



Francieli Fátima de Camargo 99817845168

CNPJ 22.986.804/0001-44

Rua Paulo João Ramos, 1727, Casa 1, Cep 88.334-560,
Estaleirinho, Balneário Camboriú, SC

Declaração

Eu, **CRISTIANO SANTOS**, CPF 944.030.159-72, RG 7.679.194-5, Engenheiro Agrônomo (CREA MT026195), com formação em Língua Inglesa pela Stanton School of English (Londres, Inglaterra, Reino Unido), Tradutor e Revisor Final da empresa **CANAL PAGE**, inscrita no CNPJ sob o número 22.986.804/0001-44, localizada na Rua Paulo João Ramos, 1727, Casa 1, Cep 88.334-560, Estaleirinho, Balneário Camboriú, SC, **DECLARO** para todos os fins que o artigo que segue abaixo, intitulado "**SEEDING SYSTEM AND DENSITY FOR WINTER *Urochloa ruzizensis* INTERCROPPED WITH SORGHUM BETWEEN SOYBEAN CROPS**", foi traduzido por esta empresa, para o idioma inglês (norte-americano), contemplando revisão textual, observando as normas gramaticais e ortográficas, assim como a adequação de estilo e de expressões características da área de estudo.

Por ser expressão da verdade, firmamos a presente declaração.

Balneário Camboriú, SC, 17 de julho de 2018

Cristiano Santos
Tradutor e Revisor Final

Francieli Fátima de Camargo
Proprietária/Gerente Administrativo

SEEDING SYSTEM AND DENSITY FOR WINTER *Urochloa ruziziensis* INTERCROPPED WITH SORGHUM BETWEEN SOYBEAN CROPS

Abstract

The intercrop of sorghum with *Urochloa ruziziensis* allows the production of grains and biomass in the winter. The objective of this study was to identify the more adequate seeding system and seed density for *Urochloa ruziziensis* intercropped with sorghum between soybean crops to obtain high grain and biomass yields with these species and evaluate the performance of the subsequent soybean crop. The experiments were carried out in the winter of 2015 and in the 2015-2016 crop season in Rio Verde GO, and Santa Helena de Goiás GO, Brazil. The treatments consisted of three seeding systems (in-row, inter-row, and broadcast), and five seed densities (2, 4, 6, 8, and 10 viable seeds m⁻²) of *U. ruziziensis* intercropped with sorghum, using monocultures of sorghum and *U. ruziziensis* as controls. The seeding density of 8 viable seeds m⁻² of *U. ruziziensis* using in-row seeding, and up to 10 viable seeds m⁻² using inter-row, and broadcast seeding do not decrease sorghum grain yield. Increasing seeding density of *U. ruziziensis* increases its dry matter yield, and the total dry matter yield when intercropped with sorghum. The intercrop of sorghum with *U. ruziziensis* increases the soil plant coverage. The dry matter of the intercrop of sorghum with *U. ruziziensis* does not affect soybean grain yield.

Keywords: biomass, *Brachiaria* spp., dry matter, *Sorghum bicolor*

Introduction

Winter sorghum has been a promising crop for grain production between soybean crops in the Center-West region of Brazil because it has similar nutritional value to maize, lower production costs, and good adaptation to different environments (Baumhardt et al., 2005; Dan et al., 2010), including those with water deficits (Cysne & Pitombeira, 2012).

The state of Goiás in Brazil has been a major producer of sorghum in the country, with sorghum crops covering areas of high (>600 m) and low (<600 m) altitudes. However, in the last decade, sorghum grains have been increasingly produced for the agro-industries of the Southwest region of the State, denoting the need of alternatives for the maintenance of straw production for the no-tillage system. Winter grasses are important for the implementation and feasibility of the no-tillage system because they have low decomposition rate, and present longer maintenance of straws on the soil surface (Torres et al., 2008).

33 The intercrop of sorghum with grass species is a promising system that allows the production
34 of grains and biomass in the winter (Mateus et al., 2011; Horvathy Neto et al., 2012; Silva et al.,
35 2013; 2015). Moreover, this biomass can be used as forage (Horvathy Neto et al., 2014; Silva et al.,
36 2014).

37 This system generates abundant root system due to the grass species, contributing to water
38 infiltration and soil aggregation and aeration (Kluthcouski et al., 2004; Silva et al., 2007). However,
39 the intercropping of winter grass species with sorghum must consider a grass seed density that
40 avoids its competition with the cereal, regardless of the altitude of the area.

41 The objective of this study was to identify the more adequate seeding system and seed density
42 for *Urochloa ruziziensis* intercropped with sorghum between soybean crops to obtain high grain and
43 biomass yields with these species and evaluate the performance of the subsequent soybean crop.

44

45 **Material and Methods**

46 Field experiments were conducted in the winter of 2015, in areas with high and low altitudes,
47 Rio Verde GO (17°47'23.9"S; 50°57'41.5"W; and 758 m of altitude) and Santa Helena de Goiás GO
48 (17°50'41.1"S; 50°36'51.0"W; and 580 m of altitude), respectively, in Brazil. The soils of the
49 experimental areas were classified as dystrophic Red Latossolo (Oxisol), which were cultivated
50 with summer soybean crops in no-tillage system for 11 (Rio Verde) and 18 (Santa Helena de Goiás)
51 years.

52 The chemical analysis of the soil of the experiment area in Rio Verde showed pH (CaCl₂) of
53 4.7, 1.50 cmol_c dm⁻³ of Ca, 0.16 cmol_c dm⁻³ of K, 1.01 cmol_c dm⁻³ of Mg, 0.30 cmol_c dm⁻³ of Al, 5.7
54 cmol_c dm⁻³ of H+Al, CEC of 8.4 cmol_c dm⁻³, sum of bases of 2.7 cmol_c dm⁻³, 7.7 mg dm⁻³ of P, base
55 saturation of 32.3%, and Al saturation of 8.5%.

56 The chemical analysis of the soil of the experiment area in Santa Helena de Goiás showed pH
57 (CaCl₂) of 4.8, 1.60 cmol_c dm⁻³ of Ca, 0.22 cmol_c dm⁻³ of K, 0.50 cmol_c dm⁻³ of Mg, 0.15 cmol_c dm⁻³

58 of Al, $3.6 \text{ cmol}_c \text{ dm}^{-3}$ of H+Al, CEC of $6.0 \text{ cmol}_c \text{ dm}^{-3}$, sum of bases of $2.4 \text{ cmol}_c \text{ dm}^{-3}$, 36 mg dm^{-3}
59 of P, base saturation of 39.1%, and Al saturation of 6.1%.

60 The mean air temperature and precipitation during the experiment, and the periods of
61 implementation and harvest of the crops are shown in Figure 1.

62

63 **Figure 1.** Mean air temperature and precipitation from January 2015 to March 2016 in Rio Verde
64 GO (RV) (Source: Comigo Cooperative meteorological station), and from January to November
65 2015 in Santa Helena de Goiás GO (SHG) (Source: Monsanto meteorological station), Brazil.

66

67 The experiment was conducted in a randomized block design with four replications, consisted
68 of three seeding systems (in-row, inter-row, and broadcast), and five seed densities (2, 4, 6, 8, and
69 $10 \text{ viable seeds m}^{-2}$) of *U. ruziziensis* intercropped with sorghum, using monocultures of sorghum
70 and *U. ruziziensis* as control.

71 The sorghum cultivar used was the BRS330, a hybrid of early cycle, red grains, and without
72 tannin. The grass species used was *Urochloa ruziziensis* because it is widely used in the Cerrado
73 biome. The plots consisted of seven 6.0-meter rows spaced 0.5 m apart. The evaluation area
74 consisted of the central 12.5 m^2 , considering 0.5 m of each row end, and the end rows as borders.

75 Weeds were controlled after soybean harvest at seven days before the implementation of the
76 treatments with application of $1,189 \text{ g a.e. ha}^{-1}$ of glyphosate, and $1,500 \text{ g a.i. ha}^{-1}$ of atrazine, with
77 flow rate of 150 L ha^{-1} . Seedings were carried out in March 13 in Rio Verde, and March 18 in Santa
78 Helena de Goiás, using a seven-row seeder to make the furrows in all seeding systems. The
79 intercrop with inter-row seeding had, in addition, two-centimeters deep furrows made with hoes.

80 Sorghum seeds were mechanically sown, and *U. ruziziensis* seeds were manually sown at 2
81 cm deep in all monocrop systems, except in the broadcast seeding, in which the *U. ruziziensis* seeds
82 were broadcasted on the soil surface, followed by the sowing of sorghum seeds, with subsequent
83 covering of the seeds. The amount of seeds used to reach the seeding densities of each plot were
84 calculated considering the seed quality (SQ) (purity, and germination index), seed weight (SW),
85 total plot size (TPS), and number of viable seeds per m^{-2} (NVS), using the formula $SW \times NVS \times$

86 $TPS \times 100 / SQ$. The seed weight of the *U. ruziziensis* was determined using the weight of one-
87 thousand seeds.

88 Soil fertilization in the intercrop and monoculture systems followed the recommendations for
89 the sorghum crop (Sousa & Lobato, 2004), using 300 kg ha⁻¹ of the 02-20-18 N-P-K fertilizer.
90 Topdressing was performed manually with application of 100 kg ha⁻¹ of nitrogen (urea) next to the
91 sorghum plant row at 25 days after emergence (DAE), when the sorghum crop was thinned to a
92 population of 180,000 plants ha⁻¹.

93 Post-emergence weed control was carried out using two manual weeding at 20 DAE, and 35
94 DAE, since the sorghum crop has no selective herbicide to control grasses. Pests, especially
95 *Spodoptera frugiperda*, were controlled with application of 50 g a.i ha⁻¹ of cypermethrin, with flow
96 rate 150 L ha⁻¹.

97 Sorghum was harvested in July, at 125 DAE. Panicle samples were collected, threshed, and
98 their grains were weighted to evaluate grain yield, and 1000-grain weight, considering a grain
99 moisture of 13%. Plant height from the stem base to the top of the panicle was measured
100 considering five random plants of each plot; and plant population was determined considering the
101 total number of panicles collected.

102 *U. ruziziensis* plants remained in the field up to 101 days after the sorghum harvest, when five
103 plants were randomly chosen in the plots to determine the plant height from the stem base to the top
104 of the last fully expanded leaf, and the number of tillers.

105 Total dry matter yields of both crops were evaluated. The biomasses of sorghum, and *U.*
106 *ruziziensis* in 1 m² areas randomly chosen using a square frame were collected separately, packed in
107 paper bags and placed in a forced-air circulation oven at 65 °C to obtain their dry weights.

108 The percentage of soil coverage by the plants was quantified considering the biomass present
109 on the soil surface at the sorghum harvest, and at 101 days after harvesting, using areas of 0.25 m²
110 randomly chosen using a graduated square frame with ten equidistant points in two places of each
111 plot, considering the points that coincided with the presence of plant cover.

112 The soybean seeds used were from the early-maturing NS7000IPRO cultivar, which has an
113 indeterminate growth habit, and presents maturation group 7.0 for the region of the experiment. The
114 soybean seeds were sown on November 10, 2015, using the same seeder used for the furrowing of
115 the area for the intercrop, and same spacing between rows. Soil fertilization consisted of application
116 of 300 kg ha⁻¹ of the 02-20-20 N-P-K fertilizer, following the recommendations for the crop (Sousa
117 & Lobato, 2004).

118 Initial plant height of soybean from the stem base to the top of the third fully developed
119 trifoliolate leaf was determined using five random plants. Soybean was harvested at 115 days after
120 sowing (March 4, 2016). The pods of the plants were sampled and threshed and their grains were
121 weighted to evaluate the grain yield, and 1000-grain weight, considering a grain moisture of 13%.

122 Individual and combined analysis of variance of the intercrop and monocrop systems were
123 carried out. Significant means were compared by the Tukey's test at 5% probability for the intercrop
124 system, and by regression analysis for the seeding densities of *U. ruziziensis*. The means of the
125 intercrop treatments were compared with those of the respective monocrops (controls) by the
126 Dunnett's test at 5% probability.

127

128 **Results and Discussion**

129 The intercrop of sorghum with *U. ruziziensis* using inter-row seeding resulted in a higher
130 sorghum grain yield than that using in-row seeding (Table 1). This was probably due to the lower
131 competition between species for water, light, nutrients, and physical space in the initial
132 development stage of the sorghum plants. Moreover, *U. ruziziensis* plants had slower emergence
133 compared to sorghum, delaying the possible competition between these species. Similar results for
134 grain production with this seeding system have been reported using grass species intercropped with
135 sorghum (Silva et al., 2014) and maize (Borghi & Crusciol, 2007).

136 In the experimental area of Rio Verde GO, only the highest seed density of *U. ruziziensis* in
137 the intercrop using in-row seeding reduced sorghum grain yield compared to the control (Table 1).

138 The highest seeding densities of *U. ruziziensis* using inter-row and broadcast seedings had no effect
 139 on sorghum grain yield. A greater number of plants of grass species can result in greater biomass
 140 production in the winter.

141

142 **Table 1.** Grain yield, 1000-grain weight, plant height, and dry matter yield of winter sorghum
 143 intercropped with five seeding densities of *Urochloa ruziziensis* in Rio Verde GO, and Santa
 144 Helena de Goiás GO, Brazil, 2015.

Seeding systems	Density (viable seeds m ⁻²)					Means* ²
	2	4	6	8	10	
--- Grain yield (Kg ha ⁻¹) ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	5,068	5,107	4,981	4,894	4,746* ¹	4,959 b
Inter-row	5,475	5,056	5,128	5,094	5,241	5,198 a
Broadcast	5,397	5,241	5,113	5,094	5,113	5,191 a
Means	5,313	5,134	5,074	5,027	5,033	
Monocrop (control)						5,404
Santa Helena de Goiás						
In-row	6,220	5,913	5,956	6,164	6,111	6,072 b
Inter-row	6,570	6,511	6,799	6,492	6,520	6,578 a
Broadcast	6,356	5,892	6,294	6,313	6,568	6,284 ab
Means	6,382	6,105	6,349	6,323	6,399	
Monocrop (control)						6,610
--- 1000-grain weight (g) ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	18.0	17.7	18.1	18.2	16.9	17.8
Inter-row	18.1	16.7	17.8	16.8	17.4	17.3
Broadcast	17.9	17.4	17.8	17.7	17.6	17.7
Means	18.0	17.3	17.9	17.6	17.3	
Monocrop (control)						17.3
Santa Helena de Goiás						
In-row	18.1	17.3	17.5	16.8	17.8	17.5
Inter-row	18.1	18.2	17.5	16.9	18.0	17.8
Broadcast	17.6	17.4	16.7	18.2	18.0	17.6
Means	18.0	17.6	17.2	17.3	17.9	
Monocrop (control)						17,4
--- Plant height (m) ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	1.41	1.42	1.41 b	1.40*	1.39 b*	1,41 b
Inter-row	1.45	1.43	1.42 ab	1.41	1.47 a	1,44 a
Broadcast	1.41	1.46	1.47 a	1.41	1.41 b	1,43 a
Means	1.43	1.44	1.43	1.41	1.42	
Monocrop (control)						1,48
Santa Helena de Goiás						
In-row	1.49	1.50	1.47	1.45	1.46	1.47 b
Inter-row	1.49	1.49	1.44	1.49	1.47	1.48 ab
Broadcast	1.49	1.50	1.52	1.50	1.49	1.51 a
Means	1.49	1.50	1.48	1.48	1.47	
Monocrop (control)						1.50
--- Dry matter yield (Kg ha ⁻¹) ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	2,070	1,995	2,047	1,880*	1,862*	1,970 a
Inter-row	1,907	1,982	1,965	1,900	1,787*	1,908 a
Broadcast	1,985	1,975	1,902	1,832*	1,870*	1,912 a
Means	1,987	1,984	1,971	1,870	1,839	
Monocrop (control)						2,220
Santa Helena de Goiás						
In-row	2,088	2,049	2,000	2,374	2,375	2,177 a

Inter-row	2,131	1,894	1,980	2,151	2,426	2,116 a
Broadcast	1,981	2,260	2,077	2,340	2,277	2,187 a
Means	2,067	2,068	2,019	2,288	2,359	
Monocrop (control)						2,270

145 *¹ Means differ significantly by the Dunnett's test at 5% probability from the control treatments.

146 *² Means followed by the same letters in the column do not differ by the Tukey's test at 5% probability.

147

148 The other treatments presented similar sorghum grain yields to the control (Table 1). This
 149 confirms the feasibility of the winter sorghum intercropped with *U. ruziziensis* in the Cerrado
 150 biome, even using a high seeding density for the grass species. Similar result was found in other
 151 studies using lower seeding density for the grass species (Mateus et al., 2011; Horvathy Neto et al.,
 152 2012; Silva et al., 2013; 2015).

153 The competition between the species used affected the plant height when using in-row
 154 seeding; the densities of 8 and 10 viable seeds m⁻² resulted in lower plant height of sorghum when
 155 compared to the control (Table 1). In general, the broadcast seeding of *U. ruziziensis* resulted in
 156 higher heights of sorghum plants, regardless of the experimental area, because of the more regular
 157 distribution of plants throughout the areas and, consequently, lower competition pressure.

158 *U. ruziziensis* were expected to suppress sorghum plants at the vegetative stage of both crops,
 159 affecting the population of sorghum plants. However, this was not observed because the intercrop
 160 was conducted in the winter season and the grass species presented a slower emergence than the
 161 sorghum. This made the sorghum to emerge and develop faster, establishing a plant population of
 162 194,000 plants ha⁻¹ in both experimental areas, with similar results to those found in the monocrops
 163 in both experimental areas (Rio Verde, and Santa Helena de Goiás).

164 Moreover, the plant competition generated a lower dry matter yield of sorghum crops in Rio
 165 Verde, compared to the control (Table 1), when using the highest seeding densities of *U.*
 166 *ruziziensis*—with in-row, and broadcast seeding when using 8 viable seeds m⁻², and with all sowing
 167 systems when using 10 viable seeds m⁻². The Santa Helena de Goiás area presented no significant
 168 differences in dry matter yield of sorghum due to its higher soil fertility (higher P content) and the
 169 better rainfall distribution during the sorghum development in that area when compared to Rio

170 Verde (Figure 1), which favored the development and accumulation of shoot biomass of the
 171 intercropped plants, which presented similar results to the monocrops.

172 The inter-row seeding in Rio Verde increased the height of the *U. ruziziensis* plants compared
 173 to the broadcast seeding (Table 2), improving the *U. ruziziensis* development, especially at the early
 174 stages due to the lower competition between species and greater solar radiation interception (Taiz et
 175 al., 2017). The broadcast seeding resulted in suppression of the *U. ruziziensis* growth, except when
 176 using the density of 4 seeds m⁻², and in all seeding systems with the highest density, presenting
 177 lower plant height than the controls.

178 The sorghum plants reduced the *U. ruziziensis* growth, as observed in other studies on
 179 intercrops of these plant species (Horvathy Neto, 2012; Silva et al., 2013; 2015). Thus, the number
 180 of tillers, and dry matter yield of the grass species were lower in all treatments of both experimental
 181 areas when compared to the controls. The sowing season (winter) and the slower establishment of
 182 the *U. ruziziensis* plants compared to the sorghum made the sorghum plants to suppress the growth
 183 of the grass species, regardless of the sowing system, even with the higher rainfall volume in the
 184 region, compared to previous years.

185

186 **Table 2.** Plant height, number of tillers, and dry matter yield of winter *U. ruziziensis* intercropped
 187 with sorghum, with five seeding densities of the grass species, in Rio Verde GO, and Santa Helena
 188 de Goiás GO, Brazil, 2015.

Seeding systems	Density (viable seeds m ⁻²)					Means* ²
	2	4	6	8	10	
--- Plant height (m) ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	0.54* ¹	0.68	0.65	0.62	0.60*	0.62 ab
Inter-row	0.67	0.66	0.72	0.63	0.65*	0.67 a
Broadcast	0.59*	0.58	0.53*	0.59*	0.66*	0.59 b
Means	0.60	0.64	0.63	0.61	0.63	
Monocrop (control)	0.80	0.76	0.80	0.80	0.85	
Santa Helena de Goiás						
In-row	0.60*	0.75	0.65	0.68	0.67	0.67 a
Inter-row	0.71	0.68	0.69	0.63	0.68	0.68 a
Broadcast	0.63*	0.58	0.59	0.61	0.72	0.63 a
Means	0.65	0.67	0.64	0.64	0.69	
Monocrop (control)	0.83	0.75	0.72	0.72	0.79	
--- Number of tillers ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	20.4*	20.6*	24.8*	28.5*	22.1*	23.3 a
Inter-row	30.9*	31.9*	26.8*	21.9*	43.5*	31.0 a
Broadcast	27.4*	21.7*	22.6*	29.8*	36.8*	27.7 a

Means	26.2	24.7	24.7	26.7	34.1	
Monocrop (control)	119.7	118.6	116.9	136.8	134.9	
Santa Helena de Goiás						
In-row	21.1*	22.5*	22.4*	30.1*	24.7*	24.2 a
Inter-row	33.2*	33.3*	27.8*	27.3*	39.2*	32.2 a
Broadcast	29.1*	22.6*	25.1*	31.2*	40.4*	29.7 a
Means	27.8	26.1	25.1	29.5	34.7	
Monocrop (control)	115.2	122.4	132.6	132.2	133.1	
--- Dry matter yield (Kg ha ⁻¹) ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	970*	774*	1,300*	1,508*	1,744*	1,259 a
Inter-row	1,040*	1,313*	1,415*	1,822*	1,590*	1,436 a
Broadcast	856*	1,102*	904*	1,173*	1,590*	1,125 a
Means	955	1,063	1,206	1,501	1,641	
Monocrop (control)	4,326	4,823	5,810	6,790	8,505	
Santa Helena de Goiás						
In-row	973*	1,365*	1,749*	2,068*	2,289*	1,688 a
Inter-row	1,154*	1,371*	1,665*	2,324*	2,444*	1,791 a
Broadcast	834*	1,108*	1,256*	1,506*	2,068*	1,354 b
Means	987	1,281	1,556	1,966	2,267	
Monocrop (control)	5,924	6,926	7,399	7,595	9,476	

189 *¹ Means differ significantly by the Dunnett's test at 5% probability from the control treatments.

190 *² Means followed by the same letters in the column do not differ by the Tukey's test at 5% probability.

191

192 The dry matter yield of *U. ruziziensis* increased linearly in the intercrop (Figure 2A) and
 193 monocrop (Figure 2B) systems in both experimental areas with increasing seeding density, as
 194 observed by Ceccon et al. (2009) in intercrops of maize with grass species. The absence of sorghum
 195 plants in the monocrops of *U. ruziziensis* resulted in a higher dry matter yield of this grass species.

196

197 **Figure 2.** Regression analysis of dry matter yields of winter *Urochloa ruziziensis* intercropped with
 198 sorghum (DMYI) (A) and as monocrop (DMYM) (B) with five seeding densities at 101 days after
 199 the sorghum harvest in Rio Verde GO, and Santa Helena de Goiás GO, Brazil, 2015.

200

201 Pariz et al. (2011) evaluated an intercrop of maize with *U. ruziziensis* and found lower
 202 competition between the species when using broadcast seeding for the grass species, compared to
 203 the in-row seeding, resulting in a higher dry matter yield for the grass species. The dry matter yields
 204 of *U. ruziziensis* using in-row and inter-row seeding were lower than that using broadcast seeding in
 205 Santa Helena de Goiás. Similar result was found by Chioderoli et al. (2010). Most *U. ruziziensis*
 206 seeds were not incorporated into the soil when using broadcast seeding; it may have hindered the
 207 establishment of the plants. This affected negatively the dry matter yield of this species, since
 208 seeding density is related to shoot biomass accumulation, regardless of the seeding system used.

209 The production of biomass in the intercrop areas differed from that of control areas. The total
 210 dry matter yields of the intercrops were lower than those of the respective *U. ruziziensis* monocrops
 211 and higher than that of the sorghum monocrops, in both experimental areas (Table 3). The greater
 212 rainfall volume in the first months of the experiment, especially in Santa Helena de Goiás, resulted
 213 in a greater development of the monoculture of *U. ruziziensis*; it was even greater with the increases
 214 in seeding density. This explains the better performance of *U. ruziziensis* in all treatments when
 215 compared to the sorghum monocrop.

216 The highest total dry matter yields were found when using the density of 10 viable seeds m⁻²
 217 of *U. ruziziensis* in monocrop (Table 3) and intercrop with sorghum in Santa Helena de Goiás
 218 (Figure 3A), resulting in greater soil plant coverage (Figure 3B). Therefore, increasing winter *U.*
 219 *ruziziensis* seeding density in intercrop with sorghum increases the dry matter yields, in the Cerrado
 220 biome, region that presents less precipitation during winter. These increases increase the biomass
 221 production and soil plant coverage, which may favor the maintenance of the no-tillage system
 222 (Silva et al., 2013; 2015; Borges, et al., 2016).

223

224 **Table 3.** Total dry matter yield, and soil plant coverage at sorghum harvest, and soil plant coverage
 225 at soybean seeding (SCSS), using intercrops of winter sorghum with five seeding densities of
 226 *Urochloa ruziziensis*, in Rio Verde GO, and Santa Helena de Goiás GO, Brazil, 2015.

Seeding system	Density (viable seeds m ⁻²)					Means* ³
	2	4	6	8	10	
--- Total dry matter yield (kg ha ⁻¹) ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	3.040* ^{1, 2}	2.769* ^{1, 2}	3.347* ^{1, 2}	3.388* ^{1, 2}	3.606* ^{1, 2}	3.230 a
Inter-row	2.947* ^{1, 2}	3.295* ^{1, 2}	3.380* ^{1, 2}	3.722* ^{1, 2}	3.337* ^{1, 2}	3.344 a
Broadcast	2.841* ^{1, 2}	3.077* ^{1, 2}	2.806* ^{1, 2}	3.005* ^{1, 2}	3.460* ^{1, 2}	3.038 a
Means	2.943	3.047	3.178	3.372	3.481	
<i>U. ruziziensis</i>						
Monocrop (control)	4.326 E	4.823 D	5.810 C	6.790 B	8.505 A	Sorghum 2.220 F
Santa Helena de Goiás						
In-row	3.061* ²	3.414* ²	3.749* ^{1, 2}	4.442* ^{1, 2}	4.664* ^{1, 2}	3.866 a
Inter-row	3.285* ²	3.265* ²	3.645* ^{1, 2}	4.475* ^{1, 2}	4.870* ^{1, 2}	3.908 a
Broadcast	2.815* ²	3.368* ²	3.333* ²	3.846* ^{1, 2}	4.345* ^{1, 2}	3.541 a
Means	3.053	3.349	3.575	4.254	4.626	
<i>U. ruziziensis</i>						
Monocrop (control)	5.924 C	6.926 BC	7.399 B	7.595 B	9.476 A	Sorghum 2.265 D
--- Soil plant coverage at sorghum harvest (%) ---						
Rio Verde						
In-row	72	76	76* ²	80* ²	80* ²	76 a
Inter-row	73	76	78* ²	80* ²	87	79 a
Broadcast	77	75	80	81	88* ¹	80 a

Means	74	75	78	80	85	
			<i>U. ruziziensis</i>			Sorghum
Monocrop (control)	81 D	93 C	98 B	100 A	100 A	63 E
			Santa Helena de Goiás			
In-row	76	77* ²	81	76* ²	80* ²	78 a
Inter-row	80	73* ²	83	67* ²	88	78 a
Broadcast	80	78	75* ²	72* ²	73* ²	75 a
Means	78	76	79	71	80	
			<i>U. ruziziensis</i>			Sorghum
Monocrop (control)	83 AB	97 A	98 A	100 A	100 A	72 B
	--- Soil plant coverage at soybean seeding (%) ---					
	Rio Verde					
In-row	78	80* ²	77* ²	82* ²	88	81 a
Inter-row	75* ²	81* ²	85* ²	86	90* ¹	83 a
Broadcast	80	83* ²	83* ²	82* ²	83	82 a
Means	77	81	81	83	87	
			<i>U. ruziziensis</i>			Sorghum
Monocrop (control)	95 B	100 A	100 A	100 A	100 A	72 C
			Santa Helena de Goiás			
In-row	80* ²	86	88* ¹	90* ¹	96* ¹	88 a
Inter-row	82	81* ²	95* ¹	91* ¹	92* ¹	88 a
Broadcast	81	88* ¹	87* ¹	85	92* ¹	86 a
Means	81	85	90	88	93	
			<i>U. ruziziensis</i>			Sorghum
Monocrop (control)	96 A	100 A	100 A	100 A	100 A	71 B

227 *^{1,2} Means differ significantly by the Dunnett's test at 5% probability from the control treatments of *U. ruziziensis* and
228 sorghum, respectively.

229 *³ Means followed by the same lowercase letters in the column and uppercase letters in the row do not differ by the
230 Tukey's test at 5% probability.

231

232

233 **Figure 3.** Regression analysis of total dry matter yield¹⁾ of intercrops (TDMI) (A) and soil plant
234 coverage at soybean seeding (SCSS) (B), using winter sorghum intercropped with five seeding
235 densities of *Urochloa ruziziensis*, in Santa Helena de Goiás GO, Brazil, 2015.

236

237 The occurrence of precipitation during the cycle of the crops, and lower precipitation after
238 sorghum harvest increased the biomass production. Thus, the soil plant coverage of most areas with
239 intercrop was greater than those with sorghum monocrop (Table 3) at soybean seeding. However,
240 soil plant coverage with monocrop of sorghum at harvest, and at soybean seeding were lower in
241 both experimental areas, compared to the *U. ruziziensis* monocrop. Therefore, sorghum monocrops
242 do not produce enough biomass for soil plant coverage as the intercrops, even with favorable soil
243 moisture and temperature for their regrowth after harvest. This confirms the importance the grass
244 species in increasing the biomass in winter intercrops. However, the soil plant coverage by the
245 sorghum monocrop in Rio Verde was higher at soybean seeding than at sorghum harvest due to the
246 regrowth of the sorghum plants. The broadcast seeding of *U. ruziziensis* at density of 10 viable

247 seeds m⁻² in the Rio Verde experimental area was the only treatment that resulted in higher soil
 248 plant coverage at soybean seeding than those of sorghum monocrops.

249 Therefore, increasing seeding density of winter *U. ruziziensis* in intercrop systems can
 250 increase the production of biomass of plants. However, the choice for these systems must consider
 251 whether grass seeding densities above the rates evaluated in the present work increase dry matter
 252 yields without decreasing sorghum grain yield.

253 The results found in the present work showed that the intercrop of winter sorghum with *U.*
 254 *ruziziensis* is promising for increasing grain yield and dry matter yield in regions of high (Rio
 255 Verde) and low (Santa Helena de Goiás) altitudes when using the seeding density of 10 viable seeds
 256 m⁻² for the grass species, regardless of the seeding system used. The increase in biomass production
 257 in the winter by using this intercrop is important because this period presents significant decreased
 258 precipitation in the Cerrado biome. The use of this grass as forage is another advantage of this
 259 system.

260 Increasing seeding density in the monocrop of *U. ruziziensis* increased its biomass production,
 261 and the plant height of the soybean plants at initial stage; however, this did not occur with sorghum
 262 monocrops (Table 4). The plant height is dependent on the stem elongation towards light (Benicasa,
 263 2004). This explains the higher biomass production of treatments with higher seeding density, and
 264 with inter-row seeding of the grass species in the intercrop with sorghum, when compared to the
 265 controls.

266

267 **Table 4.** Plant height at initial stage, grain yield, and 1000-grain weight of soybean plants grown
 268 after the intercrop of winter sorghum with five seeding densities of *Urochloa ruziziensis*, in Rio
 269 Verde GO, Brazil, 2015-2016.

Seeding systems	Density (viable seeds ha ⁻¹)					Means* ³
	2	4	6	8	10	
	--- Plant height at initial growth stage (cm) ---					
In-row	26	26	26	27	28	27 a
Inter-row	25	26	26	27	27* ¹	26 a
Broadcast	28	26	27	27	28	27 a
Means	26	26	27	27	28	
	<i>U. ruziziensis</i>					
Monocrop (control)	28 AB	30 AB	31 AB	31 AB	34 B	Sorghum 24 A
	--- Grain yield (kg ha ⁻¹) ---					

In-row	2,258	2,181* ¹	2,432	2,520	2,480	2,422 a
Inter-row	2,369	2,495	2,575	2,373	2,275	2,417 a
Broadcast	2,230	2,295	2,463	2,285	2,375	2,330 a
Means	2,286	2,395	2,490	2,393	2,377	
<i>U. ruziziensis</i>						
Monocrop (control)	2,532 A	2,587 A	2,423 A	2,408 A	2,476 A	Sorghum 2,460 A
--- 1000-grain weight (g) ---						
In-row	172	167	168	175	172	171 a
Inter-row	169	170	172	169	175	171 a
Broadcast	165* ¹	167	170	165	169	168 a
Means	170	168	170	170	172	
<i>U. ruziziensis</i>						
Monocrop (control)	181 A	177 A	174 A	171 A	171 A	Sorghum 172 A

270 *^{1,2} Means differ significantly by the Dunnett's test at 5% probability from the control treatments of *U. ruziziensis* and
271 sorghum, respectively.

272 *³ Means followed by the same lowercase letters in the column and uppercase letters in the row do not differ by the
273 Tukey's test at 5% probability.

274

275 The intercrops with seeding densities of 4 viable seeds m⁻² of the grass species using in-row
276 seeding decreased the grain yield of soybean plants; and the intercrop with seeding densities of 2
277 viable seeds m⁻² using broadcast seeding decreased the 1000-grain weight of soybean plants when
278 compared to the controls (Table 4). The higher dry matter yield of the monocrop probably improved
279 the soybean grain yield but did not affect the 1000-grain weight.

280 The similar dry matter contents produced in the intercrop and monocrop systems denote their
281 suitability for the maintenance of no-tillage systems. Great biomass productions also allow better
282 control of weeds, soil moisture maintenance, and soil erosion protection. Thus, increasing seeding
283 density of *U. ruziziensis* for intercrop with sorghum is a sustainable practice for agricultural systems
284 in the Cerrado biome.

285

286 Conclusions

287 The intercrop of sorghum with *U. ruziziensis* does not decrease sorghum grain yield when
288 using seeding densities of up to 8 viable seeds m⁻² for the grass species for in-row seeding, and up
289 to 10 viable seeds m⁻² for broadcast seeding, regardless of the altitude of the area.

290 Increasing the seeding density of *U. ruziziensis* for the intercropping with sorghum increases
291 the dry matter yield of the grass species, and total dry matter yield (sorghum and *U. ruziziensis*).

292 The intercrop of sorghum with *U. ruziziensis* increases the soil plant coverage for the
293 implementation of soybean crops in no-tillage system.

294 The dry matter of the intercrop of sorghum with *U. ruziziensis* does not affect soybean grain
295 yield.

296

297 **References**

298 Baumhardt, R.L., Tolck, J.A., Winter, S.R. 2005. Seeding practices and cultivar maturity effects on
299 simulated dryland grain sorghum yield. *Agronomy Journal* 97: 935-942.

300 Benicasa, M.M.P. 2004. *Análise de Crescimento de Plantas (noções básicas)*. FUNEP, Jaboticabal,
301 Brasil. 42p.

302 Borges, L.P., Silva, A.G., Goulart, M.M.P., Teixeira, R.I., Simon, G.A., Costa, K.A.P. 2016.
303 Seeding density of *Brachiaria ruziziensis* intercropped with grain sorghum and effects on soybean
304 in succession. *African Journal of Agricultural Research* 11:4343-4353.

305 Borghi, E., Crusciol, C.A.C. 2007. Produtividade de milho, espaçamento e modalidade de
306 consorciação com *Brachiaria brizantha* em sistema plantio direto. *Pesquisa Agropecuária*
307 *Brasileira* 42:163-171.

308 Ceccon, G., Staut, L.A., Kurihara, C.H. 2009. Cerrado: Manejo de *Brachiaria ruziziensis* em
309 consórcio com milho safrinha e rendimento de soja em sucessão. *Revista Plantio Direto* 113: 4-8.

310 Chioderoli, C.A., Mello, L.M.M., Grigolli, P.J., Silva, J.O.R., Cesarin, A.L. 2010. Consorciação de
311 braquiárias com milho outonal em plantio direto sob pivô central. *Engenharia Agrícola* 30:1101-
312 1109.

313 Cysne, J.R.B., Pitombeira, J.B. 2012. Adaptabilidade e estabilidade de genótipos de sorgo granífero
314 em diferentes ambientes do estado do Ceará. *Revista Ciência Agronômica* 43: 273-278.

315 Dan, H.A., Carrijo, M.S., Carneiro, D.F., Costa, K.A.P., Silva, A.G. 2010. Desempenho de plantas
316 sorgo granífero sobre condições de sombreamento. *Acta Scientiarum-Agronomy* 32: 675-679.

317 Horvathy Neto, A., Silva, A.G., Teixeira, I.R., Simon, G. A., Assis, R.L., Rocha, V.S. 2012.
318 Consórcio sorgo e braquiária para produção de grãos e biomassa na entressafra. *Revista Brasileira*
319 *de Ciências Agrárias* 7: 743-749.

320 Horvathy Neto, A., Silva, A.G., Teixeira, I.R., Costa, K. A. P., Assis, R.L. 2014. Consórcio de
321 sorgo granífero e braquiária na safrinha para produção de grãos e forragem. *Revista Caatinga* 27:
322 132-141.

323 Kluthcouski, J., Aidar, H., Stone, L.F., Cobucci, T. 2004. Integração lavoura-pecuária e o manejo
324 de plantas daninhas. *Informações Agronômicas* 106: 1-20.

325 Mateus, G.P., Crusciol, C.A.C., Borghi, É., Pariz, C.M., Costa, C., Silveira, J.P.F. 2011. Adubação
326 nitrogenada de sorgo granífero consorciado com capim em sistema de plantio direto. *Pesquisa*
327 *Agropecuária Brasileira* 46: 1161-1169.

328 Pariz, C.M., Andreotti, M., Azenha, M.V., Bergamaschine, A.F., Mello, L.M.M., Lima, R.C. 2011.
329 Produtividade de grãos de milho e massa seca de braquiárias em consórcio no sistema de integração
330 lavoura-pecuária. *Ciência Rural* 41: 875-882.

331 Silva, M.B., Kliemann, H.J., Silveira, P.M., Lanna, A.C. 2007. Atributos biológicos do solo sob
332 influência da cobertura vegetal e do sistema de manejo. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira* 42:
333 1755-1761.

334 Silva, A.G., Moraes, L.E., Horvathy Neto, A., Teixeira, I.R., Simon, G.A. 2013. Consórcio na
335 entrelinha de sorgo com braquiária na safrinha para produção de grãos e forragem. *Semina-Ciências*
336 *Agrárias* 34:3475-3488.

337 Silva, A.G., Moraes, L.E., Horvathy Neto, A., Teixeira, I.R., Simon, G.A. 2014. Consórcio sorgo e
338 braquiária na entrelinha para produção de grãos, forragem e palhada na entressafra. *Revista Ceres*
339 61: 697-705.

340 Silva, A.G., Horvathy Neto, A., Teixeira, I.R., Costa, K.A.P., Braccini, A.L. 2015. Seleção de
341 cultivares de sorgo e braquiária em consórcio para produção de grãos e palhada. *Semina-Ciências*
342 *Agrárias* 36: 2951-2964.

- 343 Sousa, D.M. G., Lobato, E. 2004. *Cerrado: correção do solo e adubação*. EMBRAPA Informação
344 Tecnológica, Brasília, Brasil. 416p.
- 345 Tais, I., Zeiger, E., Moller, I.M., Murphy, A. 2017. *Fisiologia e desenvolvimento vegetal*. Porto
346 Alegre: Artmed. 858 p.
- 347 Torres, J.L.R., Pereira, M.G., Fabian, A.J. 2008. Produção de fitomassa por plantas de cobertura e
348 mineralização de seus resíduos em plantio direto. *Pesquisa Agropecuária Brasileira* 43: 421-428.