Appl. Ent. Phytopath. Vol. 75, No. 1, Sep. 2007

Evaluation of different empirical models of crop/weed competition to estimate yield and LAI losses from common lambsquarters (*Chenopodium album*) in corn (*Zea mays*)

M. AGHABEYGI^{1*}, E. ZAND² and M. A. BAGHESTANI MEIBODI²

1- Agricultural Research Center of Varamin
2- Iranian Research Institute of Plant Protection, Tehran

ABSTRACT

Usefulness and validity of different empirical yield loss models to predict the effect of common lambsquarters competition in corn were evaluated in a two year experiment in Karaj, Iran during 2001 and 2002 growing seasons. Experimental factors were 2, 5, 10 and 15 plants m⁻² in the first experiment and 6.6, 13.3 and 20 plants m⁻² in the second experiment and relative time of common lambsquarters emergence of simultaneous to, at 2-3 and 4-5 leaf stages of corn in the first experiment and simultaneous to, at 2-3 and 5-6 leaf stages of corn in the second experiment. Results indicated that the highest corn yield and LAI losses were observed at simultaneous emergence of weed and corn resulted in 85 and 92% yield loss, and 73 and 53% LAI loss in the first and second years of experiments, respectively. Also, delaying common lambsquarters emergence reduced its competitive ability against corn. Comparison of different empirical models revealed that the empirical yield loss models based on density and the relative time of weed emergence, and the weed relative leaf area, also the rectangular hyperbolic yield loss model based on weed density were more reliable at predicting corn yield and LAI losses according to their high coefficient of determination (R2). Also, results indicated that the negative effect of the relative time of common lambsquarters emergence on corn yield loss was more than weed density, so that the rectangular hyperbolic yield loss model based on weed density was more capable to predict yield loss at each of weed emergence times.

Key words: empirical yield loss model, relative damage coefficient, weed density, weed, emergence time.

^{*} Corresponding author: maghabeygi@yahoo.com

M. Aghabeygi, E. Zand and M. A. Baghestani Meibodi

References

ALDRICH, R. G. 1987. Predicting crop yield reduction from weeds. Weed Tech. 1: 199-206.

ANONYMOUS, 2002. Agricultural statistics. No: 1, Horticulture and agronomy crops. Ministry of Jihad-e-Agriculture. 171pp. (In Persian)

BECKETT, T. H. E., W. STOLLER and L. M. WAX, 1988. Interference of four annual weeds in corn (*Zea mays*). Weed Sci. 36: 764-769.

BEILINSKI, M. S., J. A. DUSKY, W. M. STALL and J. P. GILREATH, 2004. Influence of common lambsquarters (*Chenopodium album*) densities and phosphorus fertilization on lettuce. Crop Protection. 23: 173-176.

BOSNIC, A. C. and C. G. SWANTON, 1997. Influence of barnyardgrass (*Echinochloa crus-galli*) time of emergence and density on corn (*Zea mays*). Weed Sci. 45: 276-282.

COLQUHOUN, J., C. M. BOERBOOM, L. K. BINNING, D. E. STOLENBERG and J. M. NORMAN, 2001. Common lambsquarters photosynthesis and seed production in three environments. Weed Sci. 49: 334-339.

CONN, J. S. and D. L. THOMAS, 1987. Common lambsquarters (*Chenopodium album*) interference in spring barley. Weed Technol. 1: 312-313.

COUSENS, R. 1985. An empirical model relating crop yied to weed and crop density and a statistical comparison with other models. J. Agric. Sci. 105:513-521.

COUSENS, R., P. BRAIN, J. T. O. O'DONOVAN and P. A. O'SULLIVAN, 1987. The use of biologically realistic equation to describe the effects of weed density and relative time of emergence on crop yield. Weed Sci. 35: 720-725.

COUSENS, R., L. FIRBANK, G. A. M. MORTIMER and R. G. R. SMITH, 1988. Variability in the relationship between crop yield and weed density for winter wheat and Bromus sterilis. J. App. Ecol. 25: 1033-1044.

CROOK, T. M. and K. A. RENNER, 1990. Common lambsquarters (*Chenopodium album*) competition and time of removal in soybeans (*Glycine max*). Weed Sci. 38: 358-364.

DIELEMAN, A., A. S. HAMILL, G. C. FOX and C. J. SWANTON, 1995. Empirical models of pigweed (*Amaranthus spp.*) interference in soybean (*Glycine max L.*). Weed Sci. 43: 612-618.

HALL, M. R., C. J. SWANTON and G. ANDERSON, 1992. The critical period of weed control in grain corn (*Zea mays*). Weed Sci. 40: 441-447.

Evaluation of different empirical models of crop/weed competition to estimate yield and LAI ...

HARRISON, S. K., E. E. REGNIER, J. T. SCHMOLL and J. E. WEBB, 2001. Competition and fecundity of giant ragweed in corn. Weed Sci. 49:224-229.

HARTLEY, M. J. and A. J. POPAY, 1992. Yield losses due to weed in sugar beet, corn and dwarf beans. Proceeding of the forthy fifth Newzeland plant protection conference, Wellington, Newzeland, 11-13 August 1992, 50-54.

KNEZEVIC, S. Z., S. F. WEISE and C. J. SWANTON, 1994. Interference of redroot pigweed (*Amaranthus retroflexus*) in corn (*Zea mays*). Weed sci. 42: 568-573.

KROPFF, M. J. and A. SPITTERS, 1992. An eco-physiological model for interspecific competition, applied to influence of *Chenopodium album* on sugar beet. Model evaluation. Weed Res. 32: 451-453.

KROPFF, M. J. and L. A. P. LOTZ, 1992. System approach to quantify crop-weed interactions and their application to weed management. Agricultural Sys. 40: 256-282.

LOOMIS, R. S., W. A. WILLIAMS, W. G. DUNCAN, A. DOVRAT and F. KUNEZ, 1968. Quantitative descriptions of foliage display and light adsorption in field communities of corn plants. Crop Sci. 8: 352-356.

LOTZ, L. A. P., J. WALLINGA and M. J. KROPFF, 1995. Crop-weed interactions: quantification and prediction in ecology and integrated farming systems (eds GLEN, D. M., M. P. GREAVES and H. M. ANDERSON). 31-47. John willley and sons LTD & SONS ltd, LONDON.

LOTZ, L. A. P., S. CHRISTENZEN and D. CLOUTIER, 1996. Prediction of the competitive effects of weed on crop yields based on the relative leaf area of weeds. Weed Res. 36: 93-101.

MASSINGA, R. A., R. S. CURRIE, M. J. HORAK and J. BOYER, 2001. Interference of palmer amaranth in corn. Weed Sci. 49: 202-208.

MICKELSON, J. A. and R. G. HARVEY, 1999. Effect of *Eriochloa villosa* density and time of emergence on growth and seed production in *Zea mays*. Weed Sci. 47: 687-692.

MOUSSAVI, M. A. 2001. Integrated weed management, principales and methods. Miad press, Tehran, Iran. 468pp.

NGOUAJIO, M., C. LEMIEUX and G. D. LEROUX, 1999. Prediction of corn (*Zea mays*) yield loss from early observations of the relative leaf area and the relative leaf cover of weeds. Weed Sci. 47:297-304.

O'DONOVAN, J. T. and R. E. BLACKSHAW, 1997. Effect of volunteer barley (*Hordeum vulgare*) interference on field pea (Pisum sativum). Weed Sci. 45:249-255.

M. Aghabeygi, E. Zand and M. A. Baghestani Meibodi

PARK, S. E., L. R. BENJAMIN and A. R. WATKINSON, 2003. The theory and application of plant competition models: an agronomic prespective.

RAHMAN, A. 1985. Weed control in maize in New Zealand. Pp 37-45, in: Maize management to market, H. A. Eagles and G. S WRATT (Eds); Agron. Soc. N. Z., Special pub. No. 4, Palmerston North, New Zealand.

SCHEWEIZER, E. E. 1983. Common lambsquarters (*Chenopodium album*) interference in sugarbeets (*Beta vulgaris*). Weed Sci. 31:5-7.

STRAHAN, R. E., GRIFFIN, J. L., REYNOLDS, D. B., and MILLER, D. K. 2000. Interference between *Rottoboelia cochinchinensis* and *Zea mays*. Weed sci. 48:205-211.

STREIBIG, J. C., G. H. COMBELLACK, G. H. PRITCHARD and R. G. RICHARDSON, 1989. Estimation of threshold for weed control in australian cereals. Weed Res. 29: 117-126.

SWANTON, C. J. and C. P. LYFORD, 1996. A test for choice between hyperbolic and sigmoidal models of crop yield response to weed density. Journals of agricultural, biological and environmental statics. 1: 97-106.

SWINTON, S. M., D. D. BUHLER, F. FORCELLA, J. L. GUNSOLUS and R. P. KING, 1994. Estimation of crop yield loss due to interference by multiple weed species. Weed Sci. 42: 103-109.

SWANTON, C. J., B. D. BOOTH and S. D. MURPHY, 2003. Weed ecology in natural and agricultural systems. CAB international publishing. 320pp.

TOLLENAAR, M. A., A. DIBO, A. AGUIERA, S. F. WEISE and C. J. SWANTON, 1994. Effect of crop density on weed interference in maize. Agronomy J. 86: 591-595.

TURNER, C., M. J. SANCHES and C. ZARAGOZA, 1996. Growth evolution of maize in competition with *Chenopodium album* and *Datura stramonium*. Proceeding of the 2nd Intrenational Weed Congress. Copenhagen, Denmark, 25-28 June 1996.

UREMIS, I., A. BAYAT, A. ULUDAG, N. BOZDOGAN, E. AKSOY, A. SOYSAL, and O. GONEN, 2004. Studies on different herbicide application methods in second crop maize field. Crop Protection. 23: 1137-1144.

WILSON, R. G. and P. WESTRA, 1991. Wild proso millet (*Panicum miliaceum*) interference in corn (*Zea mays*). Weed Sci. 39: 217-220.

YENISH, J. P., B. R. DURDAN, D. W. MILLER and D. L. WYSE, 1992. Wheat (*Triticum aestivum*) yield reduction from common milkweed (*Asclepias syriaca*) competition. Weed Sci. 45: 127-131.

Evaluation of different empirical models of crop/weed competition to estimate yield and LAI ...

Address of the authors: Eng. M. AGHABEYGI, Agricultural Research Center of Varamin, Iran; Dr. E. ZAND and Dr. M. A. BAGHESTANI MEIBODI, Iranian Research Institute of Plant Protection, P. O. Box 1454, Tehran 19395, Iran.

M. Aghabeygi, E. Zand and M. A. Baghestani Meibodi