

Studies on intergenotypic competition in upland rice

D.N. Bastia*, S.R. Das and T.K. Mishra

Department of Plant Breeding and Genetics, College of Agriculture, Orissa University of Agriculture and Technology, Bhubaneswar-751 002, Orissa, India

ABSTRACT

The competitive interactions of ten upland rice genotypes were assessed by growing binary mixtures and component monocultures for evaluating the agricultural value of variety mixture for higher productivity. Also attempt was made to correlate different characters with competitive ability and to use such information in selection strategies for developing upland varieties with high yields and competitive ability. The different parameters of de Wit's model like relative yield, relative crowding coefficient and relative reproductive rate were used for assessing competitive interactions. It was found that competitiveness is associated with the increased grains per panicle, higher grain fertility and better grain filling. The genotypes Kalinga III, Badami and Khandagiri were found to possess high competitive ability. It was also noticed that the binary mixtures like Badami + Annada, Pathara + Badami, Badami + Annada, Ghanteswari + Sidhant, Suphala + Annapurna, Parijat + Badami out yielded the best component parent.

Key words: Binary mixture, intergenotypic competition, rice

The ecologically handicapped rainfed upland environment contributes abysmally low to the total rice production, mainly due to a large number of interacting factors like unfavourable crop environment, poor crop husbandry, severe weed competition and lack of adaptability of varieties to moisture stress (Das and Ray, 1994). Use of varietal mixtures in such situation offers excellent possibilities of disease control and alleged advantage over monocultures which include greater stability of performance across diverse environment and yield synergism through efficient utilization of resources (Marshall and Brown, 1973; Chaudhury and Paroda, 1979 and Barret, 1981). In a mixture population, there is competition between component genotypes as well as the performance of genotype differs from its performance in homogenous monoculture. The genotypes also vary in their competitive ability.

During the present investigation an attempt was made to synthesize and evaluate binary mixtures and determine their agricultural value for higher productivity in risk prone rainfed upland situations. In addition to this an effort has also been made to correlate different characters with higher competitive ability and to use

such information in future selection strategies where an equilibrium between competitive ability and agronomic productivity can be realized.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The basic experimental material consisting of 10 high yielding upland rice varieties were utilized to develop forty five binary mixtures. These mixtures along with ten monocultures were evaluated in a Randomized Block Design at Rice Research Station, OUAT, Bhubaneswar during wet season 2000. The spacing was maintained at 10 x 10 cm to enforce adequate competition among the plants. Observations were recorded on nine metric characters. In the mixture plots, separate observations were recorded on each variety. The data were analysed according to de Wit's model (1960) to give a quantitative description of the competitive interactions. Parameters like Relative Yields (RY), Relative Crowding Coefficient (RCC) and Relative Reproductive Rate (RRR), were used to assess competitive interactions, among the varieties.

Relative Yield (RY) is the ratio of the yield of a genotype in mixture to its yield in monoculture.

Table 1. Performance of monoculture and mixture with deviation (%) from the mean of the constituent monoculture and the best component in upland rice

| i/j | i(gm/plot) | j(g/plot) | + (g/plot) | i + j (t ha ⁻¹) | Deviation (%) MP | Deviation (%) BC |
|-------|------------|-----------|------------|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|
| 1 | | | 1280 | 3.56 | | |
| 2 | | | 1430 | 3.97 | | |
| 3 | | | 1220 | 3.39 | | |
| 4 | | | 1705 | 4.74 | | |
| 5 | | | 1420 | 3.94 | | |
| 6 | | | 1435 | 3.99 | | |
| 7 | | | 1710 | 4.72 | | |
| 8 | | | 1635 | 4.54 | | |
| 9 | | | 1570 | 4.36 | | |
| 10 | | | 1435 | 4.15 | | |
| 1+2 | 660 | 540 | 1200 | 3.33 | -11.44 | -29.82 |
| 1+3 | 960 | 455 | 1415 | 4.20 | 13.20 | -17.25 |
| 1+4 | 605 | 645 | 1250 | 3.47 | -16.25 | -26.90 |
| 1+5 | 815 | 700 | 1515 | 3.93 | 12.22 | -11.40 |
| 1+6 | 730 | 725 | 1455 | 4.04 | 7.16 | -14.91 |
| 1+7 | 650 | 710 | 1360 | 3.77 | -9.03 | -20.46 |
| 1+8 | 750 | 550 | 1300 | 3.61 | -10.81 | -23.90 |
| 1+9 | 715 | 150 | 1165 | 3.24 | -18.24 | -31.87 |
| 1+10 | 735 | 450 | 1185 | 3.29 | -12.71 | -30.70 |
| 2+3 | 840 | 585 | 1425 | 3.96 | 7.54 | -16.67 |
| 2+4 | 670 | 815 | 1485 | 4.13 | -5.26 | -13.16 |
| 2+5 | 785 | 830 | 1615 | 4.49 | 13.33 | -5.56 |
| 2+6 | 720 | 995 | 1715 | 4.77 | 19.72 | 0.29 |
| 2+7 | 825 | 870 | 1695 | 4.15 | 7.96 | -0.87 |
| 2+8 | 790 | 775 | 1565 | 4.35 | 2.12 | -0.85 |
| 2+9 | 860 | 825 | 1685 | 4.68 | 12.33 | -1.46 |
| 2+10 | 750 | 690 | 1440 | 4.00 | 0.52 | -15.78 |
| 3+4 | 580 | 765 | 1345 | 3.74 | -8.03 | -21.35 |
| 3+5 | 520 | 715 | 1235 | 3.43 | -6.44 | -27.78 |
| 3+6 | 530 | 965 | 1495 | 4.15 | 12.62 | -12.57 |
| 3+7 | 550 | 985 | 1535 | 4.27 | 4.78 | -10.23 |
| 3+8 | 705 | 1025 | 1730 | 4.81 | 21.19 | 1.17 |
| 3+9 | 585 | 1125 | 1710 | 4.75 | 22.58 | 0.00 |
| 3+10 | 645 | 845 | 1490 | 3.84 | 12.24 | -12.87 |
| 4+5 | 835 | 770 | 1605 | 4.47 | 2.72 | -6.14 |
| 4+6 | 755 | 1060 | 1815 | 5.04 | 15.61 | 6.14 |
| 4+7 | 790 | 680 | 1470 | 4.09 | -13.91 | -14.04 |
| 4+8 | 705 | 590 | 1395 | 3.87 | -16.47 | -18.42 |
| 4+9 | 805 | 705 | 1510 | 4.19 | -7.79 | -11.70 |
| 4+10 | 860 | 810 | 1670 | 4.64 | 6.31 | -2.34 |
| 5+6 | 785 | 775 | 1560 | 4.33 | 9.28 | -8.77 |
| 5+7 | 790 | 905 | 1695 | 4.71 | 8.31 | -0.88 |
| 5+8 | 690 | 810 | 1500 | 4.17 | -1.80 | -12.28 |
| 5+9 | 710 | 880 | 1590 | 4.42 | 4.09 | -7.02 |
| 5+10 | 880 | 700 | 1580 | 4.39 | 10.68 | -7.60 |
| 6+7 | 735 | 860 | 1595 | 4.33 | 1.43 | -6.73 |
| 6+8 | 795 | 835 | 1630 | 4.53 | 8.19 | -4.68 |
| 6+9 | 555 | 780 | 1335 | 3.71 | -11.15 | -21.93 |
| 6+10 | 1010 | 750 | 1760 | 4.89 | 22.65 | 2.92 |
| 7+8 | 785 | 880 | 1665 | 4.63 | -0.45 | -2.63 |
| 7+9 | 960 | 790 | 1750 | 4.86 | 6.71 | 2.34 |
| 7+10 | 690 | 530 | 1220 | 3.39 | -22.42 | -28.65 |
| 8+9 | 780 | 860 | 1640 | 4.56 | 2.34 | -4.09 |
| 8+10 | 770 | 685 | 1455 | 4.34 | -5.21 | -14.91 |
| 9-10 | 700 | 735 | 1435 | 3.99 | -4.49 | -16.08 |
| Mean | 741.333 | 776.222 | 1503 | 4.16 | | |
| CV | 14.829 | 20.059 | 11103 | 1.10 | | |
| SE(m) | 16.368 | 22.941 | 22501 | 0.621 | | |

1= KalingaIII, 2 = Parijat, 3 = Suphala, 4 = Pathara, 5= Khandagiri, 6= Badami, 7 = Ghanteswari, 8 = Annapurna, 9= Sidhant, 10= Annada

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis of variance in respect of nine characters revealed highly significant differences among the treatments in respect of majority of the characters. The advantages of the mixtures over the mean performance of the corresponding monocultures and the best component parent (Table 1) indicated variations ranging from -22.42 % to 22.65 % and - 31.87 to 6.14 %, respectively. Twenty seven out of the forty five binary mixture out yielded the mean of the corresponding monocultures. The maximum increase of 22.65 % was observed in Badami + Annada combination followed by Suphala + Sidhant, Suphala + Annapurna, Parijat + Badami, Pathara + Badami, Parijat + Khandagiri, Kalinga III + Suphala, Suphala + Badami, Suphala + Annala, Kalinga III + Khandagiri and Khandagiri + Annada. Only five binary mixtures *viz.*, Pathara + Badami, Badami + Annada, Ghanteswari + Sidhant, Suphala + Annapurna and Parijat + Badami out-yielded the best component parent. Higher grain yield and greater stability of performance over environments of the varietal mixture has also been reported by Allard, 1961; Simmonds, 1962; Qualset, 1968; Bhatt and Derera, 1973. This may possibly due to synergistic interaction of the component lines.

Average relative yield values for characters like plant height, panicle length, flag leaf area, grain number, fertility percentage and 100 seed weight was approximately 0.5 indicating the varieties were equally competitive with regard to these characters (Table 2). However, the relative yield values estimated for

effective tillers plant⁻¹, grain yield plant⁻¹ and grain yield plot⁻¹, in a binary mixture exhibited a different trend *i.e.*, existence of competitive interaction among the varieties for these characters. From the relative yield values, it was found that Badami exhibited highest average relative yield followed by Kalinga III, Khandagiri, Parijat and Sidhant. The relative yield (RY) is the ratio of the yield in mixture with that of the yield in monoculture. A perusal of average RCC (Table 3) revealed that varieties like Kalinga III, Badami, Khandagiri, Parijat and Sidhant exhibited higher estimates of RCC for characters, like grain yield plot⁻¹. Kalinga III, also exhibited higher RCC values for all other characters except for panicle length. Badami exhibited higher RCC values for all characters except flag leaf area. Higher RCC values for eight characters except plant height was exhibited by Khandagiri. Hence, it may be concluded that Kalinga III was found to be the most aggressive variety followed by Badami, Khandagiri, Parijat and Sidhant.

A perusal of average RRR values (Table 4) revealed that the varieties Kalinga III, Badami and Khandagiri had higher average RRR. The relative magnitude of RRR values of Kalinga III was higher (>1.0) in seven binary mixtures out of nine for grain yield/plot. In Badami and Khandagiri higher estimates of RRR were obtained in six and five mixture components, respectively. This indicated their better fitness to mixture population.

As our basic interest during the present investigation was to identify such characters which not

Table 2. Average relative yield of the 10 rice genotypes for different metric characters

| Varieties | Plot yield | Grain yield plant ⁻¹ | Plant height | Panicle length | Flag leaf area | Grain number | Effective tillers plant ⁻¹ | Grain fertility (%) | 100-seed weight |
|-------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Kalinga III | 0.572 | 0.516 | 0.486 | 0.482 | 0.463 | 0.550 | 0.470 | 0.527 | 0.522 |
| Parijat | 0.526 | 0.329 | 0.496 | 0.497 | 0.496 | 0.448 | 0.379 | 0.486 | 0.499 |
| Suphala | 0.470 | 0.342 | 0.499 | 0.507 | 0.478 | 0.443 | 0.413 | 0.477 | 0.518 |
| Pathara | 0.453 | 0.428 | 0.486 | 0.517 | 0.441 | 0.498 | 0.499 | 0.474 | 0.497 |
| Khandagiri | 0.537 | 0.543 | 0.492 | 0.508 | 0.503 | 0.538 | 0.494 | 0.583 | 0.510 |
| Badami | 0.589 | 0.504 | 0.501 | 0.500 | 0.391 | 0.508 | 0.500 | 0.517 | 0.517 |
| Ghanteswari | 0.482 | 0.424 | 0.494 | 0.506 | 0.519 | 0.461 | 0.480 | 0.457 | 0.499 |
| Annapurna | 0.481 | 0.389 | 0.499 | 0.502 | 0.503 | 0.450 | 0.466 | 0.461 | 0.500 |
| Sidhant | 0.512 | 0.323 | 0.468 | 0.486 | 0.474 | 0.461 | 0.407 | 0.509 | 0.496 |
| Annada | 0.462 | 0.386 | 0.481 | 0.481 | 0.433 | 0.456 | 0.413 | 0.454 | 0.468 |

Table 3. Average relative crowding coefficient of 10 rice varieties for different metric characters

| Varieties | Plot yield | Grain yield plant ⁻¹ | Plant height | Panicle length | Flag leaf area | Grain number | Effective tillers plant ⁻¹ | Grain fertility (%) | 100-seed weight |
|-------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Kalinga III | 1.524 | 1.756 | 1.033 | 0.988 | 1.012 | 1.281 | 1.187 | 1.101 | 1.064 |
| Parijat | 1.019 | 0.787 | 1.016 | 0.996 | 1.159 | 0.917 | 0.801 | 0.959 | 0.981 |
| Suphala | 0.802 | 0.728 | 1.032 | 1.015 | 1.025 | 0.889 | 0.783 | 0.968 | 1.033 |
| Pathara | 0.925 | 1.078 | 0.997 | 1.038 | 0.924 | 1.051 | 1.247 | 0.953 | 0.986 |
| Khandagiri | 1.038 | 1.038 | 0.989 | 1.012 | 1.104 | 1.144 | 1.084 | 1.222 | 1.017 |
| Badami | 1.183 | 1.183 | 1.014 | 1.011 | 0.856 | 1.084 | 1.135 | 1.067 | 1.032 |
| Ghanteswari | 0.984 | 0.984 | 1.015 | 1.016 | 1.072 | 0.958 | 1.299 | 0.947 | 1.004 |
| Annapurna | 0.978 | 0.948 | 1.007 | 1.001 | 1.081 | 0.952 | 1.035 | 0.946 | 1.015 |
| Sidhant | 1.037 | 0.789 | 0.952 | 0.984 | 1.021 | 0.982 | 0.878 | 1.022 | 0.967 |
| Annada | 0.884 | 0.922 | 0.959 | 0.949 | 0.868 | 0.900 | 0.944 | 0.899 | 0.921 |

Table 4. Average relative reproductive rate of 10 rice genotypes for different characters

| Varieties | Plot yield | Grain yield plant ⁻¹ | Plant height | Panicle length | Flag leaf area | Grain number | Effective tillers plant ⁻¹ | Grain fertility (%) | 100-seed weight |
|-------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-----------------|
| Kalinga III | 1.326 | 1.517 | 1.393 | 1.102 | 0.808 | 0.953 | 1.271 | 1.046 | 1.244 |
| Parijat | 0.983 | 0.877 | 0.972 | 0.957 | 0.837 | 0.799 | 0.997 | 1.084 | 0.971 |
| Suphala | 0.637 | 0.707 | 0.869 | 0.929 | 1.079 | 1.154 | 0.924 | 0.981 | 0.671 |
| Pathara | 1.088 | 1.122 | 1.001 | 0.978 | 1.020 | 0.924 | 1.054 | 0.995 | 1.294 |
| Khandagiri | 1.101 | 1.070 | 0.998 | 0.952 | 1.045 | 0.931 | 1.075 | 1.452 | 1.047 |
| Badami | 1.162 | 1.059 | 0.972 | 1.088 | 1.213 | 1.067 | 1.001 | 0.962 | 1.115 |
| Ghanteswari | 1.069 | 1.221 | 0.977 | 1.091 | 1.074 | 1.029 | 1.067 | 0.904 | 1.104 |
| Annapurna | 1.059 | 1.003 | 0.916 | 1.113 | 1.213 | 1.046 | 0.939 | 0.953 | 1.124 |
| Sidhant | 1.099 | 1.119 | 1.105 | 0.878 | 0.916 | 1.275 | 0.978 | 1.053 | 0.789 |
| Annada | 0.893 | 0.801 | 0.937 | 0.977 | 0.987 | 1.003 | 0.796 | 0.962 | 1.103 |

Table 5. Percent increase or decrease over expected value (monoculture) for different yield attributing characters in Badami

| Binary mixture combinations | Plot yield | Panicle length | Grain number | Grain fertility (%) | 100-grain weight | Tillers plant ⁻¹ |
|-----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Badami + Kalinga III | 1.12 | -3.09 | -8.56 | -1.36 | -0.85 | 0.00 |
| Badami + Parijat | 38.77 | -1.32 | 9.65 | 8.21 | 5.95 | 9.30 |
| Badami + Suphala | 34.58 | -0.88 | 2.41 | -2.99 | -0.52 | 9.30 |
| Badami + Pathara | 47.38 | 3.98 | 5.67 | 8.21 | 3.40 | -13.95 |
| Badami + Handagiri | 8.08 | -0.86 | 1.45 | -0.57 | 4.25 | -6.98 |
| Badami + Ghanteswari | 2.51 | -0.44 | 0.36 | 6.23 | 10.21 | -6.98 |
| Badami + Annapurna | 10.87 | 1.33 | 11.33 | 9.26 | -0.85 | -4.65 |
| Badami + Sidhant | -22.59 | -0.44 | -11.45 | -8.84 | 2.13 | 2.33 |
| Badami + Annada | 40.86 | -0.44 | 4.70 | 10.46 | 3.40 | 9.30 |
| Total | 161.58 | -2.16 | 15.56 | 28.61 | 27.12 | -2.33 |
| Average | 17.91 | -0.24 | 1.73 | 3.18 | 3.01 | -0.26 |

only determine high yield in mixture but also responsible for maintaining higher productivity in monoculture, a comparison between grain yield and other associated characters was made under competitive situations. A study of increased (%) performance of component cultures in mixture as compared to performance in monoculture (Table 5, 6 and 7) for different characters in three highly competitive genotypes like Badami, Khandagiri and Kalinga III, revealed that the competitiveness was associated with the increased number of grains panicle⁻¹, higher grain fertility and better grain filling (high grain weight). Therefore, it

maybe concluded that high grain number/panicle, higher grain fertility and better seed filling strengthens the view that highly competitive plants are those which are capable of producing larger and more number of viable seeds. But it is a foregone conclusion that where genetic selection has been made for large seeds, there was usually been a corresponding decrease in number of grains/panicle and the best means of increasing yield may be to select for high grain number/panicle and allow the seed size to move as a more or less random variable (Grafius *et al.*, 1976).

Table 6. Percent increase or decrease over expected value (monoculture) for different yield attributing characters in Khandagiri

| Binary mixture combinations | Plot yield | Panicle length | Grain number | Grain fertility (%) | 100-grain weight | Tillers plant ⁻¹ |
|-----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Khandagiri + Kalinga III | -1.40 | 1.50 | 8.77 | 11.63 | 1.33 | -21.56 |
| Khandagiri – Parijat | 16.90 | 2.50 | 7.76 | 15.68 | 4.00 | 7.84 |
| Khandagiri + Suphala | 0.70 | 1.00 | 4.74 | 21.40 | 3.16 | 27.45 |
| Khandagiri + Pathara | 8.45 | 0.05 | 9.20 | 12.37 | -5.33 | -3.92 |
| Khandagiri + Badami | 10.56 | 2.50 | 6.18 | 19.60 | 3.11 | -1.96 |
| Khandagiri + Ghentaswari | 11.26 | -1.00 | 11.94 | 18.76 | 2.66 | 0.90 |
| Khandagiri+ Annapurna | -2.82 | 0.00 | 3.88 | 15.23 | 2.22 | -17.64 |
| Khandagiri-Sidhant | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.74 | 15.97 | -0.88 | -3.92 |
| Khandagiri + Annada | 23.94 | 3.00 | 12.37 | 13.37 | 2.22 | 3.92 |
| Total | 67.59 | 9.55 | 66.58 | 144.01 | 12.49 | -8.89 |
| Average | 7.51 | 1.06 | 7.40 | 16.00 | 1.39 | 0.99 |

Table 7. Percent increase or decrease over expected value (monoculture) for different yield attributing characters in Kalinga III

| Binary mixture combinations | Plot yield | Panicle length | Grain number | Grain fertility (%) | 100-grain weight | Tillers plant ⁻¹ |
|-----------------------------|------------|----------------|--------------|---------------------|------------------|-----------------------------|
| Kalinga III + Parijat | 3.12 | -0.12 | 13.65 | 5.49 | 1.32 | -0.18 |
| Kalinga III + Suphala | 50.00 | 0.42 | 24.65 | 9.36 | 1.76 | 30.90 |
| Kalinga III + Pathara | -5.46 | -4.27 | 1.73 | 1.59 | 3.08 | -21.81 |
| Kalinga III + Khandagiri | 27.34 | -2.99 | 18.99 | 7.35 | 5.28 | -10.90 |
| Kalinga III + Badami | 14.06 | -5.55 | 10.36 | 2.48 | 3.96 | -14.54 |
| Kalinga III + Ghanteswari | 1.56 | -2.56 | 5.81 | 2.06 | 3.52 | -10.90 |
| Kalinga III + Annapurna | 17.18 | -1.28 | 17.58 | 5.08 | 5.28 | -10.90 |
| Kalinga III + Sidhant | 11.72 | 11.11 | -8.47 | 5.16 | 4.84 | -0.36 |
| Kalinga III + Annada | 14.84 | -2.13 | 10.05 | 6.18 | 7.92 | -12.72 |
| Total | 134.36 | -7.37 | 94.35 | 44.77 | 36.96 | -51.41 |
| Average | 14.93 | -0.82 | 10.40 | 4.97 | 4.11 | -5.71 |

REFERENCES

- Allard RW 1961. Relationship between genetic diversity and consistency of performance in different environments, *Crop Sci* 2: 127-133
- Barret JA 1981. The evolutionary consequences of monocultures. In genetic consequences of Mammals change. Eds. JA Bistoon and LM Cook, Academic Press PP. 239-248
- Bhatt GM and Derera NF 1973. Heterogeneity in relation to performance in breadwheat. Proc. Fourth Int. Wheat Genet Symp, Univ., Missouri, Columbia, pp.489-493
- Chaudhury BS and Paroda RS 1979. Stability in relation to homogenous and heterogeneous populations in wheat. *Wheat Indian J Genet* 39: 425-433
- Das SR and Ray A 1994. Varietal needs for rainfed uplands in Orissa State. Present status, Projections and difficulties. Paper presented at workshop on rice productivity in eastern region states, OUAT, Bhubaneswar, Feb 7-9: 1994
- Dewit CT 1960. On competition vrs. Land bouw. *Onders. Agric. Res.* , 66(8), Pudoc, Wageningin, pp.82
- Grafius JE, Thomas RI and Barnad J 1976. Effects of components of yield in barley. *Crop Sci*, 16: 637-677
- Marshall DR and Brown ADH 1973. Stability of performance of mixtures and multilines. *Euphyllitica* 22: 405-412
- Qualset CO 1968. Population structures and performance in wheat proc. Third Int. Wheat Genet. Gyp., Canberra, Australia, pp.397-402
- Simonds NW 1962. Variability in crop plants, its use and conservation. *Biol Rev* 37: 422-465