SHORT COMMUNICATION

Allelopathic potential of mango leaves for weed management in rose (Rosa hybrida ev. Happiness) basins

P. CHALLA* and V. RAVINDRA

Division of Plant Physiology and Biochemistry Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta, Bangalore - 560 089, India

Key words: Allelopathy, mango leaf mulch, rose weed management

INTRODUCTION

Allelopathy plays a significant role in the cultivation of horticultural crops. In recent years, it is being explored as one of the means for weed management to reduce chemical inputs into the horticultural production systems. The allelochemicals released from cover crops or crop residues/ mulches provide weed control (4,6). Allelopathic suppression of weeds is receiving greater attention as a possible alternative weed management strategies (1). A comparison on the use of herbicides and horticultural crop wastes like dry leaves of mango and neem trees as mulches to manage weeds in rose (*Rosa hybrida* cv. Happiness) basins is reported in the present study.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Pruned rose Cv. Happiness plants were planted in July, 1997 at a spacing of 1.0×1.0 m in 12m^2 plots having 12 plants each in the experimental field at the Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, Hessaraghatta. The treatments were: pre-emergence water sprays of diuron (@ 1.0 kg a.i./ha), Oxyfluorfen (@ 0.5 kg a.i/ha) in combination with sulfosate and glyphosate (8 ml/l), mango (Mangifera indica L.) and neem (Azadirachta indica L.) dry leaf mulching @ 20 kg/plot 15 days after planting, manual weeding and weedy check. The experiment was laid out in randomised block design with three replications. Observations were recorded on weed flora density and biomass and rose flower yield per plot.

Simultaneously, a laboratory experiment was conducted to test the effect of leaf leachates of mango on the germination and seedling growth of some cereals and vegetable seeds. The dry mango leaves were soaked for 24 h in distilled water @ 20 g/litre at ambient temperature (28°C) and filtered to collect the leachates. Petriplates (Dia. 9 cm) lined with Whatman No. 1 filter paper were used for conducting the germination test. Seven ml leachate was added to each petriplate and the same amount of distilled water served as control. The petriplates were kept at ambient temperature of 28°C.

^{*}Correspondence author

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The weed flora density and biomass were significantly influenced by the differe: treatments. The predominant weeds in the experimental area were: Monocots (*Cyperu Cynodon, Echinochloa* Spp, *Digitaria marginata, Panicum* and *Commelina benghalensi*. and Dicots (*Amaranthus viridis, Tridax procumbens, Euphorbia hirta, Mimosa pudic. Blumea mollis, Lagasca* Spp, *Phyllanthus niruri, Sonchus arvensis* and *coronopus didyma* (Tables 1, 2).

Table 1. Effect of weed control treatments on weed profile in rose basins

Treatments	Monocot weed spp.		Dicot weed spp.	
	60 DAT	120 DAT	60 DAT	120 DAT
Weedy check	Cyperus, Cynodon Echinochloa, Digitaria, Setaria, Commelina, Eleusine Eragrostis	Cyperust, Cynodon, Echinochloa, Digitaria, Setaria, c, Commelina, Eleusine, Eragrostis	Euphorbia, Mimosa, Blunea ,Achyranthus Phyllanthus, Tridax, Amarauthus, Coronopus, Malvestrum, Urena	Euphorbia, Mimosa Blumea, Achyranthus, Phyllanthus, Tridax, Amaranthus, Coronopu Malvestrum, Urena
Hand weeding (monthly)	Cyperus, Cynodon, Echinochloa, Commelina	Cyperus, Cynodon, Commelina	Euphorbia, Blumea. Tridax , Lagasca. Bidens, Mimosa. Amaranthus	Euphorbia, Blumea, Tridax, Phylanthus
Mango leaf mulch	Cyperus, Cynodon	Cyperus, Cynodon, Commelina	Nil	Euphorbia, Blumea
Neem leaf mulch	Cyperus , Cynodon, Echinochloa	Cyperus , Cynodon, Commelina	Lagasca, Blumea	Euphoribia, Blumea, Mimosa, Tridax, Lagasca
Radish live mulch	Cyperus, Cynodon, Echinochloa, Commelina	Cyperus , Cynodon, Echinochloa , Echinochloa	Lagasca, Blumea, Amaranthus, Coronopus	Euphorbia, Blumea, Lagasca, Amaranthu Coronopus
Diuron + Sulfosate	Cyperus, Cynodon	Cyperus, Cynodon, Commelina	Euphorbia	Euphorbia, Blumea, Tridax, phyllanthus
Oxyflurofen +glyphosate	Cyperus, Cynodon	Cyperus, Cynodon. Commelina	Euphorbia	Euphorbia, Blumea, Tridax, Phyllanthus
Oxyfluroten +glyphosate	Cyperus, Cynodon	Cyperus, Cynodon, Commelina	Euphorbia	Euphorbia, Blumea, Tridax, Phyllanthus

DAT = Days after treatment

Table 2. Effect of weed control treatments on Cyperus and Cynodon density in Rose during July pruning

Treatments	Cyperus rotuno	lus (No/m²)	Cynodon dactylon (No/m²)	
	30 DAS	60 DAS	30 DAS	60 DAS
Weedy check	34.0	54.0	36.0	80.0
Hand weeding monthly	33.2	50.0	18.0	76.0
Mango leaf mulch	6.0	11.2	5.2	22.0
Neem leaf mulch	5.2	8.0	0.0	0.0
Radish live mulch	17.2	20.2	0.0	5.2
Diuron + sulfosate	20.6	20.2	6.0	20.2
Oxyfluorfen + glyphosate	20.6	33.2	9.2	5.2
Oxyfluorfen + sulfosate	30.0	30.0	12.0	12.0

DAS = Days after sowing

The observation of the experimental plots 60 days after treatment imposition, indicated that all the dicot weeds except *Euphorbia hirta* were controlled in the herbicide treated and mango leaf mulched plots. In the neem leaf mulched plots, *Blumea* and *Lagasca* were also present. After 120 days, the observations indicated that only *Euphorbia hirta*, *Amaranthus viridis* and *Lagasca* were present in the herbicide treated and mango leaf mulched plots. While in other pots, most of the dicot weeds were present (Table 1,2). The reduction in weed biomass was due to the reduction in the weed number and suppressed weed growth (Table 3).

Table 3. Effect of weed control treatments on Rose flower yield and weed dry weight during July, 1997 and January, 1998 pruned plots

Treatments	Rose flow	ers (No/plot)	Weed dry weight (g/m2*) Jan. 1998		
	July, 1997	Jan. 1998	Monocots	Dicots	
Weedy check	26	86	34.9	19.4	
Handweeding (monthly)	30	107	24.6	8.0	
Mango leaf mulch	26	117	10.4	7.5	
Neem leaf mulch	20	90	12.3	20.5	
Radish live mulch	31	106	14.0	8.7	
Diuron + sulfosate	38	118	18.8	8.0	
Oxyfluorfen + glyphosate	29	107	21.2	7.4	
Oxyfluorfen + sulfosate	26	89	30.0	9.2	

^{* 60} days after treatment

The treatments did not affected the crop growth. The rose flower numbers was marginally higher in herbicide treated and mango leaf mulched plots. Various organ mulches like straw, leaves, husks and crop residues have been successfully used in cult vated fields. In banana, use of organic mulches increased the yield (2,3). The beneficial effects of mango leaf mulch on improving yield have also been reported in cauliflower (5).

The mango leaf leachates did not affect germination of the finger millet, whea french bean, tomato, brinjal, pumpkin, onion, cowpea and chillies even at 2% concentratio (Table 4). However, the radicle growth in finger millet and french bean was reduced by 8 and 89%, respectively. In radish the cotyledonary leaves were etiolated and there was reduction in chlorophyll 'a' and 'b' by 50 and 75% respectively (Table 5).

Table 4. Allelopathic effect of mango leaf leachates on fingermillet and french bean seed germinatio and seedling growth in bioassay*

Leachate concentration (%)	Finger m	let		French bean		
	Germination (%)	Root length (mm)	Shoot length (mm)	Germination (%)	Root length (mm)	Shoot lengtl (mm)
Control (DW)	100	4.60	2.3	93	9.2	2.50
1.00	100	0.99	1.09	86	0.99	1.07
0.50	100	2.35	1.81	90	2.10	2.00
0.25	100	3.72	1.85	96	3.61	2.48

Control = Distilled water

Table 5. Effect of mango leaf leachates of leaf chlorophyll content of Radish Cv. Arka Nishant

Leachate concentration (%)	OD at 660 μ chlorophyll'a'	OD at 645µ chlorophyll'b'	OD at 645 μ Total chlorophyll
Control	0.30	0.12	0.18
1.00	0.15	0.03	0.07
0.50	0.24	0.06	0.14
0.25	0.27	0.10	0.15

Control = Distilled water, OD= Optical denesity

It is presumed that the high content of phenolics in mango leaves may be responsible for the inhibition of seedling growth in the laboratory bioassay. Further detailed studies are required to explore the bioherbicidal nature of mango leaves and the chemical nature of the allelopathins of mango leaf leachates.

^{*}No adverse effect was seen on germination and seedling growth of brinjal, tomato, pumpkin, onion, cowpea and chillie.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are thankful to the Director, Indian Institute of Horticultural Research, for providing the necessary facilities and to Mr. J. Rajendran and Mr. M. Laxmaiah for technical assistance.

REFERENCES

- 1. Altieri, M.A. (1988). In *Weed Management in Agroecosystems : Ecological Approaches* (Eds., M.A. Altieri and M. Liebman), pp. 1-6. Boca Raton, FL, USA : CRC Press
- 2. Battacharya, R.K. and V.N. Madhava Rao (1985). Soil covers increased banana production. *Indian Horticulture* **30**: 58.
- 3. Kotoky, U. and R.K. Battacharya (1991). Bunch weight and yield of banana as influenced by organic mulches. *Indian Journal of Horticulture* **48**: 121-123.
- 4. Putnam,, A.R. and DeFrank, J. (1979). Use of cover crops to inhibit weeds. *Proceedings of IX International Congress of Plant Protection* pp. 580-582.
- 5. Singh, S.B. and Mishra, R.S. (1976). Effect of various mulches on the growth and yield of cauliflower (*Brassica oleracea* L.) var. Botrytis. *Progressive Horticulture* 7:65-67.
- 6. White, R.L., Worsham, A.D. and Blum, U. (1989). Allelopathic potential of legume debris and aqueous extracts. *Weed Science* 37: 674-679.