

Yield Gap Analysis Extended to Marketable Grain Reveals the Profitability of Organic Lentil-Spring Wheat Intercrops

Loïc Viguière¹, Laurent Bedoussac¹, Etienne-Pascal Journet¹, Eric Justes²

¹INRA, France, ²CIRAD, France

Abstract:

Introduction: Lentil (*Lens culinaris* Med.) is a popular legume that has many advantages for nutrition and –as other legumes– for agriculture, such as reduced need for synthetic fertilizers and improved N availability for the following crop. Yet, lentil has been overlooked by farmers in Europe mainly because of its low and unstable yields, notably due to frequent lodging, bruchid beetles damages and weed competition.

Intercropping is the simultaneous growth of two or more species in the same field for a significant period. Like other legume-cereal intercrops that have been shown to increase total yield and gross margin, lentil-wheat intercrops may be a way to increase lentil production by reducing pests and weeds damages.

The issues of lodging and bruchid damage in lentil were analysed by adapting the “yield gap” concept which identifies and quantifies “limiting” and “reducing” factors of a crop. Here, we addressed three questions: do lentil-spring wheat intercrops have i) higher total grain yield?, ii) higher mechanical harvest efficiency?, and iii) higher profitability than sole cropped lentil?

Material and methods: A two-year field experiment was carried out in SW France in 2015 and 2016 under organic farming rules. Four lentil and two spring wheat cultivars were grown as sole crops and bispecific intercrops grown in partial additive design (100%L:17%W). The “yield gap” concept was adapted to estimate all grain losses by adding losses during mechanical harvest and losses due to insufficient quality.

Results: Mean total intercrop grain yield before mechanical harvest was higher than mean sole crop yield (1.91 ± 0.47 vs. 1.57 ± 0.29 t ha⁻¹, respectively), with a lower mean yield of lentil in intercrop than in sole crop (1.06 ± 0.28 vs. 1.61 ± 0.54 t ha⁻¹, respectively). This led to a lower mean gross margin of intercrops than lentil sole cropped (1797 ± 469 vs. 2396 ± 706 € ha⁻¹, respectively) based on actual yield before mechanical harvest.

The percentage of bruchid-damaged grain did not differ significantly between intercrop and sole crop lentil (ca. 41%). However, lentil lodging was much lower in intercrop than in sole crop (15% vs. 40%, respectively), which increased lentil harvest efficiency (75% vs. 50%, respectively). This led to a similar mechanically harvested yield of lentil in intercrop and sole crop (0.80 t ha⁻¹).

Consequently, mean marketable gross margin of intercrops was higher than that of sole cropped lentil and wheat (974 ± 376 vs. 713 ± 348 and 304 ± 26 € ha⁻¹, respectively) due to the addition of marketable wheat yield, and far higher than the margin of sole cropped wheat.

Conclusion: We thus demonstrated the profitability of organic lentil-spring wheat intercrops, mainly due to greater mechanical harvest efficiency, despite the additional costs of grain sorting and cleaning after harvest. This demonstrates the relevance of extending the yield gap concept to include all grain losses for assessing profitability of intercrops.

Keywords: Lodging, bruchid, harvest efficiency, gross margin



ESA2018

XV^e European Society for Agronomy Congress

August 27-31, 2018 - Geneva, Switzerland

www.esa-congress-2018.ch

ABSTRACT BOOK



INNOVATIVE CROPPING AND FARMING SYSTEMS FOR HIGH QUALITY FOOD PRODUCTION SYSTEMS

CICG, GENEVA SWITZERLAND
27 - 31 AUGUST 2018

COMMITTEES

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

- Christoph Carlen (president), Agroscope, Conthey, Switzerland
- Alice Baux, Agroscope, Nyon, Switzerland
- Raphaël Charles, FiBL, Lausanne, Switzerland
- Emmanuel Frossard, ETH, Zürich, Switzerland
- Bernard Jeangros, Agroscope, Nyon, Switzerland
- Fabio Mascher, SSA/SGPW and Agroscope, Nyon, Switzerland
- Monique Schwartz-Seale, Agroscope, Nyon, Switzerland
- Sokrat Sinaj, Agroscope, Nyon, Switzerland

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

CORE SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

- Emmanuel Frossard (president), ETH, Zürich, Switzerland
- Alice Baux, Agroscope, Nyon, Switzerland
- Christoph Carlen, Agroscope, Conthey, Switzerland
- Raphaël Charles, FiBL, Lausanne, Switzerland
- Bernard Jeangros, Agroscope, Nyon, Switzerland
- Fabio Mascher, Agroscope and SSA/SGPW, Nyon, Switzerland
- Sokrat Sinaj, Agroscope, Nyon, Switzerland

EXTENDED SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

- Bernard Belk, Federal Office of Agriculture, Switzerland
- Jan Bengtsson, University of Agric. Sciences, Sweden
- Else Bünemann, FiBL, Switzerland
- Nathalie Colbach, INRA Dijon, France
- Branco Cupina, University of Novi Sad, Serbia
- Philippe Debeake, INRA Castanet-Tolosan, France
- Antonio Delgado, University of Sevilla, Spain
- Maria Finckh, University of Kassel, Germany
- Felix Herzog, Agroscope, Switzerland
- Jürg Hiltbrunner, Agroscope, Switzerland
- Eric Justes, CIRAD, France
- Andreas Keiser, HAFL, Switzerland
- Samuel Knapp, Techn. University of München, Germany
- François Lefort, Hepia, Switzerland
- Frank Liebisch, ETH, Switzerland
- Thomas Nesme, Bordeaux Sciences Agro, France
- Astrid Oberson, ETH, Switzerland
- Elisa Pellegrino, Sant'Anna University of Pisa, Italy
- Didier Pellet, Agroscope, Switzerland
- Pirjo Peltonen-Sainio, MTT Agrifood Research, Finland
- Caroline Rémond, University of Reims Champagne-Ardenne, France
- Evan Rocco, University of Tirana, Albania
- Mariana C. Rufino, Lancaster University, United Kingdom
- Meagan Schipanski, Colorado State University, United States of America
- Urs Schmidhalter, Techn. University of München, Germany
- Fred Stoddard, University of Helsinki, Finland
- Roberto Tuberosa, University of Bologna, Italy
- Marcel van der Heijden, Agroscope, Switzerland
- Christine Watson, SRUC, United Kingdom
- Jacques Wery, Montpellier Supagro, France
- Philip White, James Hutton Institute, United Kingdom
- Judith Wirth, Agroscope, Switzerland
- Noura Ziadi, Quebec Research and Development Centre, Canada