

## Journal of Plant Production

Journal homepage: [www.jpp.mans.edu.eg](http://www.jpp.mans.edu.eg)  
Available online at: [www.jpp.journals.ekb.eg](http://www.jpp.journals.ekb.eg)

### Evaluation The Effect of Intercropping Garlic with Grapevines on Productivity, Phytoremediation, Competitive Indices and Plant Parasitic Nematode Community

Mohsen, F. S.<sup>1\*</sup>; R. M. A. El-Ashry<sup>2</sup> and H. G. Zyada<sup>3</sup>



<sup>1</sup>Horticulture Department (Pomology), Faculty of Agriculture, Zagazig University, Egypt.

<sup>2</sup>Plant Protection Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Zagazig University, Egypt.

<sup>3</sup>Horticulture Department (Olericulture), Faculty of Agriculture, Zagazig University, Egypt.



#### ABSTRACT

The present investigation was carried out during winter of the consecutive seasons (2018/2019 and 2019/2020) on 9 year old Flame Seedless grapevines grown in a private vineyard at Sharkia Governorate, Egypt. Garlic (Balady cv) was intercropped with grapevines (Flame Seedless cv) on dripper irrigation lines, as a try to reduce numbers of phytonematodes in grapevine soil. For grapevines, the obtained results referred that intercropping insignificantly ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) increased number of berries/bunch, weight of 100 berries and berry firmness, separation force, total soluble solids percentage, anthocyanin content and yield/ vine as well as bunch weight and width, berry length, berry diameter and berry shape index compared to sole grapevines. For garlic (Balady cv), the achieved results pointed out that plant height, number of leaves/plant, leaf fresh weight/ plant, nick diameter as well as bulb diameter, height and weight/ plant insignificantly decreased when garlic intercropped with grapevines compared to control. Competition indices; *i.e.*, land equivalent ratio (LER), area time equivalent ratio (ATER) and land utilization efficiency (LUE) showed that, intercropping garlic with grapevines was more efficient than sole cropping system. Aggressively estimation demonstrated that grapevines were dominant advantages while garlic was dominated. Moreover, intercropping garlic (Balady cv) with grapevines was obviously decreased population density of phytonematodes infesting grapevine orchard. Generally, garlic together with other biocontrol agents in grapevine orchards has the potential to be an efficient and environmentally agricultural management method to reduce numbers of plant parasitic nematodes.

**Keywords:** Grapevines, garlic, intercropping, yield, growth, competitive indices, plant parasitic nematodes.

#### INTRODUCTION

Grape (*Vitis vinifera*, L.) is one of the most popular and serious fruit crops all over the world, especially in temperate, subtropical and tropical regions with high export possibility. In Egypt, grapes are one of the most widely grown fruit crops. Egypt's grape cultivation is spread geographically from the north to the south and the area dedicated to vineyards is raising year after year. The harvestable area in Egypt reached 77,895 hectares which produced 1,703,394 tons (FAO, 2017). Grapes quality is marked for the consumer, producer as well as exporter. Serious parameters that participate in the quality of grapes include their taste, color, size and texture. Grapes quality is more effective than yield in the excellent table grapes production (Peppi *et al.*, 2006).

Garlic (*Allium sativum*, L.) is a substantial crop in Egypt utilized medicinally for processing of microbial infection, hypertension and memory loss (AbouZid and Mohamed, 2011). It is one of the most serious bulb vegetable plants and is next to onion in importance (Hamma *et al.*, 2013). Productivity and quality of garlic change greatly with location, cultivar, agricultural methods, soil type and date of harvest.

One of the techniques of land utilization for supreme production is intercropping practice (Bhatnagar *et al.*, 2007)

which can supply a fundamental yield advantage compared to sole cropping. Suitable intercropping systems could raise the microbial diversity in the growth media (Hauggaard-Nielsen and Jensen, 2005), use several resources more effectively (Javanmard *et al.*, 2009) and maximize growth and productivity of crops (Cecilio *et al.*, 2011). In addition, Kumari *et al.* (2018) reported that the net income of mango trees was the highest in onion intercrop followed by garlic. Furthermore, the maximum benefit- cost ratio was achieved by onion intercrop.

Phytonematodes are of great economically important pests particularly, root-knot nematodes (RKNs), (*Meloidogyne* spp.), the citrus nematode (*Tylenchulus semipenetrans*) and lesion nematodes (*Pratylenchus* spp.) which are ranked at the top among the five major plant pathogens and the first among the ten most important genera of plant parasitic nematodes in the world (Mukhtar *et al.*, 2018 and Ravichandra, 2018). However, the overall average annual yield loss in important horticultural crops worldwide accounts to 13.54 % (Reddy, 2008).

Nowadays, control methods varied greatly by using cultural practice, botanicals, intercropping, resistant cultivars and chemical nematicides. Particularly with RKNs, which is targeted by 48% of global use across crops (Coyne *et al.*, 2009). IPM programs are generally

\* Corresponding author.  
E-mail address: [faridmsamy@yahoo.com](mailto:faridmsamy@yahoo.com)  
DOI: 10.21608/jpp.2021.169553

recommended for the control. As a result of fast acting and considerable results of nematicides, they have been applied widely to control phytonematodes but, they are unfriendly methods, costly and produce environmental hazards. Therefore, research on alternatives to chemical nematicides has received a strong impulse and considered a wide range of options including intercropping and botanical nematicides. Since, a wide variety of plant species, representing 57 families have been shown to have nematocidal compounds such as alkaloids, isothiocyanates, phenols, glycosides, thiophenics, tannins, saponins and fatty acids (Gommers,1981; Akhtar, 2000; Chitwood, 2002; Ntalli and Caboni, 2012).

Various non-chemical alternatives are available for the control of plant parasitic nematodes. However, some non-chemical methods may not be particularly effective when used alone, making integration of methods is necessary to achieve optimal nematode control, particularly in sustainable agriculture. So, this work aimed to evaluate the influence of garlic (*Balady cv*) intercropped with Flame Seedless grapevines on yield and fruit quality of grape as well as growth and yield of garlic. Furthermore, investigate the influence of intercropping garlic on suppressing phytonematodes infecting Flame Seedless grapevines under field conditions.

## MATERLIAS AND METHODS

The present investigation was carried out during the two consecutive winter seasons (2018/2019 and 2019/2020) on 9 years old Flame Seedless grapevines grown in a private vineyard at Sharkia Governorate, Egypt. Intercropping system (grape: garlic) was used to evaluated yield and fruit quality of grape (*Flame Seedless cv*) and growth and yield of garlic (*Balady cv*) as well as controlling phytonematodes some competitive indices of grape and garlic. These treatments were arranged in a randomized complete block design with five replicates as a simple experiment.

The grapevines of the experiment were chosen to be nearly similar in growth vigor, healthy as well as uniformly received the ordinary cultural treatments (irrigation, fertilization and pest management). The selected vines were trellised on Spanish Baron System and planted at 2 × 3 m apart in sandy soil conditions under drip irrigation system. Vines were trained on the report of the cane pruning system and pruned to leave around 50 buds/ vine (10 fruit canes/ vine × 5 buds/ cane) at winter of each season. After the fruit set, all experimental vines were adjusted to 30 cluster/ vine and all clusters were tipped to approximately 16 cm length. Some physical and chemical analysis of the experimental soil at 0-30 cm as shown in Table 1, according to Chapman and Pratt (1978).

**Table 1. Physical and chemical properties of the used soil (average two seasons)**

| Physical properties |           |                    |                          | Soil texture     |                 |                         |                               |                              |                 |    |     |
|---------------------|-----------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------|----|-----|
| Clay (%)            | Silt (%)  | Fine sand (%)      | Coarse sand (%)          |                  | Loamy sand      |                         |                               |                              |                 |    |     |
| 9.3                 | 13.8      | 18.9               | 58.0                     |                  |                 |                         |                               |                              |                 |    |     |
| Chemical properties |           |                    |                          |                  |                 |                         |                               |                              |                 |    |     |
| pH                  | E.C.      | Organic matter (%) | Soluble cations (meq./L) |                  |                 | Soluble anions (meq./L) |                               |                              | Available (ppm) |    |     |
|                     | m.mohs/cm |                    | Mg <sup>++</sup>         | Ca <sup>++</sup> | Na <sup>+</sup> | Cl <sup>-</sup>         | HCO <sub>3</sub> <sup>-</sup> | SO <sub>4</sub> <sup>-</sup> | N               | P  | K   |
| 8.03                | 0.35      | 0.68               | 2.63                     | 2.90             | 1.54            | 3.45                    | 2.20                          | 1.42                         | 78              | 16 | 114 |

The experimental unit area was (6 m<sup>2</sup>) which contained 2 dripper lines (50 cm distance between drippers) with 2 m length and 3 m between rows. One dripper line was utilized for the samples to measure vegetative growth and the other one dripper line was utilized for yield determination. Sole garlic component planted at four dripper lines each of 2 m length and 1m width with the same planting space (50 cm). Each dripper (sole or intercropping system) was planted with 5 cloves. The cultural practices; *i.e.*, irrigation, fertilization, and pest control including weeds were applied in suitable time as recommended for grape and garlic.

### Data recorded:

#### For grapevines:

When the total soluble solids (TSS) reached around 16° Brix, grape vines were harvested. Then, each vine bunches (replicate) were picked and the yield/ vine (kg) was listed. Furthermore, five bunches per replicate were randomly chosen to determine the following traits: Bunch weight (g), number of berries/ bunch and 100 berry weight (g). Berry firmness was measured by using a fruit Push-Pull Effegi penetrometer device (Model FD 101) supplemented with a plunger penetrator. Berry removal force was measured by using a hook instead of the plunger. Berry firmness and berry removal force were expressed in Newtons (N). Berry polar length and diameter (cm) utilizing Vernier caliper and then berry shape index; *i.e.*, length/diameter was then calculated.

Also, the chemical constituents of berry were defined in berry juice next being extracted from hundred berries from each replicate. Also, total soluble solids percentage (Brix°) determined by utilizing a hand refractometer. Moreover, total acidity percentage was estimated in the presence of phenolphthalyne by titration against sodium hydroxide (0.1 N) as an indicator. Then, total juice acidity was presented as g tartaric acid per hundred juice ml. Subsequently, each juice sample TSS/ acid ratio was calculated (AOAC, 2012). Samples of berries were lyophilized until a constant weight was obtained. The anthocyanin content was colorimetrically determined (OD 535 nm) according to the method described by (Francis, 2000).

#### For garlic:

At 135 days after the planting: Plant height (cm), leaf number per plant, leaf fresh weight per plant (g) and root dry weight per plant (g) were recorded. Also, nick diameter (cm), bulb diameter (cm), height (cm) and weight (g) were tabulated in both seasons. Garlic bulbs were harvested at 200 days after planting. Moreover, at 180 days after planting, ten plants were randomly chosen from each plot to measured number of cloves per bulb and bulb yield (ton/ fed). Also, total soluble solids percentage (TSS) in garlic bulbs was determined according to A.O.A.C (2012).

**Competitive indices:**

**Land equivalent ratio (LER):**

This parameter was determined for grapevines and garlic yield recorded per feddan as specified by Mead and Willey (1980) equation as follows:

$$LER = L_v + L_g$$

$$L_{\text{grapevine}} (L_v) = \frac{Y_{vg}}{Y_{vv}}$$

$$L_{\text{garlic}} (L_g) = \frac{Y_{gv}}{Y_{gg}}$$

**Where:**  $L_v$  and  $L_g$  are the relative yield of grapevines and garlic, respectively, as well as  $Y_{vv}$  and  $Y_{gg}$  are the yields per feddan of grapevines and garlic, respectively, as sole crops and  $Y_{vg}$  and  $Y_{gv}$  are the yields of grapevines and garlic, respectively, as intercrop yields of each components.

**Area time equivalent ratio (ATER):**

ATER was calculated as specified by Hiebsch and McCollum (1987) equation as follows:

$$ATER = \frac{Y_{vg}/Y_{vv} \times t_v + Y_{gv}/Y_{gg} \times t_g}{T}$$

**Where:**  $Y_{vg}$  = intercropped yield of grapevines,  $Y_{vv}$  = sole yield of grapevines,  $Y_{gv}$  = intercropped yield of garlic,  $Y_{gg}$  = sole yield of garlic,  $t_v$  = the duration of grapevines in days (365 days),  $t_g$  = the duration of garlic in days (200 days) as well as  $T$  = the overall duration by days of intercropping system.

**Land utilization efficiency percentage (LUE%)**

By utilizing ATER and LER values between grapevines and garlic, the land utilization efficiency percentage (LUE %) was studied as specified by Mason *et al.* (1986) equation as follows:

$$LUE = \frac{LER \times ATER}{2} \times 100$$

**Aggressivity (A):**

Mc Gilchrist (1965) equation was utilized to calculated aggressivity value as follows: they were calculated according to the following equations, for combination of 50:50 and 100:100,:

$$A_{vg} = L_v - L_g \quad \text{and} \quad A_{gv} = L_g - L_v$$

**Effect of intercropping garlic on the population density of phytonematodes infesting soil of grapevine orchard:**

Nematode samples were collected from Flame Seedless grapevines during two consecutive seasons. According to the experimental design mentioned before, the selected grapevines were separated from each other by one parallel row and labeled. The control treatment was left without intercropping garlic plants. Five subsamples were

taken at depth of 15-27cm from the rhizosphere area and near the trunk of each vine with a hand trowel after two, four and six months of intercropping garlic areas or control treatments. Subsamples were mixed together to form a composite sample of about 1 kg, reserved in polyethylene bags. Icebox was used to keep samples at 18°C, immediately sent to the laboratory for nematode extraction.

Nematode extraction was processed by using an aliquot sample of 250 g. Extraction was done by using a combination of sieving and Baermann trays technique (Hooper *et al.*, 2005). For nematode identification, one ml of nematode suspension was pipetted into Hawksely counting slide and nematodes were examined with the aid of the research microscope under 100X magnification. Based on morphology of adult and juvenile forms nematodes were identified according to Mai and Lyon (1975) and Siddiqi (1986). Species of *Meloidogyne* were identified on the basis of perineal pattern according to Eisenback *et al.* (1981). The nematode reduction (%) was calculated according to the following equation:

$$\text{Reduction (\%)} = \frac{\text{Control} - \text{Treated}}{\text{Control}} \times 100$$

**Experimental design and statistical analysis:**

This experiment included 3 treatments (sole grapevines, sole garlic and intercropping system treatment). The statistical layout of this experiment was completely randomized block design. The least significance difference (LSD) was utilized to differentiate means at the 5 % level of probability. The obtained means were compared utilizing Statistic version 9 computer program (Analytical software, 2008).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

**Grapevines yield and its quality:**

Data presented in Table 2, reveal that intercropping garlic under grapevines insignificantly increased yield per vine, bunch weight and bunch width compared to sole grape during both seasons. In contrast, bunch shape index was insignificantly decreased under intercropping system compared to sole planting. Number of berries per bunch, weight of 100 berries, separation force and berry firmness increased by using garlic as intercropping system under grapevines without significant difference compared to sole grape (Table 3). Moreover, berry length, berry diameter and shape index of grape were increased with intercropping treatment by garlic compared to sole planting (Table 4). Furthermore, garlic as intercropping system insignificantly increased total soluble solids (TSS), acidity and TSS/acidity ratio as well as anthocyanin content of grape berries compared to sole grapevines planting (Table 5).

**Table 2. Effect of intercropping garlic entire grapevine rows on yield/vine (kg), bunch weight (g), bunch width (cm) and bunch shape index during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seasons**

| Treatments           | Yield/vine (kg)        |                        | Bunch weight (g)       |                        | Bunch width (cm)       |                        | Bunch shape index      |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                      | 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 |
| Sole grapevine       | 12.7                   | 13.3                   | 418.9                  | 439.5                  | 14.2                   | 15.0                   | 1.13                   | 1.07                   |
| Intercropping system | 13.8                   | 14.6                   | 455.7                  | 483.1                  | 14.7                   | 15.4                   | 1.09                   | 1.04                   |
| LSD at 5%            | 2.88                   | 1.92                   | 71.99                  | 68.03                  | 5.81                   | 5.84                   | 0.44                   | 0.30                   |

**Table 3. Effect of intercropping garlic entire grapevines rows on number of berries/bunch, weight of 100 berries (g), separation force (N) and berry firmness (N) during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seasons**

| Treatments           | Number of berries/bunch |                        | Weight of 100 berries (g) |                        | Separation force (N)   |                        | Berry firmness(N)      |                        |
|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                      | 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 |
| Sole grapevines      | 127.0                   | 131.4                  | 326.4                     | 331.8                  | 7.11                   | 7.33                   | 6.13                   | 6.27                   |
| Intercropping system | 132.5                   | 140.2                  | 340.6                     | 343.1                  | 7.30                   | 7.52                   | 6.27                   | 6.40                   |
| LSD at 5%            | 17.23                   | 10.33                  | 23.81                     | 9.51                   | 0.65                   | 1.11                   | 0.30                   | 0.86                   |

**Table 4. Effect of intercropping garlic entire grapevines rows on berry length (cm), berry diameter (cm), berry shape index, during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seasons**

| Treatments           | Berry length (cm)      |                        | Berry diameter (cm)    |                        | Berry shape index      |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                      | 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 |
| Sole grapevines      | 1.60                   | 1.72                   | 1.71                   | 1.64                   | 0.94                   | 1.05                   |
| Intercropping system | 1.66                   | 1.78                   | 1.73                   | 1.69                   | 0.96                   | 1.05                   |
| LSD at 5%            | 0.34                   | 0.53                   | 0.34                   | 0.28                   | 0.69                   | 0.39                   |

**Table 5. Effect of intercropping garlic entire grapevines rows on TSS (Brix°), acidity (%), TSS/acid ratio and anthocyanin (mg/kg) content during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seasons**

| Treatments           | TSS (%)                |                        | Acidity (%)            |                        | TSS/acid ratio         |                        | Anthocyanin (mg/kg)    |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
|                      | 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 |
| Sole grapevines      | 18.3                   | 17.0                   | 0.58                   | 0.57                   | 31.5                   | 29.9                   | 418.2                  | 402.4                  |
| Intercropping system | 18.7                   | 17.6                   | 0.57                   | 0.56                   | 32.8                   | 31.4                   | 424.6                  | 411.0                  |
| LSD at 5%            | 2.40                   | 1.14                   | 0.05                   | 0.07                   | 3.99                   | 4.73                   | 53.02                  | 93.76                  |

The improvement in yield and quality of grapes can be attributed to a reduction in the extent of nematode infestation in the growing media, resulting in improved growth and thus increased yield and its quality. This trend may as a result of garlic allelopathy conferred by compounds. Garlic effectiveness is depending on the released sulfur compounds. These compounds may be assimilated through anaerobe, where spread inorganic sulphide like H<sub>2</sub>S which is has a toxicity effect for root knot nematodes (Gong *et al.*, 2013).

In the same line, Kanwar *et al.* (1993) demonstrated that intercropped medicinal plants in orchards of citrus and mango enhanced fruit quality as TSS, acidity, total sugar content and fruit weight compared to sole planting system. Also, the growth parameters and yield quality of *Pongamia pinnata* trees were improved when intercropped with sweet basil plants (Suvera *et al.*, 2015). Similarly, Nandi and Ghosh (2016) indicated that, one year growing of medicinal plants pointed out that *Pudina* and *Bramhi* can be cultivated in the inter space of the orchard with no adverse influence on *Mosambi* sweet orange. Fruits quality (TSS, total acidity % and anthocyanin content) of pomegranate trees were significantly increased under intercropping with sweet basil or rosemary plants (Ali *et al.*, 2019).

**Garlic growth and yield components:**

As shown in Table 6, plant height, leaf number per plant, fresh weight of leaves per plant and root dry weight

per plant of garlic were insignificantly decreased with intercropping system treatment compared to sole crop, in most cases, during the two consecutive seasons. The decreases in plant height were about 15.17 and 22.51 % for the intercropping system over control treatment (sole garlic planting) in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons, respectively. In other words, garlic yield components, in most cases were significantly decreased when intercropped under grapevines compared to the sole planting system in both seasons (Table 7). The decreases in bulb weight per plant were 31.24 and 28.91 % for the intercropping system over control treatment (sole garlic planting) in the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons, respectively. Furthermore, cloves number per bulb significantly increased when garlic intercropped with grapevines compared to sole garlic in both seasons (Table 8). While, total bulb yield per feddan significantly decreased under intercropping system compared to sole crop. There is no significant difference regard TSS percentage in the first season but it significant decrease when garlic intercropped with grapevines compared to sole planting in the second one. These results are following with those found by Jiang *et al.* (1994) on lettuce, garlic, wheat-maize and sweet potato-wheat-tobacco when intercropped with *Paulownia* trees as well as Sujatha *et al.* (2011) on *Ocimum basilicum* and *Artemisia pallens* when intercropped with arecanut (*Areca catechu*, L.) trees.

**Table 6. Effect of intercropping garlic entire grapevine rows on plant height (cm), number of leaves per plant, the weight of leaves per plant (g) and root dry weight per plant (g) of garlic at 135 days after planting during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seasons**

| Treatments           | Plant height (cm)      |                        | Number of leaves per plant |                        | Fresh weight of leaves per plant (g) |                        | Root dry weight per plant (g) |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------|
|                      | 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 |
| Sole garlic          | 83.7                   | 82.2                   | 9.33                       | 9.7                    | 55.8                                 | 51.8                   | 2.97                          | 3.57                   |
| Intercropping system | 71.0                   | 63.7                   | 8.33                       | 9.0                    | 36.2                                 | 25.5                   | 2.77                          | 2.80                   |
| LSD at 5%            | 31.92                  | 34.62                  | 2.48                       | 5.17                   | 36.05                                | 16.77                  | 0.66                          | 0.83                   |

**Table 7. Effect of intercropping garlic entire grapevine rows on nick diameter (cm), bulb diameter (cm), bulb height (cm) and bulb weight per plant (g) of garlic at 135 days after planting during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seasons**

| Treatments           | Nick diameter (cm)     |                        | Bulb diameter (cm)     |                        | Bulb height (cm)       |                        | Bulb weight per plant (g) |                        |
|----------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|
|                      | 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 |
| Sole garlic          | 1.70                   | 1.60                   | 3.90                   | 3.97                   | 4.23                   | 4.03                   | 32.97                     | 33.90                  |
| Intercropping system | 1.40                   | 1.10                   | 3.00                   | 3.13                   | 3.37                   | 3.27                   | 22.67                     | 24.10                  |
| LSD at 5%            | 0.25                   | 0.43                   | 1.55                   | 1.15                   | 0.76                   | 0.14                   | 8.98                      | 11.71                  |

**Table 8. Effect of intercropping garlic entire grapevines rows on cloves number per bulb, yield per feddan (ton) and total soluble solids percentage of garlic plant during 2019 and 2020 seasons**

| Treatments           | Cloves number /bulb |       | Yield /feddan (ton) |        | Total soluble solids (%) |       |
|----------------------|---------------------|-------|---------------------|--------|--------------------------|-------|
|                      | 2019                | 2020  | 2019                | 2020   | 2019                     | 2020  |
|                      | Sole garlic         | 15.30 | 15.57               | 1846.1 | 1898.4                   | 34.77 |
| Intercropping system | 16.90               | 18.10 | 634.67              | 674.80 | 34.80                    | 34.60 |
| L.S.D. at 5%         | 0.86                | 0.52  | 483.42              | 511.32 | 0.87                     | 0.25  |

**Competitive indices between grapevines and garlic plants:**

Results in Table 9, reveal that the competitive indices as combined yield utility in terms of LER, ATER and LUE % were the greatest when garlic intercropped with grapevines (1.27, 1.27 ; 1.12, 1.11 and 119.28 , 119.13) during 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> seasons, respectively, compared to sole

crop. Indeed, intercropping of garlic and grapevines was extra productive than growing them single (sole crop), as can be visible from the below pointed values which were better than 1.00. The obtained results were true in both seasons. This could be due to the reason that grapevines/garlic intercropping system planted in the same intra and inter row spacing accord suitable more efficacious total resource utilization and greater overall production than sole planting and the staying intercropping arrangements. Furthermore, aggressivity (A) values of grapevines (Avg) and garlic plants (Agv) were calculated for fruits and bulb yield per feddan of grapevines as well as garlic, respectively. In particular, grapevines were the dominated one (Avg positive), while, garlic was the dominant species (Agv negative). The same results were recorded by (Ali *et al.*, 2019) when rosemary or sweet basil was intercropped with pomegranate trees.

**Table 9. Effect of intercropping garlic entire grapevines rows on competitive indices between grapevines and garlic components during 2018/2019 and 2019/2020 seasons**

| Treatments           | Land equivalent ratio (LER) |                        | Area time equivalent ratio (ATER) |                        | Land utilization efficiency (LUE %) |                        | Aggressivity of grapevines to garlic (Avg) |                        | Aggressivity of garlic to grapevines (Agv) |                        |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------|--|------------------------|--|------------------------|
|                      | 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 |
|                      | Sole garlic                 | 1.00                   | 1.00                              | 1.00                   | 1.00                                | 100.00                 | 100.00                                     | +0.00                  | +0.00                                      | -0.00                  |
| Intercropping system | 1.27                        | 1.27                   | 1.12                              | 1.11                   | 119.28                              | 119.13                 | +0.58                                      | +0.56                  | -0.58                                      | -0.56                  |
| LSD at 5%            | 0.11                        | 0.17                   | 0.15                              | 0.13                   | 12.98                               | 14.83                  | 0.29                                       | 0.22                   | 0.29                                       | 0.22                   |

**Influence of intercropping garlic on phytonematodes infesting soil of grapevine orchard:**

Intercropping garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) significantly ( $P \leq 0.05$ ) decreased numbers of phytonematodes (Table 10). The inhibitory effect varied according to garlic sample and nematode species. The highest values were detected with 1E and 3F site samples with percent reduction reached 97.0, 93.4; 76.66, 74.89;

89.26, 93.71; 93.64, 92.24 and 92.36, 91.78 %, with *M. incognita*, *R.reniformis.*, *Pratylenchus* spp., *Helicotylenchus* spp. and *Tylenchorhyncus* spp., respectively. While, the lowest values were observed with 2F with percent reduction of 72.19, 63.83, 93.0, 89.72 and 89.43 % with *M. incognita*, *R.reniformis*, *Pratylenchus* spp., *Helicotylenchus* spp. and *Tylenchorhyncus* spp., respectively.

**Table 10. Effect of garlic intercropping on numbers of *Meloidogyne incognita*, *R.reniformis*, *Pratylenchus* spp., *Helicotylenchus* spp. and *Tylenchorhyncus* spp. under field condition in 2018/2019 season**

| Site/Treatments  | <i>M. incognita</i> | <i>R. reniformis</i> | <i>Pratylenchus</i> spp. | <i>Helicotylenchus</i> spp. | <i>Tylenchorhyncus</i> spp. |
|------------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Control          | 23.10a              | 175.70a              | 17.70a                   | 40.90a                      | 39.30a                      |
| 1E Intercropping | 0.60b               | 41.00b               | 1.90b                    | 2.60b                       | 3.00b                       |
| Reduction %      | (97.40)             | (76.66)              | (89.26)                  | (93.64)                     | (92.36)                     |
| Control          | 26.00a              | 201.80a              | 10.50a                   | 33.20a                      | 48.80a                      |
| 2E Intercropping | 2.50b               | 49.50b               | 1.60b                    | 3.50b                       | 4.30b                       |
| Reduction %      | (90.38)             | (75.47)              | (84.76)                  | (89.45)                     | (91.18)                     |
| Control          | 22.30a              | 160.10a              | 18.70a                   | 25.30a                      | 30.30a                      |
| 2F Intercropping | 6.20b               | 57.90b               | 1.30b                    | 2.60b                       | 3.20b                       |
| Reduction %      | (72.19)             | (63.83)              | (93.04)                  | (89.72)                     | (89.43)                     |
| Control          | 24.40a              | 192.40a              | 17.50a                   | 24.50a                      | 43.80a                      |
| 3F Intercropping | 1.60b               | 48.30b               | 1.10b                    | 1.90b                       | 3.60b                       |
| Reduction%       | (93.44)             | (74.89)              | (93.71)                  | (92.24)                     | (91.78)                     |

\* Values represent number of nematodes per 250 g soil.

\* Each value is a mean of 5 replicates.

\* Values in brackets indicate % reduction

$$\text{Reduction } (\%) = \frac{\text{Control} - \text{Treated}}{\text{Control}} \times 100$$



The parallel values in the second season (Table 11) were 63.09, 39.24, 87.50, 88.90 and 88.14% with *M.incognita*, *R.reniformis*, *Pratylenchus* spp., *Helicotylenchus* spp. and *Tylenchorhyncus* spp., respectively. Generally as shown in Tables (10 and 11), intercropping garlic caused marked decrease in population density of tested plant parasitic nematodes. Intercropping was more effective in the first season compared to that in the second one.

Due to restrictions governing the use of nematicides and chemical soil fumigants in place, environmentally friendly or sustainable control options are in demand on

conventional as well as organic farms. Among eco-friendly methods used to control plant parasitic nematodes (PPNs), a practical strategy such as intercropping was used in organic farms especially in intensively-cultivated greenhouse and field production (Liu et al., 2006). Sulphur compounds which found in liliaceous crops, such as *Allium sativum* L., *Allium cepa* L. and *Allium fistulosum* L., are hydrolyzed to form a variety of isochiocyanates with broad nematicidal, fungicidal, antibiotic and phytotoxic effects (Choi et al., 2007). Moreover, the release of sulfur-containing compounds from garlic playing an important role in controlling phytonematodes (Biao Gong et al., 2013).

**Table 11. Intercropping effect of garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) on numbers of IJs of *Meloidogyne incognita*, *Rotylenchulus* spp., *Pratylenchus* spp., *Helicotylenchus* spp. and *Tylenchorhyncus* spp. under field condition in 2019/2020 season**

| Site/Treatments | <i>M. incognita</i> | <i>R. reniformis</i> | <i>Pratylenchus</i> spp. | <i>Helicotylenchus</i> spp. | <i>Tylenchorhyncus</i> spp. |         |
|-----------------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|---------|
| 1E              | Control             | 17.60a               | 109.90a                  | 7.50a                       | 34.10a                      | 37.50a  |
|                 | Intercropping       | 0.60 b               | 41.00b                   | 1.60b                       | 2.60b                       | 3.00b   |
|                 | Reduction %         | (96.59)              | (62.69)                  | (78.66)                     | (92.37)                     | (92.00) |
| 2E              | Control             | 18.70a               | 128.80 a                 | 8.80a                       | 25.70a                      | 43.30a  |
|                 | Intercropping       | 2.50b                | 49.50b                   | 1.90 b                      | 3.50b                       | 4.30b   |
|                 | Reduction %         | (86.63)              | (61.56)                  | (78.40)                     | (86.38)                     | (90.06) |
| 2F              | Control             | 16.80a               | 95.30a                   | 10.40a                      | 23.60a                      | 27.00a  |
|                 | Intercropping       | 6.20b                | 57.90b                   | 1.30b                       | 2.60b                       | 3.20b   |
|                 | Reduction %         | (63.09)              | (39.24)                  | (87.50)                     | (88.98)                     | (88.14) |
| 3F              | Control             | 15.80a               | 101.60 a                 | 9.80a                       | 18.90a                      | 35.80a  |
|                 | Intercropping       | 1.60b                | 48.30b                   | 1.10b                       | 1.90b                       | 3.60b   |
|                 | Reduction%          | (89.87)              | (52.6)                   | (88.77)                     | (89.94)                     | (89.94) |

\* Values represent number of nematodes per 250 g soil.

\* Each value is a mean of 5 replicates.

\* Values in brackets indicate % reduction

$$\text{Reduction (\%)} = \frac{\text{Control} - \text{Treated}}{\text{Control}} \times 100$$

Many literatures have been assembled expressing that Garlic’s residues can produce the damage to vegetable crops by nematode and other soil-borne diseases (Park et al., 2005; Choi et al., 2007; Danquah et al., 2011).

Intercropping significantly increased root dry weight, and much less substantially shoot dry weight and plant height (Zhang et al., 2015). Chinese leek possesses a high resistance to root knot nematodes, has strong nematicidal activity against *M. incognita* and can significantly reduce the incidence of disease caused by nematodes (Huang et al., 2016).

Youssef and El-Nagdi, 2012 showed that nematode criteria decreased in sugar beet roots intercropped with garlic, either three or six months after inoculation and the reduction due to garlic cloves contain pyruvic acid and ammonia together with diallyl disulphide. Moreover, Nigh, 1985 revealed that garlic possess biochemical substances of which allelopathic substances are toxic to nematodes or garlic contents of allelopathic substances or that garlic did not provide essential elements for nematode development. The population of *R. reniformis* and *M. incognita* were significantly reduced in garlic monoculture or when garlic was intercropped with vegetables such as tomato (Ameen ,1996).

The combination between different control methods (cultural, chemical, resistant cultivars, intercropping and naturally occurring biological control agents) could be playing a significant role in the management of phytonematodes (Abd-Elgawad, 2019).

Generally, obtained results clear that the intercropping system can be a way to produce more income and reducing the cost of the utilized resources with efficient way.

## CONCLUSION

The present study showed that intercropping of garlic (*Balady cv*) with grapevines (*Flame Seedless cv*) affects growth and productivity of the two species and also the competitive indices between them. This system of intercropping is promising in line of sustainable production. Also, intercropping garlic with grapevines was effective in reducing damage caused by the root-knot nematode, *M.incognita* which considered the most destructive PPNS, and increased yield of grapevine. All these benefits were achieved without adding or modify the used irrigation and fertilization programme of grapevines. They could be used by the producers under the same conditions as it is a profitable systems of cultivation with high yield advantages. Garlic plants were effective in reducing number of nematode and increased grape production as a result of the release of sulfur compounds likely, which playing a main role.

## REFERENCES

A.O.A.C. (2012). Official methods of analysis. 19<sup>th</sup> edition. 2<sup>nd</sup> revision. Gaithersburg, MD, USA, Association of Official Analytical Chemists.

- Abd-Elgawad, M. M. M. (2019). Plant-parasitic nematodes of strawberry in Egypt: a review. *Bulletin of the National Research Centre*, 43:47.
- AbouZid, S. and A. Mohamed (2011). Survey on medicinal plants and spices used in Beni-Sueif, Upper Egypt. *J. Ethnobiol. Ethnomed.*, 7:18.
- Akhtar, M. (2000). Nematicidal potential of the neem tree *Azadirachta indica* (A. Juss). *Integrated Pest Management Reviews*, 5: 57–66.
- Ali, A. A.; S. M. A. Elmasry and M. A. I. Abdelkader (2019). Response of productivity and competitive indices of pomegranate trees, sweet basil and rosemary to different intercropping systems. *International Journal of Environment*, 8 (1): 32-42.
- Ameen, H.H.(1996).Influence of garlic *Allium sativum* on populations of *Rotylenchulus reniformis* and *Meloidogyne incognita* infecting cowpea and tomato. *Al-Azhar J. Agric. Res.*, 23:77–85.
- Analytical Software (2008). Statistix Version 9, Analytical Software, Tallahassee, Florida, USA.
- Bhatnagar, P.; M. K. Kaul and J. Singh (2007). Effect of intercropping in Kinnow based production system. *Indian Journal of Arid Horticulture*, 2 (1): 15-17.
- Biao Gong; Sean Blossies; Xiu Li; Min Wei; Fengjuan Yang; Qinghua Shi and Xiufeng Wang (2013). Efficacy of garlic straw application against root-knot nematodes on tomato. *Scientia Horticulturae*, 161: 49-57.
- Cecilio, A. B.; B. L. A. Rezende; J. C. Barbosa and L. C. Grangeiro (2011). Agronomic efficiency of intercropping tomato and lettuce. *An. Acad. Bras. Cienc.*, 83 (3): 1109–1119.
- Chapman, H. and P. Pratt (1978). *Methods of Analysis for Soils, Plants and Waters*. Div. Agric. Sci., Univ. Calif. USA., 16-38.
- Chitwood, D.J. (2002). Phytochemicals based strategies for nematode control. *Annual Review of Phytopathology*, 40: 221-249.
- Choi, I.H.; S.C. Shin. and I.K. Park (2007). Nematicidal activity of onion (*Allium cepa*) oil and its components against the pine wood nematode (*Bursaphelenchus xylophilus*). *Nematology* 9: 231–235.
- Coyne, D.L.; H.H. Fourie and M. Moens (2009). Current and future management strategies in resource-poor farming. Pp:444-475, In :*RootKnot Nematodes*, Eds: Perry R.N., Moens M., Starr J.L., Wallingford, UK:CAB Int.
- Danquah, W.B.;M.A. Back; I.G.Grove andP.P.J. Haydock (2011). *In vitro* nematicidal activity of a garlic extract and salicylaldehyde on the potato cyst nematode *Globodera pallida*. *Nematology*, 13(7): 869-885.
- Eisenback, J.D.; H. Hirschmann, J.W. Sasser and A.C. Traintaphyllous (1981). *A Guide Key to the Four Most Common Species of Root-Knot Nematodes (Meloidogyne spp.) with pictorial key*. Cooperative Publication of the Departments of Plant Pathology and Genetics, North Carolina State Univ. and United State Agency for Int. Develop., Raleigh, North Carolina, 48.
- FAO (2017). FAOSTAT. Statistical Database. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, Rome, Italy.
- Francis, F. J. (2000). Anthocyanins and betalains: composition and applications. *Cereal Foods World* 45: 208-213.
- Gommers, F.J. (1981). Biochemical interactions between nematodes and plants and their relevance to control. *Helminthological Abstracts*, 50 :9-24.
- Gong, B., Blossies, S., Li, X., Wei, M., Yang, F., Shi, Q., and Wang, X. (2013). Efficacy of garlic straw application against root-knot nematodes on tomato. *Scientia horticulturae*, 161, 49-57.
- Hamma, I. L.; U. Ibrahim and A. B. Mohammed (2013). Growth, yield and economic performance of garlic (*Allium sativum* L.) as influenced by farm yard manure and spacing in Zaria, Nigeria. *Journal of Agricultural Economics and Development*, 2(1):1-5.
- Hauggaard-Nielsen, H. and E.S. Jensen, (2005). Facilitative root interactions in intercrops. *Plant and Soil*, 274 (1-2): 237–250.
- Hiebsch, C.K. and R.E. McCollum (1987). Area×time equivalency ratio: a method for evaluating the productivity of intercrops. *Agron. J.*, 79: 15–22.
- Hopper, D.J.; Hallmann, J. and Subbotin, S.A. (2005). Methods of extraction, processing and detection of plant and soil nematodes. Pp 53-84. In: *Plant Parasitic Nematodes in Subtropical and Tropical Agriculture*. Eds: Luc M.; Sikora A.R. and Bridge J., CAB International, Wallingford, UK.
- Huang, Yong-hong, ; Mao, Zhen-chuan and Xie, Bing-yan (2016). Chinese leek (*Allium tuberosum* Rottler ex Sprengel) reduced disease symptom caused by root-knot nematode. *Journal of Integrative Agriculture*, 15(2): 364–372.
- Javanmard, A.; A. D. M. Nasab; A. Javanshir; M. Moghaddam and H. Janmohammadi (2009). Forage yield and quality in intercropping of maize with different legumes as double-cropped. *J. Food Agric. Environ.*, 7 (1): 163–166.
- Jiang, Z.; L. Gao, Y. Fang and X. Sun (1994). Analysis of Paulownia-intercropping types and their benefits in Woyang County of Anhui Province. *Forest Ecology and Management*, 67 (1-3): 329-337.
- Kanwar, J.S.; S.S. Brar, and H. R. Chopra (1993). Status of intercropping of orchards in the Punjab. *Punjab Hort. J.*, 33: 109-115.
- Kumari, S.; S. Kumar and A. Kavita (2018). Onion as vegetable intercrop in mango mother tree orchard augments yield and economic return. *Int. J. Curr. Microbiol. App. Sci.*, 7 (3): 3441-3446.
- Liu, Y.; J. Hua; Y. Jiang and D. Wen (2006). Nematode communities in greenhouse soil of different ages from Shenyang suburb. *Helminthologia*, 43(1):51-55.
- Mai, W.F. and H.H. Lyon (1975). *Pectoral key to genera of plant parasitic nematodes*. Cornell Univ. Press, Ithaca, New York, 219 pp.
- Mason, S. C.; D. E. Leihner and J. J. Vorst (1986). Cassava-cowpea and cassava-peanut intercropping. 1. yield and land use efficiency. *Agron. J.*, 78: 43-46.

- Mc Gilchrist, C.A. (1965). Analysis of competition experiments. *Biometrics*, 21: 975- 985.
- Mead, R. and R.W. Willey (1980). The concept of a 'land equivalent ratio' and advantages in yields from intercropping. *Exp. Agric.*, 16: 217-228.
- Mukhtar, T.; A. Jabbar; M. U. Raja and H. Javed, (2018). Management of root-knot nematode, *Meloidogyne incognita*, in tomato with two *Trichoderma* species. *Pakistan J. Zool.*, 50: 1195-1198.
- Nandi, P. and S.N. Ghosh (2016). Effect of medicinal plants as intercrop on plant and soil of Mosambi sweet orange grown in laterite soil. *International Journal of Minor Fruits, Medicinal and Aromatic Plants*, 2 (2): 11-13.
- Nigh, E.L. (1985). Allelopathic activity of plants to nematode. *J. Nematol.*, 17:518. (abstract).
- Ntalli, N.G. and P. Caboni (2012). Botanical nematicides: a review. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 60: 9929-9940.
- Osman, H.A.; A.Y. El-Gindi; H.H. Ameen; M.M.A. Youssef and A.M. Lashein (2005). Evaluation of the nematocidal effects of smashed garlic, sincocin and nemaless on the root-knot nematode *Meloidogyne incognita* infecting cowpea plants. *Bull. Nat. Res. Centre*, 30:297-305.
- Peppi, M. C.; M. W. Fidelibus and N. Dokoozlian (2006). Abscisic acid application timing and concentration affect firmness, pigmentation, and color of 'Flame Seedless' grapes. *HortScience* 41: 1440-1445.
- Ravichandra, N.G. (2018). *Horticultural nematology*. New Delhi, Heidelberg, New York, Dordrecht, Springer Publishing, London, UK, 412 pp.
- Reddy, P. P. (2008). *Diseases of horticultural crops: nematode problems and their management*, Jodhpur: Scientific Publishers, 379pp.
- Siddiqi, M.R. (1986). *Tylenchida, parasites of plants and insects*. C.A.B. Commons. Inst. Parasit. ; Slough, UK, 645 pp.
- Sujatha, S.; R. Bhat; C. Kannan and D. Balasimha (2011). Impact of intercropping of medicinal and aromatic plants with organic farming approach on resource use efficiency in arecanut (*Areca catechu* L.) plantation in India. *Industrial Crops and Products*, 33: 78-83.
- Suvera, A. H.; N. S. Thakur and S. K. Jha (2015). Herbage and essential oil yield of *Ocimum* spp. intercropped under *Pongamia pinnata* based silvi-medicinal systems in Gujarat, India. *The Bioscan International Journal of life science*, 10 (1): 81-85.
- Whitehead, A. G. (1998). *Plant nematode control*. CAB International, Wallingford, UK.
- Youssef, M.M.A. and W., M.A. El-Nagdi (2012). Antagonistic potential of certain legumes to *Meloidogyne incognita* on sugar beet. *Archives of Phytopathology and Plant Protection*, 45 (14): 1724-1731
- Zhang, X.H.; D.Y. Lang ; E.H. Zhang and Y.J. Zhang, (2015). Effect of intercropping of *Angelica sinensis* with garlic on its growth and rhizosphere microflora. *Int. J. Agric. Biol.*, 17: 554-560.

## تقييم تأثير تحميل الثوم مع العنب على الإنتاجية والمعالجة النباتية والعلاقات التنافسية ومجتمع النيما تودا المتطفلة على النبات

فريد سامي محسن<sup>1</sup>، رمضان محمد أحمد العشري<sup>2</sup> وهاني جمال زيادة<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> قسم البساتين (فاكهة) - كلية الزراعة - جامعة الزقازيق - مصر.

<sup>2</sup> قسم وقاية النبات - كلية الزراعة - جامعة الزقازيق - مصر.

<sup>3</sup> قسم البساتين (خضراوات) - كلية الزراعة - جامعة الزقازيق - مصر.

أجري هذا البحث خلال شتاء الموسمين المتتاليين (2019/2018 و 2020/2019) على كرمات العنب "صنف فليم سيدلس" عمرها 9 سنوات مزروعة في مزرعة عنب خاصة بمنطقة أبو حماد بمحافظة الشرقية، مصر، تمت زراعة الثوم (صنف البلدي) مع العنب (صنف فليم سيدلس) على خطوط الري بالتنقيط، كما تم زراعتها كمحصول منفرد للمقارنة، كان الهدف من هذه التجارب هو تقييم مكونات محصول العنب وجودته بالإضافة إلى نمو وإنتاجية نباتات الثوم والعلاقات التنافسية بينهما، بالإضافة إلى محاولة تقليل أعداد النيما تودا التي تصيب العنب. بالنسبة للعنب، أشارت النتائج المتحصل عليها إلى أن زراعة الثوم (صنف البلدي) مع العنب أدت إلى زيادة عدد الحبات لكل عنقود ووزن مائة حبة وقوة شد الحبة مع عدم وجود فرق معنوي بين الزراعة تحملاً وزراعة العنب منفرداً، كما لوحظ نفس الاتجاه فيما يتعلق بالنسبة للمواد الصلبة الذاتية الكلية والمحتوى من الأنتوسيانين والمحصول لكل كرمة، وكذلك وزن وعرض العنقود وطول الحبة وقطر الحبة ومؤشر شكل الحبة. أما بالنسبة للثوم، أشارت النتائج المتحصل عليها إلى أن ارتفاع النبات، وعدد الأوراق لكل نبات، والوزن الطازج للأوراق لكل نبات، وقطر العنق، وقطر البصلة، وارتفاع البصلة ووزن البصلة لكل نبات، انخفض بفاوق غير معنوي عند تحميل الثوم مع العنب عند المقارنة بالكنترول، وأظهرت العلاقات التنافسية مثل نسبة المكافئ الأرضي، ونسبة المكافئ الأرضي لوحدة الزمن، وكفاءة استخدام الأرض، وقد خلصت الدراسة إلى أن تحميل الثوم (صنف البلدي) مع كروم العنب كانت أكثر فائدة من نظام الزراعة المنفردة لكروم العنب، كما أظهر تقدير العدوانية أن العنب كان سائداً، بينما كان الثوم هو المسود عليه، علاوة على ذلك أدت زراعة الثوم محملاً مع العنب إلى انخفاض واضح في أعداد النيما تودا، ويعد استخدام الثوم مع عوامل المكافحة الحيوية الأخرى في بساتين العنب من وسائل المكافحة الصديقة للبيئة وتظهر فعالية كبيرة في خفض أعداد النيما تودا المتطفلة على النبات.