Weed population, nitrogen removal by weeds and crop yield under maize + blackgram intercropping system in Chhattisgarh plains

Sanjay K. Dwivedi, G. K. Shrivastava, A. P. Singh and S.S. Kolhe

Department of Agronomy, Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) E-mail : sanjay dwivedi2000@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The experiment consisted of five planting geometry *viz.*, sole maize, sole blackgram, maize + blackgram (1:1), maize + blackgram (2:1) and maize + blackgram (2:2) and four weed management practices *viz.*, weedy check, hand weeding (HW) at 30 DAS, alachlor 2.0 kg/ha as pre emergence (PRE) and alachlor 1.5 kg/ha as PRE + HW at 40 DAS. These treatments were evaluated under split plot design with three replications. At harvest of maize (105 DAS), weed population and nitrogen removals of all species of weeds were significantly highest under sole maize. However, the highest nitrogen removal by weeds was recorded under weedy check by all the weed species, while the lowest removal of nitrogen was in alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS. Among the planting geometry, the grain yield, productivity rating index (PRE), production efficiency (PE) and weed control efficiency of maize was highest under maize + blackgram (2:1) for maize, however weed smothering efficiency of maize was highest under maize + blackgram (1:1). The same parameters were highest under sole blackgram. At harvest stages of blackgram (75 DAS) and maize (105 DAS), dry weight of weeds was lowest with the application of alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS. This treatment produced maximum grain yield, PRI and PE of maize and blackgram, along with higher WCE.

Key words: Weed management, Maize, Blackgram, Intercropping

Weed management in intercropping system needs concentrated efforts to provide weed free environment to both the crop components. The development of wide spectrum herbicide in the recent past has opened up excellent opportunities for chemical weed control in component crops of differential nature growing in association with each other. The safe herbicide for an intercropping system would be the one option, which controls the weed flora effectively till the component crops develop their own canopy to combat weeds. Alachlor a broad spectrum herbicide could safely be used in different intercropping systems for controlling dicot and monocot weeds. Physical manipulations of the intercrop environment for weed control very closely resemble those used for sole crops. Many researchers have suggested competitive crop cover and high plant density to reduce weed growth (Altieri and Liebman 1986). Intercropping offers the possibility of a mixture of crops capturing a great share of available resources than in monocropping, preempting their use by weeds. Besides, intercropping also reduces weeding cost and realizes higher total productivity of the system and monetary return (Pandey and Prakash 2002). But this system alone is not sufficient to ensure adequate weed control because of varied canopy coverage by intercrops. Planting geometry, which modifies the crop canopy structure and micro-climate, in combination with weed management practices, may influence weed infestation to a great extent. Hence, an attempt was made to integrate manual and chemical weeding in addition to planting geometry.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Field experiments were conducted at Instructional Farm of Indira Gandhi Krishi Vishwavidyalaya, Raipur (Chhattisgarh) during kharif season of 2004 and 2005 under split plot design with three replications. The experiment consisted of five planting geometry viz., sole maize (45 cm), sole blackgram (30 cm), maize (45 cm) + blackgram (1:1), maize (30 cm) + blackgram (2:1) and maize (30 cm) + blackgram (2:2) and four weed management practices viz., weedy check, HW at 30 DAS, alachlor 2.0 kg/ha as pre emergence PRE and alachlor 1.5kg/ha as (PRE) + HW at 40 DAS. The experimental soil was Vertisols (typical fine montmorillonitic, hyperthermic, udic choromuster) with pH 7.2, EC 0.12 ds/m and available N, P and K of 216, 12.10 and 366 kg/ha, respectively. The application of fertilizer in sole maize was 100:60:40 kg N:P:K/ha, whereas in the case of sole blackgram, application of fertilizer was 20:40:20 kg N:P:K/ha. The composite maize 'Navjot' and blackgram 'TAU-2' was sown on 12th July, 2004 and 13th July, 2005 with the plot size 37.8 m². Alachlor was applied threough

Knapsack sprayer using flat-fan nozzle as per the treatment. The amount of herbicide and water (500 litre/ha) required was calculated on the basis of land area to be sprayed. Weedy plots remained infested with natural population of weeds till the harvesting of crops with root elongation. The blackgram was harvested on 4th to 7th October, 2005, wereas, maize was harvested on 17th to 22nd October 2004 and 21st to 25th October 2005. The total N content in weed (at harvest of crops) was determined by Kjeldhal method. The uptake of nitrogen by weeds at harvest of crops was calculated by multiplying the dry matter accumulation of weeds (kg ha⁻¹) at harvest with the respective percentage composition of nitrogen. Weed smothering efficiency (WSE) is the capacity of intercrop to suppress the weeds as compared to sole crop. It is calculated with the following formula and expressed in percentage.

$$WSE = \frac{DMS - DMI}{DMS} \times 100$$

Where, DMS: Dry matter of weeds of sole crop, DMI: Dry matter of weeds of inretrcrop and WSE: Weed smothering efficiency. The Productivity Rating Index (PRI) pertaining to maize crop was worked out with following formula to judge the performance of the treatments.

PRI (%) = $\frac{\text{treatment (t ha^{-1})}}{\text{Standard yield of the crop (t ha^{-1})}} \times 100$

The standard yield of maize was considered 2000 kg/ha. The standard yield of blackgram was considered 300 kg/ha.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Weeds population

Out of seven weed species, *Alternanthera sessilis* and *Cyperus rotundus* among sedges, *Cynodon dactylon* among grasses and in broad leaf weeds *Cynotis axillaries* were predominant weeds infesting the experimental field (Table 1). At 75 DAS of blackgram, weed population of different species were significantly higher under sole maize compared to other treatments during both the years (Table 2). Among planting geometry treatment, maize + blackgram (1:1) resulted in lowest weed density of *C. axillaries, C. dactylon,* and *C. rotundus,* whereas lowest population of *A. sessilis, Brachiaria ramosa* and other weeds was noted under sole blackgram. Here, it may be argued that blackgram reduced the population and dry

weight of weeds due to its smothering effect. The weed suppression due to smother of crop was about the same as that obtained with two HW. Rana and Pal (1989), Kurchania et al. (1995) and Dubey (1998) also reported similar findings. Alachlor 1.5 kg /ha + HW at 40 DAS effectively controlled weeds compared to other treatments during both the years. On the other hand, highest weed population was observed under weedy check over HW at 30 DAS, alachlor 2.0 kg/ha and alachlor 1.5 kg/ha+HW at 40 DAS. Application of alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS significantly controlled all the species of weeds over weedy check as well as HW at 30 DAS and alachlor 2.0 kg/ha. At 105 DAS of maize, weed population of all species of weeds were significantly highest under sole maize as compared to other treatments, during both the years (Table 3). Among the intercropping treatments, significantly the lowest weed population of all species were observed under maize + blackgram (1:1). Weed management practices had statistically significant effect on weed population during both the years. The lowest weed population of all species was registered under application of alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS in comparison to other treatments during both the years. Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS gave the best performance in controlling all the weed species over weedy check as well as HW at 30 DAS and alachlor 2.0 kg/ha.

Weed control efficiency

Highest weed dry matter production was observed under sole maize, which was significantly higher in comparison to other treatments, during both the years. As regards to weed management, alachlor 1.5 kg/ha+HW at 40 DAS had registered significantly lowest amount of dry matter production of all species of weeds, during both the years. At the same stage highest dry matter production was observed under weedy check treatment during both the years. It shows that the combine or integrated approach is more beneficial in controlling weeds than the HW or chemical approach alone (Chandel et al. 1995, Vairavan et al. 1997). WCE at 75 DAS for blackgram was highest under alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS (92 and 91%) followed by HW at 30 DAS treatment (75 and 76%) and alachlor 2.0 kg/ha (69 and 69%) during both the years (Fig.1). WCE at harvest of maize was significantly influenced by weed management, where all the weed management treatments resulted in increased WCE over the weedy check during both the years of the experimentation. The highest WCE was observed under alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS (86 and 83%) which was followed by alachlor 2.0 kg/ha (60 and 59%) and HW at 30 DAS (59 and 53%) during both the years (Fig. 1).

| Botanical Name | Common name | Family | Local name | Growth habit* |
|------------------------|-----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| Sedges | | | | |
| Cyperus rotundus | Purple nutsedge | Cyperaceae | Motha | P M Rs Rv |
| Alternanthera sessilis | Joyweed | Amaranthaceae | Resham kanta | A D Rs Rv |
| Grassy Weeds | | | | |
| Cynodon dactylon | Bermuda grass | Poaceae | Doob grass | P M Rs Rv |
| Brachiaria ramosa | Signal grass | Poaceae | Shipi | A M Rs Rv |
| Broad leaf weeds | | | | |
| Convolvulus arvensis | Field bindweed | Convolvulaceae | Hirankhuri | A D Rs Rv |
| Phyllanthus niruri | Niruri | Euphorbiaceae | Hazardana | A D Rs |
| Cynotis axillaries | Cyanotis grass | Commelinaceae | Kena | A D Rv Rs |

Table 1. In predominant weed flora in the experimental field

*A - Annual; P - Perennial; D - Dicot; M - Monocot, Rs - Reproducing by seeds; Rv - Reproducing by vegetative means

Weed smothering efficiency of maize

Weed smothering efficiency (WSE) at harvest of maize are presented Fig. 2. WSE was appreciably influenced by planting geometry at harvest of maize during both the years. The highest WSE was obtained under maize + blackgram (1:1) which was remarkably higher over maize + blackgram (2:2) and maize + blackgram (2:1) during both the years. This confirms the findings of Pandey and Prakash (2002).

Nitrogen removal by weeds

Different planting geometry appreciably influenced N removal by weeds during both the years. In general, the highest nitrogen removal by weeds was noted in sole maize, while lowest removal of nitrogen was registered under sole blackgram (Table 4). However, the lowest nitrogen removal by C. dactylon, C. axillaris and C. rotundus (first year only) was noted under maize + blackgram (1:1). The highest nitrogen removal by weeds was obtained under weedy check by all the weed species, while the lowest removal of nitrogen was noted under alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS. Nitrogen removal by all species of weed was influenced significantly due to planting geometry and weed management practices. In planting geometry, sole maize allowed the highest removal of nitrogen in all species of weeds viz. A. sessilis, C. axillaries, C. dactylon, B. ramosa, C. rotundus and other weeds over rest of the treatments, during both the years. In case of planting geometry, lowest removal of nitrogen by all species of weeds was noted under maize + blackgram (1:1) over other treatments (Table 4). Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS removed lower amount of nitrogen by all species of weeds in comparison to other treatments. The significantly higher amount of nitrogen removal was depicted under weedy check treatment with respect to all weed species. It may also be seen from the examination of Table 4 that uncontrolled weeds depleted 20.47 and 19.29 kg N/ha at 78 days stage for blackgram crop; 32.1 and 31.75 kg N/ha at 105 days stage of maize crop during 2004 and 2005, respectively in weedy check plots which was significantly higher than that of all other treatments. The least reduction in the uptake of these nutrients by the weeds was obtained in alachlor 1.5 kg/ha+HW at 40 DAS, which may attributed to the reduction in total density of weeds caused by treatment. Nutrient uptake by weeds at their active growth stage have also been reported by Muthuvel et al. (1988) and Ramamoorthy and Lakshmanachary (1997). Among the planting geometry maize + blackgram (2:1) found to be best in terms of maize yield and sole blackbgram in terms of blackgram yield. The application of alachlor 1.5 kg/ha +HW at 40 DAS, resulted in significantly highest grain yield of maize and blackgram (Dixit and Gautam 1996, Malai and Muthusankaranarayanan 1999).

Grain yield, productivity rating index (PRI) and production efficiency (PE)

Maize: In respect to planting geometry treatments, the grain yield, PRI and PE were significantly highest with the treatment of maize + blackgram (2:1) followed by maize + blackgram (1:1). However, it was the lowest under maize + blackgram (2:2). All the weed management practices recorded significantly higher values of grain yield, PRI and PE over weedy check during both the years. Application of alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS recorded significantly higher values over other weed management practices during both the years. (Table 5).

Blackgram: Under various treatment of planting geometry, the grain yield, PRI and PE were significantly highest under sole blackgram and the lowest was observed

| | | | | | lant populs | ation (/m²) c | of weeds a | t 75 DAS | | | | |
|---|---------------|--|----------------|----------------------|----------------------|--------------------|---------------------|-------------------|----------------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Treatment | Altern | anthera ilis | Cyn axil | votis laris | Cyr dae | odon tylon | Brac | chiaria nosa | Cyp rotu | erus ndus | 0ŧ | lers |
| | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 |
| Planting Geometry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P ₁ - Maize sole | 3.5 | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 3.1 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| | (14.5) | (11.2) | (8.6) | (9.4) | (5.3) | (6.2) | (8.7) | (10.0) | (5.1) | (4.4) | (6.4) | (6.4) |
| P ₂ - Blackgram sole | 2.7 | 2.5 | 2.6 | 2.7 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 1.7 | 1.8 | 1.8 |
| | (9.2) | (8.2) | (7.4) | (6.7) | (5.1) | (6.0) | (5.3) | (5.3) | (3.3) | (2.7) | (3.3) | (32) |
| P_3 - Maize + blackgram (1:1) | 3.1 | 2.9 | 2.2 | 2.2 | 1.8 | 1.8 | 2.3 | 2.4 | 1.6 | 1.6 3 2) | 1.9 | 1.9 2 5 |
| | (11.8) | (0.01) | (n.c) | (0.c) | (3.4) | (3.3) | (0.1) | (0.1) | (7.4) | (7.3) | (3.8) | (c.c) |
| P_4 - Maize + blackgram (2:1) | 3.3 | 3.3 | 2.5 2.5 | 2.6 | 5 0 7 10 | 2.2 | 2.5 | 2.6 3.9 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.3 2.3 | 2.3 |
| D Maira + blockmin ().) | (6.21) 0 C | (c.61) 0 C | (0.) 7.3 | (/.0) | (4./) | (1.c) 1.c | (1.1) | (?./) ? ? C | (4.3) | (4.1) 1 0 | (5.5) 1 c | (7.0) (7.0) |
| 15- IVIAIZU - UIAUNGLAIII (2.2) | (10.7) | (103) | (L 2) | (2) | (4 0) | (48) | 1 (4 7) | (6.9) | 0.7 (0 C) | (3 E) | (4 2) | (7 S) |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Weed Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| W ₁ - Weedy check | 5.7 | 5.6 | 3.9 | 4.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 4.3 | 4.2 | 2.9 | 2.7 | 3.4 | 3.4 |
| W ₂ - HW at 30 DAS | (34.0) 2.2 | (305) 2.2 | (14.7) 2.0 | (5.51) 2.0 2.0 | (12.5) 1.4 2.5 | (12.7) 1.6 | (18.1) 1.9 | (17.2) 2.3 | (8.0) 2.1 | (7.1) 5 0 (1) | (10.8) | (10.9) |
| W3 - Alachlor 2.0 kg/ha | (4.0) 2.6 | (4.4) 2.5 | (0.c) 2.8 | (0.c) 2.9 | (c.1) 9.1 | (57) 2.2 2.2 | (1.5) 2.4 2.5 | (1.c) 2.3 | (4.1) | (5.4) 1.7 | (1.9) | (1.8) 2.1 |
| W_4 – Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha+HW at 40 DAS | (6.3) | $\begin{array}{c} (0.0) \\ 1.6 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $ | (7.7) | (6.7) | (3.2) | (42) | (5.2) | (4.8) 1.4 0 | (7. 8) 0.6 0.6 | (2.4) 1.1 | (3.8) 1.6 | (4.0) |
| LSD (P=0.05) | (2.7) 0.1 | (2.0) 0.1 | $(1.2) \\ 0.1$ | (1.3) 0.1 | (0.8) 0.1 | $(1.1) \\ 0.1$ | (0.8) 0.1 | (c.1) 0.1 | (0.2) 0.1 | (0.7) | (2.0) 0.1 | (1.7) 0.1 |

Weed population, nitrogen removal by weeds and crop yield under maize + blackgram intercropping system in Chhattisgarh plains

Original values are given in parenthesis

| | | | | Pla | nt populati | on (m ²) of | weeds at | harvest | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Treatment | Altern ses | anthera silis | Cyr axil | 10tis Varis | Cync dact | nobo nobo | Brac] ran | hiaria 105a | Cyp | erus ndus | Oth | lers |
| | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 |
| Planting Geometry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| P ₁ - Maize sole | 4.4 | 4.1 | 3.3 | 3.4 | 2.7 | 2.8 | 4.6 | 4.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 2.6 | 2.6 |
| | (20.9) | (18.8) | (11.9) | (12.7) | (7.8) | (8.5) | (22.8) | (23.3) | (7.3) | (7.3) | (8.2) | (8.4) |
| P ₂ - Blackgram sole | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| D - Maiza +hladhmmun (1.1) | (0.0) 3.6 | (0.0) 3 0 | (0.0) 2.6 | (0.0) | (0.0) 2 1 | (0.0) 2 - C | (0.0) 3.6 | (0.0) 3.6 | (0.0) 1.6 | (0.0) 1.6 | (0.8) 2.5 | (0.8) 2.5 |
| 13 - IVIAIZO - UIAUNELAIII (1.1) | (14.0) | (15.6) | (7.2) | (2.5) | 4.6) | (5.0) | (14.0) | (13.8) | (2.2) | (2.1) | (9.5) | (6.7) |
| P ₄ - Maize +blackgram (2:1) | 4.0 | 4.2 | 3.1 | 3.2 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 2.4 | 2.5 | 2.9 | 2.9 |
| | (17.1) | (18.8) | (10.5) | (11.0) | (6.2) | (7.3) | (18.6) | (20.3) | (6.5) | (6.1) | (8.5) | (8.8) |
| P ₅ - Maize +blackgram (2:2) | 3.8 | 3.7 | 2.9 | 3.0 | 2.2 | 2.4 | 3.9 | 3.9 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 2.7 | 2.7 |
| | (15.6) | (15.0) | (8.8) | (9.3) | (5.2) | (6.4) | (16.4) | (16.3) | (5.9) | (5.2) | (7.5) | (1.6) |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 |
| Weed Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| W ₁ - Weedy check | 4.9 | 4.9 | 3.6 | 3.7 | 3.3 | 3.5 | 5.0 | 4.4 | 3.0 | 2.7 | 3.5 | 3.6 |
| | (27.7) | (28.2) | (15.0) | (15.8) | (12.5) | (13.7) | (24.5) | (22.9) | (10.5) | (8.2) | (13.8) | (14.6) |
| W ₂ - HW at 30 DAS | 3.1 | 3.1 | 2.2 2.3 | 2.3 , | 1.6 202 | 1.6 | 3.3 | 3.7 | 2.2 2.5 | 5.5 7 57 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| W Alachlor 2 0 koʻha | (C.01) 33 | (10.6) | (5.C) 0 C | (c.c) 0 % | 1 8 (77) | (0.7) 0 C | (12.4) 3.0 | (5.61) | (2.C) 1 4 | (4.8) 1 5 | (5.5) 2 .4) | (3.0) 2 2 2 |
| | (11.8) | (11.7) | (8.9) | (6.4) | (3.2) | (4.1) | (17.3) | (16.5) | (1.5) | (2.1) | (5.4) | (4.9) |
| W ₄ - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha+ HW at 40 DAS | 2.1 | 2.0 | 1.39 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 1.4 | 1.8 | 2.0 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| | (4.0) | (4.0) | (1.6) | (1.7) | (1.2) | (1.5) | (3.2) | (4.2) | (0.3) | (1.4) | (2.6) | (2.7) |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 |

Sanjay K. Dwivedi, G. K. Shrivastava, A. P. Singh and S.S. Kolhe

Original values are given in parenthesis

| Treatment Alternative Cypensis Brachiaria Cynoris Brachiaria Cynoris Guida 2004 2005 2004 <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th>Nit</th> <th>rogen rem</th> <th>oval at har</th> <th>vest (kg/ha</th> <th>•</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> | | | | | Nit | rogen rem | oval at har | vest (kg/ha | • | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|
| $ \begin{array}{l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l $ | Treatment | Alterna sessi | nthera lis | Cype rotur | erus Idus | Brach ram | iaria osa | Cyn axil | totis laris | Cyne daet | odon Vlon | ð | hers |
| Planting Geometry Prinding Geometry Pri-Maïze sole 48 3.6 0.8 0.7 1.2 1.4 0.4 0.6 0.6 2.3 Pri-Maïze sole 4.8 3.6 0.8 0.7 1.2 1.4 0.4 0.6 0.6 0.5 </th <th></th> <th>2004</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2004</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2004</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2004</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2004</th> <th>2005</th> <th>2004</th> <th>2005</th> | | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | Planting Geometry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | P ₁ -Maize sole | 4.8 | 3.6 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 2.3 | 2.4 |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | | (8.6) | (8.0) | (1.3) | (1.4) | (3.8) | (3.9) | (0.8) | (0.9) | (1.0) | (1.2) | (3.9) | (4.0) |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | P ₂ -Blackgram sole | 2.7 | 2.6 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 0.8 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 1.5 | 1.5 |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | | (-) | (-) | - | - | - | (-) | (-) | - | (-) | - | - | - |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | P_3 -Maize + blackgram (1:1) | 3.9 | 3.6 | 0.5 | 1.3 | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.7 | 1.7 |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | | (5.7) | (5.4) | (1.2) | (1.2) | (2.4) | (2.3) | (0.5) | (0.5) | (0.0) | (0.0) | (2.7) | (3.0) |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | P_4 -Maize + blackgram (2:1) | 4.2 | 4.4 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 2.2 |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | | (9.9) | (6.7) | (1.3) | (1.3) | (3.1) | (3.4) | (0.7) | (0.8) | (1.0) | (1.2) | (3.8) | (4.0) |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | P ₅ -Maize + blackgram (2:2) | 3.4 | 3.1 | 0.8 | 0.6 | 1.0 | 1.1 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 1.9 | 1.9 |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | | (5.9) | (6.0) | (1.4) | (1.1) | (2.9) | (2.9) | (0.6) | (0.7) | (0.0) | (1.1) | (3.7) | (3.7) |
| | LSD (P=0.05) | 1.1 | 1.1 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.1 | NS | 0.2 | 0.5 | 0.5 |
| Weed Management Wreed Management W_1 -Weedy check 9.8 9.2 1.7 1.4 2.7 2.5 0.8 0.7 1.4 1.3 4.2 W_2 -HW at 30 DAS 2.0 1.4.1) (14.0) (3.1) (2.4) (5.2) (4.8) (1.3) (1.4) (2.4) (2.6) (6.1) W_2 -HW at 30 DAS 2.0 1.6 0.7 0.5 0.7 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.7 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.3 0.7 0.3 0.3 0.7 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.7 0.3 0.3 0.4 0.4 2.0 0.7 0.3 0.7 0.3 0.7 0.3 0.7 0.3 0.7 0.3 0.7 0.3 0.7 0.3 | | (2.1) | (2.0) | (NS) | (NS) | (0.8) | (0.8) | (0.2) | (0.2) | (NS) | (NS) | (1.0) | (NS) |
| $ \begin{split} W_r - Weedy check & 9.8 & 9.2 & 1.7 & 1.4 & 2.7 & 2.5 & 0.8 & 0.7 & 1.4 & 1.3 & 4.2 \\ & 14.1) & (14.0) & (3.1) & (2.4) & (5.2) & (4.8) & (1.3) & (1.4) & (2.4) & (2.6) & (6.1) \\ & W_r - Wa at 30 DAS & 2.0 & 1.6 & 0.7 & 0.5 & 0.7 & 0.2 & 0.2 & 0.7 & 0.7 \\ & (5.4) & (5.1) & (1.5) & (1.6) & (2.6) & (3.2) & (0.5) & (0.4) & (0.7) & (2.3) \\ & W_s - Alachlor 2.0 kg/ha & + HW & 0.8 & 0.7 & 0.3 & 0.3 & 0.4 & 0.4 & 2.0 \\ & W_4 - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha & + HW & 0.8 & 0.7 & 0.1 & 0.7 & (0.7) & (0.7) & (0.7) & (0.7) & (3.7) \\ & W_4 - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha & + HW & 0.85 & 0.6 & 0.1 & 0.7 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\ & W_4 - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha & + HW & 0.85 & 0.6 & 0.1 & 0.7 & (0.7) & (0.7) & (0.7) & (0.7) & (0.7) & (0.7) & (0.7) \\ & W_4 - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha & + HW & 0.85 & 0.6 & 0.1 & 0.7 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\ & U_4 - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha & + HW & 0.85 & 0.6 & 0.1 & 0.7 & 0.1 & 0.2 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\ & W_4 - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha & + HW & 0.85 & 0.6 & 0.1 & 0.7 & 0.1 & 0.2 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 & 0.1 \\ & U_4 - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha & + HW & 0.85 & 0.6 & 0.1 & 0.7 & 0.1 & 0$ | Weed Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | W ₁ -Weedy check | 9.8 | 9.2 | 1.7 | 1.4 | 2.7 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 1.4 | 1.3 | 4.2 | 4.1 |
| W ₂ -HW at 30 DAS 2.0 1.6 0.7 0.5 0.7 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.1 (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (2.3) (0.7) (0.7) (0.7) (0.7) (0.7) (3.7) <td></td> <td>14.1)</td> <td>(14.0)</td> <td>(3.1)</td> <td>(2.4)</td> <td>(5.2)</td> <td>(4.8)</td> <td>(1.3)</td> <td>(1.4)</td> <td>(2.4)</td> <td>(2.6)</td> <td>(6.1)</td> <td>(6.4)</td> | | 14.1) | (14.0) | (3.1) | (2.4) | (5.2) | (4.8) | (1.3) | (1.4) | (2.4) | (2.6) | (6.1) | (6.4) |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | W ₂ -HW at 30 DAS | 2.0 | 1.6 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.5 | 0.7 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| $ \begin{array}{llllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$ | | (5.4) | (5.1) | (1.5) | (1.6) | (2.6) | (3.2) | (0.5) | (0.5) | (0.4) | (0.7) | (2.3) | (2.7) |
| $ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$ | W ₃ -Alachlor 2.0 kg/ha | 2.7 | 2.4 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| W4 - Alachlor1.5 kg/ha + HW 0.85 0.6 0.1 0.7 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.7 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.7 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.7 0.1 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 | | (5.1) | (5.0) | (0.5) | (0.6) | (3.7) | (3.5) | (0.7) | (0.7) | (0.6) | (0.7) | (3.7) | (3.4) |
| LSD (P=0.05) (2.3) (2.1) (0.1) (0.3) (0.7) (0.9) (0.2) (0.2) (0.4) (0.4) (1.9) (1.9) (1.9) (0.2) (0.4) (0.4) (1.9) (1.9) (1.6) (1.6) (1.6) (1.6) (0.3) (0.3) (0.3) (0.7) (0.7) (0.2) (0.2) (0.3) | W ₄ - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS | 0.85 | 0.6 | 0.1 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.7 | 0.8 |
| LSD (P=0.05) 0.9 0.9 0.2 0.2 0.3 0.24 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.1 0.4 (1.6) (1.6) (0.3) (0.3) (0.7) (0.7) (0.2) (0.2) (0.3) (0.3) (0.8) | | (2.3) | (2.1) | (0.1) | (0.3) | (0.7) | (6.0) | (0.2) | (0.2) | (0.4) | (0.4) | (1.9) | (2.1) |
| (1.6) (1.6) (0.3) (0.3) (0.7) (0.7) (0.2) (0.2) (0.3) (0.3) (0.8) | LSD (P=0.05) | 0.9 | 0.9 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.3 | 0.24 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.4 | 0.4 |
| | | (1.6) | (1.6) | (0.3) | (0.3) | (0.7) | (0.7) | (0.2) | (0.2) | (0.3) | (0.3) | (0.8) | (0.8) |

| | | | Μ | lize | | | | | Black | gram | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------|-------|-------|------|------|--------------|-----------------|-------|-------|------|------|
| Treatment | Grain (kg/ | ı yield /ha) | Id | RI | H | E | Graiı (kg | ı yield /ha) | Id | RI | F | E |
| | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 | 2004 | 2005 |
| Planting Geometry | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Maize sole | 2935 | 2142 | 146.8 | 107.1 | 28.8 | 20.8 | ı | I | I | ı | ı | ı |
| Blackgram sole | ı | ı | ı | ı | ı | ı | 633 | 665 | 211.2 | 221.9 | 8.1 | 8.5 |
| Maize + Blackgram (1:1) | 3080 | 2235 | 154.0 | 111.8 | 30.2 | 21.7 | 382 | 453 | 127.5 | 151.1 | 4.9 | 5.8 |
| Maize + Blackgram (2:1) | 3143 | 2311 | 157.2 | 115.6 | 30.8 | 22.4 | 190 | 329 | 63.4 | 109.8 | 2.4 | 4.2 |
| Maize + Blackgram (2:2) | 2356 | 1738 | 117.8 | 86.9 | 23.1 | 16.9 | 293 | 411 | 97.8 | 137.8 | 3.7 | 5.3 |
| LSD (P =0.05) | 163 | 152 | 8.2 | 7.7 | 1.6 | 1.5 | 31.5 | 43.4 | 14.8 | 21.9 | 0.6 | 0.8 |
| Weed Management | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Weedy check | 2117 | 1538 | 105.9 | 76.9 | 20.8 | 14.9 | 265 | 253 | 88.3 | 84.5 | 3.4 | 3.3 |
| HW at 30 DAS | 3096 | 2224 | 154.8 | 111.2 | 30.4 | 21.6 | 407 | 488 | 135.8 | 162.7 | 5.2 | 6.2 |
| Alachlor 2.0 kg/ha | 2931 | 2056 | 146.6 | 102.8 | 28.7 | 20.0 | 400 | 516 | 133.3 | 172.0 | 5.1 | 6.7 |
| Alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS | 3370 | 2608 | 168.5 | 130.5 | 33.1 | 25.3 | 427 | 602 | 142.4 | 200.8 | 5.4 | 7.7 |
| LSD (P=0.05) | 70 | 130 | 3.5 | 6.6 | 0.7 | 1.3 | 18.3 | 28.6 | 12.7 | 15.4 | 0.5 | 0.6 |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | |

PRI - Productivity rating index, PE - Production efficiency

209

Weed population, nitrogen removal by weeds and crop yield under maize + blackgram intercropping system in Chhattisgarh plains



W₂ - Hand weeding at 30 DAS W₃ - Alachlor 2.0 kg/ ha

W4 - Alachlor 1.5 kg/ ha+ HW at 40 DAS

Fig. 1. WCE (%) at 75 days of blackgram and at 105 DAS of maize as influenced by weed management in maize + blackgram intercropping system

under maize + blackgram (2:1). All weed management practices recorded significantly higher values of grain yield, PRI and PE over weedy check during both the year. Application of alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS recorded significantly higher values over rest of all weed management practices during both the years, however, during first year it was found to be at par to HW at 30 DAS and alachlor 2.0 kg/ha. Several workers also advocated about the integrated approach of weed management including chemical and mechanical methods for obtaining more net return and benefit : cost ratio (Satao *et al.* 1995, Krishnasamy and Krishnasamy 1996, Ramamoorthy *et al.* 1995 and Pandey *et al.* 2001).

Results of the present investigation suggest that, among the planting geometry maize + blackgram (2:1) found to be best in terms of maize yield and sole blackbgram in terms of blackgram yield. The application of alachlor 1.5 kg/ha + HW at 40 DAS, resulted in significantly highest grain yield, PRI, PE of maize and blackgram. The weed control efficiency was also higher in the same combination.

REFERENCES

- Altieri MA and Liebman M. 1986. Insect, weed and plant disease management in multiple cropping systems 183-217. In : *Multiple Cropping Systems*. (Ed. Fracis CA) Mcmillan Publishing Company, New York.
- Chandel AS, Saxena SC and Singh K. 1995. Intereted weed control and its economics in soybean (*Glycine max*) growth in Mollisols of Utter Pradesh. *Indian J. Agron.* **40**(2): 228-234.
- Dixit A and Gautam KC. 1996. Effect of atrazine on growth and yield of winter maize. *Ann. Agril. Res.* **17**(2): 121-124.
- Dubey MP. 1998. Growth, yield and economics of soybean (*Glycine max*) as influenced by weed control methods and row spacing. *Indian J. Agron.* **43**(3): 540-545.



P₃ - Maize + Blackgram (1:1)

P₄ - Maize + Blackgram (2:1)

P₅ - Maize + Blackgram (2:2)

Fig. 2. WSE efficiency (%) at 105 DAS of maize as influenced by planting geometry in maize + blackgram intercropping system

- Krishnasamy S and Krishnasamy R. 1996. Integrated weed management for the pre monsoon sown sorghum cowpea intercropping system under rainfed *Vertisols*. *Madras Agril. J.* 83 (5): 300-302.
- Kurchania SP, Tiwari JP, Bhalla CS and Paradkar NR. 1995. Weed control in soybean based intercropping. *The World Weeds*, 2 (3-4): 155-159.
- Malai AS and Muthusankaranarayanan A. 1999. Effect of intercropping and weed management practices on growth and yield of irrigated sorghum. *Madras Agril. J.* **86** (1-3): 43-45.
- Muthuvel P, Sivasamy R, Subramanian V, Udayasoorian C and Ramulu US. 1988. Sorghum yield and nutrient uptake under varying levels of N in a sorghum- blackgram intercropping system. *Madras Agril. J.* **75** (11-12): 405-408.
- Pandey AK and Prakash V. 2002. Weed management in maize and soybean intercropping system. *Indian J. Weed Sci.* 34 (182): 58-62.
- Pandey AK, Prakash V, Singh RD and Mani VP. 2001. Integrated weed management in maize (*Zea mays*). *Indian J. Agron.* 46(2): 260-265.
- Ramamoorthy K, Ramasamy M and Vairavan K. 1995. Chemical and cultural weed control in irrigated soybean (*Glycine max*). *Indian J. Agron.* **40** (1): 127-128.
- Ramamoorthy D and Lakshamanachary AS. 1997. The effect of different weedicides on the biochemical changes in blackgram (*Vigna mungo* (L.) *Hepper var* T.9). *Adv. Pl.. Sci.* **10** (2): 165-171.
- Rana KS. and Pal M. 1989. Effect of intercropping system and weed control on crop weed competition and grain yield of pigeonpea. *Crop Res.* 17 (2): 179-182.
- Satao RN, Nemade SU, Mankar DD and Solanke VM. 1995. Relative efficacy and economy of weed control methods in kharif sorghum. *PKVRes. J.* 19 (1): 77-78.
- Vairavan K, Ramaswamy M and Srinivasan K. 1997. Integrated weed management in pigeonpea + blackgram system. *Madras Agril. J.* 84 (2):77-78.