

**COMPETITIVE INTERACTIONS BETWEEN WEEDS
AND CHICKPEA (*CICER ARIETINUM* L.): TOWARDS
THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INTEGRATED WEED
MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

Jeremy Patrick Milroy Whish

B.Sc.(Hons), Grad. Dip. Hort. Sc., M.Rur. Sci. (NE)

Agronomy and Soil Science

School of Rural Science and Natural Resources

CRC for Weed Management Systems

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy of the University of New England

August 1999

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my supervisors: Brian Sindel; Robin Jessop; and Warwick Felton, for their guidance and encouragement. In particular, I thank Brian and Robin for many interesting discussions, and Warwick for sharing his expertise in the design and management of field experiments.

This project has been completed as a sub module of a larger project and I would like to extend my gratitude to the members of DAN 262 for their advice, help and friendship. I especially thank Dick Medd and Lisa Rew for their critical comments during the preparation of this thesis.

The experiment described in Chapter 9 was conducted jointly with Lisa Rew and Warwick Felton and their involvement in this experiment is duly acknowledged as is Steve Harden's statistical analyses and John Gavin's technical assistance.

I also acknowledge the support provided by Ken and Margaret Brooks at the Douglas McMaster Research Farm, Warialda; and Finn Fensbo, Mike Nowland, Paul Nash, Graham Starr and Karen Cassin at the Tamworth Centre for Crop Improvement.

I especially thank Bob Murison for his help, advice, and patience in teaching, advising, and helping with the statistical analyses throughout this thesis, and also for many interesting discussions.

Over the last ten years I have worked from the Department of Agronomy and Soil Science and I would like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Department for creating a good social environment in which to work.

I thank Giselle for supporting me while I chased my dreams; and Aidan, Finian, and Ella who have helped make the last three years so much fun.

The financial assistance of the Grains Research and Development Corporation is gratefully acknowledged as is the assistance provided to me by the CRC for Weed Management Systems

Abstract

The production of chickpea (*Cicer arietinum* L.) in the northern grains region of eastern Australia has great potential for breaking grass disease cycles, improving soil nutritional status, and alternating herbicides within crop rotations. However, the susceptibility of chickpea to weed competition has hindered its adoption in rotations. This thesis investigates the agronomic production of chickpea by examining how manipulations of sowing pattern, timing of herbicide applications, and selection of varietal material affect its competitive interaction with weeds.

It was found that the manipulation of chickpea sowing pattern from narrow (32 cm rows) to wide (64 cm rows) had no detrimental effect on chickpea yield when grown in competition with varying densities of *Rapistrum rugosum* (L.) All. (turnip weed) or *Avena sterilis* ssp. *ludoviciana* (Durieu) Nyman (wild oat). Increasing the weed (wild oat, turnip weed) density was found to reduce the chickpea yield in a manner best described by a rectangular hyperbolic model. From the model, weed densities of 8 turnip weeds m⁻² or 10 wild oats m⁻² reduced chickpea yield by more than 50% compared with a weed-free control.

Only a few herbicides are available for use in chickpea crops and many of these pose high risk for the development of herbicide resistance. To improve weed control in chickpea crops and to reduce the risk of developing herbicide resistance, herbicides should be applied at strategic times to maximise their effectiveness and minimise the need for repeat applications. Chickpea and weed (wild oat, turnip weed) growth studies were combined with time of weed removal studies, and the results correlated with degree-day measurements to identify the optimum time for weed control. For the two experimental sites examined in this thesis, Tamworth and Warialda in northern New South Wales, a heat sum of 444 degree-days was considered the optimum time for controlling weeds, because it maximised crop yield and minimised weed seed return to the seed bank.

The selection of varietal material with greater early vigour and ability to shade is often seen as a means of improving the competitive ability of a crop. The low stature and relatively open canopy of current chickpea varieties suggest that this is an area for potential improvement. Comparisons between existing varieties and new breeding lines showed that current breeding objectives are improving the competitive ability of chickpea. In my opinion, however, chickpea weed

management would be improved more effectively by concentrating on the agronomic areas of chickpea production.

The effects of the position of weeds in relation to the chickpea crop and shading by weeds were also examined. The position of the weeds in relation to the crop row had no effect on chickpea yield. However, yield was increased if the weed distribution was clumped in high density patches compared with being evenly distributed throughout the crop.

Increased shading at the time of chickpea flowering (as in the case of turnip weed growth) by 50% significantly reduced yield and could partially explain some of the yield loss from the weed density experiments.

It is hoped that these areas of investigation will form the foundation of an integrated weed management package; however, further work (as discussed in Chapter 10) is required to relate crop and weed growth to environmental parameters. Understanding the weed and crop growth under particular environmental conditions would enable the development of simulation models which could be used for forecasting experimental outcomes and eventually assist farm management decisions.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	vi
List of Tables	x
List of Figures	xi
List of Plates	xiii
List of Equations	xiv
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
Chapter 2 Background review	4
2.1 History of cropping practices in the northern grains region	4
2.2 Soil nutrition	7
2.3 Soil erosion	8
2.4 Soil moisture.....	8
2.5 Sowing date	9
2.6 Plant disease	9
2.7 Weed control.....	9
2.7.1 Turnip weed	10
2.7.2 Wild oats	11
2.7.3 Cultural weed management	12
2.8 Conclusion	14
Chapter 3 Site descriptions and climate	15
3.1 Introduction	15
3.2 Tamworth	15
3.2.1 Tamworth research areas 1996/97	17
3.3 Warialda	21
3.3.1 Warialda research areas 1996/97	21
3.4 Conclusion	24
Chapter 4 Determining the competitive ability of desi chickpea varieties	25
4.1 Introduction	25
4.2 Methods	27
4.2.1 Plant material.....	28
4.2.2 Experimental design.....	30
4.2.3 Maintenance	31

4.2.4	<i>Non-destructive measurements</i>	31
4.2.5	<i>Harvest</i>	31
4.3	Results	32
4.3.1	<i>Crop and weed establishment</i>	32
4.3.2	<i>Crop grain yields</i>	32
4.3.3	<i>Dry matter production</i>	33
4.3.4	<i>Canopy development and relative cover</i>	35
4.3.5	<i>Indian mustard dry-weight and seed production</i>	37
4.4	Discussion	39
4.4.1	<i>Competitive ability of chickpea lines</i>	40
4.4.2	<i>Competitive ability of Indian mustard</i>	41
4.5	Conclusion	41
Chapter 5 The effect of row spacing and weed density on the yield loss of chickpea		43
5.1	Introduction	43
5.1.1	<i>Competition</i>	43
5.1.2	<i>Row spacing</i>	46
5.2	Materials and methods	48
5.2.1	<i>Sites</i>	48
5.2.2	<i>Plant material</i>	48
5.2.3	<i>Sowing</i>	49
5.2.4	<i>Experimental design</i>	50
5.2.5	<i>Maintenance</i>	51
5.2.6	<i>Non-destructive measurements</i>	52
5.2.7	<i>Harvest</i>	52
5.3.8	<i>Analysis</i>	52
5.3	Results	53
5.3.1	<i>Weed density</i>	53
5.3.2	<i>Weed dry matter</i>	58
5.4	Discussion	62
Chapter 6 Predicting yield loss with relative cover measurements		65
6.1	Introduction	65
6.2	Materials and methods	70
6.3	Results	71
6.4	Discussion	94
Chapter 7 The critical time for weed control		98
7.1	Introduction	98
7.2	Materials and methods	102
7.2.1	<i>Sites</i>	102

7.2.2 Plant material.....	102
7.2.3 Sowing	102
7.2.4 Experimental design.....	102
7.2.5 Measurements.....	103
7.2.6 Removal	103
7.2.7 Maintenance	104
7.2.8 Harvest	104
7.2.9 Statistical analysis.....	104
7.3 Results	105
7.3.1 The effect of weed removal times on chickpea yield.....	105
7.3.2 The effect of weed removal times on potential seed return to the seed bank.....	109
7.3.3 The effect of weeds on chickpea growth.....	112
7.3.4 Using relative cover to predict crop growth.....	118
7.4 Discussion.....	119
7.5 Conclusion.....	123
Chapter 8 The effect of late season shading on chickpea yield	124
8.1 Introduction	124
8.2 Materials and methods	125
8.2.1 Sites	125
8.2.2 Plant material.....	125
8.2.3 Sowing	125
8.2.4 Experimental design.....	126
8.2.5 Shading	126
8.2.6 Maintenance.....	127
8.2.7 Harvest	127
8.2.8 Statistical analysis.....	127
8.3 Results	127
8.4 Discussion.....	130
Chapter 9 The influence of strategically positioned weeds on the yield of chickpea.....	133
9.1 Introduction	133
9.2 Materials and methods	138
9.2.1 Site	138
9.2.2 Plant material.....	138
9.2.3 Sowing	138
9.2.4 Experimental design.....	140
9.2.5 Maintenance.....	140
9.2.6 Harvest	141
9.2.7 Analysis 141	

9.3 Results	141
9.4 Discussion.....	144
Chapter 10 Conclusions.....	147
10.1 Introduction	147
10.2 Quantification of competitive effects of weeds on chickpea.....	147
10.3 Establishment of a sound basis for the timing of weed control.....	148
10.4 Identification of cultural management practices and breeding objectives for chickpea which increase its competitive ability	149
10.5 Future research directions	149
10.5.3 <i>Environmental effects</i>	150
References	152
Appendix	165

List of Tables

Table 2.1. The effect of different farming practices on the critical production constraints of cereal crops in the northern grains region of eastern Australia.....	7
Table 3.1 Soil description of research area, Tamworth 1996.....	17
Table 3.2 Soil description of research area, Tamworth 1997.....	18
Table 4.1 Characteristics of selected chickpea varieties taken from 1995 desi core trial results	29
Table 4.2 Sowing densities.....	30
Table 4.3 Grain yields of winter crops grown with and without a pseudo weed (Mustard cv. JE13*2).....	33
Table 4.4 Above-ground dry matter weights at harvest of winter crops grown with and without a pseudo weed (Mustard research line JE13*2)	35
Table 4.5 Relative canopy loss of winter crops grown with a pseudo weed (Mustard cv. JE13*2)	37
Table 5.1 Estimated values of the parameters for the hyperbolic curves fitted to the 1996 data in Fig. 5.1.....	55
Table 5.2 Estimated values of the parameters for the hyperbolic curves fitted to the 1997 data in Fig. 5.2.. ..	57
Table 5.3 Estimated values of the parameters for the hyperbolic curves fitted to the 1996 data in Fig. 5.3.	59
Table 5.4 Estimated values of the parameters for the hyperbolic curves fitted to the 1997 data in Fig. 5.4.	61
Table 6.1 Estimated values for parametric models used for the prediction of 1996 chickpea yield loss due to infestations of turnip weed and wild oat.. ..	74
Table 6.2 Estimated values for parametric models used to predict 1997 chickpea yield loss due to infestations of turnip weed.....	92
Table 7.1 Description of time of weed removal treatments	103
Table 7.2 Mean chickpea yield (g m ⁻²) for each of the time of weed removal treatments.....	107
Table 9.1 Expected and actual mean weed densities achieved in each of the weed position treatments for wild oat and turnip weed.	142
Table 9.2 Table of predicted chickpea yields calculated at five weed plants m ⁻² for each of the strategic weed position treatments for wild oat and turnip weed.	144
Table A.1. Predicted values for the parametric and non-parametric models at Times 1 and 2, 1996.....	165
Table A.2 Predicted values for the parametric and non-parametric models at the four times of assessment.	166

List of Figures

Fig. 2.1 Distribution of <i>Rapistrum rugosum</i> in 1982.	10
Fig. 3.1 Mean monthly rainfall and temperature at the Tamworth Centre for Crop Improvement.....	16
Fig. 3.2 Monthly rainfall and mean monthly temperatures at the Tamworth Centre for Crop Improvement, 1996	19
Fig. 3.3 Monthly rainfall and mean monthly temperatures at the Tamworth Centre for Crop Improvement, 1997.	20
Fig. 3.4 Monthly rainfall and mean monthly temperature for Douglas McMaster Research Farm, Warialda, 1996.	23
Fig. 3.5 Monthly rainfall and mean monthly temperatures for Douglas McMaster Research Farm, Warialda, 1997.	24
Fig. 4.1. Relationship between total crop dry weight at maturity and grain yield for Warialda and Tamworth.....	34
Fig. 4.2. Relationship between crop grain yield loss and the pseudo weed (Indian mustard) dry weight at the time of harvest; values are given for all crops, breeding lines, and replicates.....	38
Fig. 4.3. Relationship between crop grain yield loss and the pseudo weed (Indian mustard) seed yield at the time of harvest; values are given for all crops, breeding lines, and replicates.	39
Fig. 5.1 Hyperbolic curves fitted to the density and row spacing data for 1996. Columns of graphs refer to the two experimental sites.	56
Fig. 5.2 Hyperbolic curves fitted to the density data for 1997. Columns refer to the two experimental sites	58
Fig. 5.3 Hyperbolic curves fitted to the weed dry matter and row spacing data for 1996.....	60
Fig. 5.4 Hyperbolic curves fitted to the weed dry weight data for 1997. Columns refer to the two experimental sites. Letters denote treatments	62
Fig. 6.1 Kropff and Spitters' 1-parameter model fitted to the Time 1 (Tamworth 70 DAS, Warialda 51 DAS) relative cover data for 1996.....	75
Fig. 6.2 Lotz <i>et al.</i> 2-parameter model fitted to the Time 1 (Tamworth 70 DAS, Warialda 51 DAS) relative cover data for 1996..	76
Fig. 6.3 Non-parametric GAM curve fitted to the Time 1 (Tamworth 70 DAS, Warialda 51 DAS) relative cover data for 1996.	77
Fig. 6.4 Kropff and Spitters' 1-parameter model fitted to the Time 2 (Tamworth 129 DAS, Warialda 106 DAS) relative cover data for 1996.....	79
Fig. 6.5 Lotz <i>et al.</i> 2-parameter model fitted to the Time 2 (Tamworth 129 DAS, Warialda 106 DAS) relative cover data for 1996.	80
Fig. 6.6 Non-parametric GAM curve fitted to the Time 2 (Tamworth 129 DAS, Warialda 106 DAS) relative cover data for 1996.	81

Fig. 6.7 Kropff and Spitters 1-parameter model fitted to the Tamworth relative cover data for 1997. Letters denote assessment times	88
Fig. 6.8 Lotz <i>et al.</i> 2-parameter model fitted to the Tamworth relative cover data for 1997.	89
Fig. 6.9 Kropff and Spitters' 1-parameter model fitted to the Warialda relative cover data for 1997.	90
Fig. 6.10 Lotz <i>et al.</i> 2-parameter model fitted to the Warialda relative cover data for 1997.	91
Fig. 6.11 Non-parametric generalised additive model (GAM) fitted to the Tamworth relative cover data for 1997.....	93
Fig. 6.12 Non-parametric generalised additive model (GAM) fitted to the Warialda relative cover data for 1997.....	94
Fig. 7.1 The effect of different times of weed removal on the grain yield of chickpea grown at Tamworth in the presence of turnip weed (A) and wild oat (B)..	106
Fig. 7.2 The effect of different times of weed removal on the grain yield of chickpea grown at Warialda in the presence of turnip weed (A) and wild oat (B).....	108
Fig. 7.3 The effect of different times of weed removal on the seed yield of turnip weed grown at Tamworth (A) and Warialda (B)..	110
Fig. 7.4 The effect of different times of weed removal on the number of wild oat tillers grown at Tamworth (A) and Warialda (B).	111
Fig. 7.5 Chickpea dry matter accumulation as a result of increasing degree-days under weed-free (▲) conditions and in the presence of turnip weed (■) for Tamworth (A) and Warialda (B).....	113
Fig. 7.6 Turnip weed dry matter accumulation as a result of increasing degree-days when grown in competition with a single density (40 plants m ⁻²) of chickpea (■) for Tamworth (A) and Warialda (B)..	114
Fig. 7.7 Chickpea dry matter accumulation as a result of increasing degree-days under weed-free (▲) conditions and in the presence of wild oat (■) for Tamworth (A) and Warialda (B)..	116
Fig. 7.8 Wild oat dry matter accumulation as a result of increasing degree-days when grown in competition with a single density (40 plants m ⁻²) of chickpea (■) for Tamworth (A) and Warialda (B)..	117
Fig. 7.9 The linear relationship between final chickpea dry weights and photographic measurements of relative cover (taken at the four assessment times) for chickpea crops growing in the presence of turnip weed (a) and wild oat (b).....	119
Fig. 8.1 The effect of different levels of shade on the grain yield of chickpea grown at Warialda:	128
Fig. 8.2 The effect of different levels of shade on total dry matter production of chickpea grown at Warialda.....	129
Fig. 8.3 The effect of different levels of shade on 100 seed weight of chickpea produced at Warialda:.....	130
Fig. 9.1 Predicted lines for each weed position treatment showing the relationship between weed density and chickpea yield.....	143

List of Plates

Plate 6.1. Example of a Time 1 photograph of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Tamworth 1996 taken 70 days after sowing from a 1.5 m height.	72
Plate 6.2. Example of a Time 2 photograph of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Tamworth 1996 taken 129 days after sowing from a 1.5 m height.	72
Plate 6.3. Example of Time 1 photograph of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Warialda in 1996 taken 51 days after sowing from a 1.5 m height.	73
Plate 6.4. Example of Time 2 photograph of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Warialda in 1996 taken 106 days after sowing from a 1.5 m height.	73
Plate 6.5. Time 1 photograph (68 DAS) of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Tamworth, 1997.....	83
Plate 6.6. Time 2 photograph (89 DAS) of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Tamworth, 1997.....	83
Plate 6.7. Time 3 photograph (131 DAS) of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Tamworth, 1997.....	84
Plate 6.8. Time 4 photograph (160 DAS) of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Tamworth, 1997.....	84
Plate 6.9. Time 1 photograph (46 DAS) of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Warialda, 1997.....	85
Plate 6.10. Time 2 photograph (75 DAS) of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Warialda, 1997.....	85
Plate 6.11. Time 3 photograph (111 DAS) of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Warialda, 1997.....	86
Plate 6.12. Time 4 photograph (139 DAS) of chickpea and turnip weed plants at Warialda, 1997.....	86
Plate 8.1 Shade shelters.	126
Plate 9.1 Pseudo-weed shade shelters in a patch across a chickpea plot.....	139
Plate 9.2 Surface view of pseudo-weed shade shelters across the chickpea plot.....	140

List of Equations

Equation 5.1 Rectangular hyperbolic model.....	51
Equation 6.1 The 1-parameter leaf-area model	67
Equation 6.2 The 2-parameter leaf-area model	67
Equation 6.3 Leaf-area model for multiple weeds.....	68
Equation 6.4 Relative cover model	68