

## Influence of irrigation schedules based on IW:CPE ratios and herbicidal weed control in isabgul

**J.R. Parmar, M.V. Patel, J.J. Patel, A.B. Parmar and S.N. Shah**  
*Department of Agronomy, Anand Agricultural University, Anand (Gujarat)*  
*E-mail : janakagri@gmail.com*

### ABSTRACT

**Application of isoproturon was most effective for the control of all weeds, which resulted 99.32% weed control efficiency and 49.0% higher mean seed yield over unweeded control. The higher water use efficiency (WUE) (3.61 kg/ha mm) was observed under 0.4 IW:CPE ratio and higher net return (Rs/ha 28904) were obtained under the treatment combination (0.4 IW:CPE ratio and application of isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence). The interaction effect of irrigation schedule and herbicidal weed control practices was found non-significant in some cases.**

**Key words:** Isabgul, *Plantago ovata*, Blonde psyllium, Irrigation, IW:CPE ratio, Herbicide

Blonde psyllium is an important medicinal crop. Gujarat commands near monopoly in the production and export of isabgul seed and seed husk to the world market. It is cultivated in India in about 1.3 lakh hectares with production of 77000 MT seed (Desai and Devra 2008). India earns about 130 crores rupees from the isabgul seed and 150 crores rupees from husk by export. Isabgul is raised as a *rabi* crop and grown in all type of soil under irrigated conditions but it does best on loamy soils.

Water is scare commodity, which if used judiciously along with suitable agrotechniques would substantially increase both plant growth, yield and yield attributes. With the introduction of high yielding varieties coupled with increased use of fertilizers and irrigation, weed problem has increased manifolds. Application of irrigation in proper amount and in proper time will go a long way in arresting the problem created by weeds. The predominant method of weed control by mechanical hoeing and manual weeding is found to be laborious and time consuming besides scarcity of labour. Under these situations, the chemical control of weeds is found to be effective and economical. Proper herbicidal weed control and irrigation scheduling can enhance the productivity of isabgul. With these dual purpose agronomic aspects in mind, an attempt was made to conduct the present study.

A field experiment was conducted during winter seasons of 2006 at agronomy farm, B.A. College of Agriculture, Anand Agricultural University, Anand. The soil was sandy loam in texture and low in organic carbon and available potassium with pH7.8. The treatment consisted of four irrigation schedules based on IW:CPE ratios and four herbicidal weed control practices. The

experiment was laid out in split plot design having four replication with allocation of irrigation schedule in main plots and herbicidal weed control in sub-plots. Isoproturon and oxadiargyl were applied at 0.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence and post-emergence, respectively in 500 liter/ha of water. Isabgul variety *GI-2* was sown by broadcasting the seeds on November 15, 2006 at 4.0 kg seed /ha and fertilized with 30+15 kg NP/ha.

### Effect on weeds

The major weeds observed in the experimental field were *Chenopodium album* (32.1%), *Chenopodium murale* (18.8%), *Argimone mexicana* (8.0%), *Tribulus terrestris* (10.6%), *Cyperus rotundus* (14.0%). Other weeds with low density (16.5%) were *Eragrotis major*, *Dactyloctenium aegyptium*, *Eleusine indica*, *Phyllanthus niruri*, and *Cynodon dactylon*. Weed density at 15 DAS was not influenced by different irrigation schedules. Irrigation at 0.4 IW:CPE ratio accounted significantly lowest weeds while, significantly lower total weed count was noticed under irrigation schedule  $I_1$  (0.4 IW:CPE ratio) at 30 DAS. At 60 DAS both ( $I_4$ ) and ( $I_1$ ) contributed lower total weed counts. The irrigation schedule  $I_1$  (0.4 IW:CPE ratio) accounted significantly the lower number of dicot and total weed count at harvest, though the weed dry weight was not significantly influenced by the number of irrigations at 30 DAS and at harvest. At 60 DAS, significantly lower dry weight of weeds was observed with irrigation schedule  $I_1$  (0.4 IW:CPE ratio) and  $I_4$  (flood irrigation-one month interval between two irrigation), respectively. Isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha caused lower weed density and weed dry weight than oxadiaryl 0.5 kg/ha (Table 1).

**Table 1. Influence of irrigation schedules based on IW:CPE ratios and herbicidal weed control on weed counts and dry weight of weeds**

Treatment	Weed count (m <sup>2</sup> ) at 30 DAS			Weed count (m <sup>2</sup> ) at 60 DAS			Weed count (m <sup>2</sup> ) at harvest			Dry weight of weeds (m <sup>2</sup> ) at harvest		
	Monocot	Dicot	Total	Monocot	Dicot	Total	Monocot	Dicot	Total	30 DAS	60 DAS	at harvest
<b>Irrigation (I)</b>												
I <sub>1</sub> (0.4 IW:CPE ratio)	10.1 *(0.8)	104.7 (1.3)	114.8 (1.4)	8.8 (0.8)	67.8 (1.1)	76.0 (1.4)	9.8 (0.8)	74.0 (1.1)	83.8 (1.3)	2064.0 (2.1)	502.3 (1.7)	2993.6 (2.0)
I <sub>2</sub> (0.6 IW:CPE ratio)	14.9 (1.0)	160.1 (1.5)	174.9 (1.6)	13.0 (0.9)	135.0 (1.5)	147.9 (1.6)	9.9 (0.9)	158.5 (1.3)	168.3 (1.6)	3077.5 (2.2)	1345.3 (2.1)	4896.2 (2.1)
I <sub>3</sub> (0.8 IW:CPE ratio)	16.0 (1.0)	240.7 (1.5)	256.8 (1.7)	19.2 (1.0)	210.5 (1.8)	229.6 (1.8)	0.7 (0.9)	171.4 (1.4)	182.1 (1.6)	3732.8 (2.2)	1561.4 (2.1)	8950.7 (2.3)
I <sub>4</sub> (Flood irrigation one month interval between two irrigation)	14.0 (1.0)	145.2 (1.4)	159.2 (1.6)	10.0 (0.9)	203.9 (1.5)	213.8 (1.6)	9.6 (0.8)	100.3 (1.3)	109.9 (1.4)	2163.7 (2.1)	568.8 (1.8)	4646.6 (2.1)
LSD (P=0.05)	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.2	NS	0.1	0.1	NS	0.2	NS
<b>Herbicidal weed control (W)</b>												
W <sub>1</sub> (H.W. at 20 and 40 DAS)	0.0 *(0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)	0.0 (0.0)
W <sub>2</sub> (Unweeded control)	20.2 (1.3)	325.9 (2.0)	346.1 (2.5)	20.0 (1.3)	309.9 (2.4)	329.9 (2.4)	14.2 (1.2)	308.7 (2.5)	322.9 (2.5)	7883.2 (3.8)	2068.7 (3.2)	12052.3 (4.0)
W <sub>3</sub> (Isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as PE)	16.6 (1.2)	5.2 (0.8)	21.9 (1.3)	14.7 (1.2)	84.6 (1.1)	99.3 (1.6)	12.5 (1.1)	1.5 (0.4)	14.0 (1.1)	26.5 (1.4)	33.8 (1.5)	5.2 (0.8)
W <sub>4</sub> (Oxadiargyl 0.5 kg/ha as POE)	18.2 (1.3)	319.6 (2.4)	337.8 (2.4)	15.8 (1.2)	222.5 (2.3)	238.3 (2.4)	13.3 (1.1)	194.0 (2.3)	207.3 (2.3)	3128.4 (3.44)	1875.3 (3.1)	9429.6 (3.7)
LSD (P=0.05)	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	1.0	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2

\* This indicate transformed value (Logarithmic transformation), NS-Non- significant, PE- Pre-emergence, POE Post- emergence, Sig.- Significant

**Table 2. Influence of irrigation schedules based on IW:CPE ratios and herbicidal weed control on growth, yield and yield attributes characters of isabgul**

Treatment	Plant height (cm)		Total tillers per plant	Effective tillers per plant	Effective spikes per plant	Non-effective spikes per plant	Length of spikes (cm)	Test weight of 1000 seeds (g)	Seed yield (kg/ha)	Straw yield (kg/ha)	Harvest index (%)
	At tillering stage	At harvest									
<b>Irrigation (I)</b>											
I <sub>1</sub> (0.4 IW:CPE ratio)	39.1	40.5	18.5	18.9	27.9	1.1	4.1	1.77	762	3978	15.7
I <sub>2</sub> (0.6 IW:CPE ratio)	36.4	38.8	16.3	17.2	26.9	1.3	3.9	1.75	682	4042	13.8
I <sub>3</sub> (0.8 IW:CPE ratio)	40.1	41.3	15.9	16.8	27.1	1.4	3.5	1.75	573	4396	11.0
I <sub>4</sub> (Flood irrigation-one month interval between two irrigation)	38.8	38.4	16.7	18.0	26.8	1.3	3.7	1.77	730	3873	15.3
LSD (P=0.05)	2.06	1.4	NS	1.2	NS	NS	0.3	NS	93.5	268.2	1.2
<b>Herbicidal weed control (W)</b>											
W <sub>1</sub> (HW at 20 and 40 DAS)	40.0	41.2	17.3	17.7	28.7	1.3	3.9	1.8	879	4363	16.5
W <sub>2</sub> (Unweeded control)	35.2	37.4	15.6	16.2	24.7	1.3	3.5	1.7	347	2690	11.6
W <sub>3</sub> (Isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as PE)	41.0	42.2	18.2	19.5	28.8	1.2	4.1	1.8	1004	5250	16.0
W <sub>4</sub> (Oxadiargyl 0.5 kg/ha as POE)	38.2	38.2	16.3	17.4	26.4	1.3	3.7	1.8	517	3986	11.6
LSD (P=0.05)	1.2	0.9	1.3	0.9	2.1	0.1	0.2	0.0	54.2	259.2	1.1

PE- Pre-emergence, POE- Post-emergence, Sig- Significant

### Effect on crop

Irrigation schedules with 0.4 IW:CPE ratio and flood irrigation at one month interval between two irrigation significantly influenced the growth attributes of isabgul. Weight of 1000 seeds was found non-significant by irrigation schedule (Table 2). Herbicidal weed control practices significantly affected the yield attributes of isabgul. Maximum values of all the yield attributes were recorded under isoproturon application and minimum under unweeded control. Reduced crop-weed competition due to isoproturon created a favorable condition for better crop growth and development (Table 2). Seed yield, straw yield and harvest index of isabgul were influenced by irrigation schedules. Significantly higher seed yield, straw yield and harvest index were recorded when irrigations were done at 0.4 IW:CPE ratio. All the weed control treatments produced significantly higher seed and straw yield except unweeded control (Table 2). Higher harvest index was observed under hand weeding at 20 and 40 DAS followed by isoproturon at 0.5 ka/ha. Isoproturon at 0.5 ka/ha was most effective in reducing crop-weed competition and producing higher 1000 seeds weight and seed yield. The highest seed yield due to isoproturon in isabgul was also reported by Mehta *et al.* (1985), Patel *et al.* (1996), Parihar *et al.* (2001) and Patel and Mehta (1990).

Interaction effect between irrigation schedules and herbicidal weed control practices were found significant at all stages of weed counts except at 15 DAS. The non-

significant results were observed for dry weight of weeds at 30 DAS and at harvest but significant at 60 DAS. The plant height, total tillers per plant, length of spike, straw yield, seed yield and harvest index were influenced by irrigation schedules and herbicidal weed control treatments.

The highest consumptive use of water was observed under treatment I<sub>3</sub> (0.8 IW:CPE ratio) followed by treatment I<sub>2</sub> (0.6 IW:CPE ratio). The highest water use efficiency was recorded under treatment I<sub>1</sub> (0.4 IW:CPE ratio) followed by treatment I<sub>4</sub> (flood irrigation-one month interval between two irrigation). The maximum water expanse efficiency was noted under the I<sub>1</sub> (0.4 IW:CPE ratio) followed by I<sub>4</sub> (flood irrigation-one month interval between two irrigation).

Treatment W<sub>3</sub> (isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence) and W<sub>2</sub> (unweeded control) had registered higher consumptive use of water. The highest water use efficiency was observed under W<sub>1</sub> followed by W<sub>3</sub>. The highest water expanse efficiency (WEE) was observed under the treatment W<sub>3</sub> followed by W<sub>1</sub> (Table 3). Maximum water use efficiency (WUE) was observed under the treatment hand weeding at 20 and 40 DAS and isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence. This might be due to minimum transpiration loss of water through weeds. This was effectively controlled by isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence.

**Table 3. Consumptive use (CU), water use efficiency (WUE) and water expense efficiency (WEE) by isabgul crop as influenced by varying levels of irrigation and herbicidal weed control practices**

Treatment	CU (mm)	WUE (kg/ha/mm)	WEE (kg/ha/mm)
<b>Irrigation (I)</b>			
I <sub>1</sub> (0.4 IW:CPE ratio)	141.80	5.374	3.810
I <sub>2</sub> (0.6 IW:CPE ratio)	180.02	3.791	2.728
I <sub>3</sub> (0.8 IW:CPE ratio)	298.62	1.917	1.910
I <sub>4</sub> (Flood irrigation-one month interval between two irrigation)	142.70	5.113	3.650
<b>Herbicidal weed control (W)</b>			
W <sub>1</sub> (HW at 20 and 40 DAS)	142.70	6.157	3.701
W <sub>2</sub> (Unweeded control)	181.27	1.915	1.461
W <sub>3</sub> (Isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as PE)	278.40	3.670	4.227
W <sub>4</sub> (Oxadiargyl 0.5 kg/ha as POE)	140.90	3.606	2.177

PE- Pre-emergence, POE- Post-emergence

The treatment combination of I<sub>4</sub>W<sub>3</sub> (flood irrigation-one month interval between two irrigation and isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence) had given the highest net returns, incremental cost benefit ratio (ICBR) and net ICBR (29279, 1:46.14, 1:45.14), respectively. The second best treatment combination was I<sub>1</sub>W<sub>3</sub> (0.4 IW : CPE ratio and isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence) with net realization (28904), ICBR (1:45.42) and net ICBR (1:44.2)(Table 4).

Thus, from the point of view of productivity and economics, the isabgul crop should be irrigated either on the basis of 0.4 IW:CPE ratio or flood irrigation-one month irrigation between two irrigation to obtain higher yield and net returns. Maintaining a weed free plot with the application of isoproturon 0.5 kg/ha as pre-emergence should be preferred for Gujarat soil for achieving highest yield and remuneration.

**Table 4. Gross realization, net realization and incremental cost benefit ratio (ICBR) and net incremental cost benefit ratio for varying irrigation schedules and herbicidal weed control practices**

Treatment combinations	Seed yield (kg/ha)	Gross realization (Rs/ha)	Total cost of production (Rs/ha)	Net realization Rs/ha	ICBR	NET ICBR
I <sub>1</sub> W <sub>1</sub>	950	33237	7304	25933	1:19.43	1:18.43
I <sub>1</sub> W <sub>2</sub>	465	16275	6194	10081	1:E	1:E
I <sub>1</sub> W <sub>3</sub>	1018	35625	6721	28904	1:45.42	1:44.42
I <sub>1</sub> W <sub>4</sub>	616	21550	11836	9714	1:1.75	1:0.75
I <sub>2</sub> W <sub>1</sub>	915	32025	7581	24444	1:15.03	1:14.03
I <sub>2</sub> W <sub>2</sub>	328	11463	6471	4991	1:-Ve	1:-Ve
I <sub>2</sub> W <sub>3</sub>	1010	35341	6999	28343	1:30.68	1:29.68
I <sub>2</sub> W <sub>4</sub>	478	16713	12114	4599	1:0.86	1:-Ve
I <sub>3</sub> W <sub>1</sub>	678	23713	7859	15854	1:8.34	1:7.34
I <sub>3</sub> W <sub>2</sub>	262	9175	6749	2426	1:-Ve	1:-Ve
I <sub>3</sub> W <sub>3</sub>	959	33575	7276	26299	1:25.46	1:24.46
I <sub>3</sub> W <sub>4</sub>	391	13687	12391	1296	1:0.34	1:-Ve
I <sub>4</sub> W <sub>1</sub>	973	34038	7304	26734	1:20.15	1:19.15
I <sub>4</sub> W <sub>2</sub>	334	11675	6194	5481	-	-
I <sub>4</sub> W <sub>3</sub>	1029	36000	6721	29279	1:46.14	1:45.14
I <sub>4</sub> W <sub>4</sub>	584	20438	11836	8601	1:1.55	1:0.55

Selling price: Seeds @ Rs. 35.00/kg

## REFERENCES

- Desai NN and Devra BS. 2008. Processing and value edition in isabgul. *Krushivigyan*: 17-19
- Mehta HM, Trivedi GC and Patel HR. 1985. Study the efficacy of herbicides for weed control in isabgul (*Plantago ovata* Forsk). In: *Proceeding of Weed Science Conference*, Anand, Gujarat Agriculture University: 75.
- Parihar GN and Singh I. 2001. Weed management in blonde psyllium (*Plantago ovata* Forsk.). *Annals of Arid zone* 40 (4): 487-489.
- Patel BS, Sadaria SG and Patel JC. 1996. Influence of irrigation, Nitrogen and Phosphorus on yield, nutrient uptake and water use efficiency of blonde psyllium (*Plantago ovata*). *Indian Journal of Agronomy* 41(1): 136-139.
- Patel PH and Mehta HM 1990. Effect of irrigation timing and isoproturon application on weeds and yield of isabgul (*Plantago ovata* Forsk). *Research Journal of Gujarat Agriculture University* 15(2): 46-48.