

**Effect of Plant Density on Growth and Yield of Maize [*Zea mays* (L.)] Hybrids at Luyengo,
Middleveld of Eswatini**

ABSTRACT

Maize is staple food and the most cultivated crop in Eswatini. However, its yield is very low partly due to use of non-optimum plant density for different maturity group maize varieties. Thus, an experiment was conducted at Luyengo, Middleveld of Eswatini during the 2018/2019 cropping season. The experiment consisted of factorial combinations of two varieties [SC 403 (early maturing) and PAN 53 (medium maturing)] and three plant densities (44444 plants/ha, 50000 plants/ha, 57143 plants/ha) in randomised complete block design in three replications. Results showed that medium maturing maize variety PAN 53 had higher leaf area, leaf area index, plant height, cob height (139.4 cm), days to 90% anthesis (69 days), dry biomass, thousand kernels mass (374.0 g), grain yield (43.1 t/ha), and stover mass (59.8 t/ha) than the early maturing variety SC 403. With respect to the effect of plant density, as the plant density increased from 44444 to 57143 plants/ha, leaf area, dry biomass at V12 and R5 growth stages, number of cobs per plant, grain yield, stover mass, and thousand kernels mass (g) were decreased while the leaf area index was increased. The interaction effects of variety and plant density were not significant on all the parameters recorded. Thus, it can be concluded that medium maturing variety PAN 53 and plant density of 44444 plants/ha (90 cm × 25 cm) are best options to maximum productivity of maize in the study area. However, it is recommended that the experiment be repeated with inclusion of more varieties and densities to reach at more conclusive recommendation.

Keywords: Maize hybrids, PAN 53, plant density, SC 403, yield

28 1. INTRODUCTION

29 Maize is the third most important cereal crop after wheat and rice in the world in terms of area
30 and production [1]. In Eswatini, maize is the staple food and the most cultivated crop in the
31 country. It is mainly grown by farmers of rural households in the communal Swazi Nation Land
32 (SNL) and constitutes 95% of the country's cereal production. Yields vary among the four agro-
33 climatic zones in Eswatini, with the highest yields obtained in the Highveld (1.55-4.90 t/ha) and
34 moist Middleveld (1.21- 4.20 t/ha) [2]. However, the maize grain yield obtained in Eswatini is
35 very low as compared to the world average (5.75 t/ha) and southern Africa average (5.786 t/ha)
36 [3]. The major reasons for low yield of maize in Eswatini are: erratic rainfall associated with
37 climate variability, fall armyworm infestation, soil acidity and associated phosphorus deficiency,
38 and use of non-optimum agronomic practices.

39
40 Plant density is one of the most important cultural practices determining grain yield, as well as
41 other important agronomic attributes of maize. Plant density and arrangement of plants in a unit
42 area greatly determine resource utilization (such as light, nutrients and water), the rate and extent
43 of vegetative growth and development of crops, competitive ability of crops with weed, soil
44 surface evaporation, light interception, lodging and development of an optimum number of
45 fruiting sites in a crop canopy [4]. Moreover, grain yield of maize is more affected by variations
46 in plant population density than of other members of the grass family because of its low tailoring
47 ability [5; 6]. Hence, optimum plant density of maize will lead to effective utilization of soil
48 moisture, nutrients, and sunlight resulting in high yield [7].

49 However, the optimum plant population of maize depends on several factors such as fertility
50 status of the soil, soil moisture, varieties, and cultural practices [8]. For instance, Jones [9]
51 recommended higher densities up to 75,000 plants ha⁻¹ in humid or irrigated areas when
52 optimum production is required. On the other hand, Chinyere [10] reported that maize plant
53 population for maximum economic grain yield varied from 30,000 to 90,000 plants per ha.

54 Hybrids developed in recent years are able to withstand higher plant density levels than older
55 hybrids [11]. The ability of newer hybrids to tolerate increased crowding stress can be attributed
56 to lower lodging frequencies, higher N use efficiency [12], higher leaf photosynthesis rates, and
57 more efficient canopy photosynthesis and stomatal conductance during water stress [13]. These
58 variations in recommended density of maize with variations in soil type, climate and varieties,
59 indicate the need to develop location and variety specific recommendation of plant density.

60 However, in Eswatini, maize spacing recommendation of 44,444 plants ha⁻¹ (90 cm×25 cm) has
61 been used since long time [14], without taking into account the numerous morphological and
62 maturity differences that exist among newer maize hybrids as well as the existence of soil and
63 climatic differences.

64 Thus, the objectives of this study were to determine the effects of plant density on growth, yield
65 components and yield of maize hybrids; and to identify the plant density that maximises the
66 productivity of different maturity group maize hybrids in the Middleveld Agro-ecological zone
67 of Eswatini.

68

69 2. MATERIALS AND METHODS

70 2.1 Description of Study Area

71 The experiment was carried out at the University of Eswatini, Faculty of Agriculture at Luyengo.
72 Luyengo is located in Middleveld agro-ecology at 26.34° S and 31.12° E at an altitude of 750m
73 above sea level, and the mean annual temperature is 18°C and annual rainfall is between 800mm
74 to 1000mm. The soil type is an *Oxisol* of the Malkerns soil series.

75 2.2 Treatments and Experimental Design

76 The experiment consisted of factorial combinations of two varieties [SC 403 (early maturing)
77 and PAN 53 (medium maturing)] and three plant densities [44444 plants/ha (90 cm × 25 cm),
78 50000 plants/ha (80 cm×25 cm), 57143 plants/ha (70 cm × 25 cm)] in randomised complete
79 block design in three replications. The size of each plot was 4 rows × 0.9 m × 4 m (14.4 m²) for
80 90 cm row spacing, 4 rows × 0.8 m × 4 m (12.8 m²) for 80 cm row spacing, and 4 rows × 0.7 m
81 × 4 m (11.2 m²) for 70 cm row spacing.

82 2.3 Experimental Field Management

84 The experimental field was ploughed and disked to a fine tilth with tractor and the plots were
85 levelled manually. According to the design, a field layout was made and each treatment was
86 assigned randomly to the experimental units within a block. After seed beds were levelled, rows
87 were made and then maize varieties were planted at the rate of one seed per hill on the 22nd
88 November 2018. Compound fertiliser 2:3:2 (22), consisting of 6.3% N, 9.4% P and 6.3% K was
89 applied as basal dressing at the rate 300 kg/ha. Gap filling was done on the 8th of December
90 2018, a week after first emergence. Limestone ammonium nitrate (LAN) containing 28%
91 nitrogen was side dressed at the rate of 100 kg/ha to all treatments at knee height growth stage of
92 maize. Weeding was carried out manually as required.

93 2.4 Data Collected

94 Plant height, leaf area index and aboveground dry biomass were measured at three growth stages,
95 *i.e.* V6 (when the collar of the sixth leaf was visible), V12 (when the collar of the 12th leaf was
96 visible) and R5 (when cobs showed a dark red color) from randomly taken three plants per plot
97 using a 5m tape and the average of the three plants was recorded. Leaf area was determined by
98 measuring the length and maximum width of all the leaves in three plants per plot. Then the leaf
99 area per plant was calculated using the formula: leaf area = average leaf length × average leaf
100 width × 0.75 × average number of leaves per plant as described by Dwyer and Stewart [15].
101 Leaf area index was calculated using the ratio of leaf area per plant over ground area occupied by
102 the plant, *i.e.* 2250 cm² for 90 cm × 25 cm spacing, 2000 cm² for 80 cm × 25 cm spacing, and
103 1750 cm² for 70 cm × 25 cm spacing.

104 The aboveground dry biomass weight was determined from sample of three plants per plot after
105 oven drying to constant weight and the values were converted to t/ha. Days to 90% anthesis was
106 recorded as number of days from planting to the period when 90% of the plants in each plot
107 produced tassel with visual observation.

108 Number of cobs per plant was determined by dividing the number of cobs per plot by the number
109 plants per plot. Thousand kernels mass (g) was determined by weighting 1000 randomly taken
110 sun dried kernels from bulk of threshed kernels from each plot area and then the mass was
111 adjusted to 12.5% moisture level. The stover mass was determined by weighing the aboveground

112 biomass per plot area at harvest after sun drying for five days and it was expressed in t/ha. The
 113 grain yield (t/ha) was determined by weighed the grain yield using a sensitive balance after
 114 shelling the sundried aboveground biomass and the grain yield was adjusted to 12.5% moisture
 115 content. Finally, the harvest index was calculated as the ratio of grain yield to the total
 116 aboveground dry biomass yield per plot.

117

118 2.5 Data Analysis

119 Data collected were subjected to analysis of variance by using GenStat statistical software 18th
 120 edition [16]. The mean separation was made using the Least Significance Difference (LSD) test
 121 at 5% level of significance.

122

123 3. RESULTS

124 3.1 Leaf Area and Leaf Area index

125 There was no significant difference between the varieties in leaf area and leaf area index.
 126 However, medium maturing maize variety PAN 53 had higher leaf area and leaf area index at V6
 127 and V12 growth stages (Table 1). On the other hand, the effect of plant density was significant
 128 ($P < 0.05$) on the leaf area at V12 and R5 growth stages and on leaf area index at R5 growth stage.
 129 At all maize growth stages, the leaf areas were decreased while the leaf area indices were
 130 increased with increasing plant density from 44444 to 57143 plants/ha (Table 1). The interaction
 131 effects of varieties and plant density were not significant on leaf area and leaf area index of
 132 maize.

133

134 Table 1. Main effects of variety and plant density on leaf area per plant and leaf area index (LAI)
 135 of maize at different growth stages

Treatment	Leaf area at V6 (cm ²)	Leaf area at V12 (cm ²)	Leaf area at R5 (cm ²)	LAI at V6	LAI at V12	LAI at R5
Variety						
PAN 53	6924	7317	8195	3.49	3.67	4.11
SC 403	6656	6631	8382	3.33	3.32	4.22
LSD (0.05)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns
Plant density (ha ⁻¹)						
44444	7200	7593a	8898a	3.20	3.37	3.95b
50000	6818	7036ab	829ab	3.41	3.52	4.15a
57143	6353	6294b	7670b	3.63	3.60	4.38a
LSD (0.05)	ns	1087.6	668.1	ns	ns	0.35

136 *ns = non-significant at P = 0.05; Means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different to each*
 137 *other at P = 0.05 according to Least Significance Difference (LSD) test.*

138

139

140 3.2 Plant Height and Cob Height

141 Varieties showed significant ($P < 0.05$) difference in plant height at V12 growth stage, while the
 142 differences in plant height at V12 and R5 growth stages and cob height were not significant.
 143 Variety PAN 53 had higher plant height than variety SC 403 at all the growth stages and higher
 144 cob height (139.4 cm) (Table 2). The effect of plant density also was not significant on plant
 145 height at all the growth stages and on cob height. The plant height at V6 showed increasing trend
 146 with increasing plant density (Table 2). The interaction effects of variety and plant density were
 147 not significant on plant height and cob height of maize.

148
 149 Table 2. Main effects of variety and plant density on plant height and cob height of maize

150

Treatment	Plant height at V6 (cm)	Plant height at V12 (cm)	Plant height at R5 (cm)	Cob height (cm)
Variety				
PAN 53	52.44	238.1a	240.0	139.4
SC 403	50.33	227.1b	233.4	133.5
LSD (0.05)	ns	8.83	ns	ns
Plant density (ha^{-1})				
44444	50.00	231.1	238.3	140.3
50000	51.50	233.5	237.4	134.3
57143	52.67	233.2	234.5	134.8
LSD (0.05)	ns	ns	ns	ns

151 *ns = non-significant at $P = 0.05$; Means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different to each*
 152 *other at $P = 0.05$ according to Least Significance Difference (LSD) test.*

153

154 3.3 Days to 90% Anthesis and Dry biomass

155 Days to 90% anthesis was not significantly different between the varieties, but variety SC 403
 156 was earlier than variety PAN 53 by four days (Table 2). Though the difference was not
 157 significant, days to anthesis was decreased with increased plant density. On the other hand, there
 158 was significant ($P < 0.05$) difference between maize varieties in dry biomass at V12 and R5
 159 growth stages where variety PAN 53 produced higher biomass than variety SC 403 at all the
 160 three growth stages (Table 3). The effect of plant density was not significant on dry biomass, but
 161 the dry biomass showed decreasing trend as the plant density increased from 44444 to 57143
 162 plants/ha at V12 and R5 growth stages (Table 3). The interaction effects of variety and plant
 163 density were not significant on days to anthesis and dry biomass of maize.

164

165

166 Table 3. Main effects of variety and plant density on days to 90% anthesis and dry biomass of
167 maize

Treatment	Days to 90% anthesis	Dry biomass at V6 (t/ha)	Dry biomass at V12 (t/ha)	Dry biomass at R5 (t/ha)
Variety				
PAN 53	69.0	6.14	18.13a	37.0a
SC 403	65.0	5.92	15.86b	30.4b
LSD (0.05)	Ns	ns	2.07	4.80
Plant density (ha ⁻¹)				
44444	69.2	6.10	18.43	34.6
50000	67.5	6.72	17.14	33.4
57143	64.3	5.28	15.42	33.1
LSD (0.05)	ns	ns	ns	ns

168 *ns* = non-significant at $P = 0.05$; Means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different to each
169 other at $P = 0.05$ according to Least Significance Difference (LSD) test.

170

171 3.4 Yield Components and Yield

172 There was significant ($P < 0.05$) difference between the varieties for thousand kernels mass,
173 while there were no significant difference between the varieties on number of cobs per plant,
174 grain yield, Stover mass and harvest index. However, variety PAN 53 had higher grain yield
175 (43.1 t/ha), Stover mass (59.8 t/ha), and thousand kernels weight (374.0 g) while variety SC 403
176 had higher harvest index (0.464) (Table 4). The effect of plant density was not significant on
177 yield components and yield of maize, but number of cobs per plant, grain yield, Stover mass, and
178 thousand kernels mass (g) showed decreasing trend as the plant density increased from 44444 to
179 57143 plants per ha (Table 4). The interaction effects of variety and plant density were not
180 significant on the yield components and yield of maize.

181 Table 4. Main effects of variety and plant density on yield components and yield of maize

Treatment	No. of cobs per plant	1000 kernels mass (g)	Grain yield (t/ha)	Stover mass (t/ha)	Harvest index
Varieties					
PAN 53	1.040	374.0a	43.1	59.8	0.436
SC 403	1.040	335.7b	33.5	45.9	0.464
LSD (0.05)	ns	34.71	ns	ns	ns
Plant density (ha ⁻¹)					
44444	1.06	381.2	43.8	70.6	0.398
50000	1.03	347.8	39.1	52.1	0.471
57143	1.03	335.6	32.1	35.8	0.481
LSD (0.05)	ns	ns	ns	ns	ns

182 *ns* = non-significant at $P = 0.05$; Means in columns followed by different letters are significantly different to each
183 other at $P = 0.05$ according to Least Significance Difference (LSD) test.

184

185

186 4. DISCUSSION

187 4.1 Leaf Area and Leaf Area Index

188 Variety PAN 53 had higher leaf area and leaf area index at V6 and V12 growth stages (Table 1)
189 owing to genetic differences in number, length and width of leaves it produced. In line with this
190 result, Ahmad et al. [17] reported the highest leaf area index (5.82) from variety Pioneer-30D55,
191 while the lowest leaf area index (5.55) was obtained from variety pioneer-3012 and attributed
192 this to less number of leaves per plant and less leaf width.

193 At all maize growth stages, the leaf area were decreased while the leaf area indices were
194 increased with increasing plant density from 44444 to 57143 plants/ha (Table 1). The reduction
195 in leaf area with higher plant density might be due to high competition for assimilates at higher
196 plant density, hence less average leaf area per plant. Increasing plant density could reduce leaf
197 area due to the accelerated leaf senescence, increased shading of leaves, and reduced net
198 assimilation of individual plants. In agreement with this result, Sangakkara et al. [18] reported
199 that the leaf area per plant tended to decline with increasing plant density in maize. Similarly,
200 Imran *et al.* [19] reported that increasing plant density from 65000 to 95000 plants ha⁻¹ decreased
201 the leaf area per plant from 2585 cm² to 2316 cm² in maize linearly and significantly. On the
202 other hand, the increased LAI at higher plant density could be on account of more area occupied
203 by green canopy of plants per unit area. The general trend is that increasing plant density
204 increases leaf area index on account of more number of plants per unit area. Williams [20] also
205 reported that one of the ways of increasing leaf area index is to increase plant density. In line
206 with this result, Abuzar et al. [6] obtained LAI of 2.77 at plant population of 120,000 plants ha⁻¹
207 while the lowest LAI (1.21) was obtained with lower plant population density of 40,000 plants
208 ha⁻¹. Dinh et al. [21] also reported that increasing plant density from 57000 to 84000 plants ha⁻¹
209 increased the leaf area index from 3.52 to 4.67 in maize.

210

211 4.2 Plant Height and Cob Height

212 Variety PAN 53 had higher plant height and higher cob height (Table 2). The differences in plant
213 height and cob height observed between the varieties might be attributed to differences in genetic
214 characteristics of the individual varieties, including height of the varieties. In conformity with
215 this result, many authors [e.g, 22; 23; 24] reported significant plant height differences among
216 maize cultivars. For instance, Azam et al. [22] reported the tallest height (145 cm) for variety
217 Cargill 707 and the shortest height (134 cm) for variety Baber. Karasu [24] also reported
218 significant difference in ear height of maize cultivars where the highest ear height (144.1 cm)
219 was recorded from variety LG 2687 and the lowest ear height (131.5 cm) was obtained for
220 variety GH2547.

221

222 The plant height at V6 showed increasing trend with increasing plant density (Table 2). The
223 increase in plant height with the increase in plant density might be due to the increase in the
224 inter-plant competition for light and the disruption of the balance of growth regulators. The
225 decrease in light penetration into middle and lower layers of canopy decreases auxin
226 decomposition and thus, plant height increases. In consistence with this result, Zamir et al. [25]
227 reported that plant height was increased significantly from 209 cm to 221 cm as the plant
228 population increased from 55556 plants ha⁻¹ to 111111 plants ha⁻¹. Adeniyan [26] also reported

229 that when the plant density was increased from 53000 plant ha⁻¹ to 106 000 plant ha⁻¹, the plant
230 height was increased significantly from 137.6 cm to 210.8 cm, respectively.

231

232 **4.3 Days to 90% Anthesis and Dry biomass**

233 Variety SC 403 was earlier than variety PAN 53 (Table 2). This might be due to the genetic
234 variation among the varieties where early maturing varieties require less heat units to reach
235 anthesis while late maturing varieties exhibit extended vegetative period [27].

236 Days to anthesis was decreased with increased plant density. The earliest anthesis observed in
237 the highest plant density might be due to intra-specific competition for soil nutrients, water and
238 sunlight among the plants which ultimately triggers the plants to early reproductive phase. In
239 agreement with this result, Nwokwu [28] reported that the lowest plant density of 20,000 plants
240 ha⁻¹ took more days to tasseling (69.89) while the earliest tasseling (67.35 days) was observed in
241 the highest plant densities of 80,000 plant ha⁻¹. In contrast to this result, Tokatlis and Koutroubas
242 [29] reported that the time from planting to silking increased from 84 to 95 days as density of
243 maize increased from five to 20 plants m⁻². Similarly, Mohammad et al. [30] reported that with
244 increasing plant density from 57000 plant ha⁻¹ to 99000 plant ha⁻¹, the number of days to 50%
245 silking was delayed in four days.

246

247 Variety PAN 53 produced higher biomass than variety SC 403 at all the three growth stages
248 (Table 3). This result was expected as medium maturing variety PAN 53 had more leaf area and
249 height than early maturing variety SC 403 resulting in more photosynthesis to accumulate more
250 dry matter. In line with this result, Aziz et al. [31] obtained the highest aboveground dry biomass
251 yield (21.54 t ha⁻¹) for late maturing maize cultivar Ehsan, while the lowest aboveground dry
252 biomass yield (16.83 t ha⁻¹) was obtained from early maturing cultivar Pahari.

253

254 The dry biomass showed decreasing trend with increased plant density at V12 and R5 growth
255 stages (Table 3) possibly due to increased inter-plant competition for growth resources like light,
256 soil moisture and nutrients. Similarly, Asea et al. [32] revealed that plant populations that are
257 higher than the optimum will lead to competition among the maize plants resulting into thin
258 plants that will give low yield. In contrast to this result, Ayman and Samier [33] reported the
259 highest dry biomass of 28914 kg ha⁻¹ at the highest plant density of 57124 plants of ha⁻¹.

260

261 **4.4 Yield Components and Yield**

262 Variety PAN 53 had higher thousand kernels mass (374.0 g), higher grain yield (43.1 t/ha), and
263 higher stover mass (59.8 t/ha), while variety SC 403 had higher harvest index (0.464) (Table 4).
264 Thousand kernels weight is a major yield component that has an essential role in determining the
265 potential yield of variety [25]. Significantly higher thousand kernels mass for medium maturing
266 variety PAN 53 might indicate the more efficient conversion of solar radiation and other growth
267 resources into economic yield due to its long grain filling period. In line with this result,
268 Moraditochae et al. [34] reported that thousand kernels weight is a trait, which is more
269 dependent on the genetic characteristics of varieties, and it is less affected by environmental
270 factors. Similarly, Belay [35] obtained significantly higher thousand kernels weight (410.15 g)
271 for the late maturing maize variety BH-661 as compared to the medium maturing variety BH-
272 QPY-545 (288.6 g).

273 The higher stover yield and grain yield for variety PAN 53 could be due to its higher height and
274 leaf area as well as its late maturity which created a better chance to utilize more nutrients and
275 more photosynthetic activity, which ultimately resulted in higher biomass production and
276 partitioning to the grain yield. In conformity with this result, Belay [35] also reported the
277 maximum grain yield ($11.09 \text{ t}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}$) for late maturing maize variety BH-661 than medium
278 maturing maize variety BH-QPY-545 ($9.57 \text{ t}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}$).

279 Harvest index indicates the physiological efficiency of a plant for changing the total dry matter
280 into economic yield [36]. Higher harvest index (0.46) was recorded for early maturing maize
281 variety SC 403 than the medium maturing variety PAN 53 (0.43) (Table 4). The higher harvest
282 index for the early maturing maize variety could be due to lower leaf area index and plant height
283 that might have reduced the above-ground dry biomass yield. In agreement with this result, Iptas
284 and Acar [37] obtained higher harvest index (41.3%) for early maturing hybrid maize than the
285 mid (40.3%) and late (30.1%) maturities of maize hybrids. Belay [35] also reported the highest
286 harvest index (47%) for medium maturing variety BH-QPY-545 than for the late maturing maize
287 variety BH-661 (36%).

288 The number of cobs per plant, thousand kernels weight (g), grain yield and stover mass showed
289 decreasing trend as the plant density increased from 44444 to 57143 plants per ha (Table 4). The
290 use of high plant densities might have reduced the supply of photosynthates to the growing ear
291 thereby reducing the number of ears per plant. . Similarly, Abuzar et al. [6] reported that the
292 number of ears per plant increased with decreased plant population density where the maximum
293 number of ears plant^{-1} (1.33) was produced in plant density of 60,000 plants per whereas the
294 lowest number of ears per plant (1.0) was produced from plant density of 140,000 plants per
295 hectare. Zamir et al. [25] also reported that as the plant population increased from 55556 plants
296 ha^{-1} to 111111 plants ha^{-1} , the number of ears per plant was significantly reduced from 1.42 to
297 1.21 possibly due to more competition for light, aeration and nutrients and consequently enabling
298 the plants in closer spacing undergo less reproductive growth.

299 Lower grain weight in high plant density was possibly due to availability of less photosynthates
300 for grain development on account of high intra-specific competition which resulted in low rate of
301 photosynthesis and high rate of respiration as a result of enhanced mutual shading. In conformity
302 with this result, Ijaz et al. [38]; and Amin and Meyasam [39] reported that as the plant density
303 increased, 1000 grain weight was decreased linearly and significantly. Abuzar *et al.* [6] also
304 reported maximum 1000 kernels weight (350.0 g) at minimum plant density (80000 plants/ha)
305 and the minimum 1000 kernels weight (166.7 g) at the highest plant population (140,000
306 plants/ha). Similarly, Mohammad et al. [30] reported that increasing plant population from
307 45000 plants ha^{-1} to 65000 plants ha^{-1} decreased thousand kernels weight and maximum thousand
308 grain weight (315 g) was produced at planting density of 45000 plants ha^{-1} .

309
310 The reduction in stover and grain yields with increased plant density might be that plant
311 populations that are higher than the optimum will lead to competition among the maize plants.
312 This result was in agreement with the study by Abuzar et al. [6] who reported the maximum
313 grain yield ($2.6 \text{ t}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}$) from 60000 plants ha^{-1} and the lowest grain yield ($0.8 \text{ t}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}$) from 140000
314 plants ha^{-1} of maize. In contrast to this result, Raouf et al. [23] reported that grain yield of maize
315 was increased with increasing density from 80,000-120,000 plants per hectare from 3910 to 4650
316 $\text{kg}\cdot\text{ha}^{-1}$. Norwood [40] also reported that hybrid maize with higher population density of 60,000

317 plants ha⁻¹ gave higher yield (4.02 t ha⁻¹) than lower population density of 30,000 plants ha⁻¹
 318 (2.69 t ha⁻¹). These differences in response suggest that the optimum plant density depends upon
 319 environmental conditions and the cultivars used.

320

321 5. CONCLUSION

322

323 Medium maturing maize variety PAN 53 had higher leaf area, leaf area index, plant height, cob
 324 height, thousand kernels mass and grain yield than the early maturing variety SC 403. As the
 325 plant density increased from 44444 to 57143 plants/ha, leaf area, number of cobs per plant,
 326 thousand kernels mass and grain yield were decreased. Thus, it can be concluded that medium
 327 maturing variety PAN 53 be adopted while plant density of 44444 plants/ha is still the best
 328 option for maize farmers. It is therefore, recommended that PAN 53 at a density of 44444
 329 plants/ha be adopted by farmers of the Middleveld Agro-ecological zone of Eswatini. However,
 330 the experiment has to be repeated over years with the inclusion of more varieties and densities to
 331 make a more reliable recommendation.

332

333 REFERENCES

334

- 335 1. Ray DK, Ramankutty N, Mueller ND, West P C, Foley JA. Recent patterns of crop yield
 336 growth and stagnation. Nature communications. 2012; 3: 1293.
- 337 2. Sihlongonyane MB, Masuku MB, Belete A. Economic Efficiency of Maize Production in
 338 Swaziland: The Case of Hhohho, Manzini and Shiselweni Regions. Research in Applied
 339 Economics. 2014; 6(3):179-195.
- 340 3. FAOSTAT. Food and Agriculture Organization Statistics Data Base, Agricultural
 341 production indices. FAO, Rome, Italy; 2017.
- 342 4. Jettner R, Loss SP, Siddique KH and Martin LD. Responses of faba bean (*Vicia faba* L.)
 343 to sowing rate in south-western Australia. I. Seed yield and economic optimum plant
 344 density. Aust. J. Agric. Res. 1998; 49: 989-998.
- 345 5. Sangoi L, Graceietti MA, Rampazzo C, Bianchetti P. The response of Brazilian maize
 346 hybrids from different eras to changes in plant density. Field Crops Res. 2002; 79:39-51.
- 347 6. Abuzar MR, Sadozai GU, Baloch MS, Baloch A, Shah,IH, Javaid T, Hussain N. Effect of
 348 plant population densities on the yield of Maize. J. Anim. Plant Sci. 2011; 21: 692-695.
- 349 7. Liu W, Tollenaar AM. and Smith G. 2004. Within row plant spacing variability does not
 350 affect maize yield. Agron. J. 2004; 96: 275-280.
- 351 8. Argenta G, Silva PR, Sangoi L. Maize plant arrangement: analysis of the state of the art.
 352 Ciência Rural. 2001; 31(6), 1075-1084.
- 353 9. Jones JB. Agronomic handbook: Management of crops, soils and their fertility. CRC
 354 press; 2002
- 355 10. Chinyere P.. Plant Spacing, Dry Matter Accumulation and Yield of Local and Improved
 356 Maize Cultivars. International Journal of Agriculture and Environment. 2013; 1:15-26.
- 357 11. Kamara AY, Menkir A, Kureh I, Omoigui LO, Ekeleme F. 2006. Performance of old and
 358 new maize hybrids grown at high plant densities in the tropical Guinea savanna.
 359 Communications in Biometry and Crop Sci, 2006; 1(1), 41-48.

- 360 12. McCullough DE, Aguilera A, Tollenaar M. N uptake, N partitioning, and photosynthetic
361 N-use efficiency of an old and a new maize hybrid. *Canadian Journal of Plant Science*,
362 1994; 74(3):479-484.
- 363 13. Dwyer LM, Stewart DW, Tollenaar M. Changes in plant density dependence of leaf
364 photosynthesis of maize (*Zea mays* L.) hybrids, 1959 to 1988. *Canadian Journal of Plant*
365 *Science*. 1991; 71(1), 1-11.
- 366 14. Edje OT, Ossom EM. *Crop Science Handbook*. Blue Moon Printers, Manzini, Swaziland;
367 2016
- 368 15. Dwyer LM, Stewart DW. Leaf area development in field-grown maize. *Agronomy*
369 *Journal*. 1986; 78:334–343.
- 370 16. GENSTAT. *Genstat for Windows 18th Edition*. VSN International, Hemel Hempstead,
371 UK; 2015
- 372 17. Ahmad AM, Bukhsh HA, Ahmad R, Malik AU, Hussain S, Ishaque M. Agro-
373 physiological traits of three maize hybrids as influenced by varying plant density. *J.*
374 *Anim. Plant Sci*. 2010; 20: 34-39.
- 375 18. Sangakkara SF, Bandaranayake PS, Gajanayake JN and Stamp P. Plant populations and
376 yield of rainfed maize growth in wet and dry seasons of the tropics. *Maydica*. 2004; 49:
377 83-88.
- 378 19. Imran S, Arif M, Khan A, Shah W, Abdul L, Ali Khan M. Effect of nitrogen levels and
379 plant population on yield and yield components of maize. *Advanced Crop Science*
380 *Technology*. 2015; 3: 170.
- 381 20. Williams MM. Agronomics and economics of plant population density on processing
382 sweet corn. *Field Crops Research*. 2012; 128:55-61.
- 383 21. Dinh HG, Sarobol ED, Sutkhet N. Effect of plant density and nitrogen fertilizer rate on
384 growth, nitrogen use efficiency and grain yield of different maize hybrids under rainfed
385 conditions in Southern Vietnam. *Journal of Natural Science*. 2015; 49:1-12.
- 386 22. Azam S, Ali M, Amin M, Bibi Sarif M. Effect of plant population on maize hybrids. *J.*
387 *Agric. Biol. Sci*. 2007; 2: 14.
- 388 23. Raouf SS, Sedghi M Gholipouri A. Effect of population density on yield and yield
389 attributes of maize hybrids. *Research Journal of Biological Sciences*. 2009; 4(4):375-379.
- 390 24. Karasu A. Effect of Nitrogen levels on grain yield and some attributes of some hybrid
391 maize cultivars. *Bulgarian Journal of Agricultural Science*. 2012; 18: 42-48.
- 392 25. Zamir MSI, Ahmad AH, Javeed HMR and Latif T. Growth and yield behavior of two
393 maize hybrids (*Zea mays* L.) towards different plant spacing. *Cercetări Agronomice în*
394 *Moldova*. 2011; 146:33-40.
- 395 26. Adeniyani ON. 2014. Effect of different population densities and fertilizer rates on the
396 performance of different maize varieties in two rain forest agro ecosystems of South
397 West Nigeria. *African Journal of Plant Science*. 2014; 8(8):410-415.
- 398 27. Wang X, Chang J, Qin G, Zhang S, Cheng X, and Li C. Analysis on yield components of
399 elite maize variety Xundan 20 with super high yield potential. *African Journal for*
400 *Agriculture Research*. 2011; 24(6): 5490-5495.
- 401 28. Nwokwu GN. Response of Maize (*Zea mays* L) varieties to planting densities. *OSR*
402 *Journal of Agriculture and Veterinary Science*. 2016; 9 (10): 01-06.
- 403 29. Tokatlis IS, Koutroubas SD. A review of maize hybrids dependence on high plant
404 populations and its implications for crop yield stability. *Field Crops Research*. 2004;
405 49:119-126.

- 406 30. Mohammad S, Jehan B, Sajjad A, Hamayoon K, Mohammad AK, Mohammad, S. Effect
407 of planting density on phenology, growth and yield of maize. Pakistan. Journal of
408 Botany. 2012; 44(2): 691-696.
- 409 31. Aziz A, Hidayat UR, Najibullah, K. Maize cultivar response to population density and
410 planting date for grain and biomass yield. Sarhad J. Agric. 2007; 23:25-30.
- 411 32. Asea G, Serumaga J, Mduruma Z, Kimenye L, Odeke M. Quality protein maize
412 production and post-harvest handling handbook for east and central Africa: Association
413 for strengthening agricultural research in the east and central Africa, Entebbe, Uganda;
414 2014
- 415 33. Ayman HA, Samier KA. Maize productivity as affected by plant density and nitrogen
416 fertilizer. International Journal of Current Microbiology Applied Science. 2015; 4(6):
417 870-877.
- 418 34. Moraditochae M, Motamed MK, Azarpour E, Khosravi Danesh R. Effects of nitrogen
419 fertilizer and plant density management in corn farming. ARPN J of Agric. and Biol. Sci.
420 2012; 7: 133-137.
- 421 35. Belay MK. Effect of Inter and Intra Row Spacing on Growth, Yield Components and
422 Yield of Hybrid Maize (*Zea mays* L.) Varieties at Haramaya, Eastern Ethiopia. American
423 Journal of Plant Sciences. 2019; 10: 1548-1564.
- 424 36. Eskandarnejad S, Khorasan K, Bakhtiari S, Heidarian, RA. Effect of row spacing and
425 plant density on yield and yield components of Sweet corn (*Zea mays* L. *saccharata*)
426 varieties. Adv. Crop Sci. 2013; 3: 81-88.
- 427 37. Iptas S, Acar AA. 2006. Effects of Hybrid and Row Spacing on Maize Forage Yield and
428 Quality. Plant, Soil and Environment. 2006; 52: 515-522.
- 429 38. Ijaz M, Sammar Raza MA, Sajid A, Kamran G, Tauqeer AY, Muhammad S, Muhammad
430 N. Differential planting density influences growth and yield of hybrid maize. Journal of
431 Environmental and Agricultural Sciences, 2015; 2:3.
- 432 39. Amin F, Meysam M. Effect of plant density to yield and yield components of maize
433 cultivars. Bulletin of Environment, Pharmacology and Life Sciences. 2014; 3:123-127.
- 434 40. Norwood C. Dryland corn in western Kansas: effect of hybrid maturity, planting date and
435 plant population. Agronomy Journal. 2001; 93: 540-547
436