MEDWIN PUBLISHERS
Committed to Create Value for Researchers

International Journal of Zoology and Animal Biology
ISSN: 2639-216X

Economic Analysis for Yield and Carrying Capacity of Intercropped Indigofera (*Indigofera zollingeriana*) and Brahum (*Brachiaria humidicola*)

Tilly Lumy FD[1]*, Judy Tumewu M[1], Herman Tiwow A[1], Liwe H[2] and Telleng MM[2]*

[1]Laboratory of Socio-Economic, Faculty of Animal Science, Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia
[2]Laboratory of Nutrition and Feed Technology, Faculty of Animal Science, Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia

Research Article
Volume 6 Issue 3
Received Date: May 22, 2023
Published Date: June 05, 2023
DOI: 10.23880/izab-16000475

***Corresponding author:** Tilly FD Lumy, Faculty of Animal Science, Sam Ratulangi University, Jln Kampus Unsrat Bahu, 95115, Manado Indonesia, Email: tiily_lumy@yahoo.co.id
Malcky M Telleng, Laboratory of Nutrition and Feed Technology, Faculty of Animal Science, Sam Ratulangi University, Indonesia, Email: adetelleng@gmail.com

Abstract

Through efficient asset management, blended societies can boost plant growth and yield. The explanation of this consider was to choose the reach similar extent of the got crops leguminosae *Indigofera zollingeriana* (Iz) and the tropical grass *Brachiaria humicola* (Bh). The explanation of this contemplate was to study the show up tantamount extent of this got alter in view of abandon and bearing limit. This test was carried out with a plan that was completely random, and it used a combination of four drugs from the planted area as follows: We used the ANOVA and HSD test to analyze the data for combination planted (C): C1, Iz planted range, which had 1.0 mx 1.0 m and Bh planted zone, which had 0.5 m x 0.25 m; C2, Iz planted range, which had 1.0 mx 1.0 m and Bh planted zone, which had 0.5 m x 0.5 m: C3, Iz planted range, which had 1.0 mx 1.5 m and Bh planted zone, which had 0.5 m x 0.25 m; C4, Iz planted range, which had 1.0 mx 1.5 m and Bh planted zone, which had 0.5 m x 0.5 m. The elements estimated were the expected acquiescence and conveying limit in view of dry matter and carrying capacity acquiescence for logical financial. The results appeared to be essentially different ($P<0.01$). The improved grain yields of intercrop in C3 have highest the total grain yield, carrying capacity and the net-income. Overall, these findings imply that following the optimum grain yields, and competitive interactions of intercrop species can be improved. It very well may be reasoned that Iz covered crops with an established area of 1.0 m x 1.5 m and Bh with an establishing area of 0.5 m x 0.25 m have the most fitting financial of yield and conveying limit.

Keywords: Combination Planted; Carrying Capacity; Net-Income

Introduction

Intercropping is one of the coordinates for managing soil ripeness. It involves growing two or more crops in the same area at the same time, as has been done for decades and helped agribusiness achieve its goals. In addition, intercropping frameworks are advantageous to smallholder ranchers in the low-input and/or high-risk tropics, where

intercropping of cereals and vegetables is widespread among smallholder ranchers due to the vegetable's capacity to address the issue of decreasing soil richness [1]. According to Hauggaard-Nielsen, et al. [2] that efficient utilization of normal and natural cycles, such as vegetable nitrogen obsession, may support surrender of non-legume crops in an intercropped framework. It is all around got on that blends of vegetables with oats would advantage agriculturists in asset restricted conditions, especially in very dry and semi-dry circumstances [3].

Intercropping between two or more edit species does not so much advance as abdicate [4], but it also improves organic characteristics, reduces problems, and prevents infections [5,6]. The crucial explanation of intercropping is to make a more noticeable surrender on a show up by streamlining resources that can't be used in a monocropping structure capably [7]. The greatest advantage of intercropping is that it improves crop efficiency and makes better use of available resources. Intercropping can safeguard soil water by giving shade, reducing wind speed, growing attack with mulch layers, and gaining ground soil structure [8]. The triumph of intercropping systems and execution of part crops are addressed principally by the openness of and the opposition between the parts for the normal assets [9].

However, some combinations under the intercropping framework have a negative impact on the surrender of the components [1]. To maximize the benefits of intercropping by increasing beneficial interspecific interactions (facilitation) and decreasing detrimental interspecific interactions (competition), a comprehensive study is required to determine the ideal spacing between the rows of soybean and maize in this system.

Materials and Methods

Experimental Site

The review was directed in the exploratory station of Asassement Institute of Agriculture Technology (AIAT) of North Sulawesi, found 12 km from Manado City. The exploratory area received 500 millimeters of precipitation on average and was effectively distributed throughout the region; however, from July to September 2020, the area experienced monthly precipitation drops of 50 to 100 millimeters. The fertile, sandy soil had a pH of about 6. Light transmission at 10.00 a.m on a radiant day as Standard under foster tall coconuts was averaging of 73 percents. The dirt tone was dull earthy colored mud. Precipitation peaks took put in January, with tall precipitation heightened This condition caused tall relative tenacity of 86 percents. Examine temperature reached out from 23.1°C to 32.7°C.

Experimental Design

Grass of *Brachiaria humidicola* (Bh) were obtained from Asassement Institute of Agriculture Technology (AIAT) of North Sulawesi. Legume seeds of *Indigofera zollingeriana* (Iz) were obtained from the Agrostology Laboratory of the Faculty of Animal Science, Sam Ratulangi University. Indigofera seeds that were planted right away were used as a nursery. Sow seeds that had grown all around were by then moved into the 2.5 kg plastic sack at this point loaded up with soil (one plant/plastic sack). The plant was grown for two months in a medium plastic sack before being transplanted to a test location and being handled by four medications of planting dispersing (PS) with push dispersing 1 m apart. Two planting space Iz: (i) 1m x 1m, and (ii) 1.0 m x 1.5 m. After two months Indigofera developed in test plots, Bh was planted. Two Planting space Bh: (i) 0.5 m x 0.25 m, and (ii) 0.5 m x 0.5 m. Intercropping having four combination and each was planted in five plot. The plot combination were: C1, Iz planted range, which had 1.0 mx 1.0 m and Bh planted zone, which had 0.5 m x 0.25 m; C2, Iz planted range, which had 1.0 mx 1.0 m and Bh planted zone, which had 0.5 m x 0.5 m: C3, Iz planted range, which had 1.0 mx 1.5 m and Bh planted zone, which had 0.5 m x 0.25 m; C4, Iz planted range, which had 1.0 mx 1.5 m and Bh planted zone, which had 0.5 m x 0.5 m. Data were at that point factually analyzed by utilizing analysis of variance (ANOVA) by implies of MINITAB (Adaptation 16). Honestly Significant Difference (HSD) was connected to decide the contrast among medications. Contrasts were considered at $p<0.05$.

Economic Assumptions

We assume that we would conduct economic calculations on one hectare of grazing land for a year with a livestock holding capacity of 4.28 to 4.82 animal units per hectare based on our research findings. Where 1 creature unit is comparable to a cow weighing 400 kg. With the cost of 1 kg live weight Rp. 60,000. The suggested labor force for overseeing pastures with an area of 1 ha is 1 individual who is given a motivator of Rp. 3,000,000 every month.

There are 10,000 Iz plants in that one hectare area, spaced at 1.0 m x 1.0 m. Iz with a total of 7,500 plants and a spacing of 1.0 m x 1.5 m; Bh with 38,330 plants spread out over 0.5 meters by 0.25 meters; Bh with 23,300 plants spread out over 0.5 m x 0.5 m. considering the Rp cost of indigofera seeds. 2,500/plant, and the seeds cost Bh Rp. 500 /clump.

Variable Observations

Gathering Indigofera was completed 90 days in the wake of planting, defoliated at 100 cm over ground level. At a height of 10 cm above the ground, brachiaria were

defoliated. The tests were dried for approximately 48 hours at 60 °C to determine their dried weight. Economic analysis, potential dry matter abdicate (ton/ha/yr), and carrying capacity (AU/ha/yr) are included in the factors. The value of the dry-weight percentage was used to calculate the dry matter surrender of each plot. After determining the capacity for each combination using the data gathered through the production of dry matter, an economic analysis is conducted to determine the value of net profit. The information gathered from the gather was used to determine the carrying capacity that it was converted to one hectare from the efficiency estimation of each plot.

Results

Potential Yield

Space for planting has an impact on how plants develop. Plants have a longer window of opportunity to form roots and engage in mass photosynthetic activity when their thickness decreases during expanding division [15]. Table 1 clearly demonstrates that intercropping at various dispersing had significant effects on the surrender and carrying capacity of dry matter *I. zollingeriana* and *B. humidicola.*

Indigofera zollingeriana dry Matter Yield

Indigofera and brachiaria were significantly affected by combination planting space, which also contributed to dry matter abdication (Table 1). As was to be expected, more indigofera and brachiaria were present in the intercropping, which led to more dry matter of these plants. Combination C2 produced the greatest dry matter absorption of indigofera, totaling 7.01 tons per year (Table 1). The decently moo give up of indigofera in this attempt was basically because of tall weed weight. When some planting columns of indigofera were replaced with *Brachiaria humidicola*, it was possible that the indigofera abdication would be reduced in comparison to its single trimming. In any case, we hypothesized that the total abdicate of collected crops—indigofera and brachiaria—may rise as a result of decreased competition, and that the abdicate of indigofera per unit range may rise as a result.

Brachiari Humidicola Dry Matter Yield

The most important factor in Brachiaria dry matter surrender was planting space (Table 1). As communicated for indigofera, the higher pace of brachiaria sections inside the intercrops the higher brachiaria were gathered (Table 1). The most raised brachiaria give up (5.75 ton ha-1yr^{-1}) was assembled from blend C3 likely because of the lower between unambiguous contest between the two yields. In separate, the most un-dry matter acquiescence of brachiaria was gotten from C2 in which brachiaria was objective covered by indigofera plants as the mind-boggling part.

Total Dry Matter Yield

The most important factor in Brachiaria dry matter surrender was planting space (Table 1). As communicated for indigofera, the higher pace of brachiaria sections inside the intercrops the higher brachiaria were gathered (Table 1). The most raised brachiaria give up (5.75 ton ha^{-1}yr^{-1}) was assembled from blend C3 likely because of the lower between unambiguous contest between the two yields. In separate, the most un-dry matter acquiescence of brachiaria was gotten from C2 in which brachiaria was objective covered by indigofera plants as the mind-boggling part.

Carrying Capacity

Conveying limit of intercropping was significantly imperative effects of mix establishing space, there was that intercropping at assorted scattering basically affected conveying limit. When compared to other combinations of planting space, combination C3 has the highest carrying capacity (4.82 AU ha^{-1} yr^{-1}) and combination C4 has the lowest.

Planting Spacing		Dry Matter Production (Ton/ha/yr)		Carrying capacity	
I. zollingeriana	*B. humidicola*	*I. zolingeriana*	*B. humidicola*	Total	(AU/yr)
1m x 1m	0.5m x 0.25m	6.52 + 0.34^{b}	3.98 + 0.13^{b}	10.51 + 0.38^{b}	4.58 + 0.17^{b}
	0.5m x 0.5m	7.01 + 0.14^{a}	2.84 + 0.07^{d}	9.85 + 0.12^{c}	4.29 + 0.05^{c}
1m x 1.5m	0.5m x 0.25m	5.31 + 0.24^{d}	5.75 + 0.08^{a}	11.06 + 0.28^{a}	4.82 + 0.12^{a}
	0.5m x 0.5m	6.06 + 0.25^{c}	3.77 + 0.05^{c}	9.83 + 0.29^{c}	4.28 + 0.13^{c}
P Value		<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
MSE		0.113	0.038	0.127	0.055

a,b,c,d Means in the same coloum with different letters show differences ($p<0.05$).

Table 1: Total Production and Carrying Capacity of Potential Dry Matter Yield of Intercropping *Indigofera zollingeriana* and *Brachiaria humidicola* .

Economic Analysis

In the flow research led in regards to monetary examination, the outcomes for the most elevated complete creation cost were gotten for the C1 blend, purportedly in light of the fact that the inflated expenses for furnishing vegetable and grass seeds with nearer separating will build the quantity of plants that should be given.

Combination C3 yields the greatest total income, most likely due to the combination's highest capacity, which also yields the greatest calculation results for the sale of livestock.

Similarly, the C3 combination's highest net profit is allegedly attributable to the high income results achieved by spending production costs that are not excessively high (Table 2).

Planting Space		Economic analysis		
I. zollingeriana	*B. humidicola*	*Total production cost (Rp. 000.000)*	Total income (Rp. 000.000)	Net profit (Rp. 000.000)
1m x 1m	0.5m x 0.25m	92.89 + 0.50a	109.81 + 3.98a	16.92 + 3.48b
	0.5m x 0.5m	84.54 + 0.16c	102.96 + 1.29c	18.43 + 1.13ab
1m x 1.5m	0.5m x 0.25m	88.62 + 0.36b	115.63 + 2.92b	27.01 + 2.55a
	0.5m x 0.5m	79.51 + 0.38d	102.74 + 3.03d	23.23 + 2.65a
P Value		<0.001	<0.01	<0.01
MSE		0.166	1.326	1.16

a,b,c,d Means in the same coloum with different letters show differences ($p<0.05$).

Table 2: Economic Analysis of Carying Capacity of Intercropping *Indig ofera zollingeriana* and *Brachiaria humidicola.*

Discussion

The most reason for appropriation of intercropping is to create higher abdicate than a immaculate stand of same arrive range in a given period, intercropping as an financial strategy for higher generation with lower levels of outside inputs [10]. This expanding utilize proficiency is imperative, especially for small-scale ranchers conjointly in zones where developing season is brief [11] and in rainfed regions [12,13]. Generation more in intercropping can be credited to the higher development rate, more biomass generation and proficient utilize of space and assets [14]. In addition, in any intercropping framework in the event that there are complementary impacts among the component crops, generation increments due to less competition among crops [10]. Intercropping can be an arrangement to differentiate agroecosystem by utilizing more leguminous crops additionally applying less mineral fertilizers [15]. Sensible intercropping might increment trim development and efficiency [16], effective utilize of the assets water, nitrogen and radiation [17], macronutrients [18] and micronutrients [15], abdicate quality [19] and lower the harm caused by maladies and bugs [2]. Focal points of intercropping vegetables with non-legumes are clarified by the complementary utilize of assets due to non-competition for the same asset specialty [20]. Increased supplement take-up in intercropping frameworks can happen spatially and transiently. Spatial nutrient take-up can be expanded through the expanding root mass, whereas transient points of interest in supplement take-up happen when crops in an intercropping framework have top supplement requests at distinctive times [21]. The advancements in digestibility were reflected in bolster admissions, live weight pick up and nourish change which were all progressed when the tree vegetable clears out were a portion of the eat less. Combine predominate elephant grass, *Gliricidia sepium, Leucaena leucocephala* and *Indigofera zollingeriana*, for all criteria, the goats bolstered the tree vegetable *Indigofera zollingeriana* recorded the leading execution [22]. Advantages of intercropping are credited to a more effective utilization of limited assets such as light, supplements and water [23]. The supplement composition of plants impacted by richness rate of the developing media and a few components of the biotic environment. Brief separate (expanded thickness) increments supplement necessity and daylight competition. Planting space influenced miniaturized scale environment (temperature, stickiness and light) and extended the pole to take-up supplement [24]. Since light is provided from over plants, people that arrange their takes off over those of neighbors advantage straightforwardly from expanded photosynthetic rates and by implication by decreasing the development of those neighbors by means of shade [25]. Smaller push dividing of 1.0 m x 0.5 m decreased the number of branches [26]. The comes about of this ponder affirmed other reports that shown vegetables are not profiting as much as non-legumes from wavy design canopies [27,28].

Other reports demonstrated that indigofera abdicate per unit developed with the affiliation of different vegetables progressed due to the complementary impact of companion

vegetable crops [10,29-31]. Intercropping of indigofera and brahum makes a wavy canopy which is more effective in light capture attempts compared to the monoculture of companion crops. Biabani [32] detailed that intercropping of two soybean cultivars which were shifted in height made wavy canopy design and thus moved forward last surrender by 11 percent. Our consider affirmed this since indigofera delivered higher abdicate in interchange planting design of C2 compared to the other designs (Table 1). In any case, a few reports have appeared that no surrender advancement of cereal crops was gotten when intercropped with vegetables [33,34].

It was likely that the incredible dividing between adjoining plants inside lines upgraded the capacities of the plants to change over the capturing sun based radiation to leaf generation [35]. Planting space *Indigofera zollingeriana* in coconut manor had impact leaf protein substance, leaf rough fiber substance and stem unrefined fiber substance [24].

Conclusion

Based on the results of this study, It very well may be inferred that the most reasonable blend for intercropping establishing frameworks between *Indigofera zollingeriana* vegetables and *brachiaria humidicola* grass is planting with a mix of *Indigofera zollingeriana* with a dividing of 1.0 mx 1.5 m, and *Brachiaria humidicola* with a separating of 0.5m x 0.25m because the combination of low production costs and high total income yields the highest net profit.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interest.

References

1. Matusso JMM, Mugwe JN, Mucheru-Muna M (2012) Potential role of cereal-legume intercropping systems in integrated soil fertility management in smallholder farming systems of sub Saharan Africa Research Application Summary. Third RUFORUM Biennial Meeting 24-28. Entebbe, Uganda.

2. Hauggaard-Nielsen H, Ambus P, Jensen ES (2001) Interspecific competition, N use and interference with weeds in pea-barley intercropping. Field Crops Research 70(2): 101-109.

3. Ghosh PK, Tripathi AK, Bandyopadhyay KK, Manna MC (2009) Assessment of nutrient competition and nutrient requirement in soybean/sorghum intercropping system. European Journal of Agronomy 31: 43-50.

4. Li LFS, Zhang XL, Li P, Christie JH, Sun SC, et al. (2003) Interspecific facilitation of nutrient uptake by intercropped maize and faba bean. Nutr Cycling Agroecosyst 65: 61-71.

5. Trenbath BR (1993) Intercropping for the management of pests and diseases. Field Crops Res 34(3-4): 381-405.

6. Smith HA, McSorley R (2000) Intercropping and pest management: A review of major concepts. Am Entomo 46(3): 154-161.

7. Moradi H, Noori M, Sobhkhizi A, Fahramand M, Rigi K (2014) Effect of intercropping in agronomy. J Nov Appl Sci 3: 315-320.

8. Mobasser HR, Vasirimehr MR, Rigi K (2014) Effect of intercropping on resources use, weed management and forage quality. IJPAES 4: 706-713.

9. Telleng MM, Wiryawan KG, Karti PDMH, Permana IG, Abdullah L (2016) Forages Production and Nutrient Composition of Different Sorghum Varieties Cultivated with *Indigofera* in Intercropping System. Media Peternakan 39(3): 203-220.

10. Willey RW (1991) Valuation and Presentation of Intercropping Advantages. Experimental Agriculture 21: 119-123.

11. Altieri MA (1999) The ecological role of biodiversity in agroecosystems Agric Ecosyst Environ 74(1-3): 19-31.

12. Maitra S, Ghosh DC, Sounda S, Jana PK (2001) Performance of inter-cropping legumes in finger millet (*Eleusine coracana*) at varying fertility levels. Indian Journal of Agronomy 46(1): 38-44.

13. Maitra S, Samui RC, Roy DK, Mondal AK (2001) Effect of cotton based intercropping system under rainfed conditions in Sundarban region of West Bengal. Indian Agriculturist 45(3-4): 157-162.

14. Telleng MM (2017) Penyediaan Pakan Berkualitas Berbasis Sorgum (*Sorghum bicolor*) dan Indigofera (*Indigofera zollingeriana*) dengan Pola Tanam Tumpangsari. Disertasi. Sekolah Pascasarjana IPB, Bogor.

15. Neugschwandtner RW, Kaul HP (2015) Nitrogen uptake, use and utilization efficiency by oat-pea intercrops. Field Crops Research 179: 113-119.

16. Cecilio AB, Rezende BLA, Barbosa JC, Grangeiro LC (2011) Agronomic efficiency of intercroppingtomato and lettuce. Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciencias 83: 1109-1119.

17. Lithourgidis AS, Dordas CA, Damalas CA, Vlachostergios DN (2011) Annual intercrops: an alternative pathway for sustainable agriculture. Australian Journal of Crop Science 5: 396-410.

18. Salehi A, Mehdi B, Fallah S, Kaul HP, Neugschwandtner RW (2018) Integrated fertilization of buckwheat-fenugreek intercrops improves productivity and nutrient use efficiency. Nutrient Cycling in Agroecosystmes 110: 407-425.

19. Klimek-Kopyra A, Skowera B, Zając T, Kulig B (2017) Mixed cropping of linseed and legumes as a ecological way to effectively increase oil quality. Romanian Agricultural Research 34: 217-224.

20. Bedoussac L, Justes E (2010) The efficiency of a durum wheat-winter pea intercrop to improve yield and wheat grain protein concentration depends on N availability during early growth. Plant and Soil 330: 19-35.

21. Anders MM, Potdar MV, Francis CA (1996) The significance of Intercropping in cropping systems. In: Ito O, Johansen C, et al. (Eds.), Dynamics of roots and nitrogen in cropping systems of the semi-arid tropics. Japan International Research Center for Agricultural Sciences. International Agricultural Series No. 3 Ohwashi, Tsukuba, Ibavaki Japan.

22. Anis SD, Kaunang ChL, Telleng MM, Rumambi A (2020) Improving diets of fattening goats with leaves of fast-growing leguminous trees. J Livestock Research for Rural Development 32(8): 132.

23. Musa M, Leitch MH, Iqbal M, Sahi FUH (2010) Spatial arrangement affects growth characteristics of barley-pea intercrops. International Journal of Agriculture and Biology 12(2010): 685-690.

24. Telleng MM, Anis SD, Sumolang CIJ, Kaunang WB, Dalie S (2020) The Effect of Planting Space on Nutrient Composition of *Indigofera zollingeriana* in Coconut Plantation. International Conference: Improving Tropical Animal Production for Food Security. IOP Conf. Series: Earth and Environmental Science 465: 01201.

25. Craine JM, Dybzinski R (2013) Mechanisms of plant competition for nutrients, water and light. Funct Ecol 27(4): 833-840.

26. Kumalasari NR, Wicaksono GP, Abdullah L (2017) Plant growth pattern, forage yield, and quality of *Indigofera zollingeriana i*nfluenced by row spacing. Media Peternakan 40(1): 14-19.

27. Ross SM, King JR, O'Donovan JT, Spaner D (2004) Forage potential on intercropping berseem clover with barley, oat, or triticale. Agronomy J 96(4): 1013-1021.

28. Jensen ES, Ambus P, Bellostas N, Biosen S, Brisson N, et al. (2006) Intercropping of cereals and grain legumes for increased production, weed control,improved product quality, and prevention of N-losses in European organic farming systems. Joint Organic Congress, May 2006, Odense, Denmark.

29. Chatterjee BN, Bhattacharya S (1986) Grain Legumes. Oxford and IBH Publishing Co, New Delhi, India, pp: 233-245.

30. Ofori F, Stem WR (1987) Cereal-legume intercropping systems. Adv Agron 41: 41-90.

31. Banik P, Bagchi DK (1993) Effect of legumes as sole and intercrop on residual soil fertility and succeeding crop in upland situation. Indian Agric 26: 58-64.

32. Biabani A, Hashemi M, Herbert SJ (2008) Agronomic performance of two intercropped soybean cultivars. Int Plant Prod 2(3): 215-222.

33. Thorsted MD, Olsen JE, Weiner J (2006) Width of clover strips and wheat rows influence rain yield in winter wheat/white clover intercropping. Field Crop Res 92: 280-290.

34. Pridham JC, Entz MH (2008) Intercropping spring wheat with cereal grains legumes, and oilseeds fails to improve productivity under organic management. Agron J 100: 1436-1442.

35. Telleng MM, Abdullah L, Permana IG, Karti PDMH, Wiryawan KG (2015) Growth and productivity of different sorghum varieties cultivated with Indigofera in intercropping system. Proceeding of the 3rd International Seminar on Animal Industry, Bogor, Indonesia, pp: 17-18.