

Table S1. Analysis of variance for all the study parameters to determine the effect of the study year.

Parameter	Degree of freedom			p-values		
	Year	Treatment	Year × Treatment	Year	Treatment	Year × Treatment
Weed density (m ⁻²)	2	9	18	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Weed biomass (g m ⁻²)	2	9	18	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Weed control (%)	2	8	16	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Number of fruits (per plant)	2	9	18	0.152	< 0.001	0.061
Tomato yield (kg per plant)	2	9	18	0.074	< 0.001	0.284
Yield gain (%)	2	8	16	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.972

The years, treatments and their interaction were the sources of variation. The p-values < 0.05 are significant.

Table S2. Analysis of variance for weed parameters for three years of the study.

Parameter	Degree of freedom	p-values		
		2019	2020	2021
Weed density (m ⁻²)	9	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Weed biomass (g m ⁻²)	9	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Weed control (%)	8	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

The only source of variation was the weed control treatment. The p-values < 0.05 are significant.

Table S3. Analysis of variance for number of tomatoes, tomato yield and yield gain (based on the pooled data of three years).

Parameter	Degree of freedom	p-values
Number of fruits (per plant)	9	< 0.001
Tomato yield (kg per plant)	9	< 0.001
Yield gain (%)	8	< 0.001

The only source of variation was the weed control treatment. The p-values < 0.05 are significant.