

Agroecology for IPM (I)

Weed Management


Paolo Bàrberi

**Institute of Life Sciences
Sant'Anna School of Advanced Studies
Pisa (Italy)**

Lecture outline

- The importance of weed management in the context of IPM (and organic agriculture)
- Integrated Weed Management System (IWMS): the agroecological approach to weed management
- A snapshot on weed biology, ecology and community dynamics: essential knowledge for IWM
- A snapshot on preventive, cultural and direct methods
- Case study on system approach to IWM
- Going wider: weed/insect functional interactions and habitat diversity

'You can't get what you want (till you know what you want)'
Joe Jackson (Body and Soul, A&M Records, 1984)



An *ante-litteram* definition of system approach

Then, in natural sciences, is the composite thing, the thing as a whole that mainly interests us, and not its components, that cannot be taken aside from the thing itself


Aristotles

(after Altieri, 1995)

The theoretical framework

Deep knowledge
of agro-ecosystem
structure and components

System approach



Agroecology
Sustainable agriculture
True IPM



DIVERSIFICATION

Ascending level of pest management complexity

Level of IPM integration

Level III

Robert Norris (UC Davis, USA)
1st ENDURE Summer School
'Biodiversity supporting crop protection'
Volterra, September 2007

Level II

Level I

Threshold for IPM

Synthetic pesticides applied by crop phenology or calendar

Conventional pest control

Synthetic pesticides; pest detection and thresholds

Transition to Level I IPM


Selective pesticides; pest detection and thresholds. Cultural tactics

Same as previous + all IPM tactics within a pest category

Same as previous + integration of all pest categories, use of crop-pest models

Same as previous + multicrop interactions, ecosystem processes, and regional aspects

Integrated pest management: increasing range of tactical components and level of integration



The importance of weed management in agricultural crops

Fruit crops



Leys and pastures



Field crops



Vegetable and medicinal crops



Integrated Weed Management (IWM)

- A **strategy** to maintain weed abundance below a 'threshold' of acceptable damage through the integration of **preventive, cultural, genetic, mechanical, biological and chemical tactics** (control means)

Shaw, 1982

Walker & Buchanan, 1982

Regnier & Janke, 1990

(modified)

Theoretical basis of IWM

- None of the **tactics** *per se* can provide adequate weed control
- Systemic approach (**Integrated Weed Management System - IWMS**): the **cropping system** defines the spatial and temporal framework of an IWM strategy
- An IWMS is not aimed to obtain outstanding weed control in the short term but **constant good weed control in the long-term**

Theoretical basis of IWM

- An IWM **strategy** is composed of several **tactics** to:
 - Reduce on-field weed emergence by acting before the onset of the crop growing season (***preventive weed management***)
 - Increase crop competitive ability against weeds (***cultural weed management***)
 - Eliminate weeds emerging during the crop growing season (***direct weed management***)
 - Terminology: Management vs Control

Tactics usable in an IWM strategy

1. PREVENTIVE

2. CULTURAL

3. DIRECT

Tactics usable in an IWM strategy

Tactic	Category	Main effect	Example	Applicability to fruit tree crops
Crop rotation	Preventive	Reduction of weed emergence	-	No
Soil tillage	Preventive + direct	Reduction of weed emergence + weed destruction	Ploughing, discing, hoeing, cultivation	Yes
Cover crops	Preventive + cultural	Reduction of weed emergence and/or competition	Green manuring prior to orchard planting, between-rows living mulch	Yes
Mulching	Preventive + cultural	Reduction of weed emergence and/or competition	In-row plastic mulches	Yes
Flame-weeding	Preventive + direct	Reduction of weed emergence + weed destruction	Use of shielded LPG-propelled burners	Yes (scarce)
Soil solarisation	Preventive	Reduction of weed emergence	Use before orchard planting	Yes (scarce)
Genotype choice	Cultural	Reduced weed competition	Use of stress-tolerant cvs (e.g. higher ability to take up soil water and nutrients)	Yes
Planting pattern	Cultural	Reduced weed competition	Reduced between-rows or in-row distance	Yes (scarce)
Fertilisation	Cultural	Reduced weed competition	Localised (in-row) application of fertilisers	Yes
Irrigation	Cultural	Reduced weed competition	Trickle/drip irrigation	Yes

Weed biology and ecology

- Knowledge of the basic biological and ecological features of **major weeds** and of **weed communities** is an **essential** prerequisite for designing any sustainable weed management strategy
- The more we want to reduce reliance on pesticides, the more we need to surrogate them with biological and ecological knowledge

Cousens & Mortimer (1995)

Weed ecophysiological groups and false seedbed technique





Fig. 4.8. Emergence periods of a range of temperate arable annual weeds in the UK (after Mortimer, 1990). The height of the shaded area indicates the relative frequency of emergence.

Seed dormancy cycle



Foley (2001)

Weed seeds: production

Number of seeds per plant produced with lack of competition		No. viable seeds remaining with 95% control
<i>Avena fatua</i>	500	25
<i>Stellaria media</i>	2,400	120
<i>Papaver rhoeas</i>	17,000	850
<i>Solanum nigrum</i>	178,000	8,900
<i>Amaranthus retroflexus</i>	196,000	9,800

Speranza & Catizone (2001, modified)

Weed seeds: germination

- Optimum and maximum depth for weed seedling emergence (cm)

	Optimum	Maximum
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	0.5-1	5
<i>Digitaria sanguinalis</i>	1	4
<i>Sinapis arvensis</i>	1	6
<i>Setaria viridis</i>	2.5	7.5
<i>Avena fatua</i>	2.5	17.5

King (1966, modified)

Germination cues, surface residues and landscape position




FIGURE 4. (A) Mean soil temperature and (B) thermal amplitude (\pm SE) in March 2003 from two residue levels, at five landscape positions: south shoulder (SSH), south midslope (SMS), valley (V), north midslope (NMS), and north shoulder (NSH). Thermal amplitude was calculated by subtracting the daily minimum temperature from the daily maximum temperature and averaging across days.


Page et al. (2006)
Weed Sci. 54 (5), 838-846

Weed seeds: germination cues

Factor	Species	+ Factor (%) ^{a,b}	- Factor (%) ^{a,b}
Light	<i>Alopecurus myosuroides</i>	86	0
	<i>Amaranthus retroflexus</i>	98	14
	<i>Brassica arvensis</i>	78	53
	<i>Datura ferox</i>	96	1
	<i>Lolium multiflorum</i>	95	82
	<i>Poa annua</i>	89	1
	<i>Portulaca oleracea</i>	28	12
Alternating temperature	<i>Poa annua</i>	92	47
	<i>Rumex crispus</i>	100	0
	<i>Sonchus arvensis</i>	57	3
	<i>Sorghum halepense</i>	20	7
Nitrate	<i>Stellaria media</i>	93	47
	<i>Chenopodium album</i>	92	55
	<i>Erysimum cheiranthoides</i>	89	57
	<i>Plantago lanceolata</i>	48	25
	<i>Plantago major</i>	93	3

Mohler (2001), modified

Weed seeds: dispersion



Mohler (2001)

RGR: Relative Growth Ratio
plant weight increase/plant
weight/day

SLA: Specific Leaf Area
leaf area/leaf weight

RWR: Root Weight Ratio
root weight/plant weight

RLI: Root Length Increase
root length increase/root
length/day

Weeds early growth

- Seed size and growth parameters (first 28 DAE)

SPECIES	Seed weight (mg)	RGR (g/g/d)	SLA (cm ² /g)	RWR (g/g)	Root diam. (mm)	RLI (cm/cm/d)
<i>A. retroflexus</i>	0.41	0.349	326	0.189	0.22	0.343
<i>C. album</i>	0.44	0.335	329	0.153	0.20	0.285
<i>A. theophrasti</i>	7.8	0.244	326	0.214	0.46	0.274
<i>X. strumarium</i>	38	0.187	237	0.217	0.35	0.227
Sunflower	61	0.197	276	0.272	0.42	0.227
Soyabean	158	0.155	242	0.241	0.64	0.201

Correlation
with ln (seed weight)

-0.99** -0.86* 0.86* 0.86* -0.93**

Seibert & Pearce (1993), modified


Coefficient of evapotranspiration

Weeds

<i>Amaranthus graecizans</i>	260
<i>Amaranthus retroflexus</i>	305
<i>Avena</i> spp.	583
<i>Chenopodium album</i>	658
<i>Panicum miliaceum</i>	267
<i>Polygonum aviculare</i>	678
<i>Portulaca oleracea</i>	281
<i>Setaria italica</i>	285
<i>Sorghum</i> spp.	304

Kale	518
Sweet pepper	865
Melon	686
Watermelon	577
Soyabean	646
Tomato	645
Common bean	700
Potato	575
Common wheat	500
Maize	361

Crops



Perennial weeds



Cynodon dactylon

Perennial weeds

- They possess organs for vegetative reproduction
- **Simple (stationary) perennials**
 - *Plantago* spp. (plantains)
 - *Rumex crispus* (curly dock)
 - *Taraxacum officinale* (dandelion)
- **Creeping (dynamic) perennials**
 - *Cirsium arvense* (thistle)
 - *Convolvulus arvensis*/*Calystegia sepium* (bindweeds)
 - *Cynodon dactylon* (bermudagrass)
 - *Sorghum halepense* (johnsongrass)

Tactics usable in an IWM strategy

1. PREVENTIVE

2. CULTURAL

3. DIRECT

IWM: Component #1

Preventive weed management

- *Aim*: to reduce density of **actual weed vegetation**
- *Mean*: exhaustion of **potential weed vegetation**:
 1. Reduce in-crop weed emergence
 2. Reduce weed seeds dispersal (*seed rain*)
- *Necessary knowledge*
 - Weed community composition
 - Ecophysiology of weed seeds germination
 - Mechanisms of weed colonisation in a cropped field
 - Mechanisms of weed reproduction and survival
- *Practical applications*
 - Crop rotation, soil tillage, false seedbed technique, cover crops and mulching, soil solarisation

IWM: Component #1

Preventive weed management




Figure 1. Yield loss in winter wheat due to rye interference, as affected by preceding crop and canopy treatment in winter wheat. Data pooled across years. Bars with identical letters are not significantly different as determined by Fisher's Protected LSD (0.05).

Anderson (2009). *Weed Tech.* 23, 564-568

Competitive = 67% increase in seeding rate + banded seed fertilisation

Cover crops



Mechanisms of weed suppression by cover crops

- **Resource competition**
 - light, water, nutrients, space
- **Release of phytotoxins (allelochemicals)**
 - from live plants
 - from residue decomposition
- **Alteration of soil physical conditions**
 - reduction of soil temperature amplitude
 - conservation of soil moisture
 - reduction of **quantity** and **quality** of transmitted radiation

Cover crops

Effect on weed seedbank (seedlings m⁻²)

Cover type	CS	LIS	Mean
Crimson clover	5809 (9%)	29806 (6%)	13152 ab (7%)
Rye	4835 (24%)	31089 (2%)	12274 ab (14%)
Subterranean clover	5208 (18%)	23605 (26%)	11092 a (22%)
Crop stubble	6365	31688	14191 b

Moonen & Bàrberi (2004), modified

Soil solarisation



Weed biomass at harvest (g m^{-2})

Crop	Soil cover type		
	Transparent PE film	Black PE film	No cover
Lettuce (13 WAS)	0.1 b	0.1 b	2.7 a
Radish (24 WAS)	0.3 b	0.4 b	21.5 a
Rocket (25 WAS)	0.4 b	2.0 b	46.9 a
Tomato (46 WAS)	82.7 b	72.2 b	146.0 a

Bàrberi & Moonen (2002)

Soil solarisation

Persistence of high T at two soil depths



Tactics usable in an IWM strategy

1. PREVENTIVE

2. CULTURAL

3. DIRECT

IWM: Component #2

Cultural weed management

- *Aim*: to reduce the need for use of **direct** weed control methods (e.g. herbicides) and increase their effectiveness
- *Mean*: choose **cultural practices** as to **increase crop competitive ability** against weeds
- *Necessary knowledge*
 - Crop/weed competitive relationships
 - Crop/weed biology and ecophysiology
 - **Critical period** for crop/weed competition
- *Practical applications*
 - Crop genotype choice, planting pattern, polycultural systems, localised fertilisation/irrigation

Crop genotype choice

- More competitive cvs. are characterised by:
 - higher height (not in all species)
 - higher attitude to tillering/branching
 - faster development (e.g. emergence)
 - higher CGR at earlier stages
- Fixation of higher crop *competitive ability* traits via genetic improvement?
- *Competitive ability* and *productivity* are often uncorrelated traits

Crop genotype choice







Standard Italian cv.



Competitive Danish cv.



Common wheat: height

Pure Line	
Modern CVs	
Old CVs	
CCPs Hungary	
CCPs UK	
ICARDA GDG	

Early differences: growth habit



Late differences: straw height



Competitive varieties

Competitive Balance Index (C_b) in potato and chickpea varieties

Crop	Variety	% yield loss	C_b
Potato	Desiré (L)	2.6	2.88
“	Kuroda (L)	3.6	2.76
“	Agata (E)	9.4	1.34
Chickpea	C136	67.2	-0.62
“	C118	97.9	-2.00

Competitive Balance Index (Wilson, 1988)

$$C_b = \log (B_{cw}/B_c)/(B_{wc}/B_w)$$

Mirabelli et al. (2003)

Sowing/transplanting technique

- Increase the **time interval** between crop and weed emergence
- Increase the **crop/weed density ratio** (*sowing method/time/rate*)
 - Risk: sub-optimum yields
- Transplanting (e.g. vegetable crops)
- Crop spatial arrangement

Polycultural systems

- Increase soil cover with vegetation in both space and time

- Exploitation of free ecological niches by useful species
- Need to have resource use complementarity between polyculture components in both space and time
- Examples: living mulches, intercropping, mixed farming systems

Tactics usable in an IWM strategy

1. PREVENTIVE

2. CULTURAL

3. DIRECT


Mechanical weed control in row crops



Intra-row

Between rows


Bed-weeding platform



Time needed for intra-row hand-weeding:
200-500 h ha⁻¹ in carrot, onion and leek

Relationship between intra-row weed density and time needed for hand-weeding

Melander & Bàrberi (2004)



Solutions for intra-row weeding



Finger weeder



Brush weeder



Flame weeder



Split hoe



Band steamer



Torsion weeder

Unconventional biological weed control



Hens in hazelnut (Turkey)



Ducks in guava (Martinica)



A recipe for resistance

- Huge fields on huge farms across a continent
- 100% minimum tillage (often zero till)
- Minimum crop diversity – mainly wheat
- The same herbicides persistently used
- **genetically diverse *L. rigidum* at high density across 60 million hectares**

Stephen Powles, University of Western Australia (2005)


An example of 'holistic' weed management in organic farming

Melander & Rasmussen (2000)

Year 1

Winter wheat
or barley


Interrow distances:
12.5 and 25.0 cm



Year 2


Row crop
(sugar beet or
vegetable)

Interrow distance:
50 cm



The Field Margin Complex (FMC)

(adapted from Greaves & Marshall, 1987)



Examples of FMCs



A functional biodiversity study

- **To study the inter-relations between:**
 - **Field Margin Complex (FMC, = boundary) structure**
 - **Richness and abundance of:**
 - **plants**
 - **beneficial insects (Coccinellidae, Syrphidae, Chrysopidae)**

in the arable part of the farm

Functional analysis

- Vegetation in the FMC



- Classification in 5 groups

- woody species
- grasses
- herbaceous dicots
- grass weeds
- dicot weeds

WEEDINESS

- FMC  **INTEGRITY**

structural complexity (niches)
management
disturbance


FMCI

Results

X	Y	a	b	r	n	P
Plant species richness	% Weediness	-0.53	72.15	-0.47	62	0.0001***
FMCII	% Weediness	-0.16	62.46	-0.30	62	0.019*
FMCII	Plant species richness	0.17	23.93	0.35	62	0.005**
Plant species richness	% Weediness	-0.88	87.13	-0.76	8	0.030*
FMCII	% Weediness	-0.36	73.57	-0.75	8	0.033*
FMCII	Plant species richness	0.27	21.05	0.65	8	0.081
FMCII	Insect density	-0.14	16.06	-0.66	8	0.076
% Weediness	Insect density	0.33	-8.83	0.75	8	0.033*
% Weediness	Insect density	0.44	-14.47	0.93	7	0.002**

What would you prioritise? Biological pest control or weed invasion risk?

Concluding remarks

- **Agroecologically-based IWM is the best approach**
 - **Cropping system diversification**
- 
- **Weed management diversification**
 - Conventional farming: ensures long-term sustainability of direct control measures (herbicides)
 - Organic farming: increases effectiveness of (less effective) direct non-chemical control measures
 - **Unravelling multitrophic interactions at different scales: the next challenge**