Low-input maize-based cropping systems implementing IWM match conventional maize monoculture’s productivity and weed control
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**Supplementary information Table 3: List of species observed at the flowering/seed formation stage or at the mature/disseminated seed stage during the weed biomass sampling at maize maturity in the four cropping systems (Maize-MSW: integrated maize rotation; MMConv: conventional maize monoculture; MMCT: conservation tillage maize monoculture; MMLI: low-input maize monoculture) from 2011 to 2015**
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\*Every crop of the MSW rotation was present every year, so 3 plots per block were dedicated to this cropping system