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ABSTRACT

The performance of *J. curcas* propagated through pre-cultivated seedlings, non-rooted cuttings and direct seeding, established at 3333, 2500, 1333 stems/ha and subjected to spot weeding, slashing and both spot weeding and slashing was evaluated. The trial was established on the 20th of December 2006, in a 3³ factorial completely randomized block design with three replications. Each plot consisted of 16 trees. Data were collected from the entire population. Height, root collar diameter (RCD) and survival were determined using standard forestry procedures. Data were analysed through one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) at 95% confidence level using SPSS version 15 (2003). *Jatropha curcas* established through pre-cultivated seedlings outperformed (P<0.05) non-rooted cuttings and direct seeded plants in terms of survival. There were no significant differences (P>0.05) among saplings established at 3333, 2500 and 1333 stems/ha planting densities as well as among those subjected to spot weeding, slashing and both spot weeding and slashing in terms of survival and growth in height and RCD. This research concludes that pre-cultivated *J. curcas* seedlings perform better in percentage survivals than non-rooted cuttings and direct seeded plants in agro-ecological conditions similar to those of the study site.
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INTRODUCTION

The crude oil crisis of the 1970s and the subsequent shortages of petro-fuels on the world market have seen the recognition of the limitations of world oil resources (Grimm, 1996; Heller, 1996; Henning, 2000; Pratt et al., 2002). Currently, the whole world is faced with critical fuel shortages accompanied with high prices as well as the global warming issue. This has prompted governmental and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to search for alternative sources of energy, which are renewable, safe and non-polluting. In this regard, renewable vegetable fuels have assumed top-priority. Special interest has been shown in the cultivation of the tropical physic nut (*Jatropha curcas* L., Euphorbiaceae) for oil extraction (Grimm, 1996; Heller, 1996).

**The Concept of Bio-diesel**

According to Biswas et al. (2006), the concept of bio-fuel dates back to 1885 when Dr. Rudolf Diesel built the first bio-diesel engine. In 1912, he predicted the potential of bio-diesel, “The use of vegetable oils for engine fuels may seem insignificant today. But such oils may in the course of time become as important as petroleum and the coal tar products of present time” (Biswas et al., 2006).

In the early 1970s, scientists discovered that the viscosity of vegetable oils could be reduced by a simple chemical process and that it could perform as petro-diesel in a modern engine (Biswas et al., 2006). Since then, technical developments have come a long way and plant oil has been highly established as a bio-fuel, equivalent to diesel. Recent environmental (e.g. Kyoto Protocol) and economic concerns have prompted the resurgence of bio-diesel throughout the world.

**World Distribution of *J. curcas***

*Jatropha curcas* is a shrub, which originated in the Caribbean, Central America and was spread by Portuguese traders as a valuable hedge plant via the Cape Verde Islands and former Portuguese Guinea (Guinea Bissau) (Henning, 2008) to countries in Africa, Asia and India (Jepsen et al., 2006). *Jatropha curcas* grows under a variety of conditions, which makes its cultivation possible across the world’s agro-ecological regions. Today, the species is cultivated in almost all tropical and sub-tropical countries as live fences.
Botanical Description of *J. curcas*

According to Leon (1987), Mabberley (1987), and Rehm and Espig (1991), the Euphorbiaceae family contains oil crops of economic importance among them *J. curcas*, *Ricinus communis* and *Sapium sebiferum*. The genus *Jatropha* belongs to the tribe *Joannesieae* of *Crotonoideae* in the *Euphorbiaceae* family (Henning, 2008). The term *Jatropha* was derived from the Greek words *jatros* (doctor) and *trophe* (food), which means medicinal uses (Heller, 1996). *Curcas* is the common name for physic nut in India (Correll and Correll, 1982).

*Jatropha curcas* grows up to a height of 3 to 5 metres and its average life, with effective yield is about 50 years (Singh *et al*., 2007). It bears fruits from the second year of its establishment and the economic yield stabilizes from the fourth or fifth year onwards (Makkar *et al*., 2001). It gives about 2 kg of seed per plant. In poor soils, the yields have been reported to be about 1 kg seed per plant (Singh *et al*., 2007).

**Sustainability of *J. curcas* Oil as an Alternative to Petro-diesel**

In the present scenario, the appropriate answer to the current oil crisis is to explore the possibility of bio-diesel. Bio-diesel is an eco-friendly, alternative fuel prepared from vegetable oils (edible or non edible) and animal fat which are renewable (Singh *et al*., 2007). The non-edible *J. curcas* oil has requisite potential of providing a promising and commercially viable alternative to petro-diesel. *Jatropha curcas* bio-diesel has the desired physio-chemical and performance characteristics comparable to petro-diesel (Kureel, 2006). It has a higher cetone number (51) than other vegetable oils and petro-diesel (46 to 50) (Kureel, 2006). This makes it an ideal alternative fuel and requires no special modification in the engine.

The initial flash point of *J. curcas* oil is 100 °C as compared to 50 °C of petro-diesel (Kureel, 2006). This creates initial engine starting problem. Similarly, the higher viscosity of *J. curcas* oil may affect the smooth flow of oil in the engine. However, these problems can easily be overcome by esterification (Kureel, 2006).

**Other Uses of *J. curcas***

The bark of the plant produces a dark blue dye, which is used for coloring cloth, fishing nets and lines (Singh *et al*., 2007). *Jatropha curcas* oil cake contains about 6 % nitrogen, 2.75 % phosphate and 0.94
% potassium and thus can be used as organic manure (Makkar et al., 2001). The seed cake or seeds can be used as animal feed (Makkar et al., 2001). The leaves can be used as food for tussler silkworms. Burnt root ashes are used as a salt substitute (Morton, 1981). Latex, which contains alkaloids (jatrophine, jatrophan, jatrophone, and curcain) has anticancerous properties and is inhibitory to watermelon mosaic virus (Tewari and Shukla, 1982). According to Agaceta et al. (1981), the latex can be used as a remedy for alopecia, anasorca, burns, dropsy, eczema, inflammation, paralysis and yellow fever. The most exploited uses of oil pressed from the seed in rural-industrial development include lubrication, soap and candle making (Tigere et al., 2006). In China, the oil is used to produce furniture varnish after boiling it with iron oxide (Ochse, 1931).

**Jatropha curcas Production in Zimbabwe**

*Jatropha curcas* was introduced into Zimbabwe in the 1940s (Makkar et al., 2001). Since then, it has spread to many parts of the country, with known concentrations in the northeastern districts of Mutoko, Wedza, Chiweshe, Mudzi and Nyanga (Jepsen et al., 2006), among small scale farmers. Efforts are under way to establish jatropha plantations across the country.

The government of Zimbabwe together with NGOs has initiated research on *J. curcas* oil for bio-diesel production. The institutions involved include Harare and Masvingo polytechnic colleges (experiments on *J. curcas* bio-diesel running engines), the Scientific and Industrial Research and Development Centre (SIRDC), the National Oil Company of Zimbabwe (NOCZIM) as well as Environment Africa (Jepsen et al., 2006). The efforts of these organizations have seen the mushrooming of small scale oil pressing mills in areas like Harare, Guruve, Mutoko and Masvingo (Jepsen et al., 2006). An extensive *J. curcas* oil extraction plant is under construction in Mutoko. Its completion may see a significant number of vehicles running on bio-diesel.

Traditionally, *J. curcas* was propagated through cuttings especially in the establishment of live fences around homesteads, kraals, fields, gardens and along roads. Planting density was dependent upon individual farmers depending on their objectives for instance to keep out livestock or as a boundary line. Once planted, the species required little or no management since it can tolerate harsh conditions and is capable of out-competing weeds. Its toxicity deters livestock thereby requiring less attention as compared to other trees. The need to grow the tree for bio-diesel means that the productivity has to be
improved. Widespread research on agronomic techniques to optimize yield of *J. curcas* is therefore pertinent.

Little has been done both on the species productivity and processing resulting in substantially less benefit from the plant’s potential uses. Although *J. curcas* is commonly planted in Zimbabwe, research on cultivation and propagation is limited (Jepsen *et al*., 2006). The areas in which there is inadequate information include fertilizer requirement, intercropping, irrigation requirements, effects of management practices, propagation methods and the use of seed cake as a feed to livestock (Tigere *et al*., 2006). This research sought to determine region and situation specific propagation method, planting density and weed management method for the cultivation *J. curcas* for seed production in Zimbabwe.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Study Site**

The trial was conducted at Bindura University farm (17°.18’S, 31°.18’E), about 7 km north-east of Bindura town. The site has red clay soils, classified as Chromic Luvisol (FAO) or Ustalfs (USDA). They were formed from mafic rocks and have a crumb microstructure. Mean annual precipitation ranges from 700 to 1050 mm and occurs during a single rainy season extending from November to April. Mean annual temperatures range from 25°C to 30°C. The area experiences frost from May to July.

The study area is dominated by *Rottboellia exaltata* with some pockets of *Cynodon dactylon*, *Heteropogon contortus* and *Hyparrhenia filipendula* as well as isolated occurrences of *Solanum sp*. The surrounding area partly consist of a mixed forest characterised by *Acacia polyacantha*, *Anona senegalensis*, *Brachystegia sp*, *Bauhinia pettersiana*, *Bauhinia thonningii*, *Combretum sp*, *Dichrostachys cineria*, *Diplorhychus conylocarpon*, *Flacourtia indica*, *Julbernaria globiflora*, *Lonchocarpus capassa*, *Rhus sp*, *Terminalia sericea* and *Strychnos sp*.

**Experimental Design**

The research was conducted in a $3^3$ factorial randomized complete block design with three replications, involving three propagation methods (transplanting pre-cultivated seedlings, non-rooted cuttings and direct seeding), three planting densities (3333, 2500 and 1333 stems/ha) and three weed management
methods (spot weeding, slashing and both slashing and spot weeding). The planting densities were chosen after Singh et al. (2007) and Heller (1996) recommendations that *J. curcas* planting densities for plantations be between 3333 and 1111 stems/ha. Blocking was done perpendicular to the soil (colour) gradient and slope. Soil colour varied from red at the upper part of the experimental site to dark brown at the lower part.

**Nursery Tending**

Three beds, each of 3 m x 1 m, were pegged, dug to a depth of 20 cm using a hoe and the soil removed using a shovel. The volume created was filled with a mixture of top soil and decayed organic matter collected from the floor of Acacia woodlands (dominated by *Acacia polyacantha*) at Bindura University farm. The floor of the bed was underlain with a polyethylene layer to avoid seedling roots growing deeper in the soil. This was after Kureel (2006) who reported the polythene bag method to give inferior seedlings as compared to the open rooted system. The seeds were sown on the first of September 2006. Sowing depth was 3 cm (Henning, 2000) with an average seed to seed distance of 10 cm. Emergence was first recorded on the eighth day of planting and on the tenth day an average germination of 92% was recorded. The seedlings were watered once everyday for a period of 8 weeks. Thereafter, watering was gradually reduced to once every two days and finally once every three days to progressively harden the seedlings. Weeds were controlled manually by hand pulling. The seedlings were monitored for growth in root collar diameter (measurements were done using a veneer caliper) and height (using a height rod and a tape measure).

**Land Preparation and Planting**

The research area was discsed to a depth of 0.2 m using a tractor drawn disk plough. Marking and pitting were done using a tape measure and manually respectively. Each research plot consisted of 16 planting stations and ranged in size from 27 m² (for the 3333 stems/ha planting density), 36 m² (for the 2500 stems/ha planting density) and 67.5 m² (for the 1333 stems/ha planting density). The planting stations measured about 20 cm in depth and 15 cm in diameter.

Transplanting of seedlings from the nursery to the research site, planting of cuttings and seeds were done on the 20th of December following precipitation amounting to 20 mm. Seedlings had attained an
average height of 45 cm and a root collar diameter of 11 mm. The seedlings were planted using a garden fork. Care was taken to avoid ‘J’ and ‘L’ rooting.

Cuttings were collected from, one year old branches and were about 5 cm in diameter, 25 cm long, with 4 to 5 buds. These specifications were adapted from Singh et al. (2007). The cuttings were planted at 10 cm depth.

As for direct seeding propagation method, two seeds were sown per planting station. The planting depth was three times the diameter of the seed (3 to 4 cm) (Singh et al., 2007). ‘Thinning to waste’ was done 2 weeks after emergence. Slashing and spot weed management practices were done after two months of planting. The total plant population was 1296 and covered about 0.4 hectares of planted area.

Field Measurements and Data Collection
Measurements were done on all the trees in the plots. Tree survival was determined by use of Equation 1 and was done after seven months of planting.

\[
\text{Survival (\%)} = \frac{\text{Total plants established} - \text{Total plants dead} \times 100}{\text{Total plants established}} \quad \text{Eqn 1}
\]

Growths in height and root collar diameter (RCD) were measured after one and seven months after planting, using a height rod and a veneer caliper, respectively. Plant height was measured as the distance in cm, between the RCD and the apical meristem. However, for some of the plants, the apical meristem was damaged by herbivores, frost or pathogens. In these cases, branch leader meristems were considered for height measurement (Balderrama and Chazdon, 2005).

Plant growth was evaluated as the mean relative growth rates in height (RGR_h) and RCD (RGR_d) over the total growth period using the formulae for classic plant growth analysis (Balderrama and Chazdon, 2005) as shown in Equations 2 and 3.

\[
RGR_h = \frac{\log_e h_f - \log_e h_i}{t_2 - t_1} \quad \text{Eqn 2}
\]
Where $RGR_h$ = Relative growth rate in height,

$h_i$ = the initial (a month after establishment, $t_1$) growths in height,

$h_f$ = the final (after $t_2$ months) growths in height.

\[
RGR_d = \frac{\log_e df - \log_e di}{t_2 - t_1} \quad Eqn 3
\]

Where $RGR_d$ = Relative growth rate in RCD,

$di$ = the initial (a month after establishment, $t_1$) growths in RCD,

$df$ = the final (after $t_2$ months) growth in RCD,

**Data Analysis**

Data on survival were arcsine transformed before being analyzed. This was done to ensure normality. Geometric means were calculated for presentation. Plant survival, growth in height and RCD, RGR$_h$ and RGR$_d$ were tested for significance among treatments through a one way analysis of variance (ANOVA) using SPSS for Windows Version 15 (2006). Differences between means were tested using LSD post hoc tests at 5% level of significance. Equation 4 shows the model for the experiment.

\[
y_{ijkl} = \mu + S_i + P_j + W_k + SP_{ij} + SW_{ik} + PW_{jk} + SPW_{ijk} + e_{ijkl} \quad Eqn 4
\]

Where: $y_{ijkl} =$ Response of trees planted at $i^{th}$ planting density, propagated through the $j^{th}$ method and with weeds managed through the $k^{th}$ method.

$\mu =$ Grand mean,

$S_i =$ Response to the $i^{th}$ planting density ($i=3333, 2500$ or $1333$ stems/ha),
\( P_j \) = Response to the \( j^{th} \) propagation method (\( j= \) pre-cultivated seedlings, non-rooted cuttings or direct seeding).

\( W_k \) = Response to the \( k^{th} \) weed management method (\( k= \) spot weeding; slashing and the two weed management methods combined),

\( SP_{ij} \) = Response to the effect of the interaction between planting density and propagation method,

\( PW_{jk} \) = Response to the effect of the interaction between propagation method and weed management technique,

\( SPW_{ijk} \) = Response to the effect of the interaction among planting densities, propagation methods and weed management techniques,

\( e_{ijkl} \) = the error term.

**RESULTS**

**Relative Growth Rates in Height and RCD**

Relative growth rates in height (RGR_{h_{7\text{months}}}) and RCD (RGR_{d_{7\text{months}}}) over a seven months period, of *J. curcas* saplings propagated through pre-cultivated seedlings and direct seeding, planted at densities 3333, 2500 and 1333 stems/ha and subjected to slashing, spot weeding and both slashing and spot weeding are shown in Table 1. Relative growth rates in height and RGR_{d_{7\text{months}}} for non-rooted cuttings are missing because the plants growth habit did not allow data on height and RCD to be collected.
Table 1: *Jatropha curcas* RGR<sub>h7months</sub> and RGR<sub>d7months</sub>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propagation Method</th>
<th>Planting Density (Stems/ha)</th>
<th>Weed Management Method</th>
<th>RGR&lt;sub&gt;h7months&lt;/sub&gt; ±SE</th>
<th>RGR&lt;sub&gt;d7months&lt;/sub&gt;±SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-cultivated seedlings</td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>0.018±0.011</td>
<td>0.035±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>0.030±0.012</td>
<td>0.010±0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>0.031±0.012</td>
<td>0.016±0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>0.015±0.011</td>
<td>0.032±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>0.015±0.011</td>
<td>0.039±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>0.018±0.011</td>
<td>0.036±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>0.017±0.011</td>
<td>0.063±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>0.032±0.012</td>
<td>0.048±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>0.016±0.011</td>
<td>0.053±0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct seeding</td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>0.028±0.014</td>
<td>0.019±0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>0.018±0.011</td>
<td>0.015±0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>0.074±0.021</td>
<td>0.047±0.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>0.015±0.021</td>
<td>0.020±0.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>0.054±0.018</td>
<td>0.038±0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>0.051±0.018</td>
<td>0.046±0.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>0.027±0.015</td>
<td>0.029±0.012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>0.028±0.016</td>
<td>0.060±0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>0.038±0.013</td>
<td>0.061±0.011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance

- Propagation Method (Prop) NS NS
- Weed management (Weed Mgt) NS NS
- Planting Density (Density) NS NS
- Prop*Density NS NS
- Prop*Weed Mgt NS NS
- Density*Weed Mgt NS NS
- Prop*Weed Mgt*Density NS NS

NS= Not significantly different at P=0.05.

Plants established through pre-cultivated seedlings did not significantly differ (P>0.05) from those established by direct seeding in terms of RGR<sub>h7months</sub>. As for planting densities, RGR<sub>h7months</sub> did not vary (P>0.05) among plants established at 3333, 2500, and 1333 stems/ha. Similarly, RGR<sub>h7months</sub> did not significantly differ (P>0.05) among plants where slashing, spot weeding and both slashing and spot weeding were practiced. The interaction between propagation methods and planting densities as well as the one between planting densities and weed management techniques did not result in significant differences (P>0.05) on Jatropha’s RGR<sub>h7months</sub>. Similarly, the interaction between propagation methods,
planting densities and weed management techniques did not result in significant differences (P>0.05) on plants’ RGRh7months.

There was no significant difference (P>0.05) between plants established through pre-cultivated seedlings and direct seeding in terms of RGRd7months. As for planting densities, there were no significant differences (P>0.05) among plants established at 3333, 2500, and 1333 stems/ha in terms of RGRd7months. Plants’ response to weed management indicated no significant differences (P>0.05) in RGRd7months among those subjected to slashing, spot weeding and both slashing and spot weeding. Plants’ response to the interaction between propagation methods and planting densities as well as planting densities and weed management techniques indicated no significant differences (P>0.05) in RGRd7months. The interaction among propagation methods, planting densities and weed management techniques did not result in significant differences (P>0.05) on plants’ response in terms of RGRd7months.

**Survivals and Growths Seven Months after Planting**

Growth in height and RCD and survival percentages of *J. curcas* achieved in 7 months are shown in Table 2.
Table 2 Survivals, height and RCD of *J. curcas* after seven months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Propagation Method</th>
<th>Planting Density (Stems/ha)</th>
<th>Weed Management Method</th>
<th>Survival (%)</th>
<th>Mean Height (cm) ±SE</th>
<th>Mean RCD (cm) ±SE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-cultivated Seedlings</strong></td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>64.33±2.18</td>
<td>2.73±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>69.24±2.27</td>
<td>2.96±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>78.17</td>
<td>75.28±2.27</td>
<td>3.30±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>77.08</td>
<td>73.09±2.07</td>
<td>2.93±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>76.24±2.01</td>
<td>3.07±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>87.50</td>
<td>69.13±2.15</td>
<td>3.11±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>77.08</td>
<td>81.88±2.05</td>
<td>3.60±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>83.33</td>
<td>74.16±2.10</td>
<td>3.36±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>78.17</td>
<td>70.66±2.21</td>
<td>3.27±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct Seeding</strong></td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>51.39</td>
<td>16.63±2.62</td>
<td>1.28±0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>17.83±3.93</td>
<td>1.58±0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>49.67</td>
<td>15.21±3.63</td>
<td>1.41±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>15.73±4.10</td>
<td>1.26±0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>16.47±3.51</td>
<td>1.35±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>19.13±3.51</td>
<td>1.44±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>29.17</td>
<td>16.96±2.90</td>
<td>1.41±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>31.25</td>
<td>18.67±2.48</td>
<td>1.61±0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>47.92</td>
<td>17.58±3.12</td>
<td>1.71±0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-rooted Cuttings</strong></td>
<td>3333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>10.42</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>20.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>24.92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2500</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>22.92</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1333</td>
<td>Slashing</td>
<td>14.58</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot &amp; slashing</td>
<td>27.08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Spot</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**

| **** =Significant differences at P=0.001; NS=not significant (P>0.05) and ‘–’=missing value. |}

**Significance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Propagation Method (Prop)</th>
<th>Weed management (Weed Mgt)</th>
<th>Planting Density (Density)</th>
<th>Prop*Density</th>
<th>Prop*Weed Mgt</th>
<th>Density*Weed Mgt</th>
<th>Prop<em>Weed Mgt</em>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**

| **** =Significant differences at P=0.001; NS=not significant (P>0.05) and ‘–’=missing value. |
Survival

Survival Variation by Propagation Method
Arcsine transformed survival data showed that saplings established by means of pre-cultivated seedlings (81.42 %) outperformed (P<0.05) those established through direct seeding (38.07 %) and cuttings (19.41 %) when the three planting densities and weed management techniques were evaluated. In turn, *J. curcas* established through direct seeding outperformed (P<0.05) the ones propagated through non-rooted cuttings in terms of survival.

Survival Variation by Planting Density
Planting densities did not differ significantly (P>0.05) among themselves in terms of *J. curcas* survival. The overall survivals of saplings established at 3333, 2500 and 1333 stems/ha were 45.60 %, 46.28 % and 45.36 % respectively.

Planting densities showed no significant differences (P>0.05) among themselves in terms of the survival of saplings propagated by planting pre-cultivated seedlings, with 3333 stems/ha density recording 79.17 %; 2500 stems/ha, 83.50 % and 1333 stems/ha, 81.61 %.

Similarly, planting densities did not differ significantly (P>0.05) on the survivals of saplings propagated by direct seeding and recorded 40.14 % for those planted at 3333 stems/ha; 36.58 %, 2500 stems/ha and 36.11 %, 1333 stems/ha density. As for saplings propagated through non-rooted cuttings, there were no significant differences in percentage survivals (P>0.05) among cuttings established at 3333 stems/ha (18.67 %), 2500 stems/ha (19.44 %) and 1333 stems/ha (20.11 %).

Survival Variation by Weed Management Method
Weed management techniques did not differ significantly (P>0.05) among themselves in terms of *J. curcas* survival. The overall survivals of saplings subjected to slashing, spot weeding and both slashing and spot weeding were 43.44 %, 50.79 % and 42.74 % respectively.

Slashing (81.61 %), spot weeding (79.86 %) and both slashing and spot weeding (82.81 %) did not result in significant differences (P>0.05) on survivals of saplings propagated by planting pre-cultivated
seedlings. Saplings propagated by direct seeding and subjected to spot weeding (50.19 %) recorded a higher (P<0.05) survival percentage when compared to those subjected to slashing (35.19 %) and both slashing and spot weeding (28.13 %). As for saplings propagated through non-rooted cuttings, weed management practices exhibited no significant differences (P>0.05) among themselves in terms of survival, with those subjected to slashing scoring 15.97 %, spot weeding, 20.78 % and both slashing and spot weeding (21.47 %).

**Height and RCD**

**Saplings Propagated through Pre-cultivated Seedlings**

In terms height, saplings propagated through pre-cultivated seedlings indicated no significant differences (P>0.05) among those subjected to slashing (Mean±SE: 73.45 cm±1.66), spot weeding (71.58 cm±1.24) and both slashing and spot weeding (73.56 cm±1.55). The same scenario was observed with RCD, recording no significant differences (P>0.05) among saplings which were subjected to slashing (3.10 cm±0.07), spot weeding (3.14 cm±0.06) and both slashing and spot weeding (3.22 cm±0.06).

Planting density had no effect (P>0.05) on growth in height as well as RCD. The mean heights achieved were: 69.98 cm±1.31 for 3333 stems/ha, 72.98 cm±1.23 for 2500 stems/ha and 75.82 cm±1.81 for 1333 stems/ha. As for RCD, the 3333 stems/ha density recorded 2.99 cm±0.06; 2500 stems/ha, 3.04 cm±0.06 and 1333 stems/ha, 3.42 cm±0.66.

**Saplings Propagated by Direct Seeding**

Saplings propagated through direct seeding indicated no significant differences (P>0.05) in terms of mean height, among those subjected to slashing (16.58 cm±0.38), spot weeding (17.38 cm±0.63) and both slashing and spot weeding (17.91 cm±0.75). However, unlike height, RCD indicated significant differences (P<0.05) with saplings subjected to slashing (1.32 cm±0.04) being thinner when compared to those which were subjected spot weeding (1.54 cm±0.64) and both slashing and spot weeding (1.54 cm±0.06). There was no significant difference (P>0.05) between *J. curcas* saplings subjected to spot weeding and both slashing and spot weeding.
Planting densities showed no significant differences (P>0.05) on height with 3333 stems/ha recording 16.53 cm±0.39; 2500 stems/ha, 17.24 cm±0.70 and 1333 stems/ha, 17.85 cm±0.35. In terms of RCD, saplings established at 1333 stems/ha (1.57 cm±0.05) were thicker (P<0.05) than those established at 3333 stems/ha (1.38 cm±0.05) and 2500 stems/ha (1.36 cm±0.05).

DISCUSSION

Propagation Methods
In spite of the high expenses involved, results on survival percentages achieved by *J. curcas* in this research indicated the necessity of pre-cultivating seedlings in a nursery, prior to transplanting them. The high survival percentages observed on plants established by planting pre-cultivated seedlings were also reported by Kobilke (1989) and Heller (1992). This observation is scientifically sensible because the pre-cultivation of seedlings under closely monitored nursery conditions gives them a physiological advantage over plants established by direct planting of either seed or cuttings. The well developed root system and stem increase the potential to survive water and other stresses. Although the pre-cultivated seedlings were observed to initially lose leaves due to transplantation shock, the roots and stem organs enabled them to quickly develop new leaves thereby increasing chances of survival. Thus, pre-cultivated seedlings easily adapted to the harsh, less controlled field environment than non-rooted cuttings and seed. However, during winter, plants established by planting pre-cultivated seedlings were the most affected, losing their apical meristems to frost, forcing the plants to develop some shoots in response to the loss of apical dominance. This is consistent with observations by Wini *et al.* (2006) and Singh *et al.* (2007) that *J. curcas* cannot withstand frost.

Although the survivals of *J. curcas* propagated through pre-cultivated seedlings surpassed those by non-rooted cuttings and direct seeding, the mortality was high considering the maximum allowed during the first year of plantation establishment. The minimum percentage survival required to avoid blanking costs is 85% compared to 81.42% recorded in this study. The mortality was mainly attributed to frost which attacked the saplings’ shoots during winter (Wini *et al.*, 2006; Singh *et al.*, 2007) and defoliation by mammals, rodents and locusts (Heller, 1992).
Unlike pre-cultivated seedlings, directly planted seed need to germinate and survive the critical, early stages of growth and development which occurs in an unpredictable natural environment characterized by harsh weather conditions and pests and diseases. This partly explains the high mortality observed on *J. curcas* established by direct seeding. Similar results were observed elsewhere (Kobilke, 1989; Heller, 1992; Kureel, 2006; Feike *et al.*, 2007). Salisbury and Ross (1992) explained that the period from germination to the time the seedling becomes established as an independent organism constitute the most critical phase in the life history of the plant. During this period, the plant is most susceptible to injury by a wide range of insect pests and parasitic fungi and water stress can prove to be fatal. Direct field observations from this study attributed the high mortality to pests and diseases chief of which were damping off (Heller, 1992; Singh, 1983), defoliation by millipedes (Heller, 1992), locusts (Heller, 1996), termites and rodents (Kar and Das, 1988; Meshram and Joshi, 1994; Biswas *et al.*, 2006; Rao, 2006). The high incidence of pests and diseases explains the high vulnerability of the tender, post germinated juvenile plants.

Perry (1980) reported plants established by direct planting of seed to give mixed results on survival. Besides, success in terms of survival percentage has been reported with plants established by direct seeding in Thailand (Sukarin *et al.*, 1987). This inconsistence with the findings of this research is reasonable because the method, as explained above, is heavily influenced by critical factors (moisture availability, pests and diseases etc) which if favourable, give high survival percentages and vice-versa. Thus, the intra-specific variation in survival percentages, across agro-ecological regions, was not unusual in view of plants established by the direct planting of seed.

Surprisingly, survival percentages of *J. curcas* established by non-rooted cuttings which are generally thought to have a physiological advantage over plants established through direct seeding (Kobilke, 1989; Heller, 1992) were similarly low. However, cuttings may be argued to have no advantage over directly planted seed because they too need to develop some crucial organs prior to the commencement of growth and development. If the environment is not conducive, cuttings may find it difficult to root and develop shoots. The high mortality observed on plants established by means of non-rooted cuttings was mainly attributed to stem rot caused by high moisture levels and defoliation by locusts and millipedes during the early growth phase (Phillips, 1975; Singh, 1983; Kar and Das, 1988; Heller, 1992; Meshram and Joshi, 1994; Heller, 1996; Biswas *et al.*, 2006). These findings agree with Heller (1996) who
reported *J. curcas* plants established by non-rooted cuttings to have lower longevity, drought, pest and disease resistance compared to plants propagated by generative means. Additionally, Kureel (2006) reported large scale *J. curcas* mortality in non-rooted cuttings planted during the rainy season. This was attributed to the high moisture levels which promoted fungal infection.

Kobilke (1989) and Heller (1992) reported non-rooted *J. curcas* cuttings to give more than 80% survivals. The inconsistence with the findings of this research could be a result of a complex interaction of factors among them agro-ecological differences, different cutting morphologies. Unlike the cuttings used in this research which despite being 5 cm thick and 25 cm long recorded low percentage survivals; Thitithanavanich (1985) reported cuttings of 3 cm diameter and 30 cm length to form more roots than those of 1 and 2 cm diameter and 15 cm length. Heller (1996) reported the rooting potential of cuttings to be influenced by the nature of the rooting media, aeration and drainage. Thus, the medium to poor aeration and drainage associated with the soils on the trial site caused water logging, a condition conducive for *Phytophthora spp*, *Pythium spp* and *Fusarium spp* which caused stem and root rot (Heller, 1992) and contributed to the low survivals recorded for non-rooted cuttings. Further, the anaerobic conditions could have limited aerobic respiration (Salisbury and Ross, 1992) since the cuttings had less or no leaves for oxygen absorption, thus retarding the growth process, culminating in the death of the cuttings. Although not specific, Hartmann and Kester (1983) reported the age of the plant from which cuttings are taken as well as the position of the cutting on the plant to determine rooting and hence survival percentage. This could have impacted less on the survival of cuttings in this research since the cuttings were collected from one year old branches (Heller, 2006; Singh *et al.*, 2007).

The lack of significant differences in RGR<sub>h7months</sub> and RGR<sub>d7months</sub> responses of pre-cultivated seedlings and direct seeding could be explained by environmental and physiological factors. The loss of the physiological advantage associated with saplings established through pre-cultivated seedlings could be explained by transplanting shock as well as the harsh climatic and edaphic conditions on the field. Transplanting seedlings from the closely monitored nursery to the field, characterized mainly by episodes of moisture deficiency could have significantly lowered the plants’ external water potential which could have caused a decrease in cellular growths (Sakurai and Kuraishi, 1988) and thus negatively impacted on RGR<sub>h7months</sub> and RGR<sub>d7months</sub> resulting in the lack of significant difference between *J. curcas* established by pre-cultivated seedlings and seedlings. It may be possible that the
effect of the transplanting shock was prolonged enough to overshadow the established root system and shoot advantage characteristic of pre-cultivated seedlings.

**Planting Densities**
Premature to the widely publicized inverse relationship between planting density and tree survival (Lahani, 1980) as well as the one between planting density and growth in height and RCD (Bhatia, 1980; Lohani, 1980; Jamroenpruscksa, 1989; Effendi and Bachtiar, 1994; Nilsson, 1994; Kohani, 1997; Taurins, 1997; Jaeghagen, 1997; Loutfy et al., 1998), findings from this research indicated planting density to have no effect on *J. curcas* survival and growth in height and RCD in the first season of establishment mainly because of the lack of intra-specific competition. This is reasonable considering the growth rate of *J. curcas* which in the favourable conditions for instance those of Thailand, is averaged at 1 m in height and 0.75 m crown diameter after 5 months of establishment (Heller, 1996) as well as the planting density treatments which were low enough to avoid canopy closure during the first season of establishment. However, depending on climatic conditions and management prescriptions later in the life cycle of *J. curcas*, canopy closure would suppress and eliminate weaker trees. Until then, none of the three planting densities can be considered ideal for the establishment of a *J. curcas* plantation for seed production in conditions similar to those at Bindura University farm.

**Weed Management Techniques**
Vegetation management is a routine practice in plantation forests and is essential for achieving high rates of productivity (Richardson, 1993). It has been shown to be critical immediately after plantation establishment, with some researchers reporting substantial growth benefits from weed control (Morris, 1994; Little and Rolando, 2001; South et al., 2001; Little and Staden, 2003). In most resource poor developing countries, spot weeding and slashing provide the foundation of weed management wherever intensive plantation management has developed.

In this study, weed management treatments caused the same survival and growth responses although spot weeding and both spot weeding and slashing were expected to give outstanding outcomes compared to slashing (Richardson, 1993; Kyato and Okamoto 2002; Coll et al., 2005; Kagombe and Gitanga, 2005). Since spot weeding and slashing liberated *J. curcas* saplings by removing the aboveground weed biomass with slashing leaving 5 cm high stumps, it may be argued that the effect was the same, resulting
in the lack of significant differences among the weed management treatments in terms of survival and growth in height and RCD. Thus, the ability of spot weeding to damage the weed’s root system was overshadowed by the removal of aboveground biomass and hence had no visible effect on *J. curcas* survival and growth. In support, Schwinning and Weiner (1998) reported aboveground weed competition to strongly affect seedlings than belowground competition hence the lack of significant difference between spot weeding and slashing.

Additionally, the fact that the weed management treatments were prescribed once, basing on financial constraints than on weed re-growth and re-infestation potential could have contributed to the lack of differences among *J. curcas* saplings subjected to spot weeding, slashing and both spot weeding and slashing. This is reasonable considering the fast re-growth vigour associated with *Rottboellia exaltata* which dominated the study site. *Rottboellia exaltata* is characterized by long and horizontally oriented leaf blades which together with the observed high density of the weed shaded the *J. curcas* saplings from sunlight thus negatively impacting on the process of photosynthesis. Thus, the initial effects of the weed management treatments on *J. curcas* survival and growth in height and RCD could have been overshadowed by weed re-growths as the season progressed.

The survival and growth responses of *J. curcas* saplings was not a function of weed management alone but many factors a combination of which could have led to the observed results. Thus, the lack of significant differences among the weed management treatments could be explained by the ability of *J. curcas* to tolerate weed competition as well. In support, Jongschaap et al. (2007) reported *J. curcas* to be weed tolerant and to have low nutrient requirements. Basing on the later, it may be argued that the degree of competition after either spot weeding or slashing was low to cause water, nutrient and light deficiencies to affect the *J. curcas* saplings’ survivals and growths in height and RCD.

However, unlike the findings of this research, Kyato and Okamoto (2002) and Coll et al. (2005), reported trees subjected to spot weeding to achieve better heights and RCDs than those subjected to slashing. This is sound since spot weeding entirely removes the weeds’ aerial biomasses unlike slashing which leaves stumps and juvenile weeds below the 5 cm slashing height thus leaving a certain degree of competition for light, water, nutrients and space. Further, spot weeding damages the weeds’ root systems thus reducing root competition compared to slashing. Wilson (1988), Parker et al. (1993), Gerry and Wilson (1995), Weiner et al. (1997), Davis et al. (1999), and Rikala and Sajala (2002) reported root
competition to have a greater impact than shoot competition on the survival and growth of saplings since
the roots of both the tree crop and weeds particularly grass and shrubs use water and nutrients from the
same layers. Casper and Jackson (1997) reported belowground competition to cause water and mineral
nutrient deficiencies to saplings.

CONCLUSION

From this study, pre-cultivated seedlings can be concluded to be the ideal method for establishing *J. curcas* plantations compared to non-rooted cuttings and direct seeding in agro-ecological conditions
similar to those of Bindura University farm. The study demonstrated *J. curcas* planting density
treatments to have no effect on the survival and growth of saplings during the first season of
establishment. Data to be collected in future may help determine the most ideal planting density. As for
weed management, the results indicated spot weeding, slashing and both spot weeding and slashing to
have the same effect on *J. curcas* survival and growth in height and RCD.
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