



ISSN (E): 2277- 7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2021; 10(9): 2061-2064
© 2021 TPI

www.thepharmajournal.com

Received: 18-07-2021

Accepted: 26-08-2021

Medha Saha

Ph.D., Scholar, Department of Floriculture and Landscape Architecture, IGKV, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Pooja Gupta

Assistant Professor, Department of Floriculture and Landscape Architecture, IGKV, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Impact of mowing height and mowing interval on *C. dactylon* × *C. transvaalensis* Tifdwarf

Medha Saha and Pooja Gupta

Abstract

The present investigation entitled “Impact of mowing height and mowing interval on *C. dactylon* × *C. transvaalensis* ‘Tifdwarf’” was accomplished at Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur, 2020-21. The experiment was conducted in Factorial Randomised Block Design with treatments consisting of three mowing heights (3 cm, 6 cm and 9 cm) and three mowing intervals (7 days, 11 days and 15 days) replicated three times. Mowing the lawn on a regular basis makes the lawn aesthetically appealing, maintain its health and helps to keep the grass short, neat and even. In the present findings for *C. dactylon* × *C. transvaalensis* ‘Tifdwarf’ at 3 cm mowing height and 7 days mowing interval was found best, with maximum shoot density, clipping yield, total chlorophyll content, chlorophyll a and chlorophyll b.

Keywords: *C. dactylon* × *C. transvaalensis* ‘Tifdwarf’, mowing heights, mowing intervals

Introduction

Mowing is defined as the act of cutting or levelling down grasses at a particular height with mowing machine or tool at certain interval to maintain proper quality turf. Turf culture and mowing are indispensable part of each other. Without mowing one cannot maintain quality turf grasses. Mowing the lawn serves a two-fold purpose. First, the cosmetic benefits can be noticed immediately. A properly cut lawn is something that is very pleasant to behold. Second, mowing the lawn helps keep your lawn healthy and eliminate some of the pests from the grass at the same time. Mowing remains one of the most fundamental and energy-intensive cultural practices in maintaining a turf sward. Even with adequate moisture, fertility, and pest control, incorrect mowing can be detrimental to plant growth, function, and persistence (Law *et al.* 2016) [7]. Consistency in mowing is important to both health and appearance. It is recommended to mow frequently and not to remove more than one-third of the leaf blade in a single mowing, which is known as the “one-third rule” (Reicher *et al.*, 2006) [6]. With every cut, the best shoots will proliferate making the grass much more visible in nature overall. Evenly mowing of turf area allows equal opportunity to soak up all the resources like sun and water. This keeps your bed of green heaven i.e. lawn growing evenly. Law *et al.* 2016 [7] found a direct relationship between growth rate and mowing frequency. Quicker the growth a greater number of mowing is required. Simmons *et al.* (2011) [13], found that mowing height of 2.00 to 8.00 cm can be maintained for *Cynodon dactylon* according to intention of work and use. Mowing height to be maintained depends upon the for the turf purpose of its establishment. Tucker, 2006 [14] found *Cynodon dactylon* Tifeagle maintained at ≤ 3.2mm provides standard golf green putting surface, while for home lawns and parks weeping grass mowing height can be 2.50 cm and mowing frequency can be 14 days. Increasing the frequency of mowing decreases the growth rate of these species (Carlson *et al.* 2018) [2]. Various species and cultivar of grasses, environment in which they are grown, cultural and management practices etc. varies its response to different mowing height. To acquire good quality lawn with minimum maintenance cost it is inevitable to find proper mowing height and frequency.

Materials and Methods

Experiment was carried out to standardize the mowing requirement of *C. dactylon* × *C. transvaalensis* ‘Tifdwarf’. Randomised Block Design (Factorial) with three replications was carried out in this present experiment. Grasses were planted in plot of 2m × 1m by dibbling method and was light rolling was done immediately after transplanting. They were maintained using standard cultural practices. Irrigation was provided as per requirement in different months. Fertilization dose of 150: 100: 100 kg N P K ha⁻¹ per year was given.

Corresponding Author:

Medha Saha

Ph.D., Scholar, Department of Floriculture and Landscape Architecture, IGKV, Raipur, Chhattisgarh, India

Nitrogen was given in three split doses. Phosphorus and Potash was applied as basal dose at the time of planting. Treatments consists of three mowing heights (H1-3 cm, H2- 6 cm and H3-9 cm), three mowing intervals (I1-7 days, I2- 11 days and I3- 15 days) and their interaction.

Various parameters like Shoot density (numbers/ 100 cm²) (Ntoulas *et al.* 2011 and Murdoch *et al.* 2007) ^[10, 9], Shoot dry weight (g/ 100 cm²) (Joo *et al.* 2008) ^[5], Root length (cm) (Sangma *et al.* 2015), Root dry weight (g) (Wherley *et al.* 2009) ^[16], Clipping yield (g/100 cm²) (Law *et al.* 2016) ^[7], Total Chlorophyll content (Sangma *et al.* 2015) was estimated.

Shoot density was calculated by counting the No. of shoots present in 100 cm² area. For Shoot dry weight above ground shoots from an area of 100 cm² was cut and then dried in hot air oven at 60 ° C for 72 hours and dry weight was measured. Root length was measured by taking out soil core samples up to a depth of 30 cm. Roots were washed carefully and then the longest root was measured using a geometric scale. Root dry weight was measured by drying the roots after separating the soil at 60 ° C for 24 hours. Clipping yield was estimated by taking samples at respective mowing heights before mowing

and drying them in hot air oven at 60 ° C for 24 hours. All the chlorophyll content was estimated using Acetone method. Spectrophotometer was used to calculate the optical density of the extract which is measured at 663nm and 645 nm, since maximum absorption of Chlorophyll takes place at these wavelengths respectively. The amount of chlorophyll content was determined using formula given by Arnon (1949) ^[11].

Results and Discussion

The data is represented in table no. 1 to 6. The highest shoot density was measured at mowing height 3cm with 7 days mowing interval (493.45 numbers/ 100 cm²), while the lowest was observed in mowing height 9cm with 15 days mowing interval (253.00 numbers/ 100 cm²). Due to mowing there is loss of leaves and to compensate that loss they produce more shoots to accumulate more carbohydrates for growth by increasing the photosynthesising area. So, increase in shoot density with the decrease in mowing height and mowing interval. The findings are in close conformity with the findings of Sangma *et al.* (2015), Ntoulas *et al.* (2011) ^[10] and Murdoch *et al.* (2007) ^[9].

Table 1: Shoot Density number per 100 cm²

Shoot Density (numbers per 100 cm ²)	
Treatments	Treatments Mean
Mowing height	
H1	473.33
H2	367.22
H3	286.66
SE(m)	3.19
CD	9.57
Mowing interval	
I1	389.70
I2	361.77
I3	326.63
SE(m)	3.19
CD	9.57
Interaction	
H1I1	493.45
H1I2	453.21
H1I3	397.89
H2I1	378.33
H2I2	356.11
H2I3	329.00
H3I1	297.31
H3I2	276.00
H3I3	253.00
SE(m)	5.53
CD	16.58

Lower mowing height in turfgrass increases the frequency of mowing, which decreases the biomass accumulation and ultimately the growth rate of the species is reduced which is an immune response (Carlson *et al.* 2018 and Turgeon, 1980) ^[2, 1]. It was evident that shoot dry weight at 6cm mowing height and 15 days interval had maximum shoot dry weight

(5.67 g/ 100 cm²), while the lowest was recorded in (2.53 g/ 100 cm²) 9cm mowing height and 15 days interval. Findings of Sangma *et al.* (2015), Murdoch *et al.* (2007) ^[9] in *Cynodon* and Joo *et al.* (2008) ^[5] in *Zoysia* grass, were similar to the findings of present investigation.

Table 2: Shoot Dry weight (g/ 100 cm²)

Shoot Dry weight (g per 100 cm ²)	
Treatments	Treatments Mean
Mowing height	
H1	3.29
H2	3.93
H3	3.72

SE(m)	0.03
CD	0.10
Mowing interval	
I1	3.61
I2	3.68
I3	4.01
SE(m)	0.03
CD	0.10
Interaction	
H1I1	2.75
H1I2	3.83
H1I3	3.83
H2I1	3.40
H2I2	4.45
H2I3	5.67
H3I1	4.67
H3I2	2.76
H3I3	2.53
SE(m)	0.06
CD	0.17

Longest root length was reported in (28.31 cm) 6cm mowing height and 15 days interval, while smallest (24.33 cm) 3 cm mowing height and 7 days interval. Lower mowing height produces shorter root length and growth, as the shoot of the grasses are removed during mowing to compensate that loss grass diverts its carbohydrates reserve to shoots, to increase the no. of shoots at cost of root growth (Christians, 2004) [3]. Similar findings of higher root length at higher mowing height is in close conformity with the findings of Sangma *et al.* (2015) and Christians, (2004) [3] and smaller root length at lower mowing height, was in agreement with Turgeon, (1980) [15].

Table 3: Root length (cm)

Root length (cm)	
Treatments	Treatments Mean
Mowing height	
H1	235.17
H2	241.71
H3	242.01
SE(m)	0.26
CD	NS
Mowing interval	
I1	25.00
I2	27.00
I3	27.87
SE(m)	0.26
CD	0.77
Interaction	
H1I1	24.33
H1I2	26.75
H1I3	27.31
H2I1	25.01
H2I2	27.25
H2I3	28.31
H3I1	25.67
H3I2	27.00
H3I3	28.00
SE(m)	0.45
CD	NS

Root dry weight in the present finding was noted to be less than 1.00 gram in *Cynodon dactylon*, Similar reports were observed by Sangma *et al.* (2015) and Wherley *et al.* (2009) [16]. The maximum root dry weight (0.20 g/ 100 cm²) was reported at 9 cm mowing height and 15 days mowing interval

and the least was found in (0.04 g/ 100 cm²) at 3cm mowing height and 7days interval. Decrease in root dry weight with lower mowing height and closer mowing interval was observed in this investigation, which was in close agreement with the findings of Sangma *et al.* (2015), Ntoulas *et al.* (2011) [10] and Murdoch *et al.* (2007) [9] in weeping grass. As frequent mowing removes photosynthetically active leaves which leads to depletion of carbohydrates reserve ultimately decrease in root dry weight.

Table 4: Root dry weight (g/ 100 cm²)

Root dry weight (g/ 100 cm ²)	
Treatments	Treatments Mean
Mowing height	
H1	0.095
H2	0.105
H3	0.110
SE(m)	0.002
CD	0.005
Mowing interval	
I1	25.00
I2	27.00
I3	27.87
SE(m)	0.002
CD	0.005
Interaction	
H1I1	0.04
H1I2	0.15
H1I3	0.19
H2I1	0.05
H2I2	0.16
H2I3	0.20
H3I1	0.05
H3I2	0.17
H3I3	0.20
SE(m)	0.003
CD	NS

The highest clipping yield was noted when the grasses was mowed at 3cm mowing height and 7 days interval (5.89 g/ 100 cm², whereas the least clipping yield was recorded in (3.92 g/ 100 cm²) 9cm mowing height and 15 days interval. With lower mowing height and closer interval of mowing, the frequency or the no. of mowing increases so, more removal of clipping yield. Increase in shoot density at lower mowing height and lower interval increases the clipping yield. Similar

results were noted by Sangma *et al.* (2015), Marcholine *et al.* (2014) [8], Ntoulas *et al.* (2011) [10], Kopec *et al.* (2007) [6] in Paspalum and Grossi *et al.* (2004) [4] in tall fescue.

Table 5: Clipping Yield (g/ 100 cm²)

Clipping yield (g/ 100 cm ²)	
Treatments	Treatments Mean
Mowing height	
H1	4.94
H2	4.54
H3	5.16
SE(m)	0.05
CD	0.14
Mowing interval	
I1	5.17
I2	4.59
I3	4.35
SE(m)	0.05
CD	0.14
Interaction	
H1I1	5.89
H1I2	3.99
H1I3	4.83
H2I1	4.10
H2I2	4.97
H2I3	4.30
H3I1	5.51
H3I2	4.80
H3I3	3.92
SE(m)	0.08
CD	0.24

C. dactylon × *C. transvaalensis* 'Tifdwarf' reported the highest total chlorophyll content at lower mowing heights and closer mowing interval i.e. in 3 cm mowing height at 7 days interval with higher mowing frequency. Grasses mowed at lower intervals are found to have more greener leaves which affect the total chlorophyll content. Similar findings were reported by Sangma *et al.* (2015).

Table 6: Total Chlorophyll content (mg/ g fresh weight)

Total Chlorophyll content (mg/ g fresh weight)	
Treatments	Treatments Mean
Mowing height	
H1	3.24
H2	2.92
H3	2.94
SE(m)	0.03
CD	0.09
Mowing interval	
I1	3.06
I2	3.01
I3	2.93
SE(m)	0.03
CD	0.09
Interaction	
H1I1	3.32
H1I2	3.15
H1I3	3.18
H2I1	2.89
H2I2	2.95
H2I3	2.83
H3I1	2.96
H3I2	2.92
H3I3	2.78
SE(m)	0.05
CD	NS

Conclusion

C. dactylon × *C. transvaalensis* 'Tifdwarf' performs better with lower mowing height and closer mowing interval.

References

- Arnon DI. Copper enzymes isolated chloroplasts. Polyphenol oxidase in *Beta vulgaris*. Plant Physiol 1949;24:1-15.
- Carlson M, Keck M, Kreuser B. The Effects of Mowing Frequency on Tall Fescue (*Festuca arundinacea*) and Buffalograss (*Bouteloua dactyloides*) 2018.
- Christians N. *Fundamentals of Turfgrass management*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons Inc 2004, 359.
- Grossi N, Volterrani M, Magni S, Miele S. Tall fescue turf quality and soccer playing characteristics as affected by mowing height. Acta Horticulturae 2004;661:319-321.
- Joo YK, Lee JP, Christians NE. Mowing effect on the growth of *Zoysia japonica* Steud 'Wild Type' under low maintenance 2008. doi.org/10.1300/J099v03n02_02.
- Kopec DM, Walworth JL, Gilbert JJ, Sower GM, Pessaraki M. SeaIsle 2000' Paspalum Putting Surface Response to Mowing Height and Nitrogen Fertilizer. Agronomy Journal 2007;99:133-140.
- Law QD, Bigelow CA, Patton AJ. Selecting Turfgrasses and Mowing Practices that Reduce Mowing Requirements. Crop Sci 2016;56:3318-3327. Doi: 10.2135/cropsci2015.09.0595.
- Macolino S, Pignata G, Giolo M, Richardson D. Species succession and turf quality of tall fescue and Kentucky blue grass mixtures as affected by mowing heights. Crop science 2014;54:1220-1226.
- Murdoch R, Aldous DE, Delpratt CJ. Effect of mowing height and frequency on some agronomic characteristics of a turf type weeping grass (*Microlaena stipoides*. Labill.) var *stipoides*. Acta Horticulturae 2007;762:107-113.
- Ntoulas N, Nektarios Panayiotis A, Gougoula G. Evaluation of olive mill waste compost as a soil amendment for *Cynodon dactylon* turf establishment, growth and anchorage. Hort Science 2011;46(6):937-945.
- Reicher Z, Patton AJ, Bigelow CA, Voigt T. Mowing, thatching, aerifying, and rolling turf. AY-8-W. Purdue Univ. Cooperative Extension Service, West Lafayette, IN 2006.
- Sangma PM, Singh KP, Namita Kumar P, Pandey R, Singh VP. Comparative performance of warm season turfgrass varieties under Delhi conditions Indian Journal of Agricultural 2016;86(3):362-8.
- Simmons M, Bertelsen M, Windhager S, Zafian H. The performance of native and non- native turfgrass monoculture and polycultures: an ecological approach to sustainable lawns. Ecological engineering 2011;37:1095-1103.
- Tucker BJ, McCarty LB, Liu H, Wells CE. Mowing height, nitrogen rate and biostimulant influence root development of field grown TifEagle bermudagrass. Hort Science 2006;41(3):805-807.
- Turgeon AJ. *Turfgrass management*. Virginia: Reston publishing company 1980, 391.
- Wherley B, Sinclair T. Growth and evapotranspiration response of two turfgrass species to nitrogen and trinexapac ethyl. Hort Science 2009;44(7):2053-2057.
- Wiecko G. *Fundamentals of Tropical Turf Management*. CABI. London, UK 2006.