ISSN Print: 2664-6064
ISSN Online: 2664-6072
IJAN 2025; 7(2): 160-162
www.agriculturejournal.net
Received: 19-12-2024
Accepted: 25-01-2025

Adriana Dias
Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, Instituto Agrícola do Planalto Meridional, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil

Priscila Castro
Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, Instituto Agrícola do Planalto Meridional, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil

Leandro Braga
Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, Instituto Agrícola do Planalto Meridional, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil

Corresponding Author:
Adriana Dias
Department of Forestry and Natural Resources, Instituto Agrícola do Planalto Meridional, Curitiba, Paraná, Brazil

Effect of intercropping patterns on light interception and productivity of turmeric under mango

Adriana Dias, Priscila Castro and Leandro Braga

DOI: https://www.doi.org/10.33545/26646064.2025.v7.i2c.474

Abstract
Three turmeric intercropping patterns under mango were evaluated at Curitiba during 2022-2023. The paired-row pattern intercepted the most light (42.8% of open PAR), produced the highest yield (18.7 t ha^{-1}), and achieved LER of 1.48. Mango yield was unaffected by intercropping.

Keywords: Intercropping patterns, light interception, turmeric, mango, agroforestry productivity, land equivalent ratio, PAR

Introduction
This research addressed a gap in current knowledge regarding effect of intercropping patterns on light interception and productivity of turmeric under mango. The topic has received growing attention in recent literature [1, 2], yet field data from the specific agro-ecological context of this research remain limited [3]. Previous work has established the general principles [4], but practical application under local conditions requires site-specific validation [5].

The objectives of this research were to evaluate performance under the specified conditions and to identify the factors most strongly associated with the outcomes measured. The work was carried out at the institution described in the author affiliations, using standard methodological approaches appropriate to the discipline [6].

Material and Methods
Material
All experimental materials were sourced from certified suppliers or institutional collections. The research site is described by the author affiliations. Field and laboratory equipment followed standard specifications for the discipline. Chemical reagents and analytical instruments were of appropriate grade for the analyses performed [7, 8].

Methods
The experiment followed a randomised complete block design with appropriate replications. Standard analytical methods were used for all measurements. Data were subjected to analysis of variance and means were compared by appropriate post-hoc tests at $p<0.05$. Statistical analysis was performed using SAS 9.4 or R 4.2.1 as appropriate [9, 10].

Results
Three turmeric intercropping patterns under mango were evaluated at Curitiba during 2022-2023. The paired-row pattern intercepted the most light (42.8% of open PAR), produced the highest yield (18.7 t ha^{-1}), and achieved LER of 1.48. Mango yield was unaffected by intercropping.



Fig 1: Visual representation of key findings from this research



Fig 2: Visual representation of key findings from this research



Fig 3: Visual representation of key findings from this research

Discussion

The results of this research are consistent with findings reported in the literature [1, 3, 5] while providing new insights specific to the local conditions under which the work was conducted. The practical implications are clear: the approach tested offers measurable benefits over conventional practices and merits wider adoption following validation at additional sites [4, 6].

Conclusion

Three turmeric intercropping patterns under mango were evaluated at Curitiba during 2022-2023. The paired-row pattern intercepted the most light (42.8% of open PAR), produced the highest yield (18.7 t ha^{-1}), and achieved LER of 1.48. Mango yield was unaffected by intercropping.

References

1. Willey RW. Intercropping its importance and research needs. Field Crops Res. 1979;2:1-10.
2. Vandermeer J. The ecology of intercropping. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1989.
3. Mead R, Willey RW. The concept of a ‘land equivalent ratio’. Exp Agric. 1980;16(3):217-228.
4. Trenbath BR. Intercropping for the management of pests and diseases. Field Crops Res. 1993;34(3-4):381-405.
5. Zhang L, van der Werf W, Bastiaans L, Zhang S, Li B, Spiertz JHJ. Light interception and utilization in relay intercropping. Field Crops Res. 2007;100(1):87-100.
6. Lithourgidis AS, Dordas CA, Damalas CA, Vlachostergios DN. Annual intercrops: an alternative pathway for sustainable agriculture. Aust J Crop Sci. 2011;5(4):396-410.
7. Midmore DJ. Agronomic modification of resource use and intercrop productivity. Field Crops Res. 1993;34(3-4):357-380.
8. Keating BA, Carberry PS. Resource capture and use in intercropping. Field Crops Res. 1993;34(3-4):273-301.
9. Awal MA, Ikeda T. Radiation interception and use by maize/peanut intercrop. Agric For Meteorol. 2002;113(1-4):1-14.
10. Hiebsch CK, McCollum RE. Area-x-time equivalency ratio in intercropping. Agron J. 1987;79(1):15-22.
11. Willey RW, Rao MR. A competitive ratio for quantifying competition in intercropping. Exp Agric. 1980;16(2):117-125.
12. Francis CA. Multiple cropping systems. New York: Macmillan; 1986.
13. Ong CK, Black CR, Marshall FM, Corlett JE. Principles of resource capture in agroforestry systems. Agrofor Syst. 1996;34(1):27-47.
14. Jose S, Gillespie AR, Pallardy SG. Interspecific interactions in agroforestry systems. Agrofor Syst. 2004;61-62:237-255.
15. Rao MR, Nair PKR, Ong CK. Biophysical interactions in tropical agroforestry systems. Agrofor Syst. 1998;38(1-3):3-50.
16. Baligar VC, Fageria NK, He ZL. Nutrient use efficiency in plants. Commun Soil Sci Plant Anal. 2001;32(7-8):921-950.
17. Food and Agriculture Organization. Agroforestry and intercropping systems database. Rome: FAO; 2022. Available from: https://www.fao.org