

# Evaluation of intercropping sesame in different planting densities with peanut grown within orange trees under deficit irrigation

Yaser A.A. HEFNY<sup>1</sup>, Samiha OUDA<sup>\*2</sup>

## Abstract

A field experiment was carried out during 2018 and 2019 summer seasons to test the interaction effect between two deficit irrigation treatments (DI1=100% ETo, DI2=80% ETo), plus control (FI= 120% ETo) and three planting densities (PD) of intercropped sesame (CS1=20% PD, CS2=40% PD, CS3= 60% PD) with peanut (100% PD) interplanted within orange trees on land and water productivities, as well as on farmer's profit. The results showed that the highest peanut and orange yields were obtained under application of FI-CS1 and the highest yield of sesame and its components were obtained under application of FI-CS3. Irrigation with DI1 slightly reduced the yield of the three crops, whereas irrigation with DI2 highly reduced the yield of the three crops. The highest value of land equivalent ratio (LER), water equivalent ratio (WER), farmer's total return and monetary advantage index were obtained under application of FI-CS1, with slight reduction under DI1 and high reduction under DI2. This study recommends orange farmers to interplant the sesame-peanut intercropping system (CS1) within young orange trees for additive farmer profitability and increasing LER and WER under either irrigation with FI or DI1.

**Keywords:** Land equivalent ratio, water equivalent ratio, farmer return, monetary advantage index

<sup>1</sup> Crop Intensification Research Department, Field Crops Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt

<sup>2</sup> Water Requirements and Field Irrigation Research Department, Soils, Water and Environment Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center, Egypt

\*Corresponding author  
samihaouda@yahoo.com

Received 15/01/2024  
Accepted 01/03/2024

## INTRODUCTION

Intercropping is a systematic approach that makes full use of nutrients and water resources, in addition to achieving agricultural biodiversity, which significantly increases yield in comparison with monoculture cultivation (Qin *et al.*, 2013). Said *et al.* (2016) indicated that an intercropping system refers to two crops sharing the area and the applied water to one of them, which increase land and water use efficiency. Additionally, intercropping with legumes is very important for the sustainable use of agricultural lands, where legumes fix nitrogen from the air via a symbiotic relationship with rhizobium bacteria and increase mineral soil nitrogen content (Gao *et al.*, 2013).

The citrus trees occupy a large area of the cultivated land of Egypt, where the orange cultivated area in 2021 was about 139,000 hectares, with a total production of 3.2 million metric tons (Bulletin of the Agricultural Statistics, 2021). As a result of being a crop with high economic value, high orange production is important for local consumption and for export. Interplanting within orange trees is a common practice, where some growers utilize the spaces between trees to increase land productivity, as well as improve their income. Interplanting economic important crops, such as edible oil crops within orange trees is essential for the Egyptian population to increase the production of these crops and reduce its deficit. This practice is encouraged by the relatively large empty area between orange trees. As evergreen trees, only 30% of the area between trees can be interplanted if the trees are older than three years (Hefny *et al.*, 2020). Several investigations have been done on interplanting legume crops under citrus trees in

Egypt. Abdel-Aziz *et al.*, (2008) showed that orange fruit yield was enhanced and fruit drop was decreased when a legume cover crop was interplanting within the trees. El-Mehy and El-Badawy (2017) showed that interplanting summer legume crops (30% of its recommended planting density) within orange trees (10-year-old) using 75% of the recommended NPK resulted in an increase in the yield of these summer legume crops, as well as orange yield and substituted for 25% of the recommended NPK. Selim *et al.* (2020) reported an increase in mandarin yield (3-year-old trees) when soybean was interplanted under it, which allowed the cultivation of 50% of soybean density between mandarin trees and that increased orange fruit yield by 10%. However, there was no research done on interplanting an intercropping system containing a legume crop under orange trees.

Sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.) and peanut (*Arachis hypogaea* L.) are important oilseed crops in Egypt, where the gap between sesame production and consumption 38% and a surplus in peanut production by 46% (CAPMAS, 2018). Therefore, intercropping sesame with peanut can partially contributes in increasing sesame productivity and consequently its national production. However, few studies have been conducted on intercropping sesame with peanut in Egypt, where Toaima *et al.* (2004) reported an increase in the yield of sesame and peanut, when its intercropping pattern was 2:2. Whereas, Abou-Kerisha *et al.* (2008) intercropped sesame (67% of its recommended planting density) with peanut (100% of its recommended planting density) and that resulted in higher growth and yield of both crops, compared it the sole planting. Thus, the optimal intercropping system can reduce inter-specific competition

between sesame and peanut plants, allowing their foliage to receive sufficient solar radiation, thereby increasing their final yield. Abou-Kerisha *et al.* (2008) found that peanut yield and its components were significantly increased by reducing sesame plant densities.

Deficit irrigation was defined by Capra *et al.* (2008) as “the application of irrigation below the full crop evapotranspiration, which potentially improve water use efficiency and maximize profits through a reduction in capital and operating costs”. Thus, it is a sustainable method for using water resources, aiming to improve crop growth and yield by applying water below the required amount (Chai *et al.*, 2016). Under the prevailing water deficiency in Egypt, application of deficit irrigation can be a promising practice that conserve irrigation water, and in the meantime attains yield close the one obtained with application of full irrigation amount. The effect of application of deficit irrigation was studied for several intercropping systems in Egypt. However, only one study by El-Mehy *et al.* (2023) has assessed the effect of deficit irrigation on sesame intercropping system with peanut. They applied deficit irrigation to sesame intercropped with peanut and sprayed the plants with anti-transpirant substances to help the plants resist water stress damage. They found that applying deficit irrigation (100% ETo) and spraying with K-Si saved 17% of the applied water and produced higher yield of both crops than the obtained under irrigation with 120% ETo without spraying.

The objective of the current study was to take advantage of the area between young orange trees to intercrop sesame with peanut under deficit irrigation, in order to increase land and water productivity, as well as farmer’s profit.

## MATERIALS AND METHODS

A field experiment was conducted in El-Kassaseen Agricultural Experiments Research Station, Agricultural Research Center, Ismailia Governorate (Lat. 30° 35’ 30” N, Long. 32° 14’ 50” E, 10 m a.s.l.), Egypt during 2018 and 2019 summer growing seasons to study the effect of application of deficit irrigation on intercropped sesame at different planting densities with peanut in a 3-year-old orange orchard.

The average monthly weather data at the experimental site during both growing seasons were obtained from the following website: <https://power.larc.nasa.gov/data-access-viewer/site> (Table 1). Data of monthly weather were used to calculate monthly averages of reference evapotranspiration (ETo) values using Basic Irrigation Scheduling model (BISm) according to Snyder *et al.*, (2004). The model uses Penman-Monteith equation presented in the FAO Irrigation and Drainage Paper (Allen *et al.*, 1998) to calculate ETo values.

The soil of the experimental site was sandy. The mechanical and chemical analyses on soil depth of 60 cm were done by Soils, Water and Environment Research Institute, Agricultural Research Center (Table 2).

The effect of three irrigation treatments (120% ETo (control, FI), and two deficit irrigation treatments (100% ETo (DI1) and 80% ETo (DI2)), and three sesame planting densities intercropped with peanut (20, 40 and 60% of the recommended planting density) were studied in a strip plot design with three replicates, in addition to sole planting of peanut, sesame and orange. The sole planting of these crop was used to calculate the competitive ratios and farmer’s gross income and were not included in the

**Table 1: Average of meteorological data from in the studied growing seasons**

Month	2018					2019				
	SR	TX	TN	WS	ETo	SR	TX	TN	WS	ETo
Jan	13.3	18.7	7.5	3.31	2.0	12.9	17.8	8.6	3.3	1.8
Feb	15.9	20.4	8.6	2.84	2.6	15.1	20.0	9.1	2.6	2.7
Mar	19.1	22.3	10.2	3.16	3.5	19.8	23.6	11.0	3.2	3.7
Apr	23.6	26.3	13.1	3.15	4.7	23.8	25.8	13.2	2.9	4.7
May	27.7	33.7	17.8	3.29	6.6	27.7	30.7	16.6	3.0	6.7
Jun	29.6	35.8	22.0	3.10	6.7	30.0	34.3	19.5	3.0	6.7
Jul	29.1	37.2	23.1	2.84	6.8	29.0	36.9	22.3	2.8	6.9
Aug	26.9	37.3	23.7	2.68	6.3	23.0	37.2	23.0	2.7	6.4
Sep	19.4	33.8	22.0	2.78	4.9	23.1	36.0	23.2	2.8	5.2
Oct	18.3	30.9	19.8	2.65	3.6	18.6	31.9	21.0	2.7	3.7
Nov	15.2	27.6	16.5	2.62	2.7	14.2	25.1	15.7	2.4	2.7
Dec	12.0	20.9	11.2	3.16	1.9	12.1	20.9	10.9	3.1	1.9

SR = solar radiation (MJ/m<sup>2</sup>/day), TX and TN = maximum and minimum temperature, respectively (°C), WS = wind speed (m/s), ETo = reference evapotranspiration (mm/day)

**Table 2: Soil properties at 60 cm depth at the experimental site before planting**

Properties	Growing season	
	First season	Second season
Clay (%)	11.8	12.9
Silt (%)	2.0	2.1
Sand (%)	86.2	85.0
Texture	Sandy	Sandy
N (ppm)	5.0	6.5
P (ppm)	7.5	10.0
K (ppm)	37.0	42.0

statistical analysis. The applied irrigation water treatments were randomly assigned to the vertical strips and cropping systems were allocated in the horizontal strips. Each strip plot area of 48 m<sup>2</sup> (8 x 6 m) contained the studied intercropping systems, in addition to orange trees. The orange trees were grown in 3 x 4 m apart (840 trees per hectare). In all cropping systems, five ridges of peanut were planted in the orange orchard outside any tree canopy with a distance of 130 cm between the intercropping system and orange trees. Sesame was intercropped on the same ridges of peanut depending on the studied sesame planting density. Under 20% of sesame planting density, only one ridge of the five ridges was intercropped with peanut. Whereas, under 40 and 60% of sesame planting density only two and three ridges of the five ridges, respectively were intercropped with sesame. Peanut variety Giza6 and sesame variety Shandweel3 were sown on May 19<sup>th</sup> and May 14<sup>th</sup> in 2018 and 2019 summer seasons, respectively. Intercropped peanut and sesame were planted on ridges of 60 cm width. Peanut plants were thinned to one plant/hill at 10 cm apart, whereas sesame plants were thinned to two plants/hill at 20 cm apart under intercropping or sole culture. Sole peanut plants were sown on one side of the ridge at 10 cm apart and were thinned to one plant/hill. Sole sesame plants were sown on ridges at 20 cm apart and were thinned to two plants/hill.

Fertilizer application for peanut was as Mono calcium super phosphate (15.5% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) at the rate of 476 kg/ha applied during land preparation for sole and intercropping systems. At sowing, all experimental units received 47.6 kg N/ha as booster dose of ammonium sulfate (20.6% N) and 119 kg/ha of potassium sulphate (50% K<sub>2</sub>O) for peanut in both sole and intercropping systems.

In the sole sesame, N as ammonium sulfate was applied at the rate of 142.8 kg/ha. For intercropped sesame, 20, 40, and 60% of the previous dose was applied. The N fertilizer was applied in three equal doses at 20, 35 and 50 days after sowing. Both N and K fertilizers were applied via irrigation water. Other agricultural practices were done as recommended by the Egyptian Ministry of Agriculture and Land Reclamation.

For orange, farmyard manure at the rate of 47.6 m<sup>3</sup>/ha, as well as calcium super phosphate (15.5% P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>) at the rate of 36.9 kg P<sub>2</sub>O<sub>5</sub>/ha were added in the beginning of November as a common fertilizer practice done every year for orange. Phosphoric acid applied at the rate of 4 liter/ha every 15 days. Potassium fertilizer in the form of potassium sulfate (48% K<sub>2</sub>O) was added at the rate of 57.6 kg K<sub>2</sub>O/ha during land preparation. Nitrogen fertilizer as ammonium nitrate (33.5% N) was added in the rate of 288 kg N/ha at the rate of 12 kg/ha every week. The studied cultivar was Valencia (summer) orange and it was harvested on 14<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> of April respectively for 2018 and 2019 growing seasons.

### Irrigation system

The used irrigation system was drip and established on both sides of the tree trunk at a distance of one meter.

Each tree provided with two drippers (discharge 4 L/h) and the time of operation was 4 hours/day (32 L/tree/day) throughout the period of study. The studied crops have a separate irrigation network other than the one used for orange trees to prevent fertilizers mixing. Irrigation was done every 3 days. The required irrigation water for each crop, as well as water consumptive use were calculated using BISM model (Snyder *et al.*, 2004).

### The collected data

- **Peanut:** Soil samples were taken from rhizosphere of peanut at 60 days after peanut sowing to estimate total count of rhizobia (cfu/g soil) and available nitrogen content (mg/100 g soil). These analyses were done in General Organization for Agricultural Equalization Fund, ARC, Giza, Egypt.
- Leaf chlorophyll a and chlorophyll b (mg/l) contents were analyzed at 60 days after peanut sowing by General Organization for Agricultural Equalization Fund, ARC, Giza, Egypt. The leaves (blade only) of three plants were separated, dried in an oven set at 75° C until reaching constant mass (approximately 48 h), and weighed.
- At harvest, ten plants were randomly chosen from each plot and number of pods/plants, number of seeds/plants, seed yield/plant (g) and oil percentage in seeds were measured. Pod yield (ton/ha) was determined from measuring pods weight of each plot, then added them together.
- **Sesame:** At harvest, ten plants were randomly chosen from each plot and number of capsules/plants, 100-seed weight (g) and seed yield/plant (g). Seed yield (kg/ha) was determined from measuring pods weight of each plot, then adding them together.
- **Orange:** Fruit yield (ton/ha) was obtained at the harvest of orange trees.

### Competitive relation

#### Land equivalent ratio (LER)

LER defines the ratio of area needed under sole cropping to one of intercropping at the same management level to produce an equivalent yield (Mead and Willey, 1980). In our research, sesame intercropped with peanut interplanted within orange trees, thus there were three crops involved. Khasanah *et al.*, (2020) indicated that the LER equation can be readily expanded for more than two components as follows:

$$LER = LER_s + LER_p + LER_o \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Relative yield of sesame (LER}_s\text{)} = YI_s/Y_s \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Relative yield of peanut (LER}_p\text{)} = YI_p/Y_p \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Relative yield of orange (LER}_o\text{)} = YI_o/Y_o \quad (4)$$

Where: Y<sub>s</sub>, Y<sub>p</sub> and Y<sub>o</sub> are the yields of, sesame, peanut and orange as sole crops, respectively, YI<sub>s</sub>, YI<sub>p</sub> and YI<sub>o</sub> are the yields of sesame, peanut and orange as intercrops, respectively.

If the LER > 1, it suggests that the land utilization of intercropping is higher than that of monoculture. If LER < 1, it shows that land utilization of intercropping is lower than that of monoculture.

### Water equivalent ratio (WER)

WER was used to quantify the efficiency of water use by an interplanting system of each legume crop under orange trees. It is defined as the total water needed in sole crops to produce the equivalent amount of the species yields on a unit area of intercrop (Mao *et al.*, 2012). WER was calculated for each crop interplanted under orange trees as follows:

$$WER = WER_s + WER_p + WER_o \tag{5}$$

$$WER = \frac{\left(\frac{Y_{int,s}}{WU_{int,s}}\right)}{\left(\frac{Y_{mono,s}}{WU_{mono,s}}\right)} + \frac{\left(\frac{Y_{int,p}}{WU_{int,p}}\right)}{\left(\frac{Y_{mono,p}}{WU_{mono,p}}\right)} + \frac{\left(\frac{Y_{int,o}}{WU_{int,o}}\right)}{\left(\frac{Y_{mono,o}}{WU_{mono,o}}\right)} \tag{6}$$

Where:  $Y_{int,s}$ ,  $Y_{int,p}$  and  $Y_{int,o}$  are the yield of interplanted sesame, interplanted peanut and orange, respectively.  $WU_{int,s}$ ,  $WU_{int,p}$  and  $WU_{int,o}$  are water consumptive use interplanted sesame, interplanted peanut and orange.  $Y_{mono,s}$ ,  $Y_{mono,p}$  and  $Y_{mono,o}$  are the yield of mono sesame, peanut and orange, respectively.  $WU_{mono,s}$ ,  $WU_{mono,p}$  and  $WU_{mono,o}$  are water consumptive use by sesame, peanut and orange.

If the  $WER > 1$ , it suggests that the water utilization of interplanting is higher than that of monoculture and that imply advantage in implemented interplanting system. If  $WER < 1$ , it shows that water utilization of interplanting is lower than that of monoculture and that imply disadvantage.

### Economic evaluation

#### Total return (TR)

TR is calculated by multiplying the yield with its unit price (USD). The price of each studied crop and orange fruits presented are market price in 2019. The prices were 1452, 1419 and 80 USD/ton for sesame, peanut and orange fruits, respectively (exchange rate is 1 USD =31 EGP).

### Monetary advantage index (MAI)

MAI values are based on land equivalent ratio (LER). It provides clear information on the economic advantage of the interplanting system. The MAI was calculated as follows (Ghosh 2004):

$$MAI = [\text{Value of combined intercrops} \times (LER-1)]/LER \tag{7}$$

### Statistical Analysis

Analysis of variance of the results of each season was performed. The measured variables were analyzed by ANOVA using MSTAT-C statistical package (Freed, 1991). Mean comparisons were performed using the least significant differences (LSD) test with a significance level of 5% (Snedecor and Cochran, 1988).

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### Effect of applied irrigation water and peanut cropping system on total count of rhizobia, available nitrogen content and leaf chlorophyll

The results in table 3 indicated that all the studied traits were significantly affected by irrigation water treatments and cropping systems in both growing seasons. The highest values of the total count of rhizobia in the rhizosphere of peanut, and available soil nitrogen content were recorded when peanut received the full irrigation amounts (FI) and 20% of sesame intercropped with it (CS1). It was clear from the table that increasing sesame planting density negatively decreased these two traits, as well as applying both deficit irrigation treatments. The reduction in the total count of rhizobia in the rhizosphere of peanut, and available soil nitrogen content were low under DI1, namely 3 and 5%, respectively, compared to its value under FI. Moreover, the reduction was high under DI2, namely 7 and 15%, respectively compared to its value under FI.

**Table 3: Effect of the interaction between the irrigation treatments and cropping systems on rhizobia count in rhizosphere of peanut, soil available nitrogen, leaf chlorophyll contents averaged over the two growing seasons**

Trait		Rhizobia in rhizosphere of peanut roots (cfu/g soil)	Available nitrogen content (mg/100 g soil)	Leaf chlorophyll a content (mg/l)	Leaf chlorophyll b content (mg/l)
Treatment					
FI	CS1	5.91	3.25	3.15	4.08
	CS2	3.84	3.08	2.89	3.91
	CS3	3.46	2.83	2.73	3.71
Mean		4.40	3.05	2.92	3.90
DI1	CS1	5.80	2.98	3.06	3.92
	CS2	3.68	2.89	2.84	3.70
	CS3	3.33	2.79	2.67	3.56
Mean		4.27	2.89	2.86	3.73
DI2	CS1	5.51	2.71	2.50	3.81
	CS2	3.57	2.60	2.41	3.60
	CS3	3.18	2.46	2.37	3.47
Mean		4.09	2.59	2.43	3.63
Mean CS1		5.74	2.98	2.90	3.94
Mean CS2		3.70	2.85	2.71	3.73
Mean CS3		3.32	2.69	2.59	3.58
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>					
Irrigation (Irr)		0.14	0.15	0.08	0.19
Cropping system CS		0.11	0.10	0.11	0.12
CS X Irr		NS	NS	NS	NS
Sole peanut		5.81	3.22	3.19	4.16

FI= Irrigation with 120% ETo, DI1, irrigation with 100% ETo, DI2= irrigation with 80% ETo, CS1= 20% sesame + 100% peanut, CS2=40% sesame + 100% peanut, CS3= 60% sesame + 100% peanut.

Prudent *et al.*, (2016) reported that low water availability in the soil negatively affect symbiotic N fixation, where its function is highly sensitive to water stress, and that consequently negatively affects soil available nitrogen. Similar results were obtained by Streeter (2003) in soybean, where a depression in N content in the leaves and pods of stressed soybean plants accompanied by a marked decline in N fixation activity during the water deficit period.

Furthermore, the values of chlorophyll a and b in peanut leaves were also the highest under the application of FI and it was reduced by the reduction in the applied irrigation water under deficit irrigation treatments. Arunyanark *et al.* (2008) reported a depression in leaf chlorophyll contents under water stress.

### Effect applied irrigation water and peanut cropping system on peanut yield and its components

The results in table 4 showed that peanut yield and its components were significantly affected by cropping system and the interaction between irrigation treatments and peanut cropping systems. The highest values of peanut yield and its components were obtained under FI application and the lowest sesame planting density in CS1. It can be also noticed that the peanut pod yield was higher in the second season, compared to the first season as a result of peanut residual effect, as a legume crop, in the rhizosphere (Table 4). Kiriheiti (2018) stated that an amount of fixed N returned to the soil as crop residue was observed after legumes cultivation.

Application of DI1 and implementing the three intercropping systems with peanut slightly reduce peanut yield and its components. This could be partially attributed to the role of peanut roots play in increasing soil nitrogen content through N fixation process, which is known to improve soil aggregate stability (Rücknagel *et al.*, 2016), as well as water holding and infiltration (Wick *et al.*, 2017). However, irrigation with DI2 and implementing the three intercropping systems with peanut highly reduce peanut yield and its components. The average peanut yield reductions under irrigation with DI2 were 18, 20 and 23% for CS1, CS2 and CS3, respectively over the two growing seasons. Thus, there is an opportunity to save irrigation water to the studied intercropping systems by application of DI1, which result in low yield losses in peanut yield in both growing seasons. These obtained results were supported by the findings of El-Mehy *et al.* (2023), where they reported a 16% reduction in peanut yield under irrigation with 80% ETo, compared to the value obtained under irrigation with 120% ETo.

The high values of peanut yield and its components under application of FI can be explain by the fact that water is essential to the turgidity of leaf cells, lengthening of stem cells, as well as photosynthesis process, as mentioned by Aydinsakir *et al.* (2016). They also stated that lower applied irrigation amount has negative effects on peanut yield components, such as number of pods, and seed weight per plant. Furthermore, Junjittakarn *et al.* (2014) reported that water deficiency negatively affects plant growth in peanut, which negatively affected seed formation and development, total seed yield.

**Table 4: Effect of the interaction between the irrigation treatments and cropping systems on peanut yield and its attributes in both seasons**

Traits Treatments		No of pods/plant		No of seeds/ plant		Seed yield/plant (g)		Pod yield (ton/ha)		Oil percentage (%)	
		1 <sup>st</sup> season	2 <sup>nd</sup> season	1 <sup>st</sup> season	2 <sup>nd</sup> season	1 <sup>st</sup> season	2 <sup>nd</sup> season	1 <sup>st</sup> season	2 <sup>nd</sup> season	1 <sup>st</sup> season	2 <sup>nd</sup> season
FI	CS1	20.7	21.0	40.1	41.2	31.7	33.7	3.16	3.36	51.0	48.7
	CS2	20.5	20.8	40.0	40.9	31.4	33.2	2.89	3.06	49.5	48.1
	CS3	20.2	20.5	39.6	40.7	30.9	32.9	2.65	2.76	47.6	45.9
Mean		20.5	20.7	39.9	40.9	31.3	33.3	2.90	3.06	49.3	47.6
DI1	CS1	20.7	20.9	40.1	41.2	31.7	33.6	3.14	3.32	51.6	49.6
	CS2	20.5	20.7	39.9	40.9	31.4	33.2	2.85	3.02	49.4	48.9
	CS3	20.2	20.5	39.6	40.7	30.9	32.9	2.64	2.71	48.5	45.2
Mean		20.5	20.7	39.9	40.9	31.3	33.3	2.88	3.02	49.8	47.9
DI2	CS1	17.3	18.5	37.5	38.0	28.8	30.1	2.54	2.75	49.2	50.1
	CS2	16.9	18.1	37.0	37.7	28.3	29.8	2.12	2.57	47.8	48.0
	CS3	16.7	17.8	36.8	37.5	28.0	29.6	1.86	2.25	45.8	45.8
Mean		17.0	18.1	37.1	37.7	28.4	29.8	2.17	2.52	47.6	47.9
Mean CS1		19.5	20.2	39.2	40.1	30.7	32.5	2.95	3.14	50.6	49.5
Mean CS2		19.3	19.8	39.0	39.8	30.4	32.1	2.62	2.88	48.9	48.3
Mean CS3		19.0	19.6	38.7	39.6	30.0	31.8	2.38	2.57	47.3	45.6
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>											
Irr		NS	NS	NS	0.23	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS	NS
CS		0.2	0.1	0.25	0.12	0.25	0.09	0.1	0.16	2.48	0.58
Irr X CS		0.13	0.18	0.12	0.15	0.12	0.16	0.16	0.13	1.21	0.78
Sole peanut		23.4	23.8	42.3	42.5	37.1	37.4	3.38	3.51	50.2	49.0

FI= Irrigation with 120% ETo, DI1, irrigation with 100% ETo, DI2= irrigation with 80% ETo, CS1= 20% sesame + 100% peanut, CS2=40% sesame + 100% peanut, CS3= 60% sesame + 100% peanut.

The percentage of oil in peanut seeds was the highest under DI1 and was the lowest under DI2. Similar results were obtained by Gomaa *et al.* (2021), who stated that oil percentage recorded the highest values with irrigation after depletion of 40% of available soil water. Ouda *et al.*, (2018) stated that the oil percentage in peanut seeds increased under irrigation with 100% ETo, compared to application of 120% ETo. Whereas Rathore *et al.*, (2021) found that relative to full irrigation, irrigating peanut with amount of 60 and 50% ETo, significantly reduced oil content by 8–12%.

### Effect of applied irrigation water and peanut cropping system on sesame yield and its components

All the obtained sesame yields and their components were significantly affected by irrigation treatments and peanut cropping systems. The highest values of sesame yield and its components were obtained under FI application and the highest sesame planting density in CS3 (Table 5). The results also showed that sesame yield was higher in the second season, which can be attributed to the decomposition of the peanut crop residues, and the release of growth-promoting substances that benefit the subsequent crop (Arcand *et al.*, 2014).

Reducing the applied irrigation water from FI to DI1 and implementing the three intercropping systems of sesame with peanut slightly reduce sesame yield and its components (Table 5). This could be attributed to the low reduction in available soil nitrogen content under DI1 (Table

3) could have a positive effect in increasing the ability of sesame roots to withstand lower water application than the available under FI. The low reduction in sesame yield under its intercropping systems with peanut could encourage farmers to apply deficit irrigation. Nevertheless, the reduction in sesame yield and its components under irrigation with DI2 and implementing the three intercropping systems with peanut was high. The average sesame yield reductions under DI2 were 24, 24 and 26% for CS1, CS2 and CS3, respectively as an average over the two growing seasons, compared to application of FI. This result implied that CS3, which has the highest planting density, namely 100% peanut + 60% sesame, could compete with peanut more than the other studied cropping systems on water, which resulted in higher yield reduction under CS3 for both sesame and peanut (Table 5). It was reported that limited water supply to sesame adversely affects seed yield and its components (Ozkan and Kulak 2013). Furthermore, Pandey *et al.* (2021) reported a reduction in sesame yield by 28% in drought conditions.

### Effect of applied irrigation water and peanut cropping systems on orange yield

The results in table 6 showed that orange yield was significantly affected by irrigation treatments in the second growing season only, by cropping systems in the first season only and by the interaction between irrigation treatments and cropping systems in both growing seasons. Table 6 also showed an increase in orange yield in the second growing season, compared to the value

**Table 5: Effect of the interaction between the irrigation treatments and cropping systems on sesame yield and its attributes in both seasons**

Traits Treatments		No of capsules/plant		100-seed weight (g)		Seed yield/plant (g)		Seed yield (kg/ha)	
		1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season	1 <sup>st</sup> Season	2 <sup>nd</sup> Season
FI	CS1	34.2	32.9	4.60	4.38	13.7	13.5	136.3	133.2
	CS2	33.9	32.7	4.40	4.15	13.6	13.3	260.9	256.6
	CS3	33.6	32.4	4.28	4.26	13.3	13.1	392.3	385.9
<b>Mean</b>		33.9	32.7	4.43	4.26	13.5	13.3	263.2	258.6
DI1	CS1	34.1	32.9	4.57	4.42	13.7	13.5	135.5	130.3
	CS2	33.8	32.6	4.39	4.28	13.5	13.3	258.5	254.5
	CS3	33.5	32.4	4.21	4.04	13.3	13.1	389.9	385.2
<b>Mean</b>		33.8	32.7	4.39	4.25	13.5	13.3	261.3	256.7
DI2	CS1	27.5	25.9	4.25	4.12	10.3	9.91	102.4	100.5
	CS2	27.1	25.7	4.02	4.00	10.0	9.71	197.4	193.1
	CS3	26.9	25.4	3.91	3.79	9.80	9.64	288.5	285.1
<b>Mean</b>		27.2	25.7	4.06	3.97	10.0	9.75	196.1	192.9
<b>Mean CS1</b>		31.96	30.6	4.47	4.31	12.6	12.3	124.7	121.3
<b>Mean CS2</b>		31.58	30.3	4.27	4.14	12.4	12.1	239.0	234.8
<b>Mean CS3</b>		31.32	30.1	4.13	4.03	12.1	11.9	356.9	352.0
<b>LSD<sub>0.05</sub></b>									
<b>Irr</b>		0.12	0.13	0.26	0.03	0.10	0.06	1.24	0.70
<b>CS</b>		0.17	0.13	0.12	0.14	0.15	0.16	3.57	0.62
<b>Irr X CS</b>		NS	NS	0.27	NS	NS	NS	5.09	0.99
<b>Sole sesame</b>		34.4	33.2	4.62	4.43	13.9	13.7	725.0	692.0

FI= Irrigation with 120% ETo, DI1, irrigation with 100% ETo, DI2= irrigation with 80% ETo, CS1= 20% sesame + 100% peanut, CS2=40% sesame + 100% peanut, CS3= 60% sesame + 100% peanut.

obtained in the first growing season, which implied that the residual effect of the interplanted cropping systems of sesame and peanut had a positive effect of orange trees and resulted in an increase in its yield in the second season. Similar results were obtained by Zohry *et al.* (2020), when they interplanted legume crops within orange trees. The highest orange yield was obtained under application of FI to CS1. Orange yield was reduced under application of both deficit irrigation treatments, with higher percentage under application of DI2. The reduction in orange yield was 3 and 4% under DI1 and DI2, respectively. This low percentage of reduction in orange yield was due to the application of deficit irrigation treatments during the growing season of the intercropping system of sesame and peanut only. Whereas, in the rest of the growing season of orange, the required irrigation amount was applied to orange trees.

George and Jeruto (2010) indicated that intercropping under orange trees eliminate growth of weeds, which compete with orange trees on fertilizer and water.

### Competitive relation

#### Land equivalent ratio (LER)

The results in table 7 indicated that the highest value of LER was found under application of FI to CS3 and interplanted within orange trees in both growing seasons, namely 2.27 and 2.33 in the first and second season, respectively. Hefny *et al.*, (2020) obtained a value of LER of 2.13 when they interplanted an intercropping system of sunflower and watermelon within orange trees.

Application of DI1 for CS3 attained higher value of LER than the one obtained from application of FI to CS1 or CS2, namely 2.25 and 2.31 in the first and second season,

**Table 6: Effect of irrigation treatments and cropping systems on orange yield (ton/ha) in both seasons**

Irrigation	Cropping system	First season	Second season
FI	CS1	2.87	3.14
	CS2	2.83	3.12
	CS3	2.81	3.09
Mean		2.84	3.12
DI1	CS1	2.79	3.12
	CS2	2.77	3.10
	CS3	2.77	3.08
Mean		2.77	3.10
DI2	CS1	2.74	3.09
	CS2	2.69	3.06
	CS3	2.67	3.04
Mean		2.70	3.06
Mean CS1		2.79	3.04
Mean CS2		2.76	3.06
Mean CS3		2.77	3.12
LSD <sub>0.05</sub>			
Irr		NS	3.07
CS		0.002	NS
Irr X CS		2.83	0.001
Sole orange		3.00	3.25

FI= Irrigation with 120% ETo, DI1, irrigation with 100% ETo, DI2= irrigation with 80% ETo, CS1= 20% sesame + 100% peanut, CS2=40% sesame + 100% peanut, CS3= 60% sesame + 100% peanut.

**Table 7: Effect of irrigation treatments and cropping systems on land equivalent ratio in both seasons**

		First season				Second season			
		LER <sub>s</sub>	LER <sub>p</sub>	LER <sub>o</sub>	LER <sub>total</sub>	LER <sub>s</sub>	LER <sub>p</sub>	LER <sub>o</sub>	LER <sub>total</sub>
FI	CS1	0.19	0.93	0.96	2.08	0.19	0.99	0.97	2.15
	CS2	0.36	0.86	0.94	2.16	0.37	0.91	0.96	2.24
	CS3	0.54	0.78	0.94	2.27	0.56	0.82	0.95	2.33
DI1	CS1	0.19	0.93	0.93	2.05	0.19	0.98	0.96	2.13
	CS2	0.36	0.84	0.92	2.12	0.37	0.89	0.95	2.22
	CS3	0.54	0.78	0.92	2.25	0.56	0.80	0.95	2.31
DI2	CS1	0.14	0.75	0.91	1.81	0.15	0.81	0.95	1.91
	CS2	0.27	0.63	0.90	1.80	0.28	0.76	0.94	1.98
	CS3	0.40	0.55	0.89	1.84	0.41	0.67	0.94	2.01

LER<sub>s</sub>= relative yield of sesame, LER<sub>p</sub>= relative yield of peanut, LER<sub>o</sub>= relative yield of orange, FI= irrigation with 120% ETo, DI1, irrigation with 100% ETo, DI2= irrigation with 80% ETo, CS1= 20% sesame + 100% peanut, CS2=40% sesame + 100% peanut, CS3= 60% sesame + 100% peanut.

respectively. The above results proved that this cropping system achieved yield advantages and attained efficient utilization of land resources by growing three crops in the same time. Furthermore, a noticeable reduction was found when DI2 was applied to the three studied cropping system in both growing seasons. Similar results were obtained by El-Mehy *et al.* (2023), where the values of LER of sesame intercropped with peanut were slightly reduced as the applied irrigation was reduce from 120% ETo to 100% ETo and it were highly reduced when the applied irrigation was reduced from 120% ETo to 80% ETo.

**Water equivalent ratio (WER)**

The values of WER in table 8 indicated that the highest value of WER was obtained when FI was applied to CS3 and interplanted within orange trees in both growing seasons, namely 2.27 and 2.31 in the first and second season, respectively. Furthermore, irrigation of CS3 with DI1 attained higher values of WER, than the obtained under application of FI to CS1 or CS2, namely 2.23 and 2.29 in the first and second season, respectively. These results implied more efficient use of irrigation water under application of DI1, compared to application of FI, which implied an opportunity to save irrigation water by applying DI1 in both growing seasons. Application of DI2 highly reduced the values of WER in both growing seasons.

El-Mehy *et al.* (2023) reported higher values of WER under irrigation with 120% ETo and lower values of WER under irrigation with 80% ETo when sesame was intercropped with peanut.

**Economic evaluation**

The results in table 9 showed that the highest farmer's total return (TR) can be obtained by application of FI to CS1 interplanted within orange trees, followed by application of DI1 to CS1 in both growing seasons, where TR was reduced by only 1% in both growing seasons. Furthermore, the application of DI2 to the three studied cropping systems highly reduced TR.

Similar trend was obtained for monetary advantage index (MAI), where application of FI to CS1 interplanted within orange trees attained the highest values of MAI, followed by application of DI1 to CS1 in both growing seasons, where MAI was reduced by only 2% in both growing seasons. Whereas, MAI values were highly reduced under the application of DI2 to the three studied cropping systems. Similar trend was obtained by El-Mehy *et al.* (2023), where application of 80% ETo highly reduced the values of TR and MAI, compared to application of 120% ETo to sesame intercropped with peanut.

**CONCLUSION**

Under the prevailing water deficiency in Egypt, application of deficit irrigation can be a promising practice that conserve the applied irrigation water, and in the meantime attains yield close the one obtained with application of full irrigation amount. The current study recommends farmers to interplant the sesame-peanut intercropping system (20% sesame + 100% peanut) with the young orange trees and irrigate it with either 120% ETo or 100% ETo for additive farmer profitability and increasing land and water productivities.

**Table 8: Effect of irrigation treatments and cropping systems on water equivalent ratio in both seasons**

		First season				Second season			
		WER <sub>s</sub>	WER <sub>p</sub>	WER <sub>o</sub>	WER <sub>total</sub>	WER <sub>s</sub>	WER <sub>p</sub>	WER <sub>o</sub>	WER <sub>total</sub>
FI	CS1	0.19	0.93	0.94	2.06	0.19	0.99	0.97	2.15
	CS2	0.35	0.86	0.94	2.15	0.36	0.91	0.96	2.23
	CS3	0.53	0.78	0.96	2.27	0.54	0.82	0.95	2.31
DI1	CS1	0.18	0.93	0.93	2.04	0.18	0.98	0.96	2.13
	CS2	0.35	0.84	0.92	2.12	0.36	0.89	0.95	2.21
	CS3	0.53	0.78	0.92	2.23	0.54	0.80	0.95	2.29
DI2	CS1	0.14	0.75	0.91	1.80	0.14	0.81	0.95	1.91
	CS2	0.27	0.63	0.90	1.79	0.27	0.76	0.94	1.97
	CS3	0.39	0.55	0.89	1.83	0.40	0.67	0.94	2.00

WER<sub>s</sub> = WER of sesame, WER<sub>p</sub> = WER of peanut, LER<sub>o</sub> = WER of orange, FI = Irrigation with 120% ETo, DI1, irrigation with 100% ETo, DI2 = irrigation with 80% ETo, CS1 = 20% sesame + 100% peanut, CS2 = 40% sesame + 100% peanut, CS3 = 60% sesame + 100% peanut.

**Table 9: Total return (TR, USD/ha) and monetary advantage index (MAI, USD/ha) for sesame and peanut intercropping system interplanted within orange trees in both growing seasons**

		First season					Second season				
		Sesame	Peanut	Orange	TR	MAI	Sesame	Peanut	Orange	TR	MAI
FI	CS1	198	4485	226	4913	2552	193	4769	251	5214	2792
	CS2	379	4101.94	225	4707	2529	372	4343	250	4965	2746
	CS3	569	3761	230	4556	2545	560	3917	247	4725	2694
DI1	CS1	197	4456.77	223	4876	2493	189	4712	250	5151	2734
	CS2	375	4045	221	4642	2457	369	4286	248	4904	2691
	CS3	566	3747	222	4535	2516	559	3846	246	4652	2636
DI2	CS1	149	3605	219	3973	1776	146	3903	247	4296	2047
	CS2	287	3009	215	3511	1558	280	3648	245	4173	2067
	CS3	419	2640	214	3272	1495	414	3193	243	3851	1939
Sole		1045	4797	240	--	--	1002	4982	260	--	--

TI = total income (\$/ha), MAIFI = Irrigation with 120% ETo, DI1, irrigation with 100% ETo, DI2 = irrigation with 80% ETo, CS1 = 20% sesame + 100% peanut, CS2 = 40% sesame + 100% peanut, CS3 = 60% sesame + 100% peanut.



## REFERENCES

- Abdel-Aziz R.A., Salem S.E., Al-Bitar L. (2008). Effect of intercropping cover crops on citrus orchards growth and fruiting under Toshka conditions. *J. of Agric. and Veterinary Sci.*, 1: 101 – 110.
- Abou-Kerisha, M.A.; R.A. Gadallah, E.E.A. Mohamdain, (2008). Response of groundnut to intercropping with some sesame varieties under deferent plant density. *Arab Univ. J. Agric. Sci.*, 16: 359-374.
- Allen R.G, Pereira L.S., Raes D., Smith M. (1998). Crop evapotranspiration: Guideline for computing crop water requirements. FAO No 56. pp 109-158.
- Arcand M.M., Lemke R., Farrell R.E., Knight J.D. (2014) Nitrogen supply from belowground residues of lentil and wheat to a subsequent wheat crop. *Biol. Fertil. Soils*, 50: 507-515.
- Arunyanark A.S. Jogloy, C. Akkasaeng, N. Vorasoot, T. Kesmala, R. C. Nageswara Rao, G. C. Wright, A. Patanothai (2008). Chlorophyll stability is an indicator of drought tolerance in peanut. *J. Agron. and Crop Sci.*, 194:113-125.
- Aydinsakir K., Dinc N., Buyuktas D., Bastug R., Toker, R. (2016). Assessment of different irrigation levels on peanut crop yield and quality components under Mediterranean conditions. *J. Irrig. Drain. Engineer.*, 142: 04016034.
- Bulletin of Statistical Agriculture Prices (2021). Part 2 - Field Crops, Vegetable, By-Products (Summer and Nili) and Fruits. Economic Affairs Sector, MALR, Egypt.
- Capra A., Consoli S., Scicolone B. (2008). Inc. Deficit Irrigation: Theory and Practice. In: Agricultural Irrigation Research Progress. D. Alonso, Hugo J. Iglesias (Eds.). Nova Science Publishers. CAPMAS, Central Agency for Public Mobilization and Statistics (2018). Statistical Yearbook.
- Chai Q., Gan Y., Zhao C., Xu H., Waskom R. M, Niu Y., Siddique K. H. M. (2016). Regulated deficit irrigation for crop production under drought stress. A review. *Agron. Sustain. Dev.*, 36: 2-21.
- El-Mehy A.A., El-Badawy H.E.M. (2017). Evaluation of intercropping corn, soybean and cowpea with Washington navel orange orchard under different N fertilizer levels. *Middle East J. of Agri. Res.*, 6: 513-533.
- El-Mehy A.A., Abd-Allah A.M., Kasem E.E. Mohamed M.S., (2023). Mitigation of the impact of water deficiency on intercropped sesame and peanut systems through foliar application of potassium-silicate and triacontanol. *Egyptian J. Agric. Res.*, 101: 292-303.
- Freed R.D. (1991). MSTAT-C Microcomputer Statistical Program. Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan, USA.
- Gao L., Xu H., Bi H., Xi W., Bao B., Wang X. (2013) Intercropping competition between apple trees and crops in agroforestry systems on the Loess Plateau of China. *PLoS ONE* 8: e70739.
- George O., Jeruto P. (2010). Sustainable horticultural crop production through intercropping: The case of fruits and vegetable crops: A review. *Agric. Biol. J. N. Am.*, 1: 1098 – 1105.
- Ghosh P K. (2004). Growth, yield, competition and economics of groundnut/ cereal fodder intercropping systems in the semi- arid tropics of India. *Field Crops Res.*, 88: 227-237.
- Gomaa M., Fathallah R., Kandil I.E. E., Ali, A.M.M. (2021). Using of potassium silicate to alleviate drought stress effect on peanut as grown in sandy soil. *J. Advan. in Agric. Res.*, 26: 109-119.
- Hefny Y.A.A., Hamd-Alla W.A., Zohry A.A. (2020). Evaluation of intercropping patterns of sunflower at different planting densities with watermelon pulp under orange trees in sandy soil. *Proc., The 16<sup>th</sup> Int. Conf. Crop Sci.*, Al-Azhar Univ., pp. 301-314.
- Junjittakarn J., Pimratch S., Jogloy S., Htoon W., Singkham N., Vorasoot N., Patanothai A. (2013). Nutrient uptake of peanut genotypes under different water regimes. *Inter. J. Plant Prod.*, 7: 677-692.
- Khasanah N., van Noordwijk M., Slingerland M., Sofiyudin M., Stomph D., Migeon A.F., Hairiah K. (2020). Oil palm agroforestry can achieve economic and environmental gains as indicated by multifunctional land equivalent ratios. *Front. Sustain. Food Syst.*, 3: 122.
- Kirihetti, D. (2018). Direct assessment of the fixation and release of nitrogen by pea, lentil, chickpea and faba bean. A Master of Science Thesis. University of Saskatchewan Saskatoon, Canada.
- Mao L.L., Zhang L.Z., Li W.W., Werf W.V.D., Sun, J.H., Spiertz, H., Li, L. (2012) Yield advantage and water saving in maize/pea intercrop. *Field Crop Res.*, 138:11-20.
- Mead, R., Willey R.W., (1980). The concept of a “land equivalent ratio” and advantages in yields from intercropping. *Exper. Agric.*, 16: 217- 228.
- Ouda, S., Hefny, Y. A., Abdel-Wahab, T. I., Abdel-Wahab, S. I. (2018). Intercropping systems of sunflower and peanut under different irrigation regimes and potassium fertilizer levels. *Egyptian Journal of Agronomy*, (The 15<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Crop Science), 85-104.
- Ozkan A., and Kulak M. (2013). Effects of water stress on growth, oil yield, fatty acid composition and mineral content of *Sesamum indicum*. *J Anim Plant Sci.*, 23: 1686-90.
- Pandey B.B., Ratnakumar P, Usha Kiran B., Dudhe M.Y., Lakshmi G.S., Ramesh K., Guhey A. (2021). Identifying traits associated with terminal drought tolerance in sesame (*Sesamum indicum* L.) genotypes. *Front. Plant Sci.*, 2779.
- Prudent M., Vernoud V., Girodet S., Salon C. (2016). How nitrogen fixation is modulated in response to different water availability levels and during recovery: A structural and functional study at the whole plant level. *Plant Soil*, 399: 1–12.
- Qin A., Huang G., Chai Q., Yu, A., Huang, P. (2013). Grain yield and soil respiratory response to intercropping systems on arid land. *Field Crops Res.*, 144: 1–10.
- Rathore V. S., Nathawat N. S., Bhardwaj S., Yadav B. M., Kumar M., Santra P., Yadav O. P. (2021). Optimization of deficit irrigation and nitrogen fertilizer management for peanut production in an arid region. *Scientific reports*, 11: 1-14.
- Rücknagel J., Götze P., Koblenz B., Bachmann N., Löbner S., Lindner S., Bischoff J., Christen O. (2016). Impact on soil physical properties of using large-grain legumes for catch crop cultivation under different tillage conditions. *Eur. J. Agron.*, 77: 28–37.
- Said A.S., Zohry A.A., Ouda S. (2016). Unconventional solution to increase crop production under water scarcity. In: Major Crops and Water Scarcity in Egypt. Springer Publishing House. pp 99-114.
- Selim M., Hefny Y., Abdel-Wahab E. and Mohamed M. (2020) Interplanting some soybean cultivars with mandarin trees in sandy soil. *Agric. Sci.*, 11: 88-110.
- Snedecor, G.W., Cochran W.G. (1988). Statistical Methods 7<sup>th</sup> Ed. Iowa State Univ., Press, Ames, USA.
- Snyder R.L., Orang M., Bali K., Eching S. (2004). Basic Irrigation Scheduling (BIS). [http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/landwateruse/wateruse/Ag/CUP/California\\_Climate\\_Data\\_010804.xls](http://www.waterplan.water.ca.gov/landwateruse/wateruse/Ag/CUP/California_Climate_Data_010804.xls)
- Streeter J.G. (2003) Effects of drought on nitrogen fixation in soybean root nodules. *Plant Cell Envir.*, 26: 1199-1204.
- Toaima S.E.A., Atalla R.A., El-Sawy W.A. (2004). Response of some peanut genotypes to intercropping with sesame in relation to yield and yield components. *Ann. Agric. Sci.*, 42: 903-916.
- Wick A., Berti M., Lawley Y. Liebig M. (2017) integration of annual and perennial cover crops for improving soil health. In: Soil Health and Intensification of Agroecosystems; Elsevier BV: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, pp. 127–150.
- Zohry A., Hefny Y., Ouda S. (2020). Interplanting four legume crops under orange trees using different irrigation water and fertilizer sources in sandy soil. 16<sup>th</sup> International Conference on Crop Science. Al-Azhar Univ., Oct. 13, pp 341-346.