PENGARUH NAUNGAN TERHADAP PERTUMBUHAN BEBERAPA JENIS GULMA YANG DITANAM SECARA CAMPURAN SEBAGAI TANAMAN PENUTUP TANAH

SKRIPSI

ALIYAH MAHARANI BALQIS
71200713057

PROGRAM STUDI AGROTEKNOLOGI
FAKULTAS PERTANIAN
UNIVERSITAS ISLAM SUMATERA UTARA
MEDAN
2024

PENGARUH NAUNGAN TERHADAP PERTUMBUHAN BEBERAPA JENIS GULMA YANG DITANAM SECARA CAMPURAN SEBAGAI TANAMAN PENUTUP TANAH

ALIYAH MAHARANI BALQIS
71200713057

Skripsi merupakan salah satu syarat untuk menyelesaikan pendidikan sarjana pada
Program Studi Agroteknologi Fakultas Pertanian
Universitas Islam Sumatera Utara

Menyetujui
Komisi Pembimbing

(Dr. Yenni Asbur, SP., MP)	**(Dr. Yayuk Purwaningrum, SP., MP)**
Ketua	**Anggota**

Mengesahkan

Dr. Ir MurniSari Rahayu, MP	**Dr. Ir. Noverina Chaniago, MP**
Dekan	**Ketua Program Studi**

Tanggal Lulus Ujian

KATA PENGANTAR

Alhamdulillah segala puji dan syukur penulis panjatkan kehadirat Allah SWT yang telah memberikan rahmat dan karunia-Nya sehingga Skripsi ini dapat diselesaikan dengan baik *insyaa Allah* dengan Judul **"PENGARUH NAUNGAN TERHADAP PERTUMBUHAN BEBERAPA JENIS GULMA YANG DITANAM SECARA CAMPURAN SEBAGAI TANAMAN PENUTUP TANAH".** Shalawat berangkaikan salam ke Ruh Nabiyullah Muhammad SAW yang diharapkan syafa'at-Nya di Yaumil Qiyamah kelak, *Aamiin.*

Dengan selesainya Usulan Penelitian ini penulis tidak lupa mengucapkan Terima Kasih kepada pihak pihak yang telah membantu yaitu:

1. Kepada Ibu Dr. Yenni Asbur, S.P. M.P selaku Ketua Komisi Pembimbing.
2. Kepada Ibu Dr. Yayuk Purwaningrum, SP. MP selaku Anggota Komisi Pembimbing.
3. Kepada Ibu Dr. Ir. Noverina Chaniago, MP. selaku Ketua Program Studi Agroteknologi.
4. Kepada Ibu Ir. Murni Sari Rahayu, M.P. selaku Dekan Fakultas Pertanian Universitas Islam Sumatra Utara.
5. Seluruh Dosen dan pegawai Fakultas Pertanian UISU Medan.
6. Seluruh rekan rekan Mahasiswa/i yang telah membantu penulis dalam menyelesaikan Skripsi Ini.
7. Kepada semua pihak yang tidak dapat penulis sebutkan satu-persatu yang telah membantu dalam pelaksanaan dan penyelesaian Skripsi ini, penulis mengucapkan banyak Terima kasih.

Akhirul kalam, jika ada kata dan penulisan Skripsi ini yang kurang berkenan, penulis menyadari akan adanya kekurangan dalam tulisan ini, untuk itu penulis sangat mengharapkan kritik dan saran yang membangun guna kesempurnaan Skripsi ini. Semoga Skripsi ini bisa bermanfaat bagi pembaca dan khususnya penulis.

Kepada Allah SWT penulis mohon ampun, taufiq dan hidayahnya semoga usaha ini senantiasa dalam keridhoannya. *Aamiin*

Medan, Mei 2024

Aliyah Maharani Balqis

DAFTAR ISI

DAFTAR PUSTAKA

Abdalla M, Hastings A, Cheng K, Yue Q, Chadwick D, Espenberg M, Truu J, Rees RM, Smith P. 2019. A critical review of the impacts of cover crops on nitrogen leaching, net greenhouse gas balance and crop productivity. Global change biology, 25(8): 2530-2543.

Adeleye MA, Akinsoji A, Adeonipekun PA. 2017. A survey of vascular epiphytes of oil palms (Elaeis guineensis JACQ.) in Lekki Conservation Centre, Lagos, Nigeria.

Adetula OA. 2004. Asystasia gangetica (L.) Anderson. PROTA (Plant Resources of Tropical Africa/Ressources végétales de l'Afrique tropicale). Record from PROTA4U. Grubben GJH, Denton OA. (Ed.). Netherlands: Wageningen.

Adjorlolo LK, Adogla-Bessa T, Amaning-Kwarteng K, Ahunu BK. 2014. Effect of season on the quality of forages selected by sheep in citrus plantations in Ghana. Tropical Grasslands-Forrajes Tropicales, 2(3): 271-277.

Aini SQ, Ifadatin S, Zakiah Z. 2022. Karakteristik morfologi pada tumbuhan paku Nephrolepis biserrata (Sw.) Schott dan Nephrolepis exaltata (L.) Schott di kawasan kampus Universitas Tanjungpura. Protobiont 11(1): 11-16.

Alliaume FWAH, Rossing WAH, Tittonell P, Jorge G, Dogliotti S. 2014. Reduced tillage and cover crops improve water capture and reduce erosion of fine textured soils in raised bed tomato systems. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 183: 127-137.

Anistia W, Marliah A, Hasanuddin H. 2022. Pengaruh gulma babadotan (Ageratum conyzoides L.) pada berbagai densitas terhadap pertumbuhan tanaman kedelai (Glycine max (L). Merill). Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Pertanian, 7(4): 1128-1133.

Arifbio. 2009. Nephrolepis sp. [Internet[. [Diakses 01 April 2024]. Tersedia pada: https://arifbio.wordpress.com/2009/12/09/nephrolepis-sp/

Ariyanti M. 2016. Peranan tanaman penutup tanah Nephrolepis biserrata pada teknik konservasi tanah dan air terhadap Neraca air di perkebunan kelapa sawit (Doctoral dissertation, Bogor Agricultural University (IPB)).

Ariyanti M, Yahya S, Murtilaksono K, Suwarto, Siregar HH. 2016a. Pengaruh tanaman penutup tanah Nephrolepis biserrata dan teras gulud terhadap aliran permukaan dan pertumbuhan kelapa sawit (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.). Kultivasi, 15(2): 121-127.

Ariyanti M, Yahya S, Murtilaksono K, Suwarto, Siregar HH. 2016. Water balance in oil palm plantation with ridge terrace and Nephrolepis biserrata as cover crop. Journal of Tropical Crop Science, 3(2): 35-55.

Ariyanti M, Mubarok S, Asbur Y. 2017. Study of Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson as cover crop against soil water content in mature oil palm plantation. Journal of Agronomy, 16(4): 154-159.

Asbur Y. 2016. Peran Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson Dalam Konservasi Tanah dan Neraca Hara di Perkebunan Kelapa Sawit Menghasilkan (Doctoral dissertation, Bogor Agricultural University (IPB)).

Asbur Y, Ariyanti M. 2017. Peran konservasi tanah terhadap cadangan karbon tanah, bahan organik, dan pertumbuhan kelapa sawit (Elaeis guineensis jacq.). Kultivasi, 16(3): 402-411.

Asbur Y, Yahya S, Murtilaksono K, Sudradjat, Sutarta ES. 2016a. The roles of Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson and ridge terrace in reducing soil erosion and nutrient losses in oil palm plantation in South Lampung, Indonesia. Journal of Tropical Crop Science 3(2):49-55.

Asbur Y, Yahya S, Murtilaksono K, Sudradjat, Sutarta ES. 2016b. Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson: Noxius Weed yang Bermanfaat di Perkebunan Kelapa Sawit Menghasilkan. In Prosiding Seminar Nasional dan Kongres Perhimpunan Agronomi Indonesia. Bogor (Vol. 27, pp. 1147-1155).

Asbur Y, Rambe RDH, Purwaningrum Y, Kusbiantoro D. 2018a. Potensi beberapa gulma sebagai tanaman penutup tanah di area tanaman kelapa sawit menghasilkan. Jurnal penelitian kelapa Sawit, 26(3), 113-128.

Asbur Y, Purwaningrum Y, Ariyanti M. 2018b. Growth and nutrient balance of Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson as cover crop for mature oil palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) plantations. Chilean journal of agricultural research, 78(4): 486-494.

Asbur Y, Purwaningrum Y, Rambe RDH, Kusbiantoro D, Hendrawan D, Khairunnisyah K. 2019. Studi jarak tanam dan naungan terhadap pertumbuhan dan potensi Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai tanaman penutup tanah. Kultivasi, 18(3): 969-976. https://doi.org/10.24198/kultivasi.v18i3.21422

Asbur Y, Purwaningrum Y, Ariyanti M. 2020. Vegetation Composition and Structure under Mature Oil Palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) Stands. In Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research (ICMR 2018) (pp. 254-260).

Asbur Y, Purwaningrum Y, Mindalisma M, Afriza MN. 2021. Neraca Hara N, P, K Tanah dengan Pemangkasan dan Pembenaman Asystasia Gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai Tanaman Penutup Tanah. In Prosiding Seminar Nasional Dies Natalis Fakultas Pertanian Universitas Sebelas Maret, Solo.

Asbur Y, Pulungan RJ, Purwaningrum Y, Rahayu MS, Siregar C, Kusbiantoro D, Khairunnisyah. 2023a. Perbaikan sifat kimia tanah dan pertumbuhan kelapa sawit rakyat TM-1 dengan pemberian kombinasi pupuk anorganik-organik dan Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai tanaman penutup tanah. Jurnal Penelitian Kelapa Sawit, 31(1): 25-42.

Asbur, Y. Purwaningrum Y, Mindalisma, Kusbiantoro D, Nasution K, Hendrawan D. 2023b. Perbaikan sifat kimia tanah dengan penanaman Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai cover crop. Median: Jurnal Ilmu Ilmu Eksakta, 15(1): 28-35.

Asbur Y. 2016. Peran Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson Dalam Konservasi Tanah dan Neraca Hara di Perkebunan Kelapa Sawit Menghasilkan (Doctoral dissertation, Bogor Agricultural University (IPB)).

Asbur Y, Ariyanti M. 2017. Peran konservasi tanah terhadap cadangan karbon tanah, bahan organik, dan pertumbuhan kelapa sawit (Elaeis guineensis jacq.). Kultivasi, 16(3): 402-411.

Asbur Y, Yahya S, Murtilaksono K, Sudradjat, Sutarta ES. 2016a. The roles of Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson and ridge terrace in reducing soil erosion and nutrient losses in oil palm plantation in South Lampung, Indonesia. Journal of Tropical Crop Science 3(2):49-55.

Asbur Y, Yahya S, Murtilaksono K, Sudradjat, Sutarta ES. 2016b. Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson: Noxius Weed yang Bermanfaat di Perkebunan Kelapa Sawit Menghasilkan. In Prosiding Seminar Nasional dan Kongres Perhimpunan Agronomi Indonesia. Bogor (Vol. 27, pp. 1147-1155).

Asbur Y, Rambe RDH, Purwaningrum Y, Kusbiantoro D. 2018a. Potensi beberapa gulma sebagai tanaman penutup tanah di area tanaman kelapa sawit menghasilkan. Jurnal penelitian kelapa Sawit, 26(3), 113-128.

Asbur Y, Purwaningrum Y, Ariyanti M. 2018b. Growth and nutrient balance of Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson as cover crop for mature oil palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) plantations. Chilean journal of agricultural research, 78(4): 486-494.

Asbur Y, Purwaningrum Y, Rambe RDH, Kusbiantoro D, Hendrawan D, Khairunnisyah K. 2019. Studi jarak tanam dan naungan terhadap pertumbuhan dan potensi Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai tanaman penutup tanah. Kultivasi, 18(3): 969-976. https://doi.org/10.24198/kultivasi.v18i3.21422

Asbur Y, Purwaningrum Y, Ariyanti M. 2020. Vegetation Composition and Structure under Mature Oil Palm (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) Stands. In Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Multidisciplinary Research (ICMR 2018) (pp. 254-260).

Asbur Y, Purwaningrum Y, Mindalisma M, Afriza MN. 2021. Neraca Hara N, P, K Tanah dengan Pemangkasan dan Pembenaman Asystasia Gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai Tanaman Penutup Tanah. In Prosiding Seminar Nasional Dies Natalis Fakultas Pertanian Universitas Sebelas Maret, Solo.

Asbur Y, Pulungan RJ, Purwaningrum Y, Rahayu MS, Siregar C, Kusbiantoro D, Khairunnisyah. 2023a. Perbaikan sifat kimia tanah dan pertumbuhan kelapa sawit rakyat TM-1 dengan pemberian kombinasi pupuk anorganik-organik dan Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai tanaman penutup tanah. Jurnal Penelitian Kelapa Sawit, 31(1): 25-42.

Asbur, Y. Purwaningrum Y, Mindalisma, Kusbiantoro D, Nasution K, Hendrawan D. 2023b. Perbaikan sifat kimia tanah dengan penanaman Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai cover crop. Median: Jurnal Ilmu Ilmu Eksakta, 15(1): 28-35.

Bagas GM. 2022. Nephrolepis biserrata Gulma Bermanfaat Bagi Perkebunan Kelapa Sawit [Internet]. [Diakses 05 Mei 2024]. Tersedia pada: https://srs-ssms.com/id/nephrolepis-biserrata-gulma-bermanfaat-bagi-perkebunan-kelapa-sawit/

Blanco-Canqui H, Shaver TM, Lindquist JL, Shapiro CA, Elmore RW, Francis CA., Hergert GW. 2015. Cover crops and ecosystem services: Insights from studies in temperate soils. Agronomy journal, 107(6): 2449-2474.

Blesh J. 2018. Functional traits in cover crop mixtures: Biological nitrogen fixation and multifunctionality. Journal of Applied Ecology, 55(1): 38-48.

Bosi CF, Rosa DW, Grougnet R, Lemonakis N, Halabalaki M, Skaltsounis AL, Biavatti MW. 2013. Pyrrolizidine alkaloids in medicinal tea of Ageratum conyzoides. Brazilian Journal of Pharmacognosy23(3): 425-432.

Büchi L, Gebhard CA, Liebisch F, Sinaj S, Ramseier H, Charles R. 2015. Accumulation of biologically fixed nitrogen by legumes cultivated as cover crops in Switzerland. Plant and Soil, 393: 163-175.

Bussmann RW, Paniagua-Zambrana NY, Njoroge GN. 2020. Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson A canthaceae. Ethnobotany of the Mountain Regions of Africa, 1-3.

Bybee-Finley KA, Mirsky SB, Ryan MR. 2016. Functional diversity in summer annual grass and legume intercrops in the northeastern United States. Crop Science, 56(5): 2775-2790.

Cane MA, Maccaferri M, Nazemi G, Salvi S, Francia R, Colalongo C, Tuberosa R. 2014. Association mapping for root architectural traits in durum wheat seedlings as related to agronomic performance. Molecular Breeding, 34: 1629-1645. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11032-014-0177-1

Chung PW, Livesley SJ, Farrell C. 2023. Leaf trait plasticity means green facades are a flexible nature-based solution for vertical greening under full-sun and heavy shade conditions. Nature-Based Solutions, 4: 100078. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nbsj.2023.100078

Cong WF, Hoffland E, Li L, Six J, Sun JH, Bao XG, Zhang FS, Van Der Werf W. 2015. Intercropping enhances soil carbon and nitrogen. Global change biology, 21(4): 1715-1726.

Couëdel A, Alletto L, Tribouillois H, Justes É. 2018. Cover crop crucifer-legume mixtures provide effective nitrate catch crop and nitrogen green manure ecosystem services. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 254: 50-59.

de Notaris C, Jensen JL, Olesen JE, Stumpf da Silva T, Rasmussen J, Panagea I, Rubæk GH. 2021. Long-term soil quality effects of soil and crop management in organic and conventional arable cropping systems. Geoderma 403. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoderma.2021.115383.

de Oliveira Marques JD, Luizão FJ, Teixeira WG, Nogueira EM, Fearnside PM, Sarrazin M. 2017. Soil carbon stocks under Amazonian Forest: distribution in the soil fractions and vulnerability to emission. Open Journal of Forestry, 7(02): 121.

Demissie HS, Mindaye TT, Teklu DN, Kebede FG. 2023. Root system architecture analysis of sorghum genotypes and its effect on drought adaptation. Rhizosphere, 27: 100772. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rhisph.2023.100772

Djaman K, Allen S, Djaman DS, Koudahe K, Irmak S, Puppala N, Darapuneni MK, Angadi SV. 2022. Planting date and plant density effects on maize growth, yield, and water use efficiency. Environmental challenges, 6: 100417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envc.2021.100417

Elhakeem A, van der Werf W, Ajal J, Lucà D, Claus S, Vico RA, Bastiaans L. 2019. Cover crop mixtures result in a positive net biodiversity effect irrespective of seeding configuration. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 285: 106627.

Fauzi R, Meiriani, Barus A. 2016. Pengaruh persentase naungan terhadap pertumbuhan bibit Mucuna bracteata D.C. asal setek dengan konsentrasi IAA yang berbeda. Jurnal Agroteknologi, 4(3): 2114-2126. https://doi.org/10.32734/joa.v4i3.2133

Feng L, Raza MA, Chen Y, Khalid MHB, Meraj TA, Ahsan F, Fan Y, Du J, Song C, Liu C, Bawa G, Zhang Z, Yuan S, Yang F, Yang, W. 2019. Narrow-wide row planting pattern improves the light environment and seed yields of intercrop species in relay intercropping system. PloS one, 14(2): e0212885. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0212885

Galloway JN, Townsend AR, Erisman JW, Bekunda M, Cai Z, Freney JR, Martinelli LA, Seitzinger SP, Sutton MA. 2008. Transformation of the nitrogen cycle: recent trends, questions, and potential solutions. Science, 320(5878): 889-892.

Ghorbel M, Brini F, Brestic M, Landi M. 2023. Interplay between low light and hormone-mediated signaling pathways in shade avoidance regulation in plants. Plant Stress, 9: 100178. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.stress.2023.100178

Gómez JA, Infante-Amate J, González de Molina M, Vanwalleghem T, Taguas EV, Lorite I. 2014. Olive cultivation, its impact on soil erosion and its progression into yield impacts in Southern Spain in the past as a key to a future of increasing climate uncertainty. Agriculture, 4(2): 170-198.

Guasconi D, Manzoni S, Hugelius G. 2023. Climate-dependent responses of root and shoot biomass to drought duration and intensity in grasslands–a meta-analysis. Science of the Total Environment, 166209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2023.166209

Gulzar H, Sofi PA, Pala NA, Peerzada IA, Shah IA, Nazir S, Kaif M. 2023. Effect of spacing and shading intensity on growth performance of Podophyllum hexandrum Royle: A critically endangered plant species of Western Himalaya. Ecological Frontiers 44: 105-111. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chnaes.2023.07.007

Guo C, Bao X, Sun H, Zhu L, Zhang Y, Zhang K, Bai Z, Zhu J, Liu X, Li A, Dong H, Zhan L, Liu L, Li C. 2024. Optimizing root system architecture to improve cotton drought tolerance and minimize yield loss during mild drought stress. Field Crops Research 308: 109305. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2024.109305

Hallama M, Pekrun C, Lambers H, Kandeler E. 2019. Hidden miners–the roles of cover crops and soil microorganisms in phosphorus cycling through agroecosystems. Plant and Soil, 434: 7-45.

Hamdani JS. 2009. Pengaruh jenis mulsa terhadap pertumbuhan dan hasil tiga kultivar kentang (Solanum tuberosum L.) yang ditanam di dataran medium. Jurnal Agronomi Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Agronomy), 37(1): 14-20.

Hamdani JS, Simarmata T. (2005). Respon tanaman kentang (Solanum tuberosum L.) Kultivar Panda terhadap pupuk organik olahan dan pupuk NPK lengkap di Kamojang Majalaya. Kultivasi, 4(1): 41-47.

Hamdani JS, Suriadinata YR, Martins L. 2016. Pengaruh naungan dan zat pengatur tumbuh terhadap pertumbuhan dan hasil tanaman kentang kultivar atlantik di dataran medium. Jurnal Agronomi Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Agronomy), 44(1): 33-39.

Hansen V, Eriksen J, Jensen LS, Thorup-Kristensen K, Magid J. 2021. Towards integrated cover crop management: N, P and S release from aboveground and belowground residues. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 313: 107392.

Hansen V, Meilvang LV, Magid J, Thorup-Kristensen K, Jensen LS. 2023. Effect of soil fertility level on growth of cover crop mixtures and residual fertilizing value for spring barley. European Journal of Agronomy, 145: 126796.

Hasanuddin G, Erida, Safmaneli. 2012. Pengaruh persaingan gulma (Synedrella nodiflora L. Gaertn) pada berbagai densitas terhadap pertumbuhan dan hasil kedelai. J. Agrista. 16 (3): 146-147.

Holmes AA, Thompson AA, Wortman SE. 2017. Species-specific contributions to productivity and weed suppression in cover crop mixtures. Agronomy journal, 109(6): 2808-2819.

Hohn CE, Bektas H. 2020. Genetic Mapping of Quantitative Trait Loci (QTLs) Associated with Seminal Root Angle and Number in Three Populations of Bread Wheat (Triticum aestivum L.) with Common Parents. Plant Mol Biol Rep., 38: 572-85. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11105-020-01214-1.

Hunter PJ, Teakle GR, Bending GD. 2014. Root traits and microbial community interactions in relation to phosphorus availability and acquisition, with particular reference to Brassica. Frontiers in Plant Science, 5(27): 1-18.

Hutasuhut MA, Febriani H. 2019. Keanekaragaman paku-pakuan terestrial di kawasan taman wisata alam Sicike-Cike. Jurnal Biolokus 2(1): 14-62.

Isaacs R, Tuell J, Fiedler A, Gardiner M, Landis D. 2009. Maximizing arthropod-mediated ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes: the role of native plants. Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment, 7(4): 196-203.

Isnaini, N. 2015. Strategi Hidup Gulma Asystasia gangetica. Indonesia: Bakrie Sumatra Utara. Medan.

Junedi H, Myrna Elsa Fathia, N. 2016. Peningkatan kemantapan agregat tanah pada ultisol melalui aplikasi ara sungsang (Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anders.). Prosiding Seminar Nasional - “Pengembangan Teknologi untuk Pengelolaan Lahan Suboptimal yang Produktif, Inklusif dan Ekonomis”. Unsri Press, Palembang.

Kairis O, Karavitis C, Kounalaki A, Salvati L, Kosmas C. 2013. The effect of land management practices on soil erosion and land desertification in an olive grove. Soil Use and Management, 29(4): 597-606.

Kamboj A, Saluja AK. (2008). Ageratum conyzoides L.: A review on its phytochemical and pharmacological profile. International Journal of Green Pharmacy (IJGP), 2(2).

Khalida R, Guntoro D, Hariyadi. 2021. Pemanfaatan Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson sebagai biomulsa untuk meningkatkan laju infiltrasi pada lahan kelapa sawit menghasilkan. Indonesian Journal of Agronomy, 49(3): 316-322.

Kilkoda AK, Nurmala T, Widayat D. 2015. Pengaruh keberadaan gulma (Ageratum conyzoides dan Boreria alata) terhadap pertumbuhan dan hasil tiga ukuran varietas kedelai (Glycine max L. Merrill) pada percobaan pot bertingkat. J. Kultivasi. 14(02): 1-9.

Kiew R, Vollesen K. 1997. Asystasia (Acanthaceae) in Malaysia. Kew Bull. 52: 965–971.

Kramberger B, Gselman A, Podvršnik M, Kristl J, Lešnik M. 2012. Environmental advantages of binary mixtures of Trifolium incarnatum and Lolium multiflorum over individual pure stands. Plant, Soil and Environment, 59(1): 22-28.

Kresnatita S, Ariffin D, Hariyono D. 2018. Sitawati Micro climate behavior on cauliflower plant canopy in intercropping system with sweet corn in central Kalimantan. Int. J. Sci. Res. Publ, 8: 76-83.

Krueger ES, Ochsner TE, Porter PM, Baker JM. 2011. Winter rye cover crop management influences on soil water, soil nitrate, and corn development. Agronomy journal, 103(2): 316-323.

Kumalasari NR, Abdullah L, Khotijah L, Indriani, Janato F, Ilman N. 2019. Pertumbuhan dan produksi stek batang Asystasia gangetica pada umur yang berbeda. Pastura 9(1): 15-17.

Langelier M, Chantigny MH, Pageau D, Vanasse A. 2021. Nitrogen-15 labelling and tracing techniques reveal cover crops transfer more fertilizer N to the soil reserve than to the subsequent crop. Agric. Ecosyst. Environ. 313: 107359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agee.2021.107359.

Li Y, Zheng Y, Liu H, Zhang Y, Hao Y, Song S, Lei B. 2019. Effect of supplemental blue light intensity on the growth and quality of Chinese kale. Horticulture, Environment, and Biotechnology, 60: 49-57. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13580-018-0104-1

Li X, Han Y, Wang G, Feng L, Wang Z, Yang B, Du W, Lei Y, Xiong S, Zhi X, Xing F, Fan Z, Xin M, Li, Y. 2020. Response of cotton fruit growth, intraspecific competition, and yield to plant density. European Journal of Agronomy, 114: 125991. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eja.2019.125991

Li H, Testerink C, Zhang Y. 2021. How roots and shoots communicate through stressful times. Trends in plant science, 26(9): 940-952. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tplants.2021.03.005

Lusweti A. 2024. Ageratum conyzoides (Billygoat Weed) [Internet]. [Diakses 17 April 2024]. Tersedia pada: https://keys.lucidcentral.org/keys/v3/eafrinet/weeds/key/weeds/Media/Html/Ageratum_conyzoides_(Billygoat_Weed).htm

Maddonni GA, Otegui ME. 2006. Intra-specific competition in maize: Contribution of extreme plant hierarchies to grain yield, grain yield components and kernel composition. Field Crops Research, 97(2-3): 155-166. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2005.09.013

Maltais-Landry G. 2015. Legumes have a greater effect on rhizosphere properties (pH, organic acids and enzyme activity) but a smaller impact on soil P compared to other cover crops. Plant and soil, 394: 139-154.

Mandozai A, Moussa AA, Zhang Q, Qu J, Du Y, Anwari G, Al Amin N, Wang P. 2021. Genome-wide association study of root and shoot related traits in spring soybean (Glycine max L.) at seedling stages using SLAF-seq. Frontiers in Plant Science, 12: 568995. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpls.2021.568995.

Marks MK, Nwachuku AC. 1986. Seed bank characteristics on a group of tropical weeds. Weed Res., 26: 151-157.

Martin-Guay MO, Paquette A, Dupras J, Rivest D. 2018. The new green revolution: sustainable intensification of agriculture by intercropping. Science of the total environment, 615: 767-772.

McSwiney CP, Bohm S, Grace PR, Robertson GP. 2010. Greenhouse gas emissions calculator for grain and biofuel farming systems. Journal of Natural Resources and Life Sciences Education, 39(1): 125-131.

Mendonça EG, Paiva LV, Stein VC, Pires MF, Santos BR, Pereira FJ. 2012. Growth Curve and Development of the Internal Calli Structure of Eucalyptus camaldulensis Dehn. Braz.Arch. Biol. Technol. 55(6): 887-896.

Moe MM, Lwin MKT. 2020. Study on some chemical tests and antimicrobial activities tests from leaves of Asystasia gangetica (L.) T. Anderson. In 3rd Myanmar Korea Conference Research Journal 3(2): 501-509.

Monfort WS, Csinos AS, Desaeger J, Seebold K, Webster TM, Diaz-Perez JC. 2007. Evaluating Brassica species as an alternative control measure for root-knot nematode (M. incognita) in Georgia vegetable plasticulture. Crop Protection, 26(9): 1359-1368.

Mousavi SR, Eskandari H. 2011. A general overview on intercropping and its advantages in sustainable agriculture. Journal of Applied Environmental and Biological Sciences, 1(11), 482-486.

Murtilaksono K, Ariyanti M, Asbur Y, Siregar HH, Sutarta ES, Yahya S, Yusuf MA. 2018. Surface runoff and soil erosion in oil palm plantation of management unit of Rejosari, PT Perkebunan Nusantara VII, Lampung. In IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science (Vol. 196, No. 1, p. 012002). IOP Publishing.

Ndiso JB, Chemining'wa GN, Olubayo FM, Saha HM. 2017. Effect of cropping system on soil moisture content, canopy temperature, growth and yield performance of maize and cowpea. International Journal of Agricultural Sciences, 7(3): 1271-1281.

Nyawade SO, Karanja NN, Gachene CK, Gitari HI, Schulte-Geldermann E, Parker ML. 2019. Intercropping optimizes soil temperature and increases crop water productivity and radiation use efficiency of rainfed potato. American Journal of Potato Research, 96: 457-471.

Panagos P, Borrelli P, Poesen J, Ballabio C, Lugato E, Meusburger K, Montanarella L, Alewell C. 2015. The new assessment of soil loss by water erosion in Europe. Environmental Science & Policy, 54: 438-447.

Pappula-Reddy, S. P., Pang, J., Chellapilla, B., Kumar, S., Dissanayake, B. M., Pal, M., ... & Siddique, K. H. (2024). Insights into chickpea (Cicer arietinum L.) genotype adaptations to terminal drought stress: Evaluating water-use patterns, root growth, and stress-responsive proteins. Environmental and Experimental Botany, 218, 105579.

Pitcure This. 2024. Nephrolepis biserrate [Internet]. [Diakses 22 Februari 2024]. Tersedia pada: https://www.picturethisai.com/id/wiki/Nephrolepis_biserrata.html#:~:text=Nephrolepis%20biserrata%20tumbuh%20dengan%20baik,lebih%20rendah%20di%20musim%20dingin.

Plantamor. 2023a. Ara Sungsang (Asystasia gangetica) [Internet]. [Diakses 24 Oktober 2023]. Tersedia pada: http://plantamor.com/species/info/asystasia/gangetica#gsc.tab=0

Plantamor. 2023b. Giant Swordfern (Nephrolepis biserrata) [Internet]. [Diakses 25 Oktober 2023]. Tersedia pada: http://plantamor.com/species/info/nephrolepis/biserrata#gsc.tab=0

Plantamor. 2023c. Bandotan (Ageratum conyzoides) [Internet]. [Diakses 25 Oktober 2023]. Tersedia pada: http://plantamor.com/species/info/ageratum/conyzoides#gsc.tab=0

Pratiwi Y, Kastono D, Indradewa D. 2019. Perbandingan Perakaran Beberapa Kultivar Kedelai (Glycine max L.) yang Mengalami Kekeringan dengan Metode Pengamatan Berbeda. Vegetalika, 8(4): 276-291.

Puangbut D, Jogloy S, Vorasoot N, Akkasaeng C, Kesmala T, Rachaputi RC, Wright GC, Patanothai A. 2009. Association of root dry weight and transpiration efficiency of peanut genotypes under early season drought. Agricultural Water Management, 96(10): 1460-1466. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.agwat.2009.04.018

Ramadhan A, Hariyono D. 2019. Pengaruh pemberian naungan terhadap pertumbuhan dan hasil pada tiga varietas tanaman stroberi (Fragaria chiloensis L.). Jurnal Produksi Tanaman, 7(1): 1-7.

Rao S, Armstrong R, Silva-Perez V, Tefera AT, Rosewarne GM. 2021. Pulse root ideotype for water stress in temperate cropping system. Plants, 10(4): 692. https://doi.org/10.3390/plants10040692

Rao S, Silva-Perez V, Armstrong R, Tefera AT, Brand J, Riffkin P, Rosewarne G. 2023. Pulse ideotypes for abiotic constraint alleviation in Australia. Plant and Soil, 492(1): 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11104-023-06159-4

Rao S, Shunmugam AS, Weiss M, Armstrong R, Silva-Perez V, Tefera AT, Rosewarne GM. 2024. Lentil root system architecture characterization and the indirect selection of smaller root systems through breeding. Field Crops Research, 308: 109283. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2024.109283

Raseduzzaman MD, Jensen ES. 2017. Does intercropping enhance yield stability in arable crop production? A meta-analysis. European Journal of Agronomy, 91: 25-33.

Raza MA, Bin Khalid MH, Zhang X, Feng LY, Khan I, Hassan MJ, Ahmed M, Ansar M, Chen YK, Fan YF, Yang F, Yang, W. 2019. Effect of planting patterns on yield, nutrient accumulation and distribution in maize and soybean under relay intercropping systems. Scientific reports, 9(1): 4947. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-41364-1

Ren M, Liu W, Liu X, Fang P, Yang W. 2016. Effect of shading signal on growth and photosynthetic characteristics of soybean seedlings. Zhongguo Shengtai Nongye Xuebao/Chinese Journal of Eco-Agriculture, 24(4): 499-505.

Robinson RA, Sutherland WJ. 2002. Post-war changes in arable farming and biodiversity in Great Britain. Journal of applied Ecology, 39(1): 157-176.

Romaidi R, Solikha M, Minarno EB. 2012. Jenis-jenis paku epifit dan tumbuhan inangnya di Tahura Ronggo Soeryo Cangar. El-Hayah, 3(1): 8-15.

Sallam A, Awadalla RA, Elshamy MM, Börner A, Heikal YM. 2024. Genome-wide analysis for root and leaf architecture traits associated with drought tolerance at the seedling stage in a highly ecologically diverse wheat population. Computational and Structural Biotechnology Journal, 23: 870-882. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.csbj.2024.01.020

Samedani B, Juraimi AS, Anwar MP, Rafii MY, Sheikh Awadz SH, Anuar AR. 2013. Competitive interaction of Axonopus compressus and Asystasia gangetica under contrasting sunlight intensity. The Scientific World Journal, 2013.

Satriawan H, Fuady Z. 2019. Analysis of weed vegetation in immature and mature oil palm plantations. Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, 20(11): 3292-3298.

Satriawan H, Fuady Z, Mayani N. 2016. Soil conservation by vegetative systems in oil palm cultivation. Polish Journal of Soil Science, 49(2): 223-235.

Satriawan H, Fuady Z, Ernawita E. 2021. The potential of Nephrolepis biserrata fern as ground cover vegetation in oil palm plantation. Biodiversitas Journal of Biological Diversity, 22(11): 4808-4816.

Sigalingging D. 2021. Apabila Mengukur Volume benda tidak teratur misalnya batu maka alat ukur yang tepat digunakan adalah [Internet]. [Diakses 26 Oktober 2023]. Tersedia pada: https://www.bintannews.com/2021/10/pengukuran-volume-benda-yang-bentuknya-tidak-teratur.html

Silalahi M. 2014. The ethnomedicine of the medicinal plants in sub-ethnic Batak, North Sumatra and the conservation perspective, dissertation. Indonesia: Universitas Indonesia.

Silva WT, Hansson M, Johansson J. 2021. Light competition and phenological adaptation of annual plants to a changing climate. Climate Change Ecology, 2: 100007. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecochg.2021.100007

Snapp S, Surapur S. 2018. Rye cover crop retains nitrogen and doesn’t reduce corn yields. Soil and Tillage Research, 180: 107-115.

Socfindo Conservation. 2024. Bandotan [internet]. [Diakses 22 Februari 2024]. Tersedia pada: https://www.socfindoconservation.co.id/plant/299

Sopandie D, Chozin MA, Sastrosumarjo S, Juhaeti T, Sahardi. 2003. Toleransi padi gogo terhadap naungan. Hayati. 10(2): 71-75.

Stirling GR, Stirling AM. 2003. The potential of Brassica green manure crops for controlling root-knot nematode (Meloidogyne javanica) on horticultural crops in a subtropical environment. Australian Journal of Experimental Agriculture, 43(6): 623-630.

Stoate C, Boatman ND, Borralho RJ, Carvalho CR, De Snoo GR, Eden P. 2001. Ecological impacts of arable intensification in Europe. Journal of environmental management, 63(4): 337-365.

Storkey J, Brooks D, Haughton A, Hawes C, Smith BM, Holland JM. 2013. Using functional traits to quantify the value of plant communities to invertebrate ecosystem service providers in arable landscapes. Journal of Ecology, 101(1): 38-46.

Suarna IW, Suryani NN, Budiasa KM, Wijaya LMS. 2019. Karakteristik tumbuh Asystasia gangetica pada berbagai aras pemupukan urea. Pastura 9 (1): 21-23.

Sumiahadi A, Chozin MA, Guntoro D. 2016. Evaluasi pertumbuhan dan perkembangan Arachis pintoi sebagai biomulsa pada budidaya tanaman di lahan kering tropis. J. Agron. Indonesia, 44(1): 98-103. http://dx.doi.org/10.24831/jai.v44i1.12509

Sun X, Zhao J, Wang G, Guan Q, Kuzyakov Y. 2023. Fine root extension in urban forest soil depends on organic mulching. Agrofor. Syst. 97 (2): 235–247. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10457-022-00801-3

Swift MJ, Izac AM, Van Noordwijk M. 2004. Biodiversity and ecosystem services in agricultural landscapes—are we asking the right questions? Agriculture, ecosystems & environment, 104(1): 113-134.

Tilman D. 1999. The ecological consequences of changes in biodiversity: a search for general principles. Ecology, 80(5): 1455-1474.

Timlin DJ, Fleisher DH, Kemanian AR, Reddy VR. 2014. Plant density and leaf area index effects on the distribution of light transmittance to the soil surface in maize. Agronomy Journal, 106(5): 1828-1837. https://doi.org/10.2134/agronj14.0160

Tiwari M, Kumar R, Min D, Jagadish SVK. 2022 Genetic and molecular mechanisms underlying root architecture and function under heat stress—A hidden story. Plant Cell Environ., 45: 771-788. https://doi.org/10.1111/pce.14266

Tribouillois H, Fort F, Cruz P, Charles R, Flores O, Garnier E, Justes E. 2015. A functional characterisation of a wide range of cover crop species: Growth and nitrogen acquisition rates, leaf traits and ecological strategies. PLoS one, 10(3): e0122156.

Turk MA, Tawaha AM. 2003. Allelopathic effect of black mustard (Brassica nigra L.) on germination and growth of wild oat (Avena fatua L.). Crop protection, 22(4): 673-677.

Turnip L, Arico Z. 2019. Studi analisis vegetasi gulma pada perkebunan kelapa sawit (Elaeis guineensis Jacq.) di Unit Usaha Marihat Pusat Penelitian Kelapa Sawit Kabupaten Simalungun Sumatera Utara. Jurnal Biologica Samudra 1(1): 64-73.

Ulfa SW. 2017. Botani Cryptogamae. Medan (ID): Perdana Publishing.

Vandermeer JH. 1992. The Ecology of Intercropping. Cambridge University Press

van der Bom FJ, Williams A, Bell MJ. 2020. Root architecture for improved resource capture: trade-offs in complex environments. Journal of Experimental Botany, 71(19): 5752-5763. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eraa324

Waidmann S, Sarkel E, Kleine-Vehn J. 2020. Same same, but different: growth responses of primary and lateral roots. J. Exp. Bot., 71(8): 2397-2411. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eraa027

Wasson, A. P., Rebetzke, G. J., Kirkegaard, J. A., Christopher, J., Richards, R. A., & Watt, M. (2014). Soil coring at multiple field environments can directly quantify variation in deep root traits to select wheat genotypes for breeding. Journal of experimental botany, 65(21): 6231-6249. https://doi.org/10.1093/jxb/eru250

Wendling M, Büchi L, Amossé C, Jeangros B, Walter A, Charles R. 2017. Specific interactions leading to transgressive overyielding in cover crop mixtures. Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 241: 88-99.

Westaway JO, Alford L, Chandler G, Schmid M. 2016. 'Asystasia gangetica'subsp.'micrantha', a new record of an exotic plant in the Northern Territory. Northern Territory Naturalist, 27: 29-35.

Xiao F, Chen C, Gong W, Xiong Y, Zhou Y, Guo W, Lo B, Wang Y. 2022. Trade-off between shade tolerance and chemical resistance of invasive Phytolacca americana under different light levels compared with its native and exotic non-invasive congeners. Environmental and Experimental Botany, 196: 104809. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envexpbot.2022.104809

Xu M, Zheng LT, He D, Chen HY, Yan ER. 2021. Microenvironment filtering and plant competition jointly structure trait distributions across co-occurring individuals. Ecological Indicators, 129, 107893. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.107893

Yahya S, Ariyanti M, Asbur Y. 2022. Perpektif Baru: Manajemen vegetasi bawah tegakan pada budidaya kelapa sawit berkelanjutan. Jurnal Agronomi Indonesia (Indonesian Journal of Agronomy), 50(3): 343-356.

Yang F, Liao D, Wu X, Gao R, Fan Y, Raza MA, Wang X, Yong T, Liu W, Liu J, Du J, Shu K, Yang W. 2017. Effect of aboveground and belowground

interactions on the intercrop yields in maize-soybean relay intercropping systems. Field Crops Research, 203: 16-23. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fcr.2016.12.007

Yildirim E, Ekİncİ M. 2017. Intercropping Systems in Sustainable Agriculture. Süleyman Demirel Üniversitesi Ziraat Fakültesi Dergisi, 12(1): 100–110.

Yu Y, Stomph TJ, Makowski D, van Der Werf W. 2015. Temporal niche differentiation increases the land equivalent ratio of annual intercrops: a meta-analysis. Field Crops Research, 184: 133-144.

Yuliani F, Rusmawan D, Iqba M. 2022. Keragaan tanaman jagung dan padi gogo dengan pola tanam tumpang sari di kabupaten Bangka Selatan. In Prosiding Seminar Nasional Perlindungan Tanaman (pp. 70-74).

Yuniarti, Chozin MA, Guntoro D, Murtilaksono K. 2018. Perbandingan Arachis pintoi dengan jenis tanaman penutup tanah lain sebagai biomulsa di pertanaman kelapa sawit belum menghasilkan. Indonesian Journal of Agronomy, 46(2): 215-221.

Zaman I, Ali M, Shahzad K, Tahir MS, Matloob A, Ahmad W, Alamri S, Khurshid MR, Qureshi MM, Wasaya A, Baig KS, Siddiqui MH, Fahad S, Datta R. 2021. Effect of plant spacings on growth, physiology, yield, and fiber quality attributes of cotton genotypes under nitrogen fertilization. Agron 11: 2589. https://doi.org/10.3390/AGRONOMY11122589.

Zunzunegui M, Ruiz-Valdepeñas E, Sert MA, Díaz-Barradas MC, Gallego-Fernández JB. 2020. Field comparison of ecophysiological traits between an invader and a native species in a Mediterranean coastal dune. Plant Physiology and Biochemistry, 146: 278-286. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.plaphy.2019.11.032

LAMPIRAN

Lampiran 1. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *A. gangetica* pada 21 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP)

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	48,50	42,00	46,50	45,67
N0G2	46,50	49,00	50,00	48,50
N1G1	41,50	47,50	51,50	46,83
N1G2	32,50	23,50	40,50	32,17

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	94,29	47,15		
Naungan	1	172,52	172,52	7,94*	0,048
Galat (a)	2	42,79	21,40		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	105,02	105,02	4,83	0,093
Naungan*Gulma	1	229,69	229,69	10,57*	0,031
Galat (b)	4	86,92	21,73		
Total	11	731,23			

KK (a)= 2,30%; KK (b)=2,45%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for TTG 21 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	47,0833	A
N1	6	39,5000	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G2	3	48,5000	A
N1 G1	3	46,8333	A
N0 G1	3	45,6667	A
N1 G2	3	32,1667	B

Lampiran 2. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *A. gangetica* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP)

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	55,00	51,50	60,00	55,50
N0G2	57,00	50,00	56,50	54,50
N1G1	57,50	67,50	55,00	60,00
N1G2	60,50	34,50	52,00	49,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	95,375	47,687		
Naungan	1	0,750	0,750	0,01tn	0,933
Galat (a)	2	30,875	15,438		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	108,000	108,000	1,14tn	0,346
Naungan*Gulma	1	75,000	75,000	0,79tn	0,424
Galat (b)	4	379,750	94,938		
Total	11	689,750			

KK (a)= 5,33%; KK (b)=8,01%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 3. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *A. gangetica* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP)

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	59,00	75,00	75,00	69,67
N0G2	64,00	53,50	53,50	57,00
N1G1	69,50	72,00	72,00	71,17
N1G2	70,00	52,50	52,50	58,33

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	15,042	7,521		
Naungan	1	6,021	6,021	0,07tn	0,811
Galat (a)	2	70,042	35,021		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	487,688	487,688	5,31tn	0,083
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,021	0,021	0,00021tn	0,989
Galat (b)	4	367,417	91,854		
Total	11	946,229			

KK (a)= 2,35%; KK (b)= 4,57%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 4. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *A. conyzoides* pada 21 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP**)**

Perlakuan	**Ulangan**			**Rataan**
	1	2	3	
N0G1	39,00	27,00	29,50	**31,83**
N0G3	21,00	40,00	41,50	**34,17**
N1G1	34,50	11,00	51,00	**32,17**
N1G3	19,00	31,50	17,00	**22,50**

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	128,04	64,02		
Naungan	1	96,33	96,33	0,36tn	**0,582**
Galat (a)	2	66,54	33,27		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	40,33	40,33	0,15tn	**0,719**
Naungan*Gulma	1	108,00	108,00	0,40tn	**0,561**
Galat (b)	4	1078,42	269,60		
Total	11	1517,67			

KK (a)= 3,32%; KK (b)=8,30%

Lampiran 5. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *A. conyzoides* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP)

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	42,00	29,50	33,00	**34,83**
N0G3	25,00	44,50	43,00	**37,50**
N1G1	45,00	19,00	54,00	**39,33**
N1G3	29,50	45,50	30,00	**35,00**

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	db	JK	KT	F-Hitung	P-Value
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	67,79	33,896		
Naungan	1	3,00	3,000	0,01tn	**0,919**
Galat (a)	2	49,62	24,812		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	2,08	2,083	0,01tn	**0,933**
Naungan*Gulma	1	36,75	36,750	0,14tn	**0,724**
Galat (b)	4	1027,42	256,854		
Total	11	1186,67			

KK (a)= 3,75%; KK (b)= 7,40%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 6. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *A. conyzoides* pada 63 Hari Setelah Perlakuan (HSP)

Perlakuan	**Ulangan**			**Rataan**
	1	2	3	
N0G1	25,00	29,50	29,50	**28,00**
N0G3	42,00	46,00	46,00	**44,67**
N1G1	50,00	22,50	22,50	**31,67**
N1G3	34,00	49,50	49,50	**44,33**

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	2,04	1,021		
Naungan	1	8,33	8,333	0,05tn	**0,828**
Galat (a)	2	70,04	35,021		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	645,33	645,333	4,19tn	**0,110**
Naungan*Gulma	1	12,00	12,000	0,08tn	**0,794**
Galat (b)	4	616,42	154,104		
Total	11	1354,17			

KK (a)= 8,02%; KK (b)=8,78%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 7. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *N. biserrata* pada 21 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP)

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	9,50	15,50	12,50	12,50
N0G3	13,50	12,50	9,00	11,67
N1G2	9,00	15,50	21,50	15,33
N1G3	9,50	12,00	14,50	12,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	38,000	19,000		
Naungan	1	7,521	7,521	0,95tn	0,385
Galat (a)	2	50,167	25,083		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	13,021	13,021	1,64tn	0,269
Naungan*Gulma	1	4,688	4,688	0,59tn	0,485
Galat (b)	4	31,667	7,917		
Total	11	145,063			

KK (a)= 4,29%; KK (b)=2,64%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 8. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *N. biserrata* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	14,50	19,00	15,00	16,17
N0G3	10,00	19,00	12,00	13,67
N1G2	11,00	16,00	33,50	20,17
N1G3	12,00	17,50	14,50	14,67

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	112,042	56,021		
Naungan	1	18,750	18,750	0,53tn	0,508
Galat (a)	2	97,125	48,562		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	48,000	48,000	1,35tn	0,310
Naungan*Gulma	1	6,750	6,750	0,19tn	0,685
Galat (b)	4	142,000	35,500		
Total	11	424,667			

KK (a)= 5,03%; KK (b)= 4,78%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 9. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Tinggi Tanaman *N. biserrata* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	14,00	19,50	19,50	17,67
N0G3	14,50	21,50	21,50	19,17
N1G2	12,00	17,50	17,50	15,67
N1G3	12,50	18,50	18,50	16,50

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	96,000	48,0000		
Naungan	1	16,333	16,3333	78,40**	0,001
Galat (a)	2	0,167	0,0833		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	4,083	4,0833	19,60*	0,011
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,333	0,3333	1,60	0,275
Galat (b)	4	0,833	0,2083		
Total	11	117,750			

KK (a)= 2,01%; KK (b)=3,17%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	18,4167	A
N1	6	16,0833	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	17,8333	A
G2	6	16,6667	B

Lampiran 10. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Cabang *A. gangetica* pada 21 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	20,00	12,00	15,00	15,67
N0G2	23,00	12,50	16,00	17,17
N1G1	13,50	14,50	15,50	14,50
N1G2	21,50	10,00	13,50	15,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	107,167	53,5833		
Naungan	1	8,333	8,3333	0,73tn	0,440
Galat (a)	2	8,667	4,3333		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	3,000	3,0000	0,26tn	0,635
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,750	0,7500	0,07tn	0,810
Galat (b)	4	45,500	11,3750		
Total	11	173,417			

KK (a)= 5,22%; KK (b)=4,66%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 11. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Cabang *A. gangetica* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	21,00	14,00	16,00	17,00
N0G2	26,00	14,50	18,00	19,50
N1G1	16,00	20,00	17,50	17,83
N1G2	25,50	12,50	16,00	18,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	103,292	51,6458		
Naungan	1	0,333	0,3333	0,02tn	0,903
Galat (a)	2	11,292	5,6458		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	5,333	5,3333	0,27tn	0,632
Naungan*Gulma	1	4,083	4,0833	0,21tn	0,674
Galat (b)	4	79,583	19,8958		
Total	11	203,917			

KK (a)= 6,13%; KK (b)=3,28%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 12. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Cabang *A. gangetica* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	23,50	24,50	20,50	22,83
N0G2	26,50	15,50	20,50	20,83
N1G1	18,00	23,50	18,50	20,00
N1G2	28,50	14,50	18,50	20,50

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	57,042	28,5208		
Naungan	1	7,521	7,5208	0,22tn	0,661
Galat (a)	2	0,542	0,2708		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	1,688	1,6875	0,05tn	0,834
Naungan*Gulma	1	4,687	4,6875	0,14tn	0,728
Galat (b)	4	134,250	33,5625		
Total	11	205,729			

KK (a)= 1,66%; KK (b)=2,90%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 13. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Cabang *A. conyzoides* pada 21 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	19,00	12,50	13,00	14,83
N0G3	9,00	17,00	36,50	20,83
N1G1	8,50	2,50	23,50	11,50
N1G3	11,50	24,00	9,00	14,83

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	158,000	79,000		
Naungan	1	65,333	65,333	0,43tn	0,547
Galat (a)	2	25,167	12,583		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	65,333	65,333	0,43tn	0,547
Naungan*Gulma	1	5,333	5,333	0,04tn	0,860
Galat (b)	4	606,333	151,583		
Total	11	925,500			

KK (a)= 8,76%; KK (b)=9,28%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 14. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Cabang *A. conyzoides* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	14,00	14,00	15,00	14,33
N0G3	9,50	27,00	36,50	24,33
N1G1	10,00	3,50	26,00	13,17
N1G3	13,00	29,00	11,50	17,83

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	231,29	115,65		
Naungan	1	44,08	44,08	0,31tn	0,610
Galat (a)	2	23,04	11,52		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	161,33	161,33	1,12tn	0,350
Naungan*Gulma	1	21,33	21,33	0,15tn	0,720
Galat (b)	4	577,83	144,46		
Total	11	1058,92			

KK (a)= 3,48%; KK (b)= 8,14%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 15. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Cabang *A. conyzoides* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	19,50	14,00	15,00	16,17
N0G3	9,50	28,00	36,50	24,67
N1G1	10,00	6,50	27,00	14,50
N1G3	13,00	31,00	16,50	20,17

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	237,13	118,563		
Naungan	1	28,52	28,521	0,20tn	0,681
Galat (a)	2	1,54	0,771		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	150,52	150,521	1,03tn	0,367
Naungan*Gulma	1	6,02	6,021	0,04tn	0,849
Galat (b)	4	582,33	145,583		
Total	11	1006,06			

KK (a)= 4,16%; KK (b)=7,13%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 16. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Daun *N. biserrata* pada 21 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	4,50	6,00	3,00	4,50
N0G3	3,00	6,00	3,50	4,17
N1G2	4,00	7,00	7,00	6,00
N1G3	5,50	7,00	4,00	5,50

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	12,7917	6,39583		
Naungan	1	6,0208	6,02083	3,80tn	0,123
Galat (a)	2	1,0417	0,52083		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	0,5208	0,52083	0,33tn	0,597
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,0208	0,02083	0,01tn	0,914
Galat (b)	4	6,3333	1,58333		
Total	11	26,7292			

KK (a)= 9,28%; KK (b)=16,18%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 17. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Daun *N. biserrata* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	4,50	9,00	2,50	5,33
N0G3	3,00	6,00	2,50	3,83
N1G2	4,50	7,50	9,50	7,17
N1G3	4,50	7,00	2,50	4,67

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	27,1250	13,5625		
Naungan	1	5,3333	5,3333	1,22tn	0,331
Galat (a)	2	7,5417	3,7708		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	12,0000	12,0000	2,74tn	0,173
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,7500	0,7500	0,17tn	0,700
Galat (b)	4	17,5000	4,3750		
Total	11	70,2500			

KK (a)= 4,47%; KK (b)= 6,35%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 18. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Jumlah Daun *N. biserrata* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	6,50	9,00	4,00	6,50
N0G3	5,00	8,50	3,50	5,67
N1G2	5,50	9,50	9,50	8,17
N1G3	9,50	7,00	4,00	6,83

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	21,2917	10,6458		
Naungan	1	6,0208	6,0208	1,01tn	0,372
Galat (a)	2	6,2917	3,1458		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	3,5208	3,5208	0,59tn	0,486
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,1875	0,1875	0,03tn	0,868
Galat (b)	4	23,9167	5,9792		
Total	11	61,2292			

KK (a)= 2,33%; KK (b)=7,00%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 19. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Luas Daun *A. gangetica* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	468,30	500,12	436,57	468,33
N0G2	131,86	130,79	129,71	130,79
N1G1	315,35	331,16	323,26	323,26
N1G2	819,77	826,25	832,73	826,25

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	612	306		
Naungan	1	227197	227197	882,52*8	0,000
Galat (a)	2	589	294		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	20530	20530	79,75**	0,001
Naungan*Gulma	1	529876	529876	2058,25**	0,000
Galat (b)	4	1030	257		
Total	11	779834			

KK (a)= 3,67%; KK (b)= 2,13%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for LDG 42 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N1	6	574,753	A
N0	6	299,558	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G2	6	478,518	A
G1	6	395,793	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N1 G2	3	826,250	A
N0 G1	3	468,330	B
N1 G1	3	323,257	C
N0 G2	3	130,787	D

Lampiran 20. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Luas Daun *A. conyzoides* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	44,88	43,92	42,96	43,92
N0G3	34,81	35,79	36,76	35,79
N1G1	104,67	104,18	105,17	104,67
N1G3	200,06	184,63	192,35	192,35

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	31,7	15,9		
Naungan	1	35418,8	35418,8	2372,02**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	31,8	15,9		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	4745,0	4745,0	317,77**	0,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	6884,2	6884,2	461,04**	0,000
Galat (b)	4	59,7	14,9		
Total	11	47171,2			

KK (a)= 11,86%; KK (b)= 11,48%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for LDC 42 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N1	6	148,510	A
N0	6	39,853	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	114,067	A
G1	6	74,297	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N1 G3	3	192,347	A
N1 G1	3	104,673	B
N0 G1	3	43,920	C
N0 G3	3	35,787	C

Lampiran 21. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Luas Daun *N. biserrata* pada 42 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	86,17	85,71	85,94	85,94
N0G3	41,41	40,63	42,20	41,41
N1G2	315,15	316,18	317,21	316,18
N1G3	217,82	213,64	215,73	215,73

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	4	2		
Naungan	1	122750	122750	60831,61**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	2	1		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	15764	15764	7812,08**	0,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	2346	2346	1162,40**	0,000
Galat (b)	4	8	2		
Total	11	140871			

KK (a)= 0%; KK (b)= 3,18%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for LDN 42 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N1	6	265,955	A
N0	6	63,677	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G2	6	201,060	A
G3	6	128,572	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N1 G2	3	316,180	A
N1 G3	3	215,730	B
N0 G2	3	85,940	C
N0 G3	3	41,413	D

Lampiran 22. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Luas Permukaan Akar *A. gangetica* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	44,71	46,70	48,72	46,71
N0G2	50,63	55,38	60,14	55,38
N1G1	24,60	22,58	23,59	23,59
N1G2	34,21	35,19	33,23	34,21

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	16,62	8,31		
Naungan	1	1471,42	1471,42	558,80**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	30,07	15,04		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	279,17	279,17	106,02**	0,001
Naungan*Gulma	1	122,84	122,84	46,71*	0,003
Galat (b)	4	10,53	2,63		
Total	11	1810,66			

KK (a)= 7,71%; KK (b)= 7,40%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for LPAG 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	51,0467	A
N1	6	28,9000	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G2	6	44,7967	A
G1	6	35,1500	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G2	3	55,3833	A
N0 G1	3	46,7100	B
N1 G2	3	34,2100	C
N1 G1	3	23,5900	D

Lampiran 23. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Luas Permukaan Akar *A. conyzoides* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	14,28	14,18	15,12	14,53
N0G3	11,96	10,94	12,93	11,94
N1G1	3,67	3,44	3,55	3,55
N1G3	11,82	12,84	13,87	12,84

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	2,555	1,278		
Naungan	1	76,104	76,104	201,08**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	0,572	0,286		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	33,735	33,735	89,13**	0,001
Naungan*Gulma	1	105,732	105,732	279,36**	0,000
Galat (b)	4	1,514	0,378		
Total	11	220,212			

KK (a)= 4,72%; KK (b)= 5,42%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for LPAC 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	13,2350	A
N1	6	8,1983	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	12,3933	A
G1	6	9,0400	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G1	3	14,5267	A
N1 G3	3	12,8433	B
N0 G3	3	11,9433	B
N1 G1	3	3,5533	C

Lampiran 24. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Luas Permukaan Akar *N. biserrata* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	25,76	23,64	21,53	23,64
N0G3	37,10	34,11	40,09	37,10
N1G2	6,17	4,48	5,33	5,33
N1G3	33,54	27,28	30,41	30,41

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	21,61	10,81		
Naungan	1	469,00	469,00	75,21**	0,001
Galat (a)	2	1,29	0,65		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	1114,00	1114,00	178,64**	0,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	101,38	101,38	16,26*	0,016
Galat (b)	4	24,94	6,24		
Total	11	1732,23			

KK (a)= 4,74%; KK (b)= 4,68%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for LPAN 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	30,3717	A
N1	6	17,8683	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	33,755	A
G2	6	14,485	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G3	3	37,1000	A
N1 G3	3	30,4100	B
N0 G2	3	23,6433	C
N1 G2	3	5,3267	D

Lampiran 25. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Panjang Akar *A. gangetica* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	57,87	56,83	58,91	57,87
N0G2	59,06	61,04	63,02	61,04
N1G1	22,15	20,17	24,13	22,15
N1G2	30,05	31,06	32,06	31,06

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	13,52	6,76		
Naungan	1	3237,70	3237,70	2197,57**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	0,46	0,23		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	109,38	109,38	74,24**	0,001
Naungan*Gulma	1	24,68	24,68	16,75*	0,015
Galat (b)	4	5,89	1,47		
Total	11	3391,63			

KK (a)= 9,39%; KK (b)= 2,05%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for PAG 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	59,4550	A
N1	6	26,6033	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G2	6	46,0483	A
G1	6	40,0100	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G2	3	61,0400	A
N0 G1	3	57,8700	B
N1 G2	3	31,0567	C
N1 G1	3	22,1500	D

Lampiran 26. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Panjang Akar *A. conyzoides* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	7,52	8,41	9,30	8,41
N0G3	6,77	4,58	5,67	5,67
N1G1	1,00	0,98	1,02	1,00
N1G3	5,69	7,43	6,56	6,56

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,3303	0,1652		
Naungan	1	31,9154	31,9154	34,09**	0,004
Galat (a)	2	1,4217	0,7109		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	5,9784	5,9784	6,39*	0,065
Naungan*Gulma	1	51,6260	51,6260	55,14**	0,002
Galat (b)	4	3,7448	0,9362		
Total	11	95,0167			

KK (a)= 10,46%; KK (b)= 12,01%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for PAC 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	7,04167	A
N1	6	3,78000	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	6,11667	A
G1	6	4,70500	A

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**	
N0 G1	3	8,41000	A	
N1 G3	3	6,56000	A	B
N0 G3	3	5,67333	B	
N1 G1	3	1,00000		C

Lampiran 27. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Panjang Akar *N. biserrata* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	4,50	4,00	5,00	4,50
N0G3	11,70	11,00	10,30	11,00
N1G2	1,10	1,70	0,50	1,10
N1G3	7,00	7,80	7,40	7,40

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,245	0,122		
Naungan	1	36,750	36,750	107,30**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	0,905	0,452		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	122,880	122,880	358,77**	0,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	10,030	10,030	10,09*	0,027
Galat (b)	4	1,370	0,343		
Total	11	162,180			

KK (a)= 7,92%; KK (b)= 6,90%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for PAN 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	7,75	A
N1	6	4,25	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	9,2	A
G2	6	2,8	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G3	3	11,0	A
N1 G3	3	7,4	B
N0 G2	3	4,5	C
N1 G2	3	1,1	D

Lampiran 28. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Volume Akar *A. gangetica* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	2,70	3,00	3,30	3,00
N0G2	4,00	3,80	4,20	4,00
N1G1	3,00	2,00	1,00	2,00
N1G2	2,40	3,00	3,60	3,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,01500	0,00750		
Naungan	1	3,00000	3,00000	4,56tn	0,100
Galat (a)	2	0,33500	0,16750		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	3,00000	3,00000	4,56tn	0,100
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,00000	0,00000	0,00tn	1,000
Galat (b)	4	2,63000	0,65750		
Total	11	8,98000			

KK (a)= 6,82%; KK (b)= 3,51%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 29. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Volume Akar *A. conyzoides* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	2,00	1,70	2,30	2,00
N0G3	1,80	2,00	2,20	2,00
N1G1	1,20	0,80	1,00	1,00
N1G3	2,10	2,00	1,90	2,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,1050	0,05250		
Naungan	1	0,7500	0,75000	30,00**	0,005
Galat (a)	2	0,1550	0,07750		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	0,7500	0,75000	30,00**	0,005
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,7500	0,75000	30,00**	0,005
Galat (b)	4	0,1000	0,02500		
Total	11	2,6100			

KK (a)= 6,07%; KK (b)= 3,45%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for VAC 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	1,5	A
N1	6	1,0	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	1,5	A
G1	6	1,0	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G3	3	2	A
N0 G1	3	1	B
N1 G1	3	1	B
N1 G3	3	1	B

Lampiran 30. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Volume Akar *N. biserrata* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	2,00	1,70	2,30	2,00
N0G3	9,80	10,00	10,20	10,00
N1G2	10,00	10,30	9,70	10,00
N1G3	9,80	10,20	10,00	10,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,060	0,0300		
Naungan	1	48,000	48,0000	1371,43**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	0,320	0,1600		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	48,000	48,0000	1371,43**	0,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	48,000	48,0000	1371,43**	0,000
Galat (b)	4	0,140	0,0350		
Total	11	144,520			

KK (a)= 4,08%; KK (b)= 1,91%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for VAN 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N1	6	10	A
N0	6	6	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	10	A
G2	6	6	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N1 G2	3	10	A
N0 G3	3	10	A
N1 G3	3	10	A
N0 G2	3	2	B

Lampiran 31. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Bobot Kering Akar *A. gangetica* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	13,50	14,10	12,90	13,50
N0G2	17,70	18,00	18,30	18,00
N1G1	6,20	6,00	5,80	6,00
N1G2	11,70	11,30	11,50	11,50

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,105	0,052		
Naungan	1	147,000	147,000	877,61**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	0,285	0,143		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	75,000	75,000	447,76**	0,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,750	0,750	4,48*	0,0102
Galat (b)	4	0,670	0,168		
Total	11	223,810			

KK (a)= 3,12%; KK (b)= 3,38%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for BKAG 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	15,75	A
N1	6	8,75	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G2	6	14,75	A
G1	6	9,75	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G2	3	18,0	A
N0 G1	3	13,5	B
N1 G2	3	11,5	C
N1 G1	3	6,0	D

Lampiran 32. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Bobot Kering Akar *A. conyzoides* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	0,70	1,30	1,00	1,00
N0G3	1,00	0,50	1,50	1,00
N1G1	0,30	0,70	0,50	0,50
N1G3	1,20	1,00	0,80	1,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,04500	0,02250		
Naungan	1	0,18750	0,18750	1,23tn	0,330
Galat (a)	2	0,18500	0,09250		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	0,18750	0,18750	1,23tn	0,330
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,18750	0,18750	1,23tn	0,330
Galat (b)	4	0,61000	0,15250		
Total	11	1,40250			

KK (a)= 9,39%; KK (b)= 2,05%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 33. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Bobot Kering Akar *N. biserrata* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	5,40	5,60	5,50	5,50
N0G3	11,00	10,80	11,20	11,00
N1G2	0,80	0,50	0,20	0,50
N1G3	10,30	10,00	10,70	10,33

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,072	0,036		
Naungan	1	24,083	24,083	238,84**	0,000
Galat (a)	2	0,052	0,026		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	176,333	176,333	1748,76**	0,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	14,083	14,083	139,67**	0,000
Galat (b)	4	0,403	0,101		
Total	11	215,027			

KK (a)= 1,78%; KK (b)= 3,51**%**

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for BKAN 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	8,25000	A
N1	6	5,41667	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	10,6667	A
G2	6	3,0000	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G3	3	11,0000	A
N1 G3	3	10,3333	A
N0 G2	3	5,5000	B
N1 G2	3	0,5000	C

Lampiran 34. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Bobot Kering Tajuk *A. gangetica* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	1,00	0,70	1,30	1,00
N0G2	0,50	1,00	1,50	1,00
N1G1	0,40	0,60	0,50	0,50
N1G2	0,80	1,00	1,20	1,00

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,4200	0,21000		
Naungan	1	0,1875	0,18750	3,41tn	0,139
Galat (a)	2	0,1400	0,07000		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	0,1875	0,18750	3,41tn	0,139
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,1875	0,18750	3,41tn	0,139
Galat (b)	4	0,2200	0,05500		
Total	11	1,3425			

KK (a)= 8,16%; KK (b)= 7,24%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 35. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Bobot Kering Tajuk *A. conyzoides* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	0,50	0,80	0,20	0,50
N0G3	0,30	0,70	0,50	0,50
N1G1	0,40	0,50	0,60	0,50
N1G3	0,50	0,60	0,40	0,50

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,135000	0,067500		
Naungan	1	0,000000	0,000000	0,00tn	1,000
Galat (a)	2	0,065000	0,032500		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	0,000000	0,000000	0,00tn	1,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,000000	0,000000	0,00tn	1,000
Galat (b)	4	0,100000	0,025000		
Total	11	0,300000			

KK (a)= 7,36%; KK (b)= 6,45%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 36. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Bobot Kering Tajuk *N. biserrata* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	2,40	2,50	2,60	2,50
N0G3	4,50	4,70	4,30	4,50
N1G2	0,70	0,30	0,50	0,50
N1G3	3,00	3,50	4,00	3,50

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,0800	0,0400		
Naungan	1	6,7500	6,7500	58,70**	0,002
Galat (a)	2	0,1400	0,0700		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	18,7500	18,7500	163,04**	0,000
Naungan*Gulma	1	0,7500	0,7500	6,52*	0,036
Galat (b)	4	0,4600	0,1150		
Total	11	26,9300			

KK (a)= 4,61%; KK (b)= 5,90%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for BKTN 63 HSP

Naungan	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0	6	3,5	A
N1	6	2,0	B

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	4,0	A
G2	6	1,5	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
N0 G3	3	4,5	A
N1 G3	3	3,5	B
N0 G2	3	2,5	C
N1 G2	3	0,5	D

Lampiran 37. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Nisbah Akar dan Tajuk *A. gangetica* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	17,70	25,71	14,08	19,16
N0G2	27,00	14,10	8,60	16,57
N1G1	15,50	10,00	11,60	12,37
N1G2	14,63	11,30	9,58	11,84

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	120,375	60,188		
Naungan	1	99,665	99,665	3,37tn	0,140
Galat (a)	2	39,695	19,848		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	7,337	7,337	0,25tn	0,645
Naungan*Gulma	1	3,203	3,203	0,11tn	0,759
Galat (b)	4	118,411	29,603		
Total	11	388,686			

KK (a)= 3,22%; KK (b)= 4,58%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 38. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Nisbah Akar dan Tajuk *A. conyzoides* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G1	1,40	1,63	5,00	2,68
N0G3	3,33	0,71	3,00	2,35
N1G1	0,75	1,40	0,83	0,99
N1G3	2,40	1,67	2,00	2,02

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	3,6914	1,8457		
Naungan	1	3,0227	3,0227	2,62tn	0,181
Galat (a)	2	4,4100	2,2050		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	0,3696	0,3696	0,32tn	0,602
Naungan*Gulma	1	1,3741	1,3741	1,19tn	0,337
Galat (b)	4	4,6172	1,1543		
Total	11	17,4849			

KK (a)= 3,23%; KK (b)= 2,87%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Lampiran 39. Data dan Analisis Sidik Ragam Nisbah Akar dan Tajuk *N. biserrata* pada 63 Hari setelah Perlakuan (HSP).

Perlakuan	Ulangan			Rataan
	1	2	3	
N0G2	2,25	2,24	2,12	2,20
N0G3	2,44	2,30	2,60	2,45
N1G2	1,14	1,67	0,40	1,07
N1G3	3,43	2,86	2,68	2,99

Analisis Sidik Ragam

Sumber Keragaman	**db**	**JK**	**KT**	**F-Hitung**	**P-Value**
Petak Utama					
Kelompok	2	0,3188	0,1594		
Naungan	1	0,2632	0,2632	2,36tn	0,199
Galat (a)	2	0,4168	0,2084		
Anak Petak					
Gulma	1	3,5182	3,5182	31,53**	0,005
Naungan*Gulma	1	2,0953	2,0953	18,78*	0,012
Galat (b)	4	0,4464	0,1116		
Total	11	7,0587			

KK (a)= 8,93%; KK (b)= 6,54%

Ket. Jika P-value < 0,05 → * (nyata), Jika P-value > 0,05 → tn (tidak nyata)

Comparisons for NATN 63 HSP

Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**
G3	6	2,71874	A
G2	6	1,63582	B

Naungan*Gulma	**N**	**Mean**	**Grouping**	
N1 G3	3	2,98849	A	
N0 G3	3	2,44899	A	B
N0 G2	3	2,20179		B
N1 G2	3	1,06984		C