

## Effects of Plant Density and Planting Patterns on Yield and Yield Components of Corn (*Zea Mays L.*) HSC 704 Cultivar

Alireza Saberi

Agronomy and Garden Research Department, Golestan Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center, AREEO, Gorgan, Iran

\***Corresponding author:** Alireza Saberi, Assistant Professor, Agronomy and Garden Research Department, Golestan Agricultural and Natural Resources Research and Education Center, AREEO, Gorgan, Iran, S.P.I.DEP. P.O. Box: 49165/363, Tel: +981713350063-64; Fax: +981713359813; E-mail: [alireza\\_sa70@yahoo.com](mailto:alireza_sa70@yahoo.com)

### Abstract

To examine the effect of plant densities and sowing patterns on yield and agronomical characteristics of corn (hybrid S.C.704), a field experiment was conducted at agricultural research station of Gorgan. This experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design arranged in a factorial with four replications. Forage corn experiment had four levels of plant densities (D1 = 65000, D2 = 75000, D3 = 85000, D4 = 95000) and with two planting arrangements (p1 = single row and p2 = double row 15 cm space apart). The results showed; there was significant difference between planting arrangement for total dry matter, number of kernel per year, kernel per row, ear length and double row produced higher amount for all above characters. In addition, plant density had a significant effect on total dry weight, number of kernel per year, number of row per year, total fresh weight, and ear length at 0.01 probability levels and with an increase in plant density amount of biomass increased. The highest forage yield was produced by 95000 plant density and 15 centimeter double row at 5% significant (93.31 ton ha<sup>-1</sup>). It might be concluded that by using double row planting pattern the inter plant competition could be decreased and higher yield might be produced.

**Keywords:** *Sowing density; Planting arrangement; Hybrid S.C.704; Forage*

**Received Date:** March 05, 2019; **Accepted Date:** April 11, 2019; **Published Date:** April 17, 2019

### Introduction

With the increase in world population, demand for food consequently will grow. It is expected that human population will increase to over 8 billion by the year 2020 and this will worsen the current scenario of food security. Improved crop productivity over the past 50 years has resulted in increasing world food supplies up to 20% per person and reducing proportion of food-insecure peoples living in developing countries from 57% to 27% of total population [1]. It is predicted that at least 10 million people will be hungry and malnourished in the world by the end of this century [1]. Thus, to reduce the food insecurity, crop production will have to be doubled, and produced in more environmentally sustainable ways [2]. This can be achieved by

**Citation:** Alireza Saberi, Effects of Plant Density and Planting Patterns on Yield and Yield Components of Corn (*Zea mays L.*) HSC 704 Cultivar. Int J Clin Med Info 2019; 2(1) 18-23.

expanding the area of crop production, increasing per hectare yield and improving crop quality. Furthermore, during the second half of the past century, rise in per hectare crop productivity was due to improved or high yield potential [3].

The relationship between growth of corn under different planting pattern and plant density is not well understood. Many changes take place in plants to enable them to compete and maintain photosynthetic activity. A consideration of the adaptation mechanisms by which density affects photosynthesis would aid the improvement of growth conditions and crop yield and would provide useful tools for future genetic engineering. Works in the late 1980s demonstrated that yields can be raised two to three-fold by using available improved varieties and appropriate agronomic techniques. But these findings need to be refined, improved and tested for local climatic, soil and crop conditions [4].

These include in the aspects of to what extent of planting pattern and plant density affect the yield and morpho-pysiological parameters of corn. In addition, no comprehensive database is available on corn under combination of pattern and density at north of Iran. Thus, studies are still needed to improve understanding of the effects of pattern and density for corn. Hence, the present study was to design with the following objectives:

### **Objectives**

1. To determine the performance of corn at different levels of plant density.
2. To study the effect of planting arrangement on yield and morphological parameters of corn.
3. To identify how interaction of planting pattern and plant density affect yield and yield components of corn.

### **Materials and Methods**

In order to the development and management for corn in summer season, the current study was conducted to finding the effects of different planting pattern and plant density on yield and yield components of corn was investigated.

A field experiment was conducted in 2006 at Gorgan agricultural research station, Northern Iran (36°N 54.00' 54°E 25.00', 51 m altitude). The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design and replicated four times. The experiment consisted of 8 treatments outlined as follows.

Forage corn experiment had four levels of plant densities (D1 = 65000, D2 = 75000, D3 = 85000, D4 = 95000) and with two planting arrangements (p1 = single row and p2 = double row 15 cm space apart). Fix distance of maize was 75 cm and the space among bushes on the furrow double row arrangement was 15 cm. Those totally were including 32 plots. Each treatment with six Reas bed and 6 meters length is planting, and in doughing - milking stage for forage harvested.

All observations on dates of recording were in accordance with related statistical design, independently and complex.

Sufficient numbers of plants were sown for each treatment to facilitate destructive sampling for determining relative growth rates at the various growth stages. The selected field was under wheat cultivated, after harvesting wheat on 15 June of 2006. The considered land plowed in deep of 20-25 cm, then with cross of desk made ready for planting. At the end the analysis of variance (ANOVA) of data was performed using the software of [5] by the procedure. GLM procedure and significant of means between the treatments were obtained using Duncan Multiple Range Test at  $P < 0.05$  [6-11].

### **Results**

The results of comparing agronomic parameters of corn at four plant densities (Table 1 - Table 4) showed, that most of the corn studied characters included; total fresh weight, total dry yield, stem dry weight, leaf dry weight, husk dry weight, ear seed row, ear diameter, stem diameter and plant height were statistically significant at 5% probability level. In addition, above yield and yield components parameters with an increase in plant density increased, i.e. the highest total fresh weight, total dry yield, stem dry weight, leaf dry weight, husk dry weight with 87.40, 14.55, 5.83, 3.14 and 2.86 t/ha respectively obtained from plant density of (95000 plant/ha). While morphological parameters got from medium plant density (75000 plant/ha), in contrast plant height increased at low and high plant density (Figure 1).



**Figure 1:** General pictures from experiments, showing canopy of double row planting pattern.

As shown at (Table 2-Table 6), the main effect investigation of planting arrangement could not change significantly amount of above treats, just increased ear dry weight 14% (from 2.72 to 3.16 t/ha), it means the benefit of planting pattern would be appear if arrange with suitable plant density.

Ear Diameter (mm)	Total Dry Weight (kg/h)	Number of Seed in Year	Seed in Year	Ear Seed Row	Total Ear Weight (kg/h)	Total Fresh Weight (kg/h)	Ear Length (mm)	Treats/Treatment
								Density
40.63	12.45	432.1	25.67	14.51	20.46	77.42	19.68	D1
42.47	13.28	439.7	26.06	14.61	21.32	80.75	19.53	D2
41.06	13.22	385	23.44	13.8	21.46	85.68	18.41	D3
41.07	14.55	399.1	24.18	14.22	21.1	87.4	18.41	D4
1.418	1.058	56.05	4.391	0.763	2.537	7.238	2.24	LSD (%)

**Table 1:** Mean comparison of yield and some agronomic characteristics of silage corn on deferent plant density (2 years results). **Note:** D = Density; D1 = 65000 plant ha-1 D21 = 75000 plant ha-1, D3 = 85000 plant ha-1, D4 = 95000 plant ha-1

Interaction of planting pattern and plant density become significant at most corn studied characters. Combination treatment of planting patterns and plant density; showed: high plant density (95000 plant/ha) in double row pattern produced the most total fresh weight (93.31 t/ha), total dry weight (15.36 t/ha), dry stem (6.04 t/ha) and dry leaf (3.38 t/ha) and number of leaf (11.91 cm). The highest plant height (214.5 cm), ear height (113.9 cm) and stem diameter (17.76 mm) obtained from plant density of 85000 plant/ha in single row pattern, while production of dry corn at double row pattern (at the same plant densities) showed better performance. Other morphological parameters and yield components such as, ear length, ear seed row, seed in row and

number of seeds per year were the best at low plant density (Table 1).

Ear Diameter (mm)	Total Dry Weight (kg/h)	Number of Seed in Year	Seed in Year	Ear Seed Row	Total Ear Weight (kg/h)	Total Fresh Weight (kg/h)	Ear Length (mm)	Treats/ Treatment
								Planting Pattern
41.82	12.71	442.3	26.57	14.6	19.81	78.55	19.84	Single row
40.79	14.04	485.7	23.1	13.97	22.36	87.08	18.18	Double row
3.847	1.611	41.89	1.727	2.062	4.43	9.156	1.162	LSD (%)

**Table 2:** Mean comparison of yield and some agronomic characteristics of silage corn on deferent planting pattern (2 years results).

Ear Diameter (mm)	Total Dry Weight (kg/h)	Number of Seed in Year	Seed in Year	Ear Seed Row	Total Ear Weight (kg/h)	Total Fresh Weight (kg/h)	Ear Length (mm)	Treats/ Treatment
								Density × Pattern
47.94	12.16	460.7	27.63	14.63	19.98	76.88	20.19	P1 × D1
44.26	12.41	465.7	27.14	15.25	19.6	75.37	20.53	P1 × D2
43.54	12.51	403.9	24.66	14.07	20.02	80.46	18.86	P1 × D3
43.5	13.75	438.9	26.86	14.44	19.64	81.48	19.76	P1 × D4
38.37	12.73	403.6	23.71	14.39	20.94	77.97	19.76	P2 × D1
40.67	14.15	413.7	24.97	13.98	23.04	86.13	18.53	P2 × D2
38.59	13.93	466.1	22.22	13.92	22.9	90.9	17.96	P2 × D3
38.64	15.36	459.4	22.5	14	22.56	93.31	17.05	P2 × D4
2.639	1.755	79.67	1.877	2.248	4.827	10.46	1.266	LSD (%)

**Table 3:** Mean comparison of yield and some agronomic characteristics of silage corn on deferent planting pattern and plant density (2 years results). **Note:** P = Planting pattern; P1 = Single row, P2 = Double row D = Density; D1 = 65000 plant/ha D21 = 75000 plant/ha, D3 = 85000 plant/ha, D4 = 95000 plant/ha.

Number of Leaf	Ear Height (cm)	Plant Height (cm)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Leaf Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Stem Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Cob Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Ear Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Husk Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Treats/ Treatment
									Density
11.46	99.12	191.3	16.09	2.668	5.037	1.178	2.613	1.898	D1
11.8	101.8	198.9	16.26	2.804	5.386	1.198	3.111	1.971	D2
11.85	111.4	213.2	15.77	2.842	5.285	1.146	3.04	2.046	D3
11.84	109.2	207.2	15.72	3.147	5.836	1.121	3.016	2.076	D4
1.185	15.31	17.75	2.26	0.174	0.559	0.289	0.633	0.1283	LSD (%)

**Table 4:** Mean comparison of yield and some agronomic characteristics of silage corn on deferent plant density (2 years results). **Note:** P = Planting pattern; P1 = Single row, P2 = Double row D = Density; D1 = 65000 plant/ha D21 = 75000 plant/ha, D3 = 85000 plant/ha, D4 = 95000 plant/ha.

Number of Leaf	Ear Height (cm)	Plant Height (cm)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Leaf Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Stem Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Cob Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Ear Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Husk Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Treats/ Treatment
									Planting Pattern
11.69	107.6	203.3	16.27	2.582	5.177	1.122	2.726	2.032	Single row
11.78	103.2	202	15.65	3.138	5.595	1.199	3.164	1.196	Double row
0.2612	3.261	7.823	1.797	0.1778	0.5606	0.6353	0.3938	0.3646	LSD (%)

**Table 5:** Mean comparison of yield and some agronomic characteristics of silage corn on deferent planting pattern (2 years results).

Number of Leaf	Ear Height (cm)	Plant Height (cm)	Stem Diameter (mm)	Leaf Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Stem Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Cob Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Ear Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Husk Dry Weight (Ton/ha)	Treats/ Treatment
									Density × Pattern
11.48	99.94	187.6	16.38	2.431	4.991	1.119	2.46	1.865	P1 × D1
11.69	105.5	201.1	17.18	2.422	5.088	1.164	2.823	2.056	P1 × D2
11.84	113.9	214.5	17.76	2.566	4.99	1.114	2.85	2.095	P1 × D3
11.77	110.9	210.1	15.76	2.91	5.631	1.094	2.773	2.112	P1 × D4
11.44	98.3	195	15.8	2.905	5.082	1.236	2.776	1.931	P2 × D1
11.91	98.09	196.8	15.34	3.185	5.685	1.322	3.938	1.886	P2 × D2
11.86	108.9	211.9	15.77	3.118	5.572	1.178	3.231	1.996	P2 × D3
11.91	107.5	204.3	15.68	3.384	6.04	1.149	3.259	2.06	P2 × D4
0.284	3.533	15.65	1.959	0.194	0.792	0.213	0.787	0.729	LSD (%)

**Table 6:** Mean comparison of yield and some agronomic characteristics of silage corn on deferent planting pattern and plant density (2 years result). Note: P = Planting pattern; P1 = Single row, P2 = Double row D = Density; D1 = 65000 plant/ha, D21 = 75000 plant/ha, D3 = 85000 plant/ha, D4 = 95000 plant/ha.

## Conclusion

With considering double row planting arrangement, plant density would be increase 15% without negative effect on yield component and the yield could be increase 20%. The highest forage yield was produced by 95000 plant density and 15 centimeter double row at 5% significant (93.31 t/ha). It might be concluded that by using double row planting pattern the inter plant competition could be decreased and higher yield might be produced.

## References

1. FAO (2003) Fertilizer use by crop in Uzbekistan. FAO, Rome, Italy.
2. Borlaug NE & Dowsell CR (2005) Feeding a world of ten billion people: a 21<sup>st</sup> century challenge. In: Tuberosa T, Phillips RL, Gale M (Eds.) In the wake of double helix: From the green revolution to the gene revaluation, 21-31 May 2003, at Bologna, Italy. Avenue Media, Bologna, Italy: 3-24.
3. Arous JL, Slafer GA, Reynolds MP, et al. (2004) Physiology of yield and adaptation in wheat and barley breeding. In: Blum A, Nguyen H (Eds.) Physiology and biotechnology integration for plant breeding. Marcel Dekker. New York, USA:

1-49.

4. Qureshi AS, Qadir M, Heydari N, et al. (2007) A reviews of management strategies for salt-prone land and water resources in Iran. International water management Institute. A Repository of Agricultural Research Outputs, Colombo, Sri Lanka.
5. SAS Institute (2004) SAS/STAT user's guide. Release 9.0. 4<sup>th</sup> (Edn.) Statistical Analysis Institute, Cary, NC, USA.
6. Duncan WG (1984) A Theory to explain the relationship between corn Population and grain yield 1. Crop Science 24(6): 1141-1145.
7. Brown RH, Beaty ER, Ethredge WJ, et al. (1970) Influence of row width and plant population on yield of two varieties of corn (*Zea mays l.*) 1. Agronomy Journal 62(6): 767-770.
8. Lutz JA Jr., Camper HM, Jones CD (1971) Row spacing and plant Population effects on corn yield. Agronomy Journal 63(1): 12-14.
9. Porter PM, Hicks DR, Lueschen WE, et al. (1997) Corn response to row width and plant population in the northern corn belt. Journal of Production Agriculture 10(2): 293-300.
10. Saberi AR, Mazaheri D, Heidari Sharif Abad H (2006) Effect of density and planting pattern on yield and some agronomic characteristics of maize KSC647. Agricultural and Natural Resources Science 1: 67-76.
11. Sprague CF, Dudley JW (1988) Corn and Corn Improvement 3<sup>rd</sup> (Edn.) Madison, Wisconsin, USA.