EFFECT OF LEAF CLIPPING AND VARIETY ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF MUNGBEAN

MD. FARUK AHMED

DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY

SHER-E-BANGLA AGRICULTURAL UNIVERSITY

SHER-E-BANGLA NAGAR, DHAKA -1207

JUNE, 2017

EFFECT OF LEAF CLIPPING AND VARIETY ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF MUNGBEAN.

BY

MD. FARUK AHMED
REGISTRATION NO.: 10-04170

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Agriculture,
Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka,
in partial fulfilment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

IN

AGRONOMY

SEMESTER: JANUARY-JUNE, 2017

Approved by:

(Prof. Dr. Md. Shahidul Islam)
Supervisor

(Prof. Dr. Md. Fazlul Karim)
Co-Supervisor

(Prof. Dr. Md. Shahidul Islam)
Chairman
Examination Committee

DEPARTMENT OF AGRONOMY
Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University
Sher-e-Bangla Nagar, Dhaka-1207

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the thesis entitled ***"EFFECT OF LEAF CLIPPING AND VARIETY ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF MUNGBEAN"*** *submitted to the Faculty of Agriculture, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of* ***MASTER OF SCIENCE IN AGRONOMY****, embodies the result of a piece of bonafide research work carried out by* ***MD. FARUK AHMED, Registration No.: 10-04170,*** *under my supervision and guidance. No part of this thesis has been submitted for any other degree or diploma.*

I further certify that any help or sources of information as has been availed of during the course of this work has been duly acknowledged & style of the thesis have been approved and recommended for submission.

Dated:

Dhaka, Bangladesh

Professor Dr. Md. Shahidul Islam
Supervisor
Department of Agronomy
Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University
Dhaka-1207

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Alhamdulillah, all praises are due to the almighty Allah for his gracious kindness and infinite mercy in all the endeavors the author to let him successfully complete the research work and the thesis leading to Master of Science.

*The author would like to express his heartfelt gratitude and most sincere appreciations to his supervisor **Dr. Md. Shahidul Islam**, Professor and Chairman, Department of Agronomy, Faculty of Agriculture, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, for his valuable guidance, advice, immense help, encouragement and support throughout the study.*

*Likewise grateful appreciation is conveyed to co-supervisor **Dr. Md. Fazlul Karim,** Professor, Department of Agronomy, Faculty of Agriculture, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, for constant encouragement, cordial suggestions, constructive criticisms and valuable advice to complete the thesis.*

The author would like to express his deepest respect and boundless gratitude to all the respectable teachers of the Department of Agronomy, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, for their valuable teaching, sympathetic co-operation and inspirations throughout the course of this study and research work.

The author wishes to extend his special thanks to Yeasinul Haque and Iqbal Mahmood for their help during experimentation. Special thanks to all other friends for their support and encouragement to complete this study.

The author is deeply indebted to his father and grateful to his respectable mother and other relatives for their moral support, encouragement and love with cordial understanding.

Finally the author appreciates the assistance rendered by the staffs of the Department of Agronomy and Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University central Farm, Dhaka, who have helped him during the period of study.

The author

EFFECT OF LEAF CLIPPING AND VARIETY ON GROWTH AND YIELD OF MUNGBEAN

ABSTRACT

The experiment was conducted at the research plot of Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University Farm, Dhaka during the period from February 2017 to June 2017 to study the effect of leaf clipping and variety on growth and yield of mungbean. The treatment consisted of two leaf clipping *viz.* C_o=No leaf clipping (control), C_1=Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescence) and six mungbean varieties *viz.* V_1 = BARI Mung-1, V_2 = BARI Mung-2, V_3 = BARI Mung-3, V_4 = BARI Mung-4, V_5 = BARI Mung-5, V_6 = BARI Mung-6. The experiment was laid out in a two factors randomized complete block design (RCBD) design with three replications. Leaf clipping,vaiety and their interaction had significant influence on growth, yield and yield components of mungbean. The tallest plant was obtained from removal of empty leaf with BARI Mung-3.The highest pod length (9.88 cm), number of pods plant^{-1} (17.13), number of seeds pod^{-1} (12.58), thousand seed weight (55.52 g) was obtained from leaf clipping with BARI Mung-6 treatment. The highest seed yield (1.61 t ha^{-1}) was obtained from BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping treatment combination while the lowest (0.78 t ha^{-1}) from BARI Mung-1 with control treatment. The most of the parameters gave the best performance which was achieved from BARI Mung-6. Again, leaf clipping showed the best performance regarding most of the yield and yield contributing parameters. In case of combined effect, BARI Mung-6 and removal of empty leaf clipping gave the best result considering yield and yield contributing parameters.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF APPENDICES

LIST OF ACRONYMS

AEZ	=	Agro-Ecological Zone
BARI	=	Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute
BBS	=	Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics
CV%	=	Percentage of coefficient of variance
cv.	=	Cultivar
DAS	=	Days after sowing
g	=	gram (s)
ha^{-1}	=	Per hectare
HI	=	Harvest Index
Hr	=	Hour
kg	=	Kilogram
LAI	=	Leaf area index
LSD	=	Least Significant Difference
Max	=	Maximum
Min	=	Minimum
mm	=	millimeter
MoP	=	Muriate of Potash
N	=	Nitrogen
NAA	=	Naphthalene acetic acid
No.	=	Number
NPK	=	Nitrogen, Phosphorus and Potassium
NS	=	Not significant
ppm	=	Parts per million
RCBD	=	Randomized complete block design
RWC	=	Relative water content
SAU	=	Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University
SRDI	=	Soil Resources and Development Institute
T	=	Ton
TSP	=	Triple Super Phosphate

viz.	=	Videlicet (namely)
Wt.	=	Weight
WUE	=	Water use efficiency

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek) is one of the leading pulse crop of Bangladesh. This commonly grown pulse crop belongs to the family Fabaceae. It ranks 4th position in respect of acreages and production among the pulses in Bangladesh (BBS, 2011). According to FAO (1999), per capita requirement of pulse is 80g/head/day, whereas it is only 10g/head/day in Bangladesh (BBS, 2006). On the nutritional point of view, mungbean is one of the best among pulses (Khan, 1981). Pulses constitute the main source of protein for the people, particularly the poor sections of Bangladesh. It is also the best source of protein for domestic animals. Besides, it has the capability to enrich soils through nitrogen fixation. Its seeds contain 51% carbohydrate, 26% protein, 3% minerals and 3% vitamins (Kaul, 1982). It is widely used as“Dal” in the country like other pulses. It contains almost double amount of protein as compared to cereals. It has a good digestibility and flavor. It is one of the most important pulse crop in our country for its high digestability, good flavor and high protein content. The green plants are used as animal feed and the residues as manure. Mungbean is a crop of short duration and drought tolerant and can grow with a minimum supply of nutrients. In Bangladesh, mungbean grows well all over the country.The total production of mungbean in Bangladesh was 32000 metric tons from an area of 39,285 hectare of land with average yield of about 0.81 t ha^{-1} during 2013-14 (BBS, 2016).Mungbean also improves physical, chemical and biological properties of soil by fixing nitrogen from atmosphere through symbiosis and hence it had played a central role in sustainable agriculture (Kannaiyan, 1999).The rice based cropping pattern has been found as an important cropping system in our country. Besides this, increasing area under wheat and maize cultivation has further reduced the area under pulses. The country is also facing an acute shortage of mungbean due to low yield. The reasons for low yield are varietal and agronomic management. Due to the shortage of land, the scope of its extensive cultivation is very limited. The agro-ecological condition of Bangladesh is favourable for munbean cultivation almost throughout the year. The crop is usually cultivated during rabi season. Now a days this crop has been well accepted by the farmers in southern and barind area of Bangladesh.

Excessive leaf development in mungbean during the later growth stages was found to be detrimental to seed yield (Patel *et al.,* 1992). Production of leaves, particular in the lower part of the plant often causes mutual shading resulting in yield reduction. Total dry matter production is positively correlated with the amount of foliage displayed in supper 50% of the canopy (Hamid *et al.,* 1990). It seems like that the foliage developed in the lower part of the canopy has little or negative contribution to dry matter production. Thus manipulation of source may provide opportunity for increasing yield in plants having habit of excessive leaf development. Inadequate leaf production in the vegetative phase indicates that during the post-flowering phase, when the sink activity was high, most photosynthates required for the growth and development of pods comes from the current photosynthesis (Kuo *et al.,* 1978). In some situations, physical leaf is adequate and even more than required, but the functional efficiency is far lower due to utilizing resources as a respiratory burden of excessive leaves (Venkateswarlu and Visperas, 1987; Mondal, 2007). Removal of apical shoot above node 5 or removal of inflorescence or axillary bud at nodes 1-4 together with the apical shoot greatly increased pod number and seed weight of mungbean (Clifford, 1979).The leaves at flowering nodes are the major contributors to seed filling and development (AVRDC, 1974). One third leaf removal from basal portion of the canopy in cowpea increased grain yield over control and severe defoliation decreased seed yield (Hossain *et al*., 2006).Greater light penetration in the canopy through defoliation has reduced the abortion of flowers and immature pods and increased seed yield in mungbean (Mondal, 2007). It is therefore imperative that for high yield formation in mungbean, plants should have adequate foliage development prior to pod development stage. Genotypic differences in leaf area development in mungbean have been reported (Hamid *et al.,* 1994). Reverse results of defoliation was also reported in mungbean (Rao and Ghildiyal 1985).No detail information is available in mungbean about source-sink relationships under discriminated source levels.

In spite of the best efforts for improving the mungbean varieties, the yield of this crop remains low. Besides this; Traditional varieties of pulse crop possess greater sources than sink, leads to poor crop performance especially when fertilization and cultural practices result in greater foliage and poor productivity (Hossain*et al*., 2006). Recently, Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute (BARI) has developed six and Bangladesh Institute of Nuclear Agriculture (BINA) has developed seven photo-sensitive high yielding cultivars of mungbean, which are getting attention to the farmers. During kharif season the crop fits well into the existing cropping system of many areas in Bangladesh.

This study was thus carried out to investigate the magnitude and positions of leaf clipping at flower initiation of mungbean in response of growth, reproductive characters and seed yield under field condition in mungbean. The present study was undertaken with the following objectives:

1. To determine the effect of leaf clipping on growth and yield of mungbean
2. To evaluate the performance of six varieties of mungbean
3. To study the combined influence of leaf clipping and variety towards maximum yield of mungbean.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A good number of research works on different aspects of mungbean production have been done by research workers in and outside of the country, especially in the South East Asia for the improvement of mungbean production. Recently Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute (BARI) and Bangladesh Institute of Nuclear Agriculture (BINA) have started research on varietal development and improvement of this crop. Research work related to the study of reproductive behaviour of mungbean was reviewed and presented in this chapter.

2.1 Effect leaf cliping on growth and yield of mungbean

Alam *et al.* (2008) conducted a research work at Agronomy Field Laboratory, Department of Agronomy and Agricultural Extension, University of Rajshahi, Rajshahi, Bangladesh during the period from 2005 to 2006 with twenty wheat genotypes to study the effect of source-sink manipulation on grain yield. Significant variations among the genotypes were observed for grains spike^{-1}, 100-grain weight and grain yield spike^{-1}. He reported that, removal of flag leaf caused decrease in grains spike^{-1}, 100-grain weight and grain yield main spike^{-1} by 9.94%, 7.65% and 16.88%, respectively compared to the treatment of no leaf removal .

Alexander *et. al.* (1982) investigated the effect of clipping frequency on competition between *Lolium perenne* and *Agrostis tenuiswas*. The yield of clippings of both species increased and then declined during the 12-week period of the experiment, but the clip yield of *Lolium* was always significantly greater than that of *Agrostis*. *Lolium* was clearly the better competitor in unclipped controls. The proportion of the biomass contributed to the mixture by *Agrostis* increased as the interval between clips decreased. Tiller production was unaffected by increased clipping frequency in *Lolium* but was increased in *Agrostis*. Total yield was much more drastically reduced by frequent clipping in *Lolium* than in *Agrostis*, where yield was practically unaffected by wide variations in clipping frequency. The results were in agreement with the field distributions of the two species. They also suggested that the differences in height and response to clipping are likely to confound any attempt to monitor the progress of competition experiments by measuring the yield of clippings.

Ali *et al.* (2008) carried out an experiment where five spring wheat varieties were utilized to study the contribution of flag leaf and awns on grain yield and its attributes. The characters associated with the photosynthetic activity were examined in relation to the grain yield and its attributes. The study revealed significant variation among different varieties, treatments and varieties × treatment. The treatments (removal of flag leaf, awns & both) caused considerable reduction in grain yield and its related characters. Removal of flag leaf had less effect on yield and related components than awns detachment. Nonetheless the detachment of flag leaf + awns revealed greater effects than individual treatment. Flag leaf area, awn length, number of grains spike^{-1} and 1000 grain weight demonstrated positive and significant association with grain yield plant^{-1}. Number of grains spike^{-1}, grain weight spike^{-1} and 1000 grain weight exhibited the maximum heritability and genetic advance over different treatments. The study investigated the presence of strong source-sink association of both flag leaf and awns with grain yield hence these traits could be used as morphological markers for selection of wheat genotypes having superior photosynthetic activity and higher grain yield.

Arzadún (2006) in Argentinean Pampas, new wheat (*Triticum aestivum* L.) cultivars were routinely introduced to farmers for dual-purpose production. The objective of this study was to evaluate the effect of planting date, clipping height on forage, and grain yield for wheat cultivars. Treatments were arranged as a 3 × 3 × 3 factorial distributed in a split-split plot within a randomized complete block design. Main plots were planting date (March, April, and May); split-plots were clipping height (3 cm, 7 cm, and no clipping); and split-split plots were a facultative cultivar Pincen, and two nonfacultative cultivars Charrua and Bordenave 223 (Bve223). In 1995 and 1996 forage yield decreased in response to a delayed planting date from March to May, whereas in 1997 it was not affected by planting date. The 3-cm clipping height yielded 21% more forage than plots clipped at 7 cm. Bve223 and Charrua produced significantly more forage than Pincen each year. Grain yield increased as planting date progressed from March to May. Clipping at 3 cm reduced grain yield compared with no clipping, while during 2 to 3 yr, 7 cm produced no significant change in grain yield compared with no clipping. In all years Bve223 produced more grain than Charrua or Pincen. Forage yield lost in response to later planting date ranged between 0 and 81% during the 3 yr; whereas grain yield increased from 40 to 190% for wheat planted in May compared with March. In conclusion, dual-purpose wheat planted during April had both good forage and grain production, and its success was influenced by cultivars.

Birsin *et al.* (2005) conducted an experiment in the experimental field of the Field Crops Department, Faculty of Agriculture, Ankara University during 1999 and 2001. Two wheat cultivars, Gerek-79 and Gün-9, were studied to examine the impacts of removing some photosynthetic structures including flag leaf, second upper leaf blade and awns on some yield related components. The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design of split-plot restriction with four replications. Removal of flag leaf resulted approximately 13, 34, 24 % reduction in grain spike^{-1}, grain weight spike^{-1} and 1000-grain weight, respectively and 2.8% increase in grain protein contents in both years. Studies indicated that significant reductions in these traits and increases in grain protein contents resulted from removal of second upper leaf blade and awns.

Biswas and Hamid (1992) reported the distribution of photosynthate within a plant represents a coordinated response between photosynthetic production by source leaves and assimilated demand of sinks. Mungbean is an herbaceous plant with indeterminate growth habit. Grain yield of mungbean is determined largely by the availability of assimilates after flowering to grain formation and by the grain capacity to accept the assimilates. The yield of final grain number and potential grain size can be termed as sink capacity. Several workers studied the growth characteristics of Mungbean. Mungbean grows slowly in the growing season picks up gradually and reaches peak at flowering. Dry matter accumulation in the vegetative phase can barely support the growth characteristics. Senescence in mungbean is rather slow and hence leaves remain active till the later phase of reproductive development.

Busso *et al*. (1995) carried out an experiment where tiller demography and growth were determined for clipped and unclipped plants of crested wheatgrass (*Agropyron desertorum*) and bluebunch wheatgrass *Pseudoroegneria spicata* under drought, natural or irrigated conditions from 1984 until 1986. Mild water stress during the 1984 growing season did not reduce herbage accumulation at the end of that season on plants of both species. Green leaf number, rate of leaf initiation, height and total green leaf area were all reduced on tillers of both species when predawn leaf xylem pressure potentials fell below 2·5 MPa during two or more growth periods. In the 3rd year of repeated treatments, the lowest daughter tiller production and growth were observed under the simultaneous influence of drought and clipping. Repeated late and severe leaf clipping of these species under long-term droughts (2 or more years) could then be expected to rapidly reduce their persistence in the community.

Chawdhury *et al*. (1982) indicated seasonal variations in leaf photos synthetic rates in mungbean. Net photosynthetic rate during the post flowering phase was higher which might be related with the sink demand.

Chowdhary *et al.*(1999) also reported that removal of flag leaf significantly reduced number of grains spike^{-1}, 1000-grain weight and grain yield. Similarly, removal of all leaves caused reduction by 17.17%, 13.27% and 27.92% for grains spike^{-1}, 100-grain weight and grain yield spike^{-1} respectively.

Clifford (1979). suggested that removal of apical shoot above node 5 or removal of inflorescence or auxiliary buds at nodes 1-4 together with the apical shoot greatly increased pod number and seed weight of mungbean.

Davidson (1965) found that the effects on variety Olympic wheat of maintaining the leaf area index (LAI), once attained, at approximately 3 and 1, and of removing whole leaves or half of each leaf at ear emergence, were assessed by comparison with an uncut crop (maximum LAI= 12). Leaf clipping at ear emergence had no significant impact on grain yield. Leaf area maintenance at LAI values of 3 and 1 greatly reduced grain yield by decreasing both grain number spike^{-1} and mean grain weight by about 50%. These effects followed earlier reductions in the rate of development of the shoot apex. The results were discussed in relation to the yields obtained and conclusions reached by English workers, and to possible scope for yield improvement.

Elsahookie *et. al*. (1988) were conducted an experiment to study the effect of leaf clipping on maize (*Zea mays* L.) performance, nine different treatments were tested on an open-pollinated genotype of maize. In the spring grown maize, grain yield plant^{-1} was increased up to 38% for plants with their upper half leaves were cut. Root weight plant^{-1} and modified flowering were also increased. Cutting the whole plant decreased grain yield and caused death of about 50% of plants. Meanwhile, leaf clipping decreased several agronomic traits in the fall grown maize. The results of modified flowering lead to the speculation that genes could change their location on the chromosome and/or material dose when plants be under stressed conditions

Hamid (1989) showed that defoliation at the reproductive stage reduced pod set and grain yield, mid the reduction was proportional to the degree of defoliation. Defoliation affected leaf photosyithetic rates in a number of crop species.

Hamid (1994) demonstrated that the development of· tertiary branches and much of the secondary branches in mungbean is counterproductive. Therefore, mungbean plant types with a maximum of two to three erect branches having shorter and thicker internodes and basal podding might be desirable for high yield potential. The hypothesis is subject to be tested by regulating source sink capacity.

Hamzi *et al*. (2018) conducted a field experiment to study the relationship between sink and source in corn plants, experiment was conducted as a factorial experiment in a Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications. A total of 3 cultivars (301, 604 and 700) and four leaf clippings (without leaf clipping, ear leaf clipping, above ear leaf clipping, and below ear leaf clipping) were used during 2007 crop season. Results showed that oil, grain yield, globulin, glutamine, and carbohydrates were different among cultivars and treatment compositions. Leaf clipping did not affect oil, globulin and carbohydrates but yield and other quality traits were influenced by leaf clipping. Ear leaf clipping and below ear leaf defoliation were ranked second for yield production. The lowest yield was observed in above ear leaf clipping treatment. Overall, all leaf clipping treatments produced similar amounts of oil, globulin and carbohydrates. The highest glutamine was obtained in above ear leaf clipping that was similar with ear leaf clipping treatment. Control treatment had the lowest glutamine similar to ear leaf clipping and below ear leaf clipping treatments. Above ear leaf clipping strongly increased grain prolamine and albumin. The lowest prolamine was obtained from below ear leaf clipping and without leaf clipping treatments. But the minimum grain albumin was belonged to ear leaf clipping. Leaf clipping treatments were ranked in four different groups with aspect to grain albumin concentration whereas control and below leaf clipping treatments had no difference in grain prolamine.

Khalifa *et al.* (2008) conducted several field experiments during two summer seasons of 2003 and 2004 to study the effect of leaf cutting on physiological traits and yield of two rice cultivars hybrid (H_5) (IR 70368 A /G 178) and inbred rice. The leaf cutting was followed from flag leaf as follows: 1.) L; Control = without leaf cutting, 2.) L_1; flag leaf cut, 3.) L_2; second leaf cut, 4.) L_3; third leaf cut, 5.) L_4; both flag leaf and second leaf cut. 6.) L_5; flag leaf, second leaf and third leaf cut together. A split plot design with four replications was used; the main plots were devoted to the cutting of leaves, while the sub-plots were assigned to the two rice cultivars. Chlorophyll, sugar, starch and grain yield parameters were severely affected by L_5, followed by L_4, L_1, L_3 and L_2 in sequence. However, as a single component affecting maximum to these parameters is the removal of flag leaf. The flag leaf contributed maximum to the yield of rice grains. L_5, L_4, L_1, L_2 and L_3 treatments grain yield (relative % of control) by 59.87, 94.92, 44.89, 29.58 and 19.98 % respectively. Flag leaf contributed to 45% of grain yield and is the single most component for yield loss. The contribution of removal of leaf in hybrid rice was minimum, suggesting the probability of maximum translocation of photosynthesis from stem to the grain during grain feeling stage of hybrid rice after leaf removal.

Kumar *et al*. (2016) investigated the virulence of *R. solanacearum* on adult host plants, infection studies of this pathogen on the seedling stages of hosts are less common. In a preliminary observation, inoculation of *R. solanacearum* F1C1 on 6- to 7-day-old tomato seedlings by a simple leaf-clip strategy resulted in a lethal pathogenic condition in seedlings that eventually killed these seedlings within a week post-inoculation. This prompted testing of the effect of this inoculation technique in seedlings from different cultivars of tomato and similar results were obtained. Colonization and spread of the bacteria throughout the infected seedlings was demonstrated using *gus*-tagged *R. solanacearum* F1C1. The same method of inoculating tomato seedlings was used with *R. solanacearum* GMI 1000 and independent mutants of *R. solanacearum* GMI 1000, deficient in the virulence genes *hrpB, hrpG, phcA* and *gspD*. Wildtype *R. solanacearum* GMI 1000 was found to be virulent on tomato seedlings, whereas the mutants were found to be non-virulent. This leaf-clip technique, for inoculation of tomato seedlings, has the potential to be a valuable approach, saving time, space, labour and costs.

Labanauskas and Dungan (1956) evaluated the early growth of branches and tillers requires importing assimilate from the main stem or other branches until they become autotrophic. In oats this usually occurs between the two and four leaf stage Partitioning has been extensively studied in small grain crops. Work in wheat and barley has shown that photosynthesis of the flag leaf, stein arid head which are the closest sources to the grain is the primary contributor to the grain. Lower leaves supply the needs of lower stem and roots.

Lambers (1987) evaluated that the total dry matter yield is the product of leaf photos synthetic activity. Grain yield the biomass production is not correlated with photos synthetic rate. And as a result selection for increased leaf photosynthetic rate has not apparently resulted in any substantial or consistent increase in yield.

Li *et al*. (2004) conducted an experiment to examine how the interactions of nutrient availability and partial ramet clipping affect growth, reproduction and biomass allocation of *Cyperus esculentus*, an invasive sedge. The plants sprouting from tubers were grown at low and high nutrient levels, and were subject either to no clipping, one, two or three clippings, with each clipping cutting half of the existing ramets at soil level. Results showed that nutrient availability and clipping frequency tended to independently affect most of growth, reproduction and biomass allocation parameters of *Cyperus esculentus* examined in that study. Increased supply of nutrients led to an increase in plant productivity and its associated traits. All of the traits, except for the number of ramets, displayed a decreasing pattern with increasing clipping frequency, indicating that *Cyperus esculentus* had undercompensatory responses to ramet clipping. It is likely that the patterns of plants' response to clipping are species specific, and depend on morphological characters of species. Its susceptibility to ramet clipping can offer opportunities for controlling this invasive species through mechanical methods such as mowing. Clipping had little effects on biomass allocation; however, root weight fraction increased with increasing clipping frequency. While nutrient availability and clipping frequency had no influence on leaf carbon concentration at harvest, both of them increased leaf nitrogen concentration, and hence reduced leaf C/N ratio.

Marshal and Wardlaw (1973) reported the strength of the grain as a sink and the relative availability and strength of sources affect the assimilate partitioning. If the top leaves are removed, the lower leaves will supply assimilate to the grain; if the lower leaves are removed the flag leaf will transport assimilate to roots.

Mahmood *et al*. (1997) carried out some studies to investigate the impact of the removal of green photosynthetic structures including flag leaf, 3rd nodal leaf and awns, on yield and some yield related parameters in two local wheat cultivars (Pasban 90 and Inqalab 91). The experiment was conducted in a triplicated randomized complete block design in split-plot fashion. The two varieties differed significantly for flag leaf area, 3rd nodal leaf area, seed set percentage, grains per spike and grain weight per spike. Effect of removing flag leaf (T_2), 3rd nodal leaf (T_3) and awns (T_4) was displayed as reduction in yield attributes. Removal of flag leaf resulted 16.4, 14.8, 34.5 and 20.0% reduction in seed set percentage, grains/spike, grain weight/spike and 100 grain weight, respectively. Reduction in these traits as a consequence of the removal of 3rd nodal leaf and awns was also significant. However the rate of the reduction was less than that of removal of flag leaf. Interaction of varieties and treatments was significant for seed set, grains/spike and 100-grain weight. Both of the varieties exhibits a marked reduction in the four traits studied when the flag leaf was removed. However, Inqalab 91 was found superior to Pasban 90. The result signified the contribution of flag leaf on yield related traits studied. In ranked order maximum contribution occurred from flag leaf followed by 3rd nodal leaf and awns at the last.

Mapfumo *et al.* (2007) were explored the viability of intensifying pearl millet and sorghum production through use of nurseries and transplanting to address the problem of poor stand establishment. The experiments were conducted over two seasons, the 1999/2000 and 2000/2001 seasons in the south eastern lowveld of Zimbabwe where the mean rainfall is less than 500 mm per annum. Treatments included two pearl millet cultivars (PMV2 and PMV3) and two sorghum cultivars (*Mutode* and *Macia*). These crops were transplanted with and without leaf clipping at three seedling ages (30, 40 and 50 days for pearl millet; 29, 39 and 49 days for sorghum). Transplants were raised in nursery seedbeds. In the 1999/2000 season, there were significant effects of cultivar ($P<0.05$) and leaf clipping ($P<0.01$) on pearl millet grain yield. Clipped seedlings yielded 932 kg ha^{-1} compared to 797 kg ha^{-1} for non-clipped seedlings while PMV3 yielded 902 kg ha^{-1} compared to 820 kg ha^{-1} for non-clipped seedlings. However, leaf clipping tended to increase yields for both cultivars. An increase in seedling age from 29 days also tended to reduce yields. It was concluded that leaf clipping of 30-day old seedlings at transplanting may enhance sorghum and pearl millet yields in the semi-arid tropics.

Mariko and Hogetsu (1987) reported that defoliated sunflower plants showed higher rates of photosynthesis than those of under foliated plants. Defoliation tends to influence the ageing of the remaining or new leaves. Old Leaves can be allowed to rejuvenate, matter ones to maintain their vigor and young ones to develop their photosynthesis rapidly. Physiological approaches in breeding for higher yield in mungbean are often directed to increase the total dry matter production and better redistribution of photosynthesis. Plant with high dry matter production capacity does not mean high seed yield potential. Increase in yields over the past decade has been possible mainly through favorable partitioning into grains. It may be shown tor mungbean also the partioning of dry matter seemed to be more favorable for increasing harvest index . Genotypes of a number of crop species with profuse branching often show poor harvest index in spite of high dry matter yield.

Mondal *et al*. (1978) reported the mass flow hypothesis an thing increasing photosynthesis , increase hydrostatic pressure and translocation rate. However, this is trce only if sinks have the ability to utilize the increased production. There wise, there would be a stead build up of sugars in the system, causing a feedback inhibition resulting in reduced photosynthesis Photosynthesis rate would be reduced to the rate at which sinks could accept assimilate. For leaf photosynthesis to be at maximum potential rates, sinks must be able to utilize all assimilate produced. Under these conditions partitioning would be controlled by sink strength that is, sink availability and the rate at which available sinks can utilize assimilate.

Moriondo *et al.* (2003) conducted an experiment on defoliation of sunflower and no significant difference was observed in terms of plant height. Similarly, Johnson (1972) in his investigation on yield and other traits of sunflower found that defoliation treatments influenced neither plant height nor lodging. Defoliation affected seed number per head, so that 34.5% reduction in seed number occurred by removal of 6 leaves from lower part of the plant (Table 5).

Muro *et al*. (2001) also came up with the same results. Removal of the plant leaves is an index for lowering photosynthesis capacity. Since at the present study defoliation was performed in the head visible stage, prior to seed number determination, the plant came up with a decrease.

Patel *et al.* (1992) reported that excessive leaf area development during the later growth stages was found to be detrimental to seed yield. Productions of leaves particularly in the lower part of the plant often caused mutual shading resulting in parasitism and eventually yield reduction.

Piening *et al*. (1969) carried out several experiments to compare yield losses in barley caused by partial defoliation and foliar infection by Drechslera teres, the causal agent of net blotch. When Gateway barley was grown under a low fertilizer regime, infection of lower leaves caused greater yield reductions than the removal of comparable leaves. In contrast, infection or removal of upper leaves reduced yields to about the same extent. Under a higher fertilizer regime, yield reductions from infection or defoliation were about equal (14%). These losses were considerably lower than those from plants on the low fertility regime and were similar to those caused by net blotch in the field. In leaf clipping experiments, root weights and yields were reduced proportionately to the amount of leaf tissue removed. The time required to head was also increased with increasing amounts of leaf clipping.

Remison *et al.* (1982) investigated the effects of N nutrition and leaf clipping after mid-silk of maize. Defoliation reduced weight of ears, grains, total dry matter above ground, harvest index and grain moisture. Crude protein was increased, specially with maximum clipping.

Rockwood (1973) reported that increased foliage losses lead to reduction in reproduction of plants. Six Costa Rican tree species were defoliated by hand twice during 1970. Subsequent collection of fruit crops during 1971 showed that control totals for fruit number and weight were much larger than totals of defoliated trees in all six species. Over 80% of the experimental defoliated plants produced no fruit what so ever. Individual controls out-produced occurred in either. It is concluded that heavy defoliation of wild trees will practically eliminate seed production for the year in which it takes place. These data and other work with crop plants have shown that both growth and reproduction are functions of leaf area. Consequently, eave defoliation drastically reduced the fitness of a plant. Herbivore consumption of plant parts has probably played an important role in the evolution of both the morphology and chemistry of plants. These data support the view that physical and chemical defenses evolved by plants have played an important role in plant—herbivore co—evolution.

Wallace *et al*. (1985) conducted the *Kyllinga nervosa* and *Themeda triandra* plants were subjected to different clipping and nitrogen availability regimes. Following an extended period of growth under these conditions, total biomass, gas exchange and several morphological parameters were measured. *Kyllinga nervosa* showed compensatory growth to moderate levels of clipping whereas any clipping reduced the total biomass of *T. triandra*. Unclipped plants of either species were unable to respond to increased levels of nitrogen. Clipped plants responded in an ambiguous fashion, with increased allocation to offtake (material removed by clipping) in both species. Total biomass of *K. nervosa* was highest at 15 mM nitrogen levels which are equivalent to field levels. Both photosynthesis and respiration rates were unaffected by nitrogen treatments. Photosynthesis was significantly reduced by the most severe clipping regime of *K. nervosa*, but was unaffected by clipping of *T. triandra*.

Wang *et al*. (2014) studied the effect of clipping height on rye grass regrowth was investigated by examining the roles of several plant hormones. Our study consisted of three treatment conditions: (1) darkness over whole plants, (2) darkness only over stubble leaf sheaths, and (3) light over whole plants. Results showed that under darkness over whole plant, low stubble height resulted in low leaf regrowth biomass. Similar leaf regrowth biomass was observed under conditions of darkness only over stubble leaf sheaths as well as light over whole plants. Each unit weight of stubble at different clipping heights has relatively similar potential of providing stored organic substance for leaf regrowth. Therefore, regrowth index, calculated as newly grown leaf biomass divided by unit stubble weight, was used to evaluate regrowth capacity at different clipping heights under minimal influence of organic substances stored in stubbles. Under light over whole plants and single clipping, low stubble height and high stubble height with root thinning resulted in low leaf biomass and high regrowth index. On the other hand, under light over whole plants and frequent clipping high leaf biomass and regrowth index were observed in high stubble height. In addition, we found that leaf zeatin and zeatin riboside (Z + ZR) affected ryegrass regrowth and that roots regulated leaf Z + ZR concentration. Thus, our results indicate that root-derived cytokinin concentration in leaves influences ryegrass regrowth at different clipping heights.

Wang *et al.*(1997) reported that removal of one half of the leaves reduced grain mass spike^{-1} and single grain mass. It was found that removal of all leaves had larger reducing effects than that of flag leaf alone. The varieties SAN-119, Shotabdi and Agrani were highly affected by defoliation treatments for grains spike^{-1} but Agrani and SAN-127 caused high reduction in 100-grain weight. The variety SAN-119, Agrani and Shotabdi showed high decrease in grain yield main spike^{-1} by defoliation treatments.

2.1 Effect of variety of mungbean

Ahmad *et al*. (2003) conducted a pot experiment in Bangladesh on the growth and yield of mungbean cultivars viz., BARI Mung-2, BARI Mung-3, BARI Mung-4, BARI Mung-5, BU mung-1, BU mung-2 and BINAI Mung-5 and found that BARI Mung-2 produced the highest seed yield while BARI Mung-3 produced the lowest.

Ali *et al.* (2014) investigated the effect of sowing time on yield and yield components of different mungbean varieties, a field experiment was conducted during 2012 at agronomic research area, University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan. Their experiment was designed according to randomized complete block design under split plot arrangement in triplicate. Different sowing times (15th June, 25th June, 5th July and 15th July) were assigned to main plots and varieties (NM-2011, NM-2006, AZRI-2006 and NM-98) were allocated to subplots. Different mungbean varieties also responded significantly towards yield and yield components and NM-2011 variety outperformed in terms of maximum seed yield (1282.87 kg ha^{-1}) than rest of varieties.

Apurv and Tewari (2004) conducted a field experiment during kharif season of 2003 in Uttaranchal, India, to investigate the effect of *Rhizobium* inoculation and fertilizer on the yield and yield components of three mungbean cultivars (Pusa 105, Pusa 9531 and Pant mung-2). The variety Pusa 9531 showed higher yield components and grain yield than Pusa 105 and Pant mung-2.

BARI (2005) found that small seeded entries had greater germination percentage than bold seeded ones which required less seed rate compared to bold seeded plants and even with same seed rate, small seeded entries accommodated more plants per unit area which contributed towards higher yield than the bold seeded ones.

BARI (2006) and BINA (2007) released several mungbean varieties and instructed that seed rate depend on seed size of a variety. BARI (2005) and BINA (2005) further reported that optimum seed rate required 30-35 kg ha^{-1} for BARI Mung-2, BARI Mung-3, BARI Mung-4, BINAI Mung-2, BINAI Mung-3, BINAI Mung-4 and BINAI Mung-7 while optimum seed rate required 35-40 kg ha^{-1} for BARI Mung-5, BARI Mung-6, BINAI Mung-5 and BINAI Mung-6.

Bhati *et al*. (2005) evaluated an experiment from 2000 to 2003 to study the effects of cultivars and nutrient management strategies on the productivity of different kharif legumes (mungbean, mothbean and clusterbean) in the arid region of Rajasthan, India. The experiment with mungbean variety K-851 gave better yield than Asha and the local cultivar. In another experiment, mungbean cv. PDM-54 showed 56.9% higher seed yield and 13.7% higher fodder yield than the local cultivar.

Bhuiyan *et al*. (2008) examined a field studies with and without Bradyrhizobium was carried out with five mungbean varieties to observe the yield and yield attributes of mungbean. Five mungbean varieties viz. BARI Mung-2, BARI Mung-4, BARI Mung-5, BINAI Mung-2 and Barisal local, and the rhizobial inoculum (Bradyrhizobium strain BAUR-604) were used. The seeds and stover were dried and weighed adjusting at 14% moisture content and yields were converted to t/ha. The yield attributing data were recorded from 10 randomly selected plants. BARI Mung-2 produced the highest seed yield (1.03 t/ha in 2001 and 0.78 t/ha in 2002) and stover yield (2.24 t/ha in 2001 and 2.01 t/ha in 2002). Higher number of pods/plant was also recorded in BARI Mung-2, while BARI Mung-5 produced the highest 1000-seed weight.

BINA (1998) observed that among nine summer mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.) cultivars, kalamung was the best performing cultivar with a potential grain yield of 793.65 kg ha^{-1} and the highest number of pods $plant^{-1}$(18.66) and high number of seeds pod^{-1}.

BINA (1998) reported that BINAI Mung5 produced higher seed yield over BINAI Mung-2. Field duration of BINAI Mung5 was about 78 days as against 82 days for BINAI Mung-2.

Chaisri *et al*. (2005) conducted a research work to study a yield trial involving 6 recommended cultivars (KPS 1, KPS 2, CN 60, CN 36, CN 72 and PSU 1) and 5 elite lines (C, E, F, G, H) in Lopburi Province, Thailand, during the dry (February-May 2002), early rainy (June-September 2002) and late rainy season (October 2002-January 2003). The Line C, KPS 1, CN 60, CN 36 and CN 72 gave high yields in the early rainy season, while line H, line G, line E, KPS 1 and line C gave high yields in the late rainy session.

Chaudhury *et al*. (1989) reported that mungbean cultivars had significant variation in dry matter accumulation in stem, leaf, seed and husk.

Hamed (1998) carried out two field experiments during 1995 and 1996 in Shalakan, Egypt, to evaluate mung bean cultivars Giza 1 and Kawny 1 under 3 irrigation intervals after flowering (15, 22 and 30 days) and 4 fertilizer treatments: inoculation with Rhizobium (R) + Azotobacter (A) + 5 (N_1) or 10 kg N/ha (N_2), and inoculation with R only +5 (N_3) or 10 kg N/ha (N_4). Kawny 1 surpassed Giza 1 in pod number per plant (24.3) and seed yield (0.970 t/ha), while Giza 1 was superior in 100-seed weight (7.02 g), biological and straw yields (5.53 and 4.61 t/ha, respectively). While Kawny 1 surpassed Giza 1 in oil yield (35.78 kg/ha), the latter cultivar recorded higher values of protein percentage and yield (28.22% and 264.6 kg/ha). The seed yield of both cultivars was positively and highly significantly correlated with all involved characters, except for 100-seed weight of Giza 1 and branch number per plant of Kawny 1.

Hossain and Solaiman (2004) investigated to find out the effects of *Rhizobium* inoculation on the nodulation, plant growth, yield attributes, seed and stover yields, and seed protein content of six mung bean (*Vigna radiata*) cultivars. The mungbean cultivars were BARI Mung-2, BARI Mung-3, BARI Mung-4, BARI Mung-5, BINAI Mung-2 and BU mung-1. *Rhizobium* strains TAL 169 and TAL 441 were used for inoculation of the seeds. Two-thirds of seeds of each cultivar were inoculated with *Rhizobium* inoculant and the remaining one-third of seeds were kept uninoculated. Among the cultivars, BARI Mung-4 performed the best in all aspects showing the highest seed yield of 1135 kg/ha.

Infante *et al*. (2003) carried out an experiment in mungbean cultivars ML 267, Acriollado and VC 1973 C under the agroecological conditions of Maracay, Venezuela, during May-July 1997. The differentiation of the development phases and stages, and the morphological changes of plants were studied. The variable totals of pod clusters, pods plant-1, seeds pods-1 and pod length were also studied. The earliest cultivar was ML 267 with 34.87 days to flowering and 61.83 to maturity. There were significant differences for total pod clusters plant^{-1} and pods plant^{-1}, where ML 267 and Acriollado had the highest values. The total seeds per pod of VC 1973C and Acriollado were significantly greater than ML 267. Acriollado showed the highest yield with 1438.33 kg/ha.

Islam *et al*. (2006) carried out an experiment at the field laboratory of the Department of Crop Botany, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh during the period from March 2002 to June 2002 to evaluate the effect of biofertilizer (*Bradyrhizobium*) and plant growth regulators (GA3 and IAA) on growth of 3 cultivars of summer mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L.). Among the mungbean varieties, BINA moog 5 performed better than that of BINA moog 2.

Ahamed *et. al.* (2011) conducted at the experimental field of Agricultural Botany Department, Sher-e- Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, Bangladesh from the period of August, 2009 to April, 2010 (Kharif –2 season). Five mungbean varieties namely BARI Mung-2 (M_2), BARI Mung-3 (M_3), BARI Mung-4 (M_4), BARI Mung-5 (M_5) and BARI Mung-6 (M_6) were used in the experiment to observe their morphophysiological attributes in different plant spacings viz. 20×10 cm (D_1), 30×10 cm (D_2) and 40×10 cm (D_3). The highest plant height of BARI Mung-4 is 49.38 cm that is statistically with the height of BARI Mung-3 (i.e. 48.38 cm). Leaf area of BARI Mung-3 was the highest (147.57 cm^2). The variety BARI Mung-3 produced the lowest leaf area of 110.00 cm^2. In the study BARI Mung-2 took 30.44 days for flowering that is statistically at per BARI Mung-6 (30.11) and BARI Mung-4 flower earliest (at 28.88 days after sowing) as compared to all other varieties.

Kabir and Sarkar (2008) carried out an experiment to study the effect of variety and planting density on the yield of mungbean in Kharif-I season (February to June) of 2003. The experiment comprised five varieties viz. BARI Mung-2, BARI Mung-3, BARI Mung-4, BARI Mung-5 and BINAMung-2. The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design with three replications. It was observed that BARI Mung-2 produced the highest seed yield and BINAMung-2 did the lowest.

Madriz-Isturiz and Luciani-Marcano (2004) conducted a field experiment in Venezuela during the rainy season of 1994-95 and dry season of 1995. Significant differences in the values of the parameters measured due to cultivar were recorded. The cultivars of mungbean named VC 1973C, Creole VC 1973A, VC 2768A, VC 1178B and Mililiter 267 were the most promising cultivars for cultivation in the area with the average yield was 1342.58 kg/ha.

Mondal (2004) conducted an experiment at farmer’s field of Rangpur zone during kharif-1 season to evaluate the performance of four mungbean varieties viz. BINAI Mung-2, BINAI Mung-5, BARI Mung-2 and BARI Mung-5. Result revealed that BINAI Mung-5 had the highest seed yield (1091 kg ha^{-1}) than the other tested varieties because it produced the greater number of pods $plant^{-1}$ and 1000 seed weight. Moreover, BINAI Mung 5 matured 5 days earlier than the others.

Muhammad *et al*. (2006) conducted an experiment to study the nature of association between *Rhizobium phaseoli* and mungbean. Inocula of two Rhizobium strains, Tal-169 and Tal-420 were applied to four mungbean genotypes viz., NM-92, NMC-209, NM-98 and Chakwal Mung-97. A control treatment was also included for comparison. The experiment was carried out at the University of Arid Agriculture, Rawalpindi, Pakistan, during kharif, 2003. Both the strains in association with NM-92 had higher nodule dry weight, which was 13% greater than other strains x mungbean genotypes combinations.

Navgire *et al*. (2001) evaluated to study seeds of mungbean cultivars BM-4, S-8 and BM-86 were inoculated with *Rhizobium* strains M-11-85, M-6-84, GR-4 and M-6-65 before sowing in a field experiment conducted by in Maharashtra, India during the kharif season of 1993-94 and 1995-96. S-8, BM-4 and BM-86 recorded the highest mean nodulation (16.66), plant biomass (8.29 q ha^{-1}) and grain yield (4.79 q ha^{-1}) during the experimental years

Parvez *et al*. (2013) conducted an experiment at the Agronomy Field Laboratory, Bangladesh Agricultural University, Mymensingh during the period from October to January 2011 to study the performance of mungbean as affected by variety and level of phosphorus. The experiment comprised four varieties viz. BARI Mung-6, Binamoog-4, Binamoog-6 and Binamoog-8 and four levels of phosphorus viz. 0, 20, 40 and 60 kg P_2O_5 ha^{-1}, and laid out in a Randomized Complete Block Design with three replications. Their results revealed that the longest plant, highest number of branches $plant^{-1}$, number of total pods plant $^{-1}$, seeds plant $^{-1}$ and seed weight plant^{-1} were obtained from BARI Mung-6. Binamoog-6 produced the highest seed yield which was as good as Binamoog-8. The second highest and the lowest seed yield were recorded from Binamoog-4 and BARI Mung-6, respectively. The highest stover yield was obtained from Binamoog-8 followed by Binamoog-4. The lowest stover yield was recorded from BARI Mung-6.

Raj and Tripathi (2005) conducted an experiment in Jodhpur, Rajasthan, India, during the kharif seasons, to evaluate the effects of cultivar (K-851 and RMG-62) as well as nitrogen (0 and 20 kg/ha) and phosphorus levels (0, 20 and 40 kg ha^{-1}) on the productivity of mungbean. The cultivars K-851 produced significantly higher values for seed and straw yields as well as yield attributes (plant height, pods plant^{-1}, seeds pod^{-1} and 1000-seed weight) compared with RMG-62. Higher net return and benefit:cost (B:C) ratio were also obtained with K-851 (Rs. 6544 ha^{-1} and 1.02, respectively) than RMG-62 (Rs. 4833 ha^{-1} and 0.76, respectively).

Rana and Singh (1992) in Kanpur, Uttar Pradesh of India reported that the yield was generally higher in *Vigna radiata* than *Vigna mango* and was the highest in cultivar PDM-11 than Sona mungbean.

Rasul *et al*. (2012) conducted a research work to establish the proper inter-row spacing and suitable variety evaluation in Faisalabad, Pakistan. Three mung bean varieties V_1, V_2, V_3 (NM-92, NM-98, and M-1) were grown at three inter-row spacing (S_1- 30 cm, S_2- 60 cm and S_3- 90 cm) respectively. Experiment was laid out in Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with split plot arrangement randomizing varieties in the main and inter-row spacing in the sub-plots. The data recorded were analysed statistically using Fisher's analysis of variance technique and Least Significant Difference (LSD) test at 5% probability level. Among varieties V_2 exhibited the highest yield 727.02 kg ha^{-1} while the lowest seed yield 484.79 kg ha^{-1} was obtained with V_3.

Rehman *et al.* (2009) conducted a field experiment to study the effect of five planting dates viz. 30th March, 15th April, 15th May, 15th June and 15th July on two mungbean varieties i.e. NM-92 and M-1 were evaluated at NWFP Agricultural University, Peshawar during summer 2004.

Uddin *et al.* (2009) carried out a study in the experimental field of the Department of Agronomy, Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University, Dhaka, Bangladesh to investigate the interaction effect of variety and fertilizers on the growth and yield of summer Mungbean during the summer season of 2007. Five levels of fertilizer viz. control, N + P +K, Biofertilizer, Biofertilizer + N + P + K and Bio-fertilizer + P + K. and three varieties BARI Mung- 5, BARI Mung- 6 and BINAI Mung 5 were also used as experimental variables. Their experiment was laid out in Randomized Block Design with fifteen treatments where each treatment was replicated three times. BARI Mung- 6 obtained highest number of nodule plant ^{1} and higher dry weight of nodule. They obtained highest number of pod plant ^{1}, seed plant ^{1}, 1000 seed weight and seed yield.

Sadi (2004) were conducted an experiment with 15 mungbean genotypes and observed that plant height, 1000-seed weight and harvest index were significantly influenced by variety(genotype). The highest seed yield was obtained in MB 45 compared to others.

Sarkar *et al*. (2013) reported that BARI Mung-2 contributed higher seed yield than BARI Mung-5 due to production of higher number of pods plant^{-1} in Bangladesh condition.

Shamsuzzaman *et al*. (2004) carried out an experiment with summer mungbean cultivars, i.e. BINAmoog-2 and BINAmoog-5, were grown during the kharif-1 season (February-May) of 2001, in Mymensingh, Bangladesh, under no irrigation ,irrigation once at 30 days after sowing (DAS), twice at 30 and 50 DAS, and thrice at 20, 30 and 50 DAS by. The two cultivars tested were synchronous in flowering, pod maturity and leaf senescence. BINAmoog-2 performed slightly better than BINAmoog-5 for most of the growth and yield parameters studied.

Thakuria and Shaharia (1990) reported that different varieties of mungbean differed significantly in seed yield and other yield related traits.

Vieiera *et al*. (2003) conducted an experiment to evaluate 25 mungbean genotypes during the summer season in Vicosa and Prudente de morais, Minas Gerais, Brazil. The yield varied from 1200 to 2000 kg ha^{-1} in Prudente de morais.

CHAPTER III
MATERIALS AND METHODS

The experiment was conducted at the research plot of Sher-E-Bangla Agricultural University Farm, Dhaka during the period from February 2017 to June 2017 to study the effect of leaf clipping and variety on growth and yield of mungbean. Materials used and methodologies followed in the present investigation have been described in this chapter.

3.1 Description of the experimental site

3.1.1 Site and soil

Geographically the experimental field was located at 23^0 77´ latitude and 90^0 35´ E longitudes at an altitude of 9 m above the mean sea level. The soil is belonged to the Agro-ecological Zone – Modhupur Tract (AEZ 28). The land topography was medium high and soil texture was silt clay with pH 8.0. The physical and chemical characteristics of the experimental soil have been presented in Appendix-II.

3.1.2 Climate and weather

The climate of the locality is subtropical which is characterized by high temperature and heavy rainfall during *Kharif* season (April-September) and scanty rainfall during *Rabi* season (October-March) associated with moderately low temperature. The experiment was conducted during *Kharif*-1 season.The experimental location has been shown in Appendix-III.

3.2 Planting materials

BARI Mung-1

BARI Mung-1 was used as planting material. BARI Mung-1 was released and developed by Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute (BARI). Plant height of the cultivar ranges from 60 to 55 cm. Its life cycle is about 60 to 65 days after emergence. One of the main characteristics of this cultivar is synchronization of pod ripening. Average yield of this cultivar is about 1200 kg ha^{-1}. The seeds of BARI Mung-2 for the experiment were collected from BARI, Joydepur Gazipur. The seeds were drum-shaped, dull and greenish and free from mixture of other seeds, weed seeds and extraneous materials.

BARI Mung-2

BARI Mung-2 was used as planting material. BARI Mung-2 was released and developed by BARI in 1987. Plant height of the cultivar ranges from 60 to 55 cm. It is resistant to *Cercospora* leaf spot and tolerant to yellow mosaic virus. Its life cycle is about 60 to 65 days after emergence. One of the main characteristics of this cultivar is synchronization of pod ripening. Average yield of this cultivar is about 1200 kg ha^{-1}. The seeds of BARI Mung-2 for the experiment were collected from BARI, Joydepur Gazipur. The seeds were drum-shaped, dull and greenish and free from mixture of other seeds, weed seeds and extraneous materials.

BARI Mung-3

BARI Mung-3 was used as planting material. It was released and developed by BARI in 1996. Plant height of the cultivar ranges from 50 to 55 cm. It is resistant to *Cercospora* leaf spot and tolerant to yellow mosaic virus. Its life cycle is about 50 to 55 days after emergence. One of the main characteristics of this cultivar is synchronization of pod ripening. Average yield of this cultivar is about 1300 kg ha^{-1}. The seeds of BARI Mung-3 for the experiment were collected from BARI, Joydepur Gazipur. The seeds were drum-shaped, dull and greenish and free from mixture of other seeds, weed seeds and extraneous materials.

BARI Mung-4

BARI Mung-4 was also used as planting material. BARI Mung-4 was released and developed by BARI in 1996. Plant height of the cultivar ranges from 52 to 57 cm. Average yield of this cultivar is about 1200 kg ha^{-1}. The seeds of BARI Mung-4 for the experiment were collected from BARI, Joydepur, Gazipur.

BARI Mung-5

BARI Mung-5 was one of the planting material used. BARI Mung-5 was released and developed by BARI in 1997. Plant height of the cultivar ranges from 40 to 45 cm. Average yield of this cultivar is about 1400 kg ha^{-1}. The seeds of BARI Mung-5 for the experiment were collected from BARI, Joydepur, Gazipur.

BARI Mung-6

BARI Mung-6 was used as planting material. BARI Mung-6 was released and developed by BARI in 2003. Plant height of the cultivar ranges from 40 to 45 cm. Average yield of this cultivar is about 1600 kg ha^{-1}. The seeds of BARI Mung-6 for the experiment were collected from BARI, Joydepur, Gazipur.

3.3 Treatments under investigation

There were two factors in the experiment as mentioned below:

Factor A: (Leaf clipping)

C_o=No leaf clipping

C_1= Leaf clipping (Removal of leaf having no inflorescence)

Factor-B: Varieties- 6

V_1 = BARI Mung-1

V_2 = BARI Mung-2

V_3 = BARI Mung-3

V_4 = BARI Mung-4

V_5 = BARI Mung-5

V_6 = BARI Mung-6

3.3.1 Treatment combinations

There are 12 treatment combinations of different leaf clipping and different varieties used in the experiment under as following:

1. C_0V_1	7. C_1V_1
2. C_0V_2	8. C_1V_2
3. C_0V_3	9. C_1V_3
4. C_0V_4	10. C_1V_4
5. C_0V_5	11. C_1V_5
6. C_0V_6	12. C_1V_6

3.4 Experimental design and layout

The experiment was laid out in a randomized complete block design (RCBD design having three replications. Each replication had 12 unit plots to which the treatment combinations were assigned randomly.The unit plot size was 5.04 m^2 (2.8 m ×1.8 m). The blocks and unit plots were separated by 0.5 m and 0.3 m spacing respectively. The layout of the experiment is presented in Appendix I.

3.5 Land preparation

The experimental land was opened with a power tiller on February12, 2017. Ploughing and cross ploughing were done with country plough followed by laddering. Land preparation was completed on March14, 2017 and was ready for sowing of seeds.

3.6 Fertilizer application

The fertilizers were applied as basal dose at final land preparation where N, K_2O, P_2O_5 ,Ca and S were applied @ 20.27 $kgha^{-1}$, 33 kg ha^{-1}, 48 kg ha^{-1}, 3.3 kg and 1.8 kg ha^{-1} respectively in all plots. All fertilizers were applied by broadcasting and mixed thoroughly with soil.

3.7 Sowing of seeds

The seeds of mungbean were sown on March 16, 2017. Before sowing seeds were treated with Bavistin to control the seed borne disease. The seeds were sown in rows in the furrows having a depth of 2-3 cm. The furrows were covered with the soils soon after seeding.

3.8 Intercultural operations

3.8.1 Weed control

The crop field was weeded and herbicides were applied as per treatment of weed control methods.

3.8.2 Thinning

Thinning was done two times; first thinning was done at 8 DAS and second thinning was done at 15 DAS to maintain optimum plant population. Plant to plant distance was maintained at 10 cm.

3.8.3 Irrigation and drainage

Pre sowing irrigation was given to ensure the maximum germination percentage. During the whole experimental period, there was a shortage of rainfall in earlier part; however, it was heavier in later one. So it was essential to remove the excess water from the field at later period **.**Irrigation was provided before 15 and 30 DAS for optimizing the vegetative growth of mungbean for the all experimental plots equally. Proper drain also made for drained out excess water from irrigation and also rainfall from the experimental plot.

3.8.4 Insect and pest control

At early stage of growth few worms (*Agrotis ipsilon*) infested the young plants and at later stage of growth pod borer (*Maruca testulalis*) attacked the plant. Ripcord 10 EC was sprayed at the rate of 1 ml with 1 litre water of 5 decimal lands for two times at 15 days interval after seedlings germination to control the insects. Plants were also attacked by yellow mosaic disease caused by yellow mosaic virus that was control in proper way. Before sowing seeds were treated with Bavistin 50 WP to protect seed borne disease. Malathion 57 EC @ 1.5 L ha^{-1} was sprayed when required.

3.9 Leaf clipping

Leaf clipping was done after flowering by removing the whole leaf with the help of a knife. New leaves after the flowering were removed continuously when ever those were opened.

3.10 Determination of maturity

At the time when 80% of the pods turned brown color, the crop was considered to attain maturity.

3.11 Harvesting and sampling

Harvesting was done when about 80% of the pods became brown to black in color**.** The matured pods were collected by hand picking from a pre demarcated area at the center of each plot. The pods were collected thrice from each plot.

3.12 Threshing

The pods were sun dried for three days by placing them on the open threshing floor. Seeds were separated from the pods by beating with bamboo sticks.

3.13 Drying, cleaning and winowing

The seeds thus collected were dried in the sun for reducing the moisture in the seeds to a safe level. The dried seeds and straw were cleaned and weighed.

3.14 Parameters studied

I. Plant height(cm)
II. Number of leaves plant^{-1}
III. Number of branches plant^{-1}
IV. Total dry matter plant^{-1} (g)
V. Days to first flowering
VI. Pod length(cm)
VII. Number of pods plant^{-1}
VIII. Number of seeds pod^{-1}
IX. 1000 seed weight (g)
X. Seed yield (t ha^{-1})
XI. Stover yield(t ha^{-1})
XII. Biological yield(t ha^{-1})
XIII. Harvest index

3.15Procedures of Data Collection

I. Plant height (cm)

The height of the selected plants were measured from the ground level to the tip of the plants at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 days after sowing.

II. Number of leaves plant^{-1}

Number of leaves per plant was counted from each selected plant sample and then averaged at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 days after sowing.

III. Number of branches plant^{-1}

Number of branches per plant was counted from each selected plant sample and then averaged 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 days after sowing.

IV. Total dry matter

Total dry mater of plant at harvest was calculated by aggregating the dry matter weight of leaves, stems, roots, pod cover, seed and other immature reproductive parts.

V. Days to first flowering

Dates of first flowering were recorded treatment wise and the period of time for first flowering in days was calculated from the date of sowing.

VI. Pod length (cm)

Pod length was measured in centimeter (cm) scale from randomly selected ten pods. Mean value of them was recorded treatment wise.

VII. Number of pods plant^{-1}

Number of pods per plant was counted from each selected plant sample.

VIII. Number of seeds pod^{-1}

Average number of seed pod^{-1} was calculated by counting the number of seed from 10 randomely selected pod for each treatment.

IX. 1000 seed weight (g)

A composite sample was taken from the yield of ten plants. The 1000-seeds of each plot were counted and weighed with a digital electric balance. The 1000-seed weight was recorded in (g).

X. Seed yield (kg ha^{-1})

Seed yield was recorded on the basis of total harvested seeds per 1m^2 and was expressed in terms of yield (kg ha^{-1}). Seed yield was adjusted about 12% moisture content.

XI. Stover yield

Stover yield was determined from the central 1 m^2 area of each plot. After threshing, the plant parts were sun-dried and weight was taken and finally converted to ton per hectare.

XII. Biological yield

The biological yield was calculated with the following formula-

Biological yield= Grain yield + Stover yield

XIII. Harvest index (%)

Harvest index was calculated on dry basis with the help of following formula-

Harvest index (HI %) = (Seed yield/ Biological yield) × 100

3.15 Data analysis

The collected data on different parameters were compiled and statistically analyzed to find out the significant difference of different mungbean variety and leaf clipping on growth and yield contributing characters of mungbean with the help of a computer package program MSTAT-C and the mean differences were adjusted by Least Significant Difference (LSD) test at 5% level of significance.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results obtained from the present study have been presented and discussed in this chapter. The data have been presented in different tables and figures. The results have been discussed, and possible interpretations are given under the following headings**.**

4.1 Plant height

There was a significant variation in plant height at 45 and 55 days after sowing (DAS) due to the leaf clipping. The tallest plant (12.16, 23.74, 38.339, 51.67 and 57.80 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) were obtained from C_1 (Removal of empty leaf) and the shortest plant (12.11, 23.71, 38.08, 47.59, and 54.15 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) from C_0 (Control). (Figure1).The increasing trend of plant with leaf clipping was also observed by Wang *et.al.* (2014).

The plant height was significantly varied with the different varieties at different DAS (Figure2). The tallest plant (15.03, 27.00, 40.78, 53.94 and 61.13 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) were obtained from V_3 (BARI Mung-3) which was statistically similar with V_2 (BARI Mung-2) and the shortest plant (10.90, 21.40, 35.54, 44.23 and 51.60 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) from V_6(BARI Mung-6) which was statistically similar with V_4 (BARI Mung-4). This variation in plant height might be attributed to the genetic characters. These results recognized Farghali and Hossein (1995) who find out that plant height varied with different varieties of mungbean.

Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety was significant in case of plant height of mungbean (Table 1). The tallest plant (15.16 , 27.27, 41.29 56.54 and 63.08 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was obtained from

C_1V_3 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment combination while the shortest (10.73, 21.06, 35.43, 41.86, and 50.03 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS respectively) with C_0V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with control) which was statistically similar with C_0V_5 (BARI Mung-5 with control) treatment combination in case of 45 and 55 DAS but it was also statistically similar with C_0V_4 (BARI Mung-4 with control) in case of 15, 25and 35 DAS.



C_0=No removal, C_1=Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescence)

Figure.1: Effect of leaf clipping on the plant height of mungbean at different days after sowing.(LSD= NS, NS, NS, 1.75, 2.68 at 15, 25, 35,45,55 DAS respectively).



V_1=BARI Mung-1, V_2=BARI Mung-2, V_3=BARI Mung-3, V_4=BARI Mung-4, V_5=BARI Mung-5, V_6=BARI Mung-6

Figure.2: Effect of varieties on the plant height of mungbean at different days after sowing (LSD=0.93, 1.85, 2.64, 3.03, 4.64 at 15, 25, 35, 45, 55 DAS respectively).

Table 1. Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety on the plant height of mungbean at different days after sowing (DAS)

Interaction	Plant height (cm) at				
	15 DAS	25 DAS	35 DAS	45 DAS	55 DAS
C_0V_1	12.13b	24.29 b-d	39.37 a-d	48.43 c-e	55.22b-e
C_0V_2	11.51bc	23.11 c-e	39.16a-e	50.19 b-d	54.93 b-e
C_0V_3	14.90 a	26.74 ab	40.27 ab	51.35 bc	59.18a-c
C_0V_4	11.13bc	22.99 c-e	36.53 c-e	48.2 c-e	54.23 b-e
C_0V_5	11.98bc	23.03 c-e	37.73 a-e	45.44 ef	51.32 de
C_0V_6	10.73 c	21.06 e	35.43 e	41.86 f	50.03 e
C_1V_1	11.65bc	23.75 cd	40.25 a-c	52.43 a-c	57.27 a-d
C_1V_2	12.31 b	24.41 bc	38.83a-e	54.20 ab	60.10 ab
C_1V_3	15.16 a	27.27 a	41.29 a	56.54 a	63.08 a
C_1V_4	10.77 c	22.93 c-e	36.66 b-e	49.50 c-e	56.15 b-e
C_1V_5	12.35 b	23.36 c-e	37.67a-e	50.73 b-d	57.02 a-d
C_1V_6	11.04bc	21.73 de	35.65 de	46.61 de	53.18 c-e
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	1.31	2.61	3.74	4.28	6.57
CV (%)	6.38	6.5	5.77	5.09	6.93

C_0=No leaf clipping, C_1=Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescence), V_1=BARI Mung-1, V_2=BARI Mung-2, V_3=BARI Mung-3, V_4= BARI Mung-4, V_5= BARI Mung-5, V_6= BARI Mung-6, LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation, DAS= Days after sowing.

4.2 Number of leaves plant^{-1}(no.)

The number of leaves plant^{-1} were significantly influenced by leaf clipping at 35, 45, 55 DAS. The maximum number of leaves plant^{-1} (5.28, 13.16, 16.49,18.44, and 21.17at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was obtained from C_0 (Control) treatment and the minimum (5.33, 13.24, 12.37, 13.82 and 15.81at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) from C_1(leaf clipping) treatment. (Figure 3)

The number of leaves plant^{-1} were significantly influenced by variety. The V_3 (BARI Mung-3) produced maximum number of leaves(6.07, 14.87, 16.78 , 18.31 and 20.64 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) and the minimum (5.07, 12.27, 15.53, 12.37 and 13.12 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) number of leaves plant^{-1} were recorded in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) (Figure 4). Rahman (2002) observed that number of leaves were significantly greater in BARI Mung-2 and BARI Mung-5 than in the BARI Mung-l with the magnitude being intermediate in the BARI Mung-2.

Interaction effect of leaf clipping and varieties had significant variation on number of leaves plant^{-1} of mungbean. The highest number of leaves plant^{-1} (6.07, 15.27,17.93 , 20.98 and 23.91 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was obtained from C_0V_3 (BARI Mung-3 with control)treatment while the lowest number of leaves plant^{-1} (5.07, 12.20, 11.80 and 13.29 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment combination(Table 2).



C_0=No leaf clipping, C_1=Leaf clipping(Removal of leaves having no inflorescence)

Figure 3: Effect of leaf clipping on the number of leaves plant^{-1}of Mungbean at different days after sowing(LSD= NS, NS, 0.70, 0.57 , 0.92 at 15, 25, 35,45,55 DAS respectively).



V_1=BARI Mung-1, V_2=BARI Mung-2, V_3 =BARI Mung-3, V_4=BARI Mung-4, V_5=BARI Mung-5, V_6=BARI Mung-6

Figure 4:Effect of varieties on the number of leaf plant^{-1}of mungbean at different days after sowing (LSD $_{(0.05)}$= 0.34, 0.90, 1.21, 0.98, 1.59 at 15, 25, 35, 45, 55 DAS respectively).

Table 2. Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety on the number of leaves plant^{-1} of mungbean at different DAS

Treatment combination	Number of leaves plant $^{-1}$				
	15 DAS	25 DAS	35 DAS	45 DAS	55 DAS
C_0V_1	5.133 b	12.67 cd	16.47 a-c	18.80 b	21.60 ab
C_0V_2	5.200 b	12.53 cd	15.80 c	16.87 d	20.30 b
C_0V_3	6.067 a	15.27 a	17.93 a	21.00 a	24.20 a
C_0V_4	5.000 b	13.27 b-d	16.33 a-c	19.40 b	22.60 ab
C_0V_5	5.200 b	12.47 d	16.33 a-c	18.87 c	21.73 ab
C_0V_6	5.067 b	12.73 cd	15.73 c	15.80 e	16.77 c
C_1V_1	5.067 b	12.67 cd	12.35 f	14.08 f	16.21 d
C_1V_2	5.333 b	13.80 bc	11.86 g	12.66 g	15.21 de
C_1V_3	6.067 a	14.47 ab	13.45 c-e	15.63 c-e	17.38 d
C_1V_4	5.200 b	12.93 cd	12.25 d-f	14.47 d-f	16.92 d
C_1V_5	5.267 b	13.40 b-d	12.50 ef	14.28 ef	15.86 d
C_1V_6	5.067 b	12.20 d	11.80 g	11.83 g	13.29 e
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.48	1.27	1.710	1.33	2.79
CV (%)	5.33	5.69	7.00	5.5	10.3

C_0=No leaf clipping, C_1=Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescence) V_1=BARI Mung-1, V_2=BARI Mung-2, V_3=BARI Mung-3, V_4= BARI Mung-4, V_5= BARI Mung-5, V_6= BARI Mung-6, LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation, DAS= Days after sowing

4.3 Number of branches plant^{-1}

Number of branches plant^{-1}was significantly varied with leaf clipping at 45 and 55 DAS (Fig. 5). The maximum number of branches plant^{-1}(0.68, 1.42, 2.05 2.51, 2.76 and at15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was obtained from C_1 (leaf clipping) treatment and the minimum number of branches plant^{-1} (0.68, 1.42, 2.05 2.39, and 2.64 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) from C_0 (control condition) treatment.

The number of branches plant^{-1}was also significantly influenced by variety at 15, 25, 35, 45, 55 DAS. (Fig 6). The maximum number of branches plant^{-1} (0.82, 1.58, 2.19, 2.60 and 2.88 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was found in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) whereas the minimum number of branches plant^{-1}(0.55, 1.30, 1.91, 2.35 and 2.56 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was recorded in V_1 (BARI Mung-4). The results obtained from the present findings were similar with the findings of Muhammad *et al*. (2006) ,Parvez*et al*. (2013) also observed that with a study, BARI Mung-6 showed the highest number of branches plant^{-1} compared to BINA Mung-4, BINA Mung-6 and BINA Mung-8.

Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety was significant on number of branches plant^{-1} at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS (Table 3). The highest number of branches plant^{-1} (0.85, 1.67, 2.36, 2.88 and 3.05 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was obtained from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment, while the lowest (0.53, 1.29, 1.93, 2.28, and 2.51 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) from C_0V_1(BARI Mung-1 with control) treatment combination.



C_0=No leaf clipping, C_1=Leaf clipping((Removal of leaves having no inflorescence)

Figure.5:Effect of leaf clipping on the number of branches plant^{-1} of mungbean at different DAS (LSD $_{(0.05)}$ = NS, NS, NS, 0.11 and 0.12 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively)



V_1=BARI Mung-1, V_2=BARI Mung-2, V_3=BARI Mung-3, V_4=BARI Mung-4, V_5=BARI Mung-5, V_6=BARI Mung-6

Figure.6: Effect of varieties on the number of branches plant^{-1} of mungbean at different DAS (LSD $_{(0.05)}$ = 0.07, 0.11, 0.13, 0.17 and 0.19 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS respectively)

Table 3: Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety on the number of branches plant^{-1}of mungbean at different

Interaction	Branches plant^{-1} (no.) at				
	15 DAS	25DAS	35DAS	45DAS	55DAS
C_0V_1	0.53 h	1.29 e	1.93 de	2.28 d	2.51 d
C_0V_2	0.57gh	1.35 c-e	1.99 c-e	2.35 cd	2.57cd
C_0V_3	0.64 fg	1.43 b-e	2.07 b-e	2.44 b-d	2.67 b-d
C_0V_4	0.71c-f	1.50 a-d	2.18 a-d	2.52 b-d	2.74 b-d
C_0V_5	0.76 a-c	1.57 ab	2.26 a-c	2.60 b-d	2.82a-d
C_0V_6	0.84 ab	1.66 a	2.34 ab	2.68 a-c	2.91 ab
C_1V_1	0.54 h	1.31 de	1.90 e	2.42 b-d	2.62 b-d
C_1V_2	0.58 f-h	1.34 b-e	2.02 c-e	2.50 b-d	2.67 b-d
C_1V_3	0.64 d-g	1.42 b-e	2.05 b-e	2.60 a-d	2.78 a-d
C_1V_4	0.70 b-e	1.50 a-e	2.21 a-d	2.67 ab	2.86 a-c
C_1V_5	0.75 a-d	1.57a-c	2.26 a-c	2.73 ab	2.95 ab
C_1V_6	0.85 a	1.67 a	2.36 a	2.88 a	3.05 a
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.11	0.16	0.16	0.21	0.24
CV (%)	8.31	6.13	4.66	5.22	5.25

C_0=No leaf clipping , C_1=Leaf clipping(Removal of leaves having no inflorescence) V_1=BARI Mung-1,V_2=BARI Mung-2,V_3=BARI Mung-3,V_4= BARI Mung-4,V_5= BARI Mung-5,V_6= BARI Mung-6 ;LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation, DAS= Days after sowing

4.4 Total dry mater weight(TDM)

The total dry matter was significantly influenced by leaf clipping at 45, 55 DAS days after sowing (DAS). The total dry matter was highest (6.02, 8.26, 10.36, 13.10 and 16.18 g at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) at C_0 treatment (control) and it was lowest (5.90, 8.12, 9.36, 10.86 and 13.75 g at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) at C_1 (leaf clipping) treatment. (Table 4).

The total dry mater weight was also significantly influenced by variety at 15, 25, 35, 45, 55 DAS. Among the six mungbean varieties the highest total dry mater (6.75, 8.82, 10.98, 13.78 and 16.79 gm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was recorded in V_3(BARI Mung-3), whereas the lowest total dry matter (5.47, 7.67, 8.91, 10.84 and 13.68 gm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS respectively) was in V_6(BARI Mung-6) (Table 5).

The interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety on total dry matter were significant at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS respectively. The highest total dry matter (6.83, 8.87, 11.50 , 14.83 and 18.00 g at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was found in C_0V_3(BARI Mung-3 with control) and the lowest value (5.44, 7.57, 8.33, 9.67 and 12.40 g at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was found in C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment combination (Table 6).



C_0=No leaf clipping, C_1=Leaf clipping(Removal of leaves having no inflorescence)

Figure7.Effect of leaf clipping on the total dry matter weight plant^{-1} at different days after sowing (LSD $_{(0.05)}$ = NS, NS, 0.48, 0.26 and 0.34 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively)



V_1=BARI Mung-1,V_2=BARI Mung-2,V_3=BARI Mung-3,V_4=BARI Mung-4,V_5=BARI Mung-5,V_6= BARI Mung-6

Figure 8.Effect of variety on the total dry matter weight plant^{-1} at different days after sowing (LSD $_{(0.05)}$ = 0.49, 0.38, 0.83, 0.46 and 0.59 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DASrespectively

Table 4. Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety on the total dry matter weight plant^{-1} at different days after sowing

Treatment	Total dry matter weight plant (g) at				
	15 DAS	25 DAS	35 DAS	45 DAS	55 DAS
C_0V_1	6.07 b-e	8.33 a-c	10.58 a-c	13.07 bc	16.17 bc
C_0V_2	6.30 a-c	8.50 ab	10.87 ab	13.63 b	16.72 b
C_0V_3	6.83 a	8.87 a	11.50 a	14.83 a	18.00 a
C_0V_4	5.57 de	7.95 c-e	9.63 cd	12.37 de	15.46 cd
C_0V_5	5.83 c-e	8.13 b-d	10.12 b-d	12.70 cd	15.80 c
C_0V_6	5.50 de	7.77 de	9.48 c-e	12.02 e	14.95 de
C_1V_1	5.87 c-e	8.17 b-d	9.43 c-e	10.93 fg	13.73 fg
C_1V_2	6.17 a-d	8.33 a-c	9.78 b-d	11.37 f	14.17 ef
C_1V_3	6.67 ab	8.77 a	10.47 a-c	12.73 cd	15.58 cd
C_1V_4	5.50 de	7.87 c-e	8.97 de	10.03 hi	13.19 gh
C_1V_5	5.77 c-e	8.03 b-e	9.17 de	10.40 gh	13.43 fg
C_1V_6	5.44 e	7.57 e	8.33 e	9.67 i	12.40 h
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.69	0.54	1.18	0.64	0.84
CV (%)	6.84	3.91	7.05	3.18	3.31

C_0=No leaf clipping, C_1=Leaf clipping(Removal of leaves having no inflorescence),V_1=BARI Mung-1,V_2=BARI Mung-2,V_3=BARI Mung-3,V_4=BARI Mung-4,V_5=BARI Mung-5,V_6= BARI Mung-6, LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation, DAS= Days after sowing

4.5Days to first flowering

Leaf clipping had significant influence on days to first flowering. The earliest flowering (33.17 DAS) was found in C_1 (leaf clipping) compared to C_0(no leaf clipping) treatment (table 4).

There was a marked difference among the varieties in the days to first flowering. The earliest flowering (32.33 DAS) was found in V_6. and the longest time (34.17 DAS) were recorded in V_1 (BARI Mung-1), which was statistically similar with V_2 treatment (Table 5).

Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety was significant on days to first flowering (Table 6). The earliest flowering (32.00DAS) was obtained from C_1V_6 combination and latest flowering (34.33DAS) was obtained from C_0V_1 (BARI Mung-1 with control) treatment.

4.5 Pod Length

There was a significant variation with the pod length of mungbean due to the leaf clipping (Table 5). The longest pod length (8.99 cm) was obtained from C_1 (leaf clipping) treatment compared to C_0 (Control) treatment.

Pod length is one of the most important yield contributing characters of mungbean. Varieties showed significant variation in pod length (Table 6). The longest pod length (9.67 cm) was recorded in V_6, which was statistically similar with V_5 (BARI Mung-5) and V_4 (BARI Mung-4).The shortest pod length (7.71 cm) was observed in V_1 (BARI Mung-1) which was statistically similar with V_2 (BARI Mung-2) . These results have the agreement with the results of Sarkar *et al.* (2004) who reported that pod length differed from variety to variety. The probable reason of this difference could be the genetic make-up of the varieties. Similar results were found by Aslam*et al*. (2004) and he observed significant differences between mungbean varieties for pod length.

Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety was significant on pod length of mungbean (Table 7). The highest pod length (9.88cm) was obtained from C_1V_6(BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping)treatment, whiles the lowest (7.43cm) from C_0V_1(BARI Mung-1 with control) which was statistically similar with C_0V_2(BARI Mung-2 with control) treatment combinations .

4.6 Number of Pod plant^{-1}

There was significant variation in the number of pods plant^{-1} due to the leaf clipping (Table 6). The maximum number of pods plant^{-1} (15.00) was obtained from C_1(leaf clipping) treatment and the minimum number of pods plant^{-1} (14.14) was obtained in C_0 (control)condition. (Table5)
The number of pod plant^{-1} was significantly influenced by variety. The highest number of pod plant^{-1}(16.67) was recorded in V_6(BARI Mung-6) whereas the lowest number of pods plant^{-1} (13.00) was recorded in V_1 (BARI Mung-1) which was statistically similar with V_2 (BARI Mung-2) (Table6). Genotypic variations in effective pods plant^{-1} was observed by Mondal*et al.*, (2004) in mungbean. Similar results were found by Aslam*et al.* (2004) and he observed significant differences between mungbean varieties for number of number of pods plant^{-1}. Similar results were also found by Parvez*et al.* (2013), Raj and Tripathi (2005), Shamsuzzaman*et al.* (2004), Madriz-Isturiz and Luciani-Marcano (2004) and Brar *et al.* (2004). They found that variety had also significant effect on number of pods plant^{-1} of mungbean.

Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety was significant on number of pods plant^{-1}. The highest number of pods plant^{-1}(17.13) was obtained from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) while the lowest number of pod plant^{-1} (12.73) from C_0V_1 (BARI Mung-1 with no leaf clipping) treatment combination (Table 7).

4.7 Number of seeds pod^{-1}

Like varietal effect, there was significant variation in the number of seeds pod^{-1} due to the leaf clipping (Table 5). The maximum number of seeds pod^{-1} 11.32 was obtained from C_1 treatment and the minimum 10.48 was from C_0. (Table7)

The number of seeds pod^{-1}of mungbean was significantly varied with varieties (Table 6). The highest number of seeds pod^{-1} 12.04 was recorded in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) which was statistically similar with V_5 (BARI Mung-5) and the lowest number of seeds pod^{-1}(9.60) was obtained from V_1(BARI Mung-1) which was closely related to V_2 (BARI Mung-2) . A result was found by Infante*et al.* (2003) which was similar with this study. They found significant difference on number of seeds pod^{-1} among the varieties. Genotypic variations in seeds pod^{-1} was also observed by Thakuria and Saharia (1990) in mungbean.

Interaction effect of different varieties and leaf clipping had a significant effect on number of seeds pod^{-1} (Table 7). The highest number of seeds pod^{-1} (12.58) was obtained from C_1V_6(BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment which was statistically similar with C_1V_5(BARI Mung-5 with leaf clipping) while the lowest (9.16) from C_0V_1(BARI Mung-1 with control) treatment combination which was statistically similar with C_0V_2(BARI Mung-2 with no leaf clipping) .

4.9 Thousand seed weight (TSW)

There was significant variation in the thousand seed weight due to the leaf clipping. The maximum thousand seed weight (51.21 g) was obtained from $C_1$and the minimum (48.45 g) from C_0,(Table 5).

Variety had been significant variation in 1000-seed weight and it was also observed in studied varieties of mungbean (Table 6). The highest 1000-seed weight (53.55 g) was recorded in V_6. In contrast, the lowest 1000-seed weight (47.09 g) was recorded in V_1 (BARI Mung-1). Genotypic variation in 1000-seed weight was also observed by Tomar*et al.*(1995) in mungbean that also supported the present experimental results. Similar results were found by Ali *et al*. (2004) and they observed significant differences between mungbean genotypes for 1000 seeds weight.

Interaction effect of different varieties and leaf clipping had a significant variation on thousand seed weight. The highest thousand seed weight (55.52 g) was obtained from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment whiles the lowest (45.91g)from C_0V_1(BARI Mung-1 with control)(Table 7).

Table 5. Effect of leaf clipping on the yield contributing characters of mungbean

Treatment	Pod length (cm)	Pod plant^{-1} (No.)	Seed pod^{-1} (No.)	1000 seed weight(g)	Days to 1st Flowering
C_0	8.44 b	14.14 b	10.48 b	48.45 b	33.56 a
C_1	8.99 a	15.00 a	11.32 a	51.21 a	33.17 b
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.38	0.52	0.33	1.84	0.34
CV (%)	6.39	5.16	4.38	5.33	1.47

C_0=No leaf clipping , C_1=Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescence), LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation

Table 6. Effect of variety on the yield contributing characters of mungbean

Treatment	Pod length (cm)	Pod plant^{-1} (No.)	Seed pod^{-1} (No.)	1000 seed weight	Days to 1st Flowering
V_1	7.70 d	13.00 d	9.59 d	47.09 c	34.17 a
V_2	7.93 cd	13.78 cd	9.96 d	48.08 c	33.83 a
V_3	8.50 bc	14.08 c	10.86 c	48.96 bc	33.17 bc
V_4	9.00 ab	14.60 bc	11.23 bc	49.57 bc	33.67 ab
V_5	9.49 a	15.27 b	11.70 ab	51.74 ab	33.00 c
V_6	9.66 a	16.67 a	12.04 a	53.55 a	32.33 d
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.67	0.9	0.57	3.18	0.59
CV (%)	6.39	5.16	4.38	5.33	1.47

V_1=BARI Mung-1, V_2=BARI Mung-2, V_3=BARI Mung-3, V_4=BARI Mung-4, V_5=BARI Mung-5, V_6=BARI Mung-6 , LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation

Table 7. Interaction effect of leaf clipping and varieties on the yield contributing characters of mungbean

Treatment	Pod length (cm)	Pod plant^{-1} (No.)	Seed pod^{-1} (No.)	1000 seed weight	Days to 1st Flowering
C_0V_1	7.43 e	12.73 h	9.157 h	45.91 e	34.33 a
C_0V_2	7.63 e	13.37 f-h	9.650 gh	46.91 de	34.00 ab
C_0V_3	8.16 de	13.60 e-h	10.49 ef	47.89 c-e	33.33 b-d
C_0V_4	8.73 cd	14.10 d-g	10.79 d-f	48.08 c-e	34.00 ab
C_0V_5	9.27 a-c	14.87 c-e	11.26 c-e	50.33 b-e	33.00 cd
C_0V_6	9.45 a-c	16.20 ab	11.50 b-d	51.57 a-c	32.00 e
C_1V_1	7.99 de	13.27 gh	10.03 fg	48.27 c-e	34.00 ab
C_1V_2	8.24 de	14.20 d-g	10.28 fg	49.25 b-e	33.67a-c
C_1V_3	8.85 b-d	14.57 c-f	11.23 c-e	50.04 b-e	33.00 cd
C_1V_4	9.28 a-c	15.10 b-d	11.68 bc	51.05 a-d	33.33 b-d
C_1V_5	9.72 ab	15.67 bc	12.13 ab	53.14 ab	33.00 cd
C_1V_6	9.88 a	17.13 a	12.58 a	55.52 a	32.67de
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.94	1.27	0.81	4.5	0.83
CV (%)	6.39	5.16	4.38	5.33	1.47

C_0=No leaf clipping, C_1=Leaf clipping(Removal of leaves having no inflorescence)V_1=BARI Mung-1,V_2=BARI Mung-2,V_3=BARI Mung-3,V_4=BARI Mung-4,V_5=BARI Mung-5,V_6= BARI Mung-6, LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation

In a column, means having similar letter(s) are statistically identical and those having dissimilar letter(s) differ significantly as per 0.05 level of probability.

4.10 Seed yield (t ha^{-1})

There was significant variation in the seed yield $hectare^{-1}$ due to the leaf clipping. The maximum seed yield $hectare^{-1}$ (1.34 ton) was obtained from C_1 (Leaf clipping) and the minimum(1.04 ton) was obtained in C_0 (Control)(Table 8).

The yield of mungbean was significantly varied with different varieties. Yield is a function of various yield components such as number of pod $plant^{-1}$, seed pod^{-1} and 1000-grain weight. The highest seed yield (1.47 t ha^{-1}) was recorded in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) which is statistically similar with V_5 (BARI Mung-5). In contrast, the lowest seed yield (0.92 t ha^{-1}) was recorded in V_1 (BARI Mung-1) which is statistically similar with V_2(BARI Mung-2) (Table 9). The probable reason of this difference might be due to higher number of pod length, number of seeds pod^{-1}. Genotypic variation in seed yield was also observed by Haque (1995) and Borah (1994).Aslam*et al*. (2004) observed significant differences between mungbean genotypes for seed yield kg $ha^{-1.}$ Khan *et al*. (2001), Reddy *et al.*, (1990) also reported significant differences between mungbean genotypes for yield (kg ha^{-1}).

Interaction effect of different varieties and leaf clipping had a significant variation on seed yield ha^{-1}. The highest seed yield (1.61 t ha^{-1}) was obtained from C_1V_6(BARI Mung-6 with removal of empty leaf) treatment combination which is statistically similar with C_1V_5 (BARI Mung-5 with removal of empty leaf)while the lowest (0.78 t ha^{-1}) from C_0V_1 (BARI Mung-1 with control) treatment combination which is statistically similar with C_0V_2 (BARI Mung-1 with control) (Table 10)

4.11 Stover yield (t ha^{-1})

The experimental result varied with growth and yield of mungbean by leaf clipping on stover yield (t ha^{-1}) of Mungbean (Table 8). Results showed that the maximum stover yield 2.89 t ha-1 was recorded from C_0 (Control) , whereas the lowest stover yield 2.73 t ha-1 was achieved from C_1 (leaf clipping).

Varieties on stover yield in mungbean genotypes had a significant variation (Table 9). Results revealed that the highest stover yield 3.00 t ha^{-1} was recorded fromV_3 (BARI Mung-3) which is statistically similar with V_1 (BARI Mung-1) and V_2 (BARI Mung-2). Whereas, the lowest stover yield 2.61 t ha^{-1} was achieved from V_6 (BARI Mung-6) which is statistically similar with V_4 (BARI Mung-4)and V_5(BARI Mung-5) treatment. Varietal performance showed significant variation on stover yield which was supported by the findings of Parvez *et al*. (2013) and Hossain and Solaiman (2004).

Significant variation was observed in the interaction effect of different types of varieties and leaf clipping on stover yield (Table 10). Results revealed that the highest stover yield 3.10 t ha^{-1} was recorded from C_0V_3(BARI Mung-3 with no removal)which is closely related with C_0V_2 (BARI Mung-2 with no removal) and statistically similar with C_0V_1 , C_0V_5 ,C_1V_3 and C_1V_2 treatments. The lowest stover yield (2.51 t ha^{-1}) was recorded from C_1V_6,(BARI Mung-6 with removal of empty leaf) treatment combination which is statistically similar with C_1V_4 (BARI Mung-1 with removal of empty leaf), C_1V_5(BARI Mung-5 with removal of empty leaf) and C_0V_6(BARI Mung-6 with with control) treatment combination.

4.12 Biological yield (t ha^{-1})

There was a significant influence in the biological yield of mungbean due to leaf clipping (Table 10). The maximum biological yield (4.07 t ha^{-1}) was found from C_1(Leaf clipping), and the minimum biological yield (2.75 t ha^{-1}) from C_0, (control) condition. (Table 8)

Biological yield of mungbean was significantly influenced by variety (Table 9). The maximum biological yield (4.14 t ha^{-1}) was found in V_5 (BARI Mung-5), which was statistically similar with V_6(BARI Mung-6) , V_3 (BARI Mung-3) and V_2(BARI Mung-2). The lowest biological yield (3.78 t ha^{-1}) was observed from V_1 (BARI Mung-1) which was statistically similar with V_2(BARI Mung-2). Varietal performance showed significant variation on biological yield which was supported by the findings of Parvez *et al*. (2013) and Hossain and Solaiman (2004).

Interaction of variety and leaf cliping had a significant influence on biological yield of mungbean (Table 10). The highest biological yield (4.20 t ha^{-1}) was obtained from C_1V_3 (BARI Mung-3 with removal of empty leaf), which was not statistically different from other treatments combination. The lowest biological yield (3.71 t ha^{-1}) was recorded from C_0V_1(BARI Mung-1 with control)

4.13 Harvest index (%)

There was a significant influence in the harvest index yield of mungbean due to leaf clipping (Table 10). The maximum harvest index (32.93 %) was found from C_1(Leaf clipping) and the minimum harvest index (26.28 %) from C_0 (control) condition. (Table8)

Harvest index of mungbean was significantly influenced by variety (Table 9). The maximum harvest index (35.99%) was found in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) which was statistically similar with V_5 (BARI Mung-5). The lowest harvest index (24.16 %) was observed from V_1 (BARI Mung-1), which was statistically similar with V_2 (BARI Mung-2) and V_3 (BARI Mung-3) treatment.

Interaction of variety and leaf cliping had a significant influence on harvest index of mungbean (Table 10). The highest harvest index (39.12 %) was obtained from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with removal of empty leaf) which was statistically similar with C_1V_5 (BARI Mung-5 with removal of empty leaf) and C_1V_4 (BARI Mung-4 with removal of empty leaf) while the lowest harvest index (20.91 %) was obtained from C_0V_1 (BARI Mung-1 with control)treatment which was statistically similar with C_0V_2 (BARI Mung-2 with control)and C_0V_3(BARI Mung-3 with control) treatment combinations.

Table 8. Effect of leaf clipping on the seed, stover, biological yield and harvest index of mungbean

Treatment	Seed yield (t ha^{-1})	Stover yield (t ha^{-1})	Biological yield (t ha^{-1})	Harvest index (%)
C_0	1.04 b	2.89 a	3.926	26.28 b
C_1	1.34 a	2.73 b	4.07	32.93 a
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.05	0.11	NS	1.52
CV (%)	5.86	5.59	5.28	7.41

C_0=No leaf clipping, C_1=Leaf clipping(Removal of leaves having no inflorescence) LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation

Table 9. Effect of variety on the seed, stover, biological yield and harvest index of mungbean

Treatment combination	Seed yield (t ha^{-1})	Stover yield (t ha^{-1})	Biological yield (t ha^{-1})	Harvest index (%)
V_1	0.92 d	2.86 abc	3.77 b	24.16 c
V_2	0.97 d	2.92 ab	3.89 ab	24.90 c
V_3	1.09 c	3.00 a	4.10 a	26.56 c
V_4	1.31 b	2.71 cd	4.01 ab	32.52 b
V_5	1.38 ab	2.75 bcd	4.13 a	33.48 ab
V_6	1.46 a	2.61 d	4.07 a	35.99 a
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.08	0.19	0.25	2.67
CV (%)	5.86	5.59	5.28	7.41

V_1=BARI Mung-1, V_2=BARI Mung-2, V_3=BARI Mung-3, V_4=BARI Mung-4, V_5=BARI Mung-5, V_6=BARI Mung-6 , LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation.

Table 10. Interaction effectof leaf clipping and variety on the seed, stover, biological yield and harvest index of mungbean

Treatment combination	Seed yield (t ha^{-1})	Stover yield (t ha^{-1})	Biological yield (t ha^{-1})	Harvest index (%)
C_0V_1	0.78 g	2.93 abc	3.71 c	20.91 e
C_0V_2	0.82 fg	2.98 ab	3.80 bc	21.55 e
C_0V_3	0.90 f	3.10 a	3.99 a-c	22.43 e
C_0V_4	1.15 de	2.79 b-d	3.94 a-c	29.24 cd
C_0V_5	1.25 cd	2.83 a-d	4.08 ab	30.68 cd
C_0V_6	1.32 c	2.70 c-e	4.02 a-c	32.85 bc
C_1V_1	1.05 e	2.79 b-d	3.84 a-c	27.40 d
C_1V_2	1.13 e	2.86 a-d	3.99 a-c	28.26 d
C_1V_3	1.29 c	2.91 a-c	4.20 a	30.70 cd
C_1V_4	1.46 b	2.62 de	4.08 ab	35.80 ab
C_1V_5	1.52 ab	2.67 c-e	4.19 a	36.27 ab
C_1V_6	1.61 a	2.51 e	4.12 ab	39.12 a
LSD $_{(0.05)}$	0.12	0.27	0.36	3.71
CV (%)	5.86	5.59	5.28	7.41

C_0=No leaf clipping , C_1=Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescence),V_1=BARI Mung-1,V_2=BARI Mung-2,V_3=BARI Mung-3,V_4=BARI Mung-4,V_5=BARI Mung-5,V_6= BARI Mung-6, LSD=Least significance difference, CV=Co-efficient of variation

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The experiment was conducted at the research plot of Sher-e-Bangla Agricultural University Farm, Dhaka during the period from February 2017 to June 2017 to effect of leaf clipping and variety on growth and yield of mungbean. In this experiment, the treatment consisted of two leaf clipping viz. C_o=No leaf clipping(Control), C_1= Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescenc) and six mungbean varieties *viz.* V_1 = BARI Mung-1, V_2 = BARI Mung-2, V_3 = BARI Mung-3, V_4 = BARI Mung-4, V_5 = BARI Mung-5, V_6 = BARI Mung-6. The experiment was laid out in a Randomized Complete Block Design (RCBD) with three replications. Data on different growth parameters, physiological parameters and yield contributing parameters of mungbean were recorded. The collected data were statistically analyzed for evaluation of the treatment effect. A significant variation among the treatment was found while different level of leaf clipping and with variety.

Plant height was significantly influenced by leaf clipping. The tallest plant (12.16, 23.74, 38.34, 51.67 and 57.80 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively), minimum number of leaves plant^{-1} (5.33, 13.24, 12.37, 13.82 and 15.81at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively), maximum number of branches plant^{-1} (0.68, 1.42, 2.05, 2.51, and 2.76 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively), lowest total dry matter plant^{-1} (5.90, 8.12, 9.36, 10.86 and 13.75 g at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively), the earliest days to first flowering (33.17 DAS), the longest pod length (8.99 cm), the maximum number of pods plant^{-1} (15.00), maximum number of seeds pod^{-1} (11.32) an highest weight of thousand seed (51.21 g) , the maximum seed yield hectare^{-1} (1.34 ton) , the maximum biological yield (4.07 t ha^{-1}) , the maximum harvest index (32.93 %) was obtained from C_1(Leaf clipping) compared to C_0(Control) treatment.

The all parameter was significantly varied due to the different varieties. The tallest plant (15.03, 27.00, 40.78, 53.94 and 61.13 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS respectively), maximum number of leaves (6.07, 14.87, 17.83, 16.74 and 19.36 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) were obtained from V_3 (BARI Mung-3) and the shortest plant (10.90, 21.40, 35.54, 44.23 and 51.60 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) the minimum (5.07, 12.27, 15.53, 12.37 and 13.12 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) number of leaves plant^{-1} were recorded in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) .The maximum number of branches plant^{-1} (0.82, 1.58, 2.19, 2.60, and 2.88 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was found in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) but minimum number of branches plant^{-1}(0.55, 1.30, 1.91, 2.35 and 2.56 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was recorded in V_1 (BARI Mung-4). The highest total dry mater (6.75, 8.82, 10.98, 13.78 and 16.79 gm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was recorded in V_3(BARI Mung-3) whereas the lowest total dry matter (5.47, 7.67, 8.91, 10.84 and 13.68 gm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS respectively) was recorded from V_6 (BARI Mung-6). The earliest of days to first flowering (32.33 DAS) was found in V_6 (BARI Mung-6). The longest pod length (9.67 cm), the highest number of pod plant^{-1} (16.67), highest number of seeds pod^{-1} (12.04), maximum weight of 1000-seed (53.55 g) were recorded in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) but the shortest pod length (7.71 cm), the lowest number of pod plant^{-1} (13.00), lowest number of seeds pod^{-1} (9.60), minimum weight of 1000-seed (47.09 g) was observed in V_1 (BARI Mung-1). The highest seed yield (1.47 t ha^{-1}) was recorded in V_6 (BARI Mung-6). In contrast, the lowest seed yield (0.92 t ha^{-1}) were recorded in V_1 (BARI Mung-1). The highest stover yield (3.00 t ha^{-1}) were recorded from V_3(BARI Mung-3). The maximum biological yield (4.14 t ha^{-1}) was found in V_5 (BARI Mung-5) but minimum was obtained fromV_1(BARI Mung-1). The maximum harvest index (35.99%) was found in V_6 (BARI Mung-6) on the other hand minimum harvest index (24.16%) was found in V_1 (BARI Mung-1)

Interaction effect of leaf clipping and variety was significant on all parameter. The tallest plant (15.16, 27.27, 41.29 56.54 and 63.08 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and

55 DAS, respectively) were obtained from C_1V_3 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment combination whereas shortest plant (10.73, 21.06, 35.43, 41.86, and 50.03 cm at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS respectively) from C_0V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with control). The highest number of leaves plant^{-1} (6.07, 15.27, 17.93, 20.98 and 23.91at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was obtained from C_0V_3 (BARI Mung-3 with control) treatment combination while the lowest number(5.07, 12.20, 11.80and 13.29 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment combination. The highest number of branches plant^{-1} (0.85, 1.67, 2.36, 2.88 and 3.05 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was obtained from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) while the lowest (0.53, 1.29, 1.93, 2.28, and 2.51 at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) from C_0V_1 (BARI Mung-1 with control) treatment combination. The highest total dry matter (6.83, 8.87, 11.50 , 14.83 and 18.00 g at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was found in C_0V_3(BARI Mung-3 with control) on the other hand the lowest (5.44, 7.57, 8.33, 9.67 and 12.40 g at 15, 25, 35, 45 and 55 DAS, respectively) was found in C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) treatment combination. The earliest days to first flowering (32.00 DAS) was obtained from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping)but latest flowering (34.33DAS) was obtained from C_0V_1 (BARI Mung-1 with control) treatment. The highest pod length (9.88 cm), maximum number of pods plant^{-1} (17.13), maximum number of seeds pod^{-1} (12.58) and highest weight of thousand seed (55.52 g), the highest seed yield (1.61 t ha^{-1}) were obtained from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with control) treatment combination. On the other hand, lowest pod length (7.43cm), minimum number of pod plant^{-1} (12.73) , minimum number of seeds pod^{-1} (9.16), the lowest weight of thousand seed (45.91g), the lowest seed yield (0.78 t ha^{-1}) were obtained from C_0V_1(BARI Mung-1 with control).. The highest stover yield (3.10 t/ha) was recorded from C_0V_3 (BARI Mung-3 with control) but lowest stover yield (2.51 t ha^{-1}) was recorded from C_1V_6 (BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) . The highest biological yield (4.20 t ha^{-1}) was obtained from C_1V_3 (BARI Mung-3 with leaf clipping) and lowest biological yield (3.71 t ha^{-1}) obtained from C_0V_1 (BARI Mung-1 with control).

The highest harvest index (39.12%) was obtained from C_1V_6(BARI Mung-6 with leaf clipping) whereas lowest harvest index (20.91%) was obtained from C_0V_1(BARI Mung-1 with control).

Conclusion

From the above findings it can be concluded that most of the parameters gave the best performance which was achieved from BARI Mung-6 (V_6). Again, Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescenc) showed the best performance regarding most of the yield and yield contributing parameters. In case of interaction effect, BARI Mung-6 and removal of empty leaf (leaf clipping) gave the best result considering yield and yield contributing parameters. The highest seed yield 1.61 t ha^{-1} was obtained from BARI Mung-6 and leaf clipping (C_1V_6). So, this treatment combination (C_1V_6) can be treated as the best treatment combination under the present study.

Recommendations

Considering above finding of the of the present experiment, further studies in this aspect may be conducted or adaptive trial is needed in different agro-ecological zones (AEZ) of Bangladesh with leaf clipping and different varieties of mungbean.

REFERENCES

Ahamed, K. U., Nahar K., Hasanuzzaman, M., Faruq, G. and Khandaker, M. (2011). Morphophysiological attributes of mungbean (*Vigna radiate L.*) varieties under different plant spacing. *World J. Agril. Sci*., **7**(2): 234-245.

Ahmad, A., Karim, M. F., Shamdane, G. and Maniruzzaman, A. F. M. (2003). Effect of time of weeding and plant density on the growth and yield of mungbean. *Bangladesh J. Agric. Res.*, **16**(2): 23-25.

Alam, M.S., Rahman, A. H. M. M., Nesa, M.N., Khan S.K. and Siddquie, N.A. (2008). Effect of source and/or sink restriction on the grain yield in wheat. *Eur. J. Applied Sci. Res.*, **4**: 258-261.

Alexander, K.I. and Thompson, K. (1982).The effect of clipping frequency on the competitive interaction between two perennial grass species.*Oecologia,* **53**: 251.

Ali, A., Choudhry, M.A. and Tanveer,A.(2004).Response of mungbean (*Vigna radiate* L.) genotypes to Rhizobium culture. *Pakistan J. Biol. Sci*., **37**(2): 80-82.

Ali, M.A., Nawab, N. N., Rasool, G. and Saleem, M. (2008). Estimates of variability and correlations for quantitative traits in Cicer arietinum L. *J. Agric. Soc. Sci.*, **4**: 177–179.

Ali, S., Khaliq, T., Ahmad, A., Rehman, M., Hussain, S., Rehman, K. and Perve, A. W. (2014). Genotypic variations in mungbean yield and its attributes in response to different sowing times.*Res. J. Agric. Environ. Manage.*, **3**(5): 255-258.

Apurv, P. and Tewari, S. K. (2004). Yield dynamics of mungbean (*Vigna radiate L.* Wilczek). varieties in poplar based agroforestry system. *Indian J. Agrofor*., **6**(2): 89-91.

Arzadún, M. J., Arroquy, J. I., Laborde, H. E. and Brevedan, R. E. (2006). Effect of planting date, clipping height, and cultivar on forage and grain yield of winter wheat in Argentinean Pampas. *Agron. J*., **98**(1):1274-1279.

Aslam, M.M., Hussain, M., Naddem, A. and Haqqani, A.M. (2004).Comparative efficiency of different mungbean genotypes under agroclimatic condition of Bukhar. *Pakistan J. Life Soc. Sci*., **2**(1): 51-53.

AVRDC (Asian Vegetable Research and Development Centre) (1974). Mungbean Report., 1975. Asian Vegetable Research and Development Center, Shanhua, Taiwan, R.O.C. pp. 35-40.

BARI (Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute). (1980). Annual Report of 1979-80. Bangladesh Agric. Res. Inst., Gazipur-1701.p. 83.

BARI (Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute). (2005). Annual Report of 2004-2005. *Bangladesh Agric. Res. Inst*. (BARI), Gazipur-1701. p.68.

BARI (Bangladesh Agricultural Research Institute). (2006). A Booklet of mungbean production technology. *Bangladesh Agric. Res. Inst*., Gazipur-1701.P. 64.

BBS (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics). (2006) .Statistical Year Book of Bangladesh. Stat. Div. Minist. Plann.Govt. People's Repub. Bangladesh, Dhaka.pp.141-142.

BBS (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics). (2011) .Statistical Year Book of Bangladesh. Stat. Div. Minist. Plann., Govt. People's Repub. Bangladesh, Dhaka.p.86.

BBS (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics). (2012). Statistical Year Book of Bangladesh. Stat. Div. Minist. Plann., Govt. People's Repub. Bangladesh, Dhaka.p.108.

BBS (Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics). (2016). Statistical Year Book of Bangladesh Bur. Stat., Stat. Div., Min. Plan., Govt. People's Republic of Bangladesh.p. 113.

Bhati, T. K., Rathore, S. S. and Gaur, N. K. (2005).Effect of improved varieties and nutrient management in kharif legumes under arid ecosystem in Institution Village Linkage Programme. *J. Arid Leg*., **2**(2): 227-229.

Bhuiyan, M.A.H., Mian, M.H. and Islam, M.S. (2008). Studies on the effects of *bradyrhizobium inoculation* on yield and yield attributes of mungbean. *Bangladesh J. Agril. Res*., **33**(3) : 449-457.

BINA (Bangladesh Institute of Nuclear Agriculture). (1998). Annual report of 1997-98. Bangladesh Inst. Nuclear Agric., Mymensingh. p. 23.

BINA (Bangladesh Institute of Nuclear Agriculture). (2007). A leaflet of BINA mung-2, BINA mung-5, BINA mung-6 and BINA mung-7. Bangladesh Inst. Nuclear Agric., Mymensingh,p.44.

BINA (Bangladesh Institute of Nuclear Agriculture).(2005). A booklet on technology released by BINA. Bangladesh Inst. Nuclear Agric., Mymensingh.p.56.

Birsin, M., Fotosentez, B., Organlarının, V. and Etkisi, Ö. 2005.Effects of Removal of Some Photosynthetic Structures on Some Yield Components in Wheat.TarımBilimleriDergisi., **11**. 364-367.

Biswas J. C. and Hamid, A. (1992). Influence of carbofuras on growth and yield of mungbean. *Bangladesh J. Bot*., **21**:255-257.

Borah, U. K. (1994). Performance of green gram genotypes under different seed rates during summer season. *J. Agri. Sci. Soc.,* North East India, **7**:79-81.

Brar, J.S., Inderjit, S., Sarvjeet, S. and Bains, T.S. (2004). SML 668: a new early maturing and high yielding variety of summer Mungbean. *J. Res. Punjab Agril. Univ.,* **41**(1): 174-181.

Busso, C. A. and Richards, J. H. (1995). Drought and clipping effects on tiller demography and growth of two tussock grasses in Utah, *J. of Arid Env.,* **29**(2): 239-251.

Chaisri, P., Kaveeta, L., Chaisri, S. and Kaveeta, R. (2005). Mungbean yield trial for cropping system in Lopburi area. *Proceedings of 43rd Kasetsart Univ. Ann. Conf.*, Thailand, 1-4 February, 2005: 214-222.

Chawdhury M. S. I., Miah, A.F. M. and Alam, S. (1982). Physiology of grain development and yield in mungbean.Naional workshop on pulses, 18-19 Aug, 1981.BARI, Joydepur, Bangladesh. Page. 179-193.

Chaudhury, D. C., Sing, R. P. and Sing, N. P. (1989). Productivity of mungbean cultivars as influenced by planting dates. *Legumes Res*., **12**(1):43-44.

Chowdhary, M.A., Mahmood, N., Rashid, T.R. and Khaliq, I. (1999). Effect of leaf area removal on grain yield and its components in spring wheat. *RACHIS.*, **18**(2): 75-78.

Clifford, P. E. (1979). Source limitation of sink yield in mungbeans. *Ann. Bot*. **43**:397-399.

Davidson, J. L. (1965). Some effects of leaf area control on the yield of wheat. *Australian J. of Agri. Res.***,** **16(**1): 721-731.

Elsahookie, M. M. and Wuhaib, K. M. (1988). Performance of clipped maize. *J. Agron. Crop Sci.,* **160**: 10–13.

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization).(1999). FAO, Production Year Book, Basic Data Unit. Statistical Division, FAO, Rome, Italy.pp.96.

Farghali, M.A., Hussein, H.A. (1995). Potential of genotypic and seasonal effects on yield of mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. wilczek). *Assuit. J. Agric*., **26(**2):13-21.

Johnson, B.J., (1972). Effect of artificial defoliation on sunflower yields and other characteristics. *Agron. J.*, **64**: 688-389.

Haque, M.M. (1995). Effect of plant population on the growth and yield of mungbean. *Bangladesh J. Sci. Ind. Res*., **3**(1): 63-69.

Hamed, M. F. (1998). Response of two mungbean varieties under irrigation intervals and certain fertilization treatments. *Ann. Agril. Sci.*, **36**(1): 31-42.

Hamid, A. (1989). Effect of source manipulations on the dynamics of pod set and flower abscission in mungbean. *J. Agron. Crop. Sci*., **163**:1-5.

Hamid, A., Kubota, F., Agata, W. and Morokuma, M.(1990). Photosynthesis transpiration, dry matters accumulation and yield performance of mungbean plant in response to water stress. *J. Fac. Agr*., **35** : 81-92.

Hamid, A., Agata, W., Kawamitsu, Y.(1994). Photosynthesis, transpiration and water use efficiency in four cultivars of mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). *Photosynmthetica*., **24**(1):96-101.

Hamzi, S. and Modarres-Sanavi, M.A., Aghaalikhani, M., Khazaei, F. and Heidari-Sharifabad, H. (2018). Effect of leaf clipping on yield and quality traits of three corn cultivars. *African J. of Plant Sci.*, **2**(2): 147-150.

Hossain, D. and Solaiman, A. R. M. (2004). Performances of mungbean varieties as affected by Rhizobium inoculants. *Bulletin Inst. Tropic. Agric.*, **27**: 35-43.

Hossain, M.A., Haque M.A., Chowdhury S, Fakir M.S.A. (2006) Effect of defoliation on morphological characters, dry mass production and seed yield in cowpea. *J. Bangladesh Soc. Agric. Sci. Technol.,* **3**:197-200.

Infante, N., Madriz, P. and Gonzalez, T. (2003). Phases of development and yield components of three mungbean cultivars (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilczek). in Maracay, Aragua state, Venezuela. *Rev. Faculty of Agro*., **20**(4): 417-429.

Islam, M. K., Islam, S. M. A., Harun-or-Rashid, M., Hossain, A. F. M. G. F., and Alom, M. M. (2006). Effect of biofertilizer and plant growth regulators on growth of summer mungbean. *Intl. J. Bot.***2**(1): 36-41.

Kabir, M. H. and Sarkar, M. A. R. (2008).Seed yield of mungbean as affected by variety and plant spacing in *Kharif*-I season.*J. Bangladesh Agril. Univ.*, **6**(2): 239–244.

Kadiri, M., Mukhtar, F. and Agboola, D. A.1997.Responses of some Nigerian vegetables to plant growth regulator treatments. *Rev. Biol. Trop.,* **44** (3): 23–28.

Kannaiyan, S. (1999). Bioresource technology for sustainable agriculture. Associated Publishing Company. New Delhi, India. p. 422.

Kaul, A. K. (1982). Pulses in Bangladesh. BARC, Farmgate, Dhaka, Bangladesh.p.27.

Khalifa, A. A., Misra, B. A., Azeem, M. N., Salem, A. E. (2008). Effect of leaf cutting on physiological traits and yield of two rice cultivars. *African J. Plant Sci.*, **2**(12): 147-150.

Khan, M. R. I. (1981) Nutritional quality characters in pulses. In: Proc. MAT. Workshop Pulses. pp. 199 -206.

Khan, B.M., and Asif, M. (2001) . Growth and yield Response of mungbean genotypes to various planting densities. *J. Res, Sci.*, **12**(2): 167 – 170.

Kumar, R., Barman, A.Phukan, T., Kabyashree, K., Singh, N. Jha, G., Sonti, R. V., Genin, S. and Ray, S. K. (2016). *Ralstonia solanacearum* virulence in tomato seedlings inoculated by leaf clipping. *Indian J. Agrofor.*, **66**(5): 180-189.

Kuo, C. C., Wang, A. C. and Cheng, M. H. (1978). Physiological basis for mungbean yield improvement. In. proc. of the first International mungbean syrnposium, Shanhua,Taiwan, pp. 205-209.

Lambers H. (1987). Variation in photosynthetic rate explain variation in growth rate and yield. *Netherlands J. Agric. Sci.*, **35:**505-519.

Li, B., Shibuya, T., Yogo, Y. and Hara, T. (2004).Effects of ramet clipping and nutrient availability on growth and biomass allocation of yellow nutsedge. *Ecological Res*., **19**(6):603-612.

Labanauskas, C. K. and Dungan, G. H. (1956).Effect of leaf clipping on growth and yield of oat. *Agro .J.* **48**:265-268.

Madriz-Isturiz, P. M. and Luciani-Marcano, J. F. (2004). Agronomic characterization of 20 cultivars of mungbean (*Vignaradiata* L.) during three seasons, in Maracay, Aragua state, Venezuela. *Rev. Faculty Agron*., **21**(1): 19-35.

Mahmood, N. and Chowdhry, M. A. (1997). Removal of green photosynthetic structures and their effect on some yield parameters in bread wheat. Wheat Information service, Japan, **85**: 14-20.

Mapfumo, S., Chiduza, C., Young, E.M., Murungu, F.S., Nyamudeza, P. (2007). Effect of cultivar, seedling age and leaf clipping on establishment, growth and yield of pearl millet (*Pennisetum glaucum*) and sorghum (*Sorghum bicolor*) transplants, *South African J. Plant and Soil*, **24**(4): 202-208

Mariko, S. and Hogestu, K. (1987). Analytical studies on the responsed of sunflower (*Helianthes annus*) to various defliation treatments. *Ecol. Res.* **2**: 1-17.

Marshal,C. and Wardlaw, I.F.(1973) A comparative study of the distribution and speed of the movement of assimilate and foliar applied phosphate in wheat. *Aus. J. Biol. Sci.*,**26**:1-13.

Mondal, M. M. A., Dutta, R. K. and Islam, M. A. (2004). Yield performance of some mungbean mutants in the northern region of Bangladesh. *Bangladesh J. Nuclear Agric.*, **19**: 32-35.

Mondal, M.M.A. (2007) A study of source-sink relationship in mungbean. Ph.D Thesis, Dept. Crop Bot., Bangladesh Agric. Univ., Mymensingh, Bangladesh.

Mondal, M.H., Brun, W.A. and Brenner, M.L. (1978) Effects of sink removal on photosynthesis and senescence in leaves of soybean (*Glycine max* L.) plants. *Plant Physiol.* **61** : 394-397.

Moriondo, M., Orlandini, S. and Villalobos, F.J. (2003).Modelling compensatory effects of defoliation on leaf area growth and biomass of sunflower (*Helianthus annuus*L.).*Europian J. of Agron.*, **19**: 161-171.

Muhammad, A., Abdul, R., Muhammad, A. and Zafar, M. I. (2006). Association among Rhizobium phaseoli strains and mungbean genotypes under rainfed conditions. *Sarhad J. Agric.***22**(3): 453-457.

Muro. J., Irigoyen, I.,Militino, A. F. and Lamsfus, C. (2001). Defoliation effects on sunflower yield reduction. *Agron. J.*, **93**: 634-637.

Navgire, K. D., Datar, V. V., Asewar, B. V. and Dahiwal, A. L. (2001). Response of mungbean cultivars to different *Rhizobium* strains under rainfed conditions. *Ann. Plant Physio*.,**15**(2): 134-137.

Parvez, M. T., Paul, S. K. andSarkar, M. A. R., (2013). Yield and yield contributing characters of mungbean as affected by variety and level of phosphorus. *J. Agrofor. Environ*., **7**(1): 115-118.

Patel, L. R., Salvi, N. M. and Patel, R. H. (1992). Response of green gram (*Phaseolus valgaris*) varieties to sulphur fertilization under different levels of nitrogen and phosphours. *Indian J. Aagron.*, **37**(4): 831-833.

Piening, L. and Kaufmann, M.L. (1969). Comparison of the effects of net blotch and leaf removal on yield in Barley. *Canadian J. of Plant Sci*., **49**: 731-735.

Rahman, M. A. (2002). A study of growth and dry matter production in mungbean genotypes. M. S. Thesis. Dept, of Crop Botany, Bangladesh Agril.Univ..Mymensingh.

Raj, S. and Tripathi, K. P. (2005). Productivity and economics of mungbean (*Vigna radiate* L.) as influenced by varieties and nutrient management. *J. Arid Legume*., **2**(2): 223-226.

Rao, J. R. K. and Ghildyal, M. C. (1985). Analysis of photosynthetic source and sink relationship in mungbean (*Vigna radiata* L. Wilezek). *Indian J. plant physiol.* **28:**135-144.

Rana, K. S. and Singh, B. N. (1992). Effect of planting dates on the yield and yield attributes of mungbean(*Vigna radiata*) and urdbean (*Vigna mungo*). *Crop Res. Hisar.*, **5**(1): 154- 156.

Rasul, F., Cheema, M. A., Sattar, A., Saleem, M. F. and Wahid, M. A. (2012). Evaluating the performance of three mungbean varieties grown under varying inter-row spacing. *J. Anim. and Plant Sci.*, **22**(4): 1030-1035.

Reddy, C.S. and Shah, C.B. (1990).Effect of growth regulators on spring bunch and Virginia runna groundnut cultivars. *Indian J. Agron*., **29** (4):516-521.

Rehman, A., Khalil, S. K., Nigar, S., Rehman, S., Haq, I., Akhtar, S., Khan, A. Z. and Shah, S. R. (2009). Phenology, plant height and yield of mungbean varieties in response to planting date. *Sarhad J. Agric.*, **25**(2): 148-152.

Remison, S.U. and Omueti, O. (1982). Effects of nitrogen application and leaf clippinf after mid-silk on yield and protein content of Maize. *Canadian J. Plant Sci.*, **62**(3):777-779

Rockwood, L. L. (1973). The effect of defoliation on seed production of six costa rican tree Species. *Ecology*, **54**(5): 1363–1369.

Sadi, S. M. (2004). Effect of variety and seed rate on the yield and quality of mungbean. M. S. Thesis, Dept. Agron., Bangladesh Agric. Univ., Mymensingh. p. 42.

Sarkar, M. A. R., Kabir, M. H., Begum, M. and Salam., M. A. (2004). Yield performance of mungbean as affected by planting date, variety and plant density. *J. Agron.* **3**(1): 18-24.

Sarkar, M. A. S., Parvez, M. T. and Paul, S. K. (2013). Yield and yield contributing characters of mungbean as affected by variety and level of phosphorus. *J. Agrofor. Environ.*, **7**(1): 115- 118.

Shamsuzzaman, A. M. M., Alam, M. S., Mondal, G. and Ahamed, K. U. (2004). Growth and yield response of summer mungbean to irrigation frequency. *J. Agric. Rural Dev.*, **2**(1): 95-100.

Thakuria, K. and Saharia, P. (1990). Response of greengram genotypes to plant density and phosphorus levels in summer. *Indian J. Agron.***35**: 431-432.

Tomar, S.S., Sharma, R.K. , Verma, O.P. , Bhadouria, S.S. and Tomar, A.S. (1995). Effect of seed rate, irrigation and phophorus levels on the yield attributes and net return of summer mungbean. *Field Crop Abst.*, **51**:237

Uddin, S., Amin, A. K. M. R., JafarUllah, M. and Asaduzzman, M. (2009). Interaction effect of variety and different fertilizers on the growth and yield of summer mungbean. *American-Eurasian J. Agron.*, **2**(3): 180-184.

Venkateswarlu, B., and Visperas, R. M. (1987) Source-sink relationships in crop plants. IRRI Res paper series **125**:1-19.

Vieiera, R. F., Oliveira, V. R. and Vieira, C. (2003). Mungbean cultivation in summer in Vicosa and Prudente de Morais. *Hort. Brasil,* **21**(1): 43- 44.

Wallace, L. L., McNaughton, S. J. and Coughenour, M. B. (1985). Effects of clipping and four levels of nitrogen on the gas exchange, growth, and production of two east africangraminoids. *American J. Bot.*, **72** (2) :231-233

Wang, Z., J. Fu, Tian, M. He, Q. and Cao, H., (1997). Effects of source/sink manipulation on net photosynthetic rate and photosynthate partitioning during grain filling in winter wheat.*Bio.Plant*.,**39**(2): 379-385.

Wang, X.L., Liu, D., Li, Z.Q. (2014). Effects of the coordination mechanism between roots and leaves induced by root-breaking and exogenous cytokinin spraying on the grazing tolerance of ryegrass. *J. Plant Res.*,**125**:407–416.

Xiao-Ling, W., Xiao-Lin, G. and Xiao-Gai, H. (2014). Effects of leaf zeatin and zeatinriboside induced by different clipping heights on the regrowth capacity of plant.*Ecol. Res*., **29**(2):167-180.

Appendix I. Layout and design of the experimental plot





Unit plot size:
2.8 m x 1.8m

Factor-A:(Leaf clipping) level-2
C_o=No leaf clipping (control)
C_1= Leaf clipping (Removal of leaves having no inflorescence)

Factor-B: Varieties-6
V_1 = BARI Mung-1
V_2 = BARI Mung-2
V_3 = BARI Mung-3
V_4 = BARI Mung-4
V_5 = BARI Mung-5
V_6 = BARI Mung-6

APPENDICES

Appendix II. Experimental location on the map of Agro-ecological Zones of Bangladesh



Appendix III. Monthly average of air temperature, relative humidity and total rainfall of the experimental site during the period from March to June, 2017

Month	Air Temperature (^0C)		Relative humidity (%)	Rainfall (mm)
	Maximum	Minimum		
February	30.1	20.2	60	71
March	31.2	21.3	62	90
April	33.4	23.2	67	160
May	34.7	25.9	70	185
June	35.4	22.5	80	277

* Monthly average,

* Source: Bangladesh Meteorological Department (Climate & weather division) Agargoan, Dhaka – 1212

Appendix IV. Characteristics of the soil of experimental field

A. Morphological characteristics of the experimental field

Morphological features	Characteristics
Location	Agronomy Field , SAU, Dhaka
AEZ	Madhupur Tract (28)
General Soil Type	Shallow red brown terrace soil
Land type	High land
Soil series	Tejgaon
Topography	Fairly leveled

B. The physical and chemical characteristics of soil (0-15 cm depth)

Constituents	Percent
Sand	26
Silt	45
Clay	29
Textural class	Silty clay

Chemical composition:

Soil characters	Value
Organic carbon (%)	0.45
Organic matter (%)	0.78
Total nitrogen (%)	0.07
Phosphorus	22.08 µg/g soil
Sulphur	25.98 µg/g soil
Magnesium	1.00 meq/100 g soil
Boron	0.48 µg/g soil
Copper	3.54 µg/g soil
Zinc	3.32 µg/g soil
Potassium	0.30 µg/g soil

Source: Soil Resources Development Institute (SRDI), Khamarbari, Dhaka

Appendix V. Analysis of variance of the data on plant height of mungbean as affected by leaf clipping and variety

Source of variation	df	Mean square value at different days after sowing				
		15	25	35	45	55
Replication	2	2.836	3.722	5.987	61.904	33.054
Leaf clipping (A)	1	0.022^{NS}	0.008^{NS}	0.877^{NS}	149.98*	119.79*
Variety (B)	5	13.752*	20.543*	23.749*	69.473*	62.385*
Leaf clipping (A) X Variety (B)	5	0.388*	0.849*	0.428*	3.358*	3.706*
Error	22	0.600	2.380	4.864	6.392	15.036

*Significant at 5% level of significance

^{NS} Non significant

AppendixVI. Analysis of variance of the data on number of leaves plant^{-1} of mungbean as affected by leaf clipping and variety

Source of variation	df	Mean square value at different days after sowing				
		15	25	35	45	55
Replication	2	0.068	0.070	0.142	0.668	1.054
Leaf clipping (A)	1	0.028^{NS}	0.071^{NS}	152.65*	638.32*	967.314*
Variety (B)	5	0.873*	4.419*	2.871*	14.110*	26.735*
Leaf clipping (A) X Variety (B)	5	0.014*	1.039*	0.069*	1.650*	4.317*
Error	22	0.080	0.565	1.020	0.613	2.721

*Significant at 5% level of significance

^{NS} Non significant

Appendix VII. Analysis of variance of the data on number of branches plant^{-1} of mungbean as affected by leaf clipping and variety

Source of variation	df	Mean square value at different days after sowing				
		15	25	35	45	55
Replication	2	0.001	0.003	0.001	0.001	0.001
Leaf clipping (A)	1	0.001^{NS}	0.00^{NS}	0.000^{NS}	0.136*	0.118*
Variety (B)	5	0.057*	0.062*	0.059*	0.050*	0.076*
Leaf clipping (A) X Variety (B)	5	0.000*	0.000*	0.002*	0.001*	0.001*
Error	22	0.003	0.008	0.009	0.016	0.020

*Significant at 5% level of significance

^{NS} Non significant

Appendix VIII. Analysis of variance of the data on total dry matter plant^{-1} of mungbean as affected by leaf clipping and variety

Source of variation	df	Mean square value at different days after sowing				
		15	25	35	45	55
Replication	2	1.091	2.105	0.528	5.459	7.793
Leaf clipping (A)	1	0.119^{NS}	0.167^{NS}	9.100*	45.473*	53.217*
Variety (B)	5	1.374*	0.975*	3.320*	6.737*	6.914*
Leaf clipping (A) X Variety (B)	5	0.005*	0.003*	0.050*	0.017*	0.017*
Error	22	0.166	0.102	0.483	0.145	0.246

*Significant at 5% level of significance

^{NS} Non significant

Appendix IX. Analysis of variance of the data on yield contributing character of mungbean as affected by leaf clipping and variety

Source of variation	df	Mean square value of different yield contributing parameters				
		Pod length	Pod plant^{-1}	Seed pod^{-1}	1000 seed wt	Days to 1st flowering
Replication	2	0.067	0.396	1.254	43.681	0.028
Leaf clipping (A)	1	2.706*	6.418*	6.469*	68.75*	1.361*
Variety (B)	5	3.919*	9.83*	5.544*	34.60*	2.628*
Leaf clipping (A) X Variety (B)	5	0.014*	0.044*	0.034*	0.654*	0.094*
Error	22	0.310	0.564	0.228	7.060	0.240

*Significant at 5% level of significance

^{NS} Non significant

Appendix X. Analysis of variance of the data on seed, stover, biological yield and harvest index of mungbean as affected by leaf clipping and variety

Source of variation	df	Mean square value of different yield and harvest index			
		Seed yield	Stover yield	Biological yield	Harvest index
Replication	2	0.016	0.030	0.088	0.236
Leaf clipping (A)	1	0.843*	0.235*	0.188*	398.136*
Variety (B)	5	0.312*	0.130*	0.113*	150.295*
Leaf clipping (A) X Variety (B)	5	0.003*	0.001*	0.002*	1.176*
Error	22	0.005	0.025	0.045	4.812

*Significant at 5% level of significance

^{NS} Non significant