.Sc. Thesis, Fac. of Agric. Minia Univ. Egypt.
- Omar, A.H. and Girgis, V.H. (2005): Some treatments affecting fruit quality of Crimson seedless grapevines. J. of Agric. Sc. Mansoura Univ. 30 (8): 4665-4673.
- Orth, A. B., Sfarra, A.; Pell, R. J. and Tien, M. (1993): Assessing the involvement of free radicals in fungicide toxicity using x-

tocopherol analogs pesticide. Biochemistry and Physiology, 47: 134-141.

- 29. Strydom, J. (2014): The effect of foliar Ethephan and ABA in combination with a leonardite fertieation Drodnct on Flame seedless grape quality. S. Afr. J. Enol. Vitic.35(2), pp.283-291.
- Taiz, A. and Zeiger, M. (2002): Plant Physiology, third Ed. 306 p. Academic press, London, pp. 100-120.
- Wilde, S. A.; Corey, R. B.; Layer, J. G. and Voigt, G. K. (1985): Soil and Plant Analysis for Tree Culture. 3rd Ed, Oxford and (BH publishing Co., New Delhi. India, pp. 1-218.
- 32. Yamamoto, L.Y., Koyama, R., Assis, A.M.D., Borges, W.F.S., Oliveira, I.R.D. and Roberto, S.R., (2015): Color of berry and juice of 'Isabel' grape treated with abscisic acid in different ripening stages. Pesquisa Agropecuaria Brasileira, 50(12), pp.l 160-1167.
- 33. Zhang, M., Yuan, B., and Leng, P. (2009): The role of ABA in trigeering ethylene biosynthesis and ripening of tomato fruit. *Journal of Experimental Botany*, 60(6), 1579-1588.

1/8/2019