The Pharma Innovation Journal 2023; 12(8): 2182-2185

www.ThePharmaJournal.com

The Pharma Innovation

ISSN (E): 2277-7695
ISSN (P): 2349-8242
NAAS Rating: 5.23
TPI 2023; 12(8): 2182-2185

www.thepharmajournal.com
Received: 03-05-2023
Accepted: 04-06-2023

Arun Kumar
Research Scholar, Department of Agriculture, Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Uttarakhand, India

ER Satendra Kumar
Assistant Professor, Department of Agriculture, Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Uttarakhand, India

Poonam Gussain
Assistant Professor, Department of Agriculture Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Uttarakhand, India

Corresponding Author:
Arun Kumar
Research Scholar, Department of Agriculture, Dev Bhoomi Uttarakhand University, Uttarakhand, India

Intercropping of maize with French bean and soybean leguminous crops

Arun Kumar, ER Satendra Kumar and Poonam Gussain

Abstract
French bean and soybean intercropping with maize was the subject of the investigation. The tallest plants were found in the only maize treatment, with the height of the plants varying amongst the treatments. The treatment that included only maize had the most cobs per plant, whereas the treatment that included both maize and French beans had the shortest cobs. In the solitary maize condition, both the weight per 1000 grains and the number of grains per cob were greatest. The treatment using only maize had the highest grain output, followed by the treatment using both maize and soybeans. French bean was more competitive than soybean, as evidenced by the relative crowding coefficient. In the intercropping system, French bean produced more than soybean. The study's findings generally imply that intercropping maize and soybeans may be more profitable than intercropping French beans. In various agro-ecological zones, more investigation is advised.

Keywords: Output, shortest cobs, condition

Introduction
To increase yield per unit of locale, intercropping is the demonstration of creating no less than two collects all the while on a comparative plot of land. Intercropping, a technique that is popular in lamentable nations and is by and large used by close to nothing and immaterial farmers, has of late gone under the spotlight in assessments highlighted further creating sensibility in cultivating. Search basal intercropping is particularly normal in gentle nations, in spite of the way that food grain improvement is uncommonly clear in tropical areas. Intercropping is a large part of the time used on little farms with confined resources since extending yields while additional creating strength across a collection of reap mixes has been shown. When intercropping, careful yield decision is huge. Since serious contest in mixed culture can either be advantageous or even pernicious depending upon the plant species picked. There will be less rivalry among the plants consequently, and resource use will be more practical. Taking into account that cereals could use a part of the nitrogen that vegetables have fixed typically, the blend of grain and vegetable is accepted to be great.
The Ponceau relative *Zea mays*, generally called maize or the "sovereign of cereals," is the third most basic grain on earth, behind rice and wheat. In Mexico, a comparative grain has for quite a while been a spine of many people's weight control plans. African and South and Central American areas. 1147 million tons of maize are made yearly as a result of serious managing (Maitra *et al*. 2019) [16]. India is the primary country after the US concerning the entire world.

Review of literature
Coming up next is a diagram of the survey "Intercropping of Maize with French bean and Soybean Leguminous yields":
In Changpu, a rainfed locale, it was shown by Naik and Singh (1992) [10] that intercropping French beans and maize was more useful than monoculture of either yield. This system defeated a single reap of French beans by 54%, with a LER of 1.31 and a higher Frackthan-indistinguishable yield.
At Pantmaker, found that the maize* soybean intercropping system's pivoting matched segment spatial arrangement extended the soybean's permission to light without reducing the maize's assigned light use.
In their 1997 assessment of the maize-based managing structure in Karnataka, Gollar and Patil found that the grain yields of maize with cowpea, French bean, soybean, and sunflower were 3421, 4544, 4024, and 2260 kg ha-1, independently, under staggered planting and 4181, 4935,

4539, and 3019 kg ha-1, separately, under simultaneous planting. A fundamentally more noticeable maize yield (4491 kg hal) was made when French beans were interplanted with the maize.

Patra *et al*. (1999) saw an upsurge in the utilization of corn cobs as indoor plants because of the transient complementarity in the relationship among maize and vegetables. They moreover saw that the yields of all the intercrops including maize were lower than those of the solitary harvests. The early life and more unmistakable shadowing of maize might be to blame for this.

In 2000, Oaxaca *et al*. focused on the intercropping of French beans and maize in Yugoslavia. The pieces of the maize yield that intercropping greatestly influences. In all of the maize yield parts, the degree of French beans (50:SO% masses), with two lines of French beans followed by a single section of maize, was awesome.

According to Wahua *et al*. (1981) [18], intercropping maize with beans and cowpeas increased the intercrop yield while essentially reducing the impact of the vegetable crops. Additionally, Singh *et al*. (1983) [19] maintained equivalent outcomes. On the other hand, intercropping soybean and dark gram aided maize grain development by 17–22%, according to Singh and Singh (1984) [20]. Chand (1971) [1] further confirmed that intercropping soybean rajmash or dull gram with maize fundamentally affected the grain yield of maize but rather prolonged seed yields, with soybean providing the greatest yields, as subsequently determined by Das and Mathur (1980) [2]. Additionally, explained the best yield of maize with cowpea and green gram intercrops in one of the years. in any event, in the resulting year. Green and boring gram were seen growing together.

When maize was intercropped with soybean and Vigna mungo, studies of maize intercropping with grain vegetables revealed a 15-20 cent increase in maize production. In addition, discovered that, when compared to pure stands of maize, intercropping with vegetables increased maize esteem by 3.4 to 5.6 q/ha. Thakur and Bora's experiment proved that intercropping vegetables had no effect on grain or stover productivity.

When maize sections were trimmed to 30 cm and intercropped with dull gram, as opposed to green gram and soybean intercropping in a similar laying out plan under the flood-affected regions of Rajasthan, maize grain yields as well as complete grain and dry grub yields were significantly higher. A yield of 24.1 q/ha of maize and 3.3 q/ha of vegetable grain was obtained using the recommended method for laying down pure maize at a 60 cm isolating distance.

According to Nyambo *et al*. (1982) [21], oats imparted superior yield at greater-than-normal dispersion as well as in paired segments without affecting the intercrops' vegetable yields and dry heap. According to Bora (1983) [22], planting pairs of maize and dull gram with each segment spaced 30 cm apart resulted in hard and fast productivity that was at its general minimum (1.34). This was noticeably superior to planting pairs of maize and dull gram with each segment spaced 60 cm apart, as well as a pure harvest of either maize or dull gram obtained maize gain yields of 49.1 q/ha in uniform section isolating of 7 s cm and 43.0 q/ha in paired lines 4 s cm isolated and 120 s cm between the matches, as opposed to the information previously revealed. In a pure stand of soybean, the yield of related soybean crops was 5.72 and 5.9 q/ha. The non-basic impact of layout estimation on the overall grain production in an intercropping arrangement was discovered by Singh and Awasthi in 1982 [23]. With an emphasis on the impact of three insulating dimensions, namely 60 cm x 30 cm. While the maize grain production was largely unaffected by intercropping at any of these spacings, 7S cm x 24 cm and 90 cm x 20 cm on pure and intercropped maize reported the greatest return regions of strength for of grain with the 7S cm x 20 cm separation.

Materials and Methods

The next section discusses the intricacies of the many tools and methods employed during the evaluation titled "Intercropping of Maize with French bean and Soybean Leguminous harvests".

Experimental area

The cultivation field in Dehradun, Uttarakhand, was the focus of the examination. Its territory is located at 30.340N and 77.960E, rising 650 meters above mean sea level.

Climatic condition

The mild cum-subtropical climate is characterized by harsh winters and scorching summers. Over the previous 20 years, the average annual precipitation has been 812 mm, and more than 80% of the precipitation is derived from western aggravations. Temperature ranged from 24.3 to 31.50 °C, while the overall humidity ranged from 61.7% in February to 66% in May. In the spring, it ranged from 64.3% to 70.8%.

Result and Discussion

In this section, under the headings and subheads that are now in effect, the exploratory discoveries of the continuing evaluation on "Intercropping of Maize with French bean and Soybean Leguminous yields" are presented and discussed.

Plant height

A vertical spatial distribution of plants is called plant level. The prescriptions (Table 1) were quite varied. The treatment TI (Sole maize) and T (Maize + soybean) were maintained for the tallest (177.3 cm) plant level, respectively. In treatment T: (Maize + French bean), a plant that was normally restrained at 175.3 cm (172 cm) was maintained. According to the data above, it is clear that the greater plant level was preserved for solitary yield. Discovered the pertinent findings that upheld the continuing audit.

Table 1: Plant height of maize on maize + French bean and maize + soybean intercropping system

Treatments	Plant Height		
	16 DAS	56 DAS	At Harvest
Sole Maize	11	72.10	177.3
Maize + French bean	9.67	70.33	173
Maize + Soybean	11.17	71	175.33
SEm+	0.51	0.85	1.25
CV%	25.15	6.19	3.71
CD {P=0.05}	2.01	3.32	4.19

Number of cobs per plant

There was a wide assortment in how much cow plants. Concerning, Tl (Sole maize) made the most cob (1.60), trailed by T' (Maize + Soybean), which conveyed 133. As to, T2 (Maize + French bean) conveyed the least cobs (1.13).

Table 2: How much corn cobs per plant for the maize, French bean, and maize soybean intercropping structures is displayed.

Treatment	No. of Cob per plant
Sole maize	1.60
Maize + French bean	1.13
Maize + soybean	1.33
SEm+	0.10
CV%	40.1
CD{P=0.05}	0.41

Cob length

Between treatments, the cob's length varied greatly (Table 3). Treatment Tl, (Sole maize), which generated the longest cob (17.19 em), was followed by Treatment T, (Maize + Soybean), which resulted in a cob measuring 16.65 cm. The T: (Maize + French bean) cob was the shortest treatment (16.44 cm). According to the findings, maize cultivated by itself produces longer cobs. The findings for cob length shown above accord exactly with Patra *et al*. (1999) [24].

Table 3: In the intercropping systems of corn and French and corn and soybean, the length of the cob for each corn plot is displayed.

Treatment	Average length of cobs per {cm}
Sole maize	17.19
Maize + French bean	16.44
Maize + soybean	16.55
SEm+	0.31
CV%	9.59
CD{P=0.05}	1.22

Number of grains per cob

The grains/cob is the focal yield property, was generally contrastingly among the arrangements (Table 4). Treatment T1 that is sole maize made the best number of grains/cob (458.3). Treatment T3 (Maize + soybean) gave the second most raised numb« of grains per cob that is (428.33). Then again. treatment T: the most irrelevant number of grains per cob (424.67). This outcome other than uncovered that sole maize had more vital number of grains 'cob than the intercrop. From the above outcome it very well might be said that sole maize planting oversaw over intercrop in regard of number of grains/cobs. Patra *et al*. (1999) [24] also tracked down routinely really number of grain/cobs in sole maize in an intercropping structure.

Table 4: Number of grains per cob of maize on maize + French bean and maize + soybean intercropping system

Treatments	No. of grains per cobs
Sole maize	458.33
Maize + French bean	434.67
Maize + Soybean	428.33
SEm+	6.83
CV%	8.12
CD{P=0.05}	26.8

1000-grain weight

Thousand grain weights are used to represent grain size. The weight of 1000 grains was significantly impacted by various treatments (Table 5). The largest weight per thousand grains was produced by TI (231.6 g). then T' (corn plus soybean) (227.6 g), which is only corn. This result implies that maize grown alone had a higher grain weight per kilogram than maize grown in intercropping.

Table 5: 1000-grain weight of maize on maize + French bean and maize + soybean intercropping system

Treatment	1000 grain weight {g}
Sole maize	231.6
Maize + French bean	227.6
Maize + soybean	228.6
Sem+	5.10
CV%	11.5
CD{P=0.05}	20.4

Grain yield

There was a noticeable distinction between the treatments when it came to grain. (Table 5). Treatment Tl single maize produced the greatest grain (5141.6 kg). The Treatment T' (Maize + Soybean; 2333.3 kg ha-j) grain yield came in second. However, T: (Maize + French bean) generated the least amount of grain (2000 kg). These results showed that single maize produced more grain than intercrops. This conclusion was also supported by the research of Karim *et al*. (1990), who asserted that monoculture in uniform row generated the maximum grain output of maize. And on the basis of this data, it was shown that in intercropping systems, (Maize + soybean) outperforms (Maize + French bean) in terms of grain yield.

Table 6: Grain yield of main on maize + French bean and maize + soybean intercropping system

Treatments	Grain yield kg/ha
Sole maize	5141.67
Maize + French bean	2000.00
Maize + French bean	2333.33
SEm+	230.37
CV%	37.90
CD{P=0.05}	904.54

Relative crowding coefficient

Relative crowding coefficient of maize was higher in maize French bean than maize + soybean result shows that French bean was more competitive than soybean.

Table 7: Relative crowding coefficient or main on maize + French bean and maize + soybean intercropping system

Treatments	Crowding coefficient
Sole maize	-
Maize + French bean	0.57
Maize + soybean	0.20

Yield of intercrops French bean and soybean

Here maximum yield was obtained from French bean that is 875 kg ha whereas lowest yield is obtained from soybean that is 395 kg ha

Table 8: Yield of intercrops French bean and soybean in kg ha-l as influenced by intercropping system

Treatments	Intercrops yield kg/ha
Sole maize	5141.6
Maize + French bean	875
Maize + soybean	395
SEm+	216.8
CV%	52.7
CD{P=0.05}	851.6

Summary and Conclusion

The experimental design employed was the Randomized Block Design (RBD) with three replications. Three distinct treatments—corn alone, corn alone plus French beans, and corn alone plus soybeans—were used in the study. The means of the data were computed using LSD with a 5% threshold of significance after statistical analysis of the gathered data. The required number of French bean, soybean, and maize plants per hectare were maintained in all treatments. The yield and yield-contributing traits of each treatment were recorded at harvest. Treatment TI (single maize) had the tallest plant, the biggest number of cobs/plants, the number of grains per cob, the length of the cob, and the 1000-grain weight for the maize yield characteristic and yield of maize under intercropping of maize with French bean and soybean leguminous crops. Height is a measure of a plant's vertical spatial dispersion. There was a sizable distinction.

Intercropping would make maize farming lucrative because it yields more than French beans. In light of this, it might be suggested to intercrop maize and soybeans in a system with two rows of each crop, even if T1 demands more. experiments that replicate the circumstances on a farmer's land in a number of agro-ecological zones in Dehradun.

Conclusion

Last but not least, the outcomes support the assertion that only the maize treated with T1 produced plants with the tallest stems. maximum yield, grain weight per thousand grains, and combinations of the ratio of plants to corn on the cob and the length of the cob. In terms of yield characteristics and yield when the two crops are intercropped, maize+ Soybean performs better than maize* French bean. As a consequence, treatment 3 of intercropping, which consisted of maize and soybeans, outperformed treatment 2 (which consisted of maize and French beans) in terms of yield.

Reference

1. Chand P. Studies on intercropping of maize with grain legumes and its impact on nitrogen economy and yield in Kully Valley. M.Sc. thesis (Agronomy), H. P. K.V. Palampur (H.P.); c1997.
2. Das SK, Mathur BP. Relative performance of different kharif legumes as Flesch, R. D., (2002). Pesquise Agropecuaria Brasileria. 1980;37:51-56.
3. Gallo ADS, Fontanétti A, Guimaraes NDF, Morinigo KPG, de Souza MDB, da Silva RF, *et al*. Agronomic characteristics, nutritional status and yield of corn intercropped with dwarf pigeon pea in different spatial arrangements of plants. Revista de Ciéncias Agrárias. 2018:41(2):356-366.
4. Ganajaxi SI, Halikatti SM, Hiremath, Chittapur BM. Intercropping of maize and frenchbean. Agricultural Research Communication Centre. 2010;31(4):286-291.
5. Gollar RG, Patil VC. Karnataka J Agric, sci. 1997;10:648-652.
6. Mohta NK, De R. Intercropping maize and soybean with soybeans. J Agric. sci. UK. 1980;95(1):117-122.
7. Mollen SR. Intercropping of maize (*Zea mays* L.) and soybean (*Glycine max*. L) with different plant population, fertilizers levels and methods of plant population, fertilizers levels and methods of planting under dryland agriculture. Mysore J Agric. Res. 1979;14(4):637.
8. Mollen SR. Intercropping of maize (*Zea mays* L.) and soybean (*Glycine max* L) with different plant population, fertilizers levels and methods of plant population, fertilizers levels and methods of planting under dryland agriculture. Mysore J Agric. Res. 1979;14(4):637.
9. Mohan HM. M.Sc. (Agri.) Iliesis, Uni. Agric Sci., Dharwad, Karnataka Nysobo, D.B, Matimati, T, Kamba, A.L. and Jana, R.K. 1982. Influence of plant combinations and planting configruation on three cereals (Maize, sorghum, millet) intercropped % dth two legumes (soybean and green gram) Proc, of 2nd Symp. Intercropping in Semi-arid areas• International Dev. Res, Centre (Tanazania) (c;f. Field Crop Abstr. 9828); c2003. p. 56-62
10. Naik LB, Singh RV. Fertil. News. 1992;37:45-47.
11. Oljaca S. J Agric. sci. 2000;135:261-270.
12. Padhi AK. Indian J Agron. 2001;46:204-210.
13. Punyalue Adirek, Jamjod Sansanee, Rerkasem Benjavan. Intercropping Maize with Legumes for Sustainable Highland Maize Production, International Mountain Society. 2021;38(1):35-44.
14. Rana RS. Singh B, Negi SC. Management of Maize/Legume Intercropping under Mid-Hill Sub-Humid Conditions. Indian J Agric. Res. 2001;35:100-103.
15. Maitra S, Shankar T, Banerjee P. Potential and Advantages of Maize-Legume Intercropping System Maize- Production and Use Publisher; c2020. p. l- 14.
16. Maitra S, Palai JB, Manasa P, Kumar DP. Potential of intercropping system in sustaining crop productivity. International Journal of Agriculture, Environment and Biotechnology, 2019; 12(1Sharma. R. et J. Oilseed Res. 2020;11:217-221.
17. Shrivastava Yadav RP, Rastogi VK Namdeo KN, Agarwal SK. Intercropping of maize with legumes under various nitrogen levels. Indian J Agron. 1983;28(2):156-158.
18. Wahua TA, Babalola O, Aken'Ova ME. Intercropping morphologically different types of maize with cowpeas: LER and growth attributes of associated cowpeas. Experimental Agriculture. 1981 Oct;17(4):407-13.
19. Bourgeois III LJ, Singh JV. Organizational slack and political behavior among top management teams. In Academy of management proceedings. Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510: Academy of Management. 1983 Aug 1;1:43-47.
20. Weiner SJ, Kollman PA, Case DA, Singh UC, Ghio C, Alagona G, *et al*. A new force field for molecular mechanical simulation of nucleic acids and proteins. Journal of the American Chemical Society. 1984 Feb;106(3):765-84.
21. Mhalu FS, Yusufali AM, Mbwana J, Nyambo R. Cholera-like diseases due to Vibrio parahaemolyticus. The Journal of Tropical Medicine and Hygiene. 1982 Aug 1;85(4):169-71.
22. Rabinowitz JL, Ostermann Jr L, Bora FW, Staeffen J. Lipid composition and de novo lipid biosynthesis of human palmar fat in Dupuytren's disease. Lipids. 1983 May;18(5):371-4.
23. Sharma ML, Goel KA, Awasthi AK, Tyagi SK. Haematological and biochemical characteristics of Heteropneustes fossilis under the stress of Congo Red (diphenyl disazo binaphthionic acid). Toxicology letters. 1982 Dec 1;14(3-4):237-41.
24. Patra JC, Pal RN, Chatterji BN, Panda G. Identification of nonlinear dynamic systems using functional link artificial neural networks. IEEE transactions on systems, man, and cybernetics, part b (cybernetics). 1999 Apr;29(2):254-62.