EFFECT OF SOIL TILLAGE SYSTEMS ON WEED INFESTATION OF HUSKED AND NAKED OATS CANOPY

Stanisław Deryło, Joanna Stachowska-Kowalczyk University of Life Sciences in Lublin

Abstract. The aim of this study was to evaluate weed infestation (the number, biomass and species composition) of husked and naked oats canopy depending on the soil tillage system (conventional, simplified with a catch crop, simplified, direct sowing) and the method of plant cultivation (mechanical and chemical) The study was carried out in 2000--2002, in Alfisols, formed from loess. The subject of the investigation was husked oats (cultivar Borowiak) and naked oats (cultivar Akt III). The largest number of weeds occurred in the canopy of husked (123 pcs·m⁻²) and naked (102 pcs·m⁻²) oats cultivar after the use of direct sowing, and in the cultivar Akt III also after simplified tillage (68.7 pcs m⁻²). The largest dry matter of weeds was determined after the application of direct sowing (Borowiak – 104.8; Akt III – 100.5 g m⁻²) and simplified tillage (Borowiak – 72.5; Akt III – 64.1 g·m⁻²). The smallest number and weight of weeds in canopies of both oats cultivars was found after conventional soil cultivation and after simplified tillage with the use of catch crop. Introducing chemical weed control affected a reduction in number and dry matter of weeds in the range from 16 to 22%, both in the canopy of cultivar Borowiak and Akt III. This was particularly effective in treatments where direct sowing and simplified tillage was used. Among weeds short-lived species predominated, but more of them occurred in the canopy of cultivar Akt III than in the canopy of the cultivar Borowiak. Tillage system and the method for weed control had a similar effect on the weed control in canopies of naked and husked oats cultivars.

Key words: cultivation, oats, tillage system, weed infestation

INTRODUCTION

Among four basic cereals in Poland, a decrease in oats cultivation area has been observed in recent years. In 2010 it was cultivated in an area of 577 thousand ha, which accounts for 5.5% of the cereal cropping area [Statistical Yearbook 2010]. Despite decreasing area of oats cultivation, in recent years many its new valuable qualities have been observed. The plant has become a subject of investigation in countries of Western Europe and in Poland. Great interest in oats results from its higher nutritional value than

Corresponding author – Adres do korespondencji: prof. dr hab. Stanisław Deryło, Department of Herbology and Plant Cultivation Techniques of University of Life Sciences in Lublin, Akademicka 13, 20-950 Lublin, e-mail: stanisław.derylo@up.lublin.pl

that in other cereals [Dzieżyc 1993, Pawłowski and Fordoński 1994, Zawiślak and Adamiak 1997, Gąsiorowski 1999, Bartnikowska 2003]. Moreover, oats is a plant with relatively small soil and temperature requirements [Niewiadomski *et al.* 1980, Adamiak and Zawiślak 1991, Zawiślak i Adamiak 1998]. It is one of few plants in cereal crop rotations which is characterized by a high competitiveness towards weeds, tolerance to simplification in tillage, and additionally it is a phytosanitary plant [Niewiadomski *et al.* 1980, Pawłowski and Deryło 1988, Adamiak and Zawiślak 1991, Bojarczuk and Bojarczuk 1992, Zawiślak and Adamiak 1997, Deryło *et al.* 2003, Andruszczak *et al.* 2010]. The mentioned valuable qualities of oats are essential in the present situation of plant production, since effective chemical technologies of weed control have currently been controversial and limited.

The aim of this study was to estimate the level of canopy weed infestation in oats (naked and husked) cultivated under conditions of different tillage systems and plant cultivation.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

The field experiment comprising two-factorial experiments was carried out in 2000-2002 on the Experimental Farm Czesławice (51°18' N; 22°16' E), owned by UP in Lublin. It was located in Alfisol formed of loess (the good wheat complex) with a slightly acid reaction (pH 6.3-6.5) and a humus content of about 1.6%. the experiment was established with the "split-plot" design in four replications, in plots with an area for harvest of 12 m². The subject of the investigation was naked oats (cv. Borowiak) and husked oats (cv. Akt III). Two factors were taken into consideration in the experiment:

factor 1 – four tillage systems:

- I conventional involving post-harvest cultivation, composed of skimming and two-time harrowing at intervals of 15 days, autumn ploughing, spring harrowing with a medium and heavy harrows, and then sowing the oats seeds and after-sowing harrowing,
- II simplified + catch crop consisted of shallow ploughing (15 cm), harrowing, sowing of the catch crop (white mustard) and after-sowing harrowing; autumn ploughing was performed before winter, ploughing in also the catch crop; in the spring, harrowing was made with a medium and heavy harrows, as well as sowing oats and after-sowing harrowing,
- III simplified involved shallow post-harvest ploughing (15 cm), two-time harrowing at intervals of 15 days, in the spring, harrowing with a medium and heavy harrow was made, as well as oats sowing and after-sowing harrowing,
- IV direct sowing was reduced to post-harvest weed control with the herbicide (Roundup 360 SL in a dose of 5 dm³·ha⁻¹), in the spring oats sowing with a special disk drill (Bosch made in USA); in the spring, prior to sowing the seeds, mineral (NPK) fertilization was applied adapted to oats requirements and the expected yield, which amounted to: N 60, P₂O₅ 50 and K₂O 80 kg·ha⁻¹ in pure component; oats was sown after a cereal-legume mixture (spring wheat + field pea) in all the years of the experiment;

factor 2 – weed control methods:

 mechanical – consisting in two-time harrowing of oats (with a medium harrow) at the plant germination and tillering stages (5-6 leaves), moreover insecticides and fungicides were used to reduce pests and diseases appearing in the oats canopy,

 chemical – applying appropriate crop-protection preparations, reducing weeds, diseases and pests occurring in oats canopy.

All the plant protection treatments were performed on optimal dates and oats developmental stages recommended by IOR in Poznań. The following pesticides were considered in appropriate doses per 1 ha: Chwastox Turbo 340 SL $-2~dm^3$, Tilt Plus $400EC-1~dm^3$, Terpal $460C~SL-1~dm^3$, Baytan Universal 19.5 WS $-200~g\cdot100~kg^{-1}$ of oats seeds, Decis 2,5 EC $-0.25~dm^3$. In this study the weed infestation of oats canopy was evaluated randomly with the botanical weighing method, annually in each plot, several days before plant harvesting, in two test areas marked with a frame of $1\times0.5~m$. The species composition, number and air dry matter of the aboveground part of weeds were determined on those microplots.

Weather conditions according to the Meteorological Station at GD Czesławice for the long-term period were characterized by the average annual temperature 7.7°C and annual total precipitation 614.0 mm. Detailed data concerning the temperature and precipitation in individual years and growing seasons was presented in Table 1. The data indicates that the first and second year of the study (2000 and 2001) were more favourable for the growth and development of oats plants than the third (2002), since the total precipitation, its distribution and air temperature in critical phases of plants were more favourable for oats growth, which therefore was more competitive towards weeds colonizing the canopies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The weed infestation of husked oats canopy was differentiated by the tillage system and the cultivation method (Tables 2-4). On average in the three-year period (2000-2002), irrespective of the tillage system, the smallest number of weeds – 65.4 pcs·m⁻² – was found on treatments with chemical cultivation (Table 2). The difference was 16.8% in comparison with mechanical cultivation. This favourable effect of chemical cultivation in limiting weed infestation was observed on all the treatments of studied tillage systems. Significant differences between plant protection methods were found on the treatment of conventional tillage and direct sowing. Irrespective of the tested factors, the least favourable year in respect of weed infestation of husked oats canopy was 2001, when the largest number of weeds was observed – 98.7 pcs·m⁻², whereas the most favourable years were 2002 and 2000. Chemical cultivation of the canopy, irrespective of the tillage system, significantly reduced by 24.1% the number of weeds in the husked oats canopy only in 2001 (Table 2).

Irrespective of cultivation method, the largest number of weeds in the tested years (2000-2002) was observed on the treatment of direct sowing – 123.3 pcs·m⁻², whereas the smallest with simplified tillage + catch crop – 39.0 pcs·m⁻². Simplified and conventional tillage were in between in this respect, and the number of weeds there amounted to 71.4 and 54.4 pcs·m⁻², respectively. On the treatment with conventional tillage, the number of weeds was significantly larger as compared with the treatment of simplified tillage with the catch crop (Table 2).

Table 1. Total precipitation and mean air temperature at the Experimental Station Czesławice in 2000-2002

Veer Specification						Month						Annnual
January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November December	December	mean
25.6	37.2	57.1	60.5	51.2	24.7	141.0	75.1	55.6	3.5	36.4	49.6	617.5
-2.1	-1.6	3.0	12.2	15.3	17.2	16.9	18.3	11.8	11.3	8.9	1.7	9.2
33.0	17.5	47.6	48.8	15.3	55.9	165.2	55.3	144.3	26.8	32.2	18.2	660.1
6.0-	-1.5	2.1	8.2	14.4	15.0	20.9	9.61	12.5	10.6	1.2	9.9-	8.0
45.9	48.0	31.5	18.2	45.8	79.3	52.2	41.7	45.1	101.5	22.4	9.8	540.2
2.0	3.0	4.2	8.3	16.7	17.0	21.2	20.2	13.0	7.0	4.5	7.3	8.8
Many years precipitation, mm 33.2	27.6	31.1	42.5	62.8	79.4	6.67	69.1	58.8	47.6	40.7	41.3	614.0
1963-2003 temperature, °C -3.2	-2.1	2.1	7.8	13.5	16.4	18.1	17.6	13.0	8.1	2.7	-1.1	7.7

Table 2. Mean number of weeds in husked oats, pcs·m⁻²

						Tillage	Tillage system						Meti	Methods	Years
Year)	conventional		simplifi	simplified with catch crop	tch crop		simplified	1	þ	direct sowing	gı	mean	san	4000
•	ax	p_{xx}	mean	а	q	mean	а	q	mean	а	q	mean	а	q	шсап
2000	9.69	58.8	64.2	30.3	26.4	28.4	8.08	72.1	76.4	105.1	9.66	102.4	71.4	64.2	8.79
2001	97.0	61.2	79.1	82.1	58.0	70.1	120.0	98.5	109.2	149.6	123.0	136.3	112.2	85.2	98.7
2002	23.2	16.7	20.0	20.2	16.5	18.4	29.8	27.4	28.6	135.8	126.4	131.1	52.2	46.8	49.5
Mean	63.3	45.6	54.4	44.2	33.6	39.0	6.97	0.99	71.4	130.2	116.3	123.3	9.87	65.4	ı
LSD _{0.05} for:	T.														
tillage	tillage systems			16.8											
cultivation	ution			13.0											
years				18.6											
interaction:	tion:														
	systems ×	systems × cultivation		12.9											
	systems × year	year		26.0											
	cultivation × year	ı × year		21.5											

 a^{x} – mechanical cultivation, b^{xx} – chemical cultivation

The other component of weed infestation of husked oats canopy, i.e. air-dry weight of weeds, was also differentiated by the tested factors (Table 3). Irrespective of the cultivation method, the largest biomass of weeds was found on treatments with direct sowing and simplified tillage system without the catch crop, which was $104.8~{\rm g\cdot m^{-2}}$ and $72.5~{\rm g\cdot m^{-2}}$, respectively. Weeds formed significantly the smallest biomass in the oats canopy on treatments with conventional tillage and with simplified one plus the catch crop, which remained on the same level and on average amounted to $20.6~{\rm g\cdot m^{-2}}$. It is notable that the chemical cultivation of oats canopies was significantly more effective in reducing their weed biomass as compared with mechanical – only between treatments with direct and simplified sowing without the catch crop.

Irrespective of the tillage system, chemical cultivation of husked oats had a significant effect on reducing the weed biomass in oats canopy (Table 3). Irrespective of the tested factors, the year 2001 was significantly more favourable to increase in weed biomass in oats canopies (79.8 g·m⁻²), whereas 2000 and 2002 were similar to each other in this respect, and on average the biomass amounted to 42.4 g·m⁻². Thus it was significantly lower in comparison with 2001.

Weed infestation of naked oats was also modified by the tested factors, i.e. the tillage system and the method for canopy cultivation (Tables 5-7). On average in three years (2000-2002), irrespective of the tillage system, significantly the largest number of weeds $-73.3 \text{ pcs} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ — was found on the treatments cultivated mechanically, whereas the smallest $-56.9 \text{ pcs} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ — on plots cultivated chemically. The difference was 22.4%. Chemical cultivation of oats canopies proved significantly effective in the simplified tillage system and with direct sowing. The most favourable growing period in respect of the weed infestation of oats canopies was 2002, when the smallest number of weeds was found $-43.7 \text{ pcs} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$, where the worst years were 2001 and 2000 (Table 5).

Irrespective of cultivation and years, the smallest number of weeds in the canopy of naked oats was found on the treatments with simplified tillage with the catch crop and conventional tillage – on average $43.4 \text{ pcs} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$, whereas the largest on the treatment with direct sowing – $102.0 \text{ pcs} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$ and simplified tillage – $68.7 \text{ pcs} \cdot \text{m}^{-2}$. It is notable that this tendency was also noticeable in individual years of the study (Table 5).

Air dry matter of weeds in naked oats was also differentiated by the tillage system and cultivation (Table 6). Irrespective of cultivation, the largest weed biomass was found on the treatments with direct sowing and simplified tillage system, which was $100.5~{\rm g\cdot m^{-2}}$ and $64.1~{\rm g\cdot m^{-2}}$, respectively, whereas significantly the smallest biomass was formed by weeds in oats canopy on the treatments with conventional tillage and simplified tillage with the catch crop; it stayed on the same level and on average, it amounted to $27.0~{\rm g\cdot m^{-2}}$.

Irrespective of the tillage system, chemical cultivation of oats canopy significantly reduced the weed biomass by 16.8% as compared with mechanical. By contrast, in individual tillage systems, the chemical cultivation of oats canopy proved to be significantly effective only on the treatment with direct sowing.

Irrespective of the tested factors, the most favourable year for the increase in weed biomass in naked oats canopy was 2001 (77.1 $g \cdot m^{-2}$), where favourable were the years 2000 and 2002, when the weed weight was the smallest and stayed on the same level, on average 43.4 $g \cdot m^{-2}$ (Table 6).

The floristic composition of the weed community colonizing husked oats canopies was differentiated by the tested experimental factors, i.e. tillage systems and cultivation (Table 4). Species of short-lived weeds growing over oats canopies showed a distinct

stability, mainly in the group of dominant weeds (they occurred annually in a high intensity), which included: *Chenopodium album*, *Capsella bursa-pastoris*, *Viola arvensis*, *Galinsoga parviflora*, *Matricaria maritima* ssp. *inodora*, *Apera spica-venti*, *Polygonum nodosum*, *Myosotis arvensis*, *Gnaphalium uliginosum*, *Plantago pauciflora*. They accounted for 83.5% to 75.0% of the total number of weeds. Of perennial weeds, *Elymus repens* and *Cirsium arvense* occurred in the largest proportion (from 95.2 to 57.1%). It is notable that the number of dominant and other weeds increased on the treatments with the simplified tillage system and direct sowing. It is noteworthy that the chemical cultivation of husked oats canopy on the treatment with direct sowing resulted in an increase in the number of some species: *Apera spica-venti*, *Viola arvensis* and *Echinochloa crus-galli*.

The number of weeds in husked oats canopy stayed on a similar level from 29 to 31 on the treatments with tested tillage systems, irrespective of cultivation. Introducing chemical cultivation resulted in a decrease in the number of species from 1 to 3 as compared with mechanical cultivation. Irrespective of the tested factors, a total of 32 weed species were found in the canopy of husked oats, whereas 33 on the treatment with chemical cultivation and 31 with mechanical. The largest number of species was found on treatments with the simplified tillage system – 32 and with direct sowing – 31.

The floristic composition of the weed community occurring in the canopy of naked oats was also modified by the tested experimental factors, i.e. tillage systems and cultivation (Table 7). Weed species occurring in oats canopy were also characterized by a high stability, mostly in the group of dominant weeds. These made the main core of oats weed infestation: Capsella bursa-pastoris, Apera spica-venti, Galinsoga parviflora, Chenopodium album, Viola arvensis, Gnaphalium uliginosum, Matricaria maritima ssp. inodora, Myosotis arvensis, Plantago pauciflora and Galium aparine. In the group of perennial weeds, the weeds with the highest proportion were Elymus repens and Cirsium arvense. It is notable that in canopies of naked oats – similarly to the husked one – there was an increase not only in the number of dominant weeds, but also of the other species participating in weed infestation, mainly on treatments with the system of simplified tillage without the catch crop and with direct sowing. Additionally, such species as Geranium pusillum, Spergula rubra, Vicia angustifolia, Solanum nigrum appeared, and of perennial ones – Sonchus arvensis (Table 7).

Irrespective of the tested factors, a total of 30 weed species were found in the canopy of naked oats, whereas 27 on treatment with chemical cultivation, and 32 with mechanical. The largest number of species was found on the treatment with direct sowing -35, whereas on the other treatments this ranged from 25 to 28.

The results of present study presenting varied weed infestation of oats canopy, resulting from the adopted tillage systems and cultivation methods, confirm the literature data indicating a considerable increase in weed infestation of crops as a result of tillage simplification involving simplification or reduction in the number of cultivation practices [Niewiadomski *et al.* 1980, Michalski 1993, Budzyński 1999, Deryło *et al.* 2003]. In this study, a significant increase in the analysed indices of weed infestation occurred mainly in the simplified tillage system and direct sowing, under conditions of mechanical canopy cultivation.

Table 3. Air-dry matter of weeds in husked oats canopy, g·m⁻²

Year						1111480	mage system						TATOR	Memods	Years
	5	conventional	Į.	simplifi	simplified with catch crop	tch crop		simplified		3	direct sowing	gu	mean	an	\$ 000
1	ax	p_{xx}	mean	а	q	mean	а	q	mean	а	q	mean	а	q	IIIcaii
2000	36.6	14.4	25.5	9.3	8.2	8.8	83.4	64.5	74.0	96.1	52.2	74.2	56.4	34.8	45.6
2001	41.7	35.9	38.8	40.6	31.3	36.0	118.1	100.4	109.2	138.2	126.4	132.3	84.6	75.0	8.62
2002	10.6	8.4	9.5	5.0	4.2	4.6	41.4	27.2	34.3	119.3	96.5	107.9	44.1	34.1	39.1
Mean	29.6	19.6	24.6	18.3	14.6	16.5	81.0	64.0	72.5	117.9	91.7	104.8	61.7	48.0	1
LSD _{0.05} for:	i.i														
tillage	tillage systems			19.6											
cultivation	tion			13.2											
years				25.4											
interaction:	tion:														
3 2	systems × (systems × cultivation		16.5											
3 ,	systems × year	year		22.8											
•	cultivation × year	× year		11.2											

Table 4. Species composition and number of weeds per 1 m² of husked oats canopy, mean from 2000-2002

ed direct sowing mean a b mean a b mean a b 11 12 13 14 15 16 11.5 4.0 6.4 5.2 8.6 5.3 5.5 11.5 3.4 7.6 7.2 3.9 5.5 11.5 3.4 7.6 7.2 3.9 5.5 11.5 3.4 7.6 7.2 3.9 3.2 4.7 10.9 7.8 5.0 5.7 9.4 4.7.0 30.3 38.6 17.2 11.0 9.4 4.7 10.9 7.8 1.2 11.0 9.4 4.7 1.2 3.9 7.1 3.1 14.0 31.1 40.6 35.8 14.4 17.9 0.4 0.7 1.2 0.9 1.1 1.0 1.4 4.9 0.2 2.5 2.0 0.4 1.6									Tillage	Tillage system							
2 3 4 5 mean a b mean a a b mean a a a a a a	No)	nventior	ıal	lduis	ified witl crop	ı catch		simplifie	þ	ģ	irect sow	ing	ш	iean	Mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 11 12 13 14 15 16 Chenopodium album 134 4 5 6 7 8 1 15 4 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 3 5 1 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td>a^{x}</td> <td>\mathbf{p}_{xx}</td> <td>mean</td> <td>а</td> <td>þ</td> <td>mean</td> <td>a</td> <td>þ</td> <td>mean</td> <td>а</td> <td>þ</td> <td>mean</td> <td>a</td> <td>þ</td> <td></td>			a^{x}	\mathbf{p}_{xx}	mean	а	þ	mean	a	þ	mean	а	þ	mean	a	þ	
Capeling of the bright of th	1	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Chenopodium album 134 4.8 9.1 2.5 1.8 2.5 14.7 8.3 11.5 4.0 6.4 5.2 8.6 5.3 Capsald bursa-pasapris 8.3 4.2 6.2 3.5 1.5 8.8 3.4 7.6 7.8 8.8 3.4 7.6 7.2 3.9 7.7 1.1 3.4 7.6 7.2 3.8 3.2 4.7 3.9 4.7 3.9 4.7 3.9 4.8 7.4 4.8 7.4 4.8 7.4 4.5 0.7 2.5 1.6 4.7 3.0 3.9 4.7 4.7 3.9 3.4 4.7 4.8 4.4 4.5 0.7 2.5 1.0 1.7 1.1 1.0 1.1 1.0 1.1 1.0 1.1 1.1 1.1 1.6 1.7 1.2 0.2 0.7 0.7 0.4 0.9 0.4 0.9 0.4 0.9 0.4 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0							- I		pe								
Capsella bursac-pasapris 8.3 4.2 6.2 3.5 5.8 5.3 5.5 11.5 3.4 7.6 7.2 3.9 Viola anvensis 7.1 5.9 6.5 5.9 2.5 4.2 2.6 3.8 3.2 4.7 10.9 7.8 3.0 7.1 10.9 1.1 1.0 1.2 3.0 2.5 4.7 10.9 3.8 3.2 4.7 10.9 7.8 3.0 4.7 10.0 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.4 11.6 11.7 16.4 4.7 3.0 3.9 7.1 3.1 4.0 3.2 4.7 3.0 3.0 5.7 11.0 11.0 11.0 11.4 11.6 11.7 16.4 4.9 3.0 3.9 4.7 3.0 3.0 3.0 4.0 3.0 4.0 3.0 4.0 3.0 4.0 3.0 4.0 3.0 4.0 3.0 4.0 3.0 4.0 3.0 4.0 <th< td=""><td>1</td><td>Chenopodium album</td><td>13.4</td><td>4.8</td><td>9.1</td><td>2.5</td><td>1.8</td><td>2.2</td><td>14.7</td><td>8.3</td><td>11.5</td><td>4.0</td><td>6.4</td><td>5.2</td><td>9.8</td><td>5.3</td><td>7.0</td></th<>	1	Chenopodium album	13.4	4.8	9.1	2.5	1.8	2.2	14.7	8.3	11.5	4.0	6.4	5.2	9.8	5.3	7.0
Viola arvensis 7.1 5.9 6.5 5.9 2.5 4.2 2.6 3.8 3.2 4.7 10.9 7.8 5.0 5.7 Galiniosage parvillora 7.0 4.8 7.4 4.5 0.7 2.5 10.3 8.3 9.4 4.70 30.3 3.8 1.0 1.1 1.0 7.8 5.0 5.7 1.1 1.1 1.4 1.1 1.4 1.1 1.4 1.1 1.4 1.4 1.1 1.4 1.7 1.4 1.7 1.4 1.7 1.4 1.7 1.4 1.7 1.4 1.7 1.7	7	Capsella bursa-pastpris	8.3	4.2	6.2	3.5	2.8	3.2	5.8	5.3	5.5	11.5	3.4	9.7	7.2	3.9	5.5
Galinsoga panyiflora 70 4.8 74 4.5 0.7 2.5 10.3 8.3 9.4 47.0 30.3 38.6 17.2 11.0 1 Marticaria martiima ssp. indodrum 5.2 1.8 3.5 5.6 2.1 3.8 12.8 5.5 9.2 4.9 3.0 3.9 7.1 3.1 Apacorium nadosum 2.2 1.8 3.4 3.4 11.9 11.4 11.6 11.7 16.4 14.0 31.1 40.6 3.8 17.1 3.1 Aposatis arreasis 1.5 0.3 1.2 1.2 0.2 0.7 0.6 0.2 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7	ϵ	Viola arvensis	7.1	5.9	6.5	5.9	2.5	4.2	5.6	3.8	3.2	4.7	10.9	7.8	5.0	5.7	5.4
Matricaria maritima ssp 5.2 1.8 3.5 5.6 2.1 3.8 12.8 5.5 9.2 4.9 3.0 3.9 7.1 3.1 moodorum moodorum 1.2 3.4 1.9 1.4 1.6 1.7 164 14.0 3.1 40.6 3.8 1.4 1.9 1.1 1.0 1.7 1.4 1.6 1.7 1.4 1.6 1.7 1.4 1.6 1.7 1.4 1.6 1.7 1.4 1.6 1.7 1.4 1.6 1.7 1.4 1.6 1.7 1.4 1.2 <	4	Galinsoga parviflora	7.0	8.4	7.4	4.5	0.7	2.5	10.3	8.3	9.4	47.0	30.3	38.6	17.2	11.0	14.5
Appera spica-venti 3.1 3.4 3.4 11.9 11.4 11.6 11.7 16.4 14.0 31.1 40.6 35.8 14.4 17.9 1 Polygonum nodosum 2.2 0.3 1.2 1.2 0.2 0.7 0.5 0.3 0.4 0.7 1.2 0.9 1.2 0.2 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.5 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.5 0.8 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.5 0.9 0.3 0.9 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.8 0.8 0.4 0.7	S	Matricaria maritima ssp. inodorum	5.2	1.8	3.5	5.6	2.1	3.8	12.8	5.5	9.2	4.9	3.0	3.9	7.1	3.1	5.1
Polygonum nodosum 22 0.3 1.2 1.2 0.7 0.5 0.3 0.4 0.7 1.2 0.9 0.3 0.4 0.5 0.4 0.7 1.2 0.9 0.3 0.6 0.4 0.6 0.2 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.5 0.8 0.3 Gnaphalium uliginosum 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.7 0.4 0.7 <th< td=""><td>9</td><td>Apera spica-venti</td><td>3.1</td><td>3.4</td><td>3.4</td><td>11.9</td><td>11.4</td><td>11.6</td><td>11.7</td><td>16.4</td><td>14.0</td><td>31.1</td><td>40.6</td><td>35.8</td><td>14.4</td><td>17.9</td><td>16.2</td></th<>	9	Apera spica-venti	3.1	3.4	3.4	11.9	11.4	11.6	11.7	16.4	14.0	31.1	40.6	35.8	14.4	17.9	16.2
Mysostis arvensis 1.5 0.3 0.9 0.3 0.6 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.7 0.4 0.9 0.3 0.8 3.7 0.0 0.4 4.9 0.2 2.5 2.0 0.4 Plantago pauciflora Plantago pauciflora 1.2 1.2 1.2 1.2 0.3 0.3 0.7 0.0 0.4 4.9 0.2 2.5 2.0 0.4 Galleopsis eterahit 0.9 1.3 1.1 0.6 1.3 1.0 0.7 0.7 0.8 0.4 0.3 0.0	۲	Polygonum nodosum	2.2	0.3	1.2	1.2	0.2	0.7	0.5	0.3	0.4	0.7	1.2	6.0	1.2	0.5	8.0
Gaaphalium uliginosum 1.2 0.3 0.4 0.9 1.3 1.0 0.7 0.7 0.0 1.8 3.4 4.8 4.1 2.4 1.6 Calcinoma parcine 0.9 1.3 1.1 0.6 1.3 1.0 2.7 1.7 2.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 1.1 1.0 Callium purpureum 0.7 0.8 0.4 0.9 0.4 0.7 <td>∞</td> <td>Myosotis arvensis</td> <td>1.5</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>6.0</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>8.0</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>9.0</td>	∞	Myosotis arvensis	1.5	0.3	6.0	0.3	9.0	0.4	9.0	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.4	0.5	8.0	0.3	9.0
Plantago pauciflora 1.2 1.5 1.4 1.2 0.3 0.8 3.7 0.0 1.8 3.4 4.8 4.1 2.4 1.6 Galeopsis terrahit 0.9 1.3 1.1 0.6 1.3 1.0 2.7 1.7 2.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 1.1 1.0 Lamium purpureum 0.7 0.8 0.8 0.4 0.3 0.4 0.0 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 1.1 1.1 1.0 Galium aparine 0.6 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.5 0.0 0.2 2.0 1.8 1.9 1.0 0.0 Stellaria media 0.3 0.4 0.7	6	Gnaphalium uliginosum	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	0.3	0.7	0.7	0.0	0.4	4.9	0.2	2.5	2.0	0.4	1.2
Galeopsis tetrahit 0.9 1.3 1.1 0.6 1.3 1.0 2.7 1.7 2.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 1.1 1.0 Lamium purpureum 0.7 0.8 0.4 0.3 0.4 0.0 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.	10	Plantago pauciflora	1.2	1.5	1.4	1.2	0.3	8.0	3.7	0.0	1.8	3.4	4.8	4.1	2.4	1.6	2.0
Lamium purpureum 0.7 0.8 0.8 0.4 0.3 0.4 0.0 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.3 0.4 Gallum aparine 0.6 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.8 1.9 1.0 0.0 <td>1</td> <td>Galeopsis tetrahit</td> <td>6.0</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>1.3</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>1.7</td> <td>2.2</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>1.1</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>1.1</td>	1	Galeopsis tetrahit	6.0	1.3	1.1	9.0	1.3	1.0	2.7	1.7	2.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	1.1	1.0	1.1
Galtum aparine 0.6 0.3 0.4 0.9 0.4 0.7 0.5 0.0 0.2 2.0 1.8 1.9 1.0 0.6 Stellaria media 0.3 0.9 0.6 0.6 2.3 1.4 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.7 1.1 0.5 1.4 Poa annua 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.9 0.6 0.7	12	Lamium purpureum	0.7	8.0	8.0	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.3	0.3
Stellaria media 0.3 0.9 0.6 0.3 1.4 0.7 0.7 0.7 0.4 1.7 1.1 0.5 1.4 Poa annua 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.7	13	Galium aparine	9.0	0.3	6.4	6.0	9.4	0.7	0.5	0.0	0.2	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.0	9.0	8.0
Poa annua 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4 Veronica persica 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.1 0.3 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.2	14	Stellaria media	0.3	6.0	9.0	9.0	2.3	1.4	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.4	1.7	1.1	0.5	1.4	1.0
Veronica persica 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1	15	Poa annua	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.7	6.0	8.0	0.4	0.4	0.4
Victa hirsuta 0.2 0.1 0.3 0.1 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 <	16	Veronica persica	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Spergularia rubra 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.1 0.4 0.0 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.4 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.6 0.2 0.1 Lamium amplexicaule 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.0 0.4 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.6 0.2 0.1 Geramium pusillum 0.1 0.4 0.2 0.1 1.4 0.8 0.3 1.4 0.8 0.2 1.0 Maricaria discoidea 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	17	Vicia hirsuta	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.2
Echinochloa crus-galli 0.2 0.2 0.7 1.7 1.2 2.0 0.6 1.3 6.0 4.2 5.1 2.2 1.6 Lamium amplexicaule 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.0 0.4 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.6 0.2 0.4 Geranium pusillum 0.1 0.4 0.2 0.1 0.7 0.4 0.1 1.4 0.8 0.3 1.4 0.8 0.2 1.0 Marricaria discoidea 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.3 0.2 0.0 0.1 Polygonum convolvulus 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.2 0.4 0.4 0.6 0.7 0.0 Spergula arvensis 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	18	Spergularia rubra	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2
Lamium amplexicaule 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.0 0.4 0.2 0.3 0.9 0.6 0.2 0.4 Geranium pusillum 0.1 0.4 0.2 0.1 0.7 0.4 0.1 1.4 0.8 0.3 1.4 0.8 0.2 1.0 Matricaria discoidea 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.3 0.2 0.0 Polygonum convolvulus 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.2 0.4 0.4 0.6 0.0 0.1 Spergula arvensis 0.1 0.0 <th< td=""><td>19</td><td>Echinochloa crus-galli</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.7</td><td>1.7</td><td>1.2</td><td>2.0</td><td>9.0</td><td>1.3</td><td>0.9</td><td>4.2</td><td>5.1</td><td>2.2</td><td>1.6</td><td>1.9</td></th<>	19	Echinochloa crus-galli	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.7	1.7	1.2	2.0	9.0	1.3	0.9	4.2	5.1	2.2	1.6	1.9
Geranium pusillum 0.1 0.4 0.2 0.1 0.7 0.4 0.1 1.4 0.8 0.3 1.4 0.8 0.2 1.0 Marricaria discoidea 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.3 0.2 0.0 Polygonum convolvulus 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.2 0.4 0.4 0.6 0.3 0.4 0.0 Spergula arvensis 0.1 0.0	20	Lamium amplexicaule	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.3	6.0	9.0	0.2	0.4	0.3
Marricaria discoidea 0.1 0.0 0.1 0.0	21	Geranium pusillum	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.7	0.4	0.1	1.4	8.0	0.3	1.4	8.0	0.2	1.0	9.0
Polygonum convolvulus 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.2 0.4 0.6 0.5 0.4 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.3 0.6 0.3 0.0 0.7 0.1 0.0	22	Matricaria discoidea	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	23	Polygonum convolvulus	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.3	0.3	9.0	0.2	0.4	0.4	9.0	0.5	0.4	0.3	0.4
0.0 0.0 0.0 0.4 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.0 0.2 0.5 1.2 0.8 0.3 0.3	24	Spergula arvensis	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0
	25	Veronica arvensis	0.0	0.0	0.0	9.0	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.5	1.2	8.0	0.3	0.3	0.3

,	neq
	continue
	e 4 c
	Tabl

-	2	3	4	5	9	7	∞	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
26	Solanum nigrum	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	6.0	0.5	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1
27	Erigeron canadensis	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	2.2	0.5	1.4	9.0	0.2	0.4
28	Sonhus asper	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
29	Sonchus oleraceus	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
30	Plantago pauciflora	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
31	Amaranthus retroflexus	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0
32	Erodium cicutarium	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	2.2	0.5	1.4	9.0	0.4	0.4
33	Polygonum aviculare	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0
34	34 Lapsana communis	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
ź	Number of weeds I	54.3	33.3	43.8	43.0	31.3	37.2	71.8	54.5	63.2	128.9	114.8	121.8	74.5	58.3	66.5
ź	Number of species I	24	24	24	24	22	25	23	23	28	25	24	26	26	29	27
						·II	– Perennia	ial								
35	Elymus repens	5.0	12.0	8.5	1.0	2.3	1.6	4.4	11.0	7.7	0.1	0.7	0.4	2.6	6.5	4.6
36	Cirsium arvense	2.6	0.1	1.3	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	9.0	0.2	0.4	6.0	0.2	0.5
37	Stachys palustris	0.7	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
38	Taraxacum officinale	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.3	0.0	0.2	0.3	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.2
39	Sonchus arvensis	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.1
40	40 Equisetum arvense	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0
Ñ	Number of weeds II	0.6	12.3	10.6	1.2	2.5	1.8	5.1	11.5	8.3	1.3	1.5	1.4	4.1	7.1	5.5
Ź	Number of species II	5	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	4	5	4	5	9	5	5
Τc	Fotal number of weeds I and II	63.3	45.6	54.4	44.2	33.6	39.0	6.97	0.99	71.4	130.2	116.3	123.3	9.87	65.4	72.0
Τc	Total number of species I and II	29	27	29	27	24	28	26	26	32	30	28	31	31	33	32

a^x – mechanical cultivation
b^{xx} – chemical cultivation
0,0 – species occurrence < 0.1

Table 5. Mean number of weeds in naked oats canopy per 1 m^2

Year conventional simplified with catch crop simplified simplified with catch crop simplified solid a b mean a b a b a a b a b a a b a <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Tillage</th> <th>Tillage system</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Met</th> <th>Methods</th> <th>Years</th>							Tillage	Tillage system						Met	Methods	Years
a* b** mean a b mean a b mean a b 0.0 56.5 58.2 29.2 26.1 27.6 78.8 64.8 71.8 100.4 80.1 90.2 67.1 56.9 6 3.8 68.1 76.0 66.3 71.6 116.8 90.2 103.5 131.0 84.2 107.6 102.1 77.2 77.2 47.9 68.7 119.1 84.2 107.6 102.1 77.2 87.7 107.1 77.2 86.9 107.1 77.2 87.9 107.0 73.3 56.9 107.1 107.0 73.3 56.9 107.1 107.0 73.3 56.9 107.0 107.0 73.3 56.9 107.0 107.0 73.3 56.9 107.0 107.0 73.3 56.9 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0 107.0	Year		conventiona	1	simplifi	ed with ca	tch crop		simplified		3	firect sowin	gu	me	ean	500
0.0 56.5 58.2 29.2 26.1 77.8 64.8 71.8 100.4 80.1 90.2 67.1 56.9 3.8 68.1 76.0 76.9 66.3 71.6 116.8 90.2 103.5 131.0 84.2 107.6 102.1 77.2 7.2 47.9 52.6 40.3 34.1 37.2 76.6 60.9 68.7 119.1 84.8 102.0 73.3 56.9 1 1 1 37.2 76.6 60.9 68.7 119.1 84.8 102.0 73.3 56.9 1 1 1 37.2 76.6 60.9 68.7 119.1 84.8 102.0 73.3 56.9 1 1 1 37.2 76.6 60.9 68.7 119.1 84.8 102.0 73.3 56.9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 </th <th></th> <th></th> <th>P_{xx}</th> <th>mean</th> <th>а</th> <th>þ</th> <th>mean</th> <th>а</th> <th>þ</th> <th>mean</th> <th>а</th> <th>þ</th> <th>mean</th> <th>а</th> <th>þ</th> <th>mean</th>			P _{xx}	mean	а	þ	mean	а	þ	mean	а	þ	mean	а	þ	mean
3.8 68.1 76.0 76.9 66.3 71.6 116.8 90.2 103.5 131.0 84.2 107.6 102.1 77.2 72. 47.9 52.6 40.3 34.1 37.2 76.6 60.9 68.7 119.1 84.8 102.0 73.3 56.9 126.0 12.3 12.3 12.3 12.3 12.3 12.3 12.3 12.3	2000		56.5	58.2	29.2	26.1	27.6	78.8	64.8	71.8	100.4	80.1	90.2	67.1	56.9	62.0
7.8 19.2 23.5 14.8 9.8 12.3 34.2 27.6 30.9 126.0 90.1 108.1 50.7 36.7 36.7 7.2 47.9 52.6 40.3 34.1 37.2 76.6 60.9 68.7 119.1 84.8 102.0 73.3 56.9 tems 15.9 12.7 12.7 18.1	2001		68.1	76.0	6.97	6.99	71.6	116.8	90.2	103.5	131.0	84.2	107.6	102.1	77.2	9.68
T2 47.9 52.6 40.3 34.1 37.2 76.6 60.9 68.7 119.1 84.8 102.0 73.3 tems tems 15.9 1 12.7 1 18.1 i.ems × cultivation 1 5.6 i.ems × year 2 8.8 1 27.0 1 19.1 84.8 102.0 73.3 1 12.7 1 12.7 1 13.1 1 15.9 1 15.	2002	27.8		23.5	14.8	8.6	12.3	34.2	27.6	30.9	126.0	90.1	108.1	50.7	36.7	43.7
tems 1. items × cultivation tems × year ivation × year	Mean	57.2	47.9	52.6	40.3	34.1	37.2	9.92	6.09	68.7	119.1	84.8	102.0	73.3	56.9	1
tems 1. items × cultivation tems × year ivation × year	LSD _{0.05} fc	Jr.														
ms × cultivation ms × year vation × year	tillage	systems			15.9											
tion: systems × cultivation systems × year cultivation × year	cultive	ation			12.7											
; × cultivation ; × year ion × year	years				18.1											
s × cultivation x × year ion × year	interac	ction:														
		systems ×	cultivation		15.6											
		systems ×	year		28.8											
		cultivation	n × year		24.9											

for explanations, see Table 2

Table 6. Air-dry matter of weeds of naked oats canopy, $g \cdot m^{\text{-}2}$

						Tillage	Tillage system						Meti	Methods	Years
Year		conventional	1	simplifi	simplified with catch crop	tch crop		simplified			direct sowing	gu	mean	an	500
I	ax	p _{xx}	mean	а	p	mean	а	p	mean	а	þ	mean	а	þ	шеап
2000	28.8	21.7	25.2	20.5	17.1	18.8	62.4	58.3	60.4	83.8	71.5	7.77	48.9	42.2	45.6
2001	52.7	49.6	51.2	48.2	36.7	42.4	101.6	97.3	99.5	125.5	104.9	115.2	82.0	72.1	77.1
2002	19.9	11.9	15.9	10.5	5.4	8.0	40.1	24.6	32.4	121.4	95.7	108.6	48.0	34.4	41.2
Mean 33.8	33.8	27.7	30.8	26.4	19.7	23.1	0.89	60.1	64.1	110.2	7.06	100.5	59.6	49.6	1
SD _{0.05} for:	::														
tillage	tillage systems			22.5											
cultivation	tion			6.6											
years				19.6											
interaction:	tion:														
,,	systems ×	systems × cultivation		18.1											
,,	systems × year	year		23.6											
J	cultivation × vear	1 × year		10.4											

for explanations, see Table 2

Table 7. Species composition and number of weeds per 1 m² of naked oats canopy, mean from 2000-2002

Species									Tillage	Tillage system							
a* b** mean a b mean b mean a b mean mean b	ž		00	nvention	al	ildmis	fied with crop	ı catch		simplifie	Ę	p	direct sowing	ing	me	mean	Mean
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 Capsella bursa-pastoris 88 2.8 5.5 3.8 5.7 7.4 3.8 5.6 1 Apera spica-venii 8.3 9.3 8.8 5.7 8.2 7.0 12.1 20.2 16.9 3.8 5.6 1.0 1.1 20.2 16.9 3.8 5.6 1.0 1.1 20.2 16.9 3.3 7.0 1.1 20.2 1.6 3.3 3.4 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.4 3.3 3.3 3.4 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3 3.3			a^{x}	\mathbf{p}_{xx}	mean	a	þ	mean	a	þ	mean	a	þ	mean	а	þ	
1—Short lived 1—Short lived 2.8 5.8 5.5 3.8 5.7 7.4 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 4.5 4.5 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.7 7.4 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.7 7.4 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.7 7.4 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.7 7.4 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.7 7.0 1.6 3.8 5.6 1.6 3.8 5.6 3.2 2.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 3.8 3.8 3.0 3.0 3.2 2.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 3.8 3.8 3.0 3.	-	2	3	4	5	9	7	8	6	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17
Apera spicaryenti 8.8 5.8 5.8 5.8 5.7 7.4 3.8 5.6 1 Apera spicar-venti 8.3 9.3 8.8 5.7 8.2 7.0 1.2.1 20.2 1.6.9 3 Galinosga parvylfora 6.3 5.4 5.8 2.5 1.3 1.9 9.4 4.5 7.0 Chenopodium album 5.4 5.8 5.6 1.3 1.9 9.4 4.5 7.0 Vola arvensis 4.3 6.8 5.5 1.3 1.0 7.5 16.2 5.3 10.8 1.0 Matricaria martima ssp. 3.0 5.7 4.6 3.3 1.0 0.2 2.7 3.0 5.7 4.6 3.3 1.0 2.2 5.2 5.3 1.6 3.3 1.0 2.2 5.2 1.6 4.7 0.4 5.5 1.0 1.1 1.0 3.3 1.0 3.1 1.0 3.1 1.0 3.2 3.2 3.2							- I	Short live	pa								
Apera spica-venti 8.3 9.3 8.8 5.7 8.2 7.0 12.1 20.2 16.9 3 Chenopodium album 5.4 2.8 2.5 1.3 1.9 9.4 4.5 7.0 1 Chenopodium album 5.4 2.3 3.8 8.0 7.0 7.5 16.2 5.3 10.8 1.0 1.1 1.0 1.1 3.1 3.5 3.3 1.0 1.2 2.7 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 1.0 2.7 1.0 1.0 1.0 2.2 2.7 1.0 1.0 2.2 2.7 3.0	1	Capsella bursa-pastoris	8.8	2.8	5.8	5.5	3.8	5.7	7.4	3.8	9.6	13.9	7.2	10.6	6.8	4.4	9.9
Galinsoga parviflora 6.3 5.4 5.8 2.5 1.3 1.9 9.4 4.5 7.0 7.0 Chenopodium album 5.4 2.3 3.8 8.0 7.0 7.5 162 5.3 10.8 1.0 1.0 1.3 1.0 2.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 3.3 1.0 2.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 1.0 2.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 1.0 2.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 3.3 1.0 0.3 0.6 2.7 0.5 1.6 1.7 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.5 1.2 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.5 1.1 1.1 1.0 2.3 1.0 0.2 1.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.6 1.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.0 1.1 0.4 0.7 0.1 0.0 0.0 <t< td=""><td>2</td><td>Apera spica-venti</td><td>8.3</td><td>9.3</td><td>8.8</td><td>5.7</td><td>8.2</td><td>7.0</td><td>12.1</td><td>20.2</td><td>16.9</td><td>35.9</td><td>36.8</td><td>36.4</td><td>15.5</td><td>18.6</td><td>17.1</td></t<>	2	Apera spica-venti	8.3	9.3	8.8	5.7	8.2	7.0	12.1	20.2	16.9	35.9	36.8	36.4	15.5	18.6	17.1
Chenopodium album 5.4 2.3 3.8 8.0 7.0 7.5 16.2 5.3 10.8 1 Fiola arvensis 4.3 6.8 5.6 3.2 2.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 Gnaphalium uliginosum 4.3 6.8 5.6 3.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 Matricaria maritima ssp. inodora 3.0 5.7 4.6 3.3 1.0 2.2 5.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 Myosotis arvensis 1.3 0.7 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.5 Plantago pauciflora 1.0 1.1 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.5 Alantago pauciflora 0.0 1.1 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 1.4 0.2 1.1 Calledium apariti 0.1 1.1 1.0 0.2 0.2 1.4 0.2 1.1 0.4 0.5 0.1 0.2	3	Galinsoga parviflora	6.3	5.4	5.8	2.5	1.3	1.9	9.4	4.5	7.0	18.4	7.3	12.8	9.1	4.6	6.9
Viola arvensis 4,3 6,8 5.6 3.2 2.7 3.1 3.5 3.3 Gnaphalium uliginosum 4,2 0.8 2.5 1.0 0.3 0.6 2.7 0.5 1.6 Matricaria maritima ssp. inodora 3.0 5.7 4.6 3.3 1.0 2.2 5.2 5.7 0.5 1.6 Myosotis arvensis 1.3 0.7 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.6 Plantago pauciflora 1.0 1.1 1.0 2.3 0.2 1.4 0.2 5.2 1.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.6 Allowootis arvensis 0.9 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 <	4	Chenopodium album	5.4	2.3	3.8	8.0	7.0	7.5	16.2	5.3	10.8	11.0	2.6	8.9	10.2	4.3	7.2
Gnaphalium uliginosum 4.2 0.8 2.5 1.0 0.3 0.6 2.7 0.5 1.6 Matricaria maritima ssp. 3.0 5.7 4.6 3.3 1.0 2.2 5.2 5.4 5.3 Mosotis arvensis 1.3 0.7 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.6 Plantago pauciflora 1.0 1.1 1.0 2.3 0.2 1.4 1.4 0.2 1.1 Callium aparine 0.9 0.3 0.6 0.9 0.0 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.5 Polygonum nodosum 0.8 0.6 0.7 1.5 0.5 1.1 0.7 0.1 0.4 0.7 0.1 Spergula arvensis 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.0 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	5	Viola arvensis	4.3	8.9	5.6	3.2	2.2	2.7	3.1	3.5	3.3	8.9	10.8	8.6	4.9	5.8	5.4
Matricaria maritima ssp. 3.0 5.7 4.6 3.3 1.0 2.2 5.2 5.4 5.3 inodora Myosotis arvensis 1.3 0.7 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.6 Plantago pauciflora 1.0 1.1 1.0 2.3 0.2 1.4 1.4 0.2 1.1 Calium aparine 0.9 0.3 0.6 0.9 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.0	9	Gnaphalium uliginosum	4.2	8.0	2.5	1.0	0.3	9.0	2.7	0.5	1.6	1.5	1.0	1.3	2.3	9.0	2.1
Myosotis arvensis 1.3 0.7 1.0 0.8 0.1 0.4 4.7 0.4 2.6 Plantago pauciflora 1.0 1.1 1.0 2.3 0.2 1.4 1.4 0.2 1.1 Galium aparine 0.9 0.3 0.6 0.9 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.2 1.1 Polygonum nodosum 0.8 0.6 0.7 1.5 0.5 1.1 0.7 0.1 0.0 Galeopsis tetrahit 0.5 1.2 0.8 0.3 1.0 0.8 1.9 1.7 1.8 Spergula arvensis 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0	7	Matricaria maritima ssp. inodora	3.0	5.7	4.6	3.3	1.0	2.2	5.2	5.4	5.3	7.5	3.3	5.4	4.8	4.4	4.6
Plantago pauciflora 1.0 1.1 1.0 2.3 0.2 1.4 1.4 0.2 1.1 Galium aparine 0.9 0.3 0.6 0.9 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.2 Polygonum nodosum 0.8 0.6 0.7 1.5 0.5 1.1 0.7 0.1 0.4 Galeopsis tetrahit 0.5 1.2 0.8 0.3 1.0 0.8 1.9 1.7 1.8 Spergula arvensis 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0	∞	Myosotis arvensis	1.3	0.7	1.0	8.0	0.1	0.4	4.7	0.4	2.6	0.7	9.0	0.7	1.9	0.4	1.0
Galium aparine 0.9 0.3 0.6 0.9 0.0 0.4 0.0 0.4 0.2 Polygonum nodosum 0.8 0.6 0.7 1.5 0.5 1.1 0.7 0.1 0.4 Galeopsis tetrahit 0.5 1.2 0.8 0.7 1.5 0.5 1.1 0.7 0.1 0.4 Spergula arvensis 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 Lamium purpureum 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.8 0.4 0.0 0.0 Veronica arvensis 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.0 Skellaria media 0.1 0.6 0.4 3.1 1.8 0.3 0.4 0.0 Skellaria media 0.1 0.6 0.4 0.3 0.8 0.6 0.3 0.6 1.4 Veronica persica 0.1 0.6 0.0	6	Plantago pauciflora	1.0	1.1	1.0	2.3	0.2	1.4	1.4	0.2	1.1	2.0	2.2	2.1	1.4	6.0	1.4
Polygonum nodosum 0.8 0.6 0.7 1.5 0.5 1.1 0.7 0.1 0.4 Galeopsis tetrahit 0.5 1.2 0.8 0.3 1.0 0.8 1.9 1.7 1.8 Spergula arvensis 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 Lamium purpureum 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.8 0.4 0.0 0.0 0.0 Veronica arvensis 0.2 1.0 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.0 <td>10</td> <td>Galium aparine</td> <td>6.0</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>6.0</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.0</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>0.1</td> <td>1.7</td> <td>6.0</td> <td>0.5</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>0.5</td>	10	Galium aparine	6.0	0.3	9.0	6.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.1	1.7	6.0	0.5	9.0	0.5
Galeopsis tetrahit 0.5 1.2 0.8 0.3 1.0 0.8 1.9 1.7 1.8 Spergula arvensis 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 Lamium purpureum 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 Veronica arvensis 0.2 1.0 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.0 <th< td=""><td>1</td><td>Połygonum nodosum</td><td>8.0</td><td>9.0</td><td>0.7</td><td>1.5</td><td>0.5</td><td>1.1</td><td>0.7</td><td>0.1</td><td>0.4</td><td>1.2</td><td>0.7</td><td>1.0</td><td>1.6</td><td>0.5</td><td>8.0</td></th<>	1	Połygonum nodosum	8.0	9.0	0.7	1.5	0.5	1.1	0.7	0.1	0.4	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.6	0.5	8.0
Spergula arvensis 0.5 0.0 0.2 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 Lamium purpureum 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.8 0.4 0.0 0.0 0.0 Veronica arvensis 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.0 Stellaria media 0.2 1.0 0.6 0.4 3.1 1.8 0.3 7.0 3.9 Echinochloa crus-galli 0.1 0.6 0.4 3.1 1.8 0.3 7.0 3.9 Echinochloa crus-galli 0.1 0.6 0.4 0.3 0.8 0.6 2.3 0.6 1.4 Veronica persica 0.1 0.0 <th< td=""><td>12</td><td>Galeopsis tetrahit</td><td>0.5</td><td>1.2</td><td>8.0</td><td>0.3</td><td>1.0</td><td>8.0</td><td>1.9</td><td>1.7</td><td>1.8</td><td>0.1</td><td>0.0</td><td>0.1</td><td>0.7</td><td>6.0</td><td>8.0</td></th<>	12	Galeopsis tetrahit	0.5	1.2	8.0	0.3	1.0	8.0	1.9	1.7	1.8	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.7	6.0	8.0
Lamium purpureum 0.3 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.8 0.4 0.0 0.1 Veronica arvensis 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.0 Stellaria media 0.2 1.0 0.6 0.4 3.1 1.8 0.3 7.0 3.9 Echinochloa crus-galli 0.1 0.6 0.4 0.3 0.8 0.6 2.3 0.6 1.4 Veronica persica 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.6 1.4 Polygonum aviculare 0.1 0.0	13	Spergula arvensis	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1
Veronica arvensis 0.2 0.0 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.0 0.0 Stellaria media 0.2 1.0 0.6 0.4 3.1 1.8 0.3 7.0 3.9 Echinochloa crus-galli 0.1 0.6 0.4 0.3 0.8 0.6 2.3 0.6 1.4 Veronica persica 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.0 <	14	Lamium purpureum	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.3	8.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.2	0.2	0.4	0.3
Stellaria media 0.2 1.0 0.6 0.4 3.1 1.8 0.3 7.0 3.9 Echinochloa crus-galli 0.1 0.6 0.4 0.3 0.8 0.6 2.3 0.6 1.4 Veronica persica 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 Polygonum aviculare 0.1 0.0	15	Veronica arvensis	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.0	1.2	1.8	1.5	0.4	0.5	0.4
Echinochloa crus-galli 0.1 0.6 0.4 0.3 0.8 0.6 2.3 0.6 1.4 Veronica persica 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 Polygonum aviculare 0.1 0.0 </td <td>16</td> <td>Stellaria media</td> <td>0.2</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>9.0</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>3.1</td> <td>1.8</td> <td>0.3</td> <td>7.0</td> <td>3.9</td> <td>0.7</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>1.0</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>3.1</td> <td>2.8</td>	16	Stellaria media	0.2	1.0	9.0	0.4	3.1	1.8	0.3	7.0	3.9	0.7	1.2	1.0	0.4	3.1	2.8
Veronica persica 0.1 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 Polygonum aviculare 0.1 0.0 0	17	Echinochloa crus-galli	0.1	9.0	0.4	0.3	8.0	9.0	2.3	9.0	1.4	7.4	2.4	4.9	2.5	1.1	1.8
Polygonum aviculare 0.1 0.0	18	Veronica persica	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1
Polygonum nodosum 0.8 0.6 0.7 1.5 0.6 1.1 0.7 0.1 0.4 Polygonum convolvulus 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.6 0.1 0.4 Poa annua 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.1 0.2 0.6 0.7 0.6 Lamium amplexicaule 0.0 0.7 0.4 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.6 0.7 0.6 Vicia amgustifolia 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 Sonchus axper 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	19	Polygonum aviculare	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
Polygonum convolvulus 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.4 Poa annua 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.1 0.2 0.6 0.7 0.6 Lamium amplexicaule 0.0 0.7 0.4 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.7 0.6 0.7 0.6 Vicia amgustifolia 0.0	20	Polygonum nodosum	8.0	9.0	0.7	1.5	9.0	1.1	0.7	0.1	0.4	1.2	0.7	1.0	1.1	0.5	8.0
Poa annua 0.1 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.1 0.2 0.6 0.7 0.6 Lamium amplexicaule 0.0 0.7 0.4 0.2 0.1 0.2 1.7 0.3 1.0 Vicia angustifolia 0.0	21	Polygonum convolvulus	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.3	9.0	0.1	0.4	0.4	0.3	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.3
Lamium amplexicaule 0.0 0.7 0.4 0.2 0.1 0.2 1.7 0.3 1.0 Vicia angustifolia 0.0 <td< td=""><td>22</td><td>Poa annua</td><td>0.1</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.2</td><td>0.3</td><td>0.1</td><td>0.2</td><td>9.0</td><td>0.7</td><td>9.0</td><td>1.3</td><td>0.2</td><td>8.0</td><td>9.0</td><td>0.3</td><td>0.3</td></td<>	22	Poa annua	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.2	9.0	0.7	9.0	1.3	0.2	8.0	9.0	0.3	0.3
Vicia angustifolia 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.	23	Lamium amplexicaule	0.0	0.7	0.4	0.2	0.1	0.2	1.7	0.3	1.0	0.3	0.3	0.3	9.0	0.4	0.5
Sonchus asper 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	24	Vicia angustifolia	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0
	25	Sonchus asper	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

ned
ontinu
00/
ð
la B

															for explanations, see Table 6
30	27	32	35	27	34	25	25	27	28	25	26	26	23	27	Total number of species I and II
65.1	56.9	73.3	102.0	84.8	119.1	68.7	6.09	9.92	37.2	34.1	40.3	52.6	47.9	57.2	Total number of weeds I and II
9	4	9	9	4	9	4	3	9	3	4	3	4	3	5	Number of species II
4.0	3.5	4.4	1.7	1.5	1.8	3.6	2.6	4.7	1.8	2.4	1.3	8.7	7.5	6.6	Number of weeds II
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	40 Artemisia vulgaris
0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2	39 Equisetum arvense
0.1	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	38 Sonchus arvensis
0.2	0.2	0.3	6.4	0.4	0.3	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.4	0.2	0.5	37 Taraxacum officinale
0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.7	36 Stachys palustris
0.5	0.2	6.0	6.4	0.2	9.0	0.2	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.0	1.3	0.1	2.6	35 Cirsium arvense
4.6	6.5	2.6	0.4	0.7	0.1	7.7	11.0	4.4	1.6	2.3	1.0	8.5	12.0	5.0	34 Elymus repens
								ial	– Perennia	П					
24	23	56	59	22	28	21	22	21	25	21	23	22	20	22	Number of species I
61.2	53.4	6.89	100.3	83.3	117.3	65.1	58.3	71.9	35.4	31.7	39.0	42.1	40.4	47.3	Number of weeds I
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	33 Matricaria discoidea
0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	32 Solanum nigrum
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	31 Juncus bufonius
0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	30 Vicia angustifolia
0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	29 Vicia hirsuta
0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	28 Spergula rubra
9.0	0.7	0.2	1.0	1.6	0.3	0.5	9.0	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.3	9.0	0.0	27 Geranium pusillum
0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	26 Plantago maior
17	16	15	14	13	12	11	10	6	8	7	9	5	4	3	1 2

According to the expectations and results of studies by other authors [Adamiak and Zawiślak 1991, Witkowski *et al.* 1994, Zawiślak and Adamiak 1997, Budzyński *et al.* 1999, Deryło *et al.* 2006, Andruszczak *et al.* 2010], the effect limiting weeds was more effective on treatments with chemical control. The number of weeds and their air-dry weight were lower on treatment protected chemically as compared with mechanical cultivation.

Analysing the species composition of weeds occurring in canopies of husked and naked oats, it should be noted that according to the literature data [Adamiak et al. 1991, Zawiślak and Adamiak 1997, Deryło et al. 2003, 2006], this was typical of this cereal. Dominant species for both forms of oats were: Chenopodium album, Capsella bursapastoris, Apera spica-venti, Viola arvensis, Galinsoga parviflora, Matricaria maritima ssp. inodora, Myosotis arvensis, Gnaphalium uliginosum, Plantago pauciflora and Polygonum nodosum. In a small group of perennial species, occurred Elymus repens and Cirsium arvense.

CONCLUSIONS

- 1. The largest number of weeds in canopy of husked and naked oats were found in the system of simplified tillage and direct sowing.
- 2. Introduction of chemical cultivation resulted in a significant reduction of weeds in naked and husked oats on treatments with direct sowing and simplified tillage, as compared with conventional tillage and simplified one with a catch crop.
- 3. Dominant weeds in canopies of both oats forms were mostly short-lived species: Chenopodium album, Capsella bursa-pastoris, Galinsoga parviflora, Viola arvensis, Matricaria quadriradiata, Apera spica-venti, Polygonum nodosum, Myosotis arvensis, Gnaphalium uliginosum; and of perennial ones, Elymus repens and Cirsium arvense.
- 4. Chemical cultivation of husked and naked oats canopy decreased the number of weeds and their air-dry matter, as compared with mechanical cultivation.
- 5. The largest weed biomass in both husked and naked oats canopies was observed on treatments with the simplified tillage system and direct sowing.
- 6. Introduction of simplified tillage and direct sowing resulted in an increase in weed infestation of canopies in the studied oats forms (husked and naked), and chemical cultivation was not fully effective.

REFERENCES

- Adamiak E., Zawiślak K., 1991. Fitocenozy chwastów owsa uprawianego w płodozmianie i wieloletniej monokulturze [Effect of varied crop sequence and chemical control of the stand on weed infestation of oat]. [In:] Synteza i perspektywy nauki o płodozmianach. Cz. II, Wyd. ART Olsztyn, 207-214 [in Polish].
- Andruszczak S., Pałys E., Kwiecińska-Poppe E., Kraska P., 2010. Wpływ poziomu agrotechniki na plonowanie nagoziarnistej i oplewionej formy owsa [The influence of agrotechnic level on yielding of naked and husked oats]. Prog. Plant Prot./Post. Ochr. Roślin 50(1), 409-413 [in Polish].
- Bartnikowska E., 2003. Przetwory z ziarna owsa jako źródło ważnych substancji prozdrowotnych w żywieniu człowieka [Oat products as a source of important bioactive substances in human nutrition]. Biul. IHAR 229, 235-245 [in Polish].

Bojarczuk J., Bojarczuk M., 1992. Reakcja owsa na niekorzystne warunki fitosanitarne gleby po różnych przedplonach [Response of oats to unfavorable phytosanitary conditions of soil after various previous crops]. Biul. IHAR 181-182, 119-127 [in Polish].

- Budzyński W., 1999. Reakcja owsa na czynniki agrotechniczne przegląd wyników badań krajowych [Oats response to agrotechnological factors review of the results of domestic research]. Żywność. Nauka. Technologia. Jakość 1(18), Supl., 11-25 [in Polish].
- Deryło S., Szymankiewicz K., Grotkowska Z., Stachowska J., 2003. Zachwaszczenie owsa siewnego w płodozmianach i wielogatunkowej monokulturze zbożowej [Weed infestation of oats at a rotation and at a multispecies monoculture of small grain crops]. Biul. IHAR 229, 73-84 [in Polish].
- Deryło S., Szymankiewicz K., Pisarski R., 2006. Dynamika zachwaszczenia łanu owsa nieoplewionego w warunkach zróżnicowanych systemów uprawy roli [Infestation dynamics of naked oats canopy under the conditions of differentiated soil tillage]. Ann. Univ. Mariae Curie-Skłodowska, Sect. E, Agricultura LXI, 133-145 [in Polish].
- Dzieżyc J., 1993. Czynniki plonotwórcze plonowanie roślin [Yield-forming factors plant yielding]. PWN Warszawa Wrocław [in Polish].
- Gasiorowski H., 1999. Współczesny pogląd na walory fizjologiczno-żywieniowe owsa [Modern view on physiological and nutritional values of oats]. Żywność. Nauka. Technologia. Jakość 1(18) Supl., 193-196 [in Polish].
- Michalski T., 1993. Wpływ posiewnych zabiegów uprawowych na rozwój i plonowanie jęczmienia jarego, owsa i pszenżyta jarego [Effect of after-sowing cultivation on the development and yield of spring barley, oats and spring triticale]. Rocz. Nauk Rol. 110(1-2), 139-147 [in Polish].
- Niewiadomski W., Adamiak J., Zawiślak K., 1980. Tolerancja 9 ważniejszych gatunków uprawnych na wieloletni siew po sobie [Tolerance of 9 major field crop species to long-term sowing in monoculture]. Zesz. Nauk. ART Olsztyn, Rolnictwo 29, 271-281 [in Polish].
- Pawłowski F., Deryło S., 1988. Plonowanie i wartość przedplonowa owsa w zmianowaniach o zróżnicowanej koncentracji zbóż [Yield and previous crop value of oats in crop rotations with diffrent concentrations of cereals]. Zesz. Probl. Post. Nauk Rol. 331, 101-108 [in Polish].
- Pawłowski F., Fordoński G. 1994. Wartość przedplonowa roślin strączkowych i owsa dla zbóż [Previous crop value of legumes and oats to cereals]. Acta Acad. Tech. Olst., Agricultura 50, 41-56 [in Polish].
- Witkowski F., Roszak W., Radecki A., 1994. Wpływ różnych sposobów uprawy ścierniska na zachwaszczenie pola [Effect of different methods for stubble cultivation on field weed infestation]. Rocz. Nauk Rol. A 110, 141-151 [in Polish].
- Zawiślak K., Adamiak E., 1997. Efektywność plonochronna płodozmianu wobec chwastów w uprawie owsa [Yield-protecting effectiveness of crop rotation towards weeds in oats cultivation]. Acta Acad. Tech. Olst., Agricultura 64, 89-99 [in Polish].
- Zawiślak K., Adamiak E., 1998. Płodozmian i pestycydy jako czynnik integrowanej uprawy owsa [Crop rotation and pesticides as factors of integrated oats cultivation]. Acta Acad. Tech. Olst., Agricultura 66, 131-142 [in Polish].

WPŁYW SYSTEMÓW UPRAWY ROLI NA ZACHWASZCZENIE ŁANU OWSA OPLEWIONEGO I NAGOZIARNISTEGO

Streszczenie. Celem badań była ocena zachwaszczenia (liczby, biomasy i składu gatunkowego) łanów owsa oplewionego i nieoplewionego w zależności od systemu uprawy roli (klasyczny, uproszczony z międzyplonem, uproszczony, siew bezpośredni) i sposobu pielęgnacji roślin (mechaniczny i chemiczny). Badania przeprowadzono w latach 2000-2002, na glebie płowej, wytworzonej z lessów. Przedmiotem badań był owies oplewiony (odmiana Borowiak) i nieoplewiony (odmiana Akt III). Największa

liczba chwastów występowała w łanie oplewionej (123 szt.·m⁻²) i nieoplewionej (102 szt.·m⁻²) odmiany owsa po stosowaniu siewu bezpośredniego, a w przypadku odmiany Akt III także po uprawie uproszczonej (68,7 szt.·m⁻²). Największą suchą masę chwastów oznaczono po stosowaniu siewu bezpośredniego (Borowiak – 104,8; Akt III – 100,5 g·m⁻²) i uprawy uproszczonej (Borowiak – 72,5; Akt III – 64,1 g·m⁻²). Najmniejszą liczbę i masę chwastów w łanach obu odmian owsa stwierdzono po klasycznej uprawie gleby oraz po uprawie uproszczonej ze stosowaniem międzyplonu. Wprowadzenie chemicznego zwalczania chwastów wpłynęło na redukcję liczby i suchej masy chwastów w zakresie od 16 do 22%, zarówno w łanie odmiany Borowiak, jak i Akt III. Szczególnie skuteczne było tam, gdzie stosowano siew bezpośredni lub uprawę uproszczoną. Wśród chwastów dominowały gatunki krótkotrwałe, ale w łanie odmiany Akt III występowało ich więcej niż w łanie odmiany Borowiak. System uprawy roli oraz sposób zwalczania chwastów miały podobny wpływ na zachwaszczenie łanów oplewionej i nieoplewionej odmiany owsa siewnego.

Słowa kluczowe: owies, pielęgnacja, system uprawy roli, zachwaszczenie

Accepted for print - Zaakceptowano do druku: 11.06.2013

For citation – Do cytowania:

Deryło S., Stachowska-Kowalczyk J., 2013. Effect of soil tillage systems on weed infestation of husked and naked oats canopy. Acta Sci. Pol., Agricultura 12(2), 23-38.