

# Research Article LAND EQUIVALENT RATIO IN RELATION TO INTERCROPPING IN YOUNG MANGO ORCHARD

# RAUT R.L.1\* AND BISEN SHARAD2

<sup>1</sup>ICAR - Krishi Vigyan Kendra, Balaghat, 481115, Madhya Pradesh, India

<sup>2</sup>College of Agriculture, Balaghat, Jawaharlal Nehru Agricultural University, Adhartal, Jabalpur, 482004, Madhya Pradesh, India \*Corresponding Author: Email-rshn\_raut71@yahoo.com

Received: October 09, 2016; Revised: October 30, 2016; Accepted: November 03, 2016; Published: November 12, 2016

Abstract- Trials were conducted at farmers field using various intercrops viz. blackgram, ginger, maize and paddy in 7- 8 years old mango (cv. Totapari and Baiganpalli) orchard under NATP-RRPS-8 Project at JNKVV, Jabalpur. It is observed that the intercrops influenced the yield attributing characters of the mango and black gram performed better as compare to other intercrops. Maximum number of fruits per branch, maximum number of fruits per plant and yield of mango per hectare were obtained with blackgram intercrop. Whereas, maximum fruit weight of mango was observed with intercrop French bean. The maximum LER was also recorded with blackgram intercrops without fillers.

Keywords- Land Equivalent Ratio, Mango, Intercrop, Blackgram, French bean, Ginger, Maize, Paddy

Citation: Raut R.L. and Bisen Sharad (2016) Land Equivalent Ratio in Relation to Intercropping in Young Mango Orchard. International Journal of Agriculture Sciences, ISSN: 0975-3710 & E-ISSN: 0975-9107, Volume 8, Issue 55, pp.-3014-3015.

**Copyright:** Copyright©2016 Raut R.L. and Bisen Sharad. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

### Academic Editor / Reviewer:

### Introduction

Mango is the most important fruit crop of the India in terms of internal consumption as well as export. The area under mango plantation is increasing day by day is India. Due to higher establishment cost of mango orchard, it is beyond the reach of small and marginal farmers. Hence, the cultivation of intercrops in the young mango orchard is desirable to maximum land and space use efficiency to generate additional income during the juvenile phase of mango orchards, [1]. Land equivalent ratio provides comparison between the intercrops and it may be helpful for selection of the intercrops to be taken in specific location [2]. The present experiments were carried out for comparative evaluation of various intercrops and their economical feasibility.

### Materials and methods

The experiment was conducted in farmers field in bearing mango orchard (7-8 years old) during the year 2001-02. The varieties Tatapari and Baiganpalli were planted at the distance of 8m x 8m. The intercrops paddy, blackgram, ginger, maize & French bean were grown in the interspace between mango plants. The

pomegranate (cv. Ganesh) was planted between two mango plants as filler crop during July 2001. The half of the area covered with filler crop pomegranate and half was kept without fillers. The scheduled package of practices was followed in mango pomegranate and other intercrops. The treatments were replicated trice in RBD [3]. Various observations were recorded on yield and yield-attributing characters of mango, yield of various intercrops and land equivalent ratio were also be calculated.

### **Results and discussion**

The inter-cropping treatments influenced the yield and yield attributing characters of mango [Table-1]. The maximum average number of panicles per branch was found with intercrop paddy without fillers and French bean with fillers and it was significantly higher over other treatments. The maximum number of fruits per branch (60), number of fruits per plant (160), yield (37.44 q/ha) and return out of sold fruits (Rs. 18,720/ha) were recorded with the intercrop blackgram without filler plants and which was recorded significantly higher from other intercrop treatments.

Average No. of			Table-1 Yield and yield attributing characters of mango as influenced by intercrops (May' 2002)											
Panicle/ branch	Average No. of fruits/branch	Average fruits/ plant	Average fruit weight (g/fruit)	Average fruit yield (q/ha)	Return out of sold fruits (Rs./ha)									
25.0	50	150	140	32.76	16380									
20.0	60	160	150	37.44	18720									
15.0	25	75	180	21.06	10530									
15.0	30	75	190	22.23	11115									
16.0	45	90	200	28.08	14040									
15.0	45	135	145	30.54	15270									
20.0	50	150	155	36.27	18135									
16.0	30	105	150	24.57	12285									
18.5	30	90	160	22.46	11230									
25.0	40	100	175	27.30	13650									
2.78	4.84	11.81	18.33	2.06	1029.90									
	Panicle/ branch 25.0 20.0 15.0 15.0 15.0 15.0 20.0 16.0 15.0 20.0 16.0 18.5 25.0 2.78	Panicle/branch fruits/branch   25.0 50   20.0 60   15.0 25   15.0 30   16.0 45   20.0 50   20.0 60   15.0 30   16.0 45   20.0 50   16.0 30   18.5 30   25.0 40   2.78 4.84	Panicle/ branch fruits/branch plant   28.0 50 150   20.0 60 160   15.0 25 75   15.0 30 75   16.0 45 90   15.0 50 150   20.0 60 160   15.0 30 75   16.0 45 135   20.0 50 150   16.0 30 105   18.5 30 90   25.0 40 100   2.78 4.84 11.81	Panicle/branch Freidge for of Freidge for of Freidge for of Freidge for of   25.0 50 150 140   20.0 60 160 150   15.0 25 75 180   15.0 25 75 190   16.0 45 90 200   15.0 25 135 145   20.0 50 150 155   16.0 30 105 155   16.0 30 105 150   18.5 30 90 160   25.0 40 100 175   2.78 4.84 11.81 18.33	Panicle/branch fruits/branch plant weight (g/fruit) (g/ha)   25.0 50 150 140 32.76   20.0 60 160 150 37.44   15.0 25 75 180 21.06   15.0 30 75 190 22.23   16.0 45 90 200 28.08   15.0 30 155 145 30.54   20.0 50 150 155 36.27   16.0 30 105 150 24.57   18.5 30 90 160 22.46   25.0 40 100 175 27.30   2.78 4.84 11.81 18.33 2.06									

Spacing (mango – mango ) = 8m x 8m, Total No. of Plants = 156/ha, Fruits sold @ Rs. 500/qt.

The maximum average fruit weight (200 g/fruit) of mango was obtained with the intercrop French bean without filler crops and it was also found significantly higher over other intercrop treatments. Similar observations were recorded [4-6] while, growing intercrops in mango orchards.

The data present in [Table-2] regarding LER of various intercrops revealed that the intercrops and filler crops influenced the yield of mango. The maximum yield (37.44 q/ha) of mango was recorded with the blackgram as intercrop. However, the minimum yield of mango was recorded with intercrop ginger with filler crops.

The intercrop blackgram recorded the maximum LER value (1.78) without filler crop followed by paddy without filler crop (1.56). Similar findings were reported by Prabhakar and Shukla, with inter cropping of vegetables. The data presented in [Table-2] also indicate that the ginger and maize crops are not suitable as intercrop in young mango orchards. Whereas, intercrop blackgram was found economical. Bhua *et al.*, also suggested intercropping in mango orchard for higher returns.

Table-2 Land Equivalent Ratio (LER) of various mango based intercropping system												
Intercrops sown in kharif 2001	Yield of intercrops with mango alone (q/ha)	Yield of intercrops with mango and filler crop Pomegranate (q/ha)	Yield of intercrops in sole cropping (q/ha)	Yield of mango with intercrop (q/ha)	Yield of mango with filler crop intercrops (q/ha)	Yield of mango in sole stand (q/ha)	LER (without filler) (1/3+4/6)	LER (with filler) (2/3+5/6)				
Paddy	32	30	37	32.76	30.54	40.50	1.67	1.56				
Blackgram	12	10	14	37.44	36.27	40.50	1.78	1.61				
Ginger	155	150	165	21.06	24.57	40.50	1.46	1.50				
Maize	45000	42000	46000	22.23	22.46	40.50	1.53	1.46				
French bean	62	60	70	28.08	27.30	40.50	1.58	153				

### Author Contributions

Author worked as Research Associate under this project.

#### Abbreviations

RBD- Randomized Block Design, LER- Land Equivalent Ratio, cv. - Cultivar

#### Conflict of Interest: None declared

## References

- [1] Bhuwa H.S., Katrodia J.S., Patel G.L. and Chundawat B.S. (1988) ActaHortic., 23, 315-319.
- Panse V.G. and Sukhatme P.V. (1985) Statistical methods for agriculture workers. (4<sup>th</sup>Edn) ICAR, New Delhi.
- [3] Prabhkar B.S. and Shukla Vishnu (1990) Ind. J. Hort., 47, 427-439.
- [4] Rajput M.S., Shrivastava K.C. and Shukla V. (1998) ActaHortic., 231, 312-315.
- [5] Sarkar S.K., Gautam B., Seethambran Y. and Vijay N. (2004) Indian J. Hort., 61(2), 125-127.
- [6] Singh J., Kashyap R. and Sharma D.P. (1996) Indian J. Hort., 53, 290-294.